

understanding of the origins and purpose of the work, the following note must take the place of the missing dust-jacket blurb, that might have spelled it out for him—though at some cost to the purchaser.

The book does not aim (and therefore cannot fail) to update this or that work, or be used in conjunction with it. Nor was it produced with any other study in mind. Its purpose is explicit in the subtitle—the relation of *Current Knowledge and Problems in The Archaeology of the London Area*. How to define the London area is one of the many problems that was left for each distinguished contributor to tackle in his own way. The omission or inclusion of this or that site, area or subject was at each contributor's discretion; we hope that their decisions may be the basis of further research and informed discussion.

Speculation, such as seems to have been missed in Mr. Merrifield's essay, has no place in studies of this type; and should any reader share the reviewer's puzzlement over the disappearance of Iron Ages A and B, he will find a succinct statement of the modern position in, for example, Professor Cunliffe's *Iron Age Communities in Britain*.

We agree that a 'serious and comprehensive re-appraisal of the archaeology of the London area' (which we did not set out to write) would require more than 67 pages; it would cost more than £1.00, too. We agree, also, that what we have published will be steadily overtaken by research and excavation. We conclude that the time is certainly not yet ripe for producing the book that Mr. Turner blames us for not having written.

## Letters

### PUBLICATION DATES

WE DERIVE enormous pleasure from *the London Archaeologist*, and I would like to make one minor suggestion. We have recently received the Spring issue and the Diary meetings in March and April had already been held. Similarly when we receive the next issue in July we will have missed the meetings at the end of June/early July. Would it be possible to extend the dates in the Diary to cover 3½-4 months to allow for printing and postal delays? 3 St. Marks Road, A. HOLLIDAY  
Teddington, Middlesex.

Editor's note: letters on similar lines to this are received from time to time. The original aims behind the entries of local lectures in the Diary were to (a) act as an area of publicity for the society and (b) provide a list of lectures and lecturers which would help other societies in compiling their own programmes (always a difficult task). It is partly for this latter reason and partly because it is not possible, for a number of good reasons, to accurately gauge the publication date of *the London Archaeologist*, that the out-of-date lectures remain in the Diary.

It has become apparent that the list of lectures does attract readers not connected with the associated society and an attempt will be made to push forward the list of lectures. However, there are a number of difficulties: some two months or more have to be allowed for publication purposes; about half the societies featured do not publish an annual list of meetings but appear to plan only some three to six months ahead; details, and even notices, of many conferences and exhibitions are often available only three or four months in advance.

### Local Societies (from p.389)

**Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society;** General Sec. Brenda Innes, 9A Upper Park Road, Bromley, Kent BR1 3HN; Membership Sec. Jill Baulch, 28 Goodwyns Vale, N.10.

**Hornchurch and District Historical Society;** Publicity Officer and Asst. Sec. Mrs. F. Caldwell, 84 Park Drive, Upminster, Essex.

**Orpington and District Archaeological Society;** Sec. I. W. C. Bouskill, 34 Haydons Close, Orpington BR5 4JE; Membership Sec. Mrs. H. Shave, 4a Northlands Avenue, Orpington BR6 9LY.

### THE INFLUENCE OF RESCUE

I NOTICE in the Winter 1975 issue of *the London Archaeologist* that two of your correspondents, Mr. D. J. Turner and Mr. T. Tatton-Brown, imply that the increases in Government money in the years following the creation of RESCUE would have come about anyway, since, in the words of one, "the bandwagon was already rolling". This may have been the case, but I assure you that no one thought so at the time and there was not the slightest trace of any evidence for it. The meetings at Barford and at Newcastle which preceded the formation of RESCUE were attended by some 50 or 60 of the most deeply involved archaeologists in the country and at no time in the long days of discussion did anyone suggest that our fears were groundless because the situation was going to improve rapidly within the next year or two. Both of these meetings were recorded in their entirety on tape so that it would be possible, if anybody were sufficiently interested, to hear precisely the mood and tenor of the discussions. Nor at the subsequent public meeting in London did any of the 700 or so persons present voice the opinion that action was unnecessary or that we need not be deeply concerned with the future of our dwindling archaeology.

When a deputation of the RESCUE Committee met Mr. Julian Amery in 1971 at no time did he suggest that we were wasting his and our time because of the Government had already decided on a programme of increased grants.

There is no doubt that the change in the Government's attitude to the environment was already taking place but also that archaeologists were among the latest of the environmentalists to become aware of the overwhelming threat to the subject of their research, and to voice their fears.

Of course, RESCUE was not the only archaeological influence on the Government in the years following 1970, but I am sure that it crystallized opinion and unified active archaeologists in an unprecedented way. Certainly no pre-existing body had spoken to the Government so clearly and directly about the need for urgent increases in funds to enable rescue archaeology to expand to a point where it could begin to cope with the scale of the threats.

The University of Birmingham, PHILIP BARKER  
Department of Extramural Studies,  
4 St. George's Square, Worcester