

The European Archaeologist

No 15 Summer 2001

CONTENTS

On the (Revised) European Convention	1
A New Rescue Archaeology in France	4
Europæ Archaeologicæ Consilium	9
Tószeg-Laposhalom	10
Rock Art Discovery in the Alqueva Dam Zone	11
In Memoriam: Ida Bognár-Kutzián	12

Committee, Round Table and Working Party Reports

Training and Education	13
Practical Training: a draft Code of Conduct	15
Professional Associations in Archaeology	16
Text of a Submission on Illicit Trade	18
Towards a European Preventive Conservation Strategy	20

Essay Competition: What Future for Studying the Past?	24
--	----

EU Programme Culture 2000	25
EU Raphael funded Project	26
EAA Conferences	26
EAA Executive Board Meeting	27
From the Secretariat	28
European Journal of Archaeology	29
The Editor's Corner	29
Letter to the Editor	30
EAA Schedule of Activities	31
Diary	31

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

Telephone + 46 300 33907
Fax + 46 300 33901
e-mail petra.nordin@raa.se

Editors Dr Karen Waugh
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

On the (Revised) European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, presented in Malta 1992

Professor Gustaf Trotzig

University of Stockholm, SWEDEN

Almost a decade has passed since the Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage was presented in Malta 1992.

I am grateful for having been invited here to say a few words on how this Convention came about.

It will not be a scientific report, but rather a personal account from one of those involved.

I will begin by outlining the prehistory of the Convention, mention some details on the practical work with the revision and then discuss the main differences between the old and the new Convention and finally notice the efforts of launching the Convention for practical use.

The prehistory of the Convention

When the trauma of the Second World War began to heal in the fifties and sixties, very few of the European countries had satisfactory protective legislation for the archaeological heritage.

So the Council of Europe took on the task of preparing a Convention in order to promote the revision of existing laws when needed, or otherwise adopting new and more efficient ones.

The work was carried out by a group of experts and the Convention came into force in November 1970 and was signed by twenty-two of the member states of the Council of Europe. Unfortunately however, it turned out to be a rather problematic document.

The Convention starts off in a declamatory style, talking of the archaeological heritage as "essential to a knowledge of the history of civilisations". It also mentions that this heritage is "seriously threatened with destruction". Unfortunately, the document begins to gradually lose its focus, and ends up discussing mainly excavations and finds.

A problem with international Conventions is that they are, on the one hand, very potent legal instruments once they have been signed – but on the other hand, if they are in any way controversial or not streamlined enough they

are not likely to get signed, in which case they become totally toothless.

This means that there is inevitably always a careful balancing act between various parties involved in the writing of a Convention and the final result is usually full of compromises.

I have not thoroughly investigated the matter, but my impression is that the content of this Convention reveals a division within the working group between the administrators, the experts on legal matters and the archaeologists. The latter, after a lot of giving and taking, finally rattle their ultimate weapons in order to get things going:

the need for scientific knowledge (that only archaeologists possess) and

the value of precious objects (which could be estimated also by non-professionals).

As a document putting forward the guiding principles for the protective legislation in a Europe on the edge of a total change, this Convention however was insufficient.

In the 1980s the need for new motorways, railroads, ports and airports, not to speak of the re-planning of old towns etc. sparked off an enormous development all over Europe. Large-scale operations soon revealed how vulnerable the archaeological heritage actually was.

Numerous hitherto unknown monuments and sites turned up in the areas for development and created problems for both the authorities and the developers.

As before, very few countries had a protective legislation that could foresee these consequences, and they certainly did not have enough skilled staff to handle the problems - something more effective had to be done.

It should be mentioned that ideas about this were already floating around in Europe in the early 1980s. In Scandinavia, an initiative was taken to prepare a recommendation within the framework of ICOMOS where a special committee for archaeology had been created, ICAHM.

To rewrite a European Convention is a complicated affair and takes time.

A faster and more flexible international legal instrument is the 'recommendation' which contrary to a Convention is only advisory. Yet it can be very influential if the states want to make use of it. The good thing is that new ideas, intentions and goals can be presented in a recommendation without fear of being too provocative and which also allows people to slowly get used to them.

It is therefore a practical way of starting a process of change, a decisive step towards a Convention by preparing the ground.

In order to speed up the work of the Council of Europe, and under the direction of the

Committee of Ministers, the work began on a recommendation.

Preparatory colloquies took place in Florence in 1984, and Nice in 1987.

The Florence colloquy was primarily aimed at the problems of archaeology in the planning process. The participants represented both archaeologists with heritage management as their speciality and planners. It was an archaeological application of what has become known as "integrated conservation". One of the speakers was no less than the president of today's session - professor Scichilone.

At the end of the colloquy a number of conclusions were adopted, some of which in reality became an action programme for the subsequent activities. After the Florence meeting it was felt that some groups of problems needed further attention and the French delegation took the initiative to host a colloquy in Nice, where archaeology and major public works were in focus.

In 1989 the recommendation "Concerning the protection and enhancement of the archaeological heritage in the context of town and country planning operations" was ready and adopted by the Committee of Ministers, and now the work started with the Convention.

The practical work with the revision

A working group was established consisting of representatives from sixteen of the European member states.

It was a rather mixed crowd with several colourful personalities, administrators, archaeologists from various backgrounds, and diplomats, for example, who took on the task. They were assisted by a distinguished expert on international law relating to this field, Prof. Patrick O'Keefe.

A practical juridical problem for the creation of a new Convention turned out to be the already existing one, as a Convention however obsolete it may be, cannot just be eliminated.

The initial idea had been just to amend and modernise the old text. This was, however, not possible for legal reasons.

Eventually, the final solution recommended by the legal advisers was to replace every line with a new one and at the same time delete the old, as when you write on a computer.

All sorts of interesting facts came to light during the work. We found that French is an easier language for writing law texts than English. This meant that we now and then had stimulating discussions with the interpreters on the correct wording. I recall one example: the excellent and useful French *expression biens culturels* would in English be 'cultural goodies' which is hardly useful in a law text.

I often had to consult the representative of the UK about certain translations.

In the beginning I said: What is the opinion of our English colleague – and the irritated answer was constantly: I am not English I am Welsh.

The solution, which I learned the hard way, was to ask: What is the opinion of our British colleague?

During the work we soon realised that Europe is not a complete unity. There is a big difference between the impressive stone-built monuments of the south and the more humble, but oddly enough from a mere archaeological point of view, better preserved sites of the north.

We were also confronted with the differences between the Roman and the German law traditions - for instance in the interpretation of the law on private and public property.

A good example of the Roman tradition can be found in the New Testament (Matthew 14:44) in the parable of the hidden treasure: "... the kingdom of heaven is like treasure hidden in a field, which a man found and hid; and for joy over it he goes and sells all that he has and buys that field."

In that way he becomes the owner of the treasure.

In England and many other countries with a Roman tradition, archaeological finds belong to the landowner.

In Sweden and other countries where the German tradition prevails, the archaeological heritage, i.e. monuments and sites regardless of where they are situated, as well as certain types of archaeological finds - belong to the Crown, nowadays the State.

I have recently been informed that this is also the case in Scotland - perhaps the relic of a Viking past.

The working group gathered on five occasions and scrutinised and discussed every line. It was not always possible to reach total unity on the exact wording immediately. Much work and persuasion took place in the corridors, over a cup of coffee or at night in some cosy restaurant.

The efficient work by the Secretariat between the meetings cannot be overestimated.

After each meeting the delegates, as homework, had to make sure that the texts were firmly established within the ministries and authorities in their home countries, in order to pave the way for the final signing.

Differences between the old and new Convention

When you compare the old and the new or revised Convention, the main difference is to be found in the change of perspectives,

from excavations and finds to the archaeological heritage in a much wider sense, as part of the cultural landscape.

Another central idea is the conviction that the struggle for the archaeological heritage could not be won by archaeologists alone. Other parties also have to feel and share the responsibility – politicians, decision-makers, planners, developers and so on.

To achieve this ideal state of affairs they should not only be confronted with the problems. No, they also have to be invited to take part in the good things and share the joy and excitement of, for instance, new discoveries.

Most important, however, is the participation of the public at large, the media and others with influence on the politicians.

Look at the Convention today, I would like to pick out the following points as being the most significant.

Article 1

The definition of the archaeological heritage is as wide as possible. We took out the word "civilisations" as irrelevant and included all imaginable remains that can illustrate the history of mankind and its relation to the natural environment. Even the word "mankind" was discussed as some delegates were of the opinion that the expression 'humankind' would be less provocative to feminists.

Of great importance is the new concept that archaeological remains may be situated both on land and under water. It means that even shipwrecks are included. This has always been a highly contentious issue, as it is connected with disagreement between countries concerning the extension of their territorial waters. We felt a certain pride that this problem which had caused the failure of the so-called Under Water Convention, could be solved in this way.

Article 2

The possibility of creating archaeological reserves even where there are no visible remains on the ground or in the water is another application of the new perspective.

Article 3

A new idea is that in the examination of monuments and sites non-destructive techniques must be used as far as possible, rather than excavation. This provision is rarely, if ever applicable to rescue excavations but it is a word of warning to over-zealous scholars.

Article 4

This also goes for the stipulation that excavated remains should not be left exposed

unless suitable measures have been taken for their protection.

Finds and objects should be kept under the best possible conditions.

Article 5

The idea of integrated conservation is now fully established.

Article 6

The principle of 'polluter pays', i.e. whoever causes the destruction of an archaeological site should be obliged to pay the excavation costs, was discussed at great length and was put forward boldly in the draft Convention.

It had, however, to be modified for the final text, since it was considered too provocative by certain states.

This was a pity as it has two major advantages: first it stimulates the developers to avoid ancient monuments and sites in the first place, and secondly the necessary funds would be available if the worst comes to the worst.

Article 9

The importance of developing public awareness is stressed in this article.

Article 10

In article 10 the controversial question of trade in archaeological objects is dealt with. This trade is not illegal or immoral as such, but the problem remains of how the merchandise emerges on the market. The Convention tries to lay a moral responsibility on one possible actor in this trade, namely the museums.

Article 11

Finally I would like to underline the importance of the provision for a continuous monitoring of the application of the Convention.

The launching of the Convention

To write a Convention is one thing, to get it known and accepted more generally is another. In order to get things going the Ministers conference in Malta adopted a European Plan for Archaeology.

The idea was to promote a general understanding of the value of the archaeological heritage as well as to facilitate the co-operation between the various actors in the field.

The plan comprised four elements:

- A Campaign organised on the theme 'The Bronze Age - the first Golden Age of Europe'
- The organisation of thematic networks combining technical co-operation with the cultural promotion of sites. Ancient places of performance were the first items on the agenda.
- The preparation of a comparative study on the state of Urban Archaeology, and finally

- A study of common documentation and inventory techniques together with the preparation of a multi-lingual glossary of archaeological terms.

Personally I was only engaged in the Bronze Age campaign.

Of all possible epochs of the past, the Bronze Age was regarded as the most appropriate for this specific purpose. It is the most glorious and rather unobserved period in European prehistory. It has conspicuous monuments all over Europe and trade routes that obviously connect cultural centres.

The idea was to unite researchers in order to create new knowledge, which could be beneficial also for a wider public.

The campaign was inaugurated in Bratislava in 1994 and ended in Berlin in 1997 after a series of meetings and exhibitions in many places.

The final conference also resulted in an impressive publication, which sums up a considerable part of the present European knowledge on the Bronze Age.

As far as I know the European Plan for Archaeology has been successfully carried out and has met a high degree of appreciation. Especially the elaborate publications have turned out to be of great importance.

So, now after a decade the time has come to evaluate the Convention and to discuss whether it is still productive or if new demands have to be met with new actions?

A New Rescue Archaeology Law in France

Françoise Audouze

Director of Research (UMR 7041),
Centre National de la Recherche
Scientific (CNRS), Nanterre Cedex,
FRANCE

An earlier article (*TEA* 10, 1998) reported the crisis in rescue archaeology in France. Laws were in force dating from 1943 and 1981, but these no longer responded to the reality of the current situation. Neither were the laws effectively reinforced by the Malta Convention because they did not specify whether it was the State or the developers who were responsible for archaeological destruction.

There had been a very rapid growth in the number of rescue operations starting in the early 1980s. As a result, a "1901 association," the *Association Française d'Archéologie nationale* (AFAN), had been set up instead of a public service because successive governments refused to recruit new civil servants. AFAN was responsible for managing more than a thousand employees and a budget of more than 100 million francs.

In the summer of 1998 a crisis erupted when the prime minister of the time replied in the affirmative to a question put to him by a local elected representative about the possibility of the Roman remains in the centre of the town of Rodez being destroyed in order to create a public car park without being subject to prosecution. At the same time, when the *Haute Comité pour la Concurrence* (High Committee for Competition) was consulted, it declared that, unlike research excavations, rescue excavations were merely ordinary public works which, as such, lay within the competition sector. The *de facto* semi-monopoly of AFAN should therefore be replaced by competitive tendering.

In protest, not only rescue archaeologists, but also many researchers and university archaeologists went on strike and demonstrated against the Ministry of Culture. The new Minister, Mme Catherine Trautman, took charge of the issue and set up a new commission, comprising a member of the *Conseil d'Etat*, the president of the association of French mayors, and a university archaeologist. Their mandate was, to produce a report on the situation, and to put forward proposals for reforming rescue archaeology in preparation for the drafting of a new law. Following their deliberations the Pêcheur-Poignant-Demoule commission, as it was called, submitted their report at the end of 1998. The report was accepted and the Ministry of Culture produced a draft law. In the preamble the authors of the report asserted that archaeology was a research activity. This was a first victory for research and rescue archaeologists for whom archaeology is a public service activity and for whom there can be no development in research without rescue archaeology. Knowledge of the Mesolithic, the Bronze Age, and the Early Middle Ages in France for example, has been revolutionised over the past decade as a result of large-scale rescue excavations. Sites have been discovered with stratigraphic remains and burials for the earlier periods and complete farms or villages for the more recent periods which, with two or three exceptions, had hitherto been completely unknown.

In conclusion, the report recommended that the Ministry of Research work in co-operation with

the Ministry of Culture in the management of rescue archaeology.

Drafting the new law took place during 1999 and a first version was presented at the end of the year to the *Assemblée Nationale*. The deputies of the majority party voted for the bill, whilst at the same time making certain improvements to it. However, it suffered a setback when it was presented to the Senate, with its liberal-right majority. The senators wished to change AFAN into a "public establishment of industrial and commercial character" (EPIC), maintaining a competitive system, despite the fact that there was general agreement for recognising the public nature of archaeology. The senators, many of whom are mayors or councillors of towns or *départements* with their own archaeological services, wanted to give these services a major role in rescue archaeology. Moreover, in their role as public developers anxious to minimise the expenses incurred by their administrations, they opposed the level of charges fixed by the *Assemblée*. Instead, they made a revolutionary proposal to make the State the owner of archaeological remains (coming into line with Scandinavian legislation). Sadly, this proposal did not survive in the ensuing debate. On no fewer than five occasions the bill passed back and forth between the two parliamentary chambers until the final vote took place in mid-December 2000.

The law covers many aspects of archaeology and confirms the nature of research and rescue archaeology. The law reaffirms the prerogative of the State, and allocates financial responsibilities:

- the responsibilities of the head of state and the funding of the *carte archéologique* to be paid for by the State;
- the payment of a tax proportional to the archaeological threats resulting from development to be exacted from the developers;
- to a new public establishment of administrative and non-commercial character (EPA), is given the roles of collecting these taxes and of carrying out rescue operations.

The EPA could also call on the support of other public establishments (universities, CNRS, museums) or private companies when it required expertise that it did not possess within its own organisation. The law also specifies the period during which State or EPA services may retain finds resulting from rescue excavations for scientific study before returning them to their owners, along with a new division of rights to exploit immovable archaeological remains

discovered by chance between the property owner and the finder.

The new law consists of fourteen articles, which can be summarised as follows:

Article 1

This incorporates the fundamental points included in the preamble and declares that: *rescue archaeology deriving from a public service mission is an integral part of archaeology ... its objective is to ensure the detection, conservation, or the protection by means of scientific study of elements of the archaeological heritage that are affected or likely to be affected by public or private works related to development ... it also has the objective of interpreting and disseminating results of research.*

Article 2

The State remains responsible for archaeological works by means of *...measures directed towards the detection, conservation, or protection by research of the archaeological heritage, by the designation of professionals responsible for each scientific action and missions to monitor and evaluate these actions...* In this way not only are the State's prerogatives reaffirmed, but as a consequence, also the central role of the regional archaeological services.

Article 3

This gives the State the task of preparing and updating the *carte archéologique*, a cartographically based inventory which, when complete, is intended to indicate archaeological zones under threat. The map is in fact an administrative document, extracts from which may on request be communicated to any person or organisation. This leads to the integration by competitive examination of AFAN staff who have hitherto been responsible for this work, as well as other archaeologists, into the State service (around 80 jobs created in two years, but the same number disappearing from AFAN and the EPA).

Article 4

...creates an EPA (public establishment of administrative and non-commercial character) responsible for carrying out the prior survey and operations of rescue excavations ... in conformity with the decisions and requirements of the State ... In carrying out its mission it involves the archaeological bodies of collectivités territoriales [towns, départements] and other bodies with a legal identity... It may call upon, on a contractual basis, other French or foreign bodies with legal identities and possessing archaeological research services... This public establishment will most probably be

called INRAP (*Institut National de Recherche d'Archéologie Préventive*).

The article ensures the scientific exploitation of the EPA's work and the dissemination of results in conjunction with public research or higher education establishments.

In addition to representatives from the supervisory ministries, the EPA's administrative council includes representatives of public research and higher education institutions and establishments in the field of archaeology, representatives of the local authorities, and public and private bodies associated with rescue archaeology. The administrative council is assisted by a scientific council.

Permanent posts of the new EPA are to be filled by contract staff. It is also planned to integrate the staff of AFAN by contract into the EPA by decree.

Articles 5 and 6

These articles define the terms of the agreement between developers and the EPA regarding the period for carrying out works once the land becomes available.

Article 7

This establishes a period of five years during which archaeological remains can stay in the care of the EPA before they must be returned to their owner.

Article 8

The funding sources for the EPA are set out here: rescue archaeology taxes, as laid down in Article 9 and subventions from the State or any other public or private body.

Article 9

A definition is given as to who is liable for tax and fixes the costs of survey and excavation. These calculations are determined by means of algebraic formulae.

1. For preliminary survey, taking into account the area in square metres (T):

$$R \text{ (in francs/m}^2\text{)} = T/320$$

2. For areas of excavation based on survey:
 - **a**, for stratified sites:

$$R = H^2T(H + 7)$$

where H = average depth of archaeological layers (in metres), and H₁ = the average depth of a sterile layer (in metres) affected by public or private works.

- **b**, for groups of non-stratified archaeological structures:

$$R = 1NsHí/T[(450)(10 + Nc) + 30$$

where Ns and Nc represent the number of hectares of simple and complex archaeological structures identified by the survey.

- **c**, for residential developments, there is a ceiling of:

$$R = T/3 \times S$$

where S is the surface less the net area of the project. If the calculation takes as a basis for survey the entire area affected by the project, it is the built surface alone that is used to calculate the tax relating to excavations.

This article was the occasion for bitter battles when the developers' lobby made its voice heard, claiming that the ceiling in formula **a** could have tiresome repercussions on urban excavations, the high costs of which might not be covered totally. Public housing projects are, moreover, exempted from tax.

Another exemption was made for local authorities with archaeological services approved by the State who could carry out their own archaeological work. This exemption could be total or partial in proportion to the total or partial carrying out of the work. Developers providing materials, equipment, or funds can also benefit from a proportional reduction in tax.

Article 10

Creates an administrative commission responsible for examining disputes regarding tax ratings.

Article 11

Modifies the articles of the *Code de l'urbanisme* [urban planning law] so as to suspend building permits until archaeological excavations have been completed.

Article 12

Defines the period for retaining archaeological remains from all categories of excavations. Much more importantly, however, it gives the State a period of five years in which to study portable antiquities discovered by chance. After this period the 1941 law comes into effect, giving half the value of the finds to the finder and the other to the landowner.

Article 13

This is what may be called an opportunist article, intended to respond to the inadequacy of the earlier laws and to the problems brought to light by the discovery of the Cosquer and Chauvet caves and the complaints of the

owners, who began a series of lawsuits. It makes provision for the State to indemnify landowners against damage they may suffer as a result of access to remains. When immovable remains (sc. decorated caves!) are discovered by chance, leading to investigations, the landowner has an interest in the results. The standard allowance and the share in any profits are fixed by decree of *the Conseil d'Etat*.

Article 14

Finally, this article provides for a government report to the parliament in 2003 on the implementation of the law, dealing with the number of rescue operations, the state of development of the *carte archéologique*, the financial situation of the EPA, and the number and nature of disputes brought to the *ad hoc* commission.

Overall, both research and rescue archaeologists are for the most part satisfied, although they fear that the level of the tax may be inadequate in the urban context. For them it is the 'least bad' solution. Nevertheless, a very active minority has been fighting very energetically against the law. They have gone so far as to bring the malcontents (amateur societies, private law societies, archaeologists from local authorities) into a new union. Their intensive lobbying has had good results as far as the local authority archaeologists are concerned. The lobby is partly made up of research and university archaeologists who have, often with good reason, feared that they would be systematically excluded from rescue activities or would find themselves in a weaker position in comparison to EPA staff. This fear is based on situations where they have been unable to demonstrate that their scientific expertise was indispensable and where, having trained excellent archaeologists, the very same have been recruited by AFAN and have taken over the leadership of rescue activities in their fields.

Local authority archaeologists also fear that they may be excluded from rescue work when they already have problems in defining their fields of operations in relation to the State services. Some of them have argued for the complete decentralisation of rescue archaeology, for which they would become responsibility. This solution appeals to the senators, who want to see maximum powers delegated by the State to local authorities, but the government and the deputies remain firmly in favour of a State solution. That being said, the senators listened enough to their local authority archaeologists to amend the bill so as to require the EPA to associate them with rescue operations rather than *having the power to call upon them*. By introducing partial or total exemption from tax for local authorities who

make use of their own archaeological services, which they will most certainly do so as to reduce costs, they have also indirectly reinforced their role. Local authority archaeological services, which originally developed in a somewhat anarchic manner without any form of scientific monitoring, are also required to be evaluated by an external body so as to be approved by the State.

France has therefore chosen public rescue archaeology, unlike many (but not all) European countries, and in particular the United Kingdom and The Netherlands, where the private alternative is applied either partially or completely. However, when legislations for the protection of the archaeological heritages are compared, the French law is not exceptional, and it is rather the minimal legal protection in the UK that contrasts with that of most of the other European countries. This was well illustrated in the session organised by Jean-Paul Demoule and Willem Willems at the EAA Annual Meeting in Lisbon last autumn.

Finally, a distinction has to be made, for which I am grateful to Peter Chowne, regarding the direction being taken by rescue archaeology in France within heritage management in comparison to, for example, rescue work in the UK. In France it is the "primary" activities linked with the destruction of archaeological sites that are the concern of the state, "Secondary" activities (for instance, conservation and restoration) do not fall under this monopoly. Let us also not forget that, to the great regret of archaeologists, the definition of environment in France does not include the human and cultural dimension, which means that there is no alliance between ecologists and archaeologists.

The law has now been passed. It is, however, not yet in force because conservative and liberal deputies and senators have referred it to the Constitutional Council, arguing that, the following reasons make it unconstitutional:

- the creation of an EPA for industrial and commercial activities;
- the attack on the freedom for enterprise of well established professionals in the sector (local authority, CNRS, and university archaeologists and other private archaeological organisations);
- the attack on the principle of free administration by local authorities;
- the attack on the freedom of expression (because of the exclusive control over access to information by the State);

- the transfer of all the goods, rights, and obligations of AFAN to the EPA, obliging the State to assure funding of all the working contracts concluded by AFAN.

The Constitutional Council has rejected the complaints, recalling that rescue archaeology is a mission of the public service and a scientific activity, that the funding of working contracts will be covered by the tax, that it is permissible for the legislature to impose restrictions on freedom for enterprise in the public interest, that the duty to associate the other partners in rescue archaeology is a response to the objection regarding freedom for enterprise, and finally, that the duty to disseminate the results and the fact that excavation reports are administrative documents that are accessible on demand makes the other objections inadmissible. The law was therefore declared to be in accordance with the constitution.

It remains now to draft the decrees. Of particular importance is the decree giving joint supervision of the EPA to the Ministries of Culture and Research: an essential prerequisite for the co-ordination of policies, training programmes in the universities, and the possibility for EPA archaeologists to take advantage of secondment for one or two years to the CNRS. Other decrees will, *inter alia*, be concerned with the internal organisation of the EPA and on modes of contract with the other archaeological partners.

A long battle of more than twenty years' duration will soon come to an end. The 1998 report is but one in a series, the conclusions of which are curiously similar but which, due to the very short tenure of Ministers of Culture, or their lack of political will to tackle such a burning question, have been prevented from taking effect.

The next step will be the involvement of EPA archaeologists in research projects or structures alongside researchers and university teachers in order to optimise the organisation. The archaeological community has in principle secured the support of the research directorates of the two ministries and of the *Sous-Direction de l'Archéologie* of the Ministry of Culture but the structures and projects remain to be worked out. This will finally lead to the indispensable linking of the two parties: rescue archaeology and research archaeology.

With thanks to Henry Cleere for the English translation of the French article.

Europæ Archaeologiæ Consilium

Adrian Olivier, President,

Europæ Archaeologiæ Consilium

Archaeologists and heritage managers working in Europe have long come together in different contexts to discuss issues of mutual concern. For several years representatives of national heritage management organisations had met annually as an informal round table to discuss common issues. However, despite many such formal and informal contacts, there was still felt to be a very strong need to develop simple, effective, and lasting mechanisms for future co-operation in the sphere of heritage management.

In all European countries archaeological heritage management is a legal concern of the state, but the successful management of archaeological resources also depends on a wide range of factors including, for example, public benefit, integration with planning processes, and interaction with official policies on agriculture, urban development, and infrastructure. All these areas are vital to heritage management, and are increasingly influenced by pan-European developments, and for countries of the European Union, by EU legislation and policy. Heritage managers across Europe thought that it was vital that they should work more closely together to discuss issues of mutual concern in a pan-European context, and in 1998 the round table agreed to create a new organisation specifically to support the management of the archaeological heritage throughout Europe.

In October 1999, after a year's gestation, the statutes of the Europæ Archaeologiæ Consilium (the European Archaeological Council) were approved by royal decree under Belgian Law. This formally established the EAC as an international non-profit making association for the heads of national organisations charged by law with the management of the archaeological heritage. On November 25, 1999, the new organisation was publicly launched at an inaugural ceremony held in Strasbourg at the offices of the Council of Europe.

The primary purpose of the EAC is to serve the specific needs of national archaeological heritage management agencies by providing a forum for such organisations to establish closer and more structured co-operation and enable the exchange of information. Membership of the Council is open to all national bodies charged with the management of the

archaeological heritage throughout Europe, including where appropriate agencies in a federal context (such as the German Lender, and the Swiss Cantons).

The objectives of the EAC are:

- to promote the exchange of information and co-operation between the bodies charged by law with the management of the archaeological heritage of the countries of Europe;
- to provide archaeological heritage management agencies with a forum for discussion and for exchange of information;
- to act as interlocutor for working towards common goals and as a monitoring and advisory body on all issues relevant to the management of the archaeological heritage in Europe, in particular in relation to the European Union and the Council of Europe;
- to promote the management, protection, scientific interpretation, publication, presentation, and public enjoyment and understanding of the archaeological heritage in Europe;
- to work together with other bodies which share its aims;
- to watch over, and act for, the well being of archaeology, in Europe and anywhere in the world.

The EAC is now developing mechanisms to achieve these objectives. The Council has set up an intelligence service to co-ordinate information on European Union and Council of Europe programmes and projects, and provides a forum for the discussion and exchange of information about heritage management practices throughout Europe. This takes place through mailings, regular meetings, special working groups, an annual heritage management symposium, and appropriate publications. The EAC will provide a single co-ordinated voice to speak out on specific issues that impact on archaeological heritage management, and to influence the development of policies by European agencies.

Four key themes have been identified:

- **Political** - to express the values of archaeological heritage management in a political context by influencing the development of pan-European policies and ensuring awareness, in the European Union and the Council of Europe, of the impact of new policies on the archaeological heritage;
- **Social** - to express the social value of archaeology, and to raise awareness of that value with the public by promoting the contribution archaeology makes to improving the general quality of life;

- **Professional** - to develop and promote consistent high standards in archaeological heritage management;
- **Academic** - to develop a broader understanding of the archaeological resource in a European context by exploring common subjects of particular concern, and advancing and enabling pan-European research programmes.

A small number of special working groups have been convened to address specific subjects of topical importance. The working groups will explore key issues and discuss specific themes and topics (where necessary, in partnership with other relevant organisations) in order to inform the development of policy and progress the aims and objectives of the EAC. An Annual European Heritage Management Symposium has been established to discuss and disseminate information on topical themes and subjects relevant to the work of the membership. The papers of the working groups and the proceedings of the annual symposium will be published regularly as occasional papers. The expanded proceedings of the first Heritage Management Symposium on the subject of the Heritage Management of Wetlands were launched at the second general assembly in Strasbourg in March 2, 2001.

Archaeology in Europe today is strong and healthy. Our conservation legislation and developing policies, methods, and techniques are increasingly sophisticated and are highly regarded throughout the world. As we work more frequently on the international stage, in a pan-European and indeed global context, it is essential that we continue to recognise the need to develop a trans-national framework, not just for the practical mechanisms of cultural heritage resource management, but also for the underlying research objectives of our discipline. The EAC has come into existence to foster collaborative arrangements and partnerships across Europe, so that we create for ourselves an appropriate European context to promote research as a statement of what is valuable to the archaeological community.

The inaugural meeting of the EAC was a very significant event in the short history of cultural heritage management and its foundation marks a major milestone in the development and growing maturity of our discipline. Many organisations concerned with cultural heritage management were represented at the meeting in Strasbourg, and by the end of its first year's existence, 21 countries will have joined the Consilium. This is vivid testimony to the need for such an organisation, and to our determination to make a lasting and positive contribution to the conservation and management of our collective cultural heritage in Europe.

Tószeg-Laposhalom: Saving a Classical Archaeological Site

Erzsébet Marton

Institute of Archaeology,
HUNGARY

Tószeg is a small settlement in the county of Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok. The name will be familiar to prehistoric archaeologists all over the world. The site was discovered by Ferenc Márton in 1876, after the subsidence of the Tisza flood. The results of his discoveries were immediately presented to the widest international audience on the occasion of the VIIIth International Congress for Archaeology and Anthropology held in Budapest in the same year.

Participants of the meeting were able to visit the site. According to the general custom of those days, finds from the site were sent to all the most famous archaeological collections of the contemporary museum world. Regular excavations were started by the Hungarian National Museum in 1905 and continued until 1928.

New excavations were started in 1949 on the occasion of another international archaeological congress. Recognising the importance of the site, the Ministry of Culture declared it protected in a decree (MM 84233/60.). Even these measures, however, could not prevent destruction. The soil from the settlement mound was removed in large quantities by locals to make loam. Local treasure hunters caused further destruction. By 1973-74 when new excavations were started the site has already suffered essential damage.

In the past four years the world famous site has faced new danger. Due to recurrent river flooding caused by deforestation in the Ukrainian parts of the Carpathians, the possibility of its total destruction became an issue.

Recently, the local government of Tószeg, with professional support from Szolnok county museum, submitted a project to the Ministry of Cultural Heritage. A circular protection system with a total length of 500 metres was built around the site. This effort can be regarded as a milestone in the protection of Hungarian archaeological monuments. The mayor of the Tószeg, István Papp, should be specifically mentioned for devoting much time and effort to this cause.

Rock Art Discovery in the Alqueva Dam Zone of the River Guadiana in Spain and Portugal

Mila Simoes de Abreu
IFRAO Representative,
PORTUGAL

The International Federation of Rock Art Organisations (IFRAO) applauds the important discovery of rock engravings by the river Guadiana in Spain and Portugal, in a zone that will be flooded by the Alqueva dam.

A Spanish archaeologist first publicise the Spanish rock engravings in April during a lecture on European prehistoric art, held at the Polytechnic of Tomar (IPT) in Portugal. His talk concentrated on fieldwork carried out at Cheles during January and February this year. IFRAO rock art researchers promptly went to Cheles and confirmed the importance of the discovery. The Spanish archaeologist sent a copy of his report, which was then given to the president of the Federation.

An absence of similar engravings further downstream in Portugal puzzled the researchers. There had certainly been no discussion of any similar engravings in February at the archaeology colloquium of the Alqueva Development and Infrastructure Enterprise (EDIA), the agency building the dam and also handling the archaeology and other impact studies. Then the *Liga para a Protecção da Natureza* (LPN), a nature protection league founded in 1948, received an anonymous tip-off about engravings just like those of Cheles, except that these continued for a distance of ten kilometres along the Guadiana river in Portugal.

In response, members of *Movimento Cota 139*, a movement aiming to limit the level of the Alqueva dam reservoir level to a height of 139 metres, went to see the engravings on Wednesday 25 April (Portugal's Liberty Day) and called in Manuel Calado, an archaeologist from the University of Lisbon. An environmental Web site called Ambiente Online broke the news of the engravings on the evening of Thursday, 26 April. The next morning, the rest of the Portuguese media pounced on the scoop.

Although members of the international scientific community are delighted by the discovery, they are also very concerned because the dam is

nearly finished and it will be difficult to avoid the destruction of these important examples of rock art. IFRAO, with thousands of amateur and specialist members on five continents, is now calling for the immediate nomination of a genuinely independent international commission to follow the situation and ensure international participation in the exploration and documentation of the rock art area.

IFRAO considers the plight of the Guadiana rock art area to be far worse than that of the Côa rock art area, discovered in Portugal in 1994-5, for the following reasons. Work on the dam is nearing completion, but it seems that the lesson of Côa dam was completely forgotten, resulting in an appalling threat to, or loss of, the rock art. Such misjudged projects are a massive burden on citizens and taxpayers that pay the colossal ensuing costs. Today there are bodies that did not exist in 1994: IPA (*Instituto Português de Arqueologia*), the Portuguese Institute of Archaeology, and CNART (*Centro Nacional de Arte Rupestre*), the National Centre of Rock Art. These bodies are responsible for keeping an inventory and register of all rock art in the country and advancing the conservation and public awareness of these sites (law no. 117/97, 14 May 1997). The IPA and CNART should have been in a position to constantly inspect the work of the EDIA. As the current president of IPA, Prof. Dr. João Zilhão, was severely critical of a similar situation during the fight to save the Côa rock art area. IFRAO urges him to show his total opposition to the destruction of the Guadiana rock art area.

IFRAO upholds the protection, study, and public awareness of rock art on all continents, irrespective of its age or connected traditions. We are therefore deeply concerned that an attributed age is once again being used as criteria in determining the importance of rock art and whether or not it is worth protecting. Rock art areas like the Guadiana, stretching two kilometres in Spain and another ten in Portugal, are always of great value and importance. If claims that most of the engravings are Neolithic (New Stone Age) prove to be true, this corpus would be quite rare as there is very little rock art in Europe attributed to the Neolithic-Chalcolithic periods (Copper and Stone Age). Examples of a similar period only exist in Valcamónica, Italy (UNESCO World Heritage Site) and Mont Bego, France.

IFRAO requests the Prime Minister and Minister of Culture in Portugal to consider the following points:

- a need for timely action to do everything possible to investigate the engravings with

the most appropriate and up-to-date methodology and with adequate time to do so, even if this means delaying or suspending the filling of the dam reservoir;

- the merit of creating a genuinely independent international commission to assess the importance and value of the rock art.

State bodies cannot be both players and referees. This was one of the most heavily criticised aspects of the C6a syndrome. IFRAO has formed an emergency delegation with specialists from four continents to follow the situation. It would be extremely beneficial if this delegation were part of an enlarged commission with representatives from Portuguese universities, archaeology associations and other groups. IFRAO can promptly indicate suitable specialists to organise training courses for all the archaeologists and students who will be needed for the tremendous effort a time sensitive investigation requires. We remember the political courage shown by the Prime Minister, António Guterres, in saving the C6a rock art area. To enable constructive dialogue, IFRAO requests an audience with the Prime Minister and his Excellency, the President of Portugal.

Finally, IFRAO wants to tell people in Portugal they can and should be proud of this discovery. When people respect the past, there is hope for the future.

Contact address:

Archaeology Unit, Department of Geology, University of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro (UTAD), Portugal.

E-mail: msabreu@utad.pt

Links: <http://www.rupestre.net/tracce/13> - Special number of Tracce --the on-line rock-art bulletin --dedicated to the Guadiana rock-art area - photos, texts, forum and chat.

In Memoriam:

Ida Bognár-Kutzián (1919-2001)

E. Bánffy

Institute of Archaeology, Budapest,
HUNGARY

Ida Bognár-Kutzián, one of the most eminent representatives of the great, pioneering generation of Hungarian archaeology, left us

on 12th February, 2001. A student of János Banner, her name was noted very early in her career. In her first major study - her first book on the Körös Culture - she already formulated an evaluation that has been valid ever since its publication in 1944. For several decades to come, her name (together with those of very few of her colleagues) was identified in international prehistoric archaeology with Hungarian research. Whichever archaeological period or culture she chose to study, she created something radically new, which has basically preserved its validity up to now. After her early studies on the Neolithic, she compiled a bulky volume from the analysis of the early Copper Age cemetery unearthed at Tiszapolgár-Basatanya, and it was also Ida Kutzián who created the first synthesis of the early and middle Copper Age of the Carpathian Basin. Since then, *more* could be told in this field, but essentially different and better could not be. Now, after 30-40 years, anybody who wishes to write a study on the Copper Age first consults her books and even her shorter summaries on the state of prehistoric research in Hungary. The determination of new cultures, the mapping of their contacts within the Carpathian Basin and beyond it, their evaluation and spatial and chronological positioning - all are connected to her name. Our knowledge of these periods can apparently be divided into two phases: before Ida Kutzián's activity and after it.

She kept active contacts with scholars of European prehistory, she knew about everything and understood everything clearly. Her international scope and openness were an especially striking and unusual phenomena in the years of seclusion. Those who envied her, and there must have been many of them, have tried to explain it with reference to her advantageous position and family contacts. But, in this, they were wrong, because it was the very strength and openness of Ida Kutzián's talent that helped her to become one of the greatest personalities of Hungarian prehistory. This openness and receptivity to new things impelled her to urge and initiate contacts between archaeology and various branches of science from the 1970s. Although, unlike many of her colleagues, she knew about the results of New Archaeology from the start, she never became a fanatic who rejected each aspect of traditional archaeology, as many English and North-American 'new archaeologists' did. At the same time, she was among the first who accepted the significance of radiocarbon dating in Hungary. She founded and directed an interdisciplinary department in the Archaeological Institute, where she made efforts to include as many experts as she knew, whether geologists, botanists or anthropologists, and including colleagues such as Sándor Bökönyi.

As a junior archaeologist, I was apprehensive when "the Legend", whom I had known only from books, suddenly came towards me in the corridor of the Archaeological Institute. Her slim, blond figure and smiling kindness hid a rigorous scientist and also a reserved personality. She was always ready to help in scientific problems, but she did not have students of her own: she let few people close to her. Perhaps the distinguished colleague, Amália Mozsolics, who has also taken her seat at the heavenly library, was her only real friend for decades. When Ida Kutzián retired, she left a blank. So it seemed to me a miracle that she approached me a few years ago with the request to prepare together the yet unpublished finds material of her Neolithic and Copper Age excavations. These few last years are a luminous memory, even if I have to finish our joint work alone. During the hours we spent among heaps of drawings and excavation diaries in her flat, I learned to know a new Ida Kutzián. This Ida worked with the same anxious and seemingly fanatical accuracy as the "old" one, but this time she also shared her doubts that lay behind her smiling mask. It was during these times that I realised how much speculation and how many doubts preceded the birth of her theories described in easy, flowing style. And it was also during this period when I could experience the warm-hearted, affectionate side of the proud, introvert personality.

The period of Hungarian archaeological science when Ida Bognár-Kutzián worked can be called favourable, despite the isolation caused by being a member of the Soviet block. For instance, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences could provide a relatively large budget for basic research and systematic excavations in the two and a half decades following the foundation of the Archaeological Institute in 1958. Nándor Kalicz and János Makkay, Ida Bognár-Kutzián's two colleagues from the "pioneering" generation, could also decide for themselves which site they wanted to study and for how long, and all the necessary equipment and staff were made available. This created the opportunity for the final elaboration of the relative chronology of the Neolithic and the Copper Age in Hungary and the Carpathian Basin on the basis of the results of carefully planned, large excavations.

Ida Bognár-Kutzián's death means the loss of one of the most eminent personalities of a decisive period of Hungarian prehistoric research.

Committee, Round Table and Working Party Reports

Training and Education: an EAA Working Party

John Collis, University of Sheffield, UK

For the last three years I have organised Round Tables at the EAA conferences on various aspects of training and education. For the next conference the Council of the EAA has asked me, rather than to organise a series of unrelated sessions, to explore the possibility of setting up something more permanent which will be able to establish a clear set of aims and then to ensure that they are pursued. So, this year at Esslingen we will be having the usual Round Table, but this time with the principal objective being to set up a Working Party on Training and Education.

The initial aims are:

1. To set the terms of reference;
2. To establish the constitutional status of the Working Party within the EAA;
3. Decide on membership and methods of communication.

I suggest we in fact take a very wide remit, and perhaps set up smaller groups to report back on particular topics. For me there are several obvious matters which need to be looked at:

What should an archaeology degree consist of?

Some work has already been done on this, both in individual countries and across Europe, and we need to get these ideas together. I think we all agree that an archaeologist needs at least some basic field training and laboratory experience, which makes Archaeology as a discipline very different from, for instance, History or Art History with which it is often linked.

To what extent do we need to rationalise and systematise the training of archaeologists throughout Europe?

There are fundamental differences in the way in which training is provided, and students from British universities are at an advantage over those in, for instance, Spain, France and Italy who have to study History or Art History before specialising in archaeology. Not only does it take them more years (and money) to qualify, but they often do not get the practical training (see my articles on what I call the 'Fragmented', 'Enclosed' and 'Open' systems of university training: Collis 1995, 2001). The Dutch are moving over to a system more similar to the British (with Bachelor, Masters,

and Doctoral degree levels), and some universities in Germany are also advocating this. Should the EAA be supporting this?

What skills and training are needed to qualify someone as an archaeologist?

At the two extremes we have firstly the German system, in which only those with the equivalent of a doctorate or a masters degree can direct an excavation (whether they have practical experience or not), and secondly the British system where no archaeological qualifications are needed at all. I would suggest that neither state of affairs is satisfactory! This dichotomy is now a pressing matter if we are to have a free movement of archaeologists within the EU, as will be the law from this year.

What is the role of 'Continuing Professional Development' (CPD)?

This is the training we all need as we pursue our careers. How can this be organised in the different countries? How might we be able to co-operate with each other?

*Should we extend our remit to schools?
Or is this a separate matter?*

How formal a set-up do we need? Should there be a central group to ensure that we have an agenda each year, and those topics will be pursued? Do we need a contact person for each country, and is this even possible?

I would like to see us establish a discussion network via email and the Web so that we can have open discussions, and disseminate information as quickly and widely as possible. innovative methods of teaching in universities, and includes a committee which

Using the Esslingen meeting as a core around which we can work, I would like us to deal with the following matters:

1. To establish a list of people in each country who are actively dealing with matters of education and training;
2. To build up a list of organisations involved in training in each country. In Britain we have several; the Subject Committee for Archaeology (SCFA) on which all the universities are represented; the Higher Education Committee (HEC) of the Institute of Field Archaeologists which deals with the interface between the profession and the universities; the Archaeology Training Forum (ATF), a committee on which all the employers and trainers are represented; the Council for British Archaeology (CBA) which is the main disseminator of information on training, careers, etc; and the Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN), a government-funded organisation which encourages good and deals with archaeology. Do other countries have any similar organisations?

3. To gather information on what the present situation is in each country, what is still needed to improve the situation, and how the EAA might be able to help.
4. To start building up a bibliography on the subject of training.

I have added some articles below that might be of interest to start us off, mainly from a British perspective. Note that *Antiquity* volume 74 (1999) was devoted to education matters. The QAA document is an official statement for the British government in which we describe the basic characteristics of an archaeology graduate from a British university. John Chapman tells me that issue 5.1 of the *European Journal of Archaeology* will be dedicated to training and education, I have not yet heard who has offered to contribute, but we may well want additional articles.

There is much to discuss, and it is becoming increasingly urgent. So, please do get in contact, especially if you wish to participate. We have offers of contributions from Germany, Spain, the Netherlands and Britain, but we need more!

Please contact:

John Collis, Dept of Archaeology, Northgate House,
West Street, Sheffield S1 4ET, UK
email: j.r.collis@sheffield.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bender S. and Smith G.S. 2000. *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-first Century*. Washington, Society for American Archaeology.
- Bishop M., Collis J., Hinton P. (1999). A future for archaeologists: professional training a career structure in archaeology. *The Archaeologist* 35:14–16.
- Chitty G. 1999. *Preliminary Review of Archaeology Training*. London, Archaeology Training Forum / English Heritage.
- Collis J.R. 1995. Celts, power and politics: whither Czech archaeology? In M. Kuna and N. Venclová eds. 1995. *Whither Archaeology? Papers in Honour of Evžen Neustupný*. Prague, Institute of Archaeology, pp. 82–92.
- Collis J.R. 2000. Towards a national training scheme. *Antiquity* 74:208–14.
- Collis J.R. 2001. L'avenir de la recherche archéologique française sur l'Âge du Fer. *Actes du XVIIe Colloque de l'Association Française pour l'Etude de l'Âge du Fer, Nevers, mai 1993*. Glux-en-Glenne, Centre Archéologique Européen du Mont Beuvray.
- Collis J. and Hinton P. 1998. Training, training and ???????. *The Archaeologist* 31:15–17.
- González Marcén P. (ed.) 2000. *Recerca, Ensenyament i Patromoni local: una visió des d'Europa. Actes de III Seminari d'Arqueologia i Ensenyament Barcelona, 16–18 novembre de 2000*. Treballs d'Arqueologia 6
- Henson D. (ed.) 1999. *Guide to Archaeology in Higher Education*. York, Council for British Archaeology.
- QAA 2000. *Benchmarking Archaeology*. Gloucester, Quality Assurance Agency.

Practical Training: a draft Code of Conduct

John Collis, University of Sheffield, UK

The following document has been discussed at the Round Table on Training at the Conference of European Archaeologists at Lisbon in September 2000, and has also been discussed by other organisations such as the Institute for Field Archaeologists (UK). It has yet to be adopted by any organisation, but we hope it will form the basis for Codes of Conduct in universities, professional institutions, indeed anyone who is putting on practical courses of any sort. Many thanks to all those who have contributed ideas so far. The code is not yet written in stone, so please send any more thoughts to:

John Collis, Dept of Archaeology, Northgate House, West Street, Sheffield S1 4ET, UK.
email: j.r.collis@sheffield.ac.uk.

1. Practical training should only be undertaken by those competent to provide the particular training offered (e.g. field survey, excavation, geophysics, and laboratory expertise). Where possible they should have recognised professional documentation of their competence.
2. Documentation provided to participants and potential participants should state clearly:
 - Who are the competent people running the project and their professional and training qualifications.
 - What specific training will be on offer (e.g. fieldwalking, excavation, finds processing, drawing, etc.), and to what level (where this can be defined, e.g. under the Institute of Archaeologists proposed levels of competence).
 - The date of the site and its nature.
 - Which categories of student or volunteer are being catered for. This can vary from people for whom the project is a working holiday with an educational aim, school children wondering whether to study archaeology at university, students fulfilling requirements for the courses, or young professionals seeking professional training. All these groups have very different needs.
 - What kinds of students or volunteers are being catered for (e.g. the level of previous experience, those with disabilities, age restrictions, etc.).
 - The way in which teaching will be carried out, preferably with a defined programme (e.g. lectures, on-site training, site documentation, mentoring by competent workers, etc).
3. The project must be fully insured for accidents, professional indemnity, etc. It should maintain legal standards of Health and Safety, e.g. in working conditions, protective clothing, first aid training, and provision of first aid kits. Every member of the team should be provided with information on what to do in an emergency, e.g. telephone numbers of medical services, and where to find the local doctor or hospital.
4. Field projects should conform to the legal requirements of the country in which they are carried out (e.g. for permits, legal access to land, deposition of finds and archives, publication, etc.). This will also normally involve carrying out an official 'Risk Assessment'.
5. There should be concern for the local social and political environment in which work is being carried out (e.g. students should not be seen to have privileged access to historical sites from which local people are excluded). It is the responsibility of the participant to enquire as to the working languages for the course, and ensure that they have sufficient command to participate fully.
6. Given the limited nature of the archaeological resource, due concern should be given to its preservation, and it should not be destroyed merely to provide training. Preferably sites which are threatened or where there are pressing research interests should be chosen rather than unthreatened sites.
7. Sites should be chosen which are suitable for the level of training being given; e.g. beginners should not start on complex, deeply stratified sites.
8. Students should not be exploited. Training excavations should not be used merely as a way of financing research; equally they should not be used as a means of undermining professional activities, e.g. by offering cut-price rescue excavations where these should be properly funded

under state and European planning legislation.

9. Any certificates given out should be endorsed by a recognised institution, e.g. a university, museum, professional body, etc.
10. Participants should be asked for feedback on their experiences, and proper consideration should be taken of complaints and suggestions. Where possible these should be passed on to the relevant institution overseeing the standards.
11. Any participants should be informed where they can make formal complaints if they are dissatisfied with their training and treatment (e.g. the professional institute, university, etc.)

Professional Associations in Archaeology

Peter Hinton
Director, Institute of Field Archaeologists , UK

The EAA has discussed professional associations in European archaeology at its last three annual meetings – in Göteborg, Bournemouth and Lisbon. Through discussion and survey it has become ever more obvious that all European archaeologists need to have access to a professional association, and a role for the EAA is now clear. To fulfil this role and to help the EAA set, maintain and improve standards for European archaeologists, an informal group started life as a round table, evolved into a “forum” and is now a full committee of the EAA: the Committee for Professional Associations in Archaeology.

In Bournemouth in 1999 we attempted some definitions. First of all we adopted (or stole!) the following definition for a profession:

an occupation in which skilled practitioners undertake their duties impartially and without the exercise of personal preference, and are subject to the oversight of their fellow practitioners.

This definition implies that the existence of a body to co-ordinate self-regulation is a prerequisite of a true profession. So far, according to an unpublished analysis by Gerhard Ermischer, there are few such bodies in European archaeology, most contenders

having more in common with learned societies or affinity groups.

Characteristics of professional associations include:

- a code of professional conduct;
- entry conditions for membership, including subscription to the code and demonstrated competence;
- providing continuing education for qualified members (publications, conferences etc);
- promoting development of the discipline;
- representing the profession;
- being equally concerned for practitioners (its members), practice (archaeology), and clients (amongst which we might include the heritage).

On this understanding, we defined a competent European archaeologist as someone who:

- subscribes to a code of professional ethics (for example, the EAA *Principles of Conduct*);
- has been validated as competent and ethical by one of Europe's professional associations (this must be a real test).

In 2000 the committee conducted a survey of EAA members to research their understanding of how many archaeologists worked in their country, how people became archaeologists, who regulated the work, and whether or not there was a professional association. The committee is very grateful to all those members who responded and to Petra Ottosson Nordin for circulating the questionnaire and forwarding the responses. The results of the survey showed an interesting range of situations, and of perceptions about how archaeology is organised in members' home states. In summary, the survey revealed that few states have professional associations matching the Bournemouth definition.

The Lisbon round table showed that there are concerns about transnational working. Most importantly, the committee believes that the systems implementing the Valetta Convention in many EU states – and EU-funded work in non-EU states – may be challenged in the European Court. Many systems for appointing archaeologists and licensing work appear to conflict with EU regulations on the free movement of professionals, and on the free movement of professional services. It seems clear that nothing should stand in the way of the free movement of professional archaeologists as individuals, but that the free movement of archaeological enterprises or companies is a more complicated issue – as demonstrated by present developments in France. In spite of jurisprudence obtained by

the French ministry, opinions remain divided on what the Court might decide. Much would depend on how strictly states adhere either to the model of a market driven economy with the free movement of archaeological enterprises or to a state monopoly. A mixture of the two would be hard to defend.

As European archaeologists, we should do what we can to manage this situation, and to prevent the unpleasant sight of archaeologists fighting each other in the Court. One of the best ways of doing this is to reduce fear of the "other"- there is a tendency to assume that archaeologists from other countries are queuing up to steal our work, and to do archaeology to lower standards than we would ourselves. Fortunately, with the EAA, we have and opportunity to research and document shared standards and to educate our community.

Self-regulation is a good way to achieve common standards. But we now know that few states have the effective professional standards recommended by the 1999 EAA business meeting, the World Heritage Convention and the Lausanne Charter. Some associations (for instance, the NVvA and the IFA) accept members from other countries; they offer internationally recognised credentials. This means that any EAA member has access to a professional association in theory. However, it is unfortunately the case at present that associations have a much-reduced influence outside their own state of origin and language zone. We need a network of national or transnational professional associations – but not a new European organisation: we have the EAA for that. The EAA's committee for professional associations provides the forum, and at the 2000 business meeting it was commissioned to develop a project to identify and compare standards for archaeologists and their work, to underpin the EAA *Principles of Conduct* and *Code of Practice*.

Professional associations may regulate their discipline by setting three different sorts of standards:

1. What a professional is (*person*);
2. How professional work should be conducted (*process*);
3. What the outcomes of professional work should be (*product*)

In 1999 we reached a very simple – and probably temporary – answer to the first requirement question. Now we must work towards the other two. A model is presented in table 1.

Hierarchical Position	Archaeological Document	Quality Management Equivalent
Top Level	EAA <i>Principles of Conduct</i> , IFA <i>Code of Conduct</i> , NVvA <i>Handvest</i> etc.	Quality manual
Second Level	Europe-wide Standard for different types of archaeological work (for example, excavation)	Quality manual
Third Level	Europe-wide guidance on principles of, for example, Archaeological excavation	Management manual
Fourth Level	One annexe each of detailed guidance on, for example, archaeological excavation in each state (IFA, NVvA etc)	Handbook
Fifth Level	Detailed appendices containing bibliographic information and contact addresses etc for each state	Handbook

Table 1. A model for the regulation of standards

This is an ambitious list, but we do not have to start with a blank sheet of paper. Some states already have key elements (for example, the IFA has standards and guidance for different projects, but with a strong UK focus). The first stages of the process must be to:

- translate and compare existing professional standards and criteria for licences;
- identify Europe-wide standards;
- identify Europe-wide principles and guidelines;
- identify national guidelines;
- assess legal advice on the Treaty of Rome, the Valletta Convention, the Maastricht Treaty, etc.;
- identify ways of promoting professional training in archaeology, so that archaeologists can meet common standards.

This lies beyond the EAA's resources and budget. The committee has been asked to assist the EAA in seeking Council of Europe support (via the EAC) for an EU-funded project. In the UK the IFA has recently been commissioned by English Heritage to research the availability of European funds for professional training in archaeology, and it is likely that this work – that that of John Collis' round table – will greatly assist the EAA in setting up a project/EU funding might pay for a

researcher and for translations, but it will not create an omniscient consultant with a thorough knowledge of the needs and practices of European archaeologists. Only EAA members can provide that, and the committee needs your help. We must ensure that our group is properly representative; at present there is a bias towards EU members and NorthWest Europe. We are preparing project proposals for the Board, so EAA members can expect a call for assistance soon. There is a steering committee of Sue Davies (UK), Gerhard Ermischer (Germany), Boudewijn Goudswaard (Netherlands: secretary), Peter Hinton (UK: chair). None of us expect to serve on this committee for life...

We hope to be able to publish a more detailed account of the results of the committee's survey of EAA members in the next newsletter.

*This submission has been written as a result of **working party and round table** discussions at previous EAA conferences (for instance at the last EAA conference in Lisbon, as reported in TEA 14).*

Text of a Submission to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport Committee of Enquiry into the Illicit Trade in Cultural Property

Neil Brodie and Staffan Lunden

on behalf of the European Association of Archaeologists

The illicit trade in antiquities is the trade in archaeological material which has been recently stolen from museums or looted from archaeological sites and exported illegally from its country of origin. This illicit trade is the cause of ongoing destruction and it is attracting the attention of various concerned groups and organisations world-wide.

The police of many countries are concerned, quite simply, because the trade is illicit. The people involved are often engaged in other criminal activities and a link with drugs trafficking has been demonstrated on more than one occasion. This is because drugs and antiquities often originate in the same poorly policed frontier areas of South America and Asia and middlemen may deal in both. There is some evidence to suggest that antiquities might be used to launder drugs money. The police are also concerned because the large but undeclared sums of money that change hands during transactions may also foster

corruption in what are often impoverished bureaucracies

National governments are sometimes concerned about the illicit trade because it causes the destruction of a national patrimony. Archaeological treasures are often material symbols of national unity. Thus governments may be less concerned about the integrity of archaeological sites than about the final fate of unearthed antiquities. It might not be illegal to dig up objects, or even to own them, but it will be against the law to export them.

Increasingly, however, governments are looking at the economic possibilities of archaeology. Archaeological sites and museums might be developed as tourist attractions and constitute a major source of foreign currency. In some countries archaeology can be the single most important tourist attraction and its importance should not be underestimated. It is a matter of great economic importance to the governments of these countries that their archaeological heritage should not be dug up and smuggled abroad.

Archaeologists are concerned about the illicit trade because it causes the looting and destruction of archaeological sites. Thus antiquities are removed from their archaeological context and the history of a site, and ultimately even of a society, cannot then be reconstructed. It is important to emphasise here that it is the destruction of sites that concerns archaeologists, not the ownership of antiquities. Archaeologists endeavour to reconstruct the lives and times of past societies – for most of human history there are no written records and archaeology offers our only access to this past. Even in countries with a long tradition of writing archaeology has much to offer. Many ancient and even recent histories record only the actions of political or religious elites, indeed sometimes they may be little more than propaganda. Archaeology is the only means available for approaching the lives of those who do not appear in the texts. Thus even in countries with a well established written record the destruction of archaeology quite often destroys the history of common people. Archaeological sites are sometimes compared to texts, there to be read by those with the time or the inclination. The unrecorded destruction of a site is akin to the burning of a text.

Thus there are different constituencies with different reasons for opposing the illicit trade in antiquities. For the police it is a criminal activity and it undermines public order. For many governments it poses a threat to the political unity or economic well-being of the state. For archaeologists it destroys history. All of these concerns are well founded and are concerns

about social cohesion. When viewed from these different perspectives the illicit trade in antiquities is, quite simply, an anti-social activity, and it is for this reason that there has been for the past thirty years or so now a concerted international effort to eradicate it.

The Organisation of the Trade

The organisation of the illicit trade is reasonably well understood. As a general rule antiquities are excavated in secret and passed on to local middlemen, who are then able to arrange for the material to be smuggled out of the country, whereupon it may be bought by one or more reputable dealers for ultimate sale to collectors or museums.

This pattern of dispersal through a chain of dealers is a regular practice and details of provenance are lost in the process. There is no legal requirement to reveal a record of ownership history, or provenance, so that there are no means available with which to trace an antiquity back to its original source, and it is not possible for a potential buyer to establish whether an antiquity was originally obtained by honest, or dishonest, means. Licit and illicit antiquities become hopelessly mixed and the response of the trade is to judge them all licit, innocent until proven guilty as one leading dealer has said (Ede 1995). Looted antiquities then acquire a patina of legitimacy when ultimately they are sold, without provenance, by reputable dealers and auction houses. There is little chance they will be recognised as looted. Thus, because of this secrecy, it is not possible to document or demonstrate a consistent link between the widespread looting of archaeological sites and museums, and the continuing appearance on the market of large quantities of unprovenanced antiquities. Nor is it possible to accurately describe or quantify the trade, so that it is difficult to engage in any kind of public debate, or construct a meaningful dialogue between those in favour and those against.

Thus the opaque conditions in which the trade operates obstruct completely any attempt to reveal the true nature of the material being traded, whether it be good or bad, and prevent open and informed debate, thereby undermining one of the fundamental bases of a free society. They also provide cover for a range of criminal activities, from faking through smuggling to money laundering. It will only prove possible to combat the illicit trade when the trade generally is fully transparent so that clear chains of ownership can be established, and it is possible to distinguish between licit and illicit material.

Scale

As the illicit trade is largely clandestine it is not open to systematic quantification and estimates of total value are usually extrapolations from what few official statistics are available. Interpol suggests that the illicit trade in cultural property is third only in value to drugs and arms, and is worth about \$4.5 billion annually, compared to about \$1 billion ten years ago. This increase is thought to be due to the emergence of a large European blackmarket (Kouroupas 1996: 11, 1998: 4).

In 1993 a submission to the British Government from the various trade organisations suggested that over half a million antiquities are exported annually (Morrison 1995: 208). How many of these were originally looted it is not possible to say. In Britain a minority of antiquities require a licence for export, and the licence records details of type and value. Licences are issued by the Department of Culture Media and Sport but their records are not available for public inspection however, nor is the Department able to release detailed statistics.

Legal Deterrents

It is not practical to police every archaeological site in the world in an attempt to keep off looters, the resources are not available. The problem has to be confronted at home in what are called the market nations – the rich countries of Europe and North America, and also increasingly east Asia – where the demand for antiquities is greatest.

There are two international conventions which are designed specifically to combat the international trade in cultural material, including antiquities. The first is the 1970 UNESCO *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property*. The second is the 1995 *Unidroit Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects*. Both of these Conventions establish an agreed set of legally binding definitions and procedures to be adhered to by signatory states.

Eighty-six countries have now ratified the UNESCO Convention, including eighteen from Europe, and it has had some effect. The United States, which is the major market nation, has also signed the Convention and in 1983 implemented two of its articles. This has allowed it to enact a series of bilateral agreements with several countries to place import restrictions on certain specified classes of archaeological or other cultural material. Agreements have been reached with Mali in Africa, and El Salvador, Bolivia, Peru,

Guatemala and Canada in America, Cyprus, and Cambodia in Asia. The effectiveness of these agreements can be judged from the booming market in pre-Columbian antiquities which has now appeared in the United Kingdom and Switzerland. Neither Switzerland nor the United Kingdom have at present ratified the UNESCO Convention, a circumstance which is regrettable enough in itself but scandalous when it is realised that their failure to ratify is directly undermining American initiatives, and that looted pre-Columbian material is now being sold in Europe rather than the United States.

To date no major market nations have ratified the Unidroit Convention and at the present time it is not clear that the United States will. It is too soon to judge the effectiveness of this convention.

These international conventions also help to set an ethical standard. Quite simply, many people seem to believe that if it is legal then it is ethical. When many of the activities related to collecting and dealing in antiquities are seen to be illegal then the activities themselves will be seen to be increasingly unethical. This is reflected in the codes of ethics prepared by the Museums Association and the International Council of Museums which require all museums to adhere to the principles of the 1970 UNESCO Convention, irrespective of its status in law.

In February 2000 HM Government announced that it would ratify neither the 1970 UNESCO Convention nor the 1995 Unidroit Convention.

Summary

The large scale trade in illegally excavated antiquities causes widespread looting of archaeological sites and the consequent destruction is a destruction of knowledge, a destruction of history. It undermines the economic bases of some poor countries and encourages criminality, both at home and abroad. The illicit trade can only be stopped by reducing demand in the market nations. This can be achieved by legal means and by public censure. The illicit trade would be dampened if the Government of the United Kingdom would ratify the UNESCO and Unidroit conventions. The Government of the United Kingdom should also take measures to ensure a fully transparent trade, so that its workings are exposed and its true nature revealed. Members of the general public will then be in a position to make informed decisions about the antiquities they buy.

Recommendations

The European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) recommends that HM Government should proceed at once to:

Ratify the 1970 UNESCO *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property*;

Ratify the 1995 Unidroit *Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects*.

Recognising that the secrecy in which the trade operates is unacceptable in a democratic society, the EAA recommends that HM Government should:

Make its Export Licensing System fully comprehensive, and make records available for public inspection;

Impose a statutory obligation upon dealers and auctioneers to reveal details of ownership history.

Further recognising that the illicit trade has links with international organised crime, the EAA recommends that HM Government should:

Encourage prosecutions to be brought to bear under the 1988 Criminal Justice Act when dealers or auctioneers are caught in possession of stolen material.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ede, J. 1995. The Antiquities trade: towards a more balanced view. In K.W. Tubb (ed.) *Trade and Betrayed*, London: Archetype, 211-15.
 Kouroupas, M.P. 1996. Quoted in *Museums Journal*, June issue, 11.
 Kouroupas, M.P. 1998. Illicit trade in cultural objects. *Conservation* 13 (1), 4-7.
 Morrison, C.R. 1995. United Kingdom export policies in relation to antiquities. In K.W. Tubb (ed.) *Trade and Betrayed*, London

Towards a European Preventive Conservation Strategy

Prof. Dr. Matthias Knaut,
 Fachhochschule für Technik und
 Wirtschaft, Berlin, GERMANY

The first initiative towards a European Preventive Conservation Strategy was taken by an international working party in September 2000 and resulted in a meeting in Vantaa, Finland. The objectives of the working party have been supported within the framework of the Raphael Programme of the European

Commission. The participating organisations are:

ICCROM - International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property;
 EVTEK - Institut of Art and Design, Department of Conservation (Finland);
 Instituto Português de Conservação e Restauro (Portugal);
 Centre de Recherche et de Restauration des Musées de France (France);
 Ministry of Cultural Heritage (Hungary).

During the preparation representatives of government departments, cultural institutions, museums and the field of education from numerous European countries exchanged information and took part in discussions on the many questions and problems concerning the issue of preventive conservation. These exchanges have brought to light the similarities and differences existed between nations and regions, as well as indicating the varying stages of development in the discipline.

Participants from 24 European countries (15 EU, and 9 non-EU countries) met in Vantaa to discuss and decide upon a European Strategy for Preventive Conservation. The original English text of the concluding document is given below. A German translation of the document is now available, and should make a much wider and easier distribution of the ideas and recommendations possible.

We are indebted to the organisers, especially Neal Putt, Richard Hördal and Rick Vos, to the chairpersons of the working parties, and the translation team of G. Breinesberger, A. Burmester and G. Krist.

Part 1: Rationale

Beyond the rich traditions of each nation, Europeans share a common identity. The fundamental values and culture of its people are common, and there are many themes that unify heritage in Europe.

More than ever before there are moves towards closer European unity. National governments have long held similar structures and policies for heritage. Based on European social and intellectual development, museums also share a common philosophy and practice. Public museums emerged in Europe in the 19th century and since then national collections have been intended as a source of education and enrichment to the public. As the decades have passed, museums across Europe have developed and remained united in the concept of providing joy, creation and progress. Their collections are a resource and a source of knowledge.

Today, museums are a driving force of cultural policy in Europe. They strengthen and act on the social, cultural and scientific traditions that cross all nations.

Used with care, heritage collections are the basis for museums to build and reinforce their own individual society and that of Europe as a whole. Collections offer rediscovery of the peoples, migrations, evolutions and ideas that have shaped and created Europe and the world. They record and store its aesthetic and scientific creations and provide a basis for further progress. They provide a sense of belonging and understanding, with a view extending from the ancient past up to the most recent and rapid changes in society. The challenge is to preserve these heritage collections, in order to carry the past forward and enrich the future.

European museums have been leaders in developing the concept and practice of preventive conservation: *multidisciplinary management to reduce the loss of cultural heritage, with the aim of benefiting the public.* Preventive Conservation is a cornerstone of any European policy of heritage preservation.

Heritage is fragile. For material heritage, the sources of damage range from the massive and horrifying impact of war and natural disasters to the insidious damage of pollution, insects, environmental conditions and individual acts of vandalism. Preventive conservation reduces risks and slows the deterioration of entire collections. Therefore it is a corner stone of any strategy of preservation, an effective and economical means to preserve the integrity of heritage, minimising the need for additional intervention on single objects.

This strategy document is based on the innovations of each nation, the accumulation of widespread and deep experience throughout Europe, and the common identification of challenges. It speaks primarily of preventive conservation in museums, however it also has relevance to archives, libraries, and other collecting institutions.

Preventive conservation is international. There has always been a unifying philosophy, and we are now moving towards an ever-stronger emphasis on the public access and use of collections. Since its origins, preventive conservation has relied on scientific exchanges, the free flow of information and parallel development of training.

Within shared international concepts, European nations have built up a vast experience. Governments have been crucial, developing

legal and administrative structures, training institutes and services to museums across Europe. Museums have begun to integrate preventive conservation into their overall policies and plans. Inter-disciplinary teams of professionals have started to develop sound methodologies and well-practised technologies to preserve collections.

This document brings together a remarkable range of contributions by participants from 24 nations. It makes the best use of Europe's resources. The Vantaa meeting participants accept responsibility for translating and promoting the document widely.

It combines input from the richest nations to those recently emerged from war, from those well established in the field of preventive conservation to those in the first steps of innovation. The strategy puts experience from across Europe to use, making the best use of available resources and proposing the most efficient and logical developments. It advocates European partnership, based on the long-standing strength of each nation.

Part 2: Strategic Themes and Lines of Action

The participants of the Vantaa meeting have identified five *themes* as a framework for effective policy and action. Action on these themes is vital in preserving the heritage of any nation and of Europe as a whole. *Lines of action* accompany each theme. These provide a more detailed basis for questioning, analysis and planning at national and institutional levels. They respect the experience and the realities of any context.

1. Leadership

Governments take the leadership in the preservation of cultural heritage, and facilitate the development of national strategies and plans.

Lines of action:

- Develop an agreed and sustainable preventive conservation strategy, adopted by government, in a way that ensures implementation.
- Establish priorities for preventive conservation strategy based on museum audits of public collections and their context.
- Museum professionals and governments engage in establishing museum accreditation or registration programmes, in which preventive conservation is fully integrated. These should involve standards, specifications or contracts agreed by museums and government.

- Use economical and social impact analysis to make the case for preventive conservation.
- Establish and maintain structures for wide public consultation to devise and develop preventive conservation strategies that are proactive as well as responsive to changing needs.

2. Institutional Planning

Museums include preventive conservation in long-term institutional planning, and use consistent methodologies in preventive conservation.

Lines of action:

- Involve all departments or units in developing all-encompassing institutional policy plans, with preventive conservation as an integrated part of these plans, and appropriate budgets assigned.
- Base institutional policy plans on sound knowledge of the composition, significance and condition of the collection, by means of surveys and/or risk assessment procedures.
- Carry out preventive conservation in museums by inter-disciplinary groups of professionals, both inside and outside of museums, properly trained in their specific activities.
- Designate staff responsibilities to preventive conservation, including them into job descriptions. Establish end responsibility for preventive conservation at the senior management level.
- Establish guidelines and methods for preventive conservation activities, including disaster plans and teams.

3 Training

All those dealing with collections have appropriate and up-to-date training in preventive conservation, according to their function and responsibility.

Lines of Action:

- In order to ensure that internal and external staff dealing with collections, as well as decision-making bodies, receive proper training/information in preventive conservation, it is necessary to:
- Define and develop the content of fundamental knowledge of preventive conservation
- Produce teaching materials in a variety of languages to support in-house training
- Organise regular opportunities of up-dating knowledge (CPD)

In order to promote a shared understanding of preventive conservation, it is necessary to:

- Establish preventive conservation, at appropriate levels, in all study programmes dealing with cultural heritage

- Define, develop and provide a curriculum in preventive conservation for conservation-restoration training institutions

In order to advance knowledge in preventive conservation, it is necessary to:

- Create opportunities for specialisation in preventive conservation (such as post-graduate diplomas and PhDs)
- Stimulate research in preventive conservation
- Develop teacher training programmes in preventive conservation

4 Access to Information

All those involved in collection care have awareness of and access to the international body of information on preventive conservation, in forms suitable to their needs.

Lines of Action:

- Use internationally recognised terminology.
- Make relevant and authoritative preventive conservation texts available through translation.
- Produce and publicise a comprehensive list of publications and other information, available through national and international sources.
- Promote access to information technologies for museums (Internet, WEBSITES) to exchange information on preventive conservation.
- Identify which organisations will be responsible for keeping data current, and for international links.
- Develop resource centres of service to many institutions, beginning from reference to existing international bodies of knowledge.
- Encourage exchange of information on preventive conservation through means such as membership of professional associations, conferences, professional exchanges, and provision of support to national and international meetings.
- Work with existing professional structures in order to identify and assess preventive conservation advisors.

5 Public Role

The public is made aware of and has a role in preventive conservation.

Lines of Action:

- Develop programmes to ensure the principle of shared care for collections, actively involving the public, creating a sense of common responsibility for cultural heritage.

- Target communication strategies at specific groups (among these age groups, heritage professionals, responsible authorities, policy makers, media) to raise awareness of the needs and benefits of conservation of cultural heritage.
- Encourage every one who has a stake in conservation to take part in decision-making, in order to develop a sense of public ownership.
- Assert that sustainability is fundamental to all actions related to collections.
- Promote the fact that cultural heritage is most meaningful and valuable in its whole context.

Part 3: Recommendations at a European level

These are specific actions recommended for implementation at the European level, to promote progress in all nations and which should be the subject of immediate co-operation. They will assemble and draw on the overall European strength of resources and support the unique evolution of each nation. The actions are practical and feasible, but innovative and significant for all of Europe. They continue the tradition of preventive conservation as a progressive common theme for European heritage.

The participants of the Vantaa meeting urge the following actions:

1. Invite the Council of Europe to bring together a group of experts in order to produce a European Charter on Sustainable Preventive Conservation, leading to a European Convention.
2. Develop a Preventive conservation Strategy for adoption by the Council of Ministers of the European Union and other member states of the Council of Europe.
3. Promote the fundamental concept of shared care, actively engaging politicians, professionals and the public in developing a strong sense of common responsibility for preventive conservation.
4. Facilitate the development of training programmes and educational materials building on existing resources.
5. Develop guidelines for museum policy plans, which include preventive conservation, using existing models and experience.
6. Urge equal access to the Internet for museums throughout Europe.

7. Create a network of institutions that will take responsibility for collecting and diffusing information on preventive conservation, taking into consideration existing bodies such as ICOM, through the Preventive Conservation Working Group of its International Committee for Conservation, and ICCROM.
8. Share experience of media and public awareness initiatives, including evaluation of these actions.

For copies of the German translation of this document, please contact: Prof. Dr. M. Knaut, Studiengang Restaurierung/Grabungstechnik, Fachhochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft Berlin, Blankenburger Pflasterweg 102, D-13129 Berlin, Germany.

Essay competition on archaeology in the 21st century

What Future for Studying the Past?

David van Reybrouck

Editorial Board, *Archaeological Dialogues*

Archaeological Dialogues is organising an essay competition on the future of archaeology. Young scholars are invited to send in manuscripts in which they develop their visionary perspectives about the nature of the discipline in the coming decades. Submissions should not be longer than 3,500 words and are due on 1st February 2002. The manuscripts will be judged by an independent jury of international experts. The three best essays will be published in *Archaeological Dialogues*, the author of the winning essay receives a 1,000 euro cheque.

Theme

In 1962, Lewis Binford wrote his landmark essay 'Archaeology as anthropology' which set the New Archaeology into motion. Twenty years later, Ian Hodder published his 'Theoretical archaeology: a reactionary view', an article which marked the birth date of contextual archaeology. Today, we are another twenty years further. Post-processual archaeology has ramified into a variety of theoretical perspectives and thematic fields. Greeted with scepticism at first, it has successfully opened up new worlds of archaeological research and has enriched the discipline with a number of innovative studies and approaches. Yet just

like its processual precedent, it has developed from theoretical avant-garde to academic establishment.

Apart from these intellectual developments, archaeology has also undergone dramatic changes in the last decades in terms of its social and political embeddedness. Awareness has been raised about the role archaeology has played and continues to play in the construction of political identity discourses. And the spectacular rise of contract archaeology in most Western countries has raised new questions about the role of our discipline in large-scale landscape modifications and about the relationship between academic archaeology and society at large. Furthermore, processes of globalisation and virtualisation have severely challenged traditional perceptions of time and space, two of the key parameters in archaeological research.

Where do we go from here? What role do you see for theoretical reflection in the archaeology of the coming decades? What position will archaeology occupy in these radically new social, political and intellectual climates? How do you see archaeology develop in the near future? And what sort of archaeology do you think we should be working towards?

Essay competition

The questions raised above are all very close to the intellectual interests of *Archaeological Dialogues*. Since its start in 1994, the journal has stimulated in-depth reflection and discussion about contemporary archaeology in Europe, irrespective of any chronological or thematic boundaries. Important contributions have been published in the field of theory, methodology, interpretation and history of archaeology, alongside a great number of articles dealing with the socio-politics of our discipline.

Like no other journal in archaeology, *Archaeological Dialogues* gives a prominent role to scholarly debate. This happens through the publication of discussion articles where experts from archaeology and adjacent disciplines like anthropology, history and geography engage with each other's ideas. Regular interviews with leading figures in the field also stress the dialectic nature of archaeological knowledge production. As such, the journal continues to play its role as a key forum for archaeological debate.

The essay competition organised by *Archaeological Dialogues* seeks to stimulate the discussion about the future of archaeology. In this it can be seen as a sequel to the 'Whither archaeology?' prize contest that was

organised by *Antiquity* in 1969-1971 (and which was won by Glynn Isaac and Evžen Neustupný). The present essay competition gives the floor to a new generation of young and promising scholars for innovative thinking about the long-term developments of our field.

Competition rules

1. The essay competition is open to all archaeologists born after 1962, regardless of their nationality or professional position. Members of the journal's editorial board, advisory board, and executive committee are excluded from participation.
2. The theme of the competition is 'What future for studying the past?'. Essays should not exceed a 3,500 word limit.
3. Deadline for submission is fixed at 1st February 2002. Essays received after that date will not be considered. Submissions should be e-mailed to: ad@arch.leidenuniv.nl. Alternatively, they can be sent to Archaeological Dialogues, P.O.Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands. Authors should provide their date of birth.
4. All submissions will be judged by an independent jury whose members will be selected from the journal's editorial and advisory board. Submissions will be studied anonymously and confidentially.
5. The three best essays will be published in *Archaeological Dialogues* 9.1 (Summer 2002). The author of the winning essay will receive a 1,000 Euro cheque. In case of deficient quality in the submissions, the jury preserves the right not to present the prize.
6. Laureates will be given written notice of the jury's decision, prior to publication in the journal.
7. No correspondence shall be entered into on the jury's decision.

Searching for Partners

EU Programme Culture 2000

We are working on a project on heritage diffusion for the Municipality of Puente Genil, Cordoba, Spain. We are hoping to integrate this work into the EU's Programme Culture 2000. At the moment we are looking for new partners to participate with us in this interesting European programme.

The Programme Culture 2000 contributes to the appraisal of a cultural common space for European peoples. In this context, the programme favours co-operation between developers, cultural operators, private and public promoters, the activities of the cultural networks of the states' members and other participants, in order to achieve the following aim, the one that we are interested in: to share and to develop on a European scale the common cultural heritage; to spread specialised knowledge and to encourage the utilisation of correct practices of conservation and the protection of this cultural heritage.

One of the areas of this programme open for submissions in the year 2001-2 is the programme of common cultural European heritage. Initiative 1, for which we are working, is particularly intended to evaluate the common cultural European heritage (mobilia, immobilia, architectural or archaeological). Programme 1.1 includes projects of a specific, innovative, or experimental nature. Within 1.1 we are particularly interested in part d, which gives subsidies for the realisation of projects that are concerned with buildings (immobilia) and archaeological heritage, concentrating on the following themes: access, sensitisation and comprehension for the young and socially-disadvantaged persons with regard to the common heritage of Europe.

The principal objective of the projects must be to emphasise the common European roots and dimensions present in similar or comparable elements of building and archaeological heritage. In our case the unifying element will be the Roman world: Roman constructions, such as villas, baths and mosaics.

As end products, the projects are intended to publish and produce guides, documentaries, pedagogic games and computer animation. One of its objectives is the interchange of experiences among professionals and the dissemination of good practices. In the case of our application the activities would be:

- intercultural visits to different partner states and sites;
- the creation of a web page in the various languages of the participants countries;
- the publication of guides and books on the work;
- the production of videos, CDs and diverse programs that enable an interchange of archaeological experiences and the recreation of the archaeological heritage of Roman times.

With regard to collaboration in the project we need a minimum number of three European collaborators. There is no maximum number

stated. At the moment we have made the following progress:

- Programme organiser: Puente Genil, Cordoba;
- Co-organisers: various bodies from Portugal (Villa Romana de Cerro da Vila and Vilamoura y Mertola); England (Sussex, with Fishbourne Roman Palace, and Bignor Roman Villa and Bath); Greece (Mystras, Ephoros), and elsewhere in Spain (Alcala de Henares, Complutum Madrid)
- Associate Partners: University of Cordoba; "Singilis" - association for the preservation of the heritage of Puente Genil; the Spanish association for the physically and mentally handicapped TANDEM; IPPAR in Portugal. We are still searching for new associates in other countries.

The financial subsidy is a minimum of 50.000 Euro and a maximum of 150.000 Euro annually. The organisers between them are required to contribute a further 50% of the finances. The duration of the initial project will not exceed one year, although the results are intended to form the basis for further subsidies for various EU countries in the future. One aim would be to create an association of supranational routes linking different places with diverse elements of Classical archaeological interest.

If you would like more information, please contact us at the following address:

Francisco Javier Avila Casasola,
Casa del Ciudadano
Parque de los Pinos s/n.
Puente Genil 14500
Cordoba, Spain
Ilustre Ayuntamiento de Puente Genil
E-mail: melkar1@hotmail.com, or
Fabila75@terra.es

I would very much urge anyone who would like more information to contact the above address since I am not at all sure I have done justice in my editing to the original English/Spanish text (Ed.).

EU Raphael funded project

Project Officer Neil Rimmington would like to establish links for a special EU Raphael funded project. The project entitled "Proactive Earthwork Management on Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site" is looking at effective management techniques for field monuments under grassland management. He wants to establish contact with archaeologists familiar with the methods of management in North and Northwest Europe, where similar climatic conditions prevail.

If you are interested in the project, please contact:

Neil Rimmington
Earth Project Officer
English Heritage
Abbey Gate House,
Market Street
Hexham
Northumberland NE46 3LX
United Kingdom

EAA Conferences

Esslingen 19-23 September 2001



For the first time the conference town itself is playing a major role in the organisation of the meeting. Municipal officials are members of the Local Organising Committee, which is headed by Dr Rüdiger Krause and Prof. Dr. Dieter Planck of the Landesdenkmalamt Baden-Württemberg. The Mayor and other leading officials from Esslingen attended the Lisbon Annual Conference and gave a clear indication of the warm welcome that EAA members can expect in September.

Please note that the registration deadline for the Esslingen Conference is **31st July**. Registrations after that date will be charged a higher fee.

Information, registration forms and details (including the programme) for the Conference could be reached at the Esslingen web-site:

<http://www.eaa2001.de>

The postal address is: EAA-Tagungsbüro 2001, Kulturreferat der Stadt Esslingen am Neckar, Marktplatz 16, 73728 Esslingen am Neckar. Fax: +49 711 35122912, email: eea2001@esslingen.de

The contact for the organisers is:

Dr. Rüdiger Krause
Landesdenkmalamt Baden-Württemberg
Silberburgstrasse 193D
701 78 Stuttgart
Germany
Email: R_Krause@t-online.de

Forthcoming EAA Conferences

In 2002 the 8th Annual Conference of the EAA will be held in Thessaloniki, Greece, from 25th to 28th of September. The President, the vice-president, the Treasurer and the EAA

Secretariat attended the first meeting with the Conference Organisers in Thessaloniki in April where it was clear that preparations are going well.

The Officers also visited St Petersburg in June and are happy to announce that the Hermitage Museum is willing and able to host the conference in 2003 (planned dates 10th to 14th of September).

For 2004 discussions are well advanced for a conference in Krakow, Poland.

The 16th EAA Executive Board Meeting

Karen Waugh

The Executive Board Meeting took place in Budapest on 9-10 September 2001 with Willem Willems, the President, in the chair. Adrian Olivier, President of the EOC, was welcomed as a guest at the meeting. The following are some of the main points discussed during the meeting.

EAA 7th Annual Meeting in Esslingen

Rüdiger Krause presented a report on the preparation for the meeting in September 2001. He informed the Board that the Scientific Committee had evaluated the proposals for academic sessions and round tables submitted to date. The Board decided to reject all session proposals that were the continuation of topics that had been discussed in the past two consecutive years. It was agreed that this would help to avoid the fossilisation of some topics. The Scientific Committee had also decided to organise more thematic, general or open sessions in which loosely related papers could be presented. Authors of papers not fitting into these sessions could be presented as posters. It was decided that the Board members were obliged to come up with proposals for papers as well as speakers, and that this point would be a permanent part of the September meeting agenda.

Finances

The Treasurer (Cecilia Aqvist) presented her report and budget for 2001. The books for 2000 were still open pending the final report from the Lisbon conference. The EAA's financial situation remains unstable since the liabilities exceed the assets. In part this is due to a considerable membership fall-out rate. The costs incurred by the journal also increase considerably every year. A reassessment of the

publication of the journal was proposed as one way in which the situation could be improved. The system of collecting membership payments was also discussed (see Secretariat's report). It was decided that all Board members should be responsible for seeking subsidies for members as well as seeking corporate members for the EAA. It was also agreed that the service in general had to be improved in order to reduce the membership fall-out. To improve membership participation, a discussion paper is to be prepared on the suggestion of creating a regional structure for the EAA with regional meetings and conferences under the auspices of the EAA. Another suggestion for improving the service to members is to devote a part of the EAA web page to the advertising of exchange programmes, job vacancies, grants, excavations etc.

Secretariat

The Board discussed changes to the voting system to allow voting by e-mail (see Secretariat's report). Also agreed was that the EAA Secretariat should remain affiliated with the RAA in Gothenburg for the next three years.

As part of the EAA web page, the preparation of the directory of European web pages is still in progress. The Board decided that the Yearbook 2000 would be the last to be published in print. All new editions would be put on the EAA web page.

Administrative Organisation of the EAA

In discussing the administrative procedures, the Board agreed to put rules and guidelines for statutory and non-statutory committees into two separate categories. It was also decided to update Russian, German, French and Spanish versions of the EAA Statutes and to put these on the website.

Minor additions have been made to internal regulations and guidelines (appendices H-N). The final versions will be put on the website. The Treasurer proposed to prepare a model for a conference budget based upon the budget prepared by the Bournemouth organisers. This would clearly be of help to the organisers of forthcoming conferences.

It was decided that a detailed calendar of the EAA activities should be prepared by the Secretariat. This task is to be completed before the next Board Meeting.

European Journal of Archaeology

The Editor reported on the good progress made, with Issues No. 3.3, 4.1 and 4.2. It was

decided to find suitable authors to present education in archaeology in various European countries.

The President informed the Board that the EAA had been offered a grant by a charitable trust to cover the costs of translations of Eastern European contributions to the EJA. Considering the interest in the trust, there remains the possibility to apply for further grants in the future.

Elections

Vacancies for the next term in office include the post of Treasurer and two Board Members.

Future Conferences

A progress report was presented by Kostas Kotsakis on the preparations for Thessaloniki in September 2002. The conference is hopefully to be organised in association with the Ministry of Culture as well as the University of Thessaloniki. The Organising and National Committees had already been set up. The organisers were hoping that the conference could be held as part of the Culture Olympics organised in Greece in the years prior to the Olympic Games in 2004.

Prospects of holding a conference in St. Petersburg were also discussed (see Forthcoming Conferences).

Public Relations

The President stressed the need to develop an efficient strategy to deal with issues of public relations. More specifically, there was a need to target groups, the most important being: archaeologists, the EU institutions, and government agencies. The vice-President (Erzebet Jerem) offered to set up a Committee on PR with the intention of producing a policy document, which could then be made part of the Long Term Plan for the EAA. A draft document would be further discussed in Esslingen.

From the Secretariat

Petra Ottosson Nordin, EAA Secretariat

We are happy to inform you that the Yearbook of 2000 has been printed and sent out to the members of 2000.

Payment methods – never ending story

It is not possible to set up an auto debit system on the international level. The EAA has therefore tried to develop a strategy of linking bank accounts to create a unifying system. Right now we have a Swedish account (and bank giro) and an UK account linked by existing corporation networks between banks on a European level.

The EAA has opened an account at the SEB Merchant Banking Office in London. A standing order mandate form has been sent out to the members from the UK and we strongly encourage all UK members to choose this method of payment for the future. The standing order mandate form to send to your bank can be obtained from the EAA Secretariat, email: petra.nordin@raa.se.

The EAA has also opened an Euro account no. 5901-82 324 16 at the SEB Bank Office in Kungsbacka, Sweden. Next year you can pay in Euro and will not have to convert currencies. From the 1st of January 2002 many European Countries will have Euro as the only valid currency. If you have an Internet connection to your bank, the charges for sending bank transfers abroad are less expensive compared to manual handling at a bank office.

The possibility of having a German account is under investigation, although it does appear difficult to find the appropriate terms for Organisations such as the EAA. Most of the bank services are directed at large-scale companies. We will, however, try to establish contacts with a German Bank whilst we're at the Esslingen meeting. Until then we suggest the use of existing alternatives: bank transfer or credit card charges (Visa or Euro/Mastercard)

Elections in 2001

A letter with the information on voting and candidacy has been sent out in May. The following positions are vacant in 2001: the treasurer of the EAA, two ordinary executive board members, and one editorial board member.

Anyone interested in standing as a candidate should send in a candidate form together with the required number of supporting letters or e-mails. The information should arrive at the EAA Secretariat's office on **13th July** at the latest. For members interested in running for a position on the executive board please note that you need 10 supporting letters or e-mails. Candidates running for a position on the editorial board need five supporting letters or e-mails.

Voting in 2001

In order to make it easier for all EAA members to be able to vote in the elections, we are introducing a system of voting by e-mail. The votes will be confidential. The submitted voting form will include a random selected number, which should be referred to either by writing the number on the envelope sent to the Secretariat or by referring to the number in the email sent to the Secretariat. The attachment will then be the actual voting paper and will be put in a ballot box here at the Secretariat. I will bring this box to the EAA Meeting in Esslingen. Members who pay their membership fees at the Conference will also receive a number and could put a vote in the ballot box.

We very much hope this system will work and will increase the number of members voting.

By applying a numbering system, the Secretariat will ensure that, although the voting remains anonymous, each member can only vote once!

EAA Website

Information on the Organisation could be found on the EAA website: <http://www.e-a-a.org>. Unfortunately the membership button on the web is not functioning. There is still a lot of work to do, but in the future it is hoped to use the member's as a forum where information on EAA, conferences, jobs and members can be made available.

European Journal of Archaeology

Introducing the Incoming General Editor, Mark Pearce



Mark Pearce studied at the Universities of Cambridge (MA), Lancaster (PhD) and Pavia and since 1995 is Lecturer in Early Prehistoric Archaeology at the University of Nottingham. Before that he lived in Italy for 10 years, where he latterly taught as a contract lecturer (*professore a contratto*) at the University of Pavia. He has a long commitment to the EAA, having attended five of the Annual Meetings so far (Ljubljana, Santiago de Compostela, Ravenna, Bournemouth and Lisbon). He organised sessions at Ravenna and Bournemouth meetings and was a member of the Scientific Secretariat at Ravenna - editing two of the proceedings volumes with Maurizio Tosi. He has been a member of the EAA since 1994.

Mark has edited and co-edited five volumes in both English and Italian, and co-authored one and authored two monographs in Italian. He has also published in the EJA (1 (1): 51-70).

He is at present excavating the mid-fourth millennium BC copper mines at Monte Loreto (Liguria, Italy) in collaboration with Roberto Maggi.

Until Mark Pearce takes over after the next Board meeting in September, John Chapman still continues his duties as General Editor of the Journal. John is on research leave and will stay in Budapest until mid September this year. Please contact him on the following address: Dr. John Chapman c/o Paszternak, I. Hegedus Gyula ut. 27A/II/3, H-1136 Budapest, Hungary. Telephone + 361 239 6337, e-mail:

icchapman90@hotmail.com or
j.c.chapman@durham.ac.uk

The Editor's Corner

Karen Waugh

It's a rather daunting task taking over as TEA editor after Professor Henry Cleere, one of the co-founders of the EAA organisation, and editor of TEA since 1997. Henry, however, is not completely out of the picture, having given me much assistance and advice in the preparation of this, my first newsletter, and for that my thanks. With his wide view of European and world-wide issues in Archaeology (and much more!), his input will be very much missed. Perhaps Henry would consider writing his own regular column in TEA in the future?

The new editor

About myself. I studied for my BA Hons in Archaeology at Durham University (1981-84). After a short interlude working in the publishing world, I returned to archaeology to work for the Museum of London (the then DGLA) I completed my PhD in 1997 at Durham University, having also studied for two years at Bonn, Germany. After a few years back in England working as a Roman pottery specialist, I moved to the Netherlands in 1992 since when I have been working for the ROB (Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek). For the last six years I have been involved with, large-scale infrastructural projects, working first on the Betuweroute and for the last two years as archaeological project manager for the High Speed Rail Link. I have maintained my publishing interests over the years, including being editor of *Rescue News* in the 1980s and English editor of *Archaeological Dialogues* during the last few years. My career so far has had a very European bias, which is why I am particularly looking forward to working on the TEA.

The future of TEA

Whilst trying to put together this newsletter, I've constantly been asking myself the question: how can we keep TEA relevant for such a wide-spread and varied membership? Europe may well be going further towards a more structured unification, but in the field of archaeology such a situation is still a long way off. For instance, whilst the implementation of the Treaty of Valetta is almost the sole topic of conversation at the moment within Dutch archaeological circles, this is clearly far from the case in other European countries.

The fundamental role of this newsletter, as the mouthpiece of the EAA is to report on all the significant developments and points of view in Europe. Before he stepped down, Henry produced a guideline for TEA clearly stating its role. In summary, coverage in the TEA includes the following:

- communication of news of the Association and its Executive Board and Committees to the membership;
- policy statements and plans emanating from the Executive Board, committees, working groups, business meetings, etc to the membership;
- announcement of and reports on the EAA annual conference and other meetings and on the Heritage Prize;

- information from international organisations of particular relevance to the study and conservation of the European archaeological heritage;
- reports on the state of archaeology in different European countries
- reports on important threats to the European archaeological heritage
- articles of general relevance to European archaeologists
- articles on the education and training of professional archaeologists;
- occasional reports of important European meetings and conferences;
- Letters to the Editor;
- Diary of national and international meetings and conferences

An extensive list. For which I need your help. Despite prolonged efforts on the part of the Board, it continues to be difficult to find enthusiastic correspondents and contributors to provide material. If you think you could help as a national correspondent for your country, or if you would like to contribute an article, or information of interest to be included don't hesitate to contact me, either direct by email: KE.Waugh@planet.nl, or via the EAA Secretariat.

The deadline for the submission of copy for the next issue (TEA 16) is 31 October 2001.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Madam and Members of the EAA,

*As Director of a Heritage House and Museum at the City of Bormla on the Island of Malta, I am extending an invitation to all your members to visit our Museum when on holiday in Malta. At the site of the Museum, test excavations have revealed the presence of various artefacts and features, including ancient script graffiti that are unique. We are therefore inviting all EAA members to visit our **museum** / or stage a mini-seminar / or study individually our finds, and give their own conclusions. The architecture of the house, the structural features, the markings on walls, the pottery, bones, chert, red ochre, stone-works, and other items are open for study and a conclusive report. As this is a private family-run initiative no funds or help were given by local authorities to promote studies about the discoveries. The research is conducted by me (a historian and*

self-taught archaeologist) with the aid of friends who assess or with whom sometimes we discuss the finds. I believe that this would be an opportunity to help us safeguard the European heritage and share its knowledge with the future generations.

Thanks in advance for your Cupertino.

John Vella - Director
Bir Mula Heritage (House & Museum),
79 Margerita Street
Bormla
MALTA

EAA SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

Some Dates of Importance for EAA Members in 2001

24 June

Deadline of membership registration to receive the first two issues of the EJA on time

1 July

List of EAA members to be sent to SAGE

13 July

Deadline for sending in candidate forms with attached short biographies and supporting e-mails

20-22 July

Nomination Committee Meeting

20 August

Deadline for sending out voting letter and ballot paper to the EAA members from the Secretariat

14 September

Ballot papers sent by ordinary mail should be received by the Secretariat. Last day for e-mail votes.

18 September

Executive Board Meeting in Esslingen.

19 September

Editorial Board Meeting in Esslingen

19 September

Opening Ceremony in Esslingen, the Heritage Prize will be presented at the opening session.

20-22 September

EAA Conference: sessions, round table discussions, poster exhibitions.

21 September

17.00 deadline for putting ballot paper in the ballot box at the Conference

22 September

16.00 Annual Business Meeting

31 October

First mailing from next year's Conference Organisers

31 October

Deadline for sending in articles and announcements for the TEA

30 November

TEA winter issue will be posted on the EAA web-site

30 November

Membership renewal forms will be sent out

31 December

End of the EAA membership current year

DIARY

12 June – 31 December 2001

MAGYart – Year of the Hungarian Culture in France

A series of exhibitions and events are being organised in France:
The whole programme can be read on <http://www.nkom.hu>

2-6 July 2001

International Medieval Congress

Leeds, UK

The theme of the Congress is '*Familia and Domus*'.

2-6 July 2001

47th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale

Helsinki, FINLAND

International Congress of Assyriology and Near Eastern Archaeology. The theme is 'Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East'. For more information see their website.

14-15 July 2001

British Association of Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology Annual Conference

University of Durham, UK

Contact: Dr. Charlotte Roberts, e-mail c.a.roberts@durham.ac.uk, or Dr. Andrew Millard, e-mail: a.r.millard@durham.ac.uk.

22-28 July 2000

23rd International Conference of Papyrology

Vienna, AUSTRIA

Contact: e-mail hermann.harraeur@onb.ac.at

23-27 July 2001

Our Protected Past

University of Exeter, UK

A conference organised by the UK's National Parks Authorities and heritage agencies to present and develop understanding and management of the historic environment in Parks and other designated areas throughout Europe.

Contact: Our Protected Past, Centre for Education, Development and Co-operation, School of Education, University of Exeter, Heavitree Road, Exeter, Devon EX1 2L, UK, or e-mail OPP-Conference@exeter.ac.uk

2-8 September 2001

14th Congress of the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences

Liège, BELGIUM

Official web site: <http://www.ulg.ac.be/prehist/uispp-home.html>

Contact: General Secretary: e-mail: prehist@ulg.ac.be or, Webmaster: miller@ulg.ac.be

3-9 September 2001

2nd International Congress on Black Sea Antiquities

Bilkent University, Ankara, TURKEY

'Local Populations of the Black Sea Littoral and their Relations with the Greek, Roman and Byzantine Worlds and Near Eastern Civilisations'.

Contact: Congress General Secretary, Dr. G. R. Tsetsckhadze, Department of Classics, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, UK, or e-mail: g.tsetsckhadze@rhbc.ac.uk

5-8 September 2001

European Society for Environmental History

St. Andrews, UK

The first European environmental history conference will cover multiple disciplines including humanities, social sciences and natural/earth sciences.

Contact: Fiona Watson, e-mail: f.j.watson@stir.ac.uk

10-13 September 2001

Colours in the Ancient Mediterranean World

University of Edinburgh, UK

Panels on Egypt, The Aegean World, Classical Art and Archaeology, and Greek and Roman Literature and Culture.

For more information see their website.

19-23 September 2001

European Association of Archaeologists

Esslingen, GERMANY

See information in this newsletter.

21-23 November 2001.

Nimrud: British School of Archaeology, Iraq

British Museum, London, UK

Papers will be presented by an international group of speakers.

Contact: Henrietta McCall, Department of Ancient Near East, The British Museum, London WC1B 2DG. Tel: +44 (0)20 7323 8657. Fax: +44 (0) 20 7323 8489.

13-15 December 2001

TAG 2001

University College Dublin, IRELAND

27 May – 2 June 2002

9th International Conference of the European Southeast Asian Archaeologists (EurASEAA)

A major international forum for current research into the archaeology and cultural heritage of Southeast Asia

Contacts: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Post Box 16176, 103 24 Stockholm, Sweden. E-mail: euraseaa2002@mfea.se

10-15 September 2002

Medieval Europe Basel 2002: 3rd International Conference of Medieval and Later Archaeology

Basel, SWITZERLAND

The central theme is 'Centre, Region, Periphery'