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Editorial

The 22nd EAA Annual Meetings in Vilnius, Lithuania are less than three months away (see Welcome to Vilnius in this newsletter). The Vilnius organizing committee has a lot of helpful links and advice for planning your trip to Vilnius on their Useful information for planning your trip page. The Timetable of sessions has been posted online, along with the Scientific Programme. Thanks to the generous support of the Wenner-Gren Foundation, all delegates with economic need were eligible to apply for financial support to attend the meeting.

The Opening Ceremony, which will take place on Wednesday, 31st August in the palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, will include the presentation of the European Archaeological Heritage Prize and the Welcome Reception. The EAA Annual Party, which takes place, as usual, on Thursday evening, will include the Opening Ceremony of the new archaeological exhibition at The Bastion of the Vilnius Defensive Wall.

The European Journal of Archaeology (EJA) will have a transition in the Book Reviews editors, which will be announced at the Annual Business Meeting (ABM) on Friday 2nd September in Vilnius. The results of the EAA election, including the positions of Treasurer, two Executive Board members, and a Nomination Committee member, will also be announced at the ABM, and will be published in the autumn issue of TEA. We strongly encourage everyone to attend the ABM, which will include other announcements and discuss the progress and development of your EAA. This is an opportunity for all members to participate directly in EAA business and decision-making. Even if you do not make it to Vilnius, please take a moment to vote in this year’s EAA election.

In the aftermath of the Brexit-poll, EAA president Felipe Criado-Boado would like to assure us all the EAA remains an inclusive society that welcomes members of all nationalities and is dedicated to fostering collaborations between all members with an interest in European archaeology.

In this issue of TEA, Executive Board member Maria Guarova presents a possible strategy for the EAA and Affiliate Organizations. The EAA Committee on Illicit Trade in Cultural Material presents their assessment of the illegal antiquities market, and their aims to tackle this problem. They remind everyone that there will be a round table discussion on ‘Illicit trafficking of Cultural Heritage’ and a related session ‘Heritage Crime: Definition, Development and Duty-based ethics’ at the Annual Meetings in Vilnius. EAA Executive Board Member Sophie Hüglin reports on ‘Archaeology and Power’, the theme of the DGUF conference in Berlin, and relations between the EAA and DGUF. In addition, there are announcements, reports on recent conferences, and reports of ongoing research projects in Scotland and Hungary.

The deadline for the Autumn Issue of TEA is 31 October 2016. As always, please e-mail us at tea@e-a-a.org if you would like to get in touch.

Katharina Rebay-Salisbury and Roderick B. Salisbury
EAA Matters

Letter from the President

by Felipe Criado-Boado, EAA president, on the behalf of EAA Executive Board and Committees (felipe.criado-boado@incipit.csic.es).

Following the Brexit referendum and especially addressing all our English, Welsh, Northern Irish and Scottish members, those who work across Europe and those European who live and work in the UK, this is a time to pause, reflect and to look forward with confidence. It is a time to remember that all societies are composed of individuals and what they create. It is a time to bring to mind that solidarity and friendship build trust, integration and unity.

Archaeologists generally, and especially those within the EAA, have demonstrated the capacity to creatively work across borders and the great value of fostering international, open communities. We in the EAA are even more committed to this focus now. We will maintain our enthusiasm for imagining a more inclusive, solidary and stronger Europe and a more representative EAA in that context. We will, therefore, create time at our next Annual Meeting in Vilnius for a Round Table to discuss the impact of the Brexit vote for European archaeology, for all the members of the EAA and especially for our UK colleagues, whom we will continue to hold in the highest regard.

We collectively need to consider how to react and respond, and how to position the EAA in this new and complex cultural, social and political environment, recognizing that this event in the UK is reflective of more widespread processes in European societies that we must recognize for intervening in them. This is a moment when an organization such as ours needs to establish and align its position with clarity, drawing on the very significant intellectual capital of its members. We look forward to this important discussion at Vilnius. We look forward to keep our founding European projection in this challenging time.

Calendar for EAA members June – December 2016

14 August  Deadline for Student Award submissions
15 August  Deadline for last cancellation for 22nd Annual Meeting
26 August  Deadline for delivery of EAA election ballot form by post
30 August  Pre-conference excursion
31 August - 4 September  EAA conference in Vilnius
31 August  Opening ceremony
1 September  EAA Annual Party
2 September  Deadline for submitting election ballot on-line, by e-mail, or at the ballot box at the EAA booth
2 September  Annual Business Meeting
3 September  Annual Dinner
4 September  Post-conference excursions
31 October  Deadline for submitting papers and announcements for TEA Winter Issue No. 50
Vote in the EAA Election 2016

- on-line here
- by email (please download the form and send it to administrator@e-a-a.org)
- by post (please download the form and send it to EAA, Letenská 4, 118 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic)
- at the ballot box at EAA conference in Vilnius

Dear Member of the European Association of Archaeologists,

The EAA is continuing its programme of change and development that will shape the Association for the next decade and beyond. Please use your chance to elect the most appropriate candidates to steer the EAA and its work.

The table below shows the current composition of the Executive Board and Nomination Committee; positions that are available for election in 2016 are highlighted in blue italics and include the Treasurer, two Ordinary Executive Board members, and a Nomination Committee member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term of Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAA Executive Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Felipe Criado-Boado</td>
<td>2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Marc Lodewijckx</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
<td>Margaret Gowen</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Manuel Fernández-Götz</td>
<td>2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
<td>Maria Gurova</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Sophie Hüglin</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Esa Mikkola</td>
<td>2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Alessandro Vanzetti</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
<td>Nurcan Yalman</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EAA Nomination Committee** |                    |                |
| Committee Member             | Tim Darvill        | 2013-2016      |
| Committee Member             | Marga Díaz-Andreu  | 2015-2018      |
| Committee Member             | Arek Marciniak     | 2014-2017      |
Following a call for nominations, the candidates proposed for each vacant position are listed below:

**TREASURER**
Gowen, Margaret

**EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBER 1**
Gurova, Maria
Lazar, Irena
Yalman, Nurcan E.

**EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBER 2**
Briggs, Stephen C.
Potrebica, Hrvoje
Salas Rossenbach, Kai

**NOMINATION COMMITTEE MEMBER**
Arnold, Bettina
Scarre, Chris

According to the Statutes only Full Members of the Association are eligible to be elected or to vote in the election process. Each Full Member is entitled to one vote per vacant position. To ensure this, you will receive an e-mail with your voting code and login information for the ‘members only’ section of the EAA web page. If you vote on-line, after entering the ‘members only’ section you simply proceed with your vote; if you vote either by postal ballot, by email, or put your ballot paper in the ballot box at the Secretariat’s desk at the conference, you need to state your unique voting code on the envelope if you are voting by mail or at the conference, or in the subject line (title) of the e-mail to which you attach your ballot paper. The election is anonymous and the unique voting code (identifiable solely by you and the EAA Administrator) serves only to verify eligibility to vote.

Ballot papers sent by ordinary mail must reach the Secretariat (European Association of Archaeologists, Letenská 4, 118 01 Praha 1, Czech Republic) before 26 August 2016. E-mail votes (to administrator@e-a-a.org; form to be downloaded from http://www.e-a-a.org, ‘Members Section’) and on-line votes (direct link through the Members section) must be received no later than 12:00hrs on 2 September 2016. The Ballot box at the Secretariat’s desk in Vilnius will be open until 12:00hrs on 2 September 2016. Ballot papers received after these deadlines, or without the unique voting code, will not be included in the official count.

The results of the election will be announced at the EAA Annual Members’ Business Meeting on Friday 2 September 2016, released shortly thereafter in the members section of the EAA web page, and published in the autumn issue of the TEA.

Sylvie Květinová
EAA Administrator
STUDENTS

SUBMIT YOUR CONFERENCE PAPER FOR THE EAA STUDENT AWARD AND WIN € 1,000 IN BOOKS

MA and PhD students and archaeologists working on a dissertation, who present a paper at the 22nd EAA conference in Vilnius, are welcome to apply for the 2016 Student Award. Please submit your paper before 14 August 2016 - please email a brief covering letter, CV, and the full text of the conference paper, following the format for contributions to the EJA, to the EAA Administrator Sylvie Květínová: administrator@e-a-a.org for consideration by the selection committee. For more information, please visit http://www.e-a-a.org/prizes_awards.htm. Papers submitted will be evaluated for their academic merit and innovative ideas.

The Award consists of a diploma, books and book vouchers worth € 1,000. The winner of the award will be announced at the Vilnius conference Opening Ceremony on 31 August 2016. The winning paper will be considered for publication in the European Journal of Archaeology (EJA).

SPONSORED BY

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Thames & Hudson

Springer

Cambridge University Press

Wiley

Oxbow Books

Oxford University Press

Archaeolingua

Left Coast Press Inc.
Welcome to Vilnius – the capital of archaeologists in 2016!

We are currently in full swing preparing for the biggest event in Lithuania in 2016 and while you are waiting for it, we invite you to explore the Scientific and Social programs of the 22nd EAA Annual Meeting!

Very inviting and very beautiful, that’s what comes to mind when talking about Vilnius. The city was first mentioned in written sources in 1323. For over five centuries, until the 18th century, Vilnius was the political and cultural centre of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Although Vilnius is known as a Baroque city, there are examples of Gothic, Renaissance, and other styles. There are more than 40 churches of different styles in Vilnius. Owing to its uniqueness, the Old Town of Vilnius was included in the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1994 because it "has preserved an impressive complex of Gothic, Renaissance, Baroque and classical buildings as well as its medieval layout and natural setting". Its many different churches are a treasure to be found, and the old town gives you an experience worth remembering.

Welcome!

Scientific program of the EAA Annual Meeting 2016
Thursday 1 September - Saturday 3 September
After the evaluation process and Scientific Committee Meeting, a total of 108 sessions and 1458 proposals have been accepted! There will be 1293 oral presentations and 165 posters!
The Scientific program, which consists of paper presentations, round table discussions and posters, will follow the framework of these six themes:

- Interpreting the Archaeological Record
- Managing Archaeological Heritage
- Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives in Archaeology
- Archaeology of the Baltic Region
- Science and Multidisciplinarity in Archaeology
- Archaeology Without Borders

All sessions will take place at historical Vilnius University - a classical university with over 430 years of academic traditions and the widest range of study programs in Lithuania. Its architectural ensemble of Gothic, Renaissance, Baroque and Classicism styles is composed of 13 courtyards with 13 buildings each consisting of several blocks, as well as the Church of St. John and belfry.

Interactive map of Vilnius University campus:


Sessions will take place in the History, Philosophy and Philology departments. We have allocated 40 lecture rooms with more than 2000 seats so that all participants can comfortably sit and listen to oral presentations. All lecture rooms are equipped with desktop PC’s, portable or stationery projectors, projector screens, magnetic boards, audio equipment and interactive whiteboards for the convenience of participants.

Registration and Exhibition area

The Exhibition hall will be located in the Department of History and is planned to be the most visited place during the conference. It will be near the registration desk, information point and, most importantly, next to the cafeteria. The intent is to create a more pleasant experience allowing attendees to enjoy a leisurely coffee break and have more time for face-to-face interaction with exhibitors. We are expecting to have more than twenty exhibitors from all over the world. Some of the booths are already reserved by academic institutions, laboratories and the world's leading publishers and booksellers in archaeology and the ancient world.
Social Program

Opening Ceremony - Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania
31st August, 2016 / Katedros a. 4, Vilnius

The 22nd Annual Meeting will begin with the traditional Opening ceremony, which will take place at the reconstructed Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania – the most famous political, diplomatic and cultural centre of the State in the 15th-17th centuries. The Opening ceremony will include the presentation of the European Archaeological Heritage Prize and EAA Student Award, along with a keynote lecture from leading academic and artistic responses to Lithuania’s archaeology.

We are pleased to announce that during the 22nd Annual Meeting all participants are invited to visit the newest and most beautiful collection of archaeological finds in Lithuania – for free. The historical and architectural development of the Palace is shown by highlighting the ancient ruins still in place and exhibiting the excavated artefacts (a truly impressive collection of about 300,000 objects).
Opening ceremony of the archaeological exhibition
“Recent Discoveries of Lithuanian Archaeology”
1st September, 2016 / Bastion of the Vilnius Defensive Wall / Bokšto Str. 20/18

On 1 September an opening ceremony of the archaeological exhibition “Recent Discoveries of Lithuanian Archaeology” will take place at the Bastion of the Vilnius Defensive Wall. Alongside this new exhibition, a permanent exhibition of Lithuania’s archaeology will be open to all delegates wishing to explore Lithuania's past and culture.

The exhibition will present the latest archaeological findings in Lithuania. Artefacts in the exhibition are being collected from the main regional museums of Lithuania in order to present the archaeology of Lithuania under one roof. During the event, participants will be welcomed by the representatives of the National Museum of Lithuania and will also be invited to taste different flavours of Lithuanian wine and traditional biscuits.

EAA Annual Party
1st September, 2016 / Concert Hall “Vakaris” / A. Stulginskio str. 8, Vilnius

All participants are invited to the EAA Annual Party, which will be hosted at the modern show and concert hall “Vakaris”. It is located in Vilnius city centre and is only a 10-minute walk from Vilnius University. We are proud to announce that the Party music will be provided by our best DJ’s, who are also archaeologists! Evening theme – Archaeologists rock!
Annual Dinner

3rd September / Vilnius Grand resort / Ezeraičiu str. 2, Ezeraičiai, Vilnius dist.

We will end the scientific program of the 22nd EAA Meeting with a remarkable event – the Annual Dinner. We would like to invite all participants of the meeting to join this event and enjoy Lithuanian cuisine, socialize, dance or just relax while admiring Lithuanian nature.

The event will take place at a luxury country estate set within 395 acres of magnificent sprawling forest and lake scenery. Its peaceful location provides a carefree getaway while remaining just 20 minutes from the buzz of central Vilnius. Surrounded by lakes, pine and birch forests, the resort is as peaceful as it is beautiful - a fitting choice for a relaxing getaway in Lithuania.

Shuttles to and from the Annual Dinner event will run on Saturday, September 3, from Vilnius University.

Volunteers

This year’s conference has managed to attract great attention from many young people who are offering to become volunteers and are ready to assist with all on-site meeting services to ensure a smooth running of the 22nd Annual Meeting. As of this moment, there are 45 volunteers from 12 different countries and their number is still growing. Young people from United States, Australia, China and many EU countries are already in our amazing volunteer team.

If you want to volunteer and be a part of an amazing team, email volunteers@eaavilnius2016.lt

WENNER-GREN GRANTS

Thanks to the generous support of the Wenner-Gren Foundation, all delegates in need, regardless of their country of work and residence, are eligible to apply for a grant to help them attend the EAA 22nd Annual Meeting in Vilnius!

The closing date for submission of grant applications is 1 June 2016.

For more information and how to apply, please follow this link: http://eaavilnius2016.lt/wenner-gren-grants/
SKY TEAM GLOBAL MEETINGS PROGRAM

SkyTeam has been chosen as the Official Alliance Network for air travel, offering the participants of the conference attractive airfares. By booking and buying airline ticket via the dedicated link below, the participants will benefit from:

- **Savings** – exclusive discounts up to 15% in both Business and Economy Class; no fee for online bookings;
- **Reward Miles** – earning Miles on frequent flyer program of a SkyTeam member airline and saving on future travels;
- **SkyTeam network** – travelling to the event from virtually anywhere in the world with over 16,270 daily flights covering more than 1,050 destinations in 179 countries.


Other useful information:

- 31 May, 2016 – Final version of the Scientific Program will be announced;
- 15 August, 2016 – Final deadline for last cancelation;
- If you need a Letter of Invitation for your VISA application, please email – [info@eaavilnius2016.lt](mailto:info@eaavilnius2016.lt)

And please remember:

**WE ARE MEETING IN VILNIUS ON THE 31st AUGUST – 4TH SEPTEMBER!**
Affiliate Organisations and the EAA: a strategy for future cooperation?

by Maria Gurova (ordinary member of the EAA Executive Board, and Executive Board member of the Association of Bulgarian Archaeologists, gurovam@yahoo.fr)

As members of the EAA we all accept, approve, appreciate and share the highest standards and principles of the Association outlined in its official documents. We contribute to the EAA’s standards and challenges, introducing and progressively improving our personal level of scientific proficiency and discourse with others. On whose behalf do we act – our own obviously (even though many of us have a solid institutional affiliation behind us); but to whom are we addressing our scientific and practical issues – to the community of potential participants of EAA conference sessions (and to the readers of the highly ranked European Journal of Archaeology, if we are authors there)? This is a significant audience. BUT is it sufficient for us? How visible and recognizable is our performance on the EAA scientific scene?

These are only a few of the reasonable and spontaneously arising questions of some part of the EAA membership. I will try to approach the issue via a virtual monologue based on current EAA documents. Let us remind ourselves of some of the prominent and crucial points of the current EAA research policy:

EAA Statutes, Article II: aims (the same text in Handbook, Article II)

The aims of the Association shall be:

1. To promote the development of archaeological research and the exchange of archaeological information in Europe;
2. To promote the management and interpretation of European archaeological heritage;
3. To promote proper ethical and scientific standards for archaeological work;
4. To promote the interests of professional archaeologists in Europe;
5. To promote cooperation with other organisations with similar aims.

Apart from the mobilization and PR aspects of these objectives, a simple question is evoked: HOW can these well-structured aims become reality? How to transform these laudable objectives into a meaningful and stimulating appeal to people – apart from disseminating our work through publication in the EJA, as mentioned above.

MY answer is: via openness and close collaboration with institutions and organisations that are behind the thousands of individual members. The EAA has already offered some places for corporate members, which brings modest financial benefits, but unfortunately there are no perceptible signs of their collective activities.

Three years ago the idea was put forward to create “Affiliate Organisations” (For examples of such organisations, refer to the Statutes of the UISPP (the oldest and most honoured organisation in the archaeological domain), alongside the existing membership categories. Affiliate Organisation status is envisaged as being open to archaeological and academic bodies that share the EAA’s professional standards and interests. The EAA Executive Board (ExB) proposed guidelines for “affiliate” status. No direct financial benefits for the EAA or the Affiliate Organisation are envisaged (the EAA non benefit side is challenged here!), but to qualify for “affiliate” status an outside organisation must have at least 5 members at any one time who are also fully paid up members of the EAA. A Memorandum is presumed to be signed by the head of the Affiliate Organisation and the EAA President (the draft of this document is actually being discussed by ExB and Statutes Committee members).

Information about the creation of this new category of “Affiliate Status” should be presented to the EAA membership and a debate should ensue in order to gauge opinion on the proposal, to be voted on at the next ABM in Vilnius (2nd September 2016).
Let me turn to my idea from the beginning – the EAA will be better able to promote new initiatives and fulfil its aims by sharing the practice with a larger spectrum of organisations (including “affiliates”) and creating space for new and challenging research and management ideas and experience emanating from different backgrounds in Europe and beyond. Many individual members will benefit if their host institution is formally affiliated with the EAA; for instance, imagine the EAA enriched by affiliation with the Hermitage Museum in St Petersburg, with the Bulgarian and Serbian Associations of Archaeologists, or with the National Museums of countries that do not deserve to be neglected merely because their scientific organisations cannot afford to pay the fees required for Corporate membership of the EAA. These potential affiliate organisations would like, in fact, to be in formal association with the EAA and would have much to contribute.

These thoughts are intended to provoke a frank and earnest debate about WHY we are in the EAA: is it to enjoy our corporate logo on the website, to attend the EAA conference for personal interest and prestige, OR is it to share the scene with partners whose potential we tend to underestimate or neglect out of lack of awareness and/or because of profit-focused strategic ambitions?
In Lighter News...

On a recent field trip through "Sierra de Barbanza" (Galicia, NW Iberia), Felipe Criado-Boado (EAA President) and Diane Gifford-Gonzalez (SAA President) found time to work together – to repair a flat tire! Luckily Rob Yanagida (Diane’s husband) was there to help. Perhaps a good metaphor of what Society for American Archaeology and EAA European Association of Archaeologists can do working together.

In a difficult place, but the view was fantastic!
Committee on the Illicit Trade in Cultural Material


During recent years, especially with the increasing political crisis in the Near East, we have observed a growing concern and urge to act and to take a firm stand against illicit trade in cultural heritage, especially as Europe is one of the main markets for illicit archaeological objects. The ‘hottest investment’ (TIME-Magazine, 12/12/2007) is, aside from unauthorised buildings development, climate change, and deliberate destruction in times of conflict, one of the biggest problems for archaeology. Reasons for investing in archaeological objects include fascination with the past, ‘great showpieces’ for display, and the limited quantity available since museums and private collectors purchase objects, removing them from the reach of both scientific community and the commercial market, often permanently.

Finds deriving from illegal excavations, artefact hunting, theft from museums/public collections, and archaeological material originating from armed conflicts taking place in various parts of the world, appear on the Western market. Often they appear with faked provenience, for example deriving from so-called ‘old collections’, and are sold apparently legitimately. Only occasionally are these acts prosecuted (Brodie 2015), and then only on a case-by-case basis with often only minor consequences for the offenders. Moreover, a significant increase of new buyers from emerging markets has been noted in recent years. Often these new markets are within the borders of unstable countries, outside of the jurisdiction of international charters, which makes the prosecution challenging if not impossible.

There is no universal policy for control and recording of publically-made finds. In rare cases, illegal/illicit finds are ultimately recovered through legal action (as happened to the Bronze Age Nebra Sky Disc, Germany), or non-professional finds are eventually acquired and recovered by public authorities or museums, with the aid of public funding, so that they can be properly studied (as in the case of the Anglo-Saxon Staffordshire Hoard, United Kingdom). Also, several finds have been repatriated from US museums and collections since 2005 (mainly to Italy and Greece, see links below), which further exposed the wrongdoings of the market. This was made possible in particular through negotiations under the pressure of existing international charters.

However, the majority of less-spectacular artefacts are routinely advertised and sold without interruption, usually through the internet, as well as through antique fairs and auction houses, or through personal connections.

The existence of these ‘private’ finds, unless already published as part of an antiquarian collection, is often ignored by many archaeologists. This is perhaps partly a consequence of the lack of firm provenances for the origins of such artefacts, and lost contextual relations which could have been used to interpret these materials, or as an attempt to disassociate themselves from such finds and their collectors. Another aspect might be the wish not to raise the commercial value of the object (see Harding 2011 for a detailed discussion on the topic), as well as for practical reasons, given the labour involved in gathering information on such finds from the large number of media through which they are routinely advertised and sold.

Especially during the past few years, a significant increase in illegal excavations and trafficking of archaeological material was noted not only in the Middle East (see e.g. the links below about detecting looting by satellite images), but also in Europe. This became easier (and also more easily traceable) through the growing use of the internet and its different platforms supporting trade. These sales would have happened before through antique or flea markets, or dealers, but increasingly these sales are now facilitated by the internet (in addition to these traditional outlets), blurring the lines between local private collectors, public platforms, and (inter)national dealers. With the beginning of the 21st century, the internet has grown exponentially also in its commercial impact, providing access
to worldwide markets for trade and exchange, which has significantly contributed to the demand for archaeological artefacts. Large numbers of these sales, particularly of ‘mundane’ finds, can be documented online.

The sheer quantity of these artefacts on the legal selling market should raise considerable concern within the archaeological community. Thousands of prehistoric artefacts are presented on a daily basis as fresh finds on the internet through mediums and platforms such as ‘treasure hunter’ internet platforms (e.g. violity.com; kladoiskateli.com), advertised and sold online through outlets such as eBay or liveauctioneers.com and sold through licensed auction houses, such as Sotheby’s and Bonhams (see links at the end of the article), as well as ‘private’ auctions and transaction without any public record. Increasingly over the last decade, the internet has offered an easy, accessible and growing platform for the rapid exchange and trade of archaeological artefacts, the sheer volume of sales making it hard to keep track of newly-advertised finds and sales. This is not only due to political crisis or growing poverty, but also due to technological improvements and hence a greater ease of finding and looting archaeological sites.

Trafficking in archaeological materials constitutes a violation of the archaeological record, interest, and informational value, and consequently contributes to the destruction of our common history. Now is the time to become more active, and to vigorously support and help the protection of world archaeological heritage.

The Committee on the Illicit Trade in Cultural Material supports the following codes of principles concerning stewardship (note here Hamilakis 1999 and 2003 for a critical view on the topic) and commercialisation of archaeological material:

**Stewardship**

The general archaeological record is unique and irreplaceable. It is therefore the duty and responsibility of every archaeologist to protect and contribute to the long-term preservation of world archaeological heritage. This includes a duty to prevent, report, and raise public and especially institutional awareness, of criminal activities such as the damage, destruction or devastation of cultural heritage, and the illegal trafficking and selling of cultural heritage.

We endeavour to protect all material culture and its context of past people and societies on the basis of the social memory of them, and not on the basis of a selectively constructed record. We have ethical responsibilities to the materials we study, the people with whom we work, and especially to the people living where we study those materials. We act with political awareness, not only to protect the cultural heritage for the future, but also with responsibility for the present, and question political decisions which result in human suffering and destruction of cultural heritage.

**Commercialisation**

Europe is one of the leading regions in the international trade of illegally acquired cultural heritage. This results in the vast destruction of archaeological sites and the loss of the material culture and connected information, all of which is essential to understanding the archaeological record. Archaeologists should consequently

- raise public awareness of the legal consequences of the damage and destruction of cultural heritage, and the resulting loss of information;
- report any illegal activity, or trade of potentially illegally-acquired material culture;
- never act as an expert for auction houses, antiquaries, or private collections if the find concerned is not going to be part of a collection open to public and research and does not have a proven pre-1970 collecting history (UNESCO convention 1970; in Italy, the date is even 1939), or anyway clearly preceding the legal date for free marketing, as assumed by the country of origin;
- contribute, in any form, to discourage commercialisation of archaeological material. The publication of illicit or doubtful goods shall be accepted only if the find concerned is not legitimised and the doubtful provenance or illicit background clearly pointed out and problematized.
Aims

The Committee on the Illicit Trade in Cultural Material aims to:

1. prevent and contrast looting and illegal excavations;
2. limit trafficking and accept selling of cultural heritage to those objects that have a certificate of legal and ethical origin (e.g. pre-1970 known and proven as valid origin, or/and as in the UNIDROIT convention (1995), or the Kulturgüterrückgabegesetz, Germany (1999 and 2007), which is planned to be even stricter in 2016);
3. develop strategies for a common European legal basis for the protection of archaeological sites and material culture;
4. develop an European standardization for the protection of cultural heritage and archaeological finds;
5. establish partnerships with specialists and enforcement agencies working in similar issues (e.g. UNESCO, Italian Carabinieri, UK Art and Antiques Unit);
6. raise public and institutional awareness of the impact of the destruction of cultural heritage and the legal consequences of doing so.

We aim to prevent and reduce looting and illegal excavations by a variety of far-reaching strategies, including organising public activities and raising of public awareness of the negative consequences of illegal excavations for the public, such as loss of cultural value, common history, identity, and touristic potential. Also, we aim to raise public awareness of the value of archaeological finds, and their context for everyone (information at schools, exhibitions, information material, brochures, collecting and publishing of information in a public database and web map). We will do this through such strategic use of press, TV, and social media.

A special focus will be on so-called ‘high end’ collectors; we hope to raise ethical issues, making it more difficult to justify their collecting practices in light of the impact it has on archaeological sites, and the loss of contextual information of the find in general. Significant attention will be also drawn to effective regulation of and engagement with legal artefact hunters (e.g. metal detectorists in countries where this hobby is legal), such as raising awareness about avoiding going on protected land, better routes for recording finds, and better advice for preserving assemblages (rather than breaking them up for resale).

Moreover, we plan to offer cooperation with local and international police officers, government agencies, and specialists working in similar issues (UNESCO, Interpol, Italian Carabinieri, and others). This will also raise the profile of 'heritage crimes', and result in partnerships with enforcement authorities (including advising export licensing authorities, customs and border control, and others). Consequently, we support a call for more coordinated sharing of information across Europe, from intelligence on sales and crime trends through to more coordinated data sharing (i.e. compatible software to enable cross-comparisons and transnational research between national and international databases). Examples of such databases can be found in Israel and Egypt (see below).

The committee moreover aims to provide a holistic overview and publish regularly reports on the current situation on heritage crime in every membership country. Over time we will kindly ask EAA-members to contribute to our studies with information about their country. Another aspiration is the creation of country-specific brochures both for archaeologists and the interested public, summarizing the current legal status, and the negative effects for all of us of unauthorised excavations, artefact hunting, theft from museums/public collections, and archaeological material originating from armed conflicts taking place in various parts of the world.

We aim to limit trafficking and accept selling of cultural heritage to those objects that have a certificate of origin as e.g. noted in the EU-directive 2014/60 and the Berliner Erklärung (1988; see Thorn 2005, Anhang 2, 407-408) by supporting the establishment of an (inter)national database in order to register finds with photo and identifier number. For example, the Israeli high court announced recently that all antiquities dealers will have to allocate every artefact an identification number and picture, which will be stored on an electronic database. Egypt is going to follow this example (see the links below in the references). Another issue will be to encourage more museums to join ICOM, and
consequently to adhere to the ICOM codes of ethics, especially articles 2, 7, and 8 (see link below).
We refer to the critical statement of C. Renfrew (2006) on museum acquisitions and the therewith connected responsibilities for the illicit trade in antiquities.

We urge all colleagues to use every communication channel, from social media and encounters with the press, to guided tours for schools, to spread information about archaeologist’s ethical standpoint and why it is important to protect our cultural heritage.

**Organisation**

Marianne Mödlinger and Matija Črešnar are currently acting head and vice of the committee, in order to take care of organizational issues.

**Members/Authors**

George Abungu, ICOM
Elif Denel, American Research Institute, Ankara
Matija Črešnar, Ljubljana
Marko Mele, Graz
Marianne Mödlinger, Bordeaux
Mehmet Özdogan, Istanbul
Suzie Thomas, University of Helsinki
Christos Tsiorogiannis, University of Cambridge
Marit Van Cant, Brussels
Armin Volkmann, Heidelberg

**Ex officio members/Authors**

Manuel Fernandez-Gotz, Edinburgh
Alessandro Vanzetti, Rome
Nurcan Yalman, Istanbul

**Forthcoming**

The committee is organising a round table discussion on ‘Illicit trafficking of Cultural Heritage: different strategies to fight it’ at this year’s annual meeting of the EAA in Vilnius, Lithuania, and a connected Session on ‘Heritage Crime: Definition, Development and Duty-based ethics’ will be held right after the round table discussion in the same room.

We aim to build up a Code of Ethics, standards for ‘responsible’ private collections and museums, and will discuss about further strategies on how to prevent illicit trafficking. We would very much appreciate the participation and contribution of everyone interested!

**References**

DOI: [10.1017/S0940739115000144](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0940739115000144)


DOI: 10.1179/pua.2003.3.2.104


Links (updated on May 10, 2016)

Doubtful objects at Christies’s and Bonham’s
http://art-crime.blogspot.it/2014/04/christies-and-bonhams-withdraw-two.html

EU-directive 2014/60

ICOM code of ethics (2013)

Repatration from the US to Italy
http://archaeologynewsnetwork.blogspot.it/2015/05/us-returns-25-looted-artefacts-to-italy.html

Amendment for the protection of cultural heritage in Germany
https://www.bundesregierung.de/Webs/Breg/DE/Bundesregierung/BeauftragtefuerKulturundMedien/kultur/kulturgutschutz/node.html

About Israel’s high court decision for antiquity dealers of December 2015:
http://ht.ly/uRr6300eL27

About Egypt’s establishment of an object database for antiquity dealers:

UNIDROIT convention 1995


Directive 93/7/EEC of the Council of the European Union: it provides for the return of cultural objects that have been unlawfully removed from the territory of a member state of the European Union.

Sarah H. Parcak on detecting looting via satellite:

Satellite images used for detecting looting in the Middle East:
http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2015/03/satellite_images_show_isis_other_groups_destroying_archaeological_sites.single.html?wp_login_redirect=0
Archeology and Power

DGUF Conference, Berlin 5 – 8 May 2016: conference review and EAA – DGUF relations report

by Sophie Hüglin, EAA Executive Board Member / DGUF Advisory Board Member,
Sophie.Hueglin@newcastle.ac.uk

At this years conference ‘Archaeology and Power’ of the German Society for Pre- and Protohistory (DGUF) in Berlin President Felipe Criado Boado and Executive Board Member Sophie Hüglin represented the EAA. This was to emphasize the importance of close relationships with Archaeology and Archaeologists in German speaking countries in general as well as with one of their politically most active archaeological organisations, the DGUF, in particular. To gain more influence on politics and society in order to serve the benefits of European Archaeology and Archaeologists, the EAA needs not only more members, but also strategic partnerships with other organisations with similar aims. In this case, EAA’s official presence helped to raise the level of awareness for DGUF’s conference which addressed aspects of power among archaeologists as well as the power-shift from professional to public in archaeology.

The DGUF – under President Diane Scherzler and Deputy Frank Siegmund – is making great efforts to internationalize the organisation. Consequently, webpage, publications and conferences become bilingual with more and more contributions being published in English. In line with this, speakers at the Berlin conference with no or little German were provided with bilingual assistants as well as texts and discussion groups in English.

The EAA on the other hand can learn from DGUF’s public relations activities which have been considerably intensified and professionalised under President Diane Scherzler, who is a project manager with the radio department of Suedwestrundfunk (SWR), a major German Public Broadcasting Company. Especially remarkable with regard to communication strategies is DGUF’s (almost) monthly newsletter, which has started with 400 subscribers four years ago and recently reached 1200. As subscription of the newsletter is not restricted to the – about 700 – members of the society, it is read widely amongst German speaking/reading archaeologists as well as by the interested public and even professional journalists. While the authors themselves stay anonymous to protect them from possible personal consequences, it is DGUF who prompts critical reports from insiders and takes editorial responsibility.

This years DGUF conference on ‘Archaeology and Power – Positionings for the future of researching the past’ was a follow-up of last year’s meeting in Tübingen which had resulted in the Tübingen Theses on Archaeology. The manifesto expresses values for professional archaeology in the current process of change especially in its relation to the public. The Tübingen Theses can still be signed.

In Berlin, more than 50 participants engaged with contributions of 30 speakers from seven countries during – inspiring, but also exhausting – three and a half days. The program addressed different aspects of ‘Archaeology and Power’. Here it will only be possible to give a short overview of the contributions and discussions evolving from them; moreover many of the contributions were filmed and are available on YouTube. The headlines were as follows:

1. History and stories of power – Past experiences
2. Creating archaeology near to the powers
3. Law and power in practical archaeology
4. Citizen Science and civil participation
5. Museums: Gatekeeper, debate setter, playthings?
6. Debates on power between discipline and civil society
7. Case studies: citizens make archaeology
8. Discourses on power in talking and writing about archaeology
9. Archaeology in the struggle for influence
10. Consequences of precariat and (economic) uncertainty
11. Research policy, national and European Agenda

The keynote speakers in part 1 looked back in history, in the case of Eike Gringmuth-Dallmer on the recent German past. He described how the ‘Wende’ – the political turnaround of the former German Democratic Republic and the subsequent unification with former West Germany – affected archaeological research institutions and the excavation sector of East Germany. Depending on the perspective it could either be called a disaster – for the Academy of Sciences – or a story of success, because legislation now following the so called ‘polluter-pays-principle’ created many temporary jobs on excavations. Coming from a Swiss perspective, Werner Stöckli made clear how much archaeological interpretation was and is shaped by current world views. In this way seemingly homogenous ethnic groups of the past like the Celts are recreated and act as constituents of positive self-identification in the present. Taking research history at Manching as an example, he showed what problems arise, when archaeological finds lead to the suspicion these praised ancestors could have been cannibals.

In his introduction Frank Siegmund reported on the difficulties to find speakers for the conference, because to his experience: „the one’s who have the power don’t want to speak about it and the one’s who haven’t are too afraid to speak about it.” While this silence is one of the constituents of power structures, Diane Scherzler pointed out in part 2 how institutional archaeology is actually rapidly loosing its influence on politicians, journalists and investors. Ignoring this process is one of the strategies with which official archaeology tries to secure its position, but actually what we see is an act of „planned lack of consequence and self-capacitation“. But „power is needed to protect the archaeological heritage”, Diane Scherzler stressed, because „power as such is not good or bad, but the purpose for what it is used” (cf. Diane Scherzler in an interview by SWR2 Campus).

To stimulate discussion with the audience, the organisers introduced a new conference format: inserted after each block of three papers there was an interval of debates in small groups. For this the audience wrote questions and remarks written by on pieces of paper which were collected and grouped during the talks and consequently served the small groups as focal points of discussion. The results of the debates were documented on a flipchart and returned to the plenary by the group moderators. Citations and photos from as well as comments on presentations and discussions were shared online via Twitter and can still be found in form of an online diary. Jaime Almansa Sánchez, Geesche Wilt and Pascal Geiger posted in their private blogs on the conference.

Fig. 1: Discussion groups: Cyril Dworsky, Sophie Huglin, Jaime Almansa Sanchez and Gerry Wait © DGUF/Daniel Stotzka
Discussing the current state of implementation of the 2005 Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society in the German federal states – with Katharina Möller and Raimund Karl – or Community Archaeology in Britain – with Hedley Roberts – in parts 3 and 4 made clear that the right to do research on the past or to decide what of it should be preserved cannot stay exclusively with the state offices, but increasingly will have to be negotiated amongst all stakeholders. For Switzerland, Thomas Reitmaier pointed out how many issues dealt with in recent referendums – like the land use regulation, the second home initiative or the energy revolution – have direct or indirect impact on archaeology. This is the reason why Swiss NGOs have formed ‘Alliance Patrimoine’ with more than 100 000 members which is able to lobby at national level. But doesn’t it need now an alliance of NGO’s to lobby at European and international level?

In part 5, Doreen Mölders, curator at the Archaeological Museum in Chemnitz, described how she increasingly has to concur with private museums that offer appropriate narratives to the growing right wing movement in East Germany. In German speaking countries archaeology and subsequently the stereotype of the archaeologist is still largely dominated by men, as Jana-Esther Fries rightfully pointed out. There is no male dominance in the subject in Spain was a remark by Jamie Almansa Sánchez; to demonstrate the underrepresentation of women in the Northern and Eastern Europe was also one of the core results of the project ‘Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe’. While the threshold between citizens, volunteers, hobby archaeologists and professionals seems to continuously break away, Gerry Wait from the Chartered Institute of Archaeologists (CIfA) offered a new way how expertise in archaeology can be tested and acknowledged beyond academia. While being well established in the United Kingdom, CIfA now promotes its model of accreditation internationally.

If we want to build real partnerships with citizen scientists, to overcome the obstacles of coded language in academic archaeology will be the way; this was pointed out by Carmen Löw in part 8. One of the most powerful ways to reach the public via the internet is to share knowledge on Wikipedia. But Wikipedia author and activist Marcus Cyron made clear: contributions to the online encyclopedia are not advertisements for the respective organisation or person, instead they must come from independent experts. In Sweden GRASCA, the new Graduate School in Contract Archaeology, gives contract archaeologists a possibility to go back to University. With this Cornelius Holtorf, Director of the program at Linnaeus University, intends to extend the services archaeologists can offer society.

In part 9, Patrick Schollmeyer provided striking examples of power play in Classical Archaeology. While 19th century protagonists – like Theodor Wiegand, Ludwig Hoffmann, Wilhelm von Bode and Ludwig Curtius – sought support for their careers and projects near the centre of power living a life of ‘fawning courtiers’ around the emperor, their 18th century predecessor Johann Joachim Winckelmann somehow the ‘founding father’ of Art History had done quite the opposite. By writing on Greek and Roman Art not in Latin – the learned language of his days – but in German – the language of the citizens he opened up the discipline. Well, what could that mean for communication in Archaeology today: English instead of German, online open access instead of printed books, pictures and films instead of texts, creative workshops and MOOCs instead of University curricula?

In the final part’s keynote, Liuben Tevdowski came back to core questions: to the quest of Europeans for their identity in periods of migratory movements, demographic change, social crisis and instable ideologies. After a process of self-reflection, he now expects Archaeology to provide new narratives fitting our time: stories of transformation, integration, multicultural and multifaceted pasts as well as the continent’s and the World’s astonishing ability of rebirth after periods of crisis.

Many of the conference presentations will be transferred into scholarly papers for volume 40, 2017 of DGUF’s journal Archäologische Informationen. President Felipe Criado Boado and Sophie Hüglin will follow editor Frank Siegmund’s invitation to contribute a paper on EAA’s position and potential in questions of power. EAA’s presence in Berlin was indeed very important for both societies – EAA and DGUF: it has intensified the partnership and lifted it to a new level of mutual support.
All in all, it was astonishing to hear about an atmosphere of intimidation that seems to prevail at least with some archaeologists when it comes to speak openly about politics and power in Archaeology in seemingly free and democratic countries like Germany, Austria or Switzerland. Looking back at our personal experiences we can confirm that – often quite surprisingly – actively engaging with organisations on European or international level like the EAA – quoting President Felipe Criado Boado – ‘opens many doors, but closes others’. Together with DGUF the EAA will continue to encourage archaeologists to think and speak free as well as to openly discuss and address the challenges of the 21st century amongst each other as well as with the public, because we believe Archaeology is a means to understand and even overcome them together.

Conference and Workshop Reports

Anthropology, Weather and Climate Change

by Felix Riede, Associate Professor and Head of Department at the Department of Archaeology, Aarhus University, DK (f.riede@cas.au.dk) and Alison Klevnäs, Lecturer at the Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies at Stockholm University, SWE (alison.klevnas@ark.su.se)

From May 27th to 29th 2016, the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (RAI) hosted a large international conference on the theme of weather, environment and climate change at the British Museum in London. The topic is of course timely in the extreme, with issues of climate change and questions of how to deal most appropriately with it looming large in public debate, in policy-making, and in research funding arenas such as the EU’s Horizon 2020 framework programme. With nearly 600 attendees and substantial press coverage, this was by all standards a high-profile academic convention. As stated in the conference booklet, the meeting was to appeal to an anthropological audience in the four-field definition of the discipline, i.e. social/cultural anthropology, biological anthropology, linguistics and, last but not least, archaeology. The latter discipline was, however, only poorly represented outside the one session organized by us – but more on this below.

In the opening speech of the conference, Lord Deben, the Chairman of the UK’s independent Committee on Climate Change, delivered a rhetorically powerful barrage of arguments against the denial of anthropogenic climate change and for the critical roles of knowledge, of academia and of
academics in this domain. This politically and ethically charged tone was mirrored in most of the sessions and plenaries. Anthropologists working on human-environment relations are increasingly unable to disentangle their work from evermore pressing issues of climate change, environmental change, and environmental catastrophe. Although these processes have for some time now be relegated to ‘nature’ (and so bracketed from serious enquiry within humanities-based disciplines), the increasing realization that humans have and are impacting this nature now combines with the increasingly obvious insight that ‘natural’ processes articulate with economic, political, cosmological and moral patterns and processes. This new wave of interest is succinctly encapsulated in the term Anthropocene, the proposed new geological epoch where humans are supposedly ‘overwhelming the great forces of nature’ (Steffen et al. 2007, 614) and the emergence of the Environmental Humanities (Nye et al. 2013), which mark the (re)discovery of the environment as a significant historical agent by environmental historians and so-called eco-critical literature scholars (see Bergholler et al. 2014).

Archaeologists are participating in the Anthropocene debate (see TEA 47 and, for instance, Boivin et al. 2016; Braje 2016; Edgeworth 2014), but their voice remains almost unheard within the Environmental Humanities. Curiously, archaeological sessions or even papers were markedly few and far between during this major conference. The majority of sessions concerned with archaeology were focused on the Pleistocene record on the relationship of climatic and environmental process on human evolution. These sessions were excellent in their own right, presenting new ideas, new data, and new approaches. However, they were also somewhat distanced from the more overtly political and ethical emphasis of the conference at large. The historical actors in the sessions focused on human evolution were species, not societies or communities; the terminology used consistently that of geologists and palaeoecologists; the substantive relevance of these studies to contemporary concerns was left largely implicit. But has archaeology – with its long and fruitful tradition of interdisciplinary environmental investigations – nothing to contribute to anthropology’s disciplinary engagement with climate change?

In a session with the title Past weather, past climate – archaeology as Environmental Humanity, we were trying to address this lacuna. Our session was well received: with many abstracts submitted and eleven papers making the final cut, it was one of the larger ones at this conference; our assigned conference room filled to near capacity throughout. We were also delighted to welcome Mike Hulme, the Professor of Climate and Culture at King’s College London, one of the keynote speakers for the conference and a central figure in contemporary climate change debate – as our discussant. Contributors came from the US, from Sweden, Norway, Denmark as well as from the UK, reflecting in part our own professional networks and in part perhaps also the vitality of this research in different regions of Europe and beyond. The session began with a short scene-setting by ourselves where we highlighted that the political and ethical concerns as well as the methods of the Environmental Humanities are most akin to those of post-processual, interpretative or historical archaeologies, but that these have largely and indeed often actively eschewed climate and environment as topics worthy of study. Vice versa, environmental archaeologists have been described as ‘theoretical Luddites’ (Barker 2001, 312) and as such are more likely to seek disciplinary articulations with the earth sciences than with politics. Our opening thesis was that in the Anthropocene, the once foundational culture/nature divide that provides the rationale for disciplinary categorizations collapses. All history arguably becomes also environmental history, all archaeology environmental archaeology. We further suggested, perhaps provocatively, that one of (environmental) archaeology’s major concerns should be issues of human climatic and environmental impacts. And in continuation we asked how we can move towards an engaged archaeology that not only writes environmental deep history, but also critically addresses the valorisation of consumption, control, and environmental engineering implicit in much of archaeological research, heritage management, and dissemination.

These issues were first taken up with a regional focus on the North, where the impacts of contemporary warming are felt acutely. Mikkel Sørensen from Copenhagen University and Anne Eg Larsen from the City Museum of Odense each presented papers on perceived changes in weather and climate in Greenland, and the human responses to them. Sørensen focused on the Inuit of prehistoric Greenland, whilst Larson drew on colonial documentary evidence to elicit perceptions of weather during pre-industrial historic times with an eye towards better understanding the earlier and
unsuccessful Norse colonisers’ interactions with the climes they faced. Britt Solli then moved to Norway and discussed heritage concerns of melting glaciers and snow patches.

The second regional groups of papers took us to warmer climates with Cameron Petrie, Cambridge University, presenting interim results from his ERC-funded TwoRains project on the emergence and decline of Indus Civilisation. Simon Stoddart, also from Cambridge University, presented key results from his ERC-funded project FRAGSUS, which focuses on the longue durée of human-environment interaction on, as he fondly and repeatedly referred to it, ‘little Malta’. Further, Paul Lane of Uppsala University reflected on the use of historical ecology and archaeological investigations for discussions of sustainability in his study region of East Africa. Concluding this block and providing a direct bridge to the following was Julia Shaw (UCL), who suggested that interdisciplinary studies of past environmental ethics in India can enlighten contemporary debates and identity-building vis-à-vis environmental concerns.

The final set of papers further delved into the ethical dimensions of environmental archaeological research. In a stimulating, erudite and eloquent paper, Karen Holmberg (New York University) drew tantalising parallels between surprise sightings of giant squid and unexpected and catastrophic environmental events such as volcanic eruptions and its attendant lightning. Then, the session organisers themselves took over with first Felix Riede (Aarhus University) reporting on a field project at the former brown coal mine of Soby in Central Jutland aimed at investigating the ‘shallow’ Anthropocene starting around 1950 from a specifically archaeological perspective. Using both traditional archaeological methods as well as novel absolute dating methods, this is one of the first projects that takes up the challenge of dealing with the very recent Anthropocene from an archaeological perspective, rather than arguing for a deep-time starting point for this new epoch that intuitively comes more natural to archaeologists. In addition to field investigations, this project has also fed into an exhibition that tells the story of brown coal extraction not as an economic adventure but an environmental catastrophe. Then, Alison Klevnäs (Stockholm University) focused in on how material culture and the narratives many museums construct around it relate – implicitly, uncomfortably – to entrenched Western notions of individualism, self-realisation and consumption. Her powerful critique lead us to discuss alternative ways of seeing and presenting material culture that connect better with the proposed solutions for future green economies. Finally, Christina Fredengren, from Stockholm University and the Swedish National Heritage Board, explicitly addressed how the unfortunate distinction of nature and culture remains strongly entrenched in the heritage sector. Benefitting from Mike Hulme’s perceptive comments, the session was interspersed with lively debate that often returned to how we can – perhaps must – use our work to contribute to contemporary debates on climate change and human environment relations. Archaeologies can tell evidence-based stories of past peoples’ resilience as well as their vulnerability. While narratives of catastrophe and collapse run the risk of suffering from sensationalism, narratives that all too strongly focus on resilience in turn risk portraying human societies as infinitely adaptable and thus immune to climate and environmental changes. This is a difficult but important balance to strike. In setting archaeology – up against the emerging Environmental Humanities, one argument throughout has been that scholars working in the latter tradition often quite explicitly articulate their scholarship with political and ethical concerns. Indeed, the Environmental Humanities draw their relevance and not least their success from this very argument. A similar engagement would require archaeologists to take responsibility for, for instance, prognoses of societal responses to future climate change, but would also give archaeological work a degree of relevance not unwelcome in these times when the Humanities are under pressure due to their perceived lack of useful input in relation to pressing societal challenges.

The recent rise in high-profile studies concerned with past human-environment interactions underlines the perceived importance of this work. Yet, for humanities-based perspectives also to acquire relevance beyond academia and, in particular, be used in policy-making, archaeologists must probably make themselves better heard in the public sphere – another point the discussion returned to repeatedly. Precisely this issue of how to make anthropological knowledge usable was the topic of the conference’s main plenary forum: here, members of the American Anthropological Association’s (AAA) Global Climate Change Task Force were invited to present their specific views – including
University of Wyoming Professor Robert Kelly’s specifically archaeological one – on how the discipline can contribute. This Task Force has recently released a report (Statement on Humanity and Climate Change), meant to provide a guiding document to recognize anthropological contributions to global climate change-related issues. Mirroring this initiative, the EAA’s sister organization the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) has in 2015 put into place a standing Committee on Climate Change Strategies and Archaeological Resources (CCSAR) and also recently made a powerful statement on the relation between archaeology, cultural heritage and climate change. The US National Parks Service (another important cultural heritage actor there) likewise has draft its Climate Change Response Strategy that also is concerned with the substantial cultural heritage under its jurisdiction (Rockman 2015). These reports recognise both the threat climate change poses to the archaeological record, but at the same time argue that this same record also offers potentially important insights into past (and hence also future) societal solutions to climate challenges. Importantly, the president of the AAA Ed Liebow made the concluding argument that anthropologists should make use of their collective representation to speak out, as a profession and as concerned scientists, about these issues. In Europe, such efforts are at present less coordinated, it seems. Similar concerns are represented by the global Integrated History and Future of People on Earth (IHOPE) initiative, anchored in Uppsala in Sweden, which provides an important clearinghouse and articulation between studies on the ground and higher-level policy initiatives such as Future Earth. One of the conclusions we took away from this inspiring RAI conference is, however, that European archaeology and European archaeologists could also benefit from reflecting on how important collective bodies such as our EAA can and should take a stance on climate change, environmental change and environmental catastrophe. Europe’s historical and archaeological records of these processes and events is actually unrivalled and could potentially provide a strong evidence base for engagement with such issues, not only at academic levels but also at the levels of dissemination and policy advice. We hope that such a dialogue will begin at coming EAA meetings.

References


Coming Together: Comparative Approaches to Population Aggregation and Early Urbanization

by Attila Gyucha, IEMA postdoctoral scholar, University at Buffalo, USA (attilagy@buffalo.edu)

The present global, accelerating process of movement of people from villages to cities has brought about a growing scholarly interest in the environmental, social, economic, and cultural causes and effects of population nucleation. Cycles of population nucleation and dispersal have occurred repeatedly in societies throughout the world over past millennia and, owing to theoretical and methodological developments, their studies have intensified remarkably in recent decades. Archaeology, therefore, can make a substantial contribution to the understanding of the origins and, even more importantly, the possible consequences of current nucleation processes.

Since 2008, the Institute for European and Mediterranean Archaeology (IEMA) at the University at Buffalo, State University of New York, hosts a visiting scholar every year, who organizes an international conference on a specific anthropological problem relevant to present, pressing social matters. This year, the 9th IEMA Visiting Scholar Conference was held on April 2-3, and entitled 'Coming Together: Comparative Approaches to Population Aggregation and Early Urbanization.'

Through case studies from Europe, the Near East, and the Americas, the participants focused on three major issues in their papers: the integrative mechanisms that brought smaller communities together, the social practices and institutions that fostered the sustainability of aggregated settlements, as well as the impacts of aggregation on long-term socio-cultural developments. Apart from urban settlements of early civilizations, prehistoric nucleated sites also were consulted in order to understand the socio-economic processes that led to their formation, and to consider variation in the trajectories of their development. During the two days, 16 papers were presented and, as the final accord of the conference, an interactive discussion took place that was broadcasted live via internet.

In addition to Michael E. Smith (Arizona State University) as the keynote speaker of the symposium, the participants included Bradley A. Ault (University at Buffalo, SUNY, USA), A. Nejat Bilgen (Dumlupinar University, Turkey), Jennifer Birch (University of Georgia, USA), Brais X. Currás (University of Coimbra, Portugal), Manuel Fernández-Götz (University of Edinburgh, UK), Bisserka Gaydarska (Durham University, UK), Laura Harrison (University at Buffalo, SUNY, USA), Alan Kaiser (University of Evansville, USA), John E. Kelly (Washington University, USA), Robin Osborne (University of Cambridge, UK), John O'Shea (University of Michigan, USA), Daniel J. Pullen (Florida State University), Pál Raczky (Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary), Clemens Reichel (University of Toronto/Royal Ontario Museum, Canada), Susan C. Ryan (Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, USA), and Inés Sastre (Spanish National Research Council, Spain).

The symposium will result in an edited volume in 2017 published by SUNY Press.

For additional information about IEMA and the conference (including abstracts) see http://iema.buffalo.edu/about/.
International Congress RESCATE

From the Stratigraphic Record to the Knowledge Society: the Archaeological Heritage as an Agent of Sustainable Development (City and Territory)

by Ana Ruiz Osuna, University of Córdoba (Spain), anaruiz@arqueocordoba.com

The general severe economic crisis, which started almost one decade ago, represents a serious threat to the protection, conservation and future sustainability of the Spanish historical heritage, and of the archaeological in particular, which is undoubtedly one our most defining signs of identity. To overcome this difficult social challenge, it is necessary to consider imaginative and innovative solutions based on scientific knowledge, rigorous work, employability and technological development. Society as a whole should reach consensuses as well. Therefore, public, private and entrepreneurial initiatives need to be provided with a more relevant and responsible role in terms of heritage. Additionally, it is essential that those agents responsible for scientific research in the field of archaeology, especially universities and ad hoc centers, promote and undertake further actions, such as measures capable of contributing not only to the sustainability of the archaeology in a very short space of time, but also in a more distant and ambitious perspective. This way, archaeology will become a factor of economic and cultural revitalization that will generate progress and social welfare.

As a consequence, and mainly through the implementation of the Cultural Scientific Project Arqueología Somos Todos (We are Archaeology), the Sísifo Research Group of the University of Cordoba has among its priorities transferring the generated knowledge to society; the scientific outreach of the archaeological heritage to social and educational sectors beyond the university.
framework through new and original interactive formats; the education and training in community values, crucial to understand the great importance of researching, preserving, disseminating and making profitable the archaeological heritage; and finally, offering responses to the growing social demand for cultural products.

Considering all this, the International Congress RESCATE. From the Stratigraphic Record to the Knowledge Society: the Archaeological Heritage as an Agent of Sustainable Development (City and Territory) aimed to present and discuss different keys that may transform Archaeology into a true driving force of knowledge, economic growth and employment. In other words, the Congress claimed to turn it into a framework capable of generating a wide range of proposals with entrepreneurial, innovative and profitable nature, but without relinquishing their educational, formative and humanistic aspects.

The subjects discussed during the Congress have been:

**Archaeology and profession**

The bursting of the Real State bubble has provoked a strong recess on public and private building activities and, consequently, on Urban Archaeology. This situation encouraged unemployment and precariousness, as well as provoked the abandonment of many archaeological remains in plots already excavated, the accumulation of thousands of archaeological reports still unstudied, disunity, and an evident general disorientation. Together with this, the economical recession has brought severe reductions, or even the cancellation, of funding for research and post-graduate projects, which has increased the academic crisis. Therefore, it is necessary to stop and think, with self-criticism, about the mistakes made and the challenges that this new situation brings to the Archaeological Heritage’s management for the following years in terms of research, conservation and diffusion, and also from an epistemological and a professional point of view.

**Communication and scientific divulgation**

The opening of new communication channels, and the fast spreading of information through the Internet and Social networks, are allowing new ways of scientific communication and divulgation for public Institutions, researchers and mass media. They should inform society without deceits, and educate it in respect and rigorous knowledge, as well as try to encourage new formulas for sustainability, job creation and economic return. The development of our discipline under a very potential guiding principle is at stake: the excellence in divulgation as a way for research’s feedback.

**Research and Education**

From the absolute conviction that education is on the basis of social and economic progress, Archaeology should develop scientific and educational strategies able to inculcate into the youth essential values such as local identity, respect to all types of Heritage and cultural diversity, gender equality, the interest for scientific research, undertaking and innovation, among others. As well as the encouragement of archaeological vocations in tomorrow’s adults, the education of people fully
compromised with their historical and archaeological heritage, with society in general and science in particular, is also needed. The future perception of the discipline and the resolution of many of today’s problems depend on this.

**Museums and heritage spaces**

The traditional spaces for knowledge transference to society, mainly museums and archaeological sites, must also face these same challenges: since the economical crisis started, public funding for the management of these spaces has been severely reduced. Many of the failed interpretive centres are aiming to become something different, competitive and up to the expectations of the visitors, more interactive and based on new technologies and on public and private management.

**New technologies**

Technological advances are allowing a better adaptation of scientific knowledge to different levels of society and improving its accessibility to the general public. Virtual immersion, online platforms, augmented reality or 3D horizons are some of the possibilities that current technology offer to archaeological research and divulgation. These are also new challenges and possibilities not only for knowledge production, but also for its transference and socialization in the frame of Digital Humanities.

**Society**

As an Historical Science, Archaeology has a very strong social responsibility. In the fulfillment of this task, all agents –archaeologists, politicians, educators, technicians, associations and, moreover, citizens- should play an active part. Some recent tendencies, such as Public Archaeology, are modifying the traditional and unidirectional information flows that have been usually produced from the institutions. But now, it is society who is searching and encouraging these interaction processes with Archaeology from many different perspectives, such as sponsorship and patronage.

**Heritage Industry**

Archaeology, often misinterpreted, needs to be understood by society as an useful science, able to provide intellectual and aesthetic leisure and also important socio-cultural and economic profits. Citizenship’s direct participation, business network and the design of cultural initiatives become an essential factor for social development and dynamization. This is aimed to favor and encourage the recovery and use of archaeological remains as an emerging source for the heritage and touristic industry.

With the scientific knowledge as our permanent basis and the use of current technological resources, the ultimate goal of this project is to try to turn archeology into an engine of economic growth, a real source of employment (especially among young people), where enterprising and innovative activities can take place; but without abandoning the claim and development of its important educational, formative and humanistic aspect. The idea is to continue, by definition and inescapably, contributing to the research, interpretation, conservation and appreciation of the archaeological heritage, as well as to lay the foundations of a scientific model for the archaeological dissemination applicable to any geographic area. This model should be based on three essential pillars: transversality, innovation and sustainability, with a clear philosophy: connecting public and private spheres, creating and strengthening international ties, and, of course, linking university with society.

In short, with this project we want to consolidate a scientific model of transposable and sustainable dissemination, able to form full people committed to their historical and archaeological heritage. We also intend to strengthen the role of Archaeology as an historical science and a sociocultural and economic driving force, able to feed itself back in uncertain times, that we will able to overcome only through an entrepreneurial culture engine.

The papers, communications and posters presented at the Congress will published as a monograph that will be released by the end of 2016.

Petrification Processes

Report on the McCord Centre Creative Workshop, 27 May 2016, Newcastle University, UK

& Invitation to Session TH1-02 at the 22nd Annual Meeting of the EAA in Vilnius, Lithuania

by Sophie Hüglin, Newcastle University, UK (Sophie.Hueglin@newcastle.ac.uk)

In Vilnius on Thursday 1st September 2016 from 14:00 – 18:30 the EAA session TH1-02 ‘Petrification Processes in (Pre-)History’ will explore the concept of ‘petrification’ in a similar way as the Creative Workshop – to be presented here – did in May. While in Newcastle the emphasis lay on the transdisciplinary aspect – bringing together science and humanities, architecture and arts, in Vilnius the contributors will come from an archaeological background only, but from across periods and geographical regions: Ancient Egypt will meet megalithic monuments and high Alpine herder’s huts will encounter cities of the Mediterranean. Transdisciplinary concepts like ‘petrification’ create new possibilities to observe processes, understand them as gestures, compare their underlying principles and find new ways to describe them independent of place and time.

What have fossils to do with cement, stone buildings with sedentariness, the pyramids with Scottish brochs, and megalithic tombs with the Hagia Sophia? Seemingly unrelated at first glance, they all can be described as results of petrification processes. ‘Petrification’ in this case is understood as a process in nature or in culture, in space or in time which makes anything harder, heavier or stronger, more stable, secure, regular, permanent, foreseeable, trans-generational or even eternal. Anything can be transformed: matter, organisms or ideas, landscape, rhythms or structures. The transformation, it can be described, estimated and even measured according to number, mass, volume, material, direction and intensity. But is not important here whether this process is intentional or conceived as ethically good or bad.

In May, the McCord Centre at Newcastle University had invited eight scholars from across disciplines and periods for a whole day to a Creative Workshop on „Petrification Processes“. The participants including some guests encountered on an exercise in – what could be called – ‘applied’ philosophy or transdisciplinary thinking: The speakers were asked to give examples of ‘petrification’ processes from their own field of research, describe them in the context of their discipline as a whole, and explore possible connections with parallel phenomena. At the same time the contributions were meant to be short – 10 min, but highly ‘illustrative’ in order to leave the major part – 20 min – to plenary discussion.

Workshop organiser and archaeologist Sophie Hüglin introduced the topic by giving a practical and theoretical example for the way ‘petrification’ can be understood: the practical example being a simple everyday object like a cup – the theoretical example looking at the consequences of quantum physics for epistemology. The ‘evolution’ of a cup as liquid container can be described as a petrification process: drinking water from two hands shaping a cup would be the primordial human gesture pre-empting vessels from organic material like leather and wood for the same purpose. Along with sedentary lifestyle these organic objects were replaced by inorganic, denser and heavier materials like ceramic and glass.

‘Petrification’ – as Sophie Hüglin explained further – can also be seen as an epistemological concept to study the world. An example for such a ‘solid’ methodology would be Newton’s mechanics with its cause-effect-relations. This corresponds to a creational world view in which „God in the beginning formed matter in solid, massy, hard, impenetrable, movable particles“ as Isaac Newton describes the core of matter, the atom. But the atom has been split and modern physics describes subatomic ‘particles’ as uniting contrary properties by being wave and particle simultaneously. So to use ‘petrification’ today as an epistemological concept in order to understand past processes cannot be separated from its opposite, the concept of ‘fragmentation’ or ‘liquification’. For archaeology and society this means to question the paradigm of progress like modern physics questions matter and relativizes time – the reality we used to take for granted.

Linking geology, chemistry and biology, Geoffrey Abbott from Newcastle University presented examples from his work which. In his research, he comes across phenomena of ‘petrification’ in
multiple ways: he studies fossils of ‘enigmatic’ organisms which have morphological characteristics that do not resemble anything we see in the present day. These organisms appeared on the earth’s surface around 400 million years ago during the process of phytoterrrestrialisation, when plants first established themselves on land. Fossilisation itself is a complex process at the molecular level. Studying the carbon cycle and fossilisation in peat, soils and ancient sediments helps us to understand the mechanisms of petrification which have a long term potential for sequestering carbon from the atmosphere during the most recent geological epoch namely the Anthropocene.

In parallel to their film montage, anthropologist Rachel Harkness and art curator Judith Winter presented results from their research initiative at the University of Aberdeen exploring the conjunctions between art, anthropology, architecture, and design. They are enthralled with concrete or ‘Liquid Stone’. It is a material that shifts between states even though it is heavily associated with stasis, stability and permanence in so much of its architectural usage. In their presentation they dwelled on concrete’s other, more liquid-like states and characteristics. Concrete, they mused, this slow-but-ever-changing material has been type-cast, perhaps miscast, as the petrified.

Archaeologist Francesco Carrer and his colleagues study the functional connection between seasonal upland dairying and permanent structures. At high altitudes in the Alps the earliest dry-stone structures occur in the Bronze Age around 2000 BC and seem to be connected with a transformation of resource exploitation. The analysis of prehistoric potsherds from Swiss sites provided the earliest evidence of high-altitude dairy production. Several parallel processes of ‘petrification’ have been going on which seemingly necessitated each other: the erection of permanent buildings, the use of ceramic vessels, and the transformation of milk – also by using salt – into durable cheese. Through this the mountain landscape itself and its perception with regard to the concept of possession must have changed tremendously.

Philosopher and classicist Undine Stabrey from Basel presented Ancient Egypt which since Jan Assmann’s ‘Stein und Zeit’ is known as the paradigm for the cultural separation of the ‘solid’ and the ‘fluid’ or of ‘star time’ and ‘life-time’. Geographically, the fertile shores of the Nile and the desert around it provide the physical base for the principal duality between the ‘liquid’ land of the living, and the ‘dry’ land of the dead. The quarters of the living at the river bank are dominated by perishable structures – even the pharaoh’s ‘palace’ is constructed from mud, while the desert is the eternal place for the dead where they are mummified in megalithic monuments of materialized geometry surrounded by a sandy ‘sea’.

Archaeologist and architect Tanja Romankiewicz from Edinburgh University described with the Iron Age Scottish brochs the opposite concept: strong stone towers for the living contrast with few fragments of the bodies of the dead. Thick stone walls protected the living from wind, weather and attacks as well as visibly marked their claim on the land. Once dead corpses were left to these elements, bones mixed with the body of the earth – or were re-incorporated into dwelling processes. Seemingly presenting a petrified façade, solidified from earlier more dynamic architectures, brochs appear as built expressions of petrified communities. However, porous walls and floor plans on the interior speak of dialogue between spaces and people as well as negotiated social relations. A closer reading suggests more complex petrification processes – for brochs as well as their dead.

Prehistorian Chris Fowler from Newcastle University presented Early Neolithic mortuary architecture from wood. The remains of the dead were placed between the upright posts from the hard trunks of mature oak trees split lengthways. Wooden screens separated this area from the outside. The sites later transformed through decay, burning, the addition of forecourts, and mound construction. Sometimes wooden features were replaced with stone elements. In western Britain equivalent monuments were built using split stone slabs. Building such monuments – in stone or in wood – defined the boundaries between the dead on the inside and the living on the outside, but also created spaces for their performative encounter and opportunities for later transformation. In this case the ‘petrification’ processes was – like in Ancient Egypt – mainly connected with grave monuments, while contemporary dwellings were not built to last.

Archaeologist, art historian and musician Gianluca Foschi called it ‘petrification of divine sound’ when musical harmony was used as proportion principle in Early Medieval church building. The
effect for example of Hagia Sophia’s original cupola – which eventually collapsed and this is why its sound effects now have to be reconstructed virtually – was to transform the voices of the choir into angelic sound from above. Early Christian buildings – apart from being places of assembly and burial – were meant to resemble the entire universe at a human scale. These architectural microcosms allowed the initiated to visually ‘listen’ to cosmic harmony and experience revelation.

We started with dualisms like ‘solid’ vs. ‘liquid’, ‘alive’ vs. ‘dead’, inside vs. outside. The last paper demonstrated that there is a third category to consider, but – especially for archaeologists – hard to grasp: the ‘airy’, the spiritual, the idea. From the Big Bang to Einstein or from the cave to heaven and back, the Workshop opened up a window in space and time for transdisciplinary thinking. By transmitting our research to the others, ‘digesting’ it in discussion we unframed our minds and freed our thinking. We found new ways to look at the familiar as well as guides into unknown territory. And in the moments when we were lost in translation or stuck in petrification we turned to laughter, went for a walk or enjoyed food and drink.
Announcements

Destruction and Reconstruction of Cultural Heritage


Zentraum für Altertumswissenschaften, Marstallhof 4, 69117 Heidelberg

Heidelberg Center for Cultural Heritage, Heidelberg University

The destruction of Cultural Heritage worldwide is a topic that receives growing attention: Cultural Heritage is threatened in armed conflicts, through climate change and environmental influences, and through neglect. The Summer School 2016 aims at covering these topics by assembling a wide range of scholars and experts to discuss the dangers faced by Cultural Heritage as well as methods to preserve and reconstruct it. What can be done to efficiently and professionally protect Cultural Heritage? What dangers does it face? Which actors have to be involved? Is the systematic destruction of Cultural Heritage a rather new phenomenon or has it been practiced throughout human history? What can be done to prevent such destructions?

The Summer School, funded by the Volkswagen Foundation, will deal with all these questions. International experts from different fields (such as Archaeology, History, Museum Studies, Law, Digital Humanities etc.) as well as key-actors from the UNESCO and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will provide an interdisciplinary perspective on the topic. Based on current research, outstanding knowledge and experience as well as newly developed technologies, a comprehensive and profound exchange with the participants will be sought.

The Summer School will take place from September 16th to September 23rd 2016 at the University of Heidelberg and will be chaired by Prof. Dr. Christian Witschel (Heidelberg Center for the Cultural Heritage), Dr. Filippo Carlá-Uhink (University of Exeter), and Dr. Maja Gori (Heidelberg University).

The Summer School invites applications from doctoral students in Archaeology, History, Art History, Law, Cultural Studies, Social and Political Sciences and related fields. Sessions will be held in English. A reader containing a comprehensive overview of the current state of research will be provided in advance. Participants are also expected to prepare a paper/contribution of their own according to their field of interest which will be presented (15 to 20 minutes) during the summer school.

There will be 15 places available. Travel and accommodation expenses of the participants will be covered by the organizers.

Your application (in English) should include:

- A letter of motivation (2 pages max.) including an explanation as to why you would like to participate in the Summer School and what previous knowledge you have on the subject; additionally a short description of your current PhD project should be given.
- A short CV presenting the main steps of your academic career.

Please send your application via e-mail as one PDF file to Michaela Böttner at the HCCH (Boettner@uni-heidelberg.de). You can also contact Mrs. Böttner in case you need further information.

The deadline for applications is July 20th 2016.

Further information: [http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/hcch](http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/hcch)
Society for medieval archaeology student colloquium

Brussels, November 3-5, 2016

Call for Papers

We are very pleased to announce that we are now accepting paper and poster abstracts for the SMA Student Colloquium to be held in Brussels, Belgium, on 3rd-5th November 2016.

We welcome papers and posters from across the medieval period (5th-16th centuries), and from all geographical areas. Papers and posters with no direct link to archaeology, but with a broader medieval significance will also be considered.

Topics that will be tackled include:

- Cross-sea interactions and connections
- The archaeology of medieval landscapes
- New methods and approaches in medieval archaeology
- Urban fabric and identity
- Commemoration in the Middle Ages
- Artefacts, crafts and society

Abstracts of maximum 150 words should be sent to: medieval.archaeology@googlemail.com

Please include 'Student Colloquium Abstract' in the subject line. Please add up to 5 keywords with paper abstracts. Papers will be 20 minutes in length, and there will be room for discussion at the end of each paper session.

DEADLINE FOR ABSTRACT SUBMISSION: Friday 9th September 2016

We will notify you if your abstract has been successful within two weeks from the deadline.

For more information: please contact: medieval.archaeology@googlemail.com, or see our website http://www.medievalarchaeology.co.uk/

More details of the programme for the colloquium (including keynote lectures and excursion to Bruges and the medieval fishing village 'Walraversijde'), and for registration will follow soon!

Registration fee:
Registration is free for members of the Society, and £20 for non members (whether students or not). However, we would like to encourage membership with the Society as the student rate will be the same. For more information on how to join, please visit:

http://www.medievalarchaeology.co.uk/index.php/how-to-join/

Art & Archaeology 2016 Conference

Jerusalem, Israel on December 11-14, 2016

Abstract Deadline: 300 word abstract by June 30, 2016

Secretariat: The Secretariat, Art & Archaeology 2016, P.O. Box 574, Jerusalem 9100402, Israel, Tel: ++972-2-6520574, Fax: ++972-2-6520558, confer@isas.co.il

Homepage: www.art-archaeology.com
Research

The Udal Project, North Uist, Outer Hebrides, Scotland

by Mark A Hall, Assistant Archaeologist Udal Project, m.hall@cne-siar.gov.uk

The latest phase of post-excavation research on the smallest site (RUX6) of the Udal, North Uist has just recommenced, funded by Historic Environment Scotland and Comhairle nan Eilean Siar. The main aim of the analysis and research is to produce a comprehensive account of the site for publication in 2016/17. Although the area, situated on the west coast of the Udal peninsular was trial-trenched in the 1960s, Iain Crawford, the project instigator and excavator, only identified it as a Bronze Age burial site in 1974 due to the effects of coastal erosion. It was not until the beginning of the 1980s that the site was excavated in its entirety by Crawford and his team. Today, the location of the site is hard to identify as it has been completely removed by the sea.

At the time of excavation the kerbed burial cairn was identified as a new type of Scottish monument, but this was the latest of a series of structures present on the site. The full analysis of the structures is currently being undertaken, but it would seem that domestic buildings and those of ritual purpose interwove from the later Neolithic period and into the Bronze Age. There are shades of the Knap of Howar in Orkney in the positioning of two late Neolithic buildings side by side (on the 1980s coast), with evidence of surrounding middens and cultivation. However, a possible mortuary structure and standing stone replaced the earlier buildings when blown shell sand covered them and the surrounding fields. Only later, after further accumulation of sand and the digging and rapid backfilling of many large pits was the kerbed cairn constructed around a cist that contained a well-preserved human skeleton.

Teasing the story from hand-written, pre-computerised notes is not easy, but enough of the evidence remains to interpret the story and the accompanying finds and samples. The Udal Project is led by Mark Hall (CnES), with support from Beverley Ballin Smith at the head of a team of specialists working on the post-excavation analysis and publication, including Dr Judith Aird, who excavated at RUX6 in the 1980s and wrote her PhD on its mammal bone.

The other key aspects of the Udal Project are to identify the approach needed for the post excavation analysis and publication of the significantly more complicated Udal sites, the mounds known as North and South; to develop and implement a funding strategy for that approach and to refine and find funding solutions for the model that makes the archaeology of the Udal (in a Uist-wide context) accessible to both Island communities and Island visitors. We hope to explore the wider European context of some of these issues in a session on archaeological museums and research centres at the EAA conference in Vilnius, 2016.
Fig. 1: Archaeologists and volunteers working in bare feet on the fragile sands and contexts of RUX6, and excavating some of the pits and midden areas (© CnES Udal Project)

Fig. 2: Donald McIntosh, Ian Crawford’s former site assistant, pointing out the remains of the RUX6 cairn site he helped excavate. 11 February 2016 (© Mark Hall, CnES Udal Project)
Ipoly-Szécsény Archaeological Project: 2015–16 Regional Survey

by Roderick B. Salisbury, University of Vienna, Austria (roderick.salisbury@univie.ac.at) and Szilvia Fábián, Hungarian National Museum, Budapest, Hungary (fabian.szilvia@hnm.hu)

The Ipoly-Szécsény Archaeological Project (ISzAP) is a new research project examining interregional trade networks, cultural change, and human-environmental interactions in the northern Carpathian Basin and its surroundings. 2015 saw the beginning of new phase of regional survey, including surface collections, coring and soil phosphate survey, and development of a regional GIS database. Fieldwork in 2015-2016 is funded by a NKA (Hungarian National Cultural Fund) Grant 3234/00276 “Szécsény-Ültetés középső neolitikus lelőhely complex régészeti felmérése – Complex archaeological survey of the Middle Neolithic site at Szécsény-Ültetés.

The ISzAP project area centers on the Szécsény-Ültetés archaeological site and includes its surrounding area in the Nógrád Basin at the northern part of Cserhát Mountain and Ipoly Valley (Fig. 1). The relatively little archaeological research that has been conducted in this area suggests that the Ipoly and Zagyva Rivers served as important transportation routes during the Neolithic. Ceramics and lithics from Szécsény-Ültetés and the few other examined sites show cultural affiliation with groups to the east, west, and south, including both eastern and western variants of the Linearbandkeramik, Bükk, Notenkopf, Szakálhát, and Vinča.

Previous research on the Neolithic of the Nógrád basin and Ipoly valley is very limited. Excavations were carried out at Szécsény-Ültetés and another local site, Karancsság-Alsó-rétek. Results of the Szécsény excavations were published in 1982 (Soós 1982) and formed the foundation of a thesis (Fábián 2002, 2010), while Karancsság provided the basis for a doctoral dissertation by Bácsmegi (2015). These projects revealed that the earliest farming occupation of the region was likely during the Notenkopf and Zseliz periods of the LBK, and that subsequent Lengyel settlements were likely to be found as well. Aside from these excavations, information about Neolithic inhabitation of the region is limited to a few stray field finds given to local museums, and a few limited excavations (Fábián et al. 2016). No systematic programs of surface collection or archaeological survey have been carried out here. However, the results we do have indicate extensive exchange networks extending east west across the northern edge of the Carpathian Basin, and down the Danube and Tisza rivers.

The new campaign seeks to address several questions that arose from this earlier research, including: (1) what is the regional settlement pattern, including the distribution of sites in the region, changes in settlement location over time, pattern of sites in relation to valleys and natural “gateways”? Is Szécsény-Ültetés a gateway site? (2) What was the significance and extent of interregional cultural interactions, and what role did this region play in prehistory? (3) How did human activity change the local landscape, and how does the changing environment affect settlement locations and subsistence choices? Our goal is to fill in the empty spaces in our archaeological database of the region, and to gain a better understanding of trade and related social interactions.

To address these questions, ISzAP co-directors Szilvia Fábián (Hungarian National Museum) and Roderick Salisbury (University of Vienna) have begun to investigate the regional settlement patterns, distribution of potential imported materials, and environmental variables. The new campaigns thus far have involved geophysical prospection, intensive and controlled surface collection, coring, and soil chemistry, in addition to spatial analysis and predictive modeling in GIS. Geophysical survey in 2014 saw the first magnetometer survey conducted at Szécsény-Ültetés (directed by Máté Stibrányi, former National Heritage Protection Centre of the Hungarian National Museum, now Gyula Forster National Centre for Cultural Heritage Management, Hungary).

Surface survey is being done by systematic, spaced transects, with finds recorded by GPS within pre-plotted sectors (Fig. 2). After GIS modeling, in which we took into consideration the geographic situation of known sites, we chose several areas at various elevations and geographic settings to survey in the Szécsény basin and at the entrance of the Ménes and Nógrádmegyer creek valleys. Although the primary focus of our research is the late Middle Neolithic period, our recent surveys have identified three previously unidentified LBK settlements, four new Bronze Age settlements,
and one new Bronze Age cremation cemeteries, as well as several prehistoric scatters that require additional examination.

Coring for stratigraphic reconstruction and soil sampling was directed by Roderick Salisbury. We cored and collected samples from Szécsény-Ültetés in 2014, and in spring 2016 we cored four locations where grass cover prevented surface survey. These data are being analyzed, and will be used to aid in site prospection, and to characterize stratigraphy at potential site locations at the elevation and topographic situation of Szécsény-Ültetés. In the next phase of research, Szécsény-Ültetés will be sampled on a regular 10 m grid for complete soil phosphate survey, and additional cores will be used to examine soils at several lowland locations in the Nógrád basin.

Current project participants include Szilvia Fábián, Nicklas Larsson, and Szabolcs Czifra (Hungarian National Museum), Roderick B. Salisbury (University of Vienna), Szilvia Guba (Kubinyi Ferenc Museum, Szécsény), Gábor Bácsmegi (Munkácsy Mihály Museum, Békéscsaba), Kata Szilágyi (Móra Ferenc Museum, Szeged), and Gábor Serlegi and Tibor Marton (Institute of Archaeology, Hungarian Academy of Sciences). The project team will expand to include other specialists and colleagues from neighboring regions, particularly on the other side of the Ipoly in Slovakia.

Fig. 1. Location of the project area and the site of Szécsény-Ültetés in the Carpathian Basin
Fig. 2. Surface collecting the fields north of Szécsény- Ültetés in April 2016
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Roman week of Cascante (Navarra, Spain)

by Marta Gómara, Director of the Roman Week of Cascante, Cultural Association Amigos de Cascante Vicus (semanaromana@gmail.com)

The project we are introducing here was started by the Cultural Association Amigos de Cascante Vicus, a non-profit organization that within its objectives has the investigation and the recovery of the archaeological heritage of Cascante, the old Latin social contract municipium Cascantum.

In 2005 we created an archaeological project in which the social implication was crucial. With this in mind, an action plan was created for the participation of all people interested in the investigation, recovery and the valuing of our Roman past. By both theoretical and practical archaeology, these people undertook investigation from first prospecting in several locations in Cascante, then excavating
in a Roman villa from the old Cascantum and later carrying our laboratory work. To fit around the participant’s full-time jobs, the course ran on the weekends, from October to May.

To commemorate the end of the course, we celebrate the Roman Week of Cascante from its first year (2005-2006).

![Poster XI Roman Week of Cascante](image)

**Fig. 1: Poster XI Roman Week of Cascante. Designer: Noelia Azagra, Ingrafik.**

In these eleven years, the Roman Week has been evolving but has the same milestones:

The **Archaeological Exhibition** was conceived to display the finds recovered during the investigation. With this aim, the communities from Cascante and nearby localities were able to discover firsthand the advances in the investigation and to view the items recovered at the two villae where we are currently working: Camponuevo I and Piecordero I.

Last year, in 2015, we celebrated the 10th anniversary of the project and wanted to do something special to mark the occasion, so we prepared a monographic exhibition on the excavation that revealed a house with opus signinum pavements and mural paintings in Cascante in the 1970s. This old excavation was almost a myth in Cascante, because although we all know about the discovery, very few had seen any of it. So, after 45 years, our community could finally see the famous mosaics and learn about our heritage. This was with thanks to the temporary cession of this by the Heritage Service of Navarra Government.

In 2016 we have a very special exhibition as we are showing epigraphic and numismatic pieces that give us very valuable information about Cascantum, even though not all these pieces have been discovered in Cascante.

**Educational Workshops Project.** Another milestone of the Roman Week of Cascante is the Educational Workshops Program with Primary school children from Cascante’s local school. Although this is a pedagogical project in general, the Roman Week gives special emphasis on teaching the children of the community.

The workshops have a direct connection with the archaeological exhibition. The children from the local Nursery School Coloretes (aged between 0 and 3 years) also participate from their own school.
The objective is that all the children, in different levels, learn some aspects of the Archaeology and their archaeological heritage through participatory games or storytelling.

**Fig. 2: Educational workshops VI Roman Week of Cascante. Author: Carolina Ruiz Marcos**

**Theatre.** For each event, the local community theatre company Spiral Teatro writes and directs a new play for the Roman Week of Cascante. This activity has grown in participation starting as a one person show and increasing with 24 performers on this occasion. These performers are local people that participate in this activity as volunteers. Carolina Ruiz, theatre director and playwright, writes a play tailored to the number of participants and the particular theme of that Roman Week. The theatre text is always advised by two of the three directors of the Roman Week: Dr. Javier Andreu and the signatory of this article.

**Fig. 3: IX Roman Week of Cascante Theatre Company. Author: Víctor Huete**

**Lecture series.** Discovery and Education are two of the main pillars of Association Vicus’ archaeological project and they are always subject to scientific rigor. From its beginning, the conferences and lectures in the Roman Week of Cascante have always had a huge importance. As with every aspect of the program, this one has grown, much more since the National University of Distance Education (UNED) started its involvement in this project in 2008. At the moment, the scientific directors are Dr. Francisco Beltrán Llorís (University of Zaragoza), Dr. Javier Andreu Pintado (University of Navarra) and Dr. María Pérez Agorreta (UNED). Each edition is dedicated to a new aspect of the Roman world that has its reflection in the actual world. This year, the lecture series is concerned with identities and nationalities, a theme currently of relevance in Spain, and Europe as a whole.

For further information and participation: [https://cascantum.blogspot.com.es/](https://cascantum.blogspot.com.es/)
Something to cool off in the middle of the summer - Timothy Darvill's Christmas cake from 2014. The decoration was inspired by the Mesolithic monument found in the car-park at Stonehenge: a series of three large posts, a pit, and a tree-throw hollow. The animals are of course pure conjecture!

Thank you, Professor Timothy Darvill from Bournemouth University, for your contribution.

We are looking for submissions of ArchaeoCakes! Please e-mail us at tea@e-a-a.org.