

STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL INTENT

Archaeological Review From Cambridge is a journal conceived and produced by students of the Department of Archaeology in the University of Cambridge. ARC was first published in 1981 and has returned to production with this issue, following a temporary hiatus.

ARC is to serve as a forum for the discussion of current archaeological research. It is designed to fill the gap which exists between the formal publication of major research projects in leading journals, and the more informal discussion which takes place at seminars and conferences. This means that although the standards of papers presented will be high, there will be room for the inclusion of 'work in progress' which might otherwise find no outlet in existing publications. The editorial committee intends to establish a journal with wide appeal by publishing thematic issues covering an extensive range of topics. The research interests of the graduate students within the department will necessarily be reflected in the topics chosen, but these interests are of sufficient diversity to allow the presentation of a broad range of themes. Above all, the journal will aim to promote the more extended discussion of subjects which are rarely debated outside the conference hall and by publishing twice a year, will provide the swift turnaround that such discussion demands.

Issues will usually comprise a thematic section (containing papers relating to a particular topic), a general section, and commentary. The intention of the general section is to provide a forum within which subjects, not connected with the thematic section but of current interest, may be presented. The commentary is intended to cover shorter notes and contributions relating to topics arising from the study and practice of archaeology. These notes may include short discussions of archaeological practice and theory, correspondence and so on, as well as brief comments on more controversial issues, and on papers in previous issues. Book reviews will also be a regular feature of each issue.

Whilst every publication necessarily reflects the biases of its editorial committee, it is the editors' intention that the journal should not explicitly align itself to any particular academic standpoint, nor support any specific political stance. The interests of the journal will extend beyond the British Isles, though papers will be presented in English.

The members of the editorial board would like to thank all those students and staff of the Cambridge Archaeology Department who have shown interest in this venture and given their support and advice, and particularly thank Jill Bewley and Colin Shell for their assistance. Financial assistance for publication was provided by the Department of Archaeology, though the Department bears no responsibility for the journal.

FOREWORD: ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE PUBLIC

Robert Bewley

This issue of Archaeological Review from Cambridge (ARC) developed out of a session on Archaeology and the Public presented at the 1982 Theoretical Archaeology Group Conference held in Durham. The response generated by that session emphasized the importance of this subject in archaeology today. The session's papers form the nucleus of the current issue, and thanks are due to Mike Parker Pearson (the organiser of the TAG session) for his co-operation. In most cases the papers have been revised, and I would like to thank all the authors for producing their papers so swiftly. This is particularly true for the additional papers from Brian Charge, Dave Crowther, Chris Chippindale, and Mark Leone (whose paper was given at a different session at TAG 1982).

The aim in this issue has been to highlight certain aspects of the relationship between professional archaeologists and other people interested in the past. Many viewpoints are expressed, but the underlying theme is the need for greater communication.

In soliciting these articles I have tried to present a broad and unbiased view of the role of the public in archaeology. The problem of communication between archaeologists and a wide general audience is not simply due to professional elitism but also to a lack of channels for adequate communication. Brian Charge's paper is an example of local impetus forging a relationship between three different professional bodies.

The most contentious aspect of the relationship between archaeologists and members of the public is that of 'treasure hunting'. Archaeologists are not in agreement amongst themselves as to how to cope with this hobby, but Dave Crowther's paper provides a good basis for discussion. The approach of Tony Gregory in Norfolk seems to be, the only way forward: co-operation and mutual education. 'STOP campaigns' (designed to curtail the activities of metal detectives) alienate many members of the public interested in the past.

Museums are examples of places where non-archaeologists (and archaeologists) can learn about the past; yet, as Leone and Gathercole stress, this is not enough. The date of an object or the excavation of a site is not as significant, on its own, as the information which it contains. It is how this information is used by archaeologists, and presented to the public, which is important.

The BBC 2 programme 'Chronicle' is one means of communication; anyone who has watched the programmes can only marvel at