the site area, and one hopes that these would be included in the centre, where the area surrounding Stonehenge as well as the monument itself would be better illustrated. Surely there can be little requirement for much more than this?

One of the other challenges which faces the HWNC(E) is that of visitor control, especially in terms of damaging turf. Downland turf is undoubtedly tough and could carry, if properly managed, a very large visitor inflow – sadly the Junic fringe is already leaching astro turf! Finally there is the matter of admission charges, which is not dealt with in the report. The new decisions so far taken will undoubtedly require greater numbers of personnel and more management with obvious increased revenue and capital implications. The site is one of world importance, and the proposed alterations will cost a great deal of money; obviously the proposal is to provide more for the visitor but it is to be hoped that HWNC will allow the admission charge to remain as low as possible. Having made the landscape more available and more accessible, it should be shown to the greatest possible number of people.

The Stonehenge Study Group Report is a milestone in the treatment of prehistoric monuments. Firstly it comprehensively deals with the landscape (rather than an individual site) in terms of preservation, explanation and display. Secondly, it con- slightly turned within a regional context which will hopefully make the archaeology of Wesssex (as a whole) much clearer to the visitor. Secondly, it considers the potential economic benefits of developing such a site.

Finally, and most importantly, it provides an example of 'open government' in the management of ancient monuments. HWNC(E) has not only provided an initial decision based on the Study Group's Report but it has also provided the basis for any informed reader to see how that decision was reached, and in turn has provided a mode for the future treatment of the display of ancient monuments in this country.

HWNC(E) must be congratulated not only for the speed and efficiency with which it carried out its initial intent but also the swiftness with which it reached an initial decision based on the published document. Having shown how capable it is of adopting an open approach, and at the risk of appearing churlish, it seems a great shame that the pattern could not have been adopted for Hidden Castle.
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models they are usually in poses such as holding the baby or grinding corn. While men are shown in active 'bread winning' roles such as hunter, farmer or metalsmith. The tenor of representation and assumed roles implies that those values ascribed to sex roles in the 20th century can be seen to exist in the past. In the use of language people are generally referred to in male terms such as 'Early Man' or 'Prehistoric Man' and the themes which are depicted are assumed to be male for example 'hunting', 'making metal', 'trade and exchange', or 'power and prestige'. The emphasis lies with activities that are the basis for a story of our evolutionary economic and social progress. Assumed female activities are shown as peripheral to these mainstream themes.

The main problem is that one can only coordinate through display what is currently known about the past and the structure of archaeological knowledge is very frequently either explicitly or implicitly male biased. Even though many deny the validity or the ability to study people through the archaeological record, most impersonal studies still contain a male bias. It is only in the past few years that a few feminist critiques and approaches have appeared in the academic literature (e.g. Conkey and Spector 1984), but even then, the effect is not remarkable.

What are the possible solutions? One is that more work needs to be done to make women in the past more visible. Displays can attempt to redress the balance by taking care in the language used and making clear the problems and uncertainties in interpreting the past. These are some of the aims of WEMAN is promoting. It is interesting to note that the Prehistoric Society (1984, 442) feels that there is a need for a more imaginative presentation of archaeology into the public and '... the emphasis of sites and sites and sites should reflect a holistic view of the past'. To achieve this demands serious consideration of how gender roles are presented. Perhaps most importantly those who work in archaeology should be aware of and consider how their own sexism affects the production of archaeological knowledge, in what and how they excavate, research and interpret the past.
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For further details contact: Jane Leggett and Sherri Steil, Newarke House Museum, The Newarke, Leicester.