

There was much debate amongst the heads of departments about the minimum number of staff needed to teach a credible degree course in archaeology in the 1990s. Our view is that the breadth of knowledge and expertise needed to cover both 'traditional' and science-based archaeology is such that it cannot be provided by a staff of less than about 12. Science-based teaching provided by either non-specialists who have 'read it up' or by a patchwork of non-archaeological specialists from science departments is simply not good enough. The one leads to bad science and the other both to bad archaeology and poorly integrated courses. Beyond the arguments about the breadth of what must be taught and how it is best covered, however, there is also the important matter of choice and flexibility. The department with a dozen lecturers can obviously offer a wider choice of courses and build in more options than can a department of four or five lecturers. The flexibility which this offers students in building their courses to meet their career objectives becomes increasingly important.

The financial and resource implications of larger departments are, to my mind, at least as powerful as the academic ones, and they are of course of academic importance in themselves. At present there is wasteful duplication of library purchases, equipment, technical assistance and much else besides. At the same time, the resources made available to small departments in terms of grants for all the above are obviously directly related to their size. Larger departments obtain larger resource bases and with them, a much greater degree of flexibility. Equally, the larger staff resource provides more opportunity for special leave and sabbaticals, and eases the burdens of administration. Within the four months after Christmas, urgent new resource implications also surfaced, as the SERC and British Academy began to talk in terms of fewer, larger grants, for larger research groups.

Even if all the departments had supported the maintenance of the *status quo*, with a larger number of departments ranging in size between three and 10 (plus the London Institute), we would have faced difficult and dangerous political problems both within our own universities and within the university system in general. Although most universities have been very supportive of their archaeology depart-

ments, recognizing them as amongst their most dynamic and innovative departments, in the increasing financial squeeze which most universities are facing, small departments become particularly vulnerable.

There is a very real risk that archaeology will suffer from piecemeal attrition over the next four years because many departments are small enough to be easily absorbed, closed or simply allowed to run down. Small departments will certainly find it increasingly difficult to maintain their share of resources at a time when resources are shrinking. Even where individual universities seek to protect their archaeology departments, however, we still have to acknowledge that the UGC is committed to eradicating large numbers of small departments (of any discipline) and is exerting strong pressure on universities to implement this policy.

We might usefully learn some lessons by comparing the experience of Spanish departments. Spanish is about as widely spread through the university system as archaeology, with a similar number of staff, mainly in small departments. A UGC review has said there are too many, too small, and has suggested several closures and an overall rationalization.

Those of us who support the concept of fewer, larger archaeology departments do so because we believe it will lead to better teaching and research, resulting from better resourcing, greater range and depth of expertise, and more opportunities for staff to provide mutual support. We fear that not only is the present deployment of resources not producing the best results for archaeology, but that in the present circumstances a strategy to maintain the *status quo* is a strategy for piecemeal, unplanned decline.

Britain is not the only country whose university archaeology is under pressure. L. P. Louwe Kooijmans, head of the Instituut voor Prehistorie, Rijksuniversitet, Leiden, sets out here recent experiences in the Netherlands. He entitles his comment:

A Dutch mirror for comfort

An alarming lamentation with an almost fatalistic undertone about the cuts and reorganizations brought about in the university

archaeology of a country with an enviable archaeological tradition and similar public support for archaeology. This is shocking. Can we say something for comfort, for support or even give some advice? Perhaps a sketch of the Dutch situation might offer some useful views. Although Dutch archaeology and Dutch universities are organized in dissimilar ways, the whole British story sounds very familiar and is mirrored in its essence on this side of the North Sea.

Let me first give some very brief and basic information on the volume and organization of Dutch archaeology, then an impression of the gales the Dutch higher education went through, and then at last a present state of affairs of archaeology in our universities. Everyone familiar with the British situation can make the comparison, see the parallels and differences.

The Netherlands have 13 universities for 14 million inhabitants: three technical, one agricultural, one economic and eight general (one of which is Calvinistic and one Roman Catholic!). Archaeology is found in five of these; in three (Leiden, Amsterdam, Groningen) as full studies in various specialisms, in two as a minor provision. Before a recent reorganization European archaeology ('pre- and protohistory') was part of the Faculties of Geography and Prehistory. Classical and all other (non-European) archaeologies were and still are part of the Faculties of Art. Both major sections have about 30 staff members, and about 150 and 100 students respectively. So the major goal of SCUPHA seems to be fulfilled in the Netherlands, be it that within each university there is no coherent organization of the archaeologies. In Leiden only, all archaeology is housed in one building.

The growth of national, provincial and municipal archaeological care for monument conservation and rescue archaeology started in the Netherlands shortly after 1945. The 1960s and 1970s were a period of growth for both these archaeological divisions and the university institutes. There has grown a close cooperation between the State Service for Archaeological Investigations (ROB, Amersfoort) and the universities, which means that the university institutes take their part in rescue excavation work. These societal connections appeared to be an important argument against financial cuts on university sections for pre- and protohistory,

the more since during the last decade an active policy has been conducted to raise public interest to give archaeology in general a stronger social basis.

Since the end of the 1970s and especially the last years, an increasing conflict can be seen between the central, regulating government and the traditionally independent and autonomous universities. The major problem is that universities did grow too fast, especially in the future expectation of decreasing numbers of students, and there is a need to cut governmental expenses in general. So universities suffer in fact year after year by governmental initiatives to lower costs: first a full change of study structure to more condensed courses; second, a reorganization of the wage and grade system for staff members, in essence a disguised system of wage cuts; third, two straightforward rounds of financial cuts, a first one of 10% of the total budget (£65 million) and a second of 6%. The goal of 'preserving quality' and 'cutting the dead wood' was heavily frustrated by political arguments, saving confessional universities and those outside Holland s.s. The allotment of cuts to discipline and university has been a good example of traditional Dutch merchandising. Fourth, there are continuously new and changing procedures aimed to raise the quality of research, involving a lot of administration, description of projects, competition for extra-university funds, and procedures for measuring research quality. The 'Academic Council', an advisory body for the Minister has been abolished and a new 'Union of Cooperating Universities' (VSNU) formed. But universities do not cooperate and are down-graded to competitors in the struggle for survival. Tremendous amounts of emergy are diverted from education and research to reorganization and defence, or simply blocked by all government measures. Far from being complete in the foregoing sentences, it might be evident that Dutch universities got their part, and one will be anxious to know how archaeology suffered.

Strong points for pre- and protohistory departments have been their rôle in rescuing cultural heritage, the regular positive publicity on university research, and a relative good fame for research quality. But some capacity has been lost (Groningen) and the same is true for the archaeologies in the Faculty of Arts (Utrecht, Amsterdam). This is compensated for by a

computer division for archaeology in Amsterdam and especially by the strong position given to prehistory and archaeology in Leiden. The Board of Leiden University considers archaeology, by old tradition, as one of its 'visiting cards'. An Archaeological Centre houses prehistory and art archaeology. Prehistory has been awarded 'renewal' and 'computerization' funds, resulting in a growth from three to seven staff members. This year a new experimental study programme will start in Leiden with a first year devoted to a basic archaeological training in contrast to all present programmes that start in the second year after a first year in another discipline. The new programme offers better specialization possibilities in the last year. It is hoped that not Leiden alone, but all archaeology may profit on the long run. The new programme will start with about 45 students.

The good archaeological facilities in three

centres, with a staff above the SCUPHA norm, seem not endangered at the moment. The demand for archaeological education gives their existence a good basis, together with the other arguments given earlier. That the archaeological departments never reach the level of 250 students considered as most rational is out of the question, as with many other minor disciplines. Another point is the argument of 'quality'. We mutually agreed that Groningen, Amsterdam and Leiden are of equal quality in research and education and I think we can state this honestly. One should not give arguments to the 'outer world' to cut the archaeological capacity but indeed try to fulfil the conditions for education and research on a good level, and I agree that the discipline has grown to a complexity that needs a minimum staff of five or six for European archaeology alone, and larger if the wider archaeological field is to be covered.

Book Chronicle

We include here books which have been received for review, or books of importance (not received for review) of which we have recently been informed. We welcome information about books, particularly in languages other than English, of interest to readers of *ANTIQUITY*. The listing of a book in the chronicle does not preclude its review in *ANTIQUITY*.

Philip M. Kendrick. **Excavations at Sabratha 1948–1951: a report on the excavations conducted by Dame Kathleen Kenyon and John Ward-Perkins.** *Journal of Roman Studies Monograph 2.* London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies for The Society for Libyan Studies, 1986. xxiii + 327 pp., 64 pls., 125 figs.

Pauline Albenda. **The palace of Sargon king of Assyria.** Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations 1986. 280 pp., 153 pls., 97 figs. 352F. Synthèse 22.

Colin Dobson & Roberta Gilchrist (ed.). **Archaeology, politics and the public.** York: York University Archaeological Publications, 1986. 51 pp. £3 paperback.

A. Fol, B. Nikolov & R.F. Hoddinott. **The new Thracian treasure from Rogozen, Bulgaria.** London: British Museum Publications, 1986. 64 pp., 12 col., 50 b/w illus. £4.50 paperback.

Philip Grierson & Mark Blackburn. **Medieval European coinage, with a catalogue of the coins in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge 1: the early middle ages (5th–10th centuries).** Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986. xxii + 674 pp., 65 pls., 28 tables, 8 maps.

Seton Lloyd. **The interval: a life in Near Eastern archaeology.** Faringdon: Lloyd Collon, 1986. 186 pp., 29 pls. Order from The Alden Press, Osney Mead, Oxford.

Birgitta Hårdh. **Ceramic decoration and social organization: regional variations seen in material from south Swedish passage-graves.** Lund: CWK Gleerup (LiberFörlag), 1986. 95 pp., 16 figs., 17 tables, 54 diagrams.

Anick Coudart & Patrick Pion (ed.). **Archéologie de la France rurale de la préhistoire aux temps modernes.** Paris: Belin, 1986. 168 pp., 226 b/w & col. illus. 150F.