

SOUTHEAST ASIAN ARCHAEOLOGY INTERNATIONAL NEWSLETTER

ISSUE NO. 11

July 2000

EDITORS

ELISABETH A. BACUS
Institute of Archaeology
University College London
31-34 Gordon Square
London WC1H 0PY UK
e.bacus@ucl.ac.uk

&

RASMI SHOOCONGDEJ
Dept. of Archaeology
Silpakorn University
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
rasmis@mozart.inet.co.th

Greetings colleagues! In future issues we would like to receive contributions for the section, **Conversations across the Continents**, which Rasmi initiated several years ago but which has been dormant for quite awhile. We thus wish to encourage you to submit short articles discussing various issues related to collaborative work between Southeast Asian and foreign archaeologists (e.g., language barriers, differences in traditions of research, cultural differences, gender, etc.). We would also like to strongly encourage students to contribute research summaries, list of papers presented, etc. for inclusion in the *Newsletter*. Please remember that the informative value of the *Newsletter* depends upon your contributions. If you have any suggestions for improving the *Newsletter*, please let us know. Also, due to financial constraints we have distributed the last two issues primarily by e-mail but have continued to send copies by regular mail to most of our Southeast Asian colleagues and those who are not on e-mail. If you have not received a copy please let us know; for those of you in SE Asia who receive it by regular mail, please let Rasmi know that you do indeed receive it. Finally, please feel free to make copies of the *Newsletter* to distribute to your colleagues and students. The deadline for submissions for the next issue is 15 November 2000.

RECENT ARTICLES ON ILLICIT ANTIQUITIES AND LOOTING IN SE ASIA

DESTRUCTION OF SOUTHEAST ASIA'S PAST THROUGH LOOTING (Reprinted from *World Archaeological Bulletin* 9:37-40). By **Rasmi Shoocongdej**, Department of Archaeology, Silpakorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

“At the WAC-4 meeting in South Africa, I gave a regional report on a serious looting problem in Southeast Asia, particularly in Cambodia. Here, I would like to continue to address this critical issue: the illicit trafficking in archaeological treasures.

I bring up this issue perhaps it is a global problem very frequently encountered in third world countries. Inevitably, this problem directly impacts on archaeological interpretation because artefacts lose value if we don't know their provenance or associated context. Knowledge of the past is thus lost forever...

Due to economic problems, the illicit antiquities traffic has been intensive in Southeast Asia for many decades, operating through a worldwide trade network. This network involves local people, middleman, antique dealer both local and foreigner, antique shops, and collectors. Many archaeological treasures have been smuggled out of their countries of origin to the illicit traffic centres. The cities in Asia well-known as centres for antiquities trading are Bangkok, Hong Kong,

Singapore, and Tokyo. The target sites often are burial sites and religious monuments. The objects most commonly stolen include prehistoric artefacts such as pottery, stone-axes, beads, bronze axes, etc. and historical artefacts such as stone and bronze sculptures of Hindu or Buddhist images, architectural decorations, etc.

However, the case of Cambodia is of particular interest for the world archaeological community because it involves some of the most popular and desired treasures for art dealers or collectors from all over the world, in particular stone-carvings. Cambodian treasures can be compared to the value of the Egyptian or Roman or Chinese antiques as well.

Looting in Cambodia

Like many countries in the world, Cambodia is a rich source of archaeological treasures. Artefacts have generally been looted from many recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites during periods of political instability. When Cambodia opened the site of Angkor Wat for tourism, antiquities unfortunately became the most popular souvenirs on sale to the tourists. As long as the commercial value of antiquities is high in the market, the looters will continue to dramatically destroy archaeological sites. Sadly, at the beginning of this year, the Thai police stopped a truck at night in Prachinburi Province, a borderland, and found that 117 Khmer stone-carvings had been illicitly smuggled out from Panteay Chamar in Cambodia to Thailand. The Panteay Chamar is the biggest Khmer sanctuary outside the city wall which was built by the great king of Khmer, King Jayavarman VII. Once the police put all the stone-carvings together, they were surprised to find bas-reliefs of Avalokitesvara (God) with a number of small figures of the Amitabha Buddha (Avalokitesvara) carved all over his arms. The style is known by Khmer specialist as Bayon art which dates to around the 13th century. According to Lawrence Briggs, an author of "The Ancient Khmer Empire" published in 1951, the bas-reliefs can therefore be identified to their original location. In addition to the 117 stolen pieces just mentioned, an object from the Panteay Chamar, which was smuggled out earlier, was found at an antique shop in River City Mall, Bangkok with a price of \$6,800. This was reported by Prof. Claude Jacques, of The French School of Far East, who is also a Khmer-specialist advising UNESCO in Cambodia. It has been reported that this smuggling is linked through the wider international network to antiquities dealers [in] France, Japan, and the USA.

Clearly, most current conservation and restoration projects have primarily focussed on around Angkor area (e.g., Banteay Srey, Phnom Kulen) owing to problems created for tourism by unexploded land mines. Consequently Angkor has the best record on an artefact inventory of all known archaeological sites in Cambodia. If there is no detailed study of other, smaller archaeological sites or sanctuaries, it will be very difficult to detect illicit traffic in antiquity and pursue legal remedies, since there is no information to confirm the origin of stolen items.

What should be done?

How can the Cambodian cultural property be protected? The response of the Cambodian government to the illegal international traffic of antiquities is to cooperate with UNESCO and the Thai government as they have been formulating antiquities legislation. At the same time, according to the Khmer Constitution of 1993, the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts plays an important role in the development and preservation of the Khmer cultural heritage.

Thailand is well-known as a center for illicit trafficking of antiquities. The Thai Fine Arts Department and The Cambodian Government have set up resolutions preventing the illicit importation or export of Thai-Khmer cultural heritage. However, the Thai Fine Arts Department needs to pursue this agreement seriously in order to protect cultural property effectively. For instance, the Thai should immediately have returned the 117 stone carvings once the investigation of their theft was finished, as they are the cultural property of Cambodia.

It was not until recently that the UNESCO organized a web page which computerized all Khmer artefacts from known archaeological sites in order to disseminate all information concerning archaeological sites and artifacts in the files. This includes the date of the record, a description of sites and artefacts, a photograph, and detail descriptions of artefact and site discovery. In the case of the archaeological treasures that have been illegally exported out of Cambodia, this information will help to identify the missing pieces. In other words, this...facility will help prove if cultural property

has been stolen from its country of origin. This will facilitate the return of cultural property under international regulation.

As archaeologists, we are aware that the problem of looting will never cease as long as people remain very poor and the demand from collectors remains very high. I think one simple way we can help save the past for the future is through education. Education about the past is a powerful tool to make people aware of their history, identity, heritage, and community/national pride. We need to promote a new perspective about the value of artefacts, and show that they are meaningless if we don't know their context. We must change the public perception of artefacts solely as art objects. Additionally, wherever we work in the field, I think it is our responsibility to produce both academic and public publications, particularly in a local language. For instance, if the archaeological objects are stolen from the country of origin, having a detailed academic report about them will indirectly help to identify these objects and proceed with legal action.

Finally, the illicit trafficking of cultural property, unfortunately, not only destroy the cultural history of Cambodia but the world history as well. It would be very sad indeed if the future Khmer generations have to go to France, UK, Japan, or the USA to study their own history!"

PS The Thai government returned the 117 Khmer stone carvings from Panteay Chamar to Cambodia at the beginning of this year.

A TREASURE TROVE OF THAI ANTIQUES ABROAD (Reprinted from *Kinnaree*, February 2000, pp.106-112). By **Somprasong Prasuchantip**, The Committee for the Deterrence of Threats to Buddhism, Thailand.

"Several copies of "Sotheby's," a catalogue featuring famous items for auction, from one of the world's foremost auction houses, have been received by the Committee for the Studying and Monitoring of Contraband Art and Antiques, and the Committee for Religion, Art, and Culture.

The copies are from an ex-dealer of antiques from one of Bangkok's most notorious antique trading centers. At face value, there is little to suggest anything special about the catalogue. However, further inspection of the titles of collections for auction, tends to attract the attention of anyone with a mandate to safeguard the country's treasure trove. For example, "Khmer, Thai, Javanese, and Tibetan Works of Art" and "Khmer, Thai, Burmese Works of Arts."

Thai artifacts and antiques are often included in auctions, appearing in scores of such catalogues. Full details are included such as particulars of the works, and a brief history and age of each item - all verified by history experts in the respective countries. What really catches the eyes, are the initial bidding prices printed below photographs of the pieces to be auctioned. These vary from a few thousand pounds sterling to price tags of millions of pounds.

Heads of Buddha images, from different periods of Thailand's history, and Sangkaloke ceramic ware, seem the most coveted items among collectors taking part in auctions. Following closely, in terms of popularity, are lintel pieces of art and Khmer sculptures. Each lot ranges from sixty to one hundred and twenty items.

More alarmingly, perhaps, is the fact that antiques or artifacts from Thailand outnumber those from neighboring countries in Asia. Such stark reality clearly contradicts the statement made by His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej back in 1963 when His Majesty proclaimed:

"The construction of contemporary buildings brings name only to the one person who builds them. With ancient monuments, the honor belongs to the nation. Each piece of old brick is, therefore, worth preserving. Without Ayutthaya, Sukhothai or Bangkok, Thailand will be utterly meaningless."

In 1988, efforts were made to reclaim from the Art Institute of Chicago to the "Narai Bandhomsindhu Lintel" and ornate piece of Khmer architecture belonging to Phanom Rung Holy Shrine in Burriam. This represents the only incident to remind the Thai people of the value and importance of that piece to the country's national heritage.

Fifteen years later, millionaire art collector, James Alsdorf (who processes ancient art works from around the world) agreed to return this national treasure to Thailand. Yet the "Narai Bandhomsindhu Lintel," is not the only, and hardly the last, piece of Thai antiquity that should be returned to the motherland - the land that gave birth to religious art.

From a study of Sotheby's documents, recorded dates clearly suggest that antique auctions from Thailand have been a regular feature since 1983-more than fifteen years-with auctions held twice a year.

Calculating the number of auctions, and estimating at least two hundred pieces auctioned at each one, approximately three thousand pieces must have been auctioned over a fifteen-year period. "Narai Bandhomsindhu Lintel," according to antique dealers, represents just one of countless lots, with no particular significance other than the profits generated by sales from each auction.

From where did these works of art originate? How could merchants, representing Thailand, source, supply and dispatch overseas over two hundred antique pieces every year? An official study of the "Ad Hoc Committee" indicates two major sources:

Firstly, antiques were brought from sites of holy shrines, in neighboring countries that escaped archaeological surveys. In Cambodia, for example, estimates put the number of such sites at around one thousand.

Secondly, antiques originate from historical sites in Thailand, including temples at different places of historical interest. Dealers prefer artwork at least three centuries old or older, from the Dvaravati, Chiang Seang, Sukhothai, Ayutthaya, and Lopburi Periods among others.

Antique dealers know that artwork most coveted by collectors in the United States and Europe is aged eight hundred years upwards. Pieces over one thousand years old can fetch as much as ten million baht per piece. A Buddha image from the Sukhothai Period was smuggled out of the country and sold to an American antique collector for two million baht. When the Thai authorities acted to negotiate its return to Thailand the price was raised to a staggering ten million baht.

The question most folk ask is: "What is the estimated value of this kind of Business?"

Around ten billion baht annually seems to be close to the mark. Accurate estimates are difficult because the sky is the limit at antique auctions. Individual dealers and art collectors often dictate the value of a genuine piece of artwork. This depends upon the pleasure they derive from either selling or owning particular pieces.

In 1999 alone, a raid launched by the Investigation Division of Provincial Police 1, resulted in the confiscation of over one thousand one hundred antique pieces. Two antique items were among one hundred and seventeen pieces confiscated in Sakaeo Province.

Officers and academics from the Fine Arts Department conducted further studies into the age and estimated value of antiques. These indicated that artwork from Banteay Chmar Shrine in Cambodia's Banteay Mienjeui Province, could fetch at least one hundred million baht in the open market. This case alone make future probes worthwhile into smuggling methods used at this site.

However, we must return to the important issue of determining whether or not there are Thai artifacts and antiques on display in museums and art institutes, or in possession of millionaire art collectors in the West. Preliminary research indicates that Mr. James Alsdorf's family, and other auction houses overseas, do have in their possession antiques from Thailand and other Asian countries. Taking a lead from what appears in the catalogues, there must be several hundred such pieces involved.

Is it now time to retrieve these treasures of national art and place them where they belong? Additionally, how can we upgrade existing security measures for protecting historical sites and antiques to meet today's circumstances? How can Thai people help monitor the situation?"

RESEARCH REPORTS

TEXTILE TECHNOLOGY IN THE PREHISTORY OF SOUTHEAST ASIA by **Judith Cameron**, Department of Archaeology and Natural History, RSPAS, Australian National University.

Previous research in Southeast Asian archaeology has focused on lithic technology, pottery or metallurgy and models of cultural interaction have been based on these technologies. The research for my PhD thesis focuses specifically on the archaeological evidence for spinning and weaving from sites in South China and Southeast Asia. Through a systematic analysis of the evidence, the research explores their origin and traces the movement of Neolithic spinners from southeast China into various

parts of Southeast Asia during the Late Neolithic/Early Metal period. The study also engenders Southeast Asian archaeology by establishing that spinning and weaving were women's work in the prehistoric period and that textile production was of considerable economic significance in early Southeast Asian societies.

NEW INVESTIGATIONS AT LAO PAKO ON THE VIENTIANE PLAIN, LAOS by **Anna Källén**, PhD student, and **Anna Karlström**, MA, from the Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Uppsala University, Sweden.

In February and March 2000, a new fieldwork campaign was started at and around the late prehistoric site Lao Pako on the Vientiane Plain in Laos. As with former investigations at the Lao Pako site, this was a Lao-Swedish co-operation project directed by Mr Bounheuang Bouasisengpaseuth of the Ministry of Information and Culture, Department of Museums and Archaeology, Vientiane in co-operation with Anna Källén (PhD student) and Anna Karlström (MA) from the Department of Archaeology and Ancient History at Uppsala University, Sweden.

The main objectives of this fieldwork were: (i) to establish the extent of what we today call the Lao Pako site, and (ii) to investigate the landscape surrounding the very site regarding prehistoric and historic remains. The research area was chosen to cover the immediate as well as the more distant parts of the Lao Pako site, covering approximately 20 sq. km. The overall aim was to provide a spatial context to and estimate the extent of the site, and to obtain a first understanding of the landscape dynamics of this area.

The field survey method was worked out considering the existing vegetation cover of the research area. The dense forest vegetation was for most part almost impenetrable, except in some limited areas that had recently been burned to clear for new rice fields or gardens. The common survey method of systematic walking in transects across the whole research area was therefore not possible to use. Instead, most of the time was spent conducting interviews with residents of the three closest villages: Ban Nabong, Ban Phone Kham and Ban Tha Kok Hai. This method resulted in information of two kinds: first, the location of find spots of artefacts or structures that had been found by villagers while working in the rice fields or digging in the ground for other reasons; and second, oral information on the location of old villages and important places from recent history. Both of these categories of information have been considered and investigated to the extent possible.

As a result, 21 sites (including the Lao Pako site itself) have been identified, investigated, plotted on a map and described in a database. There were no possibilities at this stage to get exact datings of the sites. Most of the sites, however, are from historic times. Several old villages with temple sites from historic times, as well as locations for a number of stray finds, have been identified. In addition, the Lao Pako site and at least one other site are from late prehistoric times. There is also one site that might date from the Neolithic. The sites, artefacts, and other material structures, if any, were visually examined and recorded. Thus, no excavations have been carried out at this stage of the investigations. At a number of sites soil samples were taken and their trace phosphate contents analysed, which can indicate settlements or other activity areas. Most samples for phosphate analysis were taken at and around the Lao Pako site. Analyses of the samples from these particular areas have made it possible to define the extent of the site; it is approximately one hectare based on the area where phosphates have been deposited.

The material from this survey and phosphate mapping is still being processed. Results will be published as soon as possible in the form of an article, and an Arcview version with all maps and photos available is soon to be found at <http://www.arkeologi.uu.se/afr> A report on former fieldwork at Lao Pako is found in: Källén Anna & Karlström, Anna 1999 *Lao Pako, a Late Prehistoric Site on the Nâm Ngum River in Laos*. BAR International Series No 777. Archaeopress, Oxford.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDS IN VIETNAM IN 1999 MADE PUBLIC Ha-Noi, Sept. 30, 1999. Published by the Vietnam English I Vietnamese News Agency, 5 Ly Thuong Kiet, Hanoi.

“New archaeological discoveries this year are being made public at the 34th national meeting of the branch in Ha Noi on Sept. 29 and 30 which is hosted by the Viet Nam Archaeological Institute.

The Stone Age relics, which come from the Hoa Binh and Bac Son Cultures were found at the Dan Cum and Na Chao caves in the northern mountainous province of Ha Giang. Archaeologists said the Dan Cum cave is one of the few large primitive caves of archaeological interest in Southeast Asia.

The Viet Nam Archaeological Institute is working with the Otago University of New Zealand to study artefacts and vestiges belonging to the Hoa Binh, Da But and Mai Pha cultures with the aim of determining the characteristics, blood types, diseases and life styles of people of that time.

As far as the Metal Age is concerned, excavations at Phu My (the central highland province of Lam Dong) have revealed for the first time moulds for bronze axes decorated with projected images of animals.

At Nam Bac in the Yen Mo district of the northern province of Ninh Binh, archaeologists have found ancient graves with well-preserved skeletons. Australian experts said those graves date back a good 3,500-years.

Many stone axes and axe moulds were also discovered at Lung Leng site in the bottom of the reservoir of the under-construction Yali hydro-electric power plant in Sa Thay district, the central highland province of Kon Tum.

In the interest of historical archaeology, excavations have been conducted at the Hau Lau site in the ancient citadel of Ha Noi, and Khai Thanh site in the Temple of Literature, also in Ha Noi. Stone and brick construction materials, and ceramic and porcelain ware were unearthed at Hau Lau, proving the existence of 2 distinct kinds of construction existing in 2 periods the 14th and 15th centuries and the 18th century. At Khai Thanh, archaeologists detected ceramic and porcelain artefacts, oil lamps, ink and pen containers, further evidence of the theory that the Temple was Viet Nam's first university. Remains of ancient buildings were also found, such as bricks, roof tiles, and decorative architectural details such as a dragon and phoenix motif dating back to the Ly-Tran dynasties (from the 11th to the 14th century).

Archaeologists also conducted further surveys on the Champa and Oc Eo Cultures with excavations at the ruins of Van Trach Hoa tower in the central province of Thua Thien-Hue. They have revealed the tower's interior and exterior structure as well as adjacent buildings and a beautifully-decorated wall section. It is reckoned that the ruins were built in the 9th or 10th century. Meanwhile, architectural remains of different structures, scales and materials, including tombs, temples and houses, were found at Oc Eo and Ba The, but their age remains unknown.

Other finds include relics of a dwelling of the Cham people from the 3rd or 4th century to the 11th or 12th century which were discovered at Dong Nghe in the central province of Quang Nam.”

RECENT PhD & MA THESES/DISSERTATIONS

KATE DOMETT 2000. *HEALTH IN LATE PREHISTORIC THAILAND*. PhD Thesis, Department of Anatomy and Structural Biology, School of Medical Sciences, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Abstract: The aim of this research was to provide a synthesis of the variation in health among prehistoric Thai communities and show that the health of these people was differentially affected by both their natural and cultural environment. Four skeletal samples comprising a total of 500 skeletons provided the material for this research. There were two coastal southeastern skeletal samples, Khok Phanom Di (2000-1500 BC, early agriculture) and Nong Nor (1100-700 BC, Bronze Age) and two inland northeastern samples, Ban Lum Khao (1400 BC, Bronze Age) and Ban Na Di (600-400 BC, Iron Age). It was hypothesised that the health profile of samples from within the same natural environment would be similar and, conversely, the health status of the northeast would be in contrast to the southeast. Additionally, it was hypothesised that changes in the cultural environment through

time, including the intensification of rice agriculture, would see an improvement in general health. Health, morbidity, and mortality were investigated through the analysis of a selection of parameters that included measures of mortality, growth, growth disturbances, joint disease, trauma, and dental health. This selection, although not exhaustive, enabled a representation of the health status of the four samples to be obtained and compared. Using a biocultural approach this information has been integrated with archaeological and ethnographic evidence for nutrition, pathogen load, and culture, to determine the effect each natural and cultural environment had on community health.

Within the southeast region the health profile of the Khok Phanom Di and Nong Nor samples were in contrast; Nong Nor had lower subadult mortality, taller adult statures and lower prevalences of dental pathologies. However, skeletal preservation was poor at Nong Nor and not all parameters could be observed. Within the northeastern samples health profiles were similar in overall prevalences of joint disease and dental health, but childhood morbidity and mortality were different. The latter, measured through observations of infant mortality, enamel hypoplasia and adult stature, were higher at Ban Lum Khao than Ban Na Di. The natural environment has had a significant influence on the health status of the people studied but not in the manner hypothesised. Comparisons within and between regions were complicated by time differences that may have affected the people's ability to cope with their environment. The comparatively poorer health suffered by the Khok Phanom Di and Ban Lum Khao communities may have been related to their settlement and adjustment of potentially new environments. In contrast, it is likely that both the Nong Nor and Ban Na Di communities were familiar with their natural environments as they were not the first settlers in their respective regions.

With respect to the cultural hypothesis, results indicated a general improvement in health had occurred through the time periods studied. The earliest sample, the people of Khok Phanom Di, was the least healthy. They had comparatively high prevalences of dental pathologies and joint disease, and high subadult mortality and morbidity, the latter reducing the attained adult stature. Health improved into the Bronze Age, particularly so in the Nong Nor sample, who had low subadult mortality and tall statures compared with the Ban Lum Khao sample. However, poor preservation of the Nong Nor skeletal material places a caveat over any interpretation. The people of the early Iron Age at Ban Na Di continued the trend for improving health. They had a moderate subadult mortality and morbidity, the latter was recovered from successfully as they reached tall statures. In addition, dental health improved and osteoarthritis decreased with time. Post-Iron Age, Thai people underwent an expansion of society led by the establishment of the centralised political regime of the Angkorian civilisation. From this selective view of skeletal health it appears the people were healthy enough to withstand the effects of such a transition. Further integration with other prehistoric Southeast Asian skeletal samples is now required to support this statement.

PETER VANDERFORD LAPE 2000. *CONTACT AND CONFLICT IN THE BANDA ISLANDS, EASTERN INDONESIA, 11TH -17TH CENTURIES*. PhD Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Brown University.

Abstract: The Banda Islands were the site of some of the fiercest struggles for trade and colonial dominance in the early modern era. These 11 islands were the world's sole source of nutmeg and mace, the "fragrant gold" that helped finance the riches of 17th century Holland. While historically important as the first foothold of what became the Dutch colonial empire in the East Indies, the pre-colonial history of these islands has remained mysterious. We know little of the trajectory of Bandanese history until it collided with that of an expanding Europe in AD 1512, when the first Portuguese ships dropped anchor under the smoking Gunung Api volcano. Just over a century later, society in Banda was irrevocably changed. The colonial era began abruptly in April of 1621, when Dutch East India Company forces, aided by Japanese mercenaries, massacred, enslaved or banished some 90% of Banda's population, and the islands were subsequently repopulated by Dutch farmers and their Asian slaves. Archaeological, historical and ethnographic research is employed to illuminate changing settlement patterns, trade networks, and ethnic and religious identity in Banda with a focus on the period between AD 1000-1621. The aim of this research has been to re-evaluate documentary sources with a "Bandacentric" view towards internal social processes, and extend understanding of long-term social change in the islands to times before the first written descriptions of the islands. This

dissertation is also an anthropological examination of culture entanglement. The objective of this dissertation is a re-telling of Banda's history, which until now has been told from a European perspective, guided as it was solely by European historical documents. This new history is centered on the forces at work within these small islands, and on links between these internal dynamics and the outside world.

DAVID KYLE LATINIS 1999. *SUBSISTENCE SYSTEM DIVERSIFICATION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC: WHERE DOES MALUKU FIT?* PhD Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Hawaii.

DUANGKAMOL AUSSAVAMAS 1999. **POTTERY ANALYSIS FROM PHANOM WAN, MUANG DISTRICT, NAKHON RATCHASIMA PROVINCE.** MA Thesis, Department of Archaeology, Silpakorn University, Thailand. Adviser, Assit Prof. Patchari Sarikaphutra.

Abstract: This study focuses on a comparative study of the pastes, forming techniques and decorative designs of pottery from two prehistoric periods of Prasat Phanom Wan. The first cultural period of Prasat Phanom Wan dates prior to 370 BC, while the second cultural period dates between 370 BC-AD 230. In addition, this study includes others artifacts to study culture change of Prasat Phanom Wan in comparison with pottery from the same regions.

There were 20 pots from the burials. The forms of domestic pottery include serving vessels, preparing vessels, and cooking vessels; some were made for offerings to the spirit of the dead. In order to study the material, temper, decoration, and firing temperature, petrographic analysis and chemical analytical techniques including ICP-Atomic Emission spectrometer were applied to compare the samples from the different periods. The results show that the clays were the same type and came from a different source. Different tempers were used in the two periods: the first period was characterized by using grog temper, and the pottery was hand formed and decorated with coils, incisions, and mat impressions. The second period was characterized by using rice chaff temper. Evidence of the use of the wheel was found on decorated pottery, specifically polished, black burnished or burnished pottery. In both periods the pottery was open-fired at a low temperature.

The analyses show that there was cultural change at Phanom Wan in comparison with other sites in the upper Mun Valley, though the potsherds show that they shared the same pottery types and temper.

PONGDHAN BANDHOM 1999. **SPATIAL OCCUPATION IN THE LATE PREHISTORIC AT PRASAT PHANOM WAN, NAKHON RATCHASIMA PROVINCE.** MA Thesis, Department of Archaeology, Silpakorn University, Thailand. Adviser, Assist. Prof. Rasmi Shoocongdej.

Abstract: The objectives of this research are: first, to study the historical background of the site; second, to establish the cultural sequence and the patterns of spatial occupations through time; and finally, to compare the results of this research with the archaeological materials found in the upper Mun Valley. Based on the archaeological evidence from the excavations between 1990 and 1993, this study analyzes the evidence both qualitatively and quantitatively in order to examine the continuity of occupations and spatial relationships between the excavation units.

In sum, it may be concluded that the site was first occupied and used as a burial site by a Bronze Age population prior to 370 BC, and continuously used until the Iron Age (370 BC – AD 230). Later, the site was modified and used as a sanctuary by the “Khmer” during the 10th century AD and 11th-12th century.

FORTHCOMING WEBSITE FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA ARCHAEOLOGY DATA EXCHANGE

The Henry Luce Foundation, Inc. has recently provided a grant to the University of Pennsylvania Museum for dissemination of scholarship on Southeast Asian Archaeology. A portion of the grant is for the initiation of a website to facilitate scholarship on the archaeology and anthropology of the region, beginning with a **web-based bibliography**. The director of the project is Joyce C. White, and the webmaster is Christopher King, a graduate student in Anthropology at the University of Hawaii. A beta version of the bibliography, which will employ the Biblioscape program, is planned to be posted with an initial set of over 2000 references in about 9 months. The bibliography will be searchable, and exportable to the user's local bibliography or word-processing program. References can be exported in several bibliographic styles. Joyce and Christopher will be seeking feedback on the site, as well as additional references. Expansion of the scholarly site is planned focusing on other archaeological, biological, and cultural databases, as well as data recording forms. Stay tuned for more details including the web address.

JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE CENTRE FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH MALAYSIA is searching for a Lecturer to teach and help develop the laboratories for scientific analyses in any of the following areas -- palaeoanthropology, metallurgy, and to help build a reference collection for fauna. The candidate must have a PhD in archaeology/anthropology. There is no deadline for application though the Centre aims to fill the position this year. For details please contact Dato Professor Zuraina Majid (zuraina@usm.my), Director of the Centre for Archaeological Research Malaysia, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 Penang, MALAYSIA. Tel: 604 8603357 / 604 6577888 ext. 2683. Fax: 604 6573546.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY invites applications for a tenure-track assistant professor in archeology beginning Sept 16, 2001. Preference will be given to applicants who can demonstrate that they have cleared all requirements for the Phd by spring 2001. We wish to complement existing strengths in Pacific Rim and Basin, and will consider western N America, E/SE Asia, & Latin America. We seek a colleague doing active field research on emerging issues, & working collaboratively with local communities. Expertise sought in paleoethnobotany, geoarchaeology, paleoenvironments, coastal adaptations, lithic technology, archaeometry, or quantitative methods. Tchng exp reqd; publications expected. Submit letter addressing res & tchn, vita, courses taught, 2 syllabi, & names/addresses (snail & email), & phone #s of 3 references to: Madonna Moss, Dept of Anth, U of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403-1218. Application deadline: Oct 15, 2000. Interviews at San Francisco AAA meeting, Nov 15-19, 2000.

GRANTS

BEAD STUDY TRUST'S GUIDO SCHOLARSHIP FUND. According to the terms of the bequest to the Bead Study Trust, the Guido Scholarship Fund is established for "suitable (bead-related) research abroad" (awards are for research outside the applicant's country of residence) and applications are invited which fall into such a category. Applicants must be subscribers to the Bead Study Trust Newsletter.

Awards from the Fund are not sufficient in themselves to finance a major research project, but should be seen either as grants-in-aid towards large projects that have already, or can reasonably expect to, attract other funds, or for small projects for which sums of 300 to 500 pounds are sufficient. Applications must be received by 31 October 2000. For further details on the Newsletter and scholarship applications, please contact: Mrs M E Hutchinson, Secretary of the Bead Study Trust, 29 Elliscombe Road LONDON SE7 7PF UK, or by e-mail: m.e.hutchinson@aapi.co.uk or bead.study.trust@aapi.co.uk

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

THE 8TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN ARCHAEOLOGISTS will be held in Sarteano, Italy from 2-6 October 2000. You are invited to participate and contribute a paper on any aspect of Southeast Asian archaeology, including proto and early history, art history, epigraphy, and traditional material culture. In accordance with the aims of our Association, the presentation of recent research and the discussion of new data are particularly welcome. The official language of the conference is English. The length of your contribution should not exceed 20 minutes. An additional 10 minutes will be reserved for discussion. Every effort will be made to raise funds for inviting a few scholars from different Southeast Asian countries who cannot obtain funding from their institutions. For further information and to receive the Second Announcement, please contact: Patrizia Zolese, Fondazione Ing. C.M. Lerici, Via V. Veneto 108, 00187 Roma, Italy; e-mail: folerici@tin.it; fax: 0039 06 4827085; phone: 0039 06 4880083.

AUSTRALASIAN ARCHAEOOMETRY 2001 will be held 5-9 February 2001 at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. The main host will be the Centre for Archaeological Research at the University of Auckland in collaboration with a number of other New Zealand research centers and academic institutions. The Australasian Archaeometry conference meets every four years. This year for the first time the conference will be held outside Australia. In 1997 the conference was attended by several hundred scholars involved in the fields of Archaeology, Anthropology, Geography, Conservation, Museology, Material Science and Applied Nuclear Science (e.g. dating materials analysis, etc). The theme session for this Symposium will be *Issues and Developments in Australasian Chronology: New Directions for the New Millennium*.

If you wish to receive further announcements and information concerning the symposium, please contact the conference organizers (by email, regular mail, fax, or fill out the online registration form at their web site): Australasian Archaeometry 2001, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New Zealand. Telephone: 64 9 373 7599 x8572. Fax: 64 9373-7441. E-mail: P.Sheppard@auckland.ac.nz Online registration: car.ant.auckland.ac.nz/archconf/arch_feedback.html

CONFERENCES, SYMPOSIA, WORKSHOPS, ETC.

The **GEORGE COEDES TODAY CONFERENCE** was held in Bangkok 9-10 September 1999, and was organized by the Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Anthropology Centre, the Centre de Documentation et de Recherches d'Études franco-thaïes (CEDREFT), and Silpakorn University. George Coedes (1886-1969) was a French scholar who made invaluable contributions to Thai studies. Working under the patronage of Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, he laid the crucial groundwork as well as directions for the study and research in epigraphy, archaeology, and Thai history within the broader Southeast Asian context. Widely known and recognised during his times, his pioneering works have provided both inspiration and intellectual prototypes for subsequent scholarly undertakings in many areas of Thai studies.

Despite his scholarly eminence, the real significance of his contributions to Thai studies, in particular, is yet to be fully understood by contemporary Thai scholars and researchers. The study of his works remains largely limited among those familiar with the French language; and not only have very few of these works have been translated into Thai, but there remains virtually no major published study of them. There is thus a real need for more widespread dissemination of his scholarly contributions in the form of an academic seminar such as this one, or through other means including collection and translation of these works, to promote further in-depth research in the various areas of Thai studies.

The conference's objectives were: 1) to disseminate George Coedes important contributions to Thai studies; 2) to provide a venue for Thai and foreign academics and specialists to exchange their

views and results of their studies on his life and work; and 3) to assemble these views and studies in a single volume for publication.

INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON INTERPRETING ASIAN CULTURES IN MUSEUMS: DISPLAYS, ACTIVITIES, STRATEGIES, organized by **Dr Brian Durrans**, **Sara Pimpaneau**, and **Sarah Posey** of The British Museum, Department of Ethnography, was held 15-17 March 2000 at The British Museum.

The present tendency for creating, refurbishing and reorganising museums and galleries - and, above all, for adapting them to changing conditions - calls into question how curators interpret objects in their care and how museum visitors receive, and rework, the interpretations they are offered. Against that background, the Workshop focused on the influence of exhibitions of Asian objects on public understanding of the cultures to which they refer. Special attention was paid to activities, such as performances and demonstrations, that enhance the displays of artefacts and engage more than the visual and literary forms of understanding commonly associated with museums.

The programme addressed the following topics: 1) Interpretation versus 'representation': can museums, with their often imposing architecture and visual/literary bias, adapt themselves to convey radically different kinds of understanding? Does letting a culture 'speak for itself' imply abandoning interpretation altogether? How might exhibitions become discourses rather than fixed statements and linked to collections-based research in which the intellectual thinking and practical activities of curators become more transparent? 2) Frames of reference: does restriction to a particular place or community in display necessarily limit the significance of a local culture to a wider frame of reference? How can critical scholarship be brought to bear on dominant or essentialist characterisations of Asian cultures, at local, national, regional or continental level? 3) Multivocality, cultural change and opportunity: to what extent are cultural exchanges, involving agents and brokers who select and determine cultural significance, compatible with a critical evaluation of how culture is constructed? What resources are available to combine insight and entertainment, treating all visitors as students and participant-observers?

Several participants presented on Southeast Asian cultures in museums and included: **Huism Tan** (Asian Civilisations Museum in Singapore), Presenting our Ancestral Heritage; **Itie van Hout** (Tropenmuseum, The Netherlands), Batik 2001: An Exhibition on Batik Textiles from Java in the Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam: A Case-study on Interpreting Aspects of Asian Cultures by Means of an Exhibition; **Yunus Arbi** (George Washington University, USA), Exhibiting West Java Regional Culture for the Local People (Bandung - West Java) for the Past 20 Years; **J. Lee** (Singapore Art Museum), Singapore Art Museum's Collection and Exhibition Policy on Southeast Asian Art; **Artemio Barbosa** (National Museum, Philippines), Curator vis-a-vis Consultants: Discord in Setting up the Museum of the Filipino? A Case Study; **P. M. Taylor** (Smithsonian Institution, USA), From Cabinets of Curiosity to the Global Digital Museum: Transforming Indonesian Material Culture in the Museum Context; **B. Bronson** (The Field Museum, USA), Exhibiting Asia in the American Midwest; **S. Cate** (Center for Southeast Asian Studies, UC Berkeley, USA), Temples, Festivals, Museums: Thai Space and Sociality.

CURRENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN SOUTHEAST ASIA was held at the 65th Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archaeology in 5-9 April 2000. Organized by **Judy Voelker**, the symposium included the following participants and presented papers: **J. White et al**, Late Quaternary Environmental Transformations in Thailand: Current Multidisciplinary Research; **M. Dega et al.**, Nature and Timing of Prehistoric Settlement East of the Mekong River: A Cambodian Case Study; **J. Krigbaum**, Isotopic Evidence for Rain Forest Clearance during the Neolithic of Tropical Southeast Asia; **V. Pigott and J. Maranki**, Skeletal Trace Element Analysis and New Evidence for Production Behavior among Prehistoric Metal Workers in Central Thailand; **M. Pietrusewsky and M. Douglas**, The Skeletal Biology of Ban Chiang: Temporal Comparisons; **B. Vernon**, Bronze Age Crucibles of northeast Thailand: Technology and Cultural Implications; **J. Voelker**, Ceramic Production and Cultural Development in the Phimai Region, Northeast Thailand during the Bronze and Iron Ages: Current Research; **S. Lertrit**, Ceramic Variability and Food Consumption Pattern in Early Historic Thailand: A View from Two Sites; **L. Lefferts**, Cross Draft or

Up-draft: Kiln Selection in Baan Sathing Maw, Songkhla Province, Southern Thailand; **P. Lape**, Political Dynamics, Trade Networks and Religious Change in the Late Pre-Colonial Banda Islands, Eastern Indonesia; **E. Bacus**, Reconsidering Complex Polities in the Central Philippine Islands: Theoretical Insights from Southeast Asia.

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON CULTURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION - CONSERVING CULTURAL HERITAGE FOR SUSTAINABLE SOCIAL , ECONOMIC AND TOURISM DEVELOPMENT: LEARNING FROM BALI CULTURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCES, coordinated by the Bali Urban Infrastructure Program - Bali Cultural Heritage Conservation Project, was held 9-14 July 2000 in Bali. For further information see their web site at: www.bali-chc.com/

CONFERENCE/WORKSHOP REPORTS

INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON ARCHAEOLOGY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA IN THE 3RD MILLENNIUM : AN EVALUATION. 27-29 September 1999, Penang. **By Suppaporn Nakhunlung**, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Chiang Mai University, Thailand.

This colloquium was a great success in bringing together a number of scholars in Southeast Asian prehistory, with a bout 70 Southeast Asian archaeologists/specialists from 16 countries attending. It should be noted here that only a few female Southeast Asian prehistorians were there. Generally, the colloquium achieved its primary aim to review the problems and the weakness as well as the strengths in Southeast Asian prehistory.

The problems identified included: 1) Many archaeological sites in Southeast Asia have been continuously intruded upon by many infrastructural development projects as well as treasure hunters; 2) Southeast Asian archaeological works have conducted more rescue archaeology than research-oriented archaeology; 3) The benefits of cultural resource management (in industrial tourism) versus research-oriented archaeology (academic purpose); 4) Problems of standardizing Southeast Asian prehistory database; 5) Language problems in accessibility of data and publications.

Weakness. A number of problems were pointed out by many attendants, some of which are: 1) The level of development in prehistory varies across Southeast Asia making it hard for integrating information; 2) Lack of integrated knowledge of Southeast Asian prehistory, e.g., sites rather than regional focus; 3) Greater public relation activities are needed in order to promote Southeast Asian prehistory to the public as well as to world archaeology.

Strengths. Some strengths were mentioned such as: 1) Intensive archaeological work has been carried out in many Southeast Asian countries with the collaboration of foreign archaeologists—well trained archaeologists can offer assistance to those who are beginning in archaeological work; 2) Many archaeological laboratories, including dating laboratories, are available all over Southeast Asia.

Future. Some proposals were made for further consideration: 1) Closer collaboration should be made among Southeast Asians; 2) Information, skills, as well as laboratories for dating and analysis should be shared; 3) More of the younger generation in this field should be encouraged and trained; 4) Training should not only focus on technical methods but also include interpretative approaches; 5) More attention should be made on “how to protect and preserve archaeological sites” rather than on “how and where to excavate;” 6) High technology should be considered for future exploration in archaeology; 7) Public awareness should be planned to encourage understanding of how the past is relevant to the present and future.

To the hosts, thank you for the warm welcome and the hospitality provided during the conference. For those who did not attend the Colloquium, you have missed many interesting presentations, especially a prehistoric-style opening ceremony, and discussions. Don't miss the next one in two years in the Philippines.

INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON ARCHAEOLOGY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA IN THE 3RD MILLENNIUM: A REVIEW. 27-29 September 1999, Penang. By **Ryan Rabett**, University of Cambridge, UK.

This conference was clearly hitting upon something significant. In the opening sessions, individual national panels of archaeologists and policy-makers from countries all around the region, relayed the current state of archaeological research; they spoke about their future plans and the problems that often beset them. And the same issues came up again and again. You could almost see them as repetitive 'hits' registering on a scoreboard. Patchy funding; a lack of facilities - both for artefactual analysis and for student training; a lack of public awareness; and limited communication between institutions, all figured prominently in this list. Yet this wasn't a meeting of doom-sayers. In fact, the impression was that this conference marked perhaps a rare opportunity. Not only could people draw solace from the fact that others were facing similar difficulties as themselves but also, and far more practically, from other individuals or institutions that had the means, facilities and help to overcome those difficulties. I feel that the formation of the Association of Southeast Asian Prehistorians (ASEAP) during a pre-conference meeting is probably timely, for it has the potential to provide an ongoing and supportive structure through which this kind of co-operation can be extended.

Optimism, or at least a growing sense of the way forward, seemed to grow as the colloquium went on. Practical suggestions were put forward, and issues were quickly ratified including: a move towards standardizing terminology and measuring systems; the breaking down of language barriers within the region, and between this region and the global archaeological community (proposed by Mr. Adi Haji Taha); and the establishment of an ASEAP Fund (Prof. Masao Nishimura) to which project coordinators from member countries could be able to turn for financial assistance. These are important, conceivably vital, steps for the region's continuing archaeological development, but they take time to implement. Indeed, a lot depends on whether these endeavours are taken beyond the conference room.

The second day of the conference centred around three 'Discussion' sessions, focusing on the region's major prehistoric periods - Palaeolithic, 'Hoabinhian' & Neolithic, and Metal Age. The success of these meetings is harder to gauge. Once again it proved that similar difficulties were often plaguing researchers regardless of their period of specialisation. As such these overarching concerns linked well to the country and research presentations of the previous day. However, although the conference organisers strove to keep proceedings on track and to time, this part of the colloquium came across as sometimes undirected and overly rushed. A desire to bring some degree of consensus to our understanding of Southeast Asian prehistory was probably asking too much of this meeting. On a purely organisational level, a change in format between the two main parts of the colloquium may have helped. Two standing microphones were available during all sessions for participants to address the presiding chairperson and panel. While this seemed to work well in the first instance, when it came to the discussion sessions it occasionally seemed something of a hindrance to active participation. On the positive side though, the inclusion of summarising over-heads (an innovation adopted part-way through these proceedings) did help considerably in focusing people's attention on the issues under debate. But in the end it seemed that comparatively less in the way of tangible progress was made in return for the great outlay of effort by all concerned. For the time available, a little more was bitten off here perhaps than anyone could realistically hope to chew.

Interestingly, there seemed at times to be a *second* conference inside this one, trying to get out. And by this I don't mean that the discussion sessions should have been left for a much larger forum - though this might be a question we could ask. The conference that was stirring beneath the surface here was one that was calling for more explicit attention to the assumptions which archaeologists bring to the data they study. Countries in the region not only have differences in methodology to accommodate in the more integrated future they are embarking towards, each also sees the Past and the place of archaeological remains within it, slightly differently. That same reconciliation is going to have to come about here as well: in the questions asked of the archaeology, and in the interpretations drawn from it. These issues were not part of the objectives set by this colloquium. Hopefully, we can now anticipate a greater circulation of research papers and materials among the region's archaeologists *because* of the important steps taken here, and more specifically,

because of the formation of ASEAP. It is further hoped that we can anticipate discussion of the different ways in which people think about the Past at future ASEAP conferences.

A post-colloquium field trip (30 September) took interested participants on a day-long tour to the Lenggong Valley in Perak state (approximately 3 hours drive from Penang).

Over the last ten years Lenggong has been a focus of intense archaeological study by the Centre for Archaeological Research Malaysia, at Universiti Sains Malaysia - one of several areas of burgeoning prehistoric interest in the country. The discovery of such sites as Bukit Jawa, Kota Tampan, and Gua Gunung Runtuh (the site of the Perak Man) in this valley have contributed to establishing Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene occupation in Malaysia, where previously it had been doubted due to a lack of evidence.

Logistically, the trip was well provided: two executive buses for the journey to Lenggong, followed by jeeps and mini-vans to transport us when the roads became lanes. When the lanes became forest trails - as they did when we ascended to Gua Gunung Runtuh - there was always plenty of bottled water and local guides to make the adventure a little easier! Lunch was laid on in lavish style under a pavilion at the Lata Kekabu waterfalls, whilst high-tea was later served in the stately surroundings of the Taiping Museum.

But how did this final day sit with the themes being put forward in the conference as a whole? The organisers had stated at the outset that the aim of the conference was to take stock of the development of Southeast Asian archaeology to date, and to foresee and help structure its future agenda. The tour of Lenggong was a showcase of recent achievements in the study of Malaysian prehistory. Perhaps the more significant moments though were not the site visits themselves, but the moments in-between, where the role being played by local communities and authorities in the modern practice of archaeology was acknowledged. These were the points of contact with the conference and its aims. Whilst at the end of the day, the colloquium itself may be characterised as a 'success awaiting implementation', it will be through the development of such existing relationships, here and elsewhere, that the promising future of Southeast Asian archaeology outlined here will be ultimately realised.

FROM OUTSIDE: SOME REFLECTIONS ON SOUTHEAST ASIAN ARCHAEOLOGY. The International Colloquium on Archaeology in Southeast Asia in the 3rd Millennium. By Eva Weiler, Göteborg University, Sweden. E-mail: eva.weiler@telia.com

Last September an "International Colloquium on Archaeology in Southeast Asia in the 3rd Millennium" was held in Malaysia in conjunction with the 30th anniversary of Universiti Sains Malaysia in Penang. This well organized colloquium was attended by 66 archaeologists from 17 different countries (88% men, 12% women). Most of the participants were Asians but there were also a few archaeologists from the United Kingdom, France, Denmark and Sweden. As one of the participants from a remote part of the world - from Malaysia's outlook - I have been asked to review the colloquium from a personal point of view or the "outsider's view". This outsider is trying to convince her Swedish students that there is still a world outside Europe, a fact that is almost overshadowed by the increasing political interest of supranational cooperation within Europe (EU).

A More Structured Agenda for Future Work

I will start by citing professor Zuraina Majid, the colloquium chairperson and dynamic director of the archaeological research centre at the university, who set the tone already in her foreword to the colloquium program: "To say that archaeology in Southeast Asia has had a chequered or uneven development mainly due to historical reasons is to say nothing new. What is new is that this collective and regional stock-taking is a necessary beginning so that not only Southeast Asian prehistory will be better understood but that we can plan to have a more structured agenda for future work."

A step in this direction was the establishment of ASEAP, The Association of Southeast Asian Prehistorians, at a pre-colloquium just for the Southeast Asian nationals. It is similar to the EAA, The European Association of Archaeologists, though the EAA is open to all archaeologists, not only prehistorians. But as far as I understand, the ASEAP will serve as a regional forum for archaeological

discussions on the time that pre-dates the drawing of political boundaries in Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. It also pre-dates the geographical spread of Islam, Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism and other main religions in the region, which just occasionally developed into "national" religions. With the ASEAP the study of Southeast Asian prehistory has been geographically and chronologically defined by its members, though there are still discussions whether the region ought to be extended to include Taiwan. Unfortunately, the proposal of a special ASEAP website for international information and debate had to be rejected because of the unequal access to Internet and private e-mail addresses in the region.

Historical Reasons

Even if the "historical reasons" for the uneven development of SE Asian archaeology are nothing new, their effects are evident. There are, for example, Vietnam with the highest number of PhD students in archaeology today, whereas its neighbouring country Laos, has just five trained archaeologists. For the on-going efforts to start higher education in archaeology at the university of Vientiane the ASEAP will hopefully work as a collective support. There is Indonesia with all higher education in archeology concentrated at four universities in the central parts of the country but an on-going regionalization of archaeological research and cultural heritage management to institutes all over the country. There is finally the Philippines with a well developed section for higher education in underwater archeology in contrast to their neighbouring huge archipelago of Indonesia with 13,000 islands.

At a practical level is the need for databases for sharing archaeological data nationally and supranationally. This kind of communication is fundamental and will hopefully include future information on current projects, field reports, articles, exhibitions etc. The need for a standard nomenclature was also discussed, especially regarding lithic technology, but such a formidable job to standardize nomenclature and metric data for regional databases of artifacts must start at more limited and clearly defined levels. An interesting case study was however a 5-step Indonesian analysis including formal, interdisciplinary and contextual data.

A third regional problem is the lack of laboratory facilities for environmental studies and absolute dating, available only in Thailand and to a certain degree in Indonesia. The Thai laboratory facilities could be better utilized by their neighbours, but discussions on relevant national undertakings and the international supply of laboratories are most urgent.

A fourth problem is the barrier of foreign languages, which SE Asia shares with all countries outside the English or French speaking world. (But do students from Myanmar and Cambodia understand each other in their native languages?) Too little attention was payed to this problem at the colloquium, though some of the younger participants tried to start the debate. Many students can't speak or understand English very well and their only chance to learn it at their university studies (e.g., in archaeology) may be a one-year course.

More Discussion, Less Paper Presentations

The speakers had been asked to focus on brief presentations and discussions rather than common paper presentations in the following plenary meetings:

- 1) Current research and future plans
- 2) Discussion on the problems and issues concerning the Paleolithic, the "Hoabinhian" & the Neolithic and the Metal Age including an afternoon session on training needs and an evening session on different research papers
- 3) Presentation and adoption of recommendations

When leaving Penang, we all had a final report of 33 pages in our hands with short summaries of the different sessions, the problems & issues defined for each period, and the recommendations - not rules - for the future.

The problems and issues dealt with basic data (terminology, classification, dating or identification of phases, spatial distribution) and methods (multidisciplinary studies, environmental reconstructions, need for databases, training in interpretive method and theory). There were theoretical discussions concerning a more holistic approach to cultural studies within/between regions, the (Paleolithic) flake/core insular and mainland dichotomy, as well as "independent

invention" versus "diffusion" or "indigenous" versus "imported", irrespective of prehistoric periods. There was above all the ambition to get away from morphological questions and concentrate more on anthropological or rather "behavioral" approaches to prehistory, especially from areas with a long tradition of archaeological research. A promising declaration was the Thai and Indonesian statement that SE Asian archaeology must also be put into a world archaeology context.

The Framework of Ideas Remains Western

Regardless of many practical problems, there is now a regional network of SE Asian archaeologists and an agenda for future research. But it is still obvious that the growth of SE Asian scientific archaeology developed from Europe and America, in the former colonial areas, as well as in Thailand that has always been a sovereign state. Also Australia is involved in archaeological projects in SE Asia, but had no delegates at this colloquium. In Scandinavia almost all the information available about SE Asian archeology comes from Cambridge or Canberra, unless you happen to visit the library of the Nordic Asian Institute in Copenhagen, Denmark, with a large assortment of Asian periodicals in English, French and Chinese.

For an outsider it was striking that so many of the SE Asian archaeologists had studied archaeology abroad, not in their native countries. The framework of ideas on prehistory is still European or American, because Asian archaeologists have not turned their back on the former colonialists but adopted much of their work. With all respect to foreign archaeologists in SE Asia - I hope to join that group myself - there is nevertheless the double dilemma. Foreign archaeologists or historians are not just trying to understand life long ago. When coming from outside they also have to stay in a quite different cultural, contemporary setting compared to their own place of residence.

What is Specific for Southeast Asia?

There are of course differences between SE Asian and Western prehistory: the lithic terminology, the problems of the "Hoabinhian" and the identification and dating of prehistoric periods. A very special problem is the introduction of agriculture that resulted in a provocative question: Shall we drop the Neolithic in SE Asia or at least create our own Neolithic?

The transition from hunting to farming is not finished in SE Asia, because many people have chosen not to live as farmers. This is usually described as "a totally different Neolithic world" in the Western reference literature. Thanks to the European focus on cereal cultivation, early focus was on the evidence of rice cultivation in Neolithic SE Asia and less on early yam and tuber cultivation, coconut trees, bananas or other useful fruit trees and plants. (The colloquium decided to keep the term "Neolithic", at least as a reference term.)

Many of the participants pointed out the good conditions for ethnoarchaeology or comparative anthropological studies in the region, a situation which ought to be even better utilized by the native archaeologists. But this is not just a question about comparative studies of hunters or collectors, the transition from hunting to farming or cultural encounters in general. The living oral tradition on megaliths in parts of Indonesia is one example of an almost global "prehistoric" phenomenon today discussed by archaeologists in other parts of the world. This is just one of Asia's contributions to world (pre-) history; there will be many more of them in the future.

Besides the Neolithic there is another main difference between SE Asian and Western Asia/European prehistory: the lack of early urbanization. This was not discussed during the colloquium, but I mention it as a second example of the differences between SE Asian archaeology and its foreign framework of ideas.

CONFERENCE ON CIRCULAR EARTHWORKS IN CAMBODIA was held from 14-19 November 1999 in the Faculty of Archaeology, Royal University of Fine Arts (RUFA), in Phnom Penh, Cambodia under the patronage of the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts and of Dr. Harald Loeschner, the German Ambassador to the Kingdom of Cambodia. Conference Review by **Ian Glover**, Institute of Archaeology, UCL.

The Conference was planned for the end of a programme of practical training in field archaeology for undergraduate students at RUFA and was organised on behalf of the German Academic Exchange

Service (DAAD) by Dr Gerd Albrecht, a noted expert on the palaeolithic cultures of the Near East and Professor Dr Barbara Albrecht, a palaeobotanist, both from the University of Tübingen, Germany, with the assistance of Dr Miriam Haidle (Tübingen), Professor H. E. Chuch Phoeurn, Under-Secretary of State for the Ministry of Culture and numerous colleagues and students from RUFA.

The Circular Earthworks of eastern Cambodia and the neighbouring districts of Binh Phuoc and Loc Ninh in southwestern Viet Nam form a distinctive and enigmatic group of archaeological sites. They were first recognised by Louis Malleret from aerial photographs in the late 1950s as land was being cleared for rubber planting and 12 sites were then noted. In 1962 B.-P. Groslier excavated at Mimot in Kompong Cham Province, Cambodia and published some brief comments in his 1966 book *Indochina* (Nagel) as well as in *Kambuja* (vol.16, 1966), a French language journal published in Phnom Penh. Investigation restarted in the 1990s with surveys by American, German, Cambodian and Vietnamese archaeologists, but the sites still present many problems.

To date some 30 have been identified in an area of some 30 by 70 km and they share many features in common. They are all about 200 m in diameter with a low bank, steeper on the interior face, which survives to some 2-4 m above the surrounding ground level. The interior ditch is clearly not a defensive moat but indicates where the earth for the bank was taken. Usually the one entrance faces the nearest water source, and some sites have a second entrance opposite to this. Some of the entrances through the bank are rather complex with internal ramps and curved walls. Inside the bank, the surface may be lower than on the exterior, but there is often a slightly raised platform opposite the entrance. It is surmised that the sites were small village settlements, protected against wild animals and unruly neighbours but it seems clear that they were not well defended forts.

The dating of these sites is also much disputed; Groslier called them 'Neolithic', but the recent German excavators are inclined to see them as Iron Age settlements of the mid-to-late first millennium BC on the basis of a single fragment of a glass bracelet found deeply buried at the Krek site. At present there are two AMS dates made on very small samples of carbon recovered from sherds at the Krek site; these give calibrated dates of, respectively 2620 - 2350 and 1920 - 1690 BC, but the Zurich laboratory cautions that the samples were very small and the presence of old geological charcoal in the clay cannot be excluded. On the basis of ceramic comparisons the Vietnamese archaeologist, Nguyen Trung Do, was inclined to date the site to the late 4th to 3rd millennium BC. The present author believes that the C14 dates may not be too far out on the basis of a total lack of bronze, iron, and hard stone and glass beads and the abundant and typical polished stone adzes, stone bracelets and incised pottery, however more research is clearly needed to resolve this and many other questions.

The Conference Programme. After a reception on 14th November at the Residence of the German Ambassador attended by H. R. H. Princess Norodom Bopha Devi, Minister of Culture and Fine Arts the following presentations were made in the Faculty of Archaeology, RUFA:

Monday 15th: Opening Address - H. Mueller-Beck; Towards Establishing Cambodian Field Archaeology - Chuch Phoeurn; The Circular Earthwork Project - G. Albrecht; Prehistoric Research in Cambodia in the 1960s - R. Mourer; New Beginning of Prehistoric Research in the 1960s - Sirik Kada; The Stone Tools of the Groslier Site - Thuy Chanthourn; The Pottery of the Groslier Site - HEANG Leang Hong; The Beng Circular Earthwork - Chhor Sivleng & Sirik Kada; Stratigraphy and Settlement Patterns of Krek 62/52 - Vin Laychour; The Stone Tools of Krek 62/52 - Heng Than; The Pottery of Krek 62/52 - Som Sophal; Radiocarbon Dating - G. Bonani (read by B. Kromer); Raw Material of Stone Tools - Udo Neumann; Pollen Analysis from Krek 62/52 - B. Albrecht; Glass Remains from Krek 62/52 - M. Haidle; Proof-reading Theses Written in English - M. Clifford; Video film: Excavation Techniques in Circular Earthworks - Ros Sokhom & Srun Tech.

Tuesday 16th: Some Remarks on the Construction of Earthworks - H. Mueller-Beck; The Hawaii Earthwork Project - M. Dega (read by B. Griffin); New Discoveries of Circular Earthworks in Vietnam - Nguyen Trung Do; Earthworks and Ethnographic Parallels - Yasushi Kojo; Circular Sites in Mun Valley, Thailand - B. Boyd (read by C. Higham); NASA/JPL Radar Studies of Circular Mounds near Angkor - E. Moore; The Circular sites of the Upper Mun Valley - C. Higham and R. Thosarat; Dating of Sinter Deposits on the Temple in Phnom Nguok Cave - B. Kromer.

Following the presentations listed above, there were displays of pottery and stone tools from the Krek and Beng sites in the Faculty of Archaeology, RUFA and in the National Museum,

Phnom Penh and of some for the material excavated by B.P. Groslier in 1962 at his 'Mimot' site (now referred to as the 'Groslier' Site, Memot).

Over the next two days participants to the conference were able visit Krek and Memot on the 'red earth' soils of eastern Cambodia close to the Vietnamese border and examine four of the earthworks including the 'Groslier' Krek 62/52, Beng and Kampoan sites.

The present author was very much impressed by the enthusiasm of the Cambodian students and the quality of their verbal and written presentations at the meeting which reflects the quality of teaching given by the German team; this augurs well for the future of prehistory in Cambodia. One big problem the Cambodia students face is the lack of books and papers in English and French in the university and I would encourage any archaeologists visiting Phnom Penh to take copies of their books and offprints for the library at RUFA.

THE TA NEI TRAINING PROGRAM, November 1999 to March 2000. (Reprinted from *YASODHADA (APSARA's Newsletter)* No. 1 (Dec. 1999), p.6.)

“A five-month training program at Ta Nei temple, financed by the Japanese government, and implemented by APSARA, ICCROM (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property) and SPAFA (SEAMEO Regional Centre for Archaeology and Fine Arts), with support from UNESCO, was begun in November 1999. The major goal of the Program is to provide advance on-site training to national technicians (archaeologists, architects and engineers) in view of establishing a professional site management team. 20 trainees were selected from amongst graduates of the Royal University of Fine Arts' Departments of Archaeology and Architecture, as well as the Institute of Technology.

Situated in an isolated area northeast of Angkor Thom, Ta Nei temple provides an ideal study setting. The ruined state of the temple surrounded by dense forest also makes it an interesting case study in terms of architectural conservation, stone treatment, vegetation control and archaeological research. Physical facilities have been constructed on-site.

The first month of the program, managed by APSARA, was designed to allow the students to develop an intimacy with the Angkor site, including its geography, the evolution of man-made infrastructures, its history, and the religious, artistic and architectural characteristics of civilisation on the Angkor plain over time. Trainees were also introduced to the history of site management and current structures governing work at Angkor. Finally, each international restoration and research team at Angkor gave thorough on-site presentations of work in progress. The next project component includes a general introduction to conservation theory and risk mapping by ICCROM specialists, as well as sessions on international legal mechanism for cultural heritage protection, forestry and labour-based technology. The final three months of the program will be principally managed by SPAFA and ICCROM specialists in archaeology, stone and brick architecture conservation, stone analysis and treatment, etc. Though during this time students will be divided into groups according to specialisation, exchange between domains will be encouraged in order to build the basis for future interdisciplinary work.

By providing a solid understanding of Angkor and its management structures during the first month of the program, followed by advanced training in increasingly technical matters, the Ta Nei training program aims to contribute to the creation of a group of professionals capable not only of implementing technically sound maintenance and conservation work across the Park, but also, and most importantly, of conceiving site management from a global perspective.”

REPORT ON TRIP TO MYANMAR (BURMA), January 2000. By **Nancy Tayles**, University of Otago.

I was a participant in the workshop on the Bronze Age site of Nyaung Gan, Myanmar, held in Myanmar in January 1999 (report by Joyce White in issue 10 (Nov. 1999) of this Newsletter). During this visit it was clear that expertise in analysis of human skeletal remains from archaeological sites does not exist in Myanmar. During 1999 further contact was made with Daw Ni Ni Myint, Director General of the Universities Historical Research Centre at the University of Yangon, and arrangements

made for me to make a further visit to Myanmar, accompanied by Dr Kate Domett. This was to include training workshops for Myanmar archaeologists in the basics of skeletal analysis and a further visit to the site of Nyaung Gan to carry out further data collection from the human skeletal remains.

The training workshops began with two days of lectures at the University of Yangon to an audience of University staff and postgraduate students. This was followed by field training sessions at the site of Nyaung Gan. This has been set up as a 'site museum' and so provided an ideal venue for teaching the process of skeletal and dental inventory, estimation of age at death, estimation of sex, and recording of metric data in situ, as well as the differentiation of human from other animal bones in the case of disturbed and co-mingled material. The time at the site was limited but allowed five days of teaching of 14 staff participants of the workshop (including field archaeology staff from the Mandalay office of the Department of Archaeology of the Union of Myanmar) and a further two days for the 16 students who made the trek from Yangon to Nyaung Gan (four hours north of Mandalay). This was a very satisfying experience for us as teachers, as all participants were highly motivated and attentive, and we believe that the participants will now have a better understanding of the value of human skeletal remains for archaeological research and of the process of excavating and recording remains.

Kate and I also spent some days recording detailed data on the skeletal material, including both skeletal and dental evidence for health and disease. These data, when analysed, will form the basis for a paper to be published in collaboration with U Pauk Pauk, Director of the excavation and Director of the Department of Archaeology in Mandalay. There is a sample of 35 burials with the skeletons in various states from almost complete to minimal representation.

During our visit to the site we stayed in the village of Nyaung Gan. We enjoyed the most gracious and generous hospitality from our hosts in the village and from U Pauk Pauk and the staff of the Mandalay Office of the Department of Archaeology. The time spent in the village was very special as there had previously been no European visitors there for more than a very brief period. We created a significant diversion for the locals by our appearance but interactions were always very genial and cordial, if somewhat limited by our lack of understanding of the language. We also had the opportunity for an all too brief but very memorable day's visit to the stunning site of Bagan. We hope to continue a fruitful relationship with the Myanmar archaeological community.

PRESENTED PAPERS

I WAYAN ARDIKA (Universitas Udayana) presented "Gillimanuk Archaeological Site" in the session entitled, *Urban Archaeology - Conservation with Development*, at the International Symposium on Cultural Heritage Conservation, 9-14 July 200, Bali.

P. BION GRIFFIN (University of Hawaii) presented "Four Thousand Elephants at Angkor: Agriculture and Collapse in the Khmer State" in the session entitled, *A Culbert Festival, Part I: Containing Culture* (organized by K. A. Pyburn), at the 65th Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archaeology, 5-9 April 2000.

SAWANG LETRIT (PhD candidate, Washington State University, lertrits@wsunix.wsu.edu) "Cultural Heritage and Large Dams in Thailand" (abstract below) at *the International Workshop on Cultural Heritage Management and Dams*, organized by Steven Brandt and Fekri Hassan, and held 14-16 February at the University of Florida.

Construction of dams of either large or small size requires careful consideration of the potential loss of cultural resources, apart from the assessment of other environmental impacts. In Thailand, a number of dams have been built during the past 40 years, and many have affected archaeological sites and other cultural resources. The first large dam in Thailand--the Chao Phraya Dam--was completed in 1957, with funding from the World Bank. Through the years, serious concerns have been voiced in Thailand over damage and destruction of cultural heritage sites (mainly archaeological sites) as a result of dam construction. Although Thai laws provide general protections for cultural resources, there is no specific legal requirement that cultural resources be considered in

planning and construction of dams (see the Ancient Monuments, Ancient Objects, Art Objects, and National Museums Act of 1961).

When a dam construction project is approved, a committee consisting of several government organizations is formed. Responsibility for rescue excavation of archaeological sites in the affected areas is assigned to the Fine Arts Department (FAD), Ministry of Education. A team of archaeologists and related specialists is sent to the project area to survey and evaluate the significance of cultural heritage that will be affected by the construction of a given dam. Excavations of archaeological sites usually follow as part of cultural heritage rescue. During the past decade, such survey and excavation of archaeological sites has often been carried out by contract companies that in some cases do not have a full range of research staff. As a result, it has been suggested by some Thai archaeologists and concerned citizens that the FAD should issue regulations requiring professional archaeologists to be responsible for such rescue activities.

Archaeological rescue projects are usually funded through large block grants provided by the organization responsible for the dams, such as the Department of Royal Irrigation and the Electricity Generating Authority of Thailand (EGAT). Nevertheless, if contract companies hire inexperienced archaeologists to fulfill the task, this leads to production of low quality reports that lack detailed information. Moreover, excavated materials are often housed in national museum storage facilities without further analysis or reporting. This is not because of the lack of funding, but the lack of professional archaeologists to do the work. Analyses of such materials by archaeologists not associated with the rescue project require permission of the FAD.

Reports resulting from the rescue of cultural resources must be submitted to the FAD. The distribution of such reports is restricted, and they generally are not disseminated to interested scholars and to the general public. In some cases, however, museums have been built to disseminate knowledge about the archaeology of the area to the general public. In many cases, dam construction also has effects upon local people's cultural heritage. Relocation of indigenous people from their sacred landscape as part of the mitigation activities sometimes raises conflicts between the cultural heritage specialists and local inhabitants.

Survey and excavations at 28 archaeological sites in the Pa Sak Dam construction area are discussed as case studies of the treatment of archaeological resources during dam construction in Thailand.

ELIZABETH MOORE (School of Oriental and African Studies, London) presented "The Shwedagon Renovation: Cultural, Ritual and Technical Considerations" at the *Crossroads and Commodification: A Symposium on Southeast Asian Art*, at the University of Michigan, 24-26 March 2000.

She also presented "Angkor AIRSAR, Water Control and Conservation at Angkor" (with A. Freeman and S. Hensley of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory) in the *NASA/JPL PacRim Significant Results Workshop*, Maui High Performance Computing Center, Hawaii, August 1999. The paper is under the agenda at <http://airsar.jpl.nasa.gov/news.htm>

MIRIAM T. STARK (University of Hawaii) presented "Segmentation and Political Process in the Mekong Delta During the Transition to History" in the session entitled, *Segmentary Organizations: Political & Economic Perspectives* (organized by C. Garraty and G. Rice), at the 65th Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archaeology, 5-9 April 2000.

MIRIAM STARK & ALEX BENTLEY presented "Pottery Economics during the Early Historic Period in the Mekong Delta" in the session entitled, *Ceramic Ecology XIII: Current Research on Ceramics 1999*, at the 98th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Chicago, 1999.

SHAH ALAM MOHAMMED ZAINI (University of Hawaii, Ph.D. candidate) presented "Spatial Analysis of the Pyu Settlement of Sriksetra" in the symposium entitled, *Burma Studies: The Next*

Generation (organized by M. Aung-Thwin), at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies, San Diego, March 2000

RECENT and FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

PETER BELLWOOD, DOREEN BOWDRY, DAVID BULBECK, DEE BEAR, VASANT SHINDE, RICHARD SHUTLER, AND GLEN SUMMERHAYES (Editors). 2000. *Indo-Pacific Prehistory: The Melaka Papers*. Volume 3. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 19.

ANNA K ÄLLÉN AND ANNA KARLSTRÖM 1999. *Lao Pako, a Late Prehistoric Site on the Nâm Ngum River in Laos*. BAR International Series No 777. Archaeopress, Oxford.

ELIZABETH MOORE 1999. *Shwedagon, Golden Pagoda of Myanmar*. With Hansjorg Mayer and U Win Pe. Thames and Hudson, London.

1999. Myanmar and Cambodia: the needs of local and foreign tourists. In *Heritage, Tourism and Local Communities*, Wiendu Nuryanti (Ed). Stuppa Indonesia, pp. 99-108. Tourism Research Development and Associates, Jogjakarta.

KAREN MUDAR 1999. How Many Dvaravati Kingdoms? Locational Analysis of First Millennium A.D. Moated Settlements in Central Thailand. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 18:1-28.

VINCENT PIGOTT (editor) 1999. *The Archaeometallurgy of the Asian Old World*. Philadelphia: Museum University of Pennsylvania.

VERNON L. SCARBOROUGH, JOHN W. SCHOENFELDER and J. STEPHEN LANSING 1999. Early Statecraft on Bali: The Water Temple Complex and the Decentralization of the Political Economy. *Research in Economic Anthropology* 20:299-330.

List of Southeast Asia articles in *ASIAN PERSPECTIVES* 38(1), Spring 1999:

P. B. Griffin, J. Ledgerwood and Chuch Phoeurn, "The Royal University of Fine Arts, East-West Center, and University of Hawai'i Program in the Archaeology and Anthropology of the Kingdom of Cambodia, 1994-1998;" **M. T. Stark, P. B. Griffin, Chuch Phoeurn, J. Ledgerwood, M. Dega, C. Mortland, N. Dowling, J. M. Bayman, Bong Sovath, Tea Van, Chhan Chamroeun, and K. Latinis**, "Results of the 1995-1996 Archaeological Field Investigations at Angkor Borei, Cambodia;" **J. Foxx and J. Ledgerwood**, "Dry-Season Flood-Recession Rice in the Mekong Delta: Two Thousand Years of Sustainable Agriculture?;" **N. H. Dowling**, "A New Date for the Phnom Da Images and Its Implications for Early Cambodia."

PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORKSHOP ON BRONZE AGE CULTURE IN MYANMAR. Published by the University of Yangon Historical Research Centre, 1999.

List of articles in *Archaeology in Southeast Asia*, *WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY* 32(1), June 2000:

L. A. Schepartz, S. Miller-Antonio and D. A. Bakken, "Upland Resources and the Early Palaeolithic Occupation of Southern China, Vietnam, Laos, Thailand and Burma;" **R. Shoocongdej**, "Forager Mobility Organization in Seasonal Tropical Environments of Western Thailand;" **K. Latinis**, "The Development of Subsistence System Models for Island Southeast Asia and Near Oceania: The Nature and Role of Arboriculture and Arboreal-based Economies;" **N. Tayles, K. Domett, and K. Nelsen**, "Agriculture and Dental caries? The Case of Rice in Prehistoric Southeast Asia;" **R. Theunissen, P. Grave and G. Bailey**, "Doubts on Diffusion: Challenging the Assumed Indian Origin of Iron Age Agate and Carnelian Beads in Southeast Asia;" **J. Miksic**, "Heterogenetic Cities in Premodern Southeast Asia;" **D. Bulbeck and Bagyo Prasetyo**, "Two Millennia of Socio-Cultural Development in Luwu, South Sulawesi, Indonesia;" **P. Lape**, "Political Dynamics and Religious Change in the Late Pre-colonial Banda Islands, Eastern Indonesia."

CALL FOR PAPERS

ASIAN PERSPECTIVES (The Journal of Archaeology for Asia and the Pacific) is currently soliciting manuscripts on Southeast and East Asian archaeology (prehistoric, historic, ethnoarchaeological) for review. *Asian Perspectives* is the leading archaeological journal devoted to the archaeology of Asia and the Pacific region. In addition to archaeology, it features articles and book reviews on ethnoarchaeology, palaeoanthropology, and physical anthropology. International specialists contribute regional reports summarizing current research and fieldwork, and present topical reports of significant sites. We are especially interested in receiving manuscripts from our Southeast Asian and Asian colleagues on recent work in their regions.

Please consider submitting your material to *Asian Perspectives*. We are beginning to select papers for the 2001 issues, and would like to receive manuscripts by August 1, 2000 for review. However, we accept manuscripts on a regular basis and encourage potential contributors to send us manuscripts at any time. For more information on *Asian Perspectives* (and information on issues contents), consult the following URL: <http://www.hawaii.edu/uhipress/journals/ap/>

PLEASE SUBMIT AP-FORMATTED MANUSCRIPTS TO: Dr. Michael Graves, EDITOR, Department of Anthropology, University of Hawai'i, 2424 Maile Way, Social Sciences Building 346 Honolulu, HI 96822-2281 USA. Email: mgraves@hawaii.edu

Submissions are currently being sought for **WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY 33(2)** on the theme of *Archaeology and Aesthetics*. Papers are invited which explore the aesthetic aspects of material culture and the body in archaeology. The notion of aesthetics helps focus on how objects and bodily practices are perceived and valued in different times and places. Papers are invited which explore any aspect of aesthetics in archaeology, which may include considerations of the formal qualities of objects, the agency of objects, notions of beauty and rightness, the sensory appreciation of objects, how assemblages of objects work together to create effects on the senses and the links between objects and the body through human practice. Submissions are due by 31 October 2000 for publication in October 2001. For further information or to submit a paper, contact the editor of this issue: Dr. Chris Gosden, Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford, 60 Banbury Road, Oxford OX2 6PN UK. E-mail: chris.gosden@anthropology.oxford.ac.uk

Submissions are currently being sought for **WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY 33(3)** on the theme of *Ancient Ecodisasters*. It is sometimes said that pre- and non-industrial societies lived in harmony with their environments and did not over-exploit natural resources. The archaeological and environmental records suggest that things were often more complex, and that hunter-gatherers, early farmers and early states could all have considerable impacts on landscape and resources. Some of these impacts were beneficial to the societies concerned, even though they might still be viewed as disastrous by European colonists (e.g., hunter-gatherer fire setting). Other impacts were less beneficial and caused environmental deterioration and/or resource decline. Papers are sought on any major changes to environment or resources caused by the activities of pre- and non-industrial societies. Submissions are due by 1 March 2001 for publication in February 2002. For further information or to submit a paper, contact the editor of this issue: Dr. Peter Rowley-Conwy, Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, Science Site, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE UK. E-mail: P.A.Rowley-Conwy@durham.ac.uk

NEW JOURNALS and NEWSLETTERS

The journal **CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES (CMAS)** was launched in 1995 and has been successfully received as the journal for those working on the preservation and management of archaeological sites. The range of articles, in terms of geography, subject matter and point of view, is broad, with a truly international perspective, in order to foster dialogue, increase understanding and improve standards of practice. The term "archaeological site" is

interpreted broadly to mean any former site of human activity, and includes underwater, rock art and palaeontological sites.

CMAS is the only journal that covers both theoretical and practical issues in archaeological site conservation. It is of direct interest to archaeologists, architects, conservators, resource managers, scientists, engineers and conservators working in heritage management agencies, conservation centres, private consultancies, and university teaching programmes in heritage management and historic preservation.

For further inquiries or to submit a manuscript for publication consideration contact:
Dr. Nicholas Stanley-Price at ICCROM, e-mail: nsp@iccrom.org

The Center for Khmer Studies (Siem Reap, Cambodia) produced the first issue of its newsletter, *SIKSACAKR*, in March 2000. One article of particular interest to archaeologists is by William Southworth entitled, "Archaeology in Cambodia: An Appraisal for Future Research." For further information on this new newsletter, contact the Center at: No. 0426, Krom 12, Phum Wat Bo, Khun Sala Kamroek, Srok Siem Reap, PO Box 09380, Siem Reap Province, Cambodia; or by e-mail: cks@camintel.com

SILPAKORN UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL is published in January and June by Silpakorn University. The journal features articles and research notes/articles in the fields of Art and Design, Science and Technology, and the Social Sciences and Humanities. Its aim is to encourage and disseminate scholarly contributions by the University's faculty members and researchers. Well-researched, innovative works by other scholars are welcome. A review committee consisting of academic experts in the relevant fields will screen all manuscripts, and the editorial board reserves the right to recommend revision/alterations, if necessary, before their final acceptance for publication.

For further information, please contact: Dr Theera Nuchpiam, Research and Development Institute, Silpakorn University, Saman Chandra Palace, Nakhon Pathom 73000, Thailand or Dr Rasmi Shoocongdej (Editorial Board).

WEBSITES OF INTEREST

Archaeology (general) web site: archaeology.about.com/science/archaeology/msubmenupro.htm

The article "First known Tibia of an Early Javanese Hominids" can be read online at *Current Anthropology Electronic Edition* 41(2), April 2000:

www.journals.uchicago.edu/CA/journal/issues/v41n2/002805/002805.html

Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago web site: rs6000.bvis.uic.edu:80/museum/

Museum of Applied Science Center for Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania Museum web site: masca.museum.upenn.edu

UNESCO Culture and Asia in the Pacific web site: www.unescobkk.org/culture/index.html