Fouilages and the Cambridge demonstration of notable Palaeolithic circumstances at La Cotte St Brelade (now triumphantly published), this heritage and potential remains unknown, unpublished or ignored. It deserves better.

We shall take a second tack. Having accepted that Paton has disavowed a role as text-book writer he must nevertheless be aware that the volume may well serve as such. The tentative reviewer should therefore draw attention to fallings.

Chronology brings confusion: BC is used throughout, even where it must be be -- as Chalcolithic 2200-1800 BC; and its combination with typology produces a strange departure from the present systems -- hence the Middle Bronze Age does not exist and Iron Age in antiquity varies from one to age by several centuries. On the early Neolithic the most recent site on the Pinnacle follows Hawkes' perceptions: my brief study of the material suggests woeful confusion of stratigraphy and associations by the excavators -- Neolithic coarse ware becomes EBA, EBA becomes LBA etc. and surely no dolerite axe-hammers with Cerny. The site is ritual from start to Gallo-Roman finish -- well worth a definitive treatment -- but not here.

On megaliths, we see much the same approach -- nominally the author's forte but hardly so on this evidence. In Brittany passage graves are Dolmens à moulins: not a gallery. The carvings at La Hougue Bie -- spiral and Acusson claimed here -- do not exist and the identifications made here are most dangerous. The entire argument for free-standing phases of complex monuments deemed understanding of megalithic phenomena and the tragic mis-encomprehension of 'Great Stones' chambers such as Le Menhir and Mont de la Ville debases a unique insular circumstance, as Hibbs and I will shortly demonstrate. La Hougue Bie, rightly perceived by Paton as a plausible contender for Early Neolithic grand tumulus status, is not disqualified by having a round mound -- Mané er Croët was already there.

To later things: the terms Chalcolithic, Beaker and Seine-Oise-Marne are not interchangeable and, as the north French have found, such confusion breeds only confusion pro-Blanchet. The extraordinary pots and exist-in-circle monuments will not yield their places to such broad treatment. Los Huettes (Alderney) and Jersey (Guernsey -- unmentioned here) are LBA sites of international importance whose implications even for Jersey are not recognised. Was the famed St Helier gold tore (not "torque", please) really a LBA import and not later loot?

On more general matters: why no decisive statement of the real status of Jersey and the rest of the archipelago, why no explanation of the processes that follow fossilisation or deposition (Hibbs, at least, has shown the way for Jersey), why no declaration of insularity vs mainland as explanation, why this book? I have spent two hours of my life in reading other references and one half in writing this review: I emerge older, sadder but no wiser, but I hope Mark Paton will.


Reviewed by Nigel Holman

This volume is the product of a conference held in New York in 1984 which was "designed to reconcile discussions of the intellectual assumptions and theoretical perspectives that inform historic exhibitions and site interpretations" (p. 1). The volume comprises 11 papers from North American contributors who share similar concerns based on an enthusiasm for public history as a creative force for change in the present. It is very well produced and should be a delight to read and has lessons of relevance for historians and archaeologists alike.

In Jo Blatti's introductory chapter she draws on her experience as an oral historian where the perceptions of informants are frequent sources of theoretical insight. She argues for historic presentations to be based on an interchange between 'scholastic' and 'popular' views. This would develop mutual understanding by the two groups without suppressing the views of one or the other, or without destroying both by attempting their fusion into a single perspective.

The paper by Pierre Lewis argues that no part of the cultural landscape is more 'historical' than any other. He criticises the use of "picket fences and velvet ropes" which separate out the 'historical' from that which is not, arguing that such segmentation leads inevitably to the belief that history is irrelevant and that it can be avoided. In a similar vein, the concern for space and time mitigates against the present fusions bearing any similarity to those which pertained in the past. Together, a "stilte-division of the intellectual assumptions and theoretical perspectives that inform historic exhibitions and site interpretations" (p. 1) is created. Michael Wallace discusses American public attitudes to history: this serves to introduce a discussion, with specific critiques three paper presentations, of the relationship between sponsors, curators and the audience.

Jane Greenfield's paper describes her works of art which feature fictional individuals from her own work: she presents the word and the world. She argues that the present volume is concerned with non-traditional presentation contexts for the presentation of the past, Michael Tettama's contribution is concerned with the traditional art-products oriented museum. He examines the formalist perspectives which prevaileid in museums until the last few decades -- which combined "a clear...sense of purpose, a well-articulated concept of educational message, and a...highly appropriate exhibit technique" (p. 71) -- with the modern analytical perspectives which have different goals but have presentation techniques which have barely altered. In the currently fashionable analytical perspectives, artefacts are seen as by-products of human behaviour and thus peripheral to
the major themes of a relevant historical consciousness. Eileen
asserts that it is necessary to address in the museum context the
basic question of why people require goods. This serves both to
critically examine contemporary materialism and to demonstrate the
revelation role of artefacts as means of communication.

Three papers discuss in more
practical terms how some of the recom-
nendations contained in papers
noted above can be achieved and how
this end product might be devised for
maximum efficiency and 'user-friendliness'. Barbara Charles
emphasises the important part
played by the design of an exhibit in
its overall effectiveness.

Irene Burnham's paper further this
discussion by demonstrating how a
central, coherent -- though not
necessarily all-inclusive -- theme
is a fundamental prerequisite for a
successful exhibit. Mary Ellen
Macleay stresses the importance of
organisation programmes which seek to
centralise visitor reaction to an
exhibit.

The paper by Warren Leon
continues the discussion in several
previous papers and looks for means
by which the visiting public can be
encouraged to gain as much as
possible from an exhibit. The use
of techniques and paradigms which
are at odds with accepted canons of
museum procedure are recommended. The paper continues by focusing on the
educational strategies which can be used to present messages.

The paper by Michael Prichard
and Dwight Pintelley is a description
and critique of the historical
presentation at Clips Island (prior
to its recent redevelopment).

Here, public presentation is a
particular challenge because of the
firmly fixed images with which
visitors arrive on the island. As
a consequence, the potential for
influencing public attitudes is so
much greater.

If the past is to play a con-
structive role in determining the
future of human society, then it
is necessary for the museum profession
to respond with self-appraisal and
a spirit of openness. Only in this
way can museums meet the needs of
the present while avoiding the
pitfall of uncritically providing
mythical oases in the image of the
present. The papers in this book
discuss many of the crucial themes
inherent in the development of
displays which fulfill these
requirements and address the
problems of the modern world.

The necessity for self-criticism
is a common thread in this book,
that is the need to develop review pro-
cedures for the benefit of the profession and their
customers and, ultimately, of society
and the public. Many contributors emphasised
the importance of providing the
public with the ability to understand
the 'museum experience' while
others emphasised the methods by
which the visitor can be encouraged
to think actively about -- rather
than watch passively -- the presen-
tations they visit. Others stress
the importance of thoughtful
planning, design and evaluation
which is necessary if these goals
are to be achieved. The examples
which all the contributors provide
make their discussions much more
convincing.

There is no mention of archae-
ology in this volume. This serves
as an excellent illustration of the
relevance of the archaeological
profession to become involved with
these important debates. The disciplinie's unique character-
istics, in terms of time depth and
materials studied makes such
involvement highly desirable.
Archaeologists must continue to
develop the self-criticism and
greater awareness of the
discipline's wider responsibilities
shown in recent years and I
recommend that you read Past Meets
Present as part of this process.

G. DE G. SIEVEKING and M.H.
NEWCOMEN. The Human Uses of Flint

Reviewed by Andy Brown

Let it first be said that I did
not attend the fourth international
conference held at Brighton Poly-
tech in April 1983, of which
this volume, along with a companion
volume of symposium papers on Flint
and Chert (Sieveking and Hart 1987) are
the published proceedings. I cannot,
therefore, compare the content of the
actual proceedings with those published, but in spite of the
fact that a number of the papers
(it is not clear how many, nor which)
were commissioned as review papers, the present papers
appear to have been skillfully
tailed by the editors to retain a
real 'conference atmosphere'. That
this is achieved by the short,
scintillating presentations, however,
hits its drawbacks: part of that
atmosphere is the frustration of
some readers never going quite far
enough.

This volume presents 10 papers
with specific archaeological relev-
ance, falling into the sub-headings
of a) Flint mines and exploitation
of sources of raw materials, b)
Spatial aspects of Flint and Chert,
from exchange studies to deposition
patterns on individual sites, c)
technological asperts of production
and d) use-wear-related topics.
The companion volume deals
with the more strictly geological
aspects of Flint and Chert.

At the extractive end of Flint
exploitation, the general chronology
of Flint mining is considered
in two papers, although here the
use of radiocarbon dates is slack,
and the exploitation of the industrial
'Flint' in Poland and chalk Flint
in Senegal receive particular
attention. The former case study
was a good example of that
conference frustration which I mentioned
above, for after four pages of
description of various stages of
mining activities and numerous
figures of dubious relevance,
Schubert finally proceeds alternative
hypotheses to account for this
data, each apparently with profound
social and economic implications.
The other essential element of the
paper was expectedly, excitingly even,
to find what? The bibliography!

The other papers in the group
are concerned with the glacial
exploitation of Flint nodules at
Neolithic Bramshill, Dorset (R.
Mercer) and the extraordinarily
well-preserved multi-period mines
of Old and Middle Kingdom Egypt (G.
Weisgerber).

Robert Miller's model of the
economic context of production and
circulation of Flint tools in the
New Kingdom period around Thebes,
as well as two other urban-related
sites in the Middle East, provides
both a stark contrast to the rather
minimal view of extractive process-
ses at the earlier sites described
by Weisgerber as well as a link
with the group of papers concerned
with exchange systems. Miller's
reconstruction reminds us that it