

# The European Archaeologist

No 12 Winter 1999

## CONTENTS

Bournemouth to Bermuda: Reflections on the 1999 EAA Annual Conference <i>Bruce Morgan</i>	1
The Annual Business Meeting	
New Officers and Board Members	2
Changes to the Statutes	3
Reports from the Round Tables	
Education and Training	3
Professional Associations in Archaeology	5
Illicit Trade in Antiquities and Cultural Material	5
The Treasurer's Report <i>Cecilia Åqvist</i>	5
Lisbon in 2000	6
New Secretariat address	6
The European Heritage Prize	7
Standards of presentation at Bournemouth <i>John Collis</i>	7
The Editor's Corner	7
Diary	8

---

Published by the European Association of Archaeologists,  
c/o Riksantikvarieämbetet, Box 10259, S-434 23  
Kungsbacka, Sweden

Telephone + 46 300 33907  
Fax + 46 300 33901  
e-mail [petra.nordin@raa.se](mailto:petra.nordin@raa.se)

Editor Dr Henry Cleere  
Assistant Editor Petra Ottosson Nordin

Editorial contents © Named authors and the EAA

*The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent official EAA policy.*

**ISSN 1022-0135**

## Bournemouth to Bermuda: Reflections on the 1999 EAA Annual Conference

**Bruce Morgan**

*(Museum of London Archaeology Service  
– MoLAS)*

I do not know if there is a collective noun for archaeologists, but having attended the 5th Annual Conference of the European Association of Archaeologists at Bournemouth University on 14-19 September 1999 and met some of the 685 participants from 40 countries I feel that we certainly need to invent one. The best collective noun would probably be a *matrix of archaeologists*. With up to 16 simultaneous lecture sessions covering topics such as contract archaeology, fragmentation, heritage management, oil lamps, and shamanism there was definitely something for everyone at the Conference. It was very pleasing to see Russia and all the former Eastern Bloc countries well represented. What really impressed me, however, was that everyone lectured in English. I wonder how many of the English could have presented a lecture in the language of the host country if the conference had been held in Bergen or Berlin. The use of one language was the most graphic proof of globalization, which was the theme of the opening address.

My only criticism of the way the conference was organized was the way that all the lectures were crammed into three days. The first two days were entirely devoted to pre-conference meetings and the opening ceremony, while the final day was devoted to coach trips, offering participants the opportunity to visit Stonehenge and other archaeological monuments within Wessex. I think that the lecture programme should have been spread over four days.

From the limited number of lecture sessions I was able to attend it is impossible to provide a comprehensive view of the proceedings. Therefore I have decided to offer a personal impression of my first EAA Conference. My first impression is that excavation is undertaken by two separate 'tribes' of archaeologists. One tribe is the contract archaeologists, undertaking developer-funded rescue projects, whilst the other tribe is the university archaeologists, who undertake excavation as summer expeditions involving sandals and sun-block. Some of the elders in both tribes remember a third group, the public sector excavators, who have become extinct over the last ten years owing to the destruction of their habitat.

This new tribal grouping of excavators raises several issues which were recurring themes in many formal and informal discussions. The first issue was that of quality (conforming to specification) in

contract archaeology, which can create a conflict with the issue of costs, and this in turn leads on to the linked issues of pay and staff training (discussed later). The second issue which clearly vexes many people is the question of who are we undertaking rescue archaeology for. As a survivor from the public-sector tribe I remember when we excavated sites threatened by development or mineral extraction to save something of our archaeological heritage, which was then considered to be public property, so the tax payer funded our work. Now the same buried heritage appears to belong to the site developers, who are now expected to fund us to excavate threatened sites on the 'polluter pays principle'. Paradoxically the less public money goes into rescue archaeology, the greater is the public interest in our work.

In this bewildering world of customers and clients the key question is, who are we now undertaking archaeological excavations for? The tribe of contract archaeologists practise polytheism, their galaxy of gods includes consultants, clients/developers, permit-givers/regulators, other archaeologists and/or research aims, and occasionally the general public. The tribe of university archaeologists have a choice of only two gods - other archaeologists and a capricious hydra known as the grant-awarding bodies.

My second impression is that within the tribe of contract archaeologists there is a universal concern with the issue of professionalism. This is a term that requires precise definition, since being a professional archaeologist to some is simply having paid employment in this type of work. However, the dictionary definition of being a professional is more complex: it states that it is the 'type of work, such as being a doctor, that needs special training ... taking part in an activity, such as sport of music for money; very competent' (*Collins Gem English Dictionary*, 1991, 426). Taking this dictionary definition I would argue that contract field archaeology in the UK today is not a true profession: it is more like a game of snakes and ladders.

We cannot, in my opinion, compare ourselves with doctors or footballers because of our relatively poor rates of pay and indifferent levels of training. The median full-time archaeological salary in the UK is £15,905 or 83% of the national average industrial wage, while some contract field staff earn as little as 53% of the national average wage (Aitchison 1999, xi). As for archaeological training within the UK the current situation is far from ideal. 'The general picture is of a professional sector in which there is the beginnings of basic provision ... The emerging impression of patchy and in places, weak organisational provision compares with findings in other studies' (Chitty, 1999, 13). However, I do realize that many UK archaeologists have done a great deal over the last twenty years to try and put things on a more professional footing, but my feeling is that this achievement is not yet complete, so we should not become complacent.

My third impression is that I found it very heartening that the EAA provided such a great opportunity for the members of the two tribes from many different

nations to come together with the consultants and permit-givers and discover more about each other's work and research. This interchange of ideas and data is one of the aims of the EAA, as set out by the President in his thoughts on the future of European Archaeology (Willems 1999).

My final impression of the Conference is that archaeologists must start studying Europe's past systematically on an international basis and break free of the rigid constraints of developer-funded projects. When we study the Roman period, how many of us only focus on material from our own modern national state, paying scant attention to the rest of the Roman Empire? Now that we have sophisticated and affordable computer technology (GIS, data bases, etc), we have for the first time the means to efficiently analyse and collate the large amounts of data we have spent the last 100 years collecting. For instance, in the not too distant future it should be possible to look at European DNA by extracting samples from the teeth of existing skeletal assemblages and collate the results on a Europe-wide basis, so as to test theories of migrations and folk movements. Such a project would be one way of getting the two tribes of excavators and their various deities to co-operate in way that they have never done before. We could then explain to the public who their ancestors were and when they arrived in Europe. Some Europeans need to be reminded that we are all immigrants it is just a question of who arrived first or last.

#### REFERENCES.

- Aitchison, K 1999 *Profiling the Profession A survey of Archaeological Jobs in the UK*. CBA, English Heritage & IFA.
- Chitty, G 1999 *Training in Professional Archaeology: A Preliminary Review*. Hawkshead Archaeology & Conservation.
- Willems, W J H 1999 *The Future of European Archaeology*. Oxbow Lecture 3.

## The Annual Business Meeting

### *New Officers and Board members*

The results of the elections were announced at the Annual Business Meeting in Bournemouth on Saturday 18 September 1999. The activities of the EAA will be in the hands of the following members for the next twelve months (the names of those elected this year are shown in **bold**, as are the terms of office of re-elected members):

#### **Executive Board**

*President*  
Willem Willems (Netherlands) 1998-2000

*Secretary*  
Arkadiusz Marciniak (Poland) **1999-2002**

*Treasurer*

Cecilia Åqvist (Sweden) 1998-2001

*Vice-President*

Elisabeth Jerem (Hungary) **1999-2002**

*Board Members*

Françoise Audouze (France) 1997-2000

Ludmila Koryakova (Russia) 1997-2000

Felipe Criado Boado (Spain) 1998-2001

Elin Dalen (Norway) 1998-2001

**François Bertemes (Luxembourg) 1999-2002**

*Editorial Board**General Editor*

John Chapman (UK) 1995-2001

*Reviews Editor*

Peter Biehl (Germany) 1998-2001

*Board Members*

Natalia Venclova (Czech Republic) 1995-2001

Paul Wagner (Germany) 1995-2001

Kostas Kotsakis (Greece) **1999-2002**

Teresa Chapa Brunet (Spain) 1998-2001

**Predrag Novakovic (Slovenia) 1999-2002**

*Editor, The European Archaeologist*

Henry Cleere (UK) 1995-2001

*Nomination Committee*

Laszlo Bartosiewicz (Hungary) 1997-2000

Susana Oliveira Jorge (Portugal) 1998-2001

**Hilke Hennig (Germany) 1999-2002**

*Statutes Committee*

Henry Cleere (UK) 1998-2002

Maria Mouliou (Greece) 1998-2001

Martin Rundkvist (Sweden) 1998-2000

In welcoming the new members, the President expressed the gratitude of the Association to those members of the Executive Board whose terms of office had come to an end – Barry Raftery (Ireland) and Viktor Trifonov (Russia) – and to the co-opted member, Maurizio Tosi (Italy).

*Changes to the Statutes*

The following changes to the Statutes, which had been circulated in advance to all members, were approved:

**Article V:1 (revised)**

Full Membership is open to professional archaeologists in the following categories:

- a Regular (annual)
- b Family (annual)
- c Student (annual)
- d Retired (annual)

e Long-term (period to be determined by the Executive Board)

f Life

Both Students and Retired Members should be considered Full Members and have the right to vote for the candidates in the elections to the various Boards.

**Article V:2 (revised)**

Associate Membership is open to non-professionals.

**Article XI:2 (revised)**

The Association shall institute the European Archaeological Prize, to be awarded periodically to an individual, institution, or local or regional government for an outstanding contribution to the protection and presentation of the European archaeological heritage.

---

## Reports from the Round Tables

Round tables have become a regular and popular feature at EAA Conferences. This year in Bournemouth was no exception, and we shall be printing the reports of several of these in our next two issues.

*Education and Training***John Collis**

The principal area of discussion at Bournemouth was a series of new British initiatives which are likely to have a profound influence on the working practices of every archaeologist in Britain, and which could well have major implications throughout Europe as well. They follow on naturally from the round table on Standards, and are intimately linked with them. Two new committees have recently come into existence which are initiating these changes:

Gill Chitty described the *Archaeology Training Forum* (ATF), which was set up on the initiative of English Heritage, and consists of delegates representing national and local government, the Institute of Field Archaeologists, employers, universities, and other national archaeological bodies. Its remit is to look at the career structure in archaeology; the skills and standards required to carry out different types of job; the provision of training both for career development and for in-service training (Continuing Professional Development – CPD); initiating courses to provide that training; the funding to carry out the necessary training; and to ensure proper standards in training.

The second body is the *Professional Training Committee* (PTC) of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA). This is working closely with the ATF, in setting standards, and imposing them

both on individual archaeologists (through membership of the IFA) and on institutions (through registration with the IFA). For both there are Codes of Conduct. It will be setting up various sub-committees to deal with each of the specialist areas of archaeology, the first of which, the Higher Education Committee (HEC) will start work this autumn, looking at the provision of teaching in universities.

The reasons for these changes are due not only to a concern with standards, but also to a recognition that university training, which most archaeologists in Britain have, only lays a general foundation, and is not adequate for those entering the profession, especially as archaeology has tended to become more and more specialized (eg academics, museums, sites and monuments records (SMRs), commercial archaeology, scientific experts of various kinds, etc. Such specialist training can only be provided once students have entered the profession, and decided in which area they wish to specialize. In addition, archaeologists will at most only spend four to seven years studying, while their professional life can span up to forty years, at a time when ideas, technology, and the aims of archaeology are changing continuously. Feedback from the profession suggests that, despite the large number of students universities are producing, there is in fact a shortage in certain areas of skilled people, in part because younger workers become disillusioned with the lack of a career structure, and with poor pay and conditions, and so are leaving the profession after only a few years. CPD is obviously one of the solutions, and has government backing;

Bob Hook discussed how CPD was developing in his own organization, English Heritage, as an example of what can be done.

Though some stop-gap measures are being brought in (eg provision of training where there are obvious needs, especially at the point at which students enter the profession), the intention of both the ATF and the IFA is to look at the long term. To this end surveys have been started on the state of British archaeology. The first has been a survey simply to find out how many archaeologists there are, where they are, and who they are working for – it seems about 4600 in Britain (Aitchison 1999).

Secondly, we have tried to get a quick idea of what they consider their training needs to be (Chitty 1999), but this will be followed up by a more detailed survey later, which will also include employers' views. A survey is already under way on the provision of specialist services, and where shortages may exist, or may do so in the future.

The next major survey will be to find out in detail what archaeologists are actually doing in the various jobs (we have some 460 different titles, ranging from very detailed ones to simply 'the archaeologist'), and the skills, both specialist and generic, that are required to carry them out. In this way we will be able to define what is need for individual posts, map out career paths, and try to ensure the necessary training.

Clearly, much of this is peculiar to Britain, and our solutions depend on using the institutions which exist, and which are very different from those in other countries. However, some of our solutions may be of interest elsewhere, and can be adapted. We must also be looking at international collaboration, arranging for individuals to take part on courses which are provided in other countries, and also looking at where we need to be developing joint training projects, and sharing experiences.

Examples that were discussed included the training which the Dutch are providing for managers of large-scale projects, or the plans at Mont Beuvray in France for an international training scheme based on the Iron Age site of Bibracte. Ludmila Koryakova described her training school in Russia, which is attracting international participation, and Rafael Greenberg discussed the problems faced by Israeli archaeologists. Both emphasized the need for an international exchange of ideas.

It is interesting to note that our colleagues in North America are going through a similar process, though we have yet to exchange ideas. Information on initiatives by the Society for American Archaeology can be found on <http://www.saa.org/Education/Curriculum>. I shall be publishing a couple of papers in *Antiquity* discussing the situation in Britain, both in general and in the universities. Copies of the two studies (Aitchison 1999; Chitty 1999) so far produced under the aegis of the ATF can be obtained free of charge from David Stocker, English Heritage, 23 Savile Row, London W1X 1AB

#### *Bibliography*

Aitchison K. 1999. Profiling the profession: a survey of archaeological jobs and job profiles in the UK. London, Institute of Field Archaeologists/Council for British Archaeology/English Heritage.

Chitty G. 1999. Preliminary Review of Archaeology Training. London, Archaeology Training Forum, English Heritage.

#### *A proposal for the Lisbon 2000 Education and Training Round Table*

Leading on from our discussion this year, I suggest that at Lisbon we discuss the training of students and volunteers on excavations. We send our students out to excavations, but often get very little feedback on what they should have learnt, they actually learnt, or how they have performed. I remember one of our students who was thrown off an excavation when she rightly complained about the low standards of recording! More and more organizations are charging large sums to provide training – are they worth it? What are the basic administrative requirements (eg matters such as insurance, accommodation, etc)? What standards should we insist on? Who should provide advice about standards, and can and should they be imposed, and if so, how? I hope at the end we will come up with a code of conduct which those providing training will be happy to agree to and implement.

However, I am open to other ideas to discuss, so let me know. Also, I would welcome help in organizing these round tables – I was desperately short of time this year, and we have not fully implemented what was agreed at Gothenburg, such as setting up a discussion group on the Web.

John Collis  
Department of Archaeology and Prehistory  
West Street  
Sheffield S1 4ET  
UK

e-mail: j.r.collis@sheffield.ac.uk

### *Professional associations in archaeology*

**Roger Thomas** gave details of the Forum for Professional Associations in Archaeology, which is to be set up under the umbrella of the EAA. Its concern was the setting of standards for European archaeologists – “quality management by person, not process or product.”

It was set against the different circumstances obtaining in the countries of Europe, a growing international trade in services (the impact of 2001), and the need to be able measure the quality of archaeologists from different countries. Professional associations are needed to regulate the market, to support archaeologists taking an ethical stance, and to promote the status of archaeologists as professionals.

In setting standards for European archaeologists, the point of departure is a simple model. A competent archaeologist must subscribe to the EAA Code of Conduct and must have been validated as competent and ethical by one of Europe's professional associations (it should be emphasized that this must be a *real* test). Already certain associations such as the NVvA in The Netherlands and the IFA in the United Kingdom accept members from other countries and offer internationally recognized qualifications.

With the objective of promoting archaeological professionalism, the Forum will be established with one or two representatives from each existing or embryonic association. Its objectives will be to advise the EAA on the promotion and application of its Code, to advise national (and international?) professional associations, and to seek grants to support the work of professional associations. The IFA will provide an e-mail contact/distribution point on [admin.ifa@virgin.net](mailto:admin.ifa@virgin.net) ([www.archaeologists.net](http://www.archaeologists.net)).

### *Illicit trade in antiquities and cultural material*

**Staffan Lundén** reported that this round table urged all the European countries to ratify the two relevant international conventions – the 1970 UNESCO

*Convention on means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export, and transfer of ownership of cultural property* and the 1995 UNIDROIT *Convention on stolen or illegally exported cultural objects*. Members should write to their governments if they had not yet ratified one or both of these conventions, requesting statements of their respective positions. The subject would be debated again at the 6th Annual Conference in Lisbon in 2000.

---

## The Treasurer's Report

*Cecilia Åqvist*

*This is an abridged version of the full report delivered to members at the Annual Business Meeting.*

The financial situation of the EAA is not good. The estimated figures for the end of 1999 indicate that there will be a deficit of approximately £4200.

We shall try even harder to obtain substantial grants, which could provide long-term security for the EAA. The main objective is to invest the funds professionally, so that the EAA can make use of the dividends and interest, the capital being secured for the future.

The Executive and Editorial Boards and the Nomination Committee will take appropriate measures for the remainder of 1999 and in 2000 to limit expenditure. The number of meetings is being limited to two each year for the Executive Board and one for the Editorial Board and the Nomination Committee. Between meetings contact will be maintained by e-mail.

It has also been decided not to publish a yearbook in 1999. However, the information will be made available to all members either by e-mail or ordinary mail.

The most important reason for the unstable financial situation is probably the fact that the membership fees have not been increased in line with inflation; they have not been changed since 1993. Although inflation has been low in western Europe over the past two or three years, it is evident to all that all costs have gone up since 1993. Inflation has been estimated to have risen 5% between 1993 and 1997 and 2% since 1998.

In order to prepare a realistic balanced budget and to make good the losses due to inflation over the past six years, it was proposed that the membership fees should be increased. The table below shows the new fees, which were approved at the Annual Business Meeting in Bournemouth. Members have been divided into twelve categories. Members from Bulgaria, Romania, and the former Soviet Union remain at the same rate for the coming year. There

is a slight increase for members from other eastern/central European countries, since the financial situation in these countries has improved slightly. These increases will restore the EAA to a stable financial position, with a balanced budget based on subscription revenue and sales of back issues of the *Journal*.

	A	B	C
<i>Fees in Euro</i>			
Full	70	25	15
Student & Retired	45	20	15
Associate	85	28	20
Family	85	28	20
<i>Fees in pounds sterling (£)</i>			
Full	45	16	10
Student & Retired	29	13	10
Associate	54	18	13
Family	54	18	13

A = members in Western Europe;

B = members in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Yugoslavia;

C = members in Bulgaria, Romania, and the former USSR countries).

Members wishing to ask questions or to make suggestions for improvement are invited to contact the Treasurer by e-mail on [cecilia.aqvist@raa.se](mailto:cecilia.aqvist@raa.se).

## Lisbon in 2000

The Sixth Annual Conference is to be held in Lisbon (Portugal) on **10-17 September 2000**. The meeting is sponsored by the Instituto Português de Arqueologia (IPA) and the main sessions will take place in the Centro Cultural de Belém.

There will be optional two-day excursions on Sunday and Monday, 10 and 11 September, visiting either the prehistoric rock-art sites in the Côa Valley (a World Heritage site) or the Iron Age hillforts of northern Portugal. Tuesday 12 September is reserved for meetings of the EAA Boards and special interest groups.

The formal opening ceremony is on the following day, and this will be followed on 14-16 September by sessions and round tables. The Annual Business Meeting will be held on the afternoon of Saturday 16 September.

Finally, a number of optional half-day and full-day excursions will be available on Sunday 17 September, visiting important archaeological sites such as the ruins of the Roman towns of Mirobriga and Conimbriga, the World Heritage city of Évora, and the megalithic monuments of the Alentejo.

There will be the usual social programme, including the now traditional EAA party and the closing dinner.

Proposals for sessions, papers, and poster displays are welcomed. They should include the name(s) and contact details of the organizers and a short abstract (c 300 words). Where the names of individual speakers in sessions are known, these should be included.

The timetable is as follows:

January	Pre-registration deadline
February	2nd mailing, Provisional Programme I
April	2nd call for papers
May	3rd mailing, Provisional Programme II
July	Registration deadline, call for papers
August	4th mailing, Final Programme

The address for all correspondence is :

EAA 2000 Meeting Secretariat  
 Instituto Português de Arqueologia  
 Avenida de Índia 136  
 1300-300 Lisboa  
 Portugal

Telephone + 351 (0) 21 361 65 00

Fax + 351 (0) 21 361 65 59

e-mail [eea2000@ipa.min-cultura.pt](mailto:eea2000@ipa.min-cultura.pt)

## New Secretariat address

It came as a terrible blow to the Association when in mid-June Natasha Morgan informed the President that she had accepted a new job outside archaeology and would be leaving on 14 July. "Tash," as she was known to many members, had become an integral part of the success of the EAA, running the Secretariat at the Museum of London with immense competence and unfailing good humour.

The officers were immediately plunged into a flurry of discussion by every possible means of communication, since it would be necessary to find not only a replacement for Natasha but also a new home for the Secretariat. By the end of July the situation had been resolved. The Swedish National Board of Antiquities (Riksantikvarieämbetet) had offered to host the Secretariat at its UV Väst branch in Kungsbacka, under the aegis of EAA Treasurer Cecilia Åqvist. It will be staffed by Petra Ottosson Nordin, who transferred from archaeology to administrative duties a couple of years ago and now takes over from Natasha (who was the guest of the Executive Board at a farewell dinner in Bournemouth). Many members who attended the Bournemouth Annual Conference will have met Petra, who has already taken a firm grasp of the Secretariat.

For members wishing to contact the Secretariat, the address is:

European Association of Archaeologists  
c/o Riksantikvarieämbetet  
Box 10259  
S-434 23 Kungsbacka  
Sweden

Telephone + 46 300 33907  
Fax + 46 300 33901  
e-mail [petra.nordin@raa.se](mailto:petra.nordin@raa.se)

## The European Archaeological Heritage Prize

The President, Willem Willems, announced at the opening session of the Fifth Annual Conference in Bournemouth that the first award of the European Archaeological Heritage Prize had been made to the Portuguese Minister of Culture, Senhor Manuel Maria Carrilho, in recognition of the leading role that he played in the preservation of the Côa Valley rock-art site in northern Portugal (now a World Heritage site). The award was made by the independent Prize Committee, under the chairmanship of EAA Past President Kristian Kristiansen.

The award takes the form of a silver statuette, the prize-winning entry by two Polish sculptors; this is accompanied by an engraved certificate. The recipient was not able to be present at the Bournemouth meeting, but Professor João Zilhão (Director of the Portuguese Institute of Archaeology) accepted the certificate on his behalf. The President travelled to Lisbon on 25 October to present the trophy itself to the Minister.

Members are invited to make nominations for the Prize in 2000. A nomination form has been prepared, and a copy is enclosed with this issue of *The European Archaeologist*.

## Standards of presentation at Bournemouth

JOHN COLLIS

At Bournemouth we provided a booklet in which advice was given on presentation of sessions, lectures and posters at international conferences such as the EAA. I would welcome any feedback and suggestions on how the booklet could be improved. It is not copyright, so if anyone wants

copies to use as the basis for other conferences, do make use of it – it can be obtained in electronic form from Tim Darvill at Bournemouth.

My over-riding impression of the lectures, however, was that the advice had made little impact. The main culprits were the native English speakers, who delivered their papers too fast, in an English which was too complex and colloquial for most non-native speakers. The applause I received when I mentioned this at the Annual Business Meeting suggests my views were shared! Presentation was especially bad at the ABM itself, with most speakers addressing the Chair or the person who had asked a question, rather than facing the audience, and addressing the back of the room. Visual presentation was not helped by the poor layout of lecture theatres (difficulty in presenting both slides and overheads at the same time). I wonder if architects ever go to lectures – most entry was via the front, so that anyone coming in late had to walk in front of the lecturer to get to a seat.

So, how do we improve (other than sacking all architects)? I suggest that it is up to session organizers to insist on proper standards from all people participating in their session. I would personally still like to see the introduction of rapporteurs to report on sessions (not the content, but to give advice on presentation); again, individual session organizers might like to think about this. I hope the organizers at Lisbon will take a strong line; we want an Association, not a Tower of Babel!

## THE EDITOR'S CORNER

Members will have seen that there has been a change of location and personnel in the Secretariat. Petra Nordin is doing a great job in taking over from Natasha Morgan, but it was a complicated handover, since the work of the Secretariat is very varied. The only casualty – and that a minor one – is *the European Archaeologist*. A good deal of work is still needed on the production side, and that is why this issue is slighter than most of the recent issues.

We were faced with two alternatives – to hold up this issue until all the production details had been sorted out, or to get it out before the end of 1999 in a less elaborate style. A lot of information has emerged from meetings of the Executive Board and from the Annual Business Meeting which we felt should be available to members with the minimum of delay, so we opted for the second alternative.

Luckily, the ever faithful John Collis has come to our aid, with a perceptive comment on the standards of lecturing at the Bournemouth Annual Conference and some interesting proposals. We also have a comment on the Conference from one of our younger members, attending this event for the first time. This makes refreshing reading after the rather

bland reports on earlier Conferences that we have published.

\*\*\*\*\*

The first issue for 2000 will have a new look. The layout is being completely revamped and we hope to carry more information and stories about European archaeology. To that end, we are looking for another Assistant Editor, to help in obtaining material for publication and in the preparation of *TEA*. Anyone interested should contact me without delay, preferably by e-mail ([cleere@cicrp.jussieu.fr](mailto:cleere@cicrp.jussieu.fr)).

The ideal candidate would have English as his/her mother tongue, a good knowledge of one or more other European languages, and contacts around Europe. Oh, yes: he/she should also be considerably younger than me (not too difficult for the great majority of EAA members, I am afraid), and should also be prepared to take over from me as Editor at the end of next year!

\*\*\*\*\*

We have received a *cri de cœur* from France. The Library of the University of Lyon was destroyed by a fire in June and lost its entire vast collection. The university is making huge efforts to restore the situation, and is seeking books, theses, scientific journals, CD-ROMs, and other forms of bibliographic material.

The Université de Lyon has a high reputation in the fields of archaeology and art history. If you have any material of this kind that you would be prepared to donate to the Library, please notify Mme Marie-Jo Malagola, Bibliothèque de l'Université de Lyon, 18 quai Claude Bernard, F-69007 Lyon, France (fax +33 4 72 72 45 55, e-mail [marie-jo.malagola@univ-lyon2.fr](mailto:marie-jo.malagola@univ-lyon2.fr)). Do NOT send the material itself at the present time, since storage space is still being sought by the university.

Henry Cleere

## DIARY

### 4-9 January 2000

*Waterways and landscapes [33rd Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology]*, Québec City (Canada)

Contact William Moss, Archéologue principal, Désign et Patrimoine, Ville de Québec, cp 700 Haute-Ville, Québec, Canada G1R 4S9 [e-mail [wmoss@ville.quebec.qc.ca](mailto:wmoss@ville.quebec.qc.ca), web <http://www.sha.org/meet20.htm>].

### 7-9 April 2000

*International Colloquium on Cranial Trepanation in Human History*, Birmingham (United Kingdom)

Contact Robert Arnott, Department of Ancient History and Archaeology, The University, Birmingham, UK [e-mail [r.g.arnott@bham.ac.uk](mailto:r.g.arnott@bham.ac.uk)]

### 18-20 April

*CAA 2000: Computing Archaeology for Understanding the Past*, Ljubljana (Slovenia).

Contact: Zoran Stancic, Centre for Scientific Research of the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts, Gosposka 13, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia [e-mail [zoran@arc-sazu.si](mailto:zoran@arc-sazu.si), web [www.zrc-sazu.si/caa/](http://www.zrc-sazu.si/caa/)].

### 15-19 May 2000

*32nd International Archaeometry Symposium*, Mexico City (Mexico)

Contact Archaeometry 2000, Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas, UNAM Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, Del. Coyoacan, Mexico DF, 04510 Mexico [e-mail [archaeom@servidor.unam.mx](mailto:archaeom@servidor.unam.mx), web <http://www.archaeometry.unam.mx>]

### 12-14 July 2000

*5th International Ancient DNA Conference (Ancient DNA 5)*, Manchester (UK)

Contact Terry Brown, Department of Biomolecular Sciences, UMIST, PO Box 88, Manchester M60 1QD, UK [e-mail [adna5@bi.umist.ac.uk](mailto:adna5@bi.umist.ac.uk)].

### 30 August-7 September 2000

*Millennium Congress of The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage – TICCIH2000*, London (UK)

Contact TICCIH2000, 42 Devonshire Road, Cambridge CB1 2BL, UK.

### 2-11 September 2000

*Limes XVIII - the 18th International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies*, Amman (Jordan)

Contact Limes XVIII, Department of Archaeology, SACOS, William Hartley Building, The University, Liverpool L69 3BX, UK [e-mail [freeman@liv.ac.uk](mailto:freeman@liv.ac.uk)].

### 10-17 September 2000

*6th EAA Annual Conference and Business Meeting*, Lisbon (Portugal)

Contact EAA 2000 Meeting Secretariat, Instituto Português de Arqueologia, Avenida de Índia 136, 1300-300 Lisboa, Portugal [e-mail [eea2000@ipa.min-cultura.pt](mailto:eea2000@ipa.min-cultura.pt)] – see page 6 of this issue of *The European Archaeologist* for further details.

### September 2000

*Meso 2000 [VIth International Conference on the Mesolithic in Europe]*, Stockholm (Sweden)

Contact The VIth Mesolithic in Europe Conference, Department of Archaeology, Stockholm University, S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden (e-mail: [agneta.akerlund@ark.su.se](mailto:agneta.akerlund@ark.su.se))

