Society of Museum Archaeologists
The Museum Archaeologist Volume 15
Conference Proceedings
Lancaster 1988

"Still Begging – Fundraising for Archaeology"

Edited by: Edmund Southworth
Society of Museum Archaeologists

"Still Begging! - Fundraising for Archaeology"

Society of Museum Archaeologists
The Museum Archaeologist Volume 15
Conference Proceedings
Lancaster 1988

Edited by:
Edmund Southworth

Society of Museum Archaeologists

ISBN 1 871855 02 0

Printed in Great Britain
Published by the Society of Museum Archaeologists
c/o Edmund Southworth
The Editor, SMA,
Liverpool Museum,
William Brown St.
Liverpool L3 8EN

Front cover illustration
Market Hall, Lancaster - now
Lancaster City Museum
Courtesy of Lancaster City Museums

Foreword

Following the conference at Lincoln in 1987 which concentrated on the philosophical issues relating to archaeology as a public service, the SMA decided to look for a subject which would confront some of the practical problems facing members of the profession. It is probably a sad reflection on the state of archaeology in museums that fundraising in its many forms emerged as one of the most important topics for discussion. In putting together the programme I was anxious to put our own efforts into the wider context of charitable and professional fundraising. I wanted to examine success and failure, good practice and good luck, whether this related to large excavations, small displays or just routine survival.

The venue for the conference emerged from the continuing desire by SMA to travel the country, giving members the opportunity to see not only different museums, but also the varied towns and cities where this country's rich archaeological heritage is discovered. We chose the city of Lancaster for its rich architectural and historical legacy, its new Maritime Museum, and to coincide with major excavations in the heart of the Roman and Medieval city. As usual the combination of venue, hospitality and the skills of our speakers made for an excellent conference.

As well as the formal papers the programme allowed for considerable discussion and debate. Not all the papers and discussion can be included here. My grateful thanks are due to all the contributors to this volume, and to Marie Ellis and Andrew White at Lancaster City Museum. The Society of Museum Archaeologists is also grateful to Lancaster City Council for its hospitality.

Edmund Southworth
Liverpool 1991

Contents

INTRODUCTION

It is never easy to summarise a Conference which contained so many thoughtful contributions; the last Chairman showed himself to be so consummate in this task that I had never realised how difficult a task it is! There are two points, however, which seemed to me to have great importance in all our deliberations. The first is that I have the impression that, to some extent, we undersell the importance of the work which we do, and that many of us fail to realise that we might be better at going out and raising money than we actually realise. The second point is that museum archaeologists cover a range of activities from fieldwork to excavation, from museum display to the long term curation of objects in stores; it strikes me, and this was reflected in the papers, that we have to be very clear about which parts of archaeology we are concerned with when we seek funding; but that nevertheless those of us who are fortunate enough to cover the whole of that range have the greatest chance of raising funds.

David Clarke presents us with many of the problems that we face when looking for funding in the field of archaeology today; it is not an optimistic paper and underlines many of the problems which we must consider. The key area is to actually decide what we are trying to deliver and to whom. Only if we can sort that out (and it may well be that we should spend more time thinking about this before we speak) are we in a position to appeal. He raises the point directly as to what museums and archaeology are about - are we about prestige and scholarship, or what the public want? I cannot help thinking (at the risk of sounding reactionary) that as the majority of public want a return to capital punishment but that the majority of their elected representatives do not, that we should be careful who we take note of! Although he raises the matter of where our current funding comes from it is difficult to put a figure on how much money from museum authorities goes towards archaeology and all the facets that I have already mentioned - but nevertheless it is a considerable amount of money and Clarke is right to ask whether we can expect to improve the position when we live in a period of social and political change. At the end of the day we are really asking if the diversity of the fields which concern us are <u>all</u> likely to attract funds, and indeed what is the product that we are marketing?

The contrasting views of John Williams in the Provinces, and Harvey Sheldon in London showed how field archaeology raises its funds; Williams indicates that his University based unit has survived without "core" funding (even though many of its staff are on fixed-term contracts) and provides hope for the future, showing that survival is possible! Williams also raises the matter of competition within archaeology and what it might mean in terms of what we, as potential community builders, might feel about it. He also deals with the principle of the "polluter paying" and thus providing the bulk of funding for excavation (and also post-excavation) via the planning process. This same point was picked up by Harvey Sheldon, who has set up a special section within the Greater London Archaeological Unit specifically to negotiate with developers in advance of development. This streamlines the process of acquiring funding for excavation while at the same time attempting to smooth the process of recording the past, bringing it to the public and at the same time creating an image of efficiency to developers for archaeological activity as a whole. It is worth noting that he felt that one of the keys to success is staff dedication coupled with an independent platform from which to speak and argue the case, as well as close co-operation with planners. This need for planning information well in advance is something that those of us who are concerned with the recovery side of information would do well to note. Sheldon also pointed to the advantages of being based in London where access to the media and to politicians is relatively easy. Gaining developer funding in the changing climate is something which is possible and can be effective but we are also reminded - as in the case of the Courage

Brewery site - that some developers (in this case the Local Authority) do not have sufficient funds to carry out archaeology to its fullest extent; the role of HBMC in cases like this is something which we should consider.

Richard Matanle guided us through the field of profit making through trading and shops; some of us may not relish the idea of having our trading operations run by volunteers, others may know that it is impossible within the structures in which they work, but aside from this we were offered a complete 'do it yourself' approach with a proven track record.

Dan Chadwick's thoughtful address on publications brought back those points about why we bother to publish at all, whether we can expect to make a profit from what we publish and the pitfalls of dealing with professional publishers. Maybe we should reconsider whether we are publishing for profit or indeed whether our profits, such as they are, are to be found in cash terms or in other, less tangible ways. Certainly Chadwick reminded us that we should think seriously about "why" and "what form" before we publish just as David Clarke had earlier emphasised the need for us to consider what we are trying to do before we do anything.

Stephen Lee from the Institute of Charity Fund-raising Managers reminded us all that there is no pot of gold - and in spite of recent changes in government legislation charitable giving is not increasing although there are more organisations seeking money from charities. In a sense he returned to the theme raised by Clarke; why we should think that we are exceptional and why we should expect money? His plea that we should be properly organised and clear in our objective and plan in advance is something which constantly recurred at the conference. In that context Edmund Southworth's contribution on the ways in which Liverpool Museum had sought sponsorship for their exhibitions, together with the pitfalls of commercial sponsorship and the attitude of ABSA and the relative success of one theme as opposed to another in fund raising, should make us all think of how we target our activities. The ensuing discussion at this session brought out the problem of charging both for access to museums and for access to many parts of the collections in the form of photographs, advice and information. The problem of charging for information from public museums is one which remains to be resolved.

In his keynote address David Clarke raised the matter of State funding and Sue Bowers from MGC gave a clear account of what the MGC can offer in the field of capital grants for buildings and conservation and more specifically storage. It is a sobering fact that the takeup for storage grants so painstakingly negotiated by the MGC has been so low; this is disturbing, at a time when so many people feel (apparently) that too little money is available. The grants of the MGC for capital development are not insignificant but nevertheless as the speaker admitted, they are not sufficient to actually create by themselves new projects - the MGC operates as a key to open up further sources of what we have already been told is relatively scarce financial aid.

The same point was dealt with by Ian Taylor when he spoke of the support that Area Museum Services can offer, for the total amount of funding in real terms for these organisations is falling, and although the Area Services are always willing to help and aid they rarely come to more then 50% of any particular project. The unglamorous field of conservation was also mentioned together with its attendant costs for finds and archaeological material.

Jon Price's contribution on the demise of MSC funding, at least through Community Programme Schemes, provided sobering thoughts; the recent ending of the Community Programme is something which many of us are concerned with; we must recognise the vast contribution made to archaeology through these schemes. The contribution covered excavation, post excavation and display. Price reminded us that ET is very different to Community Programme in terms of the people it attracts and the role it

plays in archaeology. The large number of local authorities and other organisations who are already unable to take up ET schemes, either because they are unconvinced, or unable to take advantage of the new scheme, is considerable. In addition Price reminded us that CP schemes over the past few years served as a reservoir from which we recruited museum employees - this way to training is something which we can certainly not assume will be possible as ET takes effect.

Several of the contributors alluded to an "environment" or "climate of change" - this concept of change implied something which is structured and linear - whether or not we approve of the change it seems to me that we live in a period where Brounian motion may be a more appropriate term to describe the change: it is extremely difficult for us to predict where funding for the future might come from or indeed in which direction we are actually going. In one of the discussion sessions the question was asked about where the £5m, which was the estimated CP contribution to archaeology in this country was going to come from in the future? Our answer must be that we do not know, that it is a gap, and that no doubt just as we have had difficult times in the past and won through so we shall have the same problems in the future.

The message contained within these papers is however clear. Firstly, money is not easy to obtain, and is not likely to become easier - state funding has declined and now is often attached to a stultifying bureaucracy which contains within it an element of control which is not always helpful. Independent funding is not easily found and even when it is it is not always sufficient. The second point that I think is clear is that we must learn to be flexible in our approaches both in terms of what we try to do and in the ways in which we try to seek funding. Thirdly, and possibly most importantly, we must clarify what we want to do, why we are doing it, and in turn be able to indicate how much it would cost to do it.

Fundamental, however, is the need to recognise that we must believe in what we are trying to do (once we have worked out what it is!), and that any approach is worth trying provided it is applied vigorously and positively - if we don't try then we will never succeed. We have to be positive and proud of what we stand for, and we have to be prepared to argue our corner, in a demanding climate we have to be positive about what we seek. Success only comes from dedication and enthusiasm - these are still our best weapons.

Tim Schadla-Hall
Chairman, Society of Museum Archaeologists

THE WELFARE STATE MENTALITY

David V. Clarke, National Museums of Scotland.

What follows carries the usual health warning: it is an expression of personal views and it cannot be assumed that these coincide on any particular point with the corporate opinion of the National Museums of Scotland. Moreover, these are comments of October 1988 and I have not sought to alter them to take account of more recent developments.

The phase "the welfare state mentality" is one of those that tells us more about the ideology of the people coining and using it than it does about those to whom it is applied. Essentially, it is intended to characterise an unwholesome dependency upon the state for the solutions to social problems and for the resources to solve them. From this comes the belief that the adoption of collectivist approaches has been so rampant in post-war Britain that individually we now lack the enterprise and initiative deemed essential for our continuance as an economically healthy and prosperous nation. Promoting this view often involves unflattering comparisons between today's attitudes and the individualism of Victorian Britain. It is wholly irrelevant to our particular purpose here whether you believe that this interpretation has a writ equivalent to Holy Scripture or is the most damaging foolishness to have entered political thought in the recent past. It is irrelevant because there is no reason to believe that our views, individually or, date I say it, collectively, will affect its pre-eminent position in Government policy making.

But what has this got to do with museums and archaeology? Our public museum system is to all intents and purposes a Victorian creation. The first ancient monuments legislation was enacted over a hundred years ago and the Royal Commissions were all established in the early years of this century, long before the notion of state support from cradle to grave had entered everyday life. In other words, even the much admired Victorians recognised that the preservation and presentation of the material remains of the past had to be a collective responsibility. They took this view in the firm belief that such activities were educational, albeit in a rather narrow sense and one which we might now categorise as ideological rather than educational. Archaeology's role was to underpin the idea of progress through the crude tools and weapons of savages and barbarians. And didn't the Romans provide a wonderful demonstration of the civilising benefits of empire for both ruler and ruled? Unfortunately, neither museums nor archaeology have such a value for current ideologies. We are altogether too crude and effective for today's manipulators of public opinion. Far too much emphasis on ambiguities.

Instead, although some archaeologists may dislike it intensely, we are for funding purposes regarded by the Government as part of the arts. The view is admirably summarised by the title of the principal Government department, the Office of Arts and Libraries. For what it is worth, it is interesting to note that libraries manage to maintain a sense of identity denied to museums. It has been apparent for many years that the disparate activities lumped together under the heading of the arts share only one major element in common - a virtually limitless capacity to spend money. This ability condemns us to permanent dissatisfaction with the level of funding we receive from the public purse, either national or local. In such circumstances the present Government's emphasis on plural funding is hardly surprising. Even if the importance of the arts was more widely recognised than it appears to be, why try to satisfy the insatiable? better the stick than the carrot.

For those of us who have been working in museums for more than ten years, present policies challenge all the fundamental assumptions that were in place when we entered the profession. It is no longer certain that future levels of core funding will enable us to maintain event the present inadequate levels of service. True, in the past, expansion was more often a hope than a

reality but every little bit that was achieved was considered safe, guaranteed for the future. To believe that now is mere foolishness. In this climate what we in Scotland saw as the relative underfunding of our archaeology may soon be seen as a positive advantage vis-a-vis the rest of Britain. From now on, our efforts are likely to become ever more concentrated on deciding what level of contraction renders any particular activity worthless in practical terms. Alternatively, we can actively seek the plural funding in line with Government policy.

This policy, as I have already said, includes museums and archaeology as part of the arts. Built into this classification are a number of assumptions, the most important of which is an association with entertainment. It has replaced education as our implicit primary role, which in turn makes our efforts amenable to the judgement of the market place. Here is the key element that underpins the introduction of the concept of plural funding. In the past, so the argument would go, museums have been insufficiently responsive to the consumers' needs and wishes. The fact that core funding came entirely from the State only enabled them to act in this way with impunity. Plural funding, on the other hand, will ensure greater value for money from the State's contribution by forcing museums to adopt more efficient practices and will promote a greater awareness of the customers' interests. If museums do not give them what they want, then they are unlikely to attract much in the way of outside funding. Moreover, this increased sensitivity to the market has to be maintained if cash flows are to remain stable. Competition rules O.K!

Stated in this rather brief and bold form, there is a great deal that many of us might feel able to agree with. Museums, by and large, have not paid much attention to what their visitors want. They have not seriously attempted to discover why a large majority of the population never visit them at all, preferring instead to draw comfort from justification from the enormous number of museum visits that national compution can provide. Even if our museum does not attract many people the success of others demonstrates that all museums are a good thing. Nor, have there been too much concern with education or entertainment. Too many museums still seem to demand a reverential attitude from the visitor - museums as reliquaries. The criticism of our past performance is not then without justification.

But the chosen remedy is not thereby shown to be correct. I want to draw out just one or two elements which make this new situation particularly difficult for museums. The idea of outside funding is not in itself particularly new. Many museums, particularly the larger ones, have been using it for some time with varying degrees of success to help fund individual projects, usually temporary exhibitions. Very few have had any significant success in attracting funds for routine core activities. Yet these are the very activities we are now being told will have to be financed in part by outside money. The alternative will be a reduced level of performance until perhaps some aspects of our work are abandoned altogether. All of this assumes that failure to acquire additional funds is itself a mark of incompetence. If only we produced the right products, sold the right goods in our shops, approached the issue with creativity and commitment, then we could raise the necessary money without undue difficulty.

The problem with this view is that it supposes that there will be a growth in the available funds that is roughly commensurate with the increased number of organisations seeking help. Such evidence as we have does not suggest that this is so. Many of our museums still have free admissions. Those national museums in London which have introduced charges have seen a dramatic fall in their attendances although they will all argue that the figures will return to previous levels even if it takes a number of years to achieve this. Of course, we shall never know what their figures might have been at that time if they had not brought in charges. But the lesson for most of us in this experience is that the

introduction of charges is likely to cause a drop in attendance which may be so severe that the costs of collecting and administering entrance fees is greater than the take at the door.

Similarly, there is no good reason to suppose that the sums available through commercial sponsorship are likely to grow to anything like the required level. Instead, increased competition is going to create a buyer's market. The perceived benefits for the sponsor are going to have to be even greater than they already are. For all but the handful of museums with international reputations the hill that has to be climbed to claim the pot of gold is getting steeper every day.

Yet a further difficulty arises from our association in the public mind with the arts, at least in the area of funding. Museums cannot complete in terms of public awareness with the performing arts. There is an immediacy and exclusiveness in the latter's productions which we cannot match. Their stars often generate considerable publicity and selling power independent of the particular performance they are appearing in. Moreover, performing arts organisations are much more narrowly focused than museums in their objectives. They exist primarily to put the show on. They don't have to curate the contents because future productions will rely on an independent set of resources. Indeed, a key marketing point for them is that the production is new and not a recreation of past successes. Even more important, the performing arts are parts of spectra which embody productions primarily aimed at commercial success through entertainment as well as those which hope to give their audiences a sublime experience. I would not wish to define where exactly artistic considerations take precedence over profit nor to claim that the two elements must be mutually exclusive. What I am interested in is the concept of a spectrum of activities, part of which provides a yardstick to measure success in strictly financial terms. Our inclusion in the arts creates an expectation that an equivalent spectrum must exist for museums. If they are analogous to government-supported theatre companies, for instance, what is our version of Andrew Lloyd Webber and his Really Useful Company? It is not an easy question to answer but somewhere in our spectrum, if it exists, there must be heritage centres.

These are a particularly interesting phenomenon both in their own right and because, I suspect, their success or failure will provide an important benchmark for the authorities judging the future levels of funding for museums. If the two terms, "heritage centres" and "museums" are not already synonyms in the public mind, they very soon will be. In this context even archaeologists who might pride themselves on the precision of their language are quite happy to see heritage centres subsumes under the title of museums (e.g. Shanks & Tilley 1987, 68-69). So indeed, one imagines, are those people who create and run such centres. After all, for heritage centres to be considered museums is to have the best of both worlds - the credibility of a museum but with a title that signals to the visitors that there will be none of the old fashioned stuffiness and dullness that they associate with a regular museum. This is the past but presented to you, the visitor, in ways that are fun, enjoyable and relatively undemanding. Nevertheless, fun, enjoyment and easy understanding are in themselves perceived to be insufficient selling points. They must be allied to the idea that it is the real past which the visitor will experience - "if the Vikings themselves were to return they would feel completely at home" says one of Jorvik's publications of its own displays.

I do not for a moment want you to think that I am here being particularly critical of heritage centres. If I was involved with one I would want the beneficial association with museums in the mind of my visitors while avoiding all the negative aspects of the word. Equally, as I shall argue in a little more detail in a moment, the credibility of museum displays is no less spurious because it has been accrued over a century or more. The essential point for our purposes is the link in the public perception between museums and heritage centres and our need to recognise that the

promotion of that link by heritage centres may well be detrimental to most museums in an area of plural funding. Heritage centres are much closer analogies for performing arts companies than are museums. The show and its associated merchandising, what the public experience, are the principal concern and other activities are quire properly subordinated to it. Museums, on the other hand, have responsibilities for preservation and facilitating scholarship which cannot and should not be shrugged off as unimportant. Notwithstanding these differences we have to recognise that the very presence of heritage centres, at least on the scale that they now exist or are planned, is in part an indictment of our failure to recognise and respond to public demand. Having now lost the initiative, I believe that museums will find it extremely hard to regain it. The very fact that most museums are an arm of government, either national or local, so long regarded as an important safeguard to ensure preservation for future generations, has now become a hideous constraint at a time when public presentation has become the main basis for judgement of our worth. Our controlling bureaucracies, conservative in the best sense of the word, cannot provide, in a sufficient number of instances, the flexible decision making procedures or the willingness to risk or indeed the financial support to enabled museums to compete successfully with independent heritage centres. The immediate outlook for museums, particularly those with major liabilities in the form of large collections, is in my judgement gloomy. Despite the emergence of what Ron Todd in a different context would characterise as modernisers, there still remain an awful lot of people in museums who chose that work, to some extent at least, because they did not want to be entrepreneurs. They did not want their lives dominated by continual fights for limited financial advantage in a commercial environment. Depending upon your viewpoint they are either maintaining tried and tested values worthy of preservation or showing a stubborn unwillingness to change and adapt to the times. Either way it is naive to suppose that they will be able to accept the new reality easily or quickly,

If anything my pessimism is increased when I consider archaeology in museums. Certainly, I think that what I have been saying about museums in general applies with equal force to museum archaeology but, in addition, there are a number of factors that increase the disadvantages of the subject's position within the museum world. I spoke earlier of the Victorians' use of archaeological material to support their broad political ideologies. Perhaps happily for our sense of righteousness, such opportunities are not available to us. No doubt most of us are, as Shanks and Tilley imply, commodifying our artefacts in ways that reflect and support capitalist economic systems. But in a more overt sense, one much closer to the problems of funding, we face a major problem. Even in the historic periods, it is a rare occasion when we can confront through archaeological means the individual in any meaningful sense. Of course, it is axiomatic that all artefacts must be the work of some individual or other but this statement is devoid of anything other than trivial meaning. Yet we presently have a government that lays such stress on the role and importance of the individual it sometimes seeks to deny the value, if not the existence, of society. Not only can we not support, therefore, the prevailing ideologies; the whole nature of our work leads us naturally to oppose it. This is not a good starting point from which to begin fund raising.

Nor are we able to counterbalance this difficulty by pointing to past achievement. Archaeology may well be a cheap science but it is an expensive art. Dr. Wainwright's important analysis of English rescue archaeology (1984) showed that the funds available for this part of our interests was in excess of £12 million in 1985. Approximately £7 million of this came from the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission and £5 million from the Manpower Services Commission. Similarly detailed figures are not available for the rest of Britain but it would not be unreasonable to suppose that the total expenditure on rescue archaeology in the United Kingdom was at that time in excess of £15 million. This is not perhaps a very large figure

relative to total museum budgets for the same period but it is likely to be much more significant when compared with museum archaeology budgets. It is impossible to be more precise because we have not had an equivalent survey of the situation in museums. Nevertheless, Dr. Wainwright has done us a great service in making the rescue archaeology figures available. He very wisely published them in the pages of a national archaeological journal rather than in a more publicly scanned source for their implications make very uncomfortable reading.

Rescue archaeology provides an important case-study for us all in a time of plural funding. You will recall that the present levels of funds and the organisational structure that administers them have arisen as the bureaucratic response to the outcry about the destruction of the archaeological record by all forms of development. This outcry was orchestrated in the early seventies by an organisation called Rescue. They are no longer the dominant force that they once were, perhaps because many of their leading members have gone on to build themselves secure positions in the Establishment they once criticised so vehemently. That at least has been in tune with the times, individual ambition replacing collective aspiration. Yet it is impossible to gainsay their achievements. In financial year 1972-73 the official rescue budget in England was less than half a million pounds, fifteen years later it is fifteen times that amount. Even allowing for inflation this is a substantial increase. Moreover, the creation of this budget led to structures and proceedings that facilitated the inflow of funds from other sources, particularly the Manpower Services Commission.

Of course, the crucial question is whether these developments were an unmitigated blessing. The answer must surely be no, especially for museums which saw relatively little of the money but have inherited many of the long-term problems created by this activity. With the benefit of hindsight we can see that rescue archaeology has been characterised by many of the aspects that are criticised by the users of the phrase "welfare state mentality". The identification of the problem, that our archaeological remains were being destroyed at a growing rate by all forms of development, led straight on to the belief that dealing with it was a straightforward matter of the State providing additional money. Once Government had acknowledged the existence of the problem the argument became entirely concerned with the level of funding. Implicit in all this were a number of assumptions. Foremost among these were that strategies which enabled a sensible choice of site and determined the appropriate level of investment already existed, and that the organisational structures capable of handling the inevitable increase in data were already in place.

None of this actually existed, of course. The consequences were not long in making themselves felt. By the end of the 1970s the mass of unpublished material was already enormous and post-excavation costs had begun to distort the overall programme quite seriously. The reaction to all this has been summarised by Dr. Wainwright (1984, 16):

"The Department's role is (now)... that of joint funder of individual projects, providing priming grants where necessary and participating in discussions with other sources of funds where this can be helpful. This process began in 1980 when the Department decided to end its previous system of providing virtually indefinite annual subsidies for some eighty organisations. Instead, it offered a series of agreements for fixed periods with the opportunity of renewal for future terms - funding by project in other words. By 1980 the pattern of rescue funding was suffering from a previous failing to initiate a system which insured a regular release of funds, so giving new ideas, projects and organisations a chance to prosper. A form of stagnation had been created which was reflected in the ever-increasing backlog of unpublished excavations and the concomitant lack of uncommitted funds which could be assigned to new projects."

It does seem to me, as someone not actively involved in the workings of rescue policy in England, that these changes have not been accomplished without pain. Nor is it clear that they have corrected the imbalance of the early years when quantity not quality, a view still strongly entrenched in Scotland, appears to have dominated decision making.

Even if all the difficulties, which are in a sense internal to rescue, are being resolved it is at least arguable that its dominant position in archaeology has damaged the subject's funding opportunities in the longer term. This is particularly the case for museums just beginning to look for alternative sources of income. Rescue archaeology was dominated for a long time by the belief that all information recovered had some value. The very act of recovery was in itself inherently worthwhile and beneficial. That seems to many archaeologists a wholly indefensible position. Because excavation is fundamentally about context and contextual relationships, information cannot be independent of the processes of recovery. Nor is it a simple relationship so that the better the processes, the greater the information content. In some circumstances, which are not easy to characterise at a general level, the result may actually be misinformation. No doubt much of this will be resolved in the mythical future when we all have sufficient time to evaluate critically the quality of the information on which our interpretations are built. In the meantime, museum storerooms are filling up with material from excavations which the judgement of time will show were not worth doing. We are all painfully aware that even objects that are donated are not without cost. At a very simple level then rescue archaeology is adding to our future costs. Even in difficult times this would be acceptable if there were significant additional benefits.

But there has never been anything in the rescue programme that looked beyond contemporary academic concerns, Whatever the criteria for choosing a site are, the idea of its potential contribution to presenting archaeology to a wider public never figures, at least in Scotland. I would be very surprised if any of you have ever had a visit from the staff of the national funding agencies enquiring about gaps in your collections and suggesting that the rescue programme might be directed towards reducing them. Many archaeologists talk about meeting their responsibilities to the public, mainly in terms of publishing an academic report or, if they are really committed, a summary for the general reader. And, of course, at a personal level that is fine and laudable but does not the subject in its overall policies for data collection have a wider responsibility to ensure that those institutions which are involved in the continuing presentation of the past have the best possible means at their disposal?

Now I have spent rather a long time on rescue archaeology. I have done so because, when we all venture forth into the marketplace in the search for money, we need to recognise that we do so with some burden. I am not criticising the individuals involved in past or present administration of the rescue programme when I say that it does not provide much of an example to show that archaeology can deliver the goods efficiently and on time. Had we known, when it first started to take off, the future value of demonstrating these attributes things might have been very different.

Perhaps, however, this is an unnecessarily despondent view. After all, archaeology has an undoubted public appeal. Newspapers regularly report it and there is a steady stream of television programmes devoted to it. Works of synthesis intended to cater for the interested laymen issue forth from virtually every publishing house in the country - I don't think we have yet had the Virago "Archaeology of Britain" but no doubt it's on its way. All of this should augur well in our search for funds. But the problem is that much of this interest is topped up by the concept of treasure and treasure seeking. Certainly, treasure in this context has a pretty broad meaning ranging from images of opulence in the case of

Egyptian gold to those of the macabre in the case of Lindow Man. That broad meaning cannot, however, disguise that treasure is a very limited concept within the context of all archaeological work. It provides only a narrow marketing base and one that is largely about yesterday's activities rather than tomorrow's.

Very little has been done in Britain to understand how representative our known archaeological remains are likely to be. Dr Wainwright, in the study I referred to earlier, also examined the distribution of scheduled monuments and their fit with information held by local sites and monuments records. He identified a number of major anomalies that suggest that national assessments have in the past been skewed in several important respects. We can certainly iron out many of these discrepancies but not in ways that will tell us whether our observed population accurately reflects the original one. An important series of studies of these problems based on Danish material has recently been published (Kristiansen 1985a). We cannot know, of course, at this stage how representative Denmark is of North European conditions but the data presented in these studies should give us pause for thought. In particular, Kristian Kristiansen offers us four graphs depicting the rates of discovery through time of four categories of material - hoards with precious metals; hoards of less precious metal, mainly bronze; hoards of stone and flint axes and daggers; and finally neolithic and bronze age settlement sites (1985b, 9, fig. 1). From these graphs a number of important points emerge. The only category in which the graph is still climbing is that for neolithic and bronze age settlements. For the other three categories the number of discoveries has been declining since at least 1905 and in the case of hoards with precious metal since 1870. For these three graphs discovery levels are now close to zero and comparable to the situation in 1805. Of course, these results are not unexpected for anyone who has thought about these issues but I think this is the first time our suppositions have been confirmed by accurate analysis.

The implications of these results for our ability to raise non-government funds over a reasonable period of time are important. Quite clearly, we have only a small chance, and a diminishing one, of being able to deliver the elements that society thinks is most characteristic of archaeology. There will, of course, be spectacular finds from time to time but if they are the key to future funding opportunities we are going to be rather like the gamblers living on the myth of the big win.

From all this you will have gathered that I am not convinced that either archaeology or more specifically museum archaeology has a marketable product. It may be that future circumstances will cause me to change my mind, nothing would delight me more. But I am not optimistic. I am not optimistic not only because of the factors that I have been trying to describe but also because I see little sign that we are resolving the immense problems of presenting archaeology effectively to the public. In terms of funding, particularly that from our non-traditional sources, museums are about public programmes. Few of us are likely to garner significant private sector contributions for storage or pure research intended only to produce an article for a journal or a monograph. By and large, private sector money is not a charitable hand-out and consequently comes with strings attached, most obviously in the form of enhanced public identify for the benefactor.

Most archaeology displays cannot deliver at this level. They are couched in terms of factual objectivity which is both dull and utterly misleading. So-called good displays are clean, colourful, have good lighting and a fair sprinkling of graphics. Even so their ability to communicate well is poor. In part this situation reflects the formidable problems of displaying archaeological material well but equally it is indicative of the fact that we have not been challenged to do any better. The difficulties of breaking out from this position should not be minimised. Even at Jorvik the actual object display is as traditional and ineffective as at most other museums. Our present

approaches create an image of displays that are value-free, mere unvarnished statements of the truth. We all know that this is nonsense, that it is something more concerned with reinforcing our status as experts than with involving the public in the real dynamics of archaeological interpretation. This is a world where there are no facts, only opinions, and these are subject to rapid and dramatic change.

Yet acknowledging this in a truly public sense produces dangers as well as opportunities. It is possible to interpret what I have just said as meaning that one version of the past is as good as the next and I would not necessarily disagree with that so long as the versions are the product of archaeologists working in good faith. But what do we do when a major defence manufacturer comes along and offers us a substantial sum, substantial in our terms not theirs, to mount an exhibition demonstrating that militarism is a basic human attitude. The implication to be drawn is, of course, that disarmament is an impossible dream not worth pursuing. With a reasonably broad brush one could develop quite a convincing presentation.

Probably this is an extreme scenario. Much more likely is that someone will develop an alternative museological approach to displaying archaeological material. If it attracts a certain amount of funding it will become the new standard and we will all dutifully jump from one intellectually conformist and sterile method to another. What I hope is that we will have sufficient courage to abandon the idea that we can present the truth and instead commit ourselves to giving the public a chance to observe and involve themselves in archaeology's search for explanations. In this way we could cultivate the concept of diversity which at least gives us a chance of competing effectively for outside funds. As I have already indicated we go into this with a lot of baggage we could well do without. But if we decline to undertake the journey, we could well find ourselves at the scrag-end of the museum world and our contribution to plural funding might just be charging research workers for the privilege of looking at our reserve collections.

References

Kristiansen, K (ed.) 1985a. *Archaeological formation processes. The representativity of archaeological remains from Danish prehistory. Copenhagen.*

Kristiansen, K 1985b. *Post-depositional formation processes and the archaeological record. A Danish perspective.*
In Kristiansen 1985a, 7-11.

Shanks, M & Tilley, C 1987. *Re-constructing archaeology. Theory and practice.* Cambridge.

Wainwright, G J 1984. The pressure of the past: Presidential Address, *Proc Prehist Soc,* 50, 1984, 1-22.

THE VIEW FROM THE PROVINCES

John H. Williams, Cumbria and Lancashire Excavation Unit

Once upon a time the title of this paper might have conjured up a picture of rural gentility as contrasted with metropolitan commerce. Today, however, to many of those living to the north of the Watford Gap it is a poignant reminder of the North-South divide.

This 'divide' is a real problem not only for the personal affairs of archaeologists but also for field archaeology itself. One does not have to look far to see that there are social and economic problems in the North and the reality must be faced that local politicians and their officers, when caught between the conflicting claims of economic development or archaeology may well favour the former although, of course, it has to be said that economic growth and archaeology are not always at odds.

One should not, however, take too negative a view for it is possible within the present economic framework to develop the cause of archaeology. It may not be within the organisational framework established in the 1970s; indeed a new archaeological infra-structure seems to be emerging borne on the tide of short term contracts and competition. The new situation may not appeal to all but need not be at odds with academic ideals. It is necessary, while obviously trying to mould the system in accordance with one's own vision, to regard changing circumstances as the opening of new market opportunities (whether or not they are!) rather than lamenting the changing face of unit archaeology. This is a pragmatic rather than an idealistic viewpoint but to succeed, perhaps even to survive today in archaeology, particularly unit archaeology, it is necessary to be positive.

This short paper is divided into three parts. Firstly, a brief introduction is given to the organisation and sources of funding of the Cumbria and Lancashire Archaeological Unit to act as background for the later parts of the paper. Secondly, the question of raising funds for excavation in today's changing circumstances is considered, and, thirdly, the theme of 'market opportunities' introduced above is further developed.

The Cumbria and Lancashire Archaeological Unit is based within the University of Lancaster with permanent and semi-permanent staff presently numbering about fifteen. Virtually all its work is project-based. Its present projects cover:

a. ***field survey*** - the Lake District National Park Survey including work on the Neolithic axe factories of the Langdale/Scafell area and the fine surviving relict landscapes of the north-east and south-west fells; the wetlands of Cumbria and Lancashire; the industrial archaeology of Rossendale.

b. ***excavation and post-excavation*** - the Bronze Age cairns at Hardendale and Manor Farm, the Roman settlements at Lancaster, Walton-le-Dale and Papcastle and the Saxon monastic site at Dacre.

c. ***historic fabric survey*** - at Furness Abbey, Whalley Abbey, Brougham Castle and Piel Castle.

The Unit also maintains the Lancashire Sites and Monuments Record and provides planning advice to the County and the Districts.

English Heritage is still the major funding source but developers, local authorities and organisations such as British Coal, British Steel and Shell have also financed work. While the Unit lacks the benefits of core funding it benefits from the academic resources of the University and the computing power and expertise available there.

This then gives a picture of a unit very much dependent on outside funding but successful, at least for the time being, perhaps because of both the range and diversity of its projects and the range and diversity of its funding. In industry, being a supplier for a large firm obviously

brings benefits but over dependence on a single outlet can be a risky venture.

The question of funding excavations is one which this paper was specifically asked to examine. What then is the best way to fund an excavation and how is that money generated? The academic importance of a site is still important but we have very much moved into the era of 'polluter pays': this raises the danger that the archaeological response will be related to the bank balance of the prospective developer and his willingness to be relieved of some of it rather than to the academic importance of the site. This is a real concern. At a more fundamental level methods can be divided into 'carrots' and 'sticks'. Some are hybrid combinations.

First it is necessary to create the right climate for archaeology by developing an archaeological profile and nurturing a sympathetic environment. This must be accomplished by both the official level by persuading local authority members and officers and also the general public. This can be referred to as the development of networks. Networks must be created, fostered but never abused.

Secondly it is necessary to formulate a project design that is valid, intelligible and reasonable. As a parallel, when looking at job applications we are immediately drawn to the one which is well organised and laid out. It must seem an obvious point that if we are trying to convince people of the worth of a project we must get the content and presentation right but how often is it ignored. This is not only relevant to written presentations for all our actions in trying to set up a project are in effect a presentation. It is essential to get the presentation right. If one wants to be regarded as a professional one must act professionally. The presentation must, however, be geared to one's audience. For example one should neither talk up nor talk down, nor provide too little or too much detail, neither bore nor be excessively short.

Thirdly it is necessary to sell the 'product' i.e. the excavation, both before and during the excavation.

Fourthly we should consider the use of legal constraints. Many developers will accept their responsibility for helping to record what is being destroyed by development. In the City of London a tremendous amount has been achieved through co-operation and there are other notable examples but this may not work everywhere. In the north developers may provide £5,000 or £10,000 but larger sums are more difficult to generate and here the persuasiveness of law, authority or policy can be helpful. The Lancashire County Structure Plan contains an archaeological policy:

'12.26 ***(a)*** To safeguard buildings, structures and sites of architectural, historic and archaeological significance along with their surroundings from decay, destruction or damage, and to prevent visual harm caused by unsympathetically designed developments or neighbouring sites.

(b) To undertake general environmental improvements and enhancement in conservation areas and in the vicinity of buildings, structures, features and sites of architectural, historical and archaeological significance.'

This could be stronger: it could be weaker. Local plans within the county are containing increasingly strong policies. In particular, attention can be drawn to the section in the Lancaster District Plan on Archaeological Sites.

In the introductory clauses we learn that...

'Archaeological investigations in Lancaster have shown the city to be sited on an important Roman settlement. Although they have provided a less than complete understanding of the nature, extent or true significance of the Roman presence there is a wide agreement that much of the developed city centre conceals a potentially exciting archaeological heritage'.

The City Council is firmly of the view that this heritage should be protected from unnecessary disturbance or destruction. It believes that this can only be achieved if there is a more precise archaeological record and where necessary a clear requirement on developers to finance investigation and rescue as part of their development schemes.

After this justification three policies follow...

19. In determining applications for development account will be taken of archaeological considerations and of the need to safeguard archaeological sites from unnecessary destruction.

20. Where development affects a site of archaeological importance the developer will be expected to allow the council's nominated archaeologist to observe the excavations and record items of interest.

21. Within the area defined on the proposals map as an "area of archaeological potential" developers may be required to finance investigation and rescue excavation for a period not exceeding six months'.

It is certainly true to say that the existence of these policies and the willingness to apply them has assisted and will, hopefully, continue to assist the funding of the present programme of work in Lancaster. With such a statement developers should be aware of the archaeological implications of development at an early stage.

There still seems, however, to be some divergence of opinion over the extent to which archaeological conditions can be applied to planning consents but it has to be acknowledged that the pioneering work by authorities such as Essex and more recently Berkshire has resulted in the increased application and acceptance of archaeological conditions. The moral must be that whether one is within or without a local planning authority it is wise to encourage the formulation and application of strong archaeological policies in County Structure Plans and in District Plans.

Perhaps Ancient Monuments legislation should also be considered. It would appear that there is an increasing use within English Heritage of scheduling powers to ensure that developers contribute towards the costs of preservation by record of sites threatened by development. It is probably true to say that in some cases the fear of scheduling has encouraged a developer to be more generous in financing rescue excavation than otherwise may have been the case.

We have been considering here coercive powers used for generating funding for archaeology. It would appear that increasingly developers are being expected to fund excavations in total. While any spreading of the burden of funding must be welcomed perhaps the most satisfactory solution would be an established policy of joint funding between developer and state. With such an arrangement the developer would see more clearly the importance of any given site. Otherwise the developer might well question the 'national importance' of a site when he is being expected to fund the project totally. A willingness from the outset to consider partnership arrangement would be a most welcome development but is this in keeping with the present political climate?

In generating funding for excavating a variety of techniques are applicable but among the qualities needed by the successful fund raiser resilience should not be forgotten. Some sorties are more successful than others but for long term success it is essential to persevere.

Finally it is very relevant to develop the theme of 'market opportunities'. To be effective in the 1980's we must regard archaeology as a business. We can still have our academic ideals, we can develop our research programme, but we must recognise that archaeology is increasingly being influenced by the market economic forces upon which industry and commerce depend. This means that we have to start thinking about archaeology in business terms. Some basic questions should be asked:

What business are we in?
What market are we in?
Who are our customers?
What are we trying to do?
What is our product?
How effective are we?

If we try to apply these questions to unit archaeology there are obviously difficulties in many areas but we might find that we are trying to provide a general archaeological service, that we are trying to cover a geographical area or indeed that we are trying to develop certain specialist expertises. We must ask the questions, we must analyse the answers and take the appropriate action. It is possible to drift without defining, shall we say, 'corporate objectives' but in today's competitive world it is clear that excellence and price will become increasingly important. At the present time there is some discussion over the territoriality of archaeological units. Units were originally set up or encouraged by the Department of the Environment to provide comprehensive geographical coverage. With competition this structure is being eroded and particularly at risk is the local knowledge base which has been built up. Competition is inevitable but local knowledge and reputation must then become an important marketable product. There must also be a worry that competition means competition by price and means the lessening of standards and a further assault on the already poor career structure of field archaeologists. There is, however, still a need to be positive, to upgrade standards and generally demonstrate a professional approach. John Harvey Jones, the former Chairman of ICI, in a recent book 'Making it Happen - reflections on leadership', noted that the only time one of ICI's plant was up to date was when it was on the drawing board. It was obsolete as soon as it was constructed. Archaeologists are not in the business of designing plant and a lot of our data is thousands of years old but we are using increasingly complex technology; there is a message that we must constantly be examining what we do and how we do it and seeking to improve our methodology and competitiveness. The goalposts have been moved. We can try to move them back but in the meantime we can be spectators or operate as effectively as we can on the new field of play.

FAMILIARITY BREEDS CONTEMPT - THE AREA MUSEUM COUNCILS REDISCOVERED

Ian S. Taylor, North West Museums and Art Galleries Service, (NWMAGS).

Area Museum Councils (AMCs) originated with a pilot scheme in the South West in 1959 to promote closer co-operation, to improve technical facilities and to obtain and distribute financial assistance to museums and galleries within the region.

Central government aid began in 1963/64 and represents up to 90% of the total income of the AMCs. In 1984 the Museums & Galleries Commission, who channel government funds to the AMCs published a 'Review of the Area Museum Councils and their Services' which recommended a number of constitutional, financial and operational changes in the management of the AMCs, but, perhaps most significantly, a doubling in real terms over five years of the government grant to the AMCs. As a result of the 1984 Review, the AMCs are with one exception now constituted as companies limited by guarantee, registered as charities and managed by elected Boards of Management, representing member local authorities and independent museums. In addition most AMCs have formed one or more professional advisory panels to assist with the allocation of grant-aid and have published grant policies setting out the range of museum improvement scheme eligible for grant-aid and the AMCs agreed priorities.

Such published priorities and highly selective grants are essential to maximise the impact of the modest resources available to the AMCs. Indeed, the total allocation of funds to the seven English AMCs in 1987/88 was only £2.6 million from a Museums & Galleries Commission budget of £5.5 million. Comparative figures for expenditure by national museums and the Arts Council are in both cases in excess of £100 million per annum.

In the case of NWMAGS the grant policy is revised annually and at present offers grants, normally up to 50% of the gross costs, towards a wide range of museum improvements. In appropriate and exceptional cases, grants of up to 100% will, however, be considered. In order to receive grants museums must be full members of the Service and conform to the Service's standard conditions of grant. In 1989/90 access to grants will also be linked to the Museums Registration Scheme which began in the North West in 1988/89. Grants may be given to more than one Museum acting together e.g. on a Countywide Consultative Committee project, although in the North West such applications have been slow to come forward with the notable exception of the joint marketing scheme 'Heritage Six' (Museums Journal Vol. 88, No 3).

Member museums are invited to apply for grants by mid-February each year. Applications are considered by the Joint Advisory Panel in March and decisions communicated to members at the end of that month. Offers of grant remain in force for six months and expenditure still uncommitted after that time may be reallocated to other projects.

Within the overall objective of helping museums in the area to improve the standards of care for their collections and service to the public, NWMAGS, through its Joint Advisory Panel, has recognised the need to:

1. give priority to conservation and other aspects of the management of collections;

2. make the most effective use of the limited resources available to the Service;

3. respond flexibly and imaginatively to the needs of curators.

These criteria will be applied when considering applications for grants towards the following eligible schemes:

Consultancy
Production of specialist reports on the development of the museum and on the needs of the museum in any of the areas listed here.

Permanent/Temporary Staff
Pump-priming grants for specialist staff to undertake temporary curatorial, conservation or documentation work.

Training
A limited number of grants towards an approved programme of in-service training and travel will be available in addition to NWMAGS own training programmes.

Research
Research generated by eligible schemes and services.

Security
Provision/improvement of the physical security of collections in store or on display against vandalism, theft or fire.

Storage
Improvement of accommodation for storage, to provide racking, boxes, cabinets, packing and framing materials. Short-term hire of storage accommodation.

Environmental Control
Equipment to monitor and control light, humidity and pollution levels.

Conservation
Conservation work by approved conservators, and conservation equipment and facilities to be used by the museum's own appropriately qualified staff.

Documentation
Improvements in documentation of collections, cataloguing and information storage and retrieval systems.

Photography
Photographic equipment or services related to an approved conservation, documentation or display scheme.

Design and Display
New and improved display schemes, audio visual presentations and the lighting and refurbishment of galleries.

Temporary Exhibitions
Origination of temporary exhibitions including ones which will be shown at more than one venue in the region.

Signing
Improvements to museum signing, both interior and exterior (excluding road signing).

Education
Development and improvement of educational facilities for public use.

Marketing and Publicity
A limited number of grants towards the cost of promotion schemes, visitor surveys and marketing advice, including joint schemes.

Disabled Access
Improvement of facilities and access for disabled visitors.

Applications falling outside the scope of this grant scheme are considered by the Joint Advisory Panel on their merits.

The terms of reference of the Area Museum Councils still exclude, however:

a) the purchase of museum objects;
b) capital expenditure on new building construction and major structural alterations;
c) normal operating expenditure such as the permanent employment of staff or payment of overheads; and
d) the provision of facilities intended solely for the use of schools.

While NWMAGS and the other AMCs attach a high priority to grant-aid, most AMCs also provide a range of high quality conservation facilities for museums in their region who find it uneconomic or impossible to employ their own specialist staff or who require extra capacity from time to time.

In the case of NWMAGS, Art, Textiles, Archaeology & Antiquities, and Natural History conservation services are offered to members at heavily subsidised rates and the conservation work is centralised at Griffin Lodge in Blackburn.

These in-house services represent, however, only one strategy for helping museums deal with the immense and growing backlog of conservation work required in the regional museums.

NWMAGS, in common with the other AMCs, therefore, provides selective assistance to museums to establish their own conservation facilities and to utilise reputable private conservators.

In addition NWMAGS is able to provide an in-house Design & Production facility to assist with the redisplay of galleries, the origination and touring of temporary exhibitions, specialist joinery work, secure transport and record photography. Increasingly, however, these traditional areas of support are being supplemented by new activities such as training, registration, marketing and fund raising advice as AMCs, within their limited budgets, strive to ensure that their services, which have been so vital to the resurgence of museums in the last 25 years, continue to match the needs of their members.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Museums and Galleries Commission, *Review of Area Museum Councils and Services*, Report by a Working Party, HMSO, 1984

Naylor, D and Taylor, I S, 'The Heritage Six - Attractions Consortium', *Museums Journal*, Vol. 88, No 3, 1988

North West Museum & Art Gallery Service, *Grant Policy,* 1989/90

North West Museum & Art Gallery Service, *Annual Report,* 1986/87

North West Museum & Art Gallery Service, *Newsletter,* published quarterly

HBMC STORAGE GRANTS: A SURVEY BY THE SOCIETY OF MUSEUM ARCHAEOLOGISTS

Isabel Churcher, Gloucestershire County Libraries, Arts and Museums, and Nick Merriman, Museum of London

Background

At the 1988 conference the Society of Museum Archaeologists was informed that the £100,000 grant available to museums through HBMC for the storage of the archive from HBMC-funded excavations had been cut by half due to the low number of applications. With the support of the Museum and Galleries Commission, the SMA instituted a project to investigate why there has been such a low rate of applications for these grants.

N.B.: Grants are limited to museums which have stores given 'approved status' by the MGC (inspections being administered through the Area Services). They are further limited to excavations with HBMC funding which have been undertaken since 1981.

The SMA project took the form of a questionnaire sent to out to 250 museums and interested parties. This report presents the main results for the questionnaire and summarises comments received as to why curators felt the scheme was not working.

Response Rate

250 questionnaires were sent out, and 102 replies received. 96 of these were from museums, 6 from Area Services.

1. MGC Approval

Q.1: 'Do you have an MGC-approved store?'

Yes:	27
No:	59
Pending/Conditional:	6

Comments: Of those not approved, 26 were planning to seek approval at some stage, or were looking at the possibility.

There also seemed to be some discrepancies between the list of MGC-approved stores supplied by the Area Services, and those in the same areas claiming to be approved.

2. Reasons for non-approval or non-application for grants

Questions 2 and 4 in the questionnaire cover related problems. Clearly, many museums were not approved because they failed to meet the MGC criteria, and others were not applying for approval because they felt they would not meet the criteria. For this reason they were not applying for the HBMC grants. The question then is, why are so many museums not applying for approval? The reasons can be divided into three categories:

1. They feel the scheme is inapplicable ***41***

Reasons given

a. They do not collect archaeological material or have a very small collection which is unlikely to increase in size:	**21**
b. They do have a significant archaeological collection, but there is no immediate prospect of HBMC material coming in:	**8**
c. They are ineligible as the scheme does not cover them geographically:	**3**
d. They are unaware of the existence of the scheme:	**3**
e. They have not applied (no specific reason):	**4**
f. They have been discouraged by the paperwork:	**2**

2. They have not, or would not, come up to standard *29*

Reasons Given:

a. No money available to make alterations to meet standards: **5**

b. No professionally trained archaeologist on the staff: **4**

c. Environmental controls not adequate: **3**

d. Criteria generally too stringent: **2**

e. Store insecure: **1**

f. Store subject to flooding: **1**

g. Museum is in historic building, not easily adaptable: **1**

3. Other Reasons *6*

a. Museum has other priorities: **5**

b. Another, approved, museum takes the material: **1**

3. HBMC Grants

Q. 3: 'Have you ever applied for HBMC storage grants?'

Yes:	25
No:	65

Grants Given

Great variations were noted in the size of grants given, ranging from over £50,000 spread over several years for several sites, to £70 for a small site archive. Average grant given seemed to be around £2,000.

Difficulties in applying for grants

Seven respondents said they had no difficulties in applying for the grants; three said they had some problems, and fifteen made no mention either way. Those who did experience difficulties mentioned problems in getting information out of HBMC (e.g. on the current price per box, or on which sites had been HBMC funded), or felt that it was a lot of paperwork for little result.

Relationship between grant and total storage costs

A.3*(a)*: '...did this [grant] cover all the storage costs?'

Yes	2
No	13
No reply	10

There seemed to be a general feeling amongst respondents that the grant covers the immediate costs of boxing material up and so on, but that it does not cover long-term storage costs which would include handling, heating, lighting, rent, new storage materials and re-cataloguing. Many also mentioned the problem that the grant does not cover the costs of work programmes to expand or improve the stores.

Reasons for an unsuccessful application

Not many respondents had made (or admitted to) unsuccessful applications. Those who had, gave the following reasons:

a. Excavations took place in 1960s and early 1970s

b. The DoE-funded excavations were undertaken by the museum service and were already housed in the museum

c. The landowner had retained part of the archive

d. 'Sites didn't qualify as rescue'

e. The material was not derived from HBMC-funded excavations

4. Why does the system not seem to be working?

Most respondents gave separate general comments in accompanying letters. A synthesis of the main points made, together with some typical quotations, is presented here. The first quotation seems to summarise well some of the general problems and frustrations encountered:

'The museum was approved as a recipient under the original scheme and then approved by the MGC, who provided us with a large grant to improve the burglar and fire alarm systems. However, we have never received any money from the HBMC storage grant budget despite the fact that the museum stores are bulging with HBMC-funded excavation material. We have found it very difficult to get any sensible information from the HBMC about how to apply for the grants, and when we have finally managed to fight out way through the application, invariably there is some excuse not to pay up. In this case the site was either not fully funded by HBMC, or dug too long ago, or was not a rescue excavation - this last excuse is the most common as the bulk of our material comes from Guardianship sites. I haven't applied for a grant for some time as the process seems to take up an enormous amount of time and energy, and my expectations of receiving any cash are limited.'

1. Long-term storage costs

This seemed to be one of the three principal reasons (see also 2. and 3.) that the scheme has not attracted as many applications as were expected. Many respondents noted the heavy overall investment required in order to bring stores up to MGC-approved standard, and that HBMC grants were not available for this (or that MGC capital grants did not cover costs). One curator commented: 'It does seem strange that money for storage is only forthcoming once the store is no longer in need of it.'

It was also felt that MGC and HBMC need to take account of the full cost of curating archives in perpetuity when fixing the level of grant. One example was given of a museum which was given C. £5,500 for five sites. This had to be set against £5,000 for roller racking, £556 for environmental monitoring equipment, plus annual running costs of £3,600 for maintenance and services, and £150 - £200 for the security system direct line. The curator's conclusion was that 'the revenue costs must be taken into consideration when an excavation is accepted by a museum.'

2. Lack of grants for non-HBMC material

This was another strong reason for the lack of applications for MGC approval and hence, lack of application for HBMC grants. In many cases, the majority of material entering museums comes from non-HBMC-funded excavations and curators consequently feel that the scheme has nothing to offer them:

'To be of any assistance to us grants would need to be available retrospectively and not just for new material coming into store. As HBMC cut their funding to rescue excavations of the kind which have been taking place in .....(now mostly developer funded) the relevance of the storage grants to us is fairly minimal.'

3. Lack of grants from pre-1981 material

This problem also attracted a great deal of comment, and the 1981 cut-off point was felt to be unreasonable:

'No grants were applied for before 1986. By that stage we had taken hundreds of boxes of DoE-funded rescue material from the 1970s, which were not eligible under the current criteria'

4. Strictness of Criteria

Some respondents felt that the criteria were far too strict: some felt they could not manage them; others felt that they had been denied approval because of too-strict adherence to the criteria. In one example, a museum had an unheated store, and the museum's conservation officer proposed to use dehumidifiers to deal with climate control. MGC insisted that the building should be heated, so the store was not approved.

5. Approval and Registration
There seemed to be some confusion between approval and registration and a feeling amongst some curators that being registered meant that their stores were therefore 'approved' for HBMC grants. Others thought that it was not necessary to have two schemes and that they should be joined.

6. Post-excavation backlog
One curator thought that the slow take-up of grants might be due to the large amount of archaeological material that has accumulated as post-excavation backlog within archaeological units. Once this is published there might be a flood of applications.

7. Administrative difficulties
Some curators felt that the scheme was administratively top-heavy, with three different organisations involved (MGC, Area Services, HBMC). This led to slowness in decisions being made, and large amounts of paperwork to be done.

8. Lack of information and co-ordination
Some curators seemed to be unaware of the scheme, and others suggested that this might be because it is some time since HBMC issued guidelines. There also seems to be some confusion amongst both museums and units over which museums are actually approved. In one case, a museum had an MGC-approved store, but the local unit was unaware of this, with the consequence that the museum did not receive any material. In other cases, MGC-approved stores have not applied for grants because no HBMC-funded work has taken place in their area since 1981.

5. Recommendations for the future
Despite criticisms, a significant number of curators felt that the idea of applying clear standards to the storage of archaeological material was a good one in principle. While some thought that the criteria were too strict, others thought they should not be watered down:

E.G. 'The criteria for approval...are a **very** useful tool for museums to get their facilities upgraded and they should not be watered down'

If it is accepted that the criteria should remain the same, it is clear that one of the main ways in which the take-up of grants could be improved would be if they took account of the 'cost of collecting,' as is suggested above, and if the scheme were extended to include pre-1981 material and even material from excavations not funded by HBMC.

Particular suggestions were made regarding the nature of the archaeological archive itself. Some museums seemed reluctant to take on enormous collections of archaeological material when there was no real benefit to be gained from housing the material. It was suggested that a general debate on the housing of the archaeological archive needs to be promoted. Specific issues to be discussed should include:

a. **Samples** 'We feel that it is essential that the relevant specialist should check all such material before expecting it to be stored. Such assessment would be based on its potential to provide information on the site... In other words, excavators need to develop a greater sense of economic realism!'

b. **Alternative storage methods:** For the paper archive, microfiche and computer disk should be explored.

c. **Co-ordination between field and site:**
To cut down on duplication of time and costs, museum-approved numbering systems should be used, appropriate storage materials used on-site, site-records should be made on materials designed for long-term preservation, documentation of material should be full (and compatible with museum systems) before hand-over, and proper arrangements for the final handing over of material should be made well in advance.

SPONSORSHIP OR PATRONAGE - A CASE STUDY

Edmund Southworth, National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside.

A paper on this theme was going to be given by a former colleague of mine who was in the event unable to prepare it due to a bereavement. He now works for an international firm of Management Consultants who shall be nameless. The title of his paper was going to be "Why my company didn't sponsor this conference". This was because I originally asked him for some money to promote the conference. His response to the request was quite blunt. "It's not worth it," he said, "What would we get out of it?" Faced with the stark question I had to admit that the potential benefits to his company were not great. He explained that the company policy on sponsorship was that they wanted to see at least 10 times the original investment back. As I had suggested a mere three hundred pounds to pay for the printing of a leaflet the company would only be looking for a total of thirty thousand pounds worth of consultancy business back at the end of the day. As we could not guarantee that - we didn't get the money. I was going to ask him also for some fifteen hundred pounds towards this publication but it was clear this was even more unlikely.

That was worth knowing. I then tried another company who asked exactly the same thing - namely what would they get out of it. By then I was better prepared and I was able to tell them that for three hundred pounds they would get their name on 3500 leaflets, distributed to SMA members, the 700 members of IFA and the 2500 members of the CBA. They were happy with that and I got the sum I requested to promote the conference but nothing for the publication which is why the company is not mentioned by name here.

Those were the preliminary thoughts which set me thinking about the difference between what I wanted, which was patronage with no strings attached, and what the people I was talking to thought I wanted which was sponsorship. I feel there is a distinction between the two in that patronage can be seen as giving money to a good cause and not expecting anything directly in return. Sponsorship, however, is a hard-nosed commercial business proposition and you must know the distinction between the two if you are going to attempt to get either.

The following is a brief case history of our efforts to raise sponsorship for our last exhibition. I am aware that National Museums do not fully represent the profession and that many of them are in a different league from local museums but I hope the general principles will be of use.

Liverpool Museum is part of the National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside and has been since 1986 when the rate-capped County Council was replaced as our employer by a board of Trustees appointed by the Prime Minister, with a great shock to the system as you can imagine. A Corporate Plan was fairly quickly on the agenda, with a marketing plan, and as part of this it was decided that our visitors should be increased from .9 million in the seven buildings we now have to 1.8 million over the next five years. To do that the Trustees were prepared to spend up to £250,000 per annum on promotion and marketing. There is a policy of "feet through the door". This is a stated aim as part of the corporate plan and in order to get "feet through the doors" we have a major exhibition programme. Just like that! There will be a major exhibition programme.

It isn't easy - it takes 3-4 years lead in for a major temporary exhibition and therefore for the first few years we were going to have to buy them in. The budget for a year to do this is £100,000. This sound good, but is not very much if you are thinking about a very large exhibition which has to attract between 50 and 150,000 visitors in a fairly deprived city. Our most recent exhibition, which has just closed, Pharaohs and Mortals, was put together by the FitzWilliam Museum in Cambridge and it was a very splendid creation of one of their academics. It represents several

years work and it was a survey of the best of Egyptian Middle Kingdom Art which collected together loans from 15 Museums in a glittering array. No mummies but a host of "goodies" all the same. We agreed over 18 months ago that this would be a joint operation between the two museums, with two venues and we would share a lot of the costs and a lot of the work. So our Design Department did the posters, leaflets, labels and graphics panels etc. and we built the more complicated stands and sent our technicians scouring the country to retrieve the more awkward slabs of stone.

The search for sponsorship was instigated at the highest level - our respective directors said they would do it - and we were kept out of the process as curators. We provided backup information as a pack which included photographs of specimens, profiles of the staff and the museums etc. A hit list was devised and, as an example of a hit list, the Egyptian Embassy suggested that the Cairo Waste Water Project would be useful to us. This is a 5 billion project which has gone mainly to British contractors to rebuild Cairo's sewage system and it apparently one of the largest construction contract ever won abroad by a British consortium. Every company associated with the project which was within 35 miles of Cambridge and Liverpool was approached and larger companies were approached at a National level. We also approached every major regional firm and I should mention Pilkington, Plesseys, Unilever etc. We provided detailed estimates of budgets and visuals on top of the basic information. The work and subsequent chasing up was done by the newly established Development Office. From that whole exercise we got nothing at all.

Instead a local businessman whom the Director has been courting for several years decided he would offer us £5000. In a way this was almost like personal patronage in the way he spent the company's money. He wanted a mention but he didn't really mind what this was or how it was done. We then approached the Association for Business Sponsorship of the Arts and said here's £5000 from a new sponsor - match it please. ABSA sent back our completed application form because it wasn't good enough. We hadn't given the sponsor enough for his money. We are again back to the difference between patronage and sponsorship. The sponsor himself wasn't too worried about what he got out of it but in order to get our matching funds we had to give him far more. In the end he got his name and the company's name on 50,000 colour leaflets, 5000 colour posters and his name on the exhibition entrance panel. He very nearly got a case of his products in the exhibition itself (This was suggested and insisted upon at a senior level. There was talk among the staff about resignations at this stage if we put a case of dog food in the exhibition -this being one of the company's products) but a compromise position was found in the Museum Foyer. This was very nearly a serious editorial problem. He also got a champagne opening for 100 of his staff and guests - but he did pay for the champagne.

£5000 was not actually much for us, even with the ABSA top up. Our sponsorship target was much higher. One of the activities which was associated with the exhibition was a competition and so we looked around for a suitable prize. As the theme of the exhibition was Egypt we thought it would be nice to offer a cruise down the Nile as a prize. As luck would have it the same businessman who offered us the £5000 also owned a travel company. He therefore earmarked £650 out of the £5000 which was the cost price of a cruise down the Nile. We were initially a bit disappointed that the cash value of the sponsorship was dwindling but at least we had a good prize for the competition. We then approached the Liverpool Daily Post and Echo for assistance in promoting the competition, which they were very pleased to do as we had a valuable and exotic prize to offer. The deal was that we would sell the evening paper in the Museum shop during the duration of the exhibition. We could live with that. The competition ran for a week, starting with half a page at the beginning of the week and tailing off to a column by the end. We calculated later that that exposure was worth approximately £16,500 which was a very good

return on our investment of £650, the cost of the holiday.

The exhibition itself was very successful with over 50,000 visitors in six weeks. We didn't charge, which always helps visitor numbers.

As an example of sponsorship for a major exhibition, our experience was mixed. We felt we had approached the problem correctly, done our research and proceeded in a professional way. A number of mistakes were probably made but overall we felt that the end result was disappointing considering the effort put in. We couldn't identify any errors in our technique apart from not having the time to research the companies we targetted and are continuing to use the same approach with our forthcoming exhibition. The supporting documentation we send to potential sponsors is now Desk-Top published, with colour photographs, and we are working for an exhibition which is still eighteen months away. So far we have had promises of £30,000, almost 30% of the budget.

In conclusion, it is important to identify clearly the benefits to the potential sponsor and sell them convincingly if you are interested in a commercial arrangement. However we obtained our funds by talking to individual businessmen, showing them what wondrous creatures curators were, and allowing them to see how they exhibition was being put together. The individual who sponsored us had a close relationship with the exhibition and it can be argued that he essentially gave us personal patronage with his company's money. My own view is that if we go for too hard-headed and commercial an approach we will do badly because we are amateurs when it comes to commerce. On the other hand a more naive approach may work better if it touches the heart of those we are aiming at.

TRADING, SALES AND SHOPS. A practical guide to profit-making.

Richard Matanle, National Shops Adviser, Age Concern, England.

The main common factor which service charities, such as Age Concern, have with the Museum service is the restriction or reduction of funding from local authorities, and the need to look elsewhere for substantial financial support. This has led to a proliferation of charity shops as the means of raising substantial regular income.

Equally so there are a number of museums and archaeological ventures which are founded in Trusts and finding it increasingly difficult to maintain or develop their services. Some of these have already moved heavily into trading as a source of income. I know, for instance, of the enormous sales area in the British Museum - with a mammoth display of cards etc. I have also seen and warmly applaud the shop at the Ironbridge Gorge Museum with their tasteful display of Coalport mugs etc. I am certain that there are many others who have followed the same course.

Readers who are not already involved will, however, want to know more about the implications of moving into this type of venture and, I am certain, will want many questions answered.

There is, first of all the legal position and this will depend on the constitutional basis of the service. To explain this I had best start in the field where I am more conversant - that of the charitable trust. Strictly speaking the raising of money by selling goods (other than donated goods) is not carrying out a charitable purpose - a charity has to be established for charitable purposes only and any charity which states within its aims the carrying out of trade would therefore be unable to register as a charity. It can however include the power to trade in the trust deed.

But what of a Trust that is already a registered charity. Firstly, it must have the power to trade in the course of carrying out its purposes stated in the trust deed. Secondly, no charity can trade via a trading subsidiary owned by itself where the trustees have no power to make this kind of investment.

I will return to trading subsidiaries later but meanwhile I want to pass on to the question of Tax. Section 360 of the 1970 Taxes Act exempts trading profits from Tax 'where such trade is carried on directly by the charity within its primary purposes'. This would include the sale of its own publications but the sale of other promotional items, such as button badges, T shirts, etc. could be challenged.

The Inland Revenue also have extra-statutory concessions which exempt the profits for small-scale trading although there are four conditions to be met -

1. The organisation is not trading regularly

2. The trading is not in competition with other traders

3. The trading is supported by the public because they wish to support the charity (and believe any profits will go to the charity's work)

4. The profits are applied for charitable purposes.

The obvious snag is the first condition - trading regularly (this is intended to exempt annual bazaars etc.).

All together the legal position in which charitable trusts find themselves is not too rosy. Many trusts have found a way round this by setting up trading subsidiaries - trading companies - with the profits covenanted back to the charity - and thus escape paying Tax on the profits and, at the same time protecting their charitable status. One added advantage is that, if the trading activity goes wrong the charity does not have to

use its funds to pay off the debts and, since the trading company has limited liability to the extent of its assets, its shareholders are not responsible for its debts.

Now I must turn to the services operated by local authorities. Clearly these are not restricted by charity law but there are clearly problems of handling the cash and preserving the profits for the use of the service. I must however point out that there appears to be little difficulty, if any, with the ear-marking of private sponsorship for rescue archaeology for instance.

There is the added problem of how you avoid paying tax on the profits made from trading. My suggestion is that it may be necessary to set up a support group after the pattern followed by Hospital Friends. The object clause for the constitution of such groups would need to be carefully written and would include advocacy on behalf of the service as well as fund raising. This would be no bad thing - indeed, in my research for this paper, I discovered at least one such group exists although they have not yet developed their fund-raising potential.

I have probably confused and even discouraged you by the emphasis on the legal aspect - but I would be less than honest if I were to steam ahead without making clear that very real problems lie in this area. If you have found difficulty in following me through this maze then there is, at the end of this paper, the title of an extremely useful book to which you can refer and in which all the details of the legal position are adequately described.

May I now move on to the actual trading activity. Obviously we are normally talking about a foyer shop - although I can imagine in a number of sites there will be the possibility of having a kiosk or something smaller. The display must be attractive and it may be possible for you to recruit the help of an expert from, say, a department store to advise. This would include the display equipment e.g. card stands and ways of avoiding a 'flat' display. Quite often it is possible to procure items free which are surplus to requirements in local stores.

Naturally, if you are to maximise profits, it will be necessary to recruit volunteers who are prepared to man the stall on a rota basis. It will, however, be necessary to have a 'key' volunteer who will be responsible for manning the stall, banking the proceeds, perhaps ordering supplies. Experience shows that, in some cases, it is necessary to off-set the expenses involved in the function of a 'key' volunteer (or Manager) by paying a small honorarium (set at a level below the current minimum wage involving National Insurance contributions).

It is interesting that the book to which I referred earlier makes a number of references to museum shops and suggests a whole range of articles which may be considered suitable for such a venture. Let me suggest some items to you... Published material relating to the collection. Range of postcards, some as notelets or greeting cards. Replicas of documents, jewellery, coins etc. A way of interesting children in the visit with a colouring in treasure hunt sheet. Cardboard cut-out models of exhibits etc.

Remember, however, it is design that sells. Look closely at the National Trust shops and you will see the best examples of design and presentation. I suggest you consult the Design Index at one of the Design Centres and you will be able to see selected items and discover the designer and the manufacturer. One of the problems to be faced is the one of deciding the quantity to be ordered. Obviously the larger the order, the lower the unit cost. But remember that all too often the potential profit will be sitting there in unsold stock and will not be realised until the total is sold. A key problem, however, is that of providing the initial money 'up front' to provide the initial stock. I had this very much in mind when suggesting a support group of 'Friends'. With such a group it would be possible to run several fund-raising events e.g. wine and cheese evenings and this could be the means, not only of strengthening the group but also of

accumulating funds, to meet the cost of the initial stock for the shop.

Finally I must attempt to outline some basic rules for trading, particularly where the staffing is undertaken by volunteers. General experience has led most charities to use a day book method. This means having a single column cash book in which each sale is recorded together with a brief description of the item. An attempt should be made at the end of each day's transactions to reconcile the total in the day book with the cash in the till. A small petty cash float can be used for sundries and this will ensure that all the takings in the till are banked direct.

It is absolutely vital that a safe system of stock control is maintained and this is best done on a weekly basis. This means having the opening stock figure, plus stock added during the week, less the value of stock sold. From this it will be possible to monitor the turnover etc., Some documentation is vital for insurance purposes.

Obviously, with any operation involving a rota of voluntary helpers, some form of monitoring or overall management is required. It may be that the group were fortunate enough to have an honorary treasurer with sufficient background experience to take complete control of the situation. If this is not possible then it may be necessary for a staff member to be delegated the responsibility for monitoring the operation through the weekly return - a function which need not take more than half an hour a week.

In the earlier turgid section on the legal implications I drew a line at mentioning VAT. However I must point out that you will be charged VAT on supplies and must include VAT in your pricing. However you will not be into the more complex business of registering and providing VAT returns until and unless your anticipated annual turnover is more than £22,100. This figure is varied from year to year and would need watching each year as the limits vary.

May I conclude by giving you the details of the book I referred to earlier. It is the only publication I know of which is relevant to the subject we have been discussing.

The Charity Trading Handbook by Hilary Blume. The Charity Trading Advisory Group, 9 Mansfield Place, London. NW3 1HS.

This advisory group was set up as a resource centre and although the title may be misleading, I can assure you museums, whether in private or public ownership, fall within the remit of the organisation. They will, therefore, respond to any requests for advice you may wish to refer to them.

Society of Museum Archaeologists
The Museum Archaeologist Volume 15
Conference Proceedings
Lancaster 1988

ISBN 1 871855 02 0