

Editorial

☞ If the first casualty of war is truth, the archaeological and historical heritage follows it swiftly into the clearing station. World War II saw the destruction of many precious and irreplaceable remains of the past. The 'Baedeker raids' deliberately launched by the Luftwaffe against the historic centres of English towns such as Bath, Canterbury, and Exeter were perhaps the only deliberate attempts to destroy monuments of the past, but much more was levelled as a by-product of armed conflict. Warsaw, Rotterdam, Lübeck, Rostock, Montecassino, Dresden – these names are all notorious, but the full list is formidable: thousands of medieval and Renaissance churches and other buildings, excavated sites such as Novgorod and Lepcis Magna, museums such as that which housed the Lake Nemi boats. And priceless archaeological relics also disappeared during the war: the most celebrated example is perhaps the skull of Peking man from Zhoukoudian, but archaeological textbooks are full of melancholy references to significant relics whose present whereabouts are unknown.

The recent Gulf War has highlighted the vulnerability of the heritage to the impact of modern total war. During the conflict there were frequent press reports of the stationing of military hardware close to major archaeological sites and of damage by aerial bombardment to important Islamic monuments, whilst it quickly became clear that the Kuwait Museum had been looted of all but its heaviest antiquities.

The end of the war revealed just how severe its impact on the archaeological heritage of Mesopotamia had been, though little of this has been made known to a wider public by the media. It has fallen to our distinguished contemporary *Archéologia* to report on the true extent of the damage. Following a survey of the archaeological riches of the war zone in its March 1991 issue, the journal sent a special envoy, Alain-Charles Lefevre, to Iraq last autumn, and his report, illustrated by some telling photographs, appeared in the December 1991 issue.

The great Al Hussain and Al Abbas mosques at Kerbala and the historic mosque of Ali at

Najaf were severely damaged, whilst the Al Maaqal mosque at Basra was almost completely destroyed. Bomb fragments gouged deep holes in the walls of the ziggurat at Ur, and the temple at Hatra (a World Heritage Monument) and the arch at Ctesiphon were also damaged. The Basra Museum was first damaged by bombing and then pillaged in the period of unrest that followed the end of hostilities.

Alain-Charles Lefevre has also reported for *Archéologia* on the depredations of the archaeological heritage of Lebanon following many years of civil war in that unhappy country. He showed that the great castle of Beaufort had suffered grievously from bombardment by virtue of its having been chosen by one of the warring factions as its headquarters, and that the World Heritage Monuments at Byblos and Baalbek had not escaped damage. Even more distressing is the fact that the archaeological sites that are so thick on the ground in Lebanon have become targets for looting on a scale unparalleled in recent years. Antiquities seem to have become the major export from Lebanon, encouraged by the multi-million-dollar black market in the remains of the past. The Druse leader, Walid Jumblatt, was reported as doing his best to retain some of this material in the country, by confiscation and purchase, but he acknowledged that he was not able to save more than a tithe of the material.

The story of looting of the archaeological heritage as a by-product of political instability and civil war is not confined to Lebanon. North Cyprus was an unhappy example until comparatively recently, when the administration established a strong Department of Antiquities, and the Sendero Luminoso terrorists in Perú have scant respect for the inviolability of the country's heritage. Similar stories have emerged from Cambodia and elsewhere in southeast Asia. The disintegration of Yugoslavia has brought in its train the shelling of the World Heritage Monuments in Dubrovnik and Split and vindictive attacks on both Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches in the region that is the scene of bitter fighting between Croats and Serbs.

The UNESCO Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954) is an admirable doctrinal document. It binds its States Party to the creation of special protection zones, which may be monuments, groups of monuments, or 'refuges intended to shelter movable cultural property in the event of armed conflict'. These may not be located near large industrial centres or important military objectives, nor may they be used for military purposes. States Party undertake to respect such designated zones, which must be identified by means of the 'distinctive emblem of the Convention,' to wit, 'a shield, pointed below, per saltire blue and white (a shield consisting of a royal-blue square, one of the angles of which forms the point of the shield, and a royal-blue triangle above the square, the space on either side being taken up by a white triangle)'. We have visited over a hundred monuments on the World Heritage List over the past two decades and cannot remember ever having seen this symbol displayed. We would, moreover, wager a modest fiver that there was no reference to it in the briefings given to allied pilots during the Gulf War (even supposing that the appropriate sites in Iraq were embellished with the symbol).

There seems to be little that can be done to resolve this sad state of affairs. *La guerre à outrance* makes no allowance for such niceties as respecting the heritage, whilst there is no rôle for international law when brother fights brother. Perhaps the distressing consequences of recent and continuing wars may concentrate official corporate thinking on the need at least to implement the provisions of the 1954 UNESCO Convention – and at the same time to combat the nauseous illicit trade in antiquities by giving teeth to that other UNESCO Convention of 1970 on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property.

❏ How many archaeologists could readily expand the acronym ICOMOS? And of the handful who are aware that it stands for the International Council on Monuments and Sites, how many could define what it does?

ICOMOS was founded in 1965 in Warsaw, as a vehicle for the promulgation of the Venice Charter of 1964, and claims to be the 'the only international non-governmental organization

that works to promote the application of theory, methodology and scientific techniques to the conservation of architectural heritage.' Its objectives are worth setting out in detail here:

- To bring together conservation specialists from all over the world and serve as a forum for professional dialogue and exchange;
- To collect, evaluate and diffuse information on conservation principles, techniques and policies;
- To cooperate with national and international authorities on the establishment of documentation centres specializing in conservation;
- To work for the adoption and implementation of international conventions on the conservation of architectural heritage;
- To participate in the organization of training programmes for conservation specialists on a worldwide scale;
- To put the expertise of highly qualified professionals and specialists at the service of the international community.

ICOMOS was created by architects and art historians, and until comparatively recently has been dominated by them. In the early 1980s, however, it became apparent that the interface between the architectural heritage and the archaeological heritage is an ill-defined one. In many countries, particularly in the Third World, no distinction is made between the protection of ancient monuments and that of historic buildings (*Bodendenkmalpflege* and *Denkmalpflege*, as our German colleagues so precisely term them). The Archaeological Survey of India, for example, is responsible for the management of the Taj Mahal as well as the largely ruined buildings of the Qutb Minar in Delhi, whilst the State Bureau of Cultural Relics in the People's Republic of China has an supervisory rôle in respect of the Great Wall, the Imperial Palace in Beijing, and the Neolithic site at Banpo. Nevertheless, ICOMOS chose to ignore the contribution of archaeologists in achieving its objectives: Andrew Saunders, late Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments, was the only archaeologist for many years to serve on its Executive Committee.

The UK National Committee of ICOMOS took the first steps in involving archaeologists in the work of the organization by means of a resolution that was adopted at the General Assembly in Rome in 1981. This called for the creation of an ICOMOS International Committee on what

eventually came to be called Archaeological Heritage Management. (The original proposal had been to adopt the US terminology, Cultural Resource Management, but this was rejected because *la gestion des ressources culturelles* was considered by francophones to be meaningless – and, indeed, it lacks precision in English.)

The campaign to create this Committee was a long one, fought in the face of determined opposition on the part of the entrenched architects and art historians of the ICOMOS establishment. The battle was finally won in 1986 and what quickly became known as ICAHM was set up under the chairmanship of Margareta Björnstad, the Swedish Riksantikvar. It held its first meeting during the 1st World Archaeological Congress at Southampton in 1986 and followed this with an International Symposium on 'Archaeology and society: Large scale rescue operations – their possibilities and problems' held in Stockholm in September 1988. The proceedings of the Stockholm Symposium, which was attended by over a hundred delegates from 37 countries, were published as ICAHM Report No. 1 in 1989.

However, the most significant result of the creation of ICAHM was the production of the Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage, which was ratified at the ICOMOS General Assembly in Lausanne in 1990. It is, perhaps, illustrative of the low esteem in which archaeologists have been held by ICOMOS that this seminal document has been given almost no publicity by the organization itself. The draft text was published in *British Archaeological News* in 1989, and copies of the definitive version were sent by the ICAHM Secretariat to the ICOMOS National Committees, but otherwise it has been one of the best-kept archaeological secrets of our time.

ANTIQUITY will be publishing the full text later this year, as part of a Special Section devoted to archaeological heritage management. In the meantime, however, what can archaeologists do to learn more about this organization and how they can take part in its activities? The first point of contact should be the relevant ICOMOS National Committee, where this exists. If you are uncertain whether there is one in your country, contact the headquarters of ICOMOS, Hôtel Saint-Aignan, 75 rue du Temple, F-75003 Paris; for the benefit of UK

archaeologists, the UK National Committee is at 10 Barley Mow Passage, London W4 4PH (telephone 081-994-6477).

And when you have discovered the address, join your National Committee, so that the archaeological view-point can be revealed to the conservation architects and architectural historians who will without doubt have held sway up to now. ICOMOS is still the only non-governmental organization working in this field, and it has considerable responsibility devolved down to it by UNESCO in various fields, notably that of the World Heritage Convention. Archaeologists will only have themselves to blame if they fail to grasp this opportunity to play a leading part in the conservation and management of the raw materials of their discipline.

🔗 International collaboration among archaeologists is very much the theme of the 1990s. With the full implementation of the Final European Act now virtually upon them, European archaeologists are now busily moving towards the creation of a European Association of Archaeologists. Archaeologists from nine European countries met in Paris in November to draw up the objectives and statutes for the proposed Association, and we hope to be able to give full details in the June issue of ANTIQUITY. Watch this space . . .

🔗 The ICAHM Charter provides the doctrinal basis for managing the archaeological heritage, but it cannot stand alone. Each country must set its own managerial and research agendas for implementation. Any study of heritage organizations around the world shows how little attention has been paid to the need for frameworks of this kind. The outstanding exception is English Heritage, which has recently published two fundamental documents that should serve as models for the rest of the world.

Until this organization was created in 1984, the venerable Ancient Monuments Inspectorate under its successive ministerial masters had carried out its work on an *ad hoc* basis. Protection was based on a combination of archaeological fashion, the relative effectiveness of period and regional pressure groups and the personal predilections of individual Inspectors. Rescue archaeology was financed on a reactive basis:

sites were dug 'because they were there' rather than in the context of a research-based agenda. Management of projects was loose, amateurish and, more often than not, wasteful. The whole process of archaeological heritage management was motivated by enthusiasm and commitment – and woefully lacking in direction, beyond the imperatives of available funding.

Since 1984 English Heritage has got its act together admirably. The first initiative, concerned with extending protection to a representative sample of monuments, was the Monuments Protection Programme, described in the November 1987 issue of *ANTIQUITY* (61: 393–408) and now moving steadily forwards. The Commission's Annual Report for 1990–1991 shows that scheduling is increasing after several years of standstill: 840 recommendations covering some 1200 monuments were prepared during the year under review, of which 425 were forwarded to the Department of the Environment. Of these, 320 were added to the schedule of ancient monuments and, more significantly, none was rejected.

Rescue archaeology has always been a major preoccupation of English Heritage: over £6 million was paid in grant-aid during 1990–1991. This in fact represents a fall of £1.4 million as compared with the previous year, but this is attributable to a considerable extent to the success of the Department's Planning Policy Guidance Note 16, *Archaeology and Planning*, which has diverted much of the burden of funding rescue archaeology in England from central government to developers.

The introduction of a policy of project funding for rescue archaeology by the Thatcher Government highlighted the need for better project management, and so English Heritage produced a document entitled *The management of archaeological projects* in 1989. This was roundly attacked by most of the English archaeological community, not least for its insistence on the validity of its concept of 'preservation by record,' which many archaeologists found (and still find) repugnant and contrary to the preservation ethic. As a result of this rebuff, and profiting from the appearance of PPG16 in 1990, English Heritage's Chief Archaeologist, Geoffrey Wainwright, and his colleagues have produced a revised and much improved second edition (1991).

The document works through the principles

of archaeological project management in the context of a large-scale excavation and its subsequent programme of post-excavation analysis and publication. It identifies five phases of a project: project planning; fieldwork; assessment of potential for analysis; analysis and report preparation; and dissemination. Each of these must have clearly defined objectives and must be appropriately resourced in terms of staff, equipment, time, and costs. Emphasis is laid on the need for regular review at each project stage, by means of sequential and phase-related project documentation. The core of the document is the third chapter, entitled 'A model for the management of archaeological projects'. It is refreshing to find that this conforms with the best current project management practice. It is a document that developers and the managers of construction and engineering projects will readily understand and it will go a long way towards convincing these necessarily hard-nosed individuals that archaeology is worthy of consideration as a basic element of their own project design and planning. Whilst it was produced in response to the policies of the present UK Government, it introduces an element of realism into the planning of archaeological projects that can only be beneficial in terms of proper resource management on any type of project. In Dr Wainwright's words, 'Formalising the management procedures which were previously implicit is fundamental to successful future archaeological endeavour and to the credibility of the profession'.

The other initiative taken by English Heritage was to create a research context within which decisions should be taken about the application of the necessarily limited funds for rescue archaeology. The Council for British Archaeology had been the first organization to recognize the need for guidelines of this kind, as early as 1983, when it published *Research objectives in British archaeology*, followed four years later by *Research priorities in archaeological science*. English Heritage carried out an extensive consultation exercise in the late 1980s, seeking views on research objectives and priorities from the period societies, CBA specialist committees and other special-interest groups, and the results were embodied in a draft document, *Developing frameworks*, which was then circulated for comment. To Dr Wainwright's manifest surprise and relief, a meeting held in London in October

1990 of representatives of all the bodies consulted was whole-hearted in its support for the draft, to which it suggested some constructive amendments. The definitive text has now been published under the title *Exploring our past: Strategies for the archaeology of England*.

The first half of the document is a review of archaeological funding in the 1980s, covering the whole gamut of operations – *in situ* preservation (covering *inter alia* sites and monuments records, planning and archaeology, the Monuments Protection Programme, survey, monuments management and historic buildings), rescue archaeology and the presentation of monuments – which is in itself a valuable *tour d'horizon*. The main thrust of the document lies, however, in the second part, 'Into the next decade'. Whilst much of it deals with the operational and management policies that English Heritage proposes to implement, nine crucial pages are devoted to academic objectives at both national and regional level.

The first category to be considered concerns processes of change, ranging from the Lower Palaeolithic to Post-Glacial transition to the Industrial Revolution. Much stress is rightly laid on settlement and land use, which is picked up again in the second category, landscape studies. This encourages the development of multi-period intensive investigations which combine systematic site prospection, excavation and environmental reconstruction, and may cover a single landscape type or spread over several. Upland landscapes threatened with afforestation, wetlands, the offshore submerged zone, alluvial and colluvial areas, ploughed landscapes and unploughed lowland are identified as specific areas where further research is needed. The priorities for urban archaeology, which has absorbed a major share of rescue archaeology funding over the past two decades, are two areas that have received scant attention over that period – the survey of historic towns to produce constraint maps and assessments of the surviving archaeological resource and studies of the origins and development of small towns and rural markets.

An innovation from the point of view of English Heritage is the archaeological study of buildings, the academic return from which is rightly adjudged to be high in terms of the contribution that it makes to economic, technological, social and cultural history. Church

archaeology continues to merit priority rating, including the archaeological study of parish churches, regional surveys of roofs, towers, and bell-frames, and reassessment and synthesis of reports on excavations of cemeteries. The last two categories are also relatively new in terms of the perceptions of government bodies. Industrial archaeology has been the object of much preservation effort, and now the compilation of a data-base capable of systematic interrogation is identified as a priority research objective. Allied to this is the nomination as the final category of 'patterns of industry and craftsmanship,' covering the sources, manufacture and distribution of stone artefacts, survey and excavation of mining sites, analysis of the contrast between urban and rural sites, further study of waste and process materials from industrial sites, and kindred themes.

The two English Heritage policy documents, taken together with PPG16 and projects such as the Monuments Protection Programme, must surely put archaeological heritage management on a firmer managerial and research footing in England than in any other country. This is not to discount the policies and publications of organizations such as the US National Park Service or the Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek (ROB) in The Netherlands. These notwithstanding, the integrated approach of English Heritage is in our experience the most effective that we have observed on our travels (apart, perhaps, from that of the former Deutsche Demokratische Republik, which is presumably a casualty of German reunification), and we are pleased to be able give it wider publicity outside the United Kingdom.

☞ Any effective heritage management programme has to be based upon a substantial data-base: you cannot decide what to protect unless you know what you have. Few countries are enlightened enough to follow the Danish example and provide legal protection for undiscovered prehistoric sites. Denmark, in fact, pioneered systematic survey and recording of archaeological sites as early as 1873, under the inspired leadership of J.J.A. Worsaae. The United Kingdom followed suit in 1908, when Royal Commissions on Ancient and Historical Monuments were established in England, Scotland and Wales. The original intention was that they should have completed their work within a

couple of decades, but the task of providing inventories of 'the ancient and historical monuments and constructions connected with the contemporary culture, civilisation and condition of life of the people . . . from the earliest times to the year 1714 . . .' proved to be an immense one which is still continuing. The range and complexity of the work of the Royal Commissions is admirably demonstrated by *The National Monuments Record: a guide to the archive*, recently published by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (available from the RCHME Publications Section, Newlands House, 37–40 Berners Street, London W1P 4BP, price £5.50).

Take the NMR's Southampton Office, for example. This houses the NAR-ONLINE computerized data-base of over 150,000 archaeological sites in Britain, which can be interrogated in a variety of ways and can provide outputs in several different formats. The London Office contains the fieldwork records of Royal Commission investigators, a library of photographs dating back to the 1860s, the records of some 1500 excavations on microfilm, the archives of notable archaeologists such as Thomas Bateman, Gerhard Bersu, Tony Brewster, Basil Brown, Lal Chitty, Kathleen Kenyon, H. St George Gray and J.P. Williams-Freeman, and much besides.

Swindon is home to the National Library of Air Photographs, probably the largest archaeological collection anywhere in the world. There are 600,000 oblique photographs and 3.5 million verticals, derived from the RCHME's own work, that of independent regional aerial archaeologists, and wartime and post-war coverage, the Ordnance Survey and commercial operators.

This is a priceless storehouse of archaeological information, and most archaeologists will be aware of the existence of at least parts of it. Now at last they can consult this long-overdue systematic guide to contents and make proper use of an unparalleled resource.

☪ The dust cloud that hung over London seems to have dispersed at last and we now know the shape of future archaeological provision in the capital as agreed between English Heritage and the Museum of London. The former Departments of Urban and of Greater London Archaeology have been abolished and

in their place there is to be a new Museum of London Archaeological Service (MOLAS), which will undertake assessments of the implications of redevelopment, excavation and publication, research projects, specialist services in environmental archaeology and finds research and non-statutory advice to developers and planning authorities. English Heritage has reserved for itself the rôles of maintaining the Greater London Sites and Monuments Record and of advising planning authorities and developers on their responsibilities under PPG16, and has taken on extra staff to provide these services. It is funding an assessment study of London's archaeology, with a view to setting priorities for preservation and excavation.

In a joint announcement about the new arrangements, English Heritage and the Museum of London congratulate themselves on having reached a position which 'provides a firm basis on which to build and develop in the years ahead', though they acknowledge that this was only achieved after 'a period of difficulty and uncertainty'. This is a remarkably anodyne description of what has happened over the past 18 months, with the dismantling of a well-established existing structure and the ejection of several hundred full-time archaeological workers into the ranks of the unemployed. By any standards the events of 1990 and 1991 were sensational, if not scandalous, and the behaviour of all the parties (including the archaeologists involved) left much to be desired. It is devoutly to be hoped that the new system, which was inspired to a large extent by a distasteful mixture of political doctrine, managerial incompetence and personal animosities, will justify the claims of its creators. London is one of the great historical capital cities of Europe, where much remains to be discovered but where unremitting commercial pressures threaten to eliminate the fugitive traces of the past. Past disputes and rivalries must be firmly consigned to oblivion in the interests of the archaeology of a city which has hitherto been deservedly praised for the effectiveness and dedication of its excavators and researchers.

We believe that the proposal made in a letter to *The Times* in November by a number of leading archaeological bodies, including the CBA, the Institute of Field Archaeologists, the Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers and the London Planning Advisory

Committee, for the establishment of a 'forum for strategic consideration by all interested parties of the problems which face London's archaeology' contains the key to the future. Only through the medium of such a body can the archaeology of London be assessed in a context that is broader than the Greater London area and its internal pressures and imperatives.

HENRY CLEERE

Noticeboard

Dr Geoffrey Wainwright, Chief Archaeologist at English Heritage, has been appointed a Visiting Professor in the Department of Archaeology at the University of Southampton.

Dr John Wilkins of the Department of Classics at the University of Exeter won the Cadbury Schweppes Prize for Innovation in the Teaching of History in the

1991 Partnership Awards for his course on 'Food in the ancient world'.

Appeals

UNESCO Director General Federico Mayor has launched a \$100 million appeal for Angkor Wat (Cambodia), in order to carry out restoration work, train staff and fund maintenance work, as well as recover material looted from the site during over 12 years of civil war.

A fine 14th-century medieval monastic hospice and a 15th-century hall house are being restored by the York Archaeological Trust. When the work is completed the buildings (to be known as Barley Hall in memory of Maurice Barley, former Chairman of the Trust who died last year) will house a re-creation of life in medieval York. The Trust is appealing for donations of multiples of £10, the cost of a single tile for roofing the buildings with replica medieval tiles.

a Tidy view of archaeology



"I'm sorry but it just looks like a hunting scene to me!"