

## Editorial

PLATE XXIX

Three matters—Zimbabwe, the Greek horse in the Met, and the teaching of archaeology in British Universities—that have recently been discussed in Editorials and reviews in these pages have been the subject of interesting letters to the Editor, and we are happy to publish them as a contribution to further discussion.

P. S. Garlake writes on Zimbabwe in a long letter dated 31 May, which we were unable to include in the September number:

It looks as if views regarding the extent and nature of recent political influence, if any, on Rhodesian archaeologists working on Great Zimbabwe are becoming as heated and confused as opinion on the Ruins' origins once was. You dealt with the subject yourself in your editorial (1971, 177), and Professors Fagan and Shaw have discussed it in reviews (*Antiquity*, 1970, 176 and 1971, 180). I mentioned it in *Great Zimbabwe*, reviewed by Professor Fagan (*Antiquity*, 1973, 188) and you printed the response of Mr Cooke, Curator of Monuments in Rhodesia (1974, 83).

Three questions of fact should be clarified initially. First, has the present Rhodesian Government issued any instructions to archaeologists regarding their publications? Cooke denies it and speaks only of 'misrepresentation' caused by 'a loose statement' of no consequence, by an MP. He does not mention that the Minister of Internal Affairs immediately responded to this statement by expressing his agreement and saying that he had 'intimated to those concerned . . . that any information or brochure on the origins of Zimbabwe should indicate quite clearly that, as yet, no irrefutable evidence is available on the origins of the Ruins' (*Rhodesian Hansard*, 4 September 1969). A year later the Minister announced that the MP's remarks 'had

certainly borne fruit . . . a new guide book is being prepared on behalf of the Historical Monuments Commission in which all theories relating to Zimbabwe will be presented absolutely impartially' (*Rhodesian Hansard*, 4 September 1970). It appeared in 1971, edited by Cooke.

Secondly, has the Rhodesian Government hampered archaeological work? This is most easily demonstrated, for it is extensively covered by the local press, by the refusal of the Ministry of Internal Affairs to permit Professor J. R. Gray, Reader in African History in the University of London, first to visit Tribal Trust Lands, secondly, to visit archaeological sites of the Zimbabwe culture on a research trip with me, and, subsequently, to enter Rhodesia at all.

Thirdly, has archaeological material been censored in Rhodesia? I know of no evidence of this and have never myself claimed that it has occurred. Papers in learned journals or expensive technical books are certainly not seen as dangerous. The proportion of people in Rhodesia with access to them is minute. Popular pamphlets, guides and Museum displays are viewed differently. Rhodesia has an official Censorship Board with extensive powers, and in February 1968 a senior censor made it clear to me that, at Government instigation, the Board intended to use these powers to get Museum displays on Zimbabwe altered. Protests prevented this then, but the threat was renewed on at least one other occasion—in August 1969. At no stage has the Government denied that these threats took place or indicated that censorship of Museum displays and publications was no longer being considered.

However, Ministerial statements in Parliament, censorship and deportation, are blunt instruments, and public. More subtle political influence is possible and it is less susceptible to demonstration. I would only remark in this connexion that the Ministerial appointment in 1966 of a member of the ruling Rhodesian Front

Party Executive Council to the Historical Monuments Commission was a new departure. Political influence with archaeology must also be seen against a background in which the number of academics prohibited from conducting research in the Tribal Trust Lands, half the territory of Rhodesia, or deported from the University of Rhodesia, must now number several dozens.

Opinion naturally varies on whether this sort of interference is legitimate. Cooke seems to suggest that Government financial support carries with it at least some responsibility to write what is agreeable when he says, 'It must also be remembered that Garlake was paid by the Rhodesian Government; most of his papers published were paid for by it.' (Actually, only 4 of the 25 or more papers I published whilst in Rhodesia were subsidized by the Monuments Commission. But that is beside the point.) It may be held more widely that governments have a responsibility to support archaeological research which does not carry with it the right to say how the information recovered is interpreted.

Judgements will also differ on whether the conditions that exist in Rhodesia are tolerable to archaeologists in Museum or Commission employ (and there are no others). Certainly the situation has not been static. Protests, including those formerly made by Cooke, had some effect. I believe that the resignations of archaeologists, including that of Mr Summers, and some of the publicity these received, may also well have caused the Rhodesian Government to reconsider how it should implement its wishes.

The new Rhodesian official *Guide book to Zimbabwe*, mentioned with satisfaction by Cooke, seems symptomatic of current local attitudes. It certainly includes extracts from Summers, Caton Thompson, and MacIver (and the extract from a paper I wrote, as Cooke mentions); but it also includes, without comment, pieces on psychic experiences, radio perception, dowsing, ayanamsa values of tower heights, and Phoenician colonization. In the end three paragraphs are devoted to an evaluation of this. Though this *Guide* does not entirely comply with the Minister's instructions 'to indicate quite clearly that no irrefutable evidence is yet available on the origins of the Ruins', I think a case can be made for considering it unacceptable and even a little shaming, compared to the previous official guides. The whole preposterous situation can be illustrated if one imagines the Home Secretary or the Minister of the Environment instructing

Professor Atkinson's guide to Stonehenge to be replaced by one that gives the Wessex culture 'equal weight' with Mycenaeans, Druids, leys, trackways, signs of the Zodiac and Unidentified Flying Objects. I am sure British archaeologists would not accept such a publication without protests.

We have given Mr Garlake's thoughtful and thought-provoking letter prominence because it is of immediate urgency, and because it deals with two issues very close to our heart, namely the way in which politics and prejudice can bedevil the progress of prehistory, and indeed all archaeology, and also the insidious way in which what may be called the non-establishment approach to the past, with its manifold lunacies and cosy comforts of unreason, encroaches, year by year, on the straight, narrow, but difficult path of historical truth. We shall be interested to hear whether Professor Fagan, Mr Cooke, Professor Shaw and others have any further comments to make on the Zimbabwe affair; and we offer the Ministry of the Interior of Rhodesia the hospitality of these columns if they wish to make any comment.

☛ We turn from Zimbabwe to the Greek bronze horse in the Metropolitan Museum of New York purchased by them in 1923 and described by the late Gisela Richter, as 'without doubt, artistically the most important single object in our classical collection', but of which in 1967 Joseph V. Noble declared, 'It's famous, but it's a fraud.' We briefly discussed this very controversial issue earlier this year (*Antiquity*, 1974, 4-5); and quoted the words of Lewis S. Brown of the American Museum of Natural History, that the horse is 'one of the most noteworthy cases of fraud in the field of art that has come to light in recent years'. We have now received a letter dated 13 August 1974 from Kate C. Lefferts, a former Conservator in the Met, and Lawrence J. Majewski, Chairman of the Conservation Center of the New York University Institute of Fine Arts, in New York. This is what they wrote:

We read with interest your editorial on the Metropolitan Museum's small exhibition of the Greek bronze horse with the reasons for and

## EDITORIAL

against its authenticity. We have been intermittently engaged in examining the horse since a month after Mr Noble declared it a forgery, and were responsible for the part of the exhibition that explained the technology and materials involved in the creation of the horse. We understand that our scientific colleagues will question your position on the value of thermoluminescence analysis but there are one or two points that we would like to bring to your attention.

The first, in connexion with the TL dating, is that each exposure of x-ray or gamma rays that the core material received was carefully noted and, before carrying out the TL test, calculations had convinced us all, with the exception of Mr Noble, that the dose was such a small percentage of that used in this type of TL testing that its effect could be discounted.

Secondly, if the heat necessary for casting on the added hind leg had been sufficient to affect the core it would have erased the accumulated TL so that the analyses would have given a comparatively modern date.

But the most important point that we would like to make is that in our lengthy examination of the horse we have accumulated a great deal of information on the method of manufacture and the materials employed, all of which is consistent with ancient practice. In other words, there is no internal evidence that the horse is a forgery.

Many different experts have examined the horse with us and many specialists have carried out a particular type of analysis. We intend to publish a complete report and the organization of individual contributions is in progress. We regret that one type of analysis, the one dating technique employed, was published out of context.

The full detailed report will be published by the Met as soon as it is completed, and we shall have it reviewed here. Meanwhile, perhaps Mr Noble and Mr Lewis S. Brown are having second thoughts. If so, let us hear them.

¶ And now to the third letter which has nothing to do with politics and forgery (or non-forgery), but concerns the development of archaeological teaching in British universities. Professor Peter Shinnie, of the Department of Archaeology in the University of Calgary, writes in a letter dated 10 July 1974:

I am particularly interested that you reprinted and commented on the letter in *The Times* concerning the lack of teaching of Chinese Archaeology. I am entirely in support of the opinions expressed but would like to make the point that Chinese Archaeology is in better shape in Britain than is the teaching of African Archaeology. Of course, everybody wants to press for his own area of special interest but I consider that one appointment for the teaching of African Archaeology in British universities, and that one limited to West Africa, shows a complete lack of appreciation of the importance of the subject.

Whereas African Studies as a whole have had a dramatic development since about 1960 with a considerable number of new posts for such subjects as History, Economics and Political Science, virtually nothing has been done about Archaeology. A great deal of lip service has been paid by historians to the need for archaeological work to make the writing of African history possible, but this has resulted in no increase in the amount of work being done on African Archaeology of post-palaeolithic times. I know there are several Africanists holding posts in British universities but only one is appointed specifically for the teaching of the Archaeology of Africa in Iron Age times.

Professor Shinnie's letter is a very timely reminder that while the teaching of archaeology in British universities has developed in the most remarkable and satisfactory fashion in the last fifteen years, and is still developing, the emphasis has been on the archaeology of Britain, and Britain in the context of north-western Europe, or sometimes Europe as a whole. When we survey the university teaching scene in British archaeology we may draw comfort from the fact that the majority of our universities with pretensions to humanistic scholarship have teachers in archaeology, but we can draw no comfort from the fact that in Great Britain we have only one Professor of Chinese Archaeology, no Professor of Indian Archaeology, no Professor of African Archaeology, no Professor of American Archaeology, no Professor of Australasian and Pacific Archaeology, and no Professor of Historical Archaeology. We have, admittedly, four Chairs of Egyptology (the Oxford one is at present vacant and

'frozen') and four or five chairs of Roman and Romano-British antiquities. But all this is too much a hangover from Victorian times when archaeology meant prehistory, Roman Britain and Egypt. We must wake up and see that in the last quarter of the twentieth century our universities in Britain can provide not only teaching in the practice of archaeology, but the continuing results of that practice, not only in these islands but in the whole world. Professor Shinnie's letter is most pertinent. No one British university could or should attempt the whole programme of teaching archaeology from Olduvai to yesterday and from China to Peru. But between them the British universities, with a teaching tradition going back over a hundred and twenty years, should achieve the goal of making available to a student all aspects of archaeology. No other country in the world has the immediate chance of doing so: the United States of America comes nearest, but there we still have too much of the nineteenth-century tradition of archaeology linked to anthropology. This was pleasant and reasonable in the days of Tylor and Haddon and *Matériaux*: but now if we describe anthropology as the science of man comprising physical anthropology, ethnology, social anthropology and archaeology, we are merely paying lip-service to an historical concept. Social anthropology has moved away to sociology: it is the sociology of the allegedly primitive peoples and there is only a difference of kind between studying a village in Madhya Pradesh or the community of Middle Wallop. Archaeology can now separate itself from the subjects it grew up with and declare itself the study of the material remains of the human past, at all times in all places, and, as such, a vital and important part of historical science.

The one person referred to in Professor Shinnie's letter is Colin Flight, of the University of Birmingham, and here we warmly recommend to readers Philip Rahtz's article, 'Archaeology in the University of Birmingham', which appeared as long ago as the autumn 1970 number of *Alta: the University of Birmingham Review*. Alas, that, the eleventh number of this interesting and stimulating review, was also the

last. But, while they survive, back numbers can be obtained, price 15p postage paid, from *Alta*, 50 Edgbaston Park Road, Birmingham 15. In case you cannot get hold of this back number here are a few sentences from Rahtz's article: 'Archaeology is combined with Ancient History in a Department which aims to present a study of ancient societies on a broad basis; its courses are unique in this country and make other university archaeology departments seem more specialized in comparison. . . . Integration of Archaeology with Ancient History is considered by the Department to be an essential feature. . . . Medieval archaeology is also taught in the School of History; here it forms part of the teaching of history, as a supplement to written sources.' Rahtz sets out the staff in the University of Birmingham involved in teaching archaeology: a Professor and four lecturers in the Department of Ancient History and Archaeology, one Lecturer (Flight) in the Centre for West African Studies, one Lecturer (John Wilkes, now translated to the Chair in London formerly held by Donald Strong) in the Department of Latin, two Lecturers in the School of History (Rahtz himself for Medieval Archaeology and Bryer for Byzantine Archaeology), and four in the Department of Extra-Mural Studies. This is an impressive collection of thirteen people and Rahtz wonders whether they should not all be co-ordinated by a Board of Archaeological Studies.

📖 The French journal *Archéologia*, which began in December 1964, has now published 70 numbers and has changed from being a bi-monthly to a monthly. It has also started a new bi-monthly supplement, or additional journal, called *Les dossiers de l'Archéologie: document Archéologia*. We have already referred to the first of these, which was *L'Archéologie aérienne: vision fantastique du passé*; the second was *Les souterrains: une archéologie inédite*; the third *Paris: Foyer d'art au moyen-âge*; the fourth (May–June 1974) is called *Merveilleux trésors archéologiques du Portugal*, and the fifth (July–August 1974) is *Alexandre le grand*. Future issues promised deal with *Les potiers gaulois*, and *Dieux, cultes, et sanctuaires de la Gaule*.

## EDITORIAL

Louis Faton, the managing director, and Andrée Faton, the editor, are to be congratulated on this enterprise—they describe *Archéologia* as the most widely read archaeological journal in Europe. Its sales in France are astonishing and the envy of the publishers and editors of *Antiquity*, *Current Archaeology* and *World Archaeology*. The May–June number of the *Dossiers* contains an index of all articles published in the first 68 numbers. The Fatons have assembled a scientific advisory committee which includes Roger Agache, Lionel Balout, Raymond Chevalier, René Gandilhon, René Joffroy, Roland Martin, André Parrot and Gilbert Charles Picard, to mention a few out of a very distinguished list of French archaeologists, who provide an admirable guarantee of the authenticity and high purpose and scholarship of *Archéologia*. The Portugal dossier seems to us of especial value and contains, *inter alia*, a very valuable article by Joaquina Soares and Carlos Tavares da Silva entitled, ‘La poterie préhistorique’, which gives a clear summary of Portuguese prehistory from the Palaeolithic to the end of the Bronze Age. C14 determinations enable the authors to date the Portuguese megaliths from 4300 BC to 2500 BC, but they add, ‘Les datations par thermoluminescence, provisoires et non encore publiées, placent des phases anciennes du mégalithisme au Ve millénaire avant J-C.’ If indeed we now have a series of TL dates for Portuguese megaliths going back before 5000 BC, our new thinking about megalithic origins needs even further reconsideration.

Early in 1974, *Rescue*, the Trust for British Archaeology, produced a draft policy document on the possible future structure of archaeology in Britain: it was entitled ‘In search of history’. This document was forwarded for comment to the Council for British Archaeology and a joint working party of the two organizations was then set up to prepare a final version. The members of this party were Derek Allen (Chairman), Martin Biddle, Chairman of *Rescue*, Nicholas Thomas, President of the Council for British Archaeology, P. A. Barker, Rosemary Cramp, P. J. Fowler, M. G. Jarrett, Graham Webster,

John Williams, and the joint secretaries, Henry Cleere and Barri Jones. Their document has now been approved by the Committee and Council of *Rescue* and by the Executive Committee of the Council for British Archaeology. We had hoped to publish it in this issue in the belief that this thoughtful and timely document deserves the widest circulation in and outside Great Britain, but, alas, pressure on space forbids. Get your copy, now called *Archaeology and Government*, from the CBA.

Archaeologists in France, Belgium and Denmark, with whom we have discussed this paper, are also interested in proposals advanced by the Council for British Archaeology for a professional institution for archaeologists. Such a body, which might be called the British Archaeological Institution, would have progressive grades of membership such as Student, Associate, Member and Fellow, in ascending order; the establishment and maintenance of professional standards would be entrusted to an examination board, which would prepare syllabuses and examinations. These proposals are still under discussion, and if and when such an institution comes into existence, we will print full details.

When, in our March number, we were referring to the TL dating of the Greek horse in the Met (to which the letter by Kate Lefferts and Lawrence Majewski refers), we wrote: ‘Recently we have been told that TL dating of four tablets from Glozel, in two separate laboratories, has given a date of about 600 BC, and we will return to this problem in a later number. Hardly anyone has any doubt that most of the Glozel material was fabricated between 1924–7’ (*Antiquity*, 1974, 5). We now return to this fascinating problem, and publish in this issue an article by McKerrell, Mejdahl, François and Portal entitled ‘Thermoluminescence and Glozel’, which may make the statement ‘Hardly anyone’ a grave understatement. They describe thermoluminescence dates for at least two dozen objects from Glozel as falling in the bracket 700 BC to AD 100; they argue that Glozel is neither a modern forgery nor an

unusual neolithic site as Morlet and Reinach claimed, but an early iron age or Gallo-Roman site. Many of our readers may be immediately convinced by their data and arguments, as we know some French archaeologists are.

Perhaps there is need to remind some of our readers of the facts about Glozel. A clear and fair summary of the controversy is given by McKerrell *et al.* in their article. On 1 March 1924 Emile Fradin, then a young man of 17, working on his family farm 17 km. south-east of Vichy, stumbled—or rather his oxen stumbled—on a site which has become one of the most controversial issues in all archaeology—far more so than the Greek horse and the Euphronios vase. Crawford wrote in the second number of *Antiquity* an account of his visit to Glozel and concluded with these words, ‘the inscriptions, the engravings, and the majority of the other finds are forgeries, and those who believe in their authenticity have been the victims of a hoax’ (*Antiquity*, 1927, 187). He persuaded Vayson de Pradenne to write an article dealing with the whole affair and this appeared in the June number of *Antiquity* in 1930 (pp. 212–22). De Pradenne concluded with these words, ‘We are not so sanguine as to expect, of course, that Dr Morlet, M. Salomon Reinach and the little group of persons round them, will ever perceive their mistake. It matters little. In actual fact, whatever may be the verdict of the Law with regard to the forger, the Glozel affair has been shown up so thoroughly that *it will never more be a danger to science* (italics ours—Ed.). One must hope, also, that all the trouble it has created will not have been in vain, and that it will have taught a useful lesson.’

An International Commission set up in 1927 reported that all the finds from Glozel were not ancient. In January 1928 *The Times* published a letter from Sir Arthur Evans expressing his surprise that anyone could have been taken in by these forgeries, and later that month, Champion, technical assistant at St-Germain, reported that all the objects from Glozel that he had examined were fakes. ‘These triple blows have demolished Glozel’, wrote Crawford, ‘after a short but gay life it is dead. On the

field of battle lie the corpses of several learned reputations. . . . We shall not refer again to Glozel—unless greatly provoked’ (*Antiquity*, 1928, 5).

The great provocation is here in the form of TL dates, and it is because we feel these dates should be widely known and discussed that we publish the McKerrell *et al.* article and invite the views of anyone who can resolve this curious problem. At least Vayson de Pradenne has been proved wrong in one thing when he said that Glozel would ‘never more be a danger to science’. But to what science is it now a danger? To physics and thermoluminescent dating? or to the humanistic science of archaeology? One thing is certain: somebody is wrong. Either there is something unexplained about these TL dates, and all our scientific colleagues assure us that there cannot be anything wrong with the TL technique, or the many distinguished archaeologists from 1925 onwards who have pronounced the Glozel finds as palpable forgeries are wrong. And another thing is certain: the site of Glozel was never properly excavated. The grubblings around by Morlet and Fradin from 1924 onwards were unscientific hogging; neither had then, or at any other time in their lives, the faintest idea of stratigraphy and archaeological evidence from the ground. The 1927 International Commission spent only a very short time in actual excavation: it was a control process. The 1928 Comité d’Études had hardly anyone on it who had any experience of fieldwork. Salomon Reinach was taken to the site in an ox-cart and idly fumbled in the ground with his hand. PL. XXIX shows two views of the excavations being conducted by the 1928 Comité d’Études in April 1928. The top photograph is a general view of the uncontrolled, unrecorded work in hand: the two figures on the left looking at the camera are Dr A. Morlet (black hat) and the policeman Harry Söderman (grey fedora). The lower photograph shows Professor Audollent, a theologian from Clermont-Ferrand, clutching some roots which have either passed through or over some tablets. He gives an air of disagreeable surprise at having been caught in some dirt archaeology. His book *L’enigme de Glozel*

(Paris, 1927) shows that this learned biblical scholar hadn't the faintest notion what Glozel was all about, or what he thought he was doing there, trowel in hand. The truth is that the Glozelians, from Morlet and Fradin to Reinach and Audollent, thought archaeological excavation was akin to digging a flower bed.

We published several years ago Dorothy Garrod's reflexions on Glozel (*Antiquity*, 1968, 172-7), and an interview between ourselves and her, from which the paragraphs in *Antiquity* were taken, will be published in full on Television in a BBC *Chronicle* programme in December. She is now, alas, dead—how fascinating it would have been to revisit Glozel with her, the Mejdahl-McKerrell TL dates in our hands—but there still lives one member of that 1927 Commission: Professor Bosch-Gimpera. We invited him to write an account of his life in archaeology and hope to publish this in full in 1975, but we quote now his memories of Glozel:

At the time of the meeting of the Congress in Amsterdam the strange finds at Glozel near Vichy in France were very much in the news. I was appointed, at the behest of Count Begouen, to be a member of a Commission of 'neutral' archaeologists to investigate the finds. . . . At Vichy we of the commission stayed at the Hotel Majestic as the guests of the Syndicat d'Initiative. We were conducted to Glozel by Dr Morlet, a physician who believed that the site would be a great attraction for tourists. The find had been made by a certain Fradin, at whose family home we examined his collection of objects found in the neighbourhood. It was a most astonishing complex of things: 'palaeolithic' pebbles with engraved animals, fossilized bones, neolithic polished celts, and clay tablets with what appeared to be Phoenician signs in the style of Eshumazar of Sidon and other uninterpretable characters. Then we examined the excavations themselves in the terrain where the objects were supposed to have been found. The general public and journalists who had gathered were prevented from entering.

That evening at the hotel we discussed our impressions. The apparently genuine pebbles with engraved animals especially puzzled us. . . . We had already noted at the excavation one pebble in a suspect vertical position which

suggested that it had been introduced from above. Further evidence of such recent introductions was obtained by our own excavation. By cutting the terrain vertically, there appeared a pocket with a clay tablet on its bottom. The pocket was filled with soft disturbed earth, which did not show the strata of the soil into which the pocket had been dug. It was easy to see how the tablets had been introduced. Smaller objects apparently had been placed beneath the strata by driving a pole into the earth to the desired level and then dropping in a pebble, for example. In some cases the pebbles had remained in a vertical and unnatural position at the bottom of the pole hole. . . . Later, one of the tablets was analysed. The clay included fresh grains of corn and even a fly whose organic substance was still fresh. . . .

It is also said that Fradin was very disappointed with our report because it had spoiled his negotiations to sell the collection of finds to an American museum. Subsequently, the police made a search of his house where they found half finished objects of the type he planned to sell. The young man was a talented sketcher and painter. When his friend Dr Morlet had loaned him books with pictures of prehistoric objects for identification, and spoken vividly of the importance of finding a prehistoric site, he conceived the idea of imitating them. . . . Glozel was supposed to be palaeolithic after the find of the pebbles and some genuine fossil bones which Fradin must have bought in an antiquarian shop.

There is the voice of a man, a man of the greatest distinction as an archaeologist, a man who happily is still with us, who was present in Glozel in 1927.\* His testimony and that of Dorothy Garrod, and the report of the 1927 Commission, must be weighed in the balance against the McKerrell-Mejdahl-François-Portal paper. This paper is a major document in the resolution of L'Affaire Glozel and as we publish it we wonder if Crawford is turning restlessly in his grave. Was the 1927 anti-Glozelian Commission which said everything was a forgery entirely mistaken? Was the 1928 Glozelian Comité d'Études which said everything was genuine and neolithic equally mistaken? Now we seem to have three parties, not only the Glozelians and anti-Glozelians,

\*Alas, as we read these press pages (12 November) a letter from Mexico reports his death a few weeks ago.

but the La Tène/Gallo-Roman modified Glozelians of this paper. It is all fascinating. Is there a major conflict between TL dating and the views of archaeologists? Are there two sets of facts: those provided by physical science and those provided by students of the material remains of man? We are, editorially, at the moment, neutral, or, as the Production Editor reminds us, as neutral as ever a Welshman can be who has already written and lectured about Glozel as a classic case of forgery. Nonplussed is the word, not neutral. But what goes on? How can this strange dispute be resolved? In one way: by scientific excavation of Glozel. Here we warmly support the suggestion of the authors of the article, and are delighted to know that this may happen.

Glozel is no longer funny: it is no longer the lunatic fringe of archaeology. But at the end of the summer, as we write, the lunacy and fun still remain on the fringe of our subject.

 The search for Noah's ark goes on. Mr Tom Crotser, head of a small religious commune in the east Texas town of Frankston, believes that he and his followers can recover the original ten commandments and also relics of the Egyptian army wiped out in pursuing Moses through the Red Sea. Mr Crotser, with 63 members of his commune, left this summer for Turkey, to climb to the spot where, he says, the ark has been embedded in the ice for fifty centuries. His organization has already made several trips up Mount Ararat and returned with gopher wood which, he says, had been dated by C14 to between four and five thousand years ago. But were there no pots in the ark? Surely TL dating can help, confuse, or corroborate?

 But, alas, we cannot end on a cheerful note. As we go to press we have received a heart-rending letter from our colleague Dr Vassos Karageorghis of the Department of Antiquities,

Nicosia. We had been wondering, fearfully, what had been happening to archaeology in Cyprus during the sad events of the summer. This is what he writes (dated 20 August):

You are no doubt aware of the calamity which has fallen upon us within a period of one month. We have seen our hopes and dreams crumble to pieces and we are faced with a very gloomy future. The morale is very low and I really wonder if we are ever to stand on our feet again. I suppose we should be thankful, those of us who survived, of being still alive.

In all this turmoil archaeology has suffered considerably. We have lost some of our finest monuments. I mention Salamis and my heart is breaking. I still cannot realise that it is true.

But life must go on. When all the bitterness is forgotten we must start again. All civil servants have offered to work for seven days a week but this is not enough. The damages amount to several hundreds of millions of pounds. There are one hundred thousand homeless refugees. Naturally I wouldn't even dream of asking government to give me any money for Antiquities (restoration of damaged monuments, excavations etc.). For this purpose I am appealing to all friends of Cyprus and all my personal friends to help me if they can and with whatever sum they wish. I propose to create a 'Special Fund for the Antiquities of Cyprus'. By writing to you I would ask you to help in letting other people know of our needs. My ambition is to keep the standard of the Department of Antiquities to the height I have toiled to bring it during the last ten years or so. I feel confident that with the help of my friends I may succeed.

We commend this sincere and moving appeal to all our readers, and we hope that our major archaeological societies, and our trusts interested in archaeology, will support this special fund. Remember the address: *Dr Karageorghis, Department of Antiquities, Nicosia, Cyprus*, and remember that we in Britain have not been invaded since the eleventh century, and that we have not had a civil war for three hundred years.



PLATE XXIX: EDITORIAL  
*Excavations in progress at Glozel in 1928: see Editorial*

*See pp. 261-4*

*Photos: Roger Viollet, Paris*

