

Editorial

Welcome to this year's edition of PIA – Papers from the Institute of Archaeology, and to an exciting, thought-provoking issue of the journal. The theme of this year's Forum and Interview is international collaboration on the part of the Institute of Archaeology (IoA), UCL, and other UK university departments, collaboration that is increasingly necessary in the current funding climate as well as holding potential benefits for all involved. In the Forum, Bill Finlayson, Director of the Council for British Research in the Levant (CBRL), gives an overview of the structure and remit of the British Schools, Institutes and Societies abroad, including a sense of where they have come from and his vision for their future. The various responses build on this from different perspectives: regional (Paul Lane, British Institute in Eastern Africa (BIEA)), funding (Michael Fulford, British Academy Board for Academy-Sponsored Institutes and Societies (BASIS)) and external (Sarah Finke, UNESCO) perspectives. Though individual positions vary, all contributors stress the ongoing – though necessarily evolving – value and contribution of these institutions, a position made particularly clear by Roger Matthews, a former director of both the British School of Archaeology in Iraq (BSAI) and the British Institute at Ankara (BIAA). A dominant theme that emerges is that of interdisciplinary and joint-venture research projects.

Though local collaboration is an increasingly prominent aspect of the work of the British institutions abroad, in the Interview we focus on a joint venture of a different type: the International Centre for Chinese Heritage and Archaeology (ICCHA), inaugurated in December 2003. Rather than providing a physical presence in China as the British institutions do in their host countries, the ICCHA's aim is to promote collaboration in research, training, funding and publication between the two countries. In the two interviews, Peter Ucko (until recently, Director and now Emeritus Professor, IoA) and Qin Ling (Peking University, Beijing) discuss the project from both the UK and Chinese perspectives, each stressing the potential benefits and opportunities for staff and students from both sides. Difficulties remain, most notably in terms of funding for projects, but the value of the increased understanding of each other's approaches that the ICCHA seeks to generate is clear. Further examples of collaborative work by IoA students are presented in fieldwork reports by Sarah Byrne (West New Britain, Papua New Guinea), Susan Holmes (Iran) and Quetta Kaye (Carriacou, West Indies).

Three of our four research papers focus on 'public archaeology' as interpreted and experienced by a variety of stakeholders. Darrin Lee Long explores the interaction between different scales of heritage – global, national and local – and how a better understanding of these complex mechanics, and particularly of the responses of indigenous communities such as the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji, an Aboriginal clan in Queensland, Australia, can lead to better heritage management.

Kalliopi Vacharopoulou takes a value-based approach to the architectural conservation technique of anastylosis – the rebuilding of structures from surviving elements. She presents the results of a survey of conservation professionals through which the broad range of values implicated in decisions around whether or not to implement anastylosis emerge: historical, symbolic, aesthetic and economic, for example. Again, the author suggests how her findings could lead to better practice in this field, including the involvement of local stakeholders.

Moving closer to home, Sarah Dhanjal applies constructivist learning theory to archaeological education in the UK, presenting the results of an experiment designed to introduce principles of archaeological method to groups of children aged 7-11. Simulating the process of excavation, the children were encouraged to interpret artefacts in trays representing different stratigraphic layers, and then to determine the chronological order of these layers. Dhanjal's paper also concludes with suggestions for best practice in terms of archaeological education more generally.

Method is another theme that emerges in this edition of PIA. Kevan Edinborough's research paper advocates the use of quantitative methods, in this case applied to the evolution of arrowhead technology in the south Scandinavian Mesolithic. Through a series of statistical techniques, he demonstrates a 1000-year period of technological stasis with implications for social structure and evolutionary processes. In the Fieldwork Reports, Farrah Brown describes the development of an archaeological GIS in Giza, whilst Velissaria Vanna had the rare opportunity to work with both modern and ancient skeletal populations in her study of biological status differences.

The Reviews further showcase the breadth of research undertaken by IoA postgraduate students. Helen Dawson, Elisabeth Pamberg and Susanna Harris introduce current research in the fields of island archaeology, Late Roman ceramics and Hallstatt textiles respectively. In their reviews, James Doeser and Ceri Ashley both offer fresh perspectives on traditional formats. Doeser looks at the innovative *Speed Conference* at the Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) Conference, December 2004, whilst Ashley reviews contemporary expressions of art and identity at "Africa Remix", part of London's Africa '05 events.

On behalf of the PIA committee, thank you to all the contributors to this year's journal: authors, referees and interviewees. Finally, I would like to thank the PIA committee for their hard work, enthusiasm and dedication, and to wish the incoming committee every success with next year's issue.

Rachel Fentem
Senior Editor