

could be collected for each town. If any community organization existed (housing group, residents' committee) they could be approached first to ensure better cooperation.

While the cluster sampling technique is statistically more manageable (Blalock 1972:523-7), biases may result from refusals to answer the questionnaire, the ability of some people to articulate their thoughts more clearly than others (especially on more abstract issues such as social change), and the involvement of archaeologists or archaeological students as interviewers. The survey design will take note of these possible biases. The content of the questionnaire and the appropriateness of the questions were discussed after the pilot study but no major changes were made.

This study is only the beginning of a detailed project (see also Cambridge Research Cooperative 1983). It is hoped that the results will be published as a joint concern by all involved in the national survey. Once this is achieved it will be possible to establish guidelines for making archaeology more interesting and perhaps even relevant to the mass of the British public.

References

- Blalock, H. M. 1972 Social Statistics (2nd edn). McGraw-Hill, New York.
- 'Boudicca'. 1982 Professional Archaeology versus People's Archaeology. Treasure Hunting November 1982:9-10.
- Cambridge Research Cooperative. 1983 "Roses" are read, my love, when violence is news... Royal Anthropological Institute Newsletter 55:5.
- Selkirk A. 1982 The War against Archaeology. Current Archaeology 85:35-6.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND TELEVISION

Bruce Norman

CHRONICLE, the television 'stones and bones' show, has been running for 17 years. It began in June 1966 and was originally a magazine programme "so bad" said David Attenborough, Controller of BBC 2 at the time, "that, if it doesn't improve it will be taken off". It improved and survived to become a 50-minute film series and has so far clocked up 194 editions.

Its origins were in radio where, in 1946, the West of England Home Service began regular archaeology programming with a series introduced by Glyn Daniel. This series continued its run for several years on the Third Programme under the title 'The Archaeologist' and began to familiarise the listening public with great names like Wheeler, Crawford, and Piggott. By 1952, it had spawned the television quiz show 'Animal, Vegetable and Mineral' (AVM), again with Wheeler and Daniel, and produced by Paul Johnstone, my predecessor as CHRONICLE editor. "It was," said the Times, "an instant and spectacular success. Libraries found that neglected shelves of archaeological books were suddenly empty." From AVM came the teasingly named 'Buried Treasure' (1954-59), and from that came CHRONICLE, with a pedigree as popular as it was serious.

I call CHRONICLE a 'show' because we are in the entertainment business - not the archaeology business. We are not further education, not Open University but, along with the other three channels, are fighting for an audience in a television world increasingly dominated by finance and a concern for high audience ratings. My responsibility as editor of CHRONICLE is to the BBC licence holders, not to the archaeologists; but having said that, my aim in the series is to be supportive of archaeologists and to reflect the thinking as well as the doing in the world of archaeology. The aim is to inform and educate the viewing public in as entertaining a way as possible and to continue the great tradition of Reithian broadcasting.

Over the years, the public that we have been trying to inform, educate and entertain has grown from an average of about one million, 10 years ago, to an average of about two-and-a-half million now, with our recent programmes on China and the Mary Rose approaching 4 million: high for BBC 2 documentaries, low when compared with 17 million for 'Coronation Street', the most consistent high-scorer on the network. However, our largest aggregate audience was for our coverage, over the three days, of the lifting of the Mary Rose, in October 1982. During this period, we transmitted two Mary Rose films and the outside broadcast of the lift itself, a total of 16 hours broadcasting seen by a collective audience of 20 million U.K. viewers as well as

viewers in Europe. It was probably the longest exposure and the largest audience that archaeology has ever had and the first time since King Tut that archaeology has really been international news.

How well we might have succeeded in informing, educating and even entertaining the public is measured by the R.I. -- Reaction Index -- the result of a survey that has invited the audience to say how much they enjoyed a programme. On a 100 point scale, sport and light entertainment get about 50, drama 60, documentaries about 70. CHRONICLE ranges from 64 to 84, well above average, but the reason for the high R.I. is not just the result of the quality of the programmes but equally the comparative smallness of the audience. The smaller the audience, the better the reaction. A small audience is predisposed to watch, already committed, and prepared to like. A big audience contains a large percentage of casual viewers who, too lazy to switch off, will, when asked, complain that they have been bored.

So, how do I choose subjects for a CHRONICLE run? I have four major considerations:

- 1) The importance of the story in archaeological terms.
- 2) The story's potential as a television film: How visual is it (pretty locations, interesting personalities, fascinating artefacts, availability of old film, stills, etc.)? Is there sufficient material for 50 minutes? (many stories fall simply because they are not BIG enough). Will it move? (Whereas radio, by stimulating the mind's eye, can transport the whole of Hannibal's entourage across the Alps, see Evans at Knossos, Woolley at Ur, or Layard at Nimrud, television cannot. It is largely restricted to present-day pictures of inanimate objects.) Can the camera, by panning across deserts, probing into trenches, following the activities of, I hope, reasonably animate archaeologists, provide sufficient movement to satisfy a movie medium?
- 3) Will the story help provide subject and visual variety and balance to the series as a whole (a dig here, a biographical assessment there, an excavation in Devon, a major monument in Denmark)?
- 4) How much? The budget. Whereas radio equals two people and a tape recorder in a shoulder bag and a programme budget of £600, television is a travelling circus of five to eight people and often as many as 30 boxes of equipment. A film in the U.K. costs about £25,000, a film in Peru or Pakistan approximately £65,000. Travel abroad becomes increasingly difficult.

Programme ideas, unlike the goddess Minerva, never spring fully armed from the head. They struggle out, weak and naked, have to be fed, watered, clothed and encouraged to grow but, before the nurturing process can begin, the embryo ideas have to be gathered. I have three sources - the public, whose pleasure and education I'm serving, the professional archaeologists, whose

subject I'm promoting, and the programme makers themselves, who are the agents of communication.

I have never actually received an idea from a member of the public that has been converted into a programme - probably because most ideas submitted are to do with ley-lines or the 'Mystery of Rennes le Chateau'. However, letters and phone calls in conjunction with the reaction indices provide a barometer of interest and a guide to the kind of programme that our viewers would like. When I ran the science series HORIZON, I knew that three topics never failed with the audience - cancer, children and dogs. The CHRONICLE equivalents are wet planks, dead bodies, treasure and palm trees or, expressed another way, underwater archaeology, Egyptology, gold artefacts and exotic locations. The best, i.e. most popular, CHRONICLE programme would be the discovery of an Egyptian mummy with gold teeth on a submerged wreck off an island in the Caribbean. However, compared with HORIZON, CHRONICLE is at a disadvantage, not only because HORIZON subjects are animate and CHRONICLE'S inanimate, but because they have an immediate audience relevance -- cancer concerns everyone -- whereas wet planks are immediately relevant to no-one. Relevance has to be explained. Archaeology films are the most difficult documentaries to make for television.

Compared with the total failure rate of ideas submitted by the general public, the professional archaeologists have a success rate of 25%. About one-quarter of our output is the direct result of a letter or extended phone call to me from a trusty or trusted archaeologist, and the reason for this is that archaeologists have become increasingly aware of what they can do for themselves. Gone are the days when I received letters that began 'Dear Sir, I don't have a television set myself but I have just completed a book/paper/dig and wonder if ...' and, only rarely now does someone suggest our covering, say, early metallurgy in south-east Spain - a fascinating topic but not one that is visually strong. Most archaeologists have become aware of our need for good but simple stories with interesting visuals that will last for 50 minutes but which are largely devoid of academic ifs, buts and maybes. They know this because they have watched the programmes or have taken part in one. Many archaeologists have become excellent performers. I no longer need a professional television front person. The archaeologists can talk direct to the audience, and what they lack in professional smoothness they more than make up for in enthusiasm. As far as I'm concerned, the more archaeologists involve themselves with archaeology on television, the better all round.

However, most programme ideas come from archaeologists indirectly through the medium of the programme makers themselves. None of my producers are professional archaeologists but they have a wide knowledge of archaeology and are constantly in touch

with archaeologists - talking, reading, picking up the 'feel' of the state of the discipline. It is this awareness of the shifts and changes in the world of archaeology that has led, I hope, to our being able to reflect these shifts and changes on the television screen.

So much for the theory, what of the practice? What has actually hit the silver screen in the past four or five years? Compared with ten years ago, I notice one major shift of emphasis in our programmes and that, put rudely, is that digs are out and counting things is in. Along with this shift, there is an increasing concern with industrial, above ground and underwater archaeology and a concern with what I'll call the subject 'philosophy'.

Digs are out for two reasons; the archaeologist seems to have lost interest in them (rescue is no longer the priority it once was) and television can't afford to film them. There was a halcyon time when CHRONICLE could start filming a dig, hope for the best and abandon it if it wasn't, from a programme point of view, sufficiently interesting. Now we can't afford to film until we know that the dig is actually significant, by which time it's too late to start as the dig's almost over and, as we are not in the business of re-creating discoveries, the sense of discovery is gone. We are, as the Americans might say, in a 'Catch 22 situation' with the result that, in the past four years, we have covered only five digs: 1) Ivor Noel Hume's dig on the seventeenth century English settlement at Williamsburg in Virginia (filmed over several seasons by them and re-edited by us, so no great time and money problem there); 2) Colin Renfrew's dig on Melos; 3) the excavation of the Orphean temple complex in the grounds of the Littlecote House, Wiltshire (as both digs were already completed we merely filmed and explained the sites); 4) Barry Cunliffe's dig at Roman Bath and 5) Martin Biddle's dig at Anglo-Saxon Repton (short, concentrated digs that could be satisfactorily filmed in our normal three-week schedule). Whilst all these films were different in feel and presentation, they had in common the fact that they showed the audience the literal and metaphorical nitty-gritty of dirt archaeology. I think that it is most important that our audience should be shown the techniques, especially new techniques, of excavation -- the backbone of archaeology -- and I shall continue to remind them at least once every CHRONICLE season.

Apart from digs, what else might the television audience have learned from CHRONICLE over the past four or five years? For the purpose of this article I have tried to do a programme subject-breakdown. It's inevitably an inexact catalogue but reveals the following:

Ancient civilisations	19
Biographies	3
Industrial archaeology	3
Above ground archaeology	3
Underwater archaeology	6
Philosophy	2
Amateur archaeology	4

The films on ANCIENT CIVILISATIONS show a fairly comprehensive world-wide spread. They include: the Greeks (4 - Philip of Macedon's grave, Acropolis preservation, the Melos dig and Santorini and theories about Thera); the Egyptians (3 - the temples of Philae, the complex at Abydos, and 'obelisks'); the Chinese (2 - the tomb of the Emperor of Ch'in, the Han and T'ang Dynasties); the North American Indians (2 - north-east and south-west), plus single programmes about the Indus valley, the Hatrans, the Incas, the people of Zimbabwe and, at home in Britain, the Stone Age, the Romans and the Anglo-Saxons. In addition, we have done separate but complete series on the Vikings and the Indian civilisations of Mexico.

BIOGRAPHIES -- specific films about the work of archaeologists as opposed to biographical sequences incorporated in the CIVILISATIONS films -- have included a re-assessment of Schliemann's work at Troy and linked biographies of Amelia Edwards and Flinders Petrie and their work in Egypt.

INDUSTRIAL ARCHAEOLOGY has been reflected by Ken Hudson's 'Electric Revolution' which travelled between the Hoover building and Brighton airport via assorted gas works and low-rise flats, and the American Tom Hughes' view of the 'Bridge that Spanned the World' - Coalbrookdale here and in the United States, and a look at the decline of the South Wales Coalfield.

ABOVE GROUND ARCHAEOLOGY has been shown in Venice, in Cecil Hewitt's programme the 'Master Carpenters', and in the film which followed the dismantling of a Sussex cottage and its re-erection in the Weald and Downland Museum.

UNDERWATER ARCHAEOLOGY has submerged with the Kyrenia ship and various other wrecks in the eastern Mediterranean, the Dutch seventeenth century merchantman 'Slot Ter Hooge', the Armada's 'Trinidad Valencera', and, of course, the 'Mary Rose' (three times, plus the outside broadcast).

Once a year I try to carry at least one topical/philosophical/debate type programme. In this category were 'The Treasure Vanishes', a look at the major archaeological finds that have disappeared in this country over the last 300 years, which contained a plea for people to search their attics. This resulted in the British Museum becoming richer by a celtic sword and

CHRONICLE nearly the poorer, as we were threatened with legal action if we revealed our thoughts on the whereabouts of missing pages from the Winchester Bible. Also in the 'debate' category were 'Whose Art is it Anyway?', the pros and cons of returning Ashanti gold, Benin bronzes, etc. to their countries and, most contentious of all, the film 'The Metal Detectives'.

Our final group of films, showing the range, extent and importance of amateur archaeology, is based on our annual CHRONICLE Archaeology Award and shows the work of the award winners: from neolithic flint counting on Hampstead Heath to interpreting standing stones in Scotland, digging in Wales and recording WW2 pill boxes in England. Making a total of forty 50-minute films, over four years.

Whether CHRONICLE has been on the side of the angels during this period, whether we have correctly and adequately reflected what is new, what is important, and what is at issue in the world of archaeology, it is not for me to say. Whether we should, as has been suggested in some quarters, turn CHRONICLE into a 'Romer's Egypt' by using amateur enthusiasts as front people or whether, as has also been suggested in certain (BBC) quarters, we should be 'more like RAIDERS OF THE LOST ARK', I very much doubt. However, what I can be certain of is that archaeology is more popular with the viewing public than sixteen years ago, and equally certain is that, however hard we try, we will never be as popular on BBC 2 as snooker.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND PUBLIC VALUES, WITH REFERENCE TO THE MAGAZINE
POPULAR ARCHAEOLOGY

Jonathan Burt

Many of the writings that deal with popular culture have tended to incorporate evaluative notions concerned with whether the phenomenon is debased or worthwhile. Those who have attacked it as debased have included both reactionary and radical writers, the former stressing the vulgarisation of traditional values, the latter seeing it as an opiate eroding a critical and active consciousness (Kando 1975; Gans 1974; Hebdige 1982). It is inevitable that much of the literature on the subject has this form, given that the scholastic world defines and arbitrates on cultural standards. The phrase, 'popular culture' itself reflects this stratification as well as pointing to the existence of cultural boundaries within society.

Obviously, within the magazine POPULAR ARCHAEOLOGY archaeologists are engaged in what one could call a public, as opposed to academic, discourse. In this they define their self-identity and prescribe what they see as correct archaeology in the social context. Whilst there is no necessary uniformity within archaeological practice itself, the idea of what is 'correct' is very much linked to a defence of the status of archaeology as a specialist discipline. As we shall see, these views often clash with those of other groups engaged in some form of related archaeological activity. In this paper I shall examine the nature of these competing views, especially as found in the pages of POPULAR ARCHAEOLOGY, and relate them historically and socially to the idea that the competing values are mutually exclusive.

Whilst the magazine is owned, and was conceived by a businessman, POPULAR ARCHAEOLOGY is edited and largely contributed to by professionals. In an early editorial it stated that it wished to bridge the gap between the professional and the amateur. "Popular Archaeology is largely written by professionals; but it is not written for professionals" (Magnusson 1979:3). Not all the articles reflect in any explicit way the conflicts alluded to above, but there are four groups which are especially relevant; these deal with: professionals and amateurs; major national archaeological events (specifically the Coppergate excavation at York and the Mary Rose); metal detecting; and the antiquities market. In other words these are articles that directly relate to the reader as a potential contributor of money and labour.

Against the background of financial cuts, POPULAR ARCHAEOLOGY responded by appealing to the restoration of the spirit of communal archaeology: the significant contributions