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Dear Colleagues,

We are approaching the XV Congress of the International Union for Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences (UISPP/IUPPS) and, namely, the deadline for submission of papers.

The XV Congress of the IUPPS will be held in Lisbon, in 2006, but its preparation includes several ongoing activities. These include not only the preparation of sessions, but the organisation of conferences and debates in 2003, 2004 and 2005, as well as the edition of several volumes devoted to Portuguese archaeology, that will be available in the opening session of the congress.

Over 110 proposals of Colloquia and Workshops have been accepted, covering a wide range, from theoretical issues to public archaeology. Accordingly, the Congress will be articulated in six main sections: “Theory and Methods”, “Archaeo-sciences”, “Hunter-gatherers”, “First farmers”, “Early metallurgy and complex societies”, “Other”.

It is important to mention that several sessions will be articulated in two major clusters: “Southern America Archaeology Panorama” and “Global State of the Art” (the later in association with IFRAO, the International Federation of Rock Art Organizations).

In the framework of the Congress preparation, the various UISPP Scientific Commissions have been most active, while proposals to establish new Commissions after 2006 are being prepared.

You will also find a paper on the Prehistory of India, by our new member of the Congress Secretary, Dr. Manoj Kumar Singh, from New Deli University.

This third issue of the Congress Bulletin includes the up-dated information and also the invitation for you to register as a member of the Congress, eventually proposing the participation in one of the already listed sessions, or suggesting a new one. In this issue, you will find the full list of proposals. You may submit papers either to one of them or to the common sessions that will be organised, as usual, in the Congress. You may also register as a volunteer (note that only 160 volunteers will be accepted).

Let me insist in the need to register as early as possible. This way you will save money (paying a lower fee) and contribute the preparation of the congress, since this has very significant costs that may only be faced with the contributions of all participants.

The Congress secretary will assist any demand of support to help preparing sessions or other events. Count on us, as we count on you.

Archaeological greetings,

Luiz Oosterbeek
Professor, Instituto Politécnico de Tomar, Portugal
Introduction, par Luiz Oosterbeek, Secrétaire Général du XV Congrès

Chers collègues,

On approche le XV Congrès de l’Union Internationale des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques (UISPP/IUPPS) et, notamment, la date limite pour proposer des communications.

The XV Congress of the IUPPS will be held in Lisbon, in 2006, but its preparation includes several ongoing activities. These include not only the preparation of sessions, but the organisation of conferences and debates in 2003, 2004 and 2005, as well as the edition of several volumes devoted to Portuguese archaeology, that will be available in the opening session of the congress.


Il faut mentionner que plusieurs sessions seront articulées sous deux grands “clusters”: “Panorama de l’Archéologie en Amérique du Sud” et “L’État de l’Art Global” (ceci en association avec IFRAO, la Fédération Internationale d’Organisations d’Art Rupestre).

Dans le cadre de la préparation du Congrès, les différentes Commissions Scientifiques de l’UISPP se sont engagées avec des propositions, alors que de suggestions de nouvelles Commissions, pour démarrer en 2006, sont en train d’être préparées.

Vous trouverez, aussi, un article sur la Préhistoire en Inde, par notre nouveau membre du Secrétariat du Congrès, Manoj Kumar Singh, de l’Université de New Deli.

Ce troisième numéro du Bulletin du Congrès inclue les informations ajournées et vous invite à l’enregistrement comme membre du Congrès, soit comme participant à des séances déjà proposées, soit en proposant une nouvelle. Vous pouvez, aussi, vous enregistrer comme volontaire. Dans ce numéro vous trouverez la liste complète des sessions. Vous pouvez soumettre vos communications soit à une de ces sessions, soit aux sessions communes qui seront, comme d’habitude, organisées. Vous pouvez, aussi, vous enregistrer comme volontaire (seulement 160 volontaires seront acceptés).

Permettez moi d’insister sur le besoin d’un enregistrement le plus tôt possible. Comme ça vous sauvez de l’argent (payant un moindre frais d’inscription) et vous contribuez à la préparation du Congrès, car celle ci a un coût significatif, qui ne peut être considéré qu’avec la contribution de tous les participants.

Le secrétariat du Congrès répondra à toutes les demandes de soutien pour la préparation de séances ou d’autres événements. Comptez sur nous, comme on compte sur vous.

Salutations archéologiques,

Luiz Oosterbeek
Professeur, Instituto Politécnico de Tomar, Portugal
Dear Colleagues,

In its XIVth Congress, that took place in Liège, Belgium, on September 2001, the UISPP has decided to held its XVth congress in Lisbon, Portugal on September 2006, having Prof. Luiz Oosterbeek, from the Polytechnic Institute of Tomar, as its General Secretary, and the major responsible for the event’s organization.

Hence, during this great meeting of archaeologists from all over the world, Portugal and, namely, its capital famous for its climate and openness to all people, will have the honour to receive our community and to make all the possible, with everyone’s collaboration, from archaeologists to public and private entities, to convert this scientific meeting into an unforgettable cultural and human experience.

As you know, our Union and its congresses (that take place every 5 years) brings together colleagues from all over the world and deals with all archaeology’s domains, chronologies and topics, always seeking for the greatest scope possible.

In a planet where the conflicts and misunderstandings between cultures are spreading in a worrying way, our scientific, cultural and civic mission is to create moments of pause, of meeting together, of exchanges of points of view, and to promote a better future for humankind, that cannot be reached but through the understanding and absolute equal respect for all the cultural traditions and for the heritage of all cultures and people.

Archaeology has given, and will continue to give, a great contribution to achieve such a positive utopia, that moves us towards a fruitful and fraternal knowledge creation.

In fact, it studies all peoples and cultural traditions in their specificities, the unique contributions each of them, throughout space and time, opening the way to the creation of such an immense wealth, the one of cultural diversity. We must not let it be lost, since it is part of the heritage we must consolidate and hand-over for future generations.

Being so, it is for me an honour to address myself to the colleagues in the whole world, on behalf of UISPP, of its General Secretary, Prof. Jean Bourgeois, from Gent University, Belgium, and of the XVth Congress’ Secretary General, appealing to your active participation in this major meeting, through your presence, through the presentation of papers or other interventions, but also through suggestions that you might want to address to the Congress’ Secretary General and that will, undoubtedly, constitute a good help to the congress’ success.

I send you my archaeological greetings and, on behalf of the UISPP and my own country, thank you in advance for any collaboration you will offer.

Vitor Oliveira Jorge
Professor, University of Oporto, Portugal
Invitation, par Vítor Oliveira Jorge, Président de l’UISPP

CHERS COLLÈGUES,


Ainsi, durant cette réunion majeure de tous les archéologues du monde, le Portugal et, en particulier, sa capitale, célèbre pour son climat et pour son ouverture à tous les peuples, auront l’honneur d’accueillir notre communauté et de tout faire pour lui proportionner, avec la collaboration de tous, archéologues et entités publiques et privées, une expérience scientifique, culturelle et humaine inoubliable.

Comme vous le savez, notre Union et ses congrès (qui s’effectuent de 5 en 5 ans) abritent en son sein des collègues de tous les pays et visent tous les domaines, périodes et thèmes de l’archéologie, en cherchant la plus grande couverture possible.

Dans une planète où les conflits et les incompréhensions entre cultures se généralisent de manière préoccupante, notre mission scientifique, culturelle et civique est de générer un centre de pause, des rencontres, d’échanges de vues, et une atmosphère de construction d’un meilleur futur pour l’humanité, qui ne pourra se réaliser que dans l’entente et le respect pour toutes les traditions culturelles et pour le patrimoine de toutes les cultures et peuples en absolue égalité de circonstances.

Pour cette utopie positive, parce qu’elle nous mobilise pour l’action fructueuse et fraternelle de la création du savoir, l’archéologie a donné, et continuera a donner, des contributions très significatives.

En effet, elle traite tous les peuples et toutes les traditions culturelles dans leur particularité, dans leur contribution unique que chacun d’eux a donné, dans l’espace et le temps, pour la création d’une immense richesse, celle de la diversité culturelle, que nous ne pouvons pas laisser se perdre car elle fait partie de l’héritage que nous devons consolider et transmettre.

De ce fait, c’est pour moi un honneur de m’adresser à tous les collègues du monde, au nom de l’UISPP, de son Secrétaire général, le Prof. Jean Bourgeois, de l’Université de Gent, Belgique, et du Secrétaire général du XVème Congrès, appelant à votre participation active lors de cette réunion majeure, par votre présence personnelle, par la présentation de communications et d’autres interventions, mais aussi, dès maintenant, par des suggestions que vous voudriez bien envoyer au Secrétaire général du Congrès et qui seront, certainement, une aide inestimable pour le succès de ce Congrès.

Mes chaleureuses salutations archéologiques. Et, aussi, au nom de l’UISPP et de mon pays, merci beaucoup, d’ores et déjà, de toute votre collaboration.

Vitor Oliveira Jorge
Professeur, Université de Porto, Portugal
IUPPS and Portugal 2006, by Jean Bourgeois, Secretary General of IUPPS

The History of the International Union for Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences goes back, in fact, to the late XIX Century, when Prehistory was beginning (http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Ithaca/7152/histor.html). Since then, regularly, international and world conferences enable the balance of research and a reflection on the future of our science.

UISPP/IUPPS, regrouping a large number of active prehistoric and protohistoric archaeologists throughout the world, includes several organisms. The directing body of our association is the Permanent Council, regrouping several hundreds of scholars from various countries in Europe, Africa, Asia or America. It is worth mentioning that the first Permanent Council of our association, then still called “International Congress for Prehistoric Anthropology and Archaeology (CIAAP)” was held in Lisbon, in 1880. The Executive Committee and the Permanent Council meet regularly (once a year and every two-three years, respectively), to define the orientation of the IUPPS, namely during the world congresses, every five years.

The scientific basic and daily activity is mostly the work of various scientific commissions and special committees, devoted to specific topics, that organise meetings, congresses and colloquia, publishing several proceedings,… in a word, doing everything a world organisation, representing a large part of the worlds’ archaeological experts, should do.

Next major activity will be IUPPS’ XV world Congress, held in Lisbon, in Portugal, in September 2006. Our Portuguese colleagues have already started its preparation, and we are convinced it will be a great moment for our association and for Portugal.

The greatest advantage offered by Portugal for such an event, apart from the country’s beauty and attractive climate, is the fact that the country’s richness in archaeological remains, and that archaeological research in Portugal has been strongly developed; it will seduce those that still don't know this rich remains. Also, for its past and geographic location, Portugal is an ideal launching base for Africa and Southern America; this should enable to state, more than before, the international and world mission our organisation must develop. Let us hope that the Lisbon Congress enables such contacts with various countries. This is the way to correspond to the wishes of the founders of the association, back in the XIX Century.

Jean Bourgeois
Professor, Ghent University, Belgium
L’UISPP et le Portugal 2006, par Jean Bourgeois,
Sécrétaire Général de l’UISPP

L’histoire de l’Union Internationale des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques remonte en fait à la fin du XIXème siècle, quand la préhistoire prenait son élan (http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Ithaca/7152/histor.html). Depuis, très régulièrement, des conférences internationales et mondiales permettent de faire le bilan de la recherche et réfléchir sur l’avenir de notre science.

L’UISPP, qui regroupe un grand nombre d’archéologues actifs dans la recherche préhistorique et protohistorique dans le monde, se compose de divers organismes. L’organe directeur de notre association est le Conseil Permanent, qui regroupe plusieurs centaines de chercheurs de nombreux pays, d’Europe, d’Afrique, d’Asie ou d’Amérique. Il est intéressant de noter que le premier Conseil Permanent de notre Association, qui s’appelait alors encore Congrès international d’Anthropologie et d’Archéologie préhistoriques (C.I.A.A.P.) a été créé à Lisbonne, en 1880. Le Comité Exécutif, qui regroupe 15 représentants élus, s’occupe de la gestion générale de l’association. Comité Exécutif et Conseil Permanent se réunissent régulièrement (resp. chaque année et tous les deux-trois ans) pour définir la ligne de l’UISPP, notamment lors des grands congrès mondiaux, qui se tiennent tous les cinq ans.

L’activité scientifique de base et au quotidien est plutôt le travail des nombreuses commissions scientifiques et comités spéciaux, qui s’occupent de thèmes spécifiques, organisent des réunions et des congrès ou colloques, publient de nombreux actes,... en un mot, font ce que l’on peut attendre d’une organisation mondiale, représentative d’une grande partie du monde archéologique.

La prochaine activité majeure est le XVème congrès mondial de l’UISPP, qui se tiendra à Lisbonne, au Portugal, en septembre 2006. Nos collègues portugais ont déjà commencé les préparatifs de ce congrès, qui ne manquera pas d’être, nous en sommes convaincus, un grand moment pour notre association et pour le Portugal.

Le grand avantage qu’offre le Portugal pour une telle organisation, outre la beauté du pays et son climat attrayant, est que le pays est riche en vestiges archéologiques, que le monde de la recherche archéologique au Portugal est fortement développé et qu’il ne manquera pas de séduire ceux qui n’en connaissent pas encore la richesse. D’autre part, de par son passé et sa position géographique, le Portugal est une ‘tête de pont’ idéale vers l’Afrique et l’Amérique du Sud; cela devrait permettre d’affirmer plus qu’auparavant, la mission internationale et mondiale que notre organisation entend développer. Espérons que le congrès de Lisbonne permette justement de développer les contacts avec ces nombreux pays. Ainsi, nous répondrons aux vœux des fondateurs de l’association, au XIXème siècle.

Jean Bourgeois
Professeur, Université de Gand, Belgique
Organization
The Congress will be held in Lisbon, at the University of Lisbon (Alameda da Universidade) in September 2006, under the organisation of a National Secretary hosted by the Polytechnic Institute of Tomar.
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GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE XV CONGRESS
INFORMATION GÉNÉRALE SUR LE CONGRÈS

When?
From the 4th to the 9th September, 2006

Quand?
Du 4 au 9 Septembre, 2006

Where?
Lisbon, Portugal. Lisbon is the Capital of Portugal, hosting a very rich complex of Museums and archaeological sites. The Congress will be held at the University of Lisbon (Alameda da Universidade, Underground station: “Cidade Universitária”), the welcoming desk being located in the Faculty of Arts (Faculdade de Letras). The opening and closing sessions will be in the Rectory (Reitoria) building, and the sessions will also be held in the Faculties of Law (Faculdade de Direito) and Sciences (Faculdade de Ciências).

Où?
Lisbonne, Portugal. Lisbonne c’est la capitale du Portugal, abritant un très riche complexe de musées et de sites archéologiques. Le Congrès se tiendra à l’Université de Lisbonne (Alameda da Universidade, station de métro: “Cidade Universitária”), avec l’accueil à la Faculté de Lettres (Faculdade de Letras). Les sessions d’ouverture et de clôture seront tenues dans le bâtiment du Rectorat (Reitoria), et les sessions se tiendront aussi dans les Facultés de Droit (Faculdade de Direito) et des Sciences (Faculdade de Ciências).

Address of the Secretary of the Congress
Adresse du Secrétariat du Congrès
Secretary of the XVth Congress of the U.I.S.P.P., c/ Prof. Luiz Oosterbeek, Instituto Politécnico de Tomar, Estrada da Serra, 2300 TOMAR, Portugal
uispp.xvcongress@ipt.pt

How to register?
You should register as soon as possible, in order to obtain a lower fee. Complete the record form in this bulletin and return it to, together with the payment (bank transfer
or credit card permission) to the Secretary of the Congress (or Top Atlântico agency), or make your on-line registration at www.uispp.ipt.pt. Registrations will only be considered if payment is also made, by sending a cheque in the due amount to the same address, by credit card permission (use included form) or by bank transfer to our account:

Bank: CAIXA GERAL DE DEPÓSITOS

Account holder: Instituto Politécnico de Tomar – UISPP
Agency: Tomar
Client n.º 100242648
Account n.º: 0813052724930
Currency: Euro
NIB: 003508130005272493062
IBAN: PT50003508130005272493062
BIC of the Bank: CGDIPTPL

Comment s’enregistrer?

Vous devrez vous enregistrer le plus tôt possible, pour bénéficier d’un moindre frais d’inscription. Complétez le formulaire dans ce bulletin et renvoyez-le au secrétariat du congrès (ou à l’agence Top Atlântico), où faites un enregistrement on-line sur www.uispp.ipt.pt. Les enregistrements ne seront considérés que si le payement a été fait aussi, soit para cheque envoyé à la même adresse, soit par permission de carte de crédit soit encore par transfert bancaire pour le compte suivant:

Banque: CAIXA GERAL DE DEPÓSITOS

Titulaire du compte: Instituto Politécnico de Tomar – UISPP
Agence: Tomar
Client n.º 100242648
Compte n.º: 0813052724930
Monnaie: Euro (€)
NIB: 003508130005272493062
IBAN: PT50003508130005272493062
BIC de la Banque: CGDIPTPL

Dead-lines

Proposal of papers/posters: January 2006

Dates limite

Proposition de communications/posters: Janvier 2006
**Participation fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Payment between January 1st and April 30th 2006</th>
<th>Payment after May 1st 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fee</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced fee</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying people</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registration entitles to be considered a member of the UISPP (except for accompanying people) until the following congress, to participate in the Congress events and to receive its pre-congress general publications. Full membership entitles also to receive the pre-congress publications, the final programme and abstracts book, the excursions guides, one excursion during the congress and entries in some Museums. Accompanying people will not receive pre-congress general publications.

Reduced fee is offered to Congress sessions’ organisers, students aged less than 30 years old and participants from countries considered by the World Bank to have a low or medium income (listed in the Congress web-site: www.uispp.ipt.pt).

**Frais d’inscription**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Payement entre le 1er Janvier et le 30 Avril 2006</th>
<th>Payement après le 1er Mai 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inscription normale</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription réduite</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompagnateur</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L’inscription donne le droit à être considéré membre de l’UISPP (excepté pour les accompagnants) jusqu’au prochain congrès, a participer aux événements du Congrès et recevoir les publications générales du pré congrès. L’inscription complète permet aussi de recevoir les publications du congrès. Les accompagnants ne reçoivent pas les publications générales pré congrès.

L’inscription réduite s’applique aux coordinateurs de sessions, aux étudiants de moins de 30 ans et aux membres des pays considérés par la Banque Mondiale comme ayant un revenus bas ou moyen (voir liste sur le site du congrès: www.uispp.ipt.pt).
How to participate in the Excursions?

The Congress will organise excursions in Portugal and Spain, before and after the Congress. Information will be available in the next issue of the Bulletin and on the Congress web-site: www.uispp.ipt.pt. The excursions will be managed with the collaboration of Top Atlântico tour operator (check the congress web site).

Comment participer aux excursions?


How to organise my travel? How to find accommodation?

You will find all support from the official tour operator of the Congress: TOP ATLÂNTICO (lisboa.congress@topatlantico.pt).

Information concerning accommodation will be available in the congress web-site. The Congress has nominated TAP Air Portugal as official air travel company (that will offer reduced prices to participants – check bellow).

We strongly recommend all colleagues travelling from countries from where a Visa is requested, to address the Congress secretary as soon as possible, in order to avoid last minute difficulties and to contact, when needed, the relevant embassies.

Comment organiser mon voyage? Où trouver du logement?

Vous trouverez tout soutien nécessaire de la part de notre agence de voyages official: TOP ATLÂNTICO (lisboa.congress@topatlantico.pt).

Les informations sur le logement seront disponibles sur le site Internet du Congrès. Le Congrès a nommé la compagnie aérienne officielle: TAP Air Portugal (qui offrira des réductions de prix de voyages en avion pour les congressistes – voir ci-dessous).

Nous conseillons vivement tous les collègues qui viennent de pays qui demandent un Visa de s’adresser au Secrétariat du Congrès dés maintenant, pour éviter des difficultés de dernière minute, et de contacter, si nécessaire, les ambassades.

Do I need a Visa?

Est-ce que j’ai besoin d’un Visa?

Only people coming from the following list of countries/special regions DO NOT need a Visa.

Seulement les personnes a provenance des pays/régions spéciales de la liste suivante N’ONT PAS BESOIN d’un Visa.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>Equator</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Holy See</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Macau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People coming from any other country **NEED TO HAVE A VISA.**

Les personnes a provenance de tous les autres pays/régions **ONT BESOIN D’UN VISA**
TIPOLOGY OF SESSIONS (papers for the sessions should be sent to the co-ordinator or the Congress Secretary)

The congress will be organised in Sections, Workshops and Colloquia.

Sections follow the activities of the UISPP commissions, and cover all chronological topics. Their aim is to gather together several experts, to discuss a variety of themes within a global subject.

Workshops address new research topics, either not considered by the Commissions or having a limited thematic scope. Their aim is to promote discussion on these topics, and to suggest guidelines for further work.

Colloquia are sessions organised by at least to co-ordinators from two different countries, aiming at bringing together up-dated perspectives on a major relevant topic, and leading to specific conclusions.

There will be paid excursion in the last week in August and the second week in September, and a free excursion during the congress. The sessions will take place in Lisbon, the first week in September 2006.

Note: Several proposed colloquia and workshops will be articulated within two major components of the Congress, entitled:

• “SAP – Southern America Archaeology Panorama”, under the general co-ordination of Maria Dulce Gaspar, Saúl Eduardo Milder and Fábio Vergara Cerqueira

• “GSA – Gobal State of the Art”, organised jointly by the 9th Scientific Commission of UISPP and IFRAO, under the general co-ordination of Jean Clottes, Mila Simões Abreu and Hipolito Collado

TIPOLOGIE DES SESSIONS (communications pour les sessions doivent être envoyées aux coordinateurs où au Secrétariat du Congrès)

Le Congrès sera organisé en trois types de sessions: Sections, Ateliers et Colloques.

Les Sections suivront les activités des commissions de l’UISPP, et couvriront tous les topiques chronologiques. Leur but est de rassembler plusieurs experts afin de discuter une variété de thèmes à l’intérieur d’un sujet global.

Les Colloques sont des sessions organisées au moins par deux coordinateurs provenant de deux pays différents, dans le but de créer perspectives actualisées sur un topique de grand relief, et arriver à des conclusions spécifiques.
Les Ateliers traitent de nouveaux topiques de recherche, n’ayant pas encore été considérés par la commission ou ayant un domaine thématique limité. Leur objectif est de promouvoir des discussion sur ces thèmes, et suggérer des lignes d’orientations pour des travaux futurs.

Il y aura des excursions payées la dernière semaine en Août et la deuxième semaine en septembre, ainsi qu’une excursion offerte pendant le Congrès. Les sessions auront lieu à Lisbonne, la première semaine de septembre, 2006.

Note: Plusieurs colloques et ateliers seront articulés avec deux composantes majeures du Congrès, intitulées:

- “SAP – Panorama de l’Archéologie en Amérique du Sud”, sous la coordination générale de Maria Dulce Gaspar, Saül Eduardo Milder, et Fábio Vergara Cerqueira

ALREADY PROPOSED COLLOQUIA
(C02, C07, C10, C19, C30, C49, C50 have been cancelled or merged other colloquia)

COLLOQUES DÉJÀ PROPOSÉS (version française sur www.uispp.ipt.pt)
(C02, C07, C10, C19, C30, C49, C50 ont été cancellés ou on rejoint d’autres colloques)

C01 – Status of Prehistoric studies in the twenty first century in India
État de l’art des études préhistoriques au XXIe siècle en Inde
(Ranjana Ray – ranthro@caluniv.ac.in, Vidula Jayswal – vidulaj@satyam.net.in)
India has amassed a wealth of data on prehistory in the last century. Still major part of it is with focus on regional characters. Vital information on dates are sparse. So is about the makers of the cultures in the subcontinent. A colloquium with the participation of both senior and young prehistorians from India will bring into proper perspective the work so far done. This will point out the limitations and throw light on the methodology and future programme for clearer understanding of the situation. The colloquium will be open to other participants who may like to take up work in the subcontinent in future and those who would share their experiences.
C03 – Theoretical Trends in South American Archaeology
Tendances Théoriques dans l'Archéologie Sud-Américaine
(Tânia Andrade de Lima – talima@montreal.com.br)
This symposium will present an overview of the theoretical trends at the basis of South American archaeology from the second half of the 20th century until the present days. Counting with the participation of archaeologists from several South American countries (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela), we intend to discuss topics such as the European influence in South American archaeology, the strong penetration of North American theory, and the independent thought of South American's Social Archaeology, opening the debate for an analysis of the theoretical consistency of the archaeological production in South America.
(SAP)

C04 – Technology and Methodology for Archaeological Practice: Practical applications for the past reconstruction
Technologie et Méthodologie pour la pratique en Archéologie: applications pratiques pour la reconstruction du passé
(Alexandra Velho – alexfiga@ipt.pt, Hans Kamermans – H.Kamermans@arch.leidenuniv.nl, UISPP Comm.4)
New methods arise everyday, as technology goes further and new opportunities of analysis are given. From Statistics to Artificial Intelligence, from GIS to 3D, today's archaeological practice has changed, as computers become more and more included in our lives. This is the space of innovation, were we invite the presentation of new ways of being archaeologist.

C05 – Re-construction, simulation, reconstitution – How real is our real, how fake is our past?
Reconstruction, simulation, reconstitution – Combien réel est notre réel? Jusqu’a quel point notre passé est imaginé?
(Gonçalo Velho – gonvelho@ipt.pt, François Djindjian – francois.djindjian@wanadoo.fr, UISPP Comm.4)
As Computer methods are developed, new means are used to present the message: Multimedia, Hyper-text, or interactive Documentaries. Following McLuhan (1994) ideas that the mean is the message, and Baudrillard philosophy that in our time all is simulation, we are challenged through the idea of what is our Past: a today's construction or a scientific result through defined methods. This world in which we are living allows us to jump into new paradigms in which technology has an important role. The challenge that we invite you in is to think on this new opportunities that arouse on this world, which take us a little bit closer to the most real reality: a hiper-reality.
Sub-colloquium: Emergence of cognitive abilities (organised in the context of C05)

Sous-colloque: Émergence des compétences cognitives (organisé dans le cadre de C05)

(Sophie Archambault de Beaune – sophie.de-beaune@mae.u-paris10.fr, Roberto Flores Guevara – rflores@cochin.inserm.fr)

The cognitive abilities of the ancient hominids seem to appear very progressively in so far as the material evidences that they left behind them are taken into account. In fact, their technical productions, which appeared more than 2 million years BP, improved very slowly. On the other hand, the evidence of non utilitarian practices, such as the burial of deaths or the first graphic expressions, made their appearance much later, not before 100 000 years BP. Besides, the human fossils themselves indicate a gradual evolution with in particular an uniform growth of the brain size.

We can query about the emergence conditions of these material and “symbolic” productions and ask oneself why only the human species could develop it. If we admit that they reflect a modification of the cognitive skills, then it is advisable to wonder what these capacities consist of? We could thus question the capacities of anticipation of the bifaces makers or the capacities of abstraction and symbolization of the first men having buried their deaths.

We could also seek to understand the conditions which led to the installation of a variety of cognitive processes during the evolution. Are they answers to the requests of a changing environment? Or the result of an evolution of the neurophysiological organization of the brain? Or a better use of anatomical and cerebral structures already installed there at the beginnings of the hominisation? It is also possible to consider a more active role of hominoids on their own development and query about the impact of their activity in the emergence of new cognitive abilities.

One can also ask whether there is something specific to the human species that could explain why the nearest parents of the hominoids, the apes, do not seem to have access to such cognitive aptitudes, at least not in so developed and systematic a manner. Are these differences the result of simply diverging process in species with equivalent potentialities at the beginning? Are there neurophysiologic differences important enough to explain these ability differences? Or is it the aptitude to transmit their knowledge to the following generations that would distinguish the human primates compared to the non human primates?

All these questions and many other deserve to be debated. This is the reason why it seemed to us that it could be profitable to rassemble specialists of different disciplines – paleoanthropologists, prehistorians, neuropsychologists, neurophysiologists, cognitivists, ethologists – all interested in the question of the emergence of cognitive abilities in the first hominoids, so that they could confront their points of view and their knowledge.
C06 – History of Human populations, palaeoecology and ancient DNA

Histoire du peuplement, paleoécologie et ADN ancien

(Eric Crubezy, Eugénia Cunha – cunhae@ci.uc.pt, Bertrand Ludes)

In the last few years, genetic studies on past human populations have developed considerably and ancient DNA became an indispensable tool in those. Either studying the history of Human populations, the kinship relations within necropolis, epidemiology or Man/animal relations, palaeogenetic studies provided spectacular insights. This colloquium aims at producing a global synthesis of these works and to explore new perspectives. All teams working in this domain are invited to participate in it.

C08 – Bioarchaeology from the Midst of Shells

La Bioarchéologie a partir des amas coquillers

(Sheila Mendonça, Eugenia Cunha – cunhae@ci.uc.pt, Sabine Eggers, – saeggers@usp.br)

The growing field of bioarchaeology has focussed primarily on methodological as well as local or regional issues during the last few years. However, certain archaeological sites scattered around the world do share some common features, a fact that opens the opportunity of better understanding human adaptation and adaptability in the past. This colloquium will focus on Mesolithic shell middens of Portugal and shellmounds from Brazil, aimed at shedding light on biarchaeological differences between fluvial and maritime/lacustric settlements regarding four main subjects: a) type and degree of bony manifestations of disease and stress; b) degree of the association of anaemia to infectious diseases; c) occurrence and expression of occupational stress, considering technological variation and adaptive strategies and d) dental diseases and wear in the light of prevailing subsistence patterns.

C09 – Land snails as food: past and present

Escargots comme nourriture: passé et présent

(David Lubell – david.lubell@ualberta.ca)

Land snails are a frequent, often abundant, component in a few Late Pleistocene and in hundreds of early to mid Holocene archaeological deposits throughout the circum-Mediterranean region. The most spectacular examples are the Capsian escargotières of eastern Algeria and southern Tunisia, but archaeological sites containing abundant land snail shells that represent food debris are known from Cantabria, the Pyrenees, southern France, Italy, southeastern Europe including the Balkans, Cyprus and the Levant, the Zagros region, Ukraine and Cyrenaica. Outside the Mediterranean area the occurrence of land snails as food debris in archaeological deposits is less common, but nonetheless present in a number of regions, including Brazil, Peru, Texas, the Caribbean, East Africa, Nigeria and Sudan. There is also evidence for past and modern use of amphibious fresh water snails as food amongst the Maya, while fresh water snails are known from Mesolithic and Neolithic sites in several regions of China. What is the significance of land snails as prehistoric food? Do they represent a signature for the period just prior to the adoption
of food producing economies? Were they a starvation food or are they evidence of feasting? Were they, in some cases, domesticated? What is the nutritional contribution of land snails to prehistoric and ethnographically documented diets? These are all questions that remain to be answered, and it will be the goal of this colloquium to bring together a group of interested scholars to develop means to answer them.

C11 – Ancient Cultural Landscapes in South Europe – their ecological setting and evolution

Ancien Terroirs de l’Europe du Sud – Son organisation écologique et évolution

(José Eduardo Mateus – jmateus@ipa.min-cultura.pt, Paula Queiroz – pqueiroz@ipa.min-cultura.pt)

The workshop intends to contribute to an overview on the new research perspectives, strategies, disciplinary contributions, and results on the ancient Mediterranean human territories. Theoretical, methodological and practical aspects will be considered. Emphasis is made on the ecological settings of these very ancient cultural landscapes, namely on the synchronous distribution of their (explored and potential) resource pools, their spatial (discontinuous / continuous) partition and organization, and their (ecological / economical) functioning. In what concerns diachrony focus will be made on the origin of the anthropogenically-induced eco-territorial sub-systems, their cultural and ecological (stability / instability) dynamics, their short-term trajectories, and long-term evolution and heritage. Finally, inter-regional regularities and/or discrepancies across the entire Mediterranean Region in their South-North and West-East gradients will be discussed.

C12 – Symbolic Wars

Guerres Symboliques

(Claire Smith – claire.smith@flinders.edu.au)

We live in a globalised world, in which the media are embedded in military undertakings, ensuing an increased commodification of war. One aspect of this is that more and more, battles are being fought through symbolic, rather than military, means. This process is exemplified in the events of September 11th and the consequent war against terrorism. These events can be interpreted in terms of a war which is being fought through symbols as much as through arms. In symbolic wars such as this the aim becomes that of destroying the cultural icons which communities use to establish and nurture their identities and alliances, rather than that of destroying traditional military targets. This session will consider the manner in which people use symbols to wage war, negotiate social position and undermine rivals. It will consider not only the uses of symbols within the context of war but also the manner in which symbols are used to jockey for position in everyday life.
C13 – The earliest inhabitants in Europe

Les premiers habitants en Europe

(Henry de Lumley – iph@mnhn.fr, UISPP Comm.3)

Several recent discoveries have renewed our knowledge on the earliest inhabitants of Europe. We know now, thanks to the findings made at Barranco León and Fuente Nueva 3, that they occupied the Mediterranean coasts since 1.3 Ma. Several fundamental problems remain unsolved:

• Where these earliest humans are coming from and the main stages of their progression through the Continent. One or several waves of settlement.
• Who were these Men: *Homo habilis, Homo rudolfensis, Homo georgicus, Homo ergaster, Homo erectus, Homo antecessor, Homo cepranensis.*
• Different raw materials débitage strategies.
• Typological characteristics of the earliest industries in Europe.
• Cultural assignements: Preolduwayen, Oldowayen, archaic industry.
• Dynamics of the interactions between the earliest europeans and their environment. Are there climatic reasons that explain the arrival of the first europeans.

C14 – Modern Humans origins in Eurasia

Origines de l’homme moderne en Eurasie

(Marcel Otte – prehist@ulg.ac.be, Janus Kozlowski – kozlowski@argohist.uj.edu.pl, Jean Pierre Bocquet – Appel – bocquet-appel@ivry.cnrs.fr)

The modifications impended into European Prehistory on the origins of modern Man have various origins, probably related to different cultural environments that were crossed and modified by this general process, having an external origin. At the same time, Humankind was changing in Europe (isolating itself genetically) and the external input was significant, for its speed and its radical differences. Local populations “could” adapt to it, but the greatest impact came from a migration of technically, anatomically and spiritually more evolved people. This (non African!) migration was a choc, that had very different repercussions according to the cultural milieu where it intervened. This acculturation and mixing phenomenon was probably the most important for the whole history of the European continent.

C15 – Iran Palaeolithic

Le Paléolithique d’Iran

(Marcel Otte – prehist@ulg.ac.be, Fereidoun Biglari – fbiglari@yahoo.com, Jacques Jaubert – j.jaubert@iquat.u-bordeaux.fr)

The Zagros mountains contain several caves, hardly explored. Certain of these have an ancient Aurignacian, crucial for the origins of modern Man in Europe. The colloquium makes the state of the art of what has been discovered and what is in process of research.
C16 – Palaeolithic hunter-gatherers concept of territory
Le concept de territoire chez les chasseurs-cueilleurs paléolithiques

(François Djindjian – francois.djindjian@wanadoo.fr, J. K. Kozlowski – kozlowski@argo.hist.uj.edu.pl, Nuno Bicho – nbicho@ualg.pt, UISPP Comm.4/Comm. 8)

How to apply hunter-gatherers concept of territory, known through comparative ethnography, to Palaeolithic populations? The methodological proposed approach consists in evidencing the areas delimited by hunter-gatherer displacements for: raw-materials procurement (flint, shells, etc.); cyclic seasonal habitats and hunting camps, looking for food required resources for the groups, life. Then, we will try to relate those displacement spaces with identified cultural areas, from the material culture structuration within a given space-time: lithic and bone industry; parietal and mobile art. Finally, we will relate these spaces with geographic spaces, structured by hydrographical basins and mountains, closing of opening with climatic variations during the late pleniglaciar, with opening and closing of passages, favouring or restricting displacements. We will then try to deduct a general organisation model for hunter-gatherer human groups, with their identification systems on one hand and exchanges on the other, in association with their territories. Participants will be invited to bring methodological and archaeological contributions for evidencing spaces and displacements, cultural areas, geographic closed spaces, etc., enabling to enrich the definition of the concept of Palaeolithic territory.

C17 – Late Palaeolithic Environments and Cultural Relations around the Adriatic
Environements du Paléolithique final et rapports culturels autour de l’Adriatique

(Amilcare Bietti – ARCHE@roma1.infn.it, Robert Whallon – whallon@umich.edu)

Similarities between Late Paleolithic/Epipaleolithic archaeological assemblages from both sides of the Adriatic have been noted several times in the past. At the same time, the area itself was undergoing major geographical and environmental changes during the late Pleistocene and early Holocene. The interplay between geographical and environmental changes on the one hand and cultural areas and contacts on the other must have been varied and complex. This symposium aims to bring together prehistorians and geologists who will present new data and analyses that add to and clarify our picture of Late Paleolithic/Epipaleolithic cultures and their contacts within the changing landscape of the Adriatic area in the late Pleistocene and early Holocene.

C18 – Mesolithic/Neolithic interactions in the Balkans and in the middle Danube basin
Interactions Mésolithique/Néolithique dans les Balcans et dans le basin moyen du Danube

(Janusz Kozlowski – kozlowski@argo.hist.uj.edu.pl, Marek Nowak – nniauj@interia.pl, UISPP Comm.12)

The problem of the role of Mesolithic basis in the Neolithization process in South-East Europe is crucial for the understanding of new economy diffusion and new ways of living. This problem has been widely discussed in recent years for the western part of central
Europe and in the West. On the contrary, for the South-East, since the Szolnok collo-
quium in 1996, this question hasn’t been approached, despite the increasing number of
discoveries and the studies on early evidences of productive economy within Mesolithic
technologies and the research on continuity-discontinuity of material and symbolic cul-
ture between the Mesolithic and the Neolithic.

C21 – Mounds Construction in the Americas
Construction de tumulus aux Amériques

(Maria Dulce Gaspar – mgaspar@alternex.com.br, Suzanne K. Fish – sfish@u.arizona.edu)

This symposium examines the social implications of mound construction in the Ameri-
cas, exploring variability across regions and time. Central themes are:

- the role of mounds as prominent elements of cultural landscapes, and
- how activities resulting in mounds were intended to transmit the enduring sym-
  bolic messages of their buildings

(SAP)

C22 – Gardeners from South America
Marâichers de l’Amérique du Sud

(Angela Buarque – abuarque@predialnet.com.br,)

The theme of the colloquium “Gardeners from South America” will focus on the presence
of the horticulturalist and ceramist Tupinambá and Guarani groups, their origin, dispersio
and contribution to the biodiversity of the South American continent.

(SAP)

C23 – Plant Use and Food Production in the Americas
Usage des plantes et production de nourriture aux Amériques

(Rita Scheel-Ybert)

Plant gathering, human management and cultivation have always been important in the
economy of prehistoric populations. Although food production is generally considered as
relatively recent in the American continent, palaeoethnobotanical studies suggest that
plant domestication might have begun earlier than it is believed.

(SAP)
C24 – Material Mnemonics in European Prehistory
Aide-mémoires matérielles en Préhistoire Européenne

(Katina Lillios – kallilos@uiowa.edu)

Beginning in the 1990s, there has been a veritable explosion of works in archaeology that concern themselves with memory. Interestingly, and perhaps significantly, much of this literature is devoted to the prehistoric past of Europe. Archaeologists have seemingly ‘discovered memory’ and have been energetically devoting themselves to identifying and analyzing memory practices, memory sites, and material mnemonics. This mnemophilia is clearly related to and dependent on emerging intellectual currents in the study of agency, biography, time, nationalism, and identity politics. Whether memory studies remain a kind of theoretical horizon – broadly experienced but short lived – or matures to become part of a more enduring phase in the evolution of archaeological theory and practice is, however, unknown. This session will provide a forum to reflexively consider where memory studies in archaeology has comes from, where it is now, and where it might lead to in the future through an examination of memory practices in the archaeological past of Europe.

C25 – The protohistoric iron age of South Asia
L’Age du Fer protohistorique du Sud de l’Asie

(S. K. Derarariyagala – asderar@sri.lanka.net)

The protohistoric Iron Age of South Africa is known to have started at well over 1000B.C. It comprises several culture spheres, typified by the situation in India and Sri Lanka, constituting larger culture complexes, such as the Megalithic Complex of peninsular India. Unfortunately, up to now, researchers have not coordinated work so as to produce an integrated view of the archaeological landscape of this period. The aim of this session is to formulate such an integrated views by bringing together the results of recent investigations on the subject.

C26 – Prehistoric Art – Signs, symbols, myth, ideology
Art Préhistorique – Signes, symboles, mythes, idéologie

(Dario Seglie – CeSMAP@cesmap.it, Marcel Otte – prehist@ulg.ac.be, Luiz Oosterbeek – loost@ipt.pt, Laurence Remacle – lremacle@student.ulg.ac.be)

This Colloquium is an important occasion for bringing together researches, opinions, theories, hypothesis and information on Rock Art, in connection with the study of Metaphisics and Ideology. The Colloquium provides the opportunity to discuss the role played by Iconography and Myth and the aid to the study coming from the traditional cultures of people still having a living heritage. In particular, we must debate the following aspects: the relations between native groups, rock art sites and their environment; problems in studying sites that are till “cult places”; problems of archaeological excavation of rock art sites; correlations of palaeo-ethnocultural areas of different periods; iconography of rock art as a reflection of palaeo-ethnic traditions; links between ancient literature, poetry, myth and pre and proto-historic rock art iconography; ritual aspects and meaning; possible roles of rock art.

(GSA)
C27 – Prehistoric art and ideology
Art Préhistorique et Idéologie
(Emmanuel Anati – ccspreist@tin.it, UISPP Comm.9)
A worldview on the interpretation and significance of art, in non-literate societies. A multidisciplinary meeting, joining together art historians, historians of religions, prehistorians, semioticians, anthropologists, ethnologists, archaeologists.
(GSA)

C28 – Symbolic spaces in Prehistoric Art: territories, travels and site location.
Espaces symboliques dans l’Art Préhistorique: territoires, déplacements et localisation des sites
(François Djindjian – francois.djindjian@wanadoo.fr, Luiz Oosterbeek – loost@ipt.pt)
The colloquium will review the issues related to prehistoric art symbolic spaces, taking methodological considerations as a starting point. It aims at bringing theoretic assumptions and arguments on the concept of symbolic spaces of prehistoric art, in relation with the other parts of the upper palaeolithic and later systems of life.
(GSA)

C29 – Epipalaeolithic Rock Art
Art Rupestre Épipaléolithique
(Hipolito Collado Giraldo – hipolitocollado@ozu.es, Milagros Fernandez, Montserrat Girrón)
In this Colloquium one wishes to study problems related with the rock art of Post-Pleistocene societies that still maintained hunting-gathering economies. We will try to define basically the technical, stylistic and iconographic characteristics of this artistic cycle, its geographical dispersion, the chronological limits and the possible continuity or break with regard to the rock art manifestations of Neolithic societies.
(GSA)
C31 – Mountain environments in prehistoric Europe: settlement and mobility strategies from Paleolithic to the early Bronze Age

Environnements montagneux en Europe préhistorique: stratégies de peuplement et mobilité du Paléolithique à l’Âge du Bronze

(Jean Guilaine – jguilaine@wanadoo.fr, Stefano Grimaldi – stefano.grimaldi@lett.unitn.it, Thomas Perrin, UISPP Comm.14)

What was the ecological and cultural role played by the mountains during prehistoric times? Were they mere physical barriers or they just represented cultural borders delimiting the mobility range of geographically-differentiated human groups? What were the adaptive responses in mountaneous environments adopted by nomadic vs. settled societies in relationship to the climatic and environmental changes occurred after the Last Ice Age? How disappeared the last hunter-gatherers who inhabited European mountains? Why settled societies occupied mountain regions where farming activities had to face considerable disadvantage by comparison with farming ones in lowland areas? When and how was the earliest metal production introduced in the mountain habitat? This session will promote a debate over these – and more – questions. It will join all scholars interested in settlement/mobility strategies adopted by prehistoric human groups in mountained environments in Europe. The expected results will be useful for the development of an overall scientific consciousness that could be used towards a geographically-oriented common European research methodology. During the last decades, the quality and quantity of the archeological research programs concerning the past of the European mountains have been dramatically increasing. The Alps represent one of the best examples: thematic conferences (for instance, “Interpretation of Sites and Material Culture from mid-high altitude Mountain Environments”, organised by P. Della Casa & K.Walsh in EAA, Lyon 2004; “Meso’97”, edited by P.Crotti), monographies (“Les Alpes et le Jura: quaternaire et préhistoire ancienne” edited by T.Tillet, among others), periodical round tables (such as those organised yearly by M.Budja in Ljubljana University), exhibitions (such as “Methods in archeological research”, Trento, Italy, 2001) represent only the most visible aspect of this developed awareness for the cultural changes occurred during the prehistory of the Alps. Elsewhere, research examples are given by the well-known Upper Paleolithic/ Mesolithic human frequentation of Cantabric region, the landscape exploitation model developed by the Neanderthals in the French Grand Causses, the cultural richness of the settled societies in the Balkans and, more extensively in Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, this increased awareness to the prehistoric events occurred on European mountains is still lacking a pan-European epistemological link between modern scholars. A powerful debate about the comparison of different archeological realities, research methodologies, theoretical models should be considered one of the most interesting path to provide this link. That is the reason for this proposal which found its origin in the new-born network ALPINET – Alpine Network for Archeological Sciences (with cofinancial participation from EU Culture Commission, Culture2000 Program).
C32 – Contemporary issues in historical archaeology
Thèmes contemporains en archéologie historique
(Pedro Paulo A. Funari – pedrofunari@sti.com.br, Nanci Vieira Oliveira, Andrés Zarankin, Ximena Senatore, Lourdes Domínguez)
The session addresses the main theoretical issues relating to the study of material culture in historical contexts. Particular attention is paid to the relationship between global trends and local specificities in historical archaeology. European, North American and Latin American experiences are explored in different and complementary ways.
(SAP)

C33 – The Palaeolithic of the Balkans
Le Paléolithique des Balkans
(Andreas Darlas – Andreas.Darlas@eps.culture.gr, Dusan Mihailovic – dmihailo@f.bg.ac.yu)
Since the symposium in Ioanninna in 1994 there has not been organized a single meeting about the Palaeolithic of the Balkans. From that time information about the Palaeolithic of certain regions are considerably extended. There have been conducted archaeological excavations at many important sites and analyses of archaeological and paleoecological evidences have been carried out making possible better insight into the material culture and way of life of Palaeolithic communities in this region. The session will consider the results of recent investigations and all other questions related to cultural, economic and social changes in this period.

C34 – Settlement Systems of the Middle Paleolithic and Middle Stone Age
Systèmes d’Habitat du Paléolithique Moyen et de la “Middle Stone Age”
(Nicholas J. Conard – nicholas.conard@uni-tuebingen.de, UISPP Comm.27)
The UISPP Congress in Lisbon provides the venue for the fourth symposium of Commission 27 on settlement systems of the Middle Paleolithic and Middle Stone Age. The symposium welcomes empirically based and theoretical studies of settlement dynamics during the period spanning roughly 300,000 to 30,000 years ago. This is the critical period in which fully modern patterns of cultural behaviour and modern human anatomy evolved. Papers may present social and economic analyses of all classes of archaeological data. Contributions from all parts of the Old World are welcome, and the scale of analysis can range from broad regional studies to specific analyses of single find horizons or sites.
C35 – Neolithic and Chalcolithic architecture in Europe and the near east: techniques of building an spatial organization

L’architecture néolithique et chalcolithique de l’Europe et du moyen orient: techniques de construction et organisation de l’espace

(Dragos Gheorghiu – gheorghiu_dragon@yahoo.com)

The purpose of the session is to offer a new perspective on prehistoric architecture (as constructive methods in relationship with functions and spatial organization), by comparing European and the Near East Neolithic and Chalcolithic building traditions.

The session intends to analyze the process of complexity produced in the architectural technology and spatial organization from Neolithic to Chalcolithic, from the simple semisubterranean dwellings to the large megarons surface dwellings with various secular or cultic functions. Other architectural features to be discussed would be the settlements’ enclosures, the settlements’ walls and palisades, both in open/flat and tell settlements.

Currently there are three archaeological instruments to reconstruct the (today) invisible parts of prehistoric architecture: the physical experiment (very rare performed at the real scale), the theoretical experiment (i.e. the engineering studies of the mechanics of buildings) and the ethnological analogy. Both experimental archaeology and ethnoarchaeology direct to a Medium Range Theory in the archaeological-architectural reconstruction; in this respect the session intends to discuss the limits of these methods and to try to find alternative solutions.

Contributors to the session are asked to discuss the following subjects:

- The comparison of the building traditions from the Near East, the Balkans, Central and Western Europe;
- The processes of technological diffusion within these cultural areas, as well as the local inventions;
- The organization and dimension of built spaces related to materials and building techniques as well as the ergonomic studies of the chaînes – opératoires of the daily life that shaped the internal spatial organization of buildings;
- The cycles of construction and deconstruction (i.e. chaînes – opératoires of building and demolishing, intentional fires, the recycling of materials, etc.);
- The analysis of micro and macro constructive structures;
- The methods of decoration of architectural features (i.e. walls, entrances, columns, pyro-objects, etc.);
- The relationships between society and architectural techniques.
C36 – The eastern Mediterranean in the west – impacts and influences
La Méditerranée orientale à l'Ouest – impactes et influences

(Teresa Júdice Gamito – tgamito@ualg.pt, Claudio Torres, Santiago Macias, Maria e Manuel Maia, Luis Fraga)

The influence of Eastern Mediterranean in the West, along centuries, if not thousands of years, and its contribution to in the development of Europe and westernmost parts of the Mediterranean is a fact that cannot be denied. It all started with the first inhabitants of Europe, in the Neolithic and Calcolithic, in Classical times, in the Roman period, in the Byzantine and Visigoth moments, in the Muslim and Ottoman periods. They were all brought here by different reasons: natural difficulties and stress, economic interests, political power and domain, religious reasons.

The analysis of these different factors and variables is an interesting one to understand the present moment and what we are or became. The flux of influences changed with time, and we see different movements and interests flowing towards the west or towards the east. Examples of this intense interaction are almost endless and interesting to discuss in a Forum like this.

Today’s globalisation is attenuating these influences and a mutual interaction is taking place, in which reality is changing quickly and the adaptation to the new forms of life becoming sometimes difficult.

C37 – Micoquien of Central Europe and Eastern Europe
Le Micoquien en Europe centrale et Europe orientale

(Larissa Koulakovska – laros@i.kiev.ua, Victor Chabai – victor.chabai@kiev.ua, Vitali Usik)

The “Micoquian” was one of the most hot theme in the Middle Paleolithic studies at the end of 60th – beginning of 70th of the last century. These were reflected not only by the discussions on the UISPP congress at Prague (1966) and conference in Poland (1968), but in numerous publications by Bosinski, Kowalski, Ulrix-Closset, Valoch, etc. In general, the discussions were concentrated on Central European Micoquian. In the course of time, the intense interest to Micoquian becomes calm.

The last decade demonstrate the sufficient increase of discussions around Micoquian in Eastern (Donetsk, 1998, 2002), Central (Krakow, 1989 and Miskolc, 1991) and Western Europe, as well as involving in this discussion some related industries, e. g. Yabrudian (Haifa, 1996). The current field investigations expand the geographical limits of Micoquian tool-kits from Portugal to Northern Ural.

Thus, Micoquian is the only Middle Paleolithic industry / techno-complex that was found in all more or less investigated regions of Europe. That is why, it is possible to state the pan-European status of this industry / techno-complex.

The following topics has been proposed for discussion:
1. Micoquian and Middle Paleolithic taxonomy and evolution in Europe;
2. The chronological limits of Micoquian industries;
3. The environmental context of Micoquian occupations;
4. The anthropological context;
5. The technological and typological peculiarities of Micoquian and related industries;
6. The models of raw material and fauna exploitations;
7. The Micoquian and Middle to Upper Paleolithic transition

C38 – European Megaliths and Black Sea hills: possibilities for comparative analysis
Mégalithes Européens et collines de la Mer Noire: possibilités pour l’analyse comparative
(P.P. Tolochko – Académie des Sciences d’Ukraine, Institut d’Archéologie, Av. Héros de Stalingrad, 12, 254655 kiev, Ukraine)

C39 – Lower Paleolithic: short and long chronologies, lithic industries linear evolution models, transition to the middle Palaeolithic
Paléolithique inférieur: chronologies courtes et longues, modèles d’évolution linéaire des industries lithiques, transition au Paléolithique moyen
(João Pedro C. Ribeiro – jpcunharibeiro@netcabo.pt, prov. title)

In the last decades, lower Paleolithic research efforts have allowed the questioning of the prevailing methods about the evolution of their main archaeological remains, the lithic industries. Considering the changes that occurred in the meanwhile in the analytical means of this kind of remains, either with the adoption of new methodologies in the study of this artefacts, or with the renewed analysis of their contexts and their chronologies, in this session we will try to bring together the newest contributions to these themes. We will also try to discuss the final evolution of these industries and the way they were substituted by the Middle Paleolithic industries.

C40 – The entities/identities of the Atlantic and Mediterranean Bronze age
Les entités/identités de l’Âge du Bronze Atlantique et Méditerranéen
(Saíte da Ponte – Saíte.da.Ponte@ipt.pt, Celso Gomes – cgomes@geo.ua.pt, Manuel João Senos Matias – mmatias@geo.ua.pt, Pedro Aguayo de Hoyos – paguayo@ugr.es)

Primary this session aims to promote the debate on the concepts of “identities” and “entities”, social structures and political economies, in the geo-political values complex mosaic of the Iberian Peninsula, as well to monitor the main interactions with the Atlantic and Mediterranean Europe. Secondly, it aims to promote the analysis and interpretation of artefacts, ideas, behaviour of peninsular indigenous communities, and the processes of their restrict and overall engagement with other European societies. Finally, it seek to establish multifunctional, scientific parameters for the known regional Iberian Peninsula Bronze age diversity. Usually, this so it is defined by opinions from several scientific families and therefore divided into two regional areas: Atlantic Bronze/Atlantic Tradition, and Iberian Bronze/Iberian Tradition.
Section (Block 1) – Materials and Methods

Materials: Includes all the analytical techniques and methods that allow both the dating and the physical and chemical characterization.

Methods: Includes all the exploration techniques, that is, Aerophotograph Survey, Satellite Methods and Applicable Geophysics, and Photogrammetry.

Coordinators: Senos Matias and Celso Gomes: mmatias@geo.ua.pt and cgomes@geo.ua.pt

Section (Block 2) – Societies of the Atlantic and Mediterranean Bronze Age

(Includes debate on the concepts of identities and entities, social structures and political economies in the geo-political values complex mosaic of the Iberian Peninsula versus Atlantic and Mediterranean European.

Coordinators: Salete da Ponte and Pedro Aguyao: saleteponte@ipt.pt

C41 – The creation of “significant places” and “landscapes” in the Northwestern half of the Iberia, during Pre and Proto-historic times. Theoretical, recording and interpretation issues from case studies in this region

La création de “lieux signifiants” et “paysages” dans la moitié Norouest de l’Ibérie, pendant les temps Pré et Proto-historiques. Questions théoriques, de registre et d’interprétation, partant de cas d’études de cette région

(Maria de Jesus Sanches – msanches@esoterica.pt, Ramón Fabregas Valcarce – phfabreg@usc.es)

The first aim of this meeting is to bring together an enlarged methodological and interpretative discussion about recent field “symbols” research carried out during the last three decades in north-western Iberia. The second aim concerns different case studies related to its local and archaeological context. Natural carved or painted surfaces, stone-built monuments and the overall settled landscape must be joined together in an interpretative web of social, cosmogonical and political relations that extend, or change, over time. As a result, particular importance is given to local or regional studies where broader interpretative perspectives are emphasized following the concepts of landscape archaeology.

No less important is to bring together researchers (and issues) traditionally constrained to their own specific field: those who investigate pre and proto-historic “art” (rock, megalithic or another kind of art), and those who make “serious” or “hard” field work (ie., excavations), as well as ethnographers, specialists on religion and art, philosophers, and so on. Also theoretical approaches dealing with the relationship between methods of recording and interpretations are other key points of this meeting. We are sadly aware that rock art sites, monuments and a vast array of the archaeological record tend to disappear due to the introduction of heavy machinery in agricultural and forestry works. Therefore, papers containing complete recordings of art (engravings, paintings or “sculptures”) made by modern or, even, experimental methods, are welcome too.
C42 – Space and place construction within stateless lineages societies – the polissemey of architecture

Construction de l’espace et du lieu dans les sociétés sans État et à lignages

(Susana Oliveira Jorge – susana.o.jorge@clix.pt, Vítor Oliveira Jorge – vojorge@clix.pt)

Building space and place, societies with no formal instances of power (namely the State) negotiated ways of introducing order into the world in some way or another. What was (were) the role(s) played by architecture (in the broader sense of the word) in constructing identity and thus producing a sense of community – a particular environment? That sense was certainly vital in oral, lineage societies, where the order needed to the constitution of society and its reproduction had to the inscribed in the very setting of ordinary life in practical action.

C43 – Symbolic figurations in the 4rd and 3rd millenia in the South of the Iberian Peninsula: the engraved schist plaques and their figurative and schematic counterparts

Répresentations symboliques aux 4ème et 3ème millénaires dans le Sud de la Péninsule Ibérique: les plaques votives en schiste, l’art mobilier et parietále.

(Victor S. Gonçalves – vsg@fl.ul.pt)

C44 – Ancient Neolithic in the Iberian Peninsula: regional and transregional components

Le Néolithique ancien dans la Péninsule Ibérique: les éléments régionaux et transregionaux.

(Mariana Diniz)

C45 – Cave Painting among tribals: an ethno-archaeological perspective

Peintures en grotte chez les tribales: une approche ethnoarchéologique

(S. Narayan – cender@satyam.net.in, A. N. Sinha)

The cave paintings are found among tribals globally. The archeologists as well as anthropologist have done considerable work on them in different part of the hills. In Shilavic hills, Rajmahal hills, Baraberhill, Gonda hills, (India), Saepatinimi (China), Himalayan hill region (Nepal) and in many more places we find close correlation in living tribal art and cave arts. The cave arts have influenced the culture tradition, folk paintings of the tribal living in the close vicinity of those cave arts. The proposed session would like to share the research findings and the experiences of the other scholars working in this field. This may open a new vista in anthropological-archaeological researches. It is going to be a strong domain of future archeological-anthropological researches in global perspective. This particular session will be of great importance as well as of interest for those who are working in this field.

(GSA)
C46 – Empowerment of Man through social culture: archaeology – Micro study of the ground level institutions

Donnant du pouvoir à l’Homme à travers la culture sociale: archéologie – micro étude des institutions de base

(Meera Datta – datta.meera@rediffmail.com)

The linkages of Archaeological institutions at village level/local level have been found in the remains of archaeological sites in the global perspective. The contemporary global scenario of such institution present a dismal picture. The present paper aims to highlight the empowerment of local level institutions in global perspective having Archaeological linkages with the various findings at various sites. I would be concentrating mostly on South East Asia scenario from local to global perspective of artifacts and atifacts.

C 47 – Animal Representations in Prehistoric Art

Representations animales en art Préhistorique

(Thomas W. Wyroll – Thomas.Wyroll@gmx.de)

Animals form the bulk of identifiable objects depicted in the art of most prehistoric societies. Indeed, they are a key source for past wild and domestic faunas and their change over time, and doubtlessly constitute an important and peculiar addition to the knowledge derived from the study of animal bones (“zooarchaeology”). However, such representations do also reflect man’s perception of nature, his “spiritual setting” therein, and too his use of the environment. To properly understand both this natural and cultural aspects of palaeoart, it is generally advisable to combine the viewpoints and results of the two chiefly involved areas of research: zoology (e.g., palaeozoology, zooarchaeology, biosystematics, biogeography, and ethology) and prehistory (such as palaeoart studies, including petroiconology, and anthropozoology). The symposium aims to bring together specialists from all these and additional related fields in order to expound and mutually discuss their recent results. Even though a larger part of the papers has to be expected to address representations of Old War larger mammals, further contributions concerning other geographical areas and biological taxa (also including humans) are welcome, too.

(GSA)

C48 – Postcolonialism and Archaeology: Studies

Post-colonialisme et archéologie: études

(Oscar Moro – papitu2000@hotmail.com, José Farrujia)

In recent years, discussions on postcolonialism have had a big impact on a wide of academic disciplines as literature, history or philosophy. Taking the definition of Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin into account, postcolonial studies should be considered as the field which seeks to analyse the global effects of European colonialism. In this sense, the term “postcolonial” refers to all cultures affected by the imperial process from the moment to colonization to the present day. In recent years, discussions on postcolonialism have had
a big impact on a wide of academic disciplines as history, anthropology and, more recently, in archaeology. However, there does not exist a comprehensive overview of postcolonial studies and archaeology. The present session is an attempt at partially filling this gap.

A mixture of excitement and confusion had surrounded postcolonial studies, a new field which seeks to provide a critical reflection on the effects of Western colonialism on cultures and societies. Although Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) is widely considered as the founding text of the field, both the term and the discipline are product of a broad tendency in literary studies of the 1990’s. In this sense, postcolonial theory was broadly defined by *The Empire Writes Back* (Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin 1989). In recent years, discussions on postcolonialism have had a big impact on a wide of academic disciplines as history, anthropology and, more recently, in archaeology.

Taking the most important works on archaeology and colonialism into account, the aim of this session is to present the latest research trends and results on archaeology and postcolonialism and to promote postcolonial perspectives in the history of archaeology. With an acknowledge that there is no monolithic understanding of the archaeological practice, we think archaeology can be analysed from a postcolonial perspective. Organizers encourage participants to study the following main themes on Archaeology and postcolonialism:

- **A rchaeology as a “colonial discourse”**. Said's *Orientalism*, first published in 1978, initiated a new area of studies, colonial discourse theory, which defined colonial “discourse” as its object of study. Colonial discourse is the complex of signs and practices that organize social existence and social reproduction within colonial relationships. On the assumption of the superiority of the western’s culture, archaeology can be defined as the western system of concepts, practices, knowledge and beliefs about the remote past which is imposed to colonial peoples. In other words, archaeology could be examined as a “colonial discourse”. From this view, it would be interesting to focus on the ways in which archaeology prevails over others non-western understandings of the remote past and the ways in which colonialism and imperialism stimulated the development of archaeology as a science and determined the organization of archaeological knowledge.

- **A rchaeology as a part of the apparatus of western power which promotes and legitimates colonial control**. Following Foucault and Said, in colonial discourse power and knowledge are joined together. It would be interesting to go deeply in the ways in which archaeological knowledge legitimates colonial domination. It is interesting, for instance, to explore the ways in which archeological science is used to legitimate strategies by which the western imperial power incorporates as its own the culture from colonized countries. In the same way, the ways in which archaeological discourse has justified colonial expansion should be analysed.

- **A rchaeology as a discourse which defines colonial identities and produced subjects**. As several authors have pointed out, concepts widely used in archaeology (“primitive”, “savage”, “tribal”, “archaic”, etc.) take the western values as norm and defines non-western cultures as inferior. Taking archaeology into account, it seems interesting to describe the ways in which the question of subject and subjectivity defines the identity (collective or individual) of colonized peoples.
C51 – History of Archaeology in the Iberian Peninsula
Histoire de l'Archéologie de la Péninsule Ibérique
(João Luís Cardoso – arqueolo@univ-ab.pt, Luís Raposo, Gloria Mora, Mariano Ayarzargüena)

This session aims to document the activity of archaeologists throughout the XIX and XX centuries with relevance to the progress in the studies and knowledge in the Archaeology of the Iberian Peninsula. The analysis and publication of inedited documents (personal documents in particular) will be privileged, specially the ones that can bring new elements on the history of research relating either to relevant sites as to different Iberian regions. It will also be enhanced the scientific path of institutions that, from the XIX century onwards, have contributed to Archaeological investigations. In this point, it will be given priority to the analysis of documents kept in archives, specially if without adequate publication and / or interpretation.

C52 – Cognitive archaeology as symbolic archaeology
Archéologie cognitive comme archéologie symbolique
(Fernando Coimbra – facoimbra@yahoo.com, George Dimitriadis – webmaster@herac.4t.com)

In the second half of the last century, theory began to have a great influence in archaeological research, but in the last twenty years that influence became more and more notorious. For example, according to Renfrew, “an important component of the cognitive-processual approach is to set out to examine the ways in which symbols were used.” (in, Towards a cognitive archaeology, 1994). These ideas present an useful methodology to research prehistoric symbolism with a scientific approach. The aim of this colloquium is to study the prehistoric mind and simbolism with a cognitive approach, towards a scientific symbolic archaeology.

The coordinators believe that is time to apply these ideas in prehistory and, in a special way, in prehistoric iconography, in order to collect the manifestations of the past mentality hidden in different symbols that appear in schematic rock art, in pottery, in the spatial distribution of tumuli, and so on. For these purposes we call the interested researchers to submit both theoretical and applied papers.

C53 – A New Dawn for the Dark Age? – Shifting Paradigms in Mediterranean Iron Age Chronology
Une nouvelle aube pour l’âge noire? Changeant les paradigmes de la chronologie de l’Âge du Fer
(Dirk Brandherm – dirk.brandherm@ruhr-uni-bochum.de, Martin Trachsel)

Much of our current chronological framework for the first half of the last millennium BC in the Mediterranean was established before the advent of science-based dating methods. Ultimately, this framework still rests on ‘historical’ dates attributed to the various styles of Greek Geometric pottery, which are partly based on information provided by ancient authors, and partly derived from Near Eastern chronology through imports of Greek
pottery in the Levant. For several decades then, our conventional chronology has remained largely unchanged, although dendro-dates and calibrated radiocarbon dates have come into increasing conflict with our established framework. The resulting problems are thrown into particularly sharp relief where ‘indigenous’ chronologies from the non-classical Mediterranean lands, established by scientific methods, conflict with the conventional dating of Greek and Phoenician imports. Such is the case e.g. in Italy, southern France and the Iberian Peninsula, where the solution all too often has been to explain away the resulting discrepancies by resorting to ad hoc concepts such as ‘heirloom theories’, ill-defined ‘transitional phases’ or similar ruses, mostly avoiding any discussion of the underlying methodological issues. In order to address these, a broader approach is needed, which pays particular attention to the specific problems raised by the juxtaposition of historical and science-based dates. The same problems currently plague chronological discussion at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, where fresh data in recent years have brought about a renewed and rather controversial debate concerning Levantine Iron Age chronology. As imports of Greek Geometric pottery from some of the relevant Syro-Palestinian sites in the past have been employed to extrapolate ‘historical’ dates not only for Dark Age Greece, but also for early Greek and Phoenician activities abroad, any changes in the East are bound to knock-on and affect the Iron Age absolute chronology of Mediterranean cultures from Italy to the Iberian Peninsula, and beyond. Recent discussions of chronological issues in different parts of the Mediterranean have all too often taken place in isolation from each other, rarely addressing the underlying methodological issues in a coherent manner. Thus the principal aim of this colloquium is to overcome the restrictions of regional or other specialisations and to provide a forum for a truly interdisciplinary discourse, in the broadest sense, bringing together scholars from all relevant areas of interest, be they experts in science-based dating methods, in Biblical, Phoenician and Greek archaeology, or any other field of Mediterranean Iron Age Archaeology. We are convinced that by analysing and comparing the problems encountered at different points of contact between distinct regional chronologies, new perspectives for their solution will open up.

C54 – On Shelter's Ledge: Histories, Theories, and Methods of Rockshelter Research
Près du bord d’un’abri sous roche: les histoires, les théories et les méthodes d’étude des abris

(Marcel Kornfeld – Anpro1@uwyo.edu, Sergey Vasil’ev – sergeyas@AV2791.spb.edu, and Laura Miotti)

Rock shelters have played a significant role in the history of archeology; from being mines for artifacts, especially of perishable materials to being thought of as a panacea for developing chronologies. Rock shelters became significant sources of prehistoric data commensurate with the development of archaeology as a discipline in the nineteenth century. Few would argue that Neandertal (Feldhofer Cave), Krapina, La Madeleine, or Laugerie-Haute, were not major sources of data about early human history.

Rock shelters are unique features of the landscape in that they offer naturally produced shelter lasting innumerable generations. However, shelters vary among themselves nearly as much as they vary from other (notable open air) archaeological manifestations. For these and other reasons rockshelters have always held a special place in archaeology, with
the Perigordian shelters providing a catalyst for developing special analytical and interpretive techniques for maximizing the information potential from their investigations.

The purpose of this session is to provide a global assessment of today’s rockshelter studies. In particularly the participants are asked to address: 1) The history and synthesis of rock shelters research in their region; 2) The theoretical perspectives of the role of rockshelters in prehistory; and 3) The field, analytical, and interpretive methods specific to rock shelter investigations. Leaving apart important problems connected with multidisciplinary studies, we wish to concentrate on the archaeological methodology, especially those issues as matching the stratigraphic excavations with spatial analysis, techniques for artifact plotting, functional interpretation of inhabited space, perspectives for identification of domestic structures in rockshelters, etc. Although we wish to begin with a historical perspective we encourage the participants to move quickly to cutting edge theoretical and methodological issues facing them in rock shelter studies today. This session provides a global view on variability of rock shelter formation, deposition, and evolution. This is a particularly significant aspect of the colloquium as it is currently unclear how rock shelters vary globally and how this variability affected their prehistoric use and today’s investigative approaches.

C55 – Romanization and Indigenous societies: rhythms, ruptures and continuities

Indigénismes et romanisation: rythmes, ruptures et continuités

( João Pedro Bernardes – jbernar@ualg.pt)

This session focus on the transformations on the indigenous communities that faced the Roman conquest. Rather than the assimilation or the resistance, it is more important to debate the rhythms of transformation for each region, that ultimately conduced to continuities or breaks that announced the end of the proto-historic societies.

C56 – Archaeology of food: recovering evidences of past gastronomic heritage

Archéologie de la nourriture: retrouvant des évidences du patrimoine gastronomique du passé

(Jordi Juan Tresseras – jjuan@ub.edu, Juan Carlos Matamala – jcmatamala@ub.edu)

In the last years historians and anthropologists have developed a veritable explosion of research into foods and its consumption and social context. In archeology we are just begining. Remains of food preparation and consumption are being more valued. Bones of animals, plant remains, residues from pottery contents, lithic tools or processing areas, dental microwear,… are some of these important indicators. The new and developing scientific techniques for reconstructing prehistoric food habits can also to contribute to integrate the archaeology of food regardless of different researchers’ specialisms.

The experimental archeology has allowed the recreation of some of the food products and its systems of elaboration identified in archeological excavations or mentioned in the historical sources. Some of them have been used in museographic projects of archeological sites or even they have been marketed, i.e. some wines, beers and condiments- In this colloquium we will try to discuss all these aspects.
C57 – Setting the Record Straight: Toward a Systematic Chronological Understanding of the Middle-Upper Palaeolithic Boundary in Eurasia

Ranger les données: Vers une compréhension systématique de la chronologie à la transition du paléolithique Moyen au paléolithique Supérieur en Eurasie

( Olaf Jöris – joeris@rgzm.de, Daniel Adler – dsadler@fas.harvard.edu, William Davies – s.w.g.davies@soton.ac.uk)

The Middle–Upper Palaeolithic boundary marks an important turning point in human history and cultural evolution. The demographic processes underlying this “transition” throughout Eurasia is among the most debated issues in Palaeoanthropology and Palaeolithic archaeology. Two fundamental models, representing opposing perspectives, have been proposed. The first suggests that Upper Palaeolithic humans coming “Out of Africa” spread rapidly into particular regions of Eurasia and later expanded their range to include other, more peripheral areas. This later phase of population expansion is argued to have instigated the extinction of Neanderthals in their last remaining refugia. The alternate model argues for a multiregional development from neanderthals to Modern humans and from the Middle to the Upper Palaeolithic. These models, and others, are based not only on the interpretation of hominin fossils and material culture from specific sites, but also, and to a large degree, on stratigraphic records and chronometric age-determinations. This session thus focuses on the evaluation and re-evaluation of both existing and new regional chronometric records in the context of recent advances in radiocarbon dating and interpretation. We hope to demonstrate that both the selective highlighting of particular radiometric dates and the uncritical use of bulk collections of unfiltered data to promote one model or the other are counter-productive, and that only the development and adoption of a systematic apparatus of quality control will contribute to the spatio-temporal understanding of the demographic processes underlying the Middle-Upper Palaeolithic boundary in Eurasia.

C58 – Come in… … and find out. Opening a new door into the analysis of hunter-gatherer social organisation and behaviour

Entrez… … et faites – vous une idée. Ouvrir une nouvelle voie pour l’analyse des organisations sociales et des comportements des peuples chasseurs-cueilleurs

(Sabine Gaudzinski – gaudzinski@rgzm.de, Olaf Jöris, Martina Sensburg, Martin Street, Elaine Turner)

Intra site spatial analyses of Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic sites provide a wealth of information about hunter-gatherer social organisation and behaviour. Over the last 40 years the application of modern excavation techniques at sites in western Eurasia has produced an extensive body of data suitable for spatial analysis. Despite this, many interpretations of spatial patterns are pre-determined by ideas originating from ethnographic observations, and tend to disregard the full potential of the available archaeological data.

Since the 1990’s several innovative analytical methods have been introduced to Palaeolithic archaeology, in combination paving the way for more detailed studies of spatial patterns. Against this background, the session seeks to evaluate and re-evaluate spatial organisation during the Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic.
C59 – Pressure Flintknapping: Experiment, context of emergence and development. Papers in honour of Jacques Tixier & Marie-Louise Inizan

Le débitage par pression: expérimentation, contextes d’apparition et développement. Session en l’honneur de Jacques Tixier & Marie-Louise Inizan

(Noura Rahmani – nourar@ualberta.ca, Pierre M. Desrosiers – servicearch@avataq.qc.ca)

Regarded as the apogee of knapping techniques, pressure flaking owes its recognition to the experiments of pioneers who elucidated the mystery of obsidian prismatic blades and bullet cores. Current archaeological data show it first appeared between 20,000 and 16,000 B.P. somewhere in Asia in a Palaeolithic context known for its advanced technical inventions. Found in Palaeo-Arctic industries this technique is considered as the best marker of the penetration into North America from Siberia. Between 10000 and 8000 B.P and associated with an increased exchange of obsidian, this technique was introduced in a Neolithic context among the most flourishing societies of the Middle East. However, its appearance in the Mesolithic of Scandinavia and its adoption by Capsian groups in North Africa, in a context of hunters-gatherers outside the obsidian exchange networks, remain exceptions to the traditional currently accepted diffusionist model. The principal aim of this session, dedicated to the technique of pressure knapping, is to bring together people working on the topic around the world to share their points of view and their results in order to expand our understanding of the contexts leading to the emergence of this technique, and the processes related to its diffusion and subsequent development.

C60 – Paleopathology: Medical approach of the relations between man and environment in Prehistory

Paléopathologie: approche médicale aux relations entre l’Homme et l’Environnement en Préhistoire

(Bertrand Mafart – mafartbertrand@aol.com)

Among the parameters governing relations between the prehistoric man and his environment, the medical component was essential. The modifications of the biotopes, technical progress human like the acquisition of fire and the cooking of food, the neolithisation with the proximity of the domesticated animals played a major role in the relations of the man and his in particular microbiological environment. Recent progress in paleoparasitology, molecular and genetic biology allows new approaches of the relations between Prehistoric men and its environment. This colloquium will make it possible to gather the best international teams for a new step to prehistoric paleopathology.
C61 – Animal exploitation by prehistoric hunter-gatherer societies: environment, subsistence and technical behaviour

Exploitation du monde animal par les sociétés de chasseurs-cueilleurs préhistoriques: environnements, subsistance et comportements techniques

(Laure Fontana – lfontana@mmsh.univ-aix.fr, François-Xavier Chauvière, UISPP – Comm.4)

Prehistoric hunter-gatherer societies have left, in their habitation sites, many kinds of remains. Some of them, whether preserved or not, can shed light on animal procurement and exploitation. These remains are of two kinds: unmodified faunal remains (food residues) and bone artefacts (by-products, finished and unfinished artefacts). These two kinds of remains have been, since the start, the subject of distinct analyses: zooarchaeozoological studies on the hand, study of bone tool industry on the other hand. Nevertheless, whatever the purposes and the means of the procurement (hunting or collecting), the raw material is the same (antler, tooth, bone). So these remains have a part of their handmade sequence (“chaîne opératoire”) in common.

Whatever the questions specific to each study, one of the main goals is the characterization of the whole animal exploitation. We have to understand its purposes connected to places and seasons of procurement, but also in relation to the procurement of other resources, such as stone raw materials. That is why this characterization is only significant in a diachronic perspective, i.e., at the scale of a year (annual cycle).

So it becomes obvious that faunal remains and bone artefacts have to be studied together, in a global and integrated analysis and in an economic perspective. Nevertheless, a two-fold approach is required to connect the patterns of procurement/transformation/consumption-use of these different products. This approach is based on various separate studies of the animal “bones” (technological and functional analysis, species identification, assessment about hunting strategies and seasons) as well as a multidisciplinary study of these remains by various specialists.

If this seems an ordinary approach, from a theoretical and methodological point of view, its application can be found only in some rare papers. This symposium offers to specialists of these disciplines working on Palaeolithic and mesolithic sites, to share their experience (e.g. informative or methodological) in this multidisciplinary field.

C62 – Coastal geoarchaeology: the research of shellmounds

Geoarchéologie de la côte: la recherche des amas de coquilles

(Marisa Coutinho Afonso – marisa@br2001.com.br, Geoff Bailey)

We intend to discuss new research on the shellmounds from Brazil and to place that research into a wider comparative framework, including new geoarchaeological and bioarchaeological work on the shellmounds of Northwest Europe, including the classic sites of the Tagus Valley (Portugal) and the Danish Ertebølle, Central and South Americas and Australia.

(SAP)
C63 – Transitions in the Palaeolithic

This session focuses on the temporal bridges that have been used since the early days of Palaeolithic studies to link the major periods in which it is divided. Its aim is to offer a world-wide varied analysis of data-rich papers from as many regions as possible.

What is meant by a ‘transition’ and what criteria can be used to distinguish transitions? The validity of the classic divisions is also addressed. Transitional periods open to discussion in this colloquium range from the “gaps” in between the major ages, to ideas such as whether the Middle Palaeolithic itself can be seen as a transition between the Lower and Upper Palaeolithic.

What are the differences between the divisions in various parts of the world, especially in those cases where geographical areas that have seen formulae of other regions used to make sense of a record which does not fit such parameters. What are the crucial aspects of hominid behaviour during these moments, and how can they be analysed are weighed against the traditional large interest on the typological classification, the latter having turned a system to aid research into a widely accepted end-product.

C64 – Space And Time: Which Diachronies, Which Synchronies, Which Scales?

Recent geoarchaeological and taphonomic studies on some of the reference sites for the establishment of the general Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic chrono-stratigraphic sequence have shown that formation and post-depositional processes are complex and discontinuous through time.

Reconstructions of the evolution (I would eliminate the word ‘diachronic’ as redundant, as diachrony means change over time) of lithic assemblages, as well as of their respective human societies, are thus dependent on our capacity to define reliable chronological assemblages, which are independent of the studied lithostratigraphic and pedo-sedimentary sequences.

Having such frameworks in mind, this session will be present the results of studies based on:

- Reconstructions of formation processes and preservation conditions of archaeological contexts
- Spatial organization studies at the site scale;
- Raw material source determination studies at the regional scale.
C65 – Typology vs Technology

Typologie vs Technologie

(T. Aubry – thaubry@sapo.pt, F. Almeida – falmeida@ipa.min-cultura.pt, A.C. Araújo –, Marc Tiffagom – mtiffagom@eresmas.com – UISPP – Comm.8)

The methodological shift which began in the late 1970’s towards the use of the Chaîne opératoire concept for the technological study of lithic assemblages is still far from achieving some of its original goals.

In fact, morpho-typological approaches still predominate in the literature and rarely integrate technological data on fundamental issues, such as the refinement of general chronostatigraphic sequences for both the Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic, and their respective behavioural variability.

In this session, through presentations of the lithic assemblages of the aforementioned periods, we try to demonstrate that technological and typological approaches can complement each other, and that such an association can only contribute to improve our definitional criteria for geographic and chronological entities.

Can examples of such a methodological association contribute to changes in the traditional frameworks, based solely on typological grounds, and produce more precise reconstructions of lithic production behaviours?

C66 – Harvesting the Sea: current perspectives on hunter-gatherer coastal adaptations

Cueillant dans la mer: perspectives actuelles sur les adaptations côtières des chasseurs-cueilleurs

(Nuno Bicho – nbicho@ualg.pt, Jonathan Haws – jonathan.haws@louisville.edu)

Much of the recent work on hunter-gatherer coastal adaptations emphasizes three related areas of research: 1) the documenting early coastal adaptations in the Pleistocene and early Holocene, 2) explaining the shift to coastal resource use and 3) the impact of human predation on marine animal communities.

Historically, archaeologists recognize early coastal research use but are limited by the destruction of paleoshorelines by postglacial sea level rise. This perhaps led to a bias against accepting any significant coastal exploitation by Pleistocene peoples. Recently, some earlier negative views on paleoproductivity in the glacial oceans have been reconsidered and many are beginning to recognize the potential of Pleistocene coastal adaptations.

Relating to the dietary role of marine resources, the primary explanatory framework employed by archaeologists was the ‘Broad Spectrum Revolution’ model. This has also been revised and altered many views on prehistoric coastal adaptation. The majority of the latest studies employ at least an implicit evolutionary ecological framework to address the problem of coastal resource selection and subsequent human impacts.

This symposium brings together researchers working in a wide range of time periods and geographic areas in order to show the variation in human use of coastal areas. The goal is not necessarily to build a consensus but to provide a forum for discussion of the many approaches to understanding human uses of coastal resources.
C67 – Settlement dynamics and Environment Resources in the Palaeolithic of Southwest France: the case of the Quercy region

Modalités d’occupations et Exploitation des milieux au Paléolithique dans le Sud-Ouest de la France: l’exemple du Quercy

(Marc Jarry – marc.jarry@inrap.fr; Jean-Philip Brugal – brugal@mmsh.univ-aix.fr; Catherine Ferrier – c.ferrier@ipgq.u-bordeaux1.fr)

Various studies on natural environments as well as technical abilities of human groups are one of the major research criterias for Prehistoric Archaeology. This should provide better details about settlement rules, survival strategies as well as a better understanding of socio-economical choices of human groups.

The key role of the South-West of France in the research of palaeolithical settlements has been proven out already. This region has been overtime impacted by continuous human settlement, hence offering an incomparable source for archaeology. Moreover, this region is made of a great variety of landscapes: from plateaus to numerous valleys and alluvial plains of the Aquitain basin, onto Pyreneens montains and foot-hills of the Massif central.

Quercy region is a typical example. As a result, a first analysis demonstrates its timely and cultural diversity. The numerous recently discovered and unpublished Palaeolithical sites have justified the launch of a large joint-research program. Various studies are performed and integrated to elaborate inter- and intrasites contributions. Multitask researches are in particulary about sedimentary and climatic environments, but also about oilarchaeology, typo-technology, zooarchaeology and cementochronology.

All of these build together synchronic and diachronic overviews. The results thereof provide a better knowledge about the evolution of the technical and cynegetical skills of the Palaeolithical hunters-gatherers. The proposed colloquia would focus on the presentation of the results of those integrated approaches by applying them the best possible to the large South-West aera in France, and beyond. It should aim at suggesting settlement and utilisation models for the environment in the Palaeolithic. Comparative analysis as well as patterning will be used.

C68 – Monumental Questions: Prehistoric Megaliths, Mounds and Enclosures

Questions monumentales: mégalithes préhistoriques, tumulus et enceintes

(David Calado – dcalado@ippar.pt, Douglas Frink, Christel and Maximilian O. Baldia)

The development of archaeology is closely tied to research on megaliths, mounds, and enclosures. In spite of this long history, archaeology is only now beginning to provide answers to long-standing questions about the most prominent prehistoric monuments. As usual, these answers suggest new research questions. Since such monumental architecture was created around the world, researchers from all continents are asked to address these questions, in order to make this meeting truly comparative.

Topics to be covered include:

• Methods and theories for excavation, analysis and preservation of monumental architecture and its contents
• Spatial analysis of monuments on a local, regional, or interregional scale
• Monuments and landscapes: their social, ethnic, and cultural implications
• New discoveries and resulting inferences
• Facts and fancies regarding monuments, ideology, and religion
• Burial mounds and their textiles
• Monuments, architecture, and art

The presentations include data from a systematic survey of the megaliths erected by hunter-gatherers in SW Portugal. Similarly, there will be presentations on huge North American mounds and enclosures, erected by hunter-gatherers between ca. 6000 and 2000 years ago. This includes new analyses of colourfully dyed textiles from the later monuments. The results of spatial analyses of hundreds of megalithic tombs, long-mounds, tumuli, and enclosures in North and Central Europe, including the oldest stone walls, will be offered.

C69 – Luminescence Dating Techniques: a User's Perspective
Techniques de datation par luminescence: une perspective d’usuaire

(Guilherme de Oliveira Cardoso – gcardoso@itn.mctes.pt, Maria Isabel Garrido Prudêncio – iprudenc@itn.mctes.pt, Maria Isabel Marques Dias – isadias@itn.mcties.pt)

Dating beyond the range of radiocarbon (c. 40 000 years ago) continues to be a challenge; a source of considerable frustration to archaeologists and others interested in the important events of the period c. 200 000 to 40 000 years ago. In the absence of volcanic sediments, the most successful techniques applicable to this time range are luminescence techniques: principally thermo luminescence, optically and infrared stimulated luminescence, also electron spin resonance. These methods depend on the conditions surrounding the sample during burial, and pose a number of challenges. Many archaeologists who use luminescence and ESR dates have a very limited understanding of how the techniques work, and how to use them optimally. This workshop is intended to bring together dating specialists and archaeologists and other “consumers” of dates, and to promote a critical and informed approach to the use of the techniques. The emphasis will be on understanding the limitations of the techniques, factors likely to affect the dates obtained, and how best to go about designing dating strategies for sites.

C70 – Archaeometry – Characterization Of Pottery. Sampling And Analytical Protocols, And Data Interpretation
Archéométrie – caractérisation de la poterie. Echantillonnage et protocoles analytiques et interprétation des données

(M. Isabel Prudêncio – iprudenc@itn.mcties.pt, Maria Isabel Marques Dias – isadias@itn.mcties.pt)

Ceramic characterization – description of the ceramic and its many properties. In archaeological studies characterization studies are performed in order to inferring how the ceramic was used and determining the geographical area of origin (provenance) and techniques involved in its manufacture.
Main topics:

- Research design considerations
  (a) identifying problems; (b) selecting a sample of potsherds; (c) sampling clay resources

- Methodologies

- Interpreting technological and characterization studies – significance of quantitative and qualitative physicochemical characterization of ceramic materials and potential raw materials with a view to accomplish the archaeological objectives.

C71 – The Contribution of Archaeometry to the Understanding of Bell Beakers Phenomenon

La contribution de l’archéométrie à la compréhension du phénomène campaniforme

(Maria Isabel Marques Dias – isadias@itim.uc.pt, M. Isabel Prudêncio – iprudenc@itim.uc.pt, A. C. Valera – antoniovalera@araqueologia.pt, Laure Salanova – laure.salanova@mcomparis10.fr, Guirec Querre – Guirec.querre@univ-rennes1.fr)

The widespread distribution of beaker finds has led to the frequent identification of a Beaker people and speculations about their origins. Theoretical positions about the Beaker phenomenon, focused on the role that this luxury pottery played as a prestige good in the social strategies of local Chalcolithic groups. The main questions posed by archaeologists are problems related with provenance, technological procedures, raw materials exploitation strategies and mechanisms of circulation. The origin of ceramic material is Geology. Clays are the major constituents when making a pot, so it is important to know how different elements make clays, what are the leftovers in the clay-making process, what are the chemical traces which can give a clue to the geographic origin of the clay and temper materials found in the finished product, etc. This methodological approach aims to obtain chemical and mineralogical features able to discriminate different pottery productions in space and time – fingerprints.

C72 – Space, Memory and Identity in the European Bronze Age

Espace, mémoire et identité à l’Âge du Bronze Européen

(Ana Bettencourt – anabett@uaum.uminho.pt, Miguel Angel de Blas Cortina – deblas@uniovi.es, Magdolna Vicze – vicze@mail.bartanet.hu)

The aim of this colloquium is to gather together several experts to know and change ideas about the European Bronze Age ceremonial places. Assuming that these places were scenes where power were negotiated and the social identity was reinforced upon certain mechanisms of memory transmission, it will be interesting to know the different kinds of places built by distinct communities and to understand the different ways who memory and identity was maintained through the Early/Middle Bronze Age and the Later Bronze Age.
C73 – Aesthetics and Rock Art III Symposium

III Symposium d’Esthétique et Art Rupestre

(Thomas Heyd – heydt@uvic.ca, John Clegg – jcless@mail.usyd.edu.au)

Our previous two symposia on aesthetics and rock art (at the 1998 IRAC in Vila Real and the 2000 IRAC in Alice Springs) gathered a number of wonderful papers on the aesthetic perspective in rock art research. Since then we have been successful in publishing a number of them in our volume Aesthetics and Rock Art (Ashgate 2005).

Presently we invite rock art researchers to help us to discuss the relevance of aesthetics for the understanding and study of rock art. We hope to take stock of the practical value that the aesthetic perspective can have. This may include its value as a heuristic in explaining societal structures or cultural institutions, or as a way to increase for understanding of the life world of the makers of rock art.

Contributions from a diversity of disciplines, including archaeology, sociology, anthropology, art history and philosophy, are welcome. Some of the issues that might be addressed include the following:

• What can the aesthetic perspective in rock art research contribute to explanation of particular societies by archaeology and anthropology?
• Can the aesthetic perspective in rock art research contribute to the understanding of the life world of other societies?
• How is aesthetic appreciation across cultural and temporal divides possible?
• What constitutes aesthetic appreciation in the rock art experience?
• What contribution does aesthetic appreciation make to the explanation of why people like to visit/see rock art sites?
• How does the aesthetic achievement of rock art compare with other aesthetic achievements? Can they be compared?
• What has been said about rock art aesthetics at other times, and, can we learn something from those claims?

(GSA)

C74 – Methods of art history tested against prehistory

Les méthodes de l’Histoire de l’Art à l’épreuve de la Préhistoire

(Marc Groenen – mgroenen@ulb.ac.be, Didier Martens)

Since the end of the XVIIIth century, art history has developed several methods to approach figured representations, focusing in particular on the Middle Ages and on the Renaissance. Study of style as a support to chronology, identification of artists’ hands, but also iconographic interpretation of the works in the light of textual or other sources had a dominating role in research ever since the XIXth century. Formal description and technological study of the work of art were added in the XXth century. If the first one aims at understanding the image as an aesthetic realisation, the second one endeavours to reconstitute the stages of the process of its genesis.
The methods elaborated by art historians have more particularly been picked up by classical archaeologists, specialists of arts of Pre-Columbian America or of the Far East. On the other hand, prehistorians continue to demonstrate, vis-à-vis these methods, a scepticism that has been even more reinforced by the inrush of laboratory sciences in their discipline. Yet, considering the results obtained in some research fields that are quite remote from the Italian Renaissance – let us think, for instance, of the use of attribution in the field of Cycladic idols –, it is definitely tempting to examine what some traditional art history tools could bring to prehistorians. Therefore, we propose to gather papers relating to the following aspects of prehistoric arts:

- stylistics considered as a possible base for dating and attribution,
- iconography, in particular recurring figured themes,
- formal analysis, including for instance the study of the existing relations between image and support, or image and spectator,
- technology of drawing and of representation, in particular the study of preparatory layout and of various elaboration phases.

(GSA)

C75 – “Archeologues sans frontieres”. Towards a history of international archeological congresses (1866-2006)

Archéologues sans frontiers. Pour une histoire des congrès archéologiques internationaux (1886-2006)

(Mircea Babes – mirceababes@yahoo.com)

In the wide research field of Prehistory and Protohistory we have today three series of large congresses which take place independently, competing or at best ignoring each other: the I.U.P.S./ U.I.S.P. (every 5 years), the WAC, which separated from the former in 1986 (every 4 years), and, most recently (since 1994), the annual EAA congresses. This is not a new situation. Inaugurated in London in 1932, the I.U.P.S. congresses competed with and eventually replaced the traditional International Congresses of Anthropology and Prehistoric Archaeology, which were initiated in 1866 in Neuchatel and met for the last time in Bucharest in 1937. A systematic, well documented and unprejudiced research into the history of these congresses could provide renewed support to the fundamental idea of unhindered collaboration between archaeologists regardless of national, political, ideological and religious borders. Such a study would certainly emphasise the organic evolution of methods, concepts and approaches related to archaeology on an international scale. It would also describe how these methods and concepts have spread from advanced research centres towards developing countries. The complex relationships between archaeology and other sciences would also be illustrated. Finally, this endeavour would reveal the economical, social and political factors which shaped in one way or another the present day outlook of our field. The proposed colloquium has to be the occasion for starting a project which should extract new data and insights from the archives and publications of past international archaeological congresses. The contribution of all interested researchers, independent of their present affiliation, would be extremely beneficial.
C76 – Antiquarians at the Megaliths
Antiquaires aux Mégalithes

(Magda Midgley – Magda.Midgley@ed.ac.uk)

Megaliths are among the most dramatic and enticing prehistoric structures. They feature in mediaeval documents and chronicles as well as in fairy tales and stories about giants. It is hardly surprising that from the earliest times scholars were attracted to the study of these monuments. From the 16th century onwards we find antiquarian descriptions of megalithic tombs, illustrations, notes on excavations and learned speculations about their significance; frequently such records are the only source of information on long destroyed monuments.

The session proposes to examine the antiquarian contribution to the study and interpretation of the megalithic tombs of Europe from the Atlantic coastline to the Baltic. Indeed, some of the European antiquarians were not merely investigators of megaliths but, rather, flamboyant characters who contributed in a more general way to the development of arts and sciences. The session will consider the nature of antiquarian approaches in different megalithic regions, from the earliest antiquarian activities until the end of the 19th century, their concerns with the investigation, recording, illustration, preservation and protection of the megaliths, as well as their interpretations of the function of the monuments.

C77 – Non-flint Raw Material Use in Prehistory: Old Prejudices and New Direction
L’utilisation préhistorique de matières premières lithiques alternatives: anciens préjugés, nouvelles perspectives

(Farina Sternke – F.Sternke@soton.ac.uk, Lotte Eigeland – lotte@superheros.as, Laurent-Jacques Costa – lj.costa@wanadoo.fr)

The study of raw material is now a central concern in the analysis of prehistoric and archaic lithic production in the Old and New World. In Europe, attention has focused almost exclusively on flint although non-flint raw materials were used as a major component on many prehistoric sites. The main research questions related to the current study of non-flint raw materials are the reasons for non-flint raw material use on one hand, and questions related to methodological problems associated commonly with the technological characteristics of the different raw materials on the other hand. This colloquium aims to give an overview of current non-flint raw material studies in different prehistoric periods and geographical areas, thereby stimulating a further debate about the central issues and increasing the dialogue among researchers in this neglected area of lithic studies.
C78 – Modern Human dispersals, environments and cultural change in the Late Pleistocene of Northwest Africa and adjacent areas

Dispersion des Hommes modernes, environnements et changements culturels à la fin du Pléistocène en Afrique du Nord Ouest et les régions avoisinantes

(Abdeljalil Bouzouggar – bouzouggar@menara.ma, Nick Barton – nick.barton@archaeology.oxford.ac.uk, Fatima-Zohra Sbihi-Alaoui – fsbihialaouyi@yahoo.fr, UISPP Comm. 34)

One of the most keenly debated issues in human evolutionary research concerns the African origins and dispersal of *Homo sapiens*. Until recently, Northwest Africa has been a much neglected region despite the occurrence of early *Homo sapiens* with the “Middle Palaeolithic” finds at Jebel Irhoud. In this region, several sites contain stratified sequences with exceptionally well-preserved organic remains offering rich sources of multi-proxy data for palaeoenvironmental and chronological studies.

The Northwest Africa is of key interest in the understanding of human evolution and behavioural development. A broader theme identified and could be discussed in the session concerns the nature, chronology and human associations with the cultural subdivision of the *Aterian*.

New radiometric data move the *Late Upper Palaeolithic* back in time to more than what it was known in North Africa. From calibrated record of AMS dates, the data of this region are compared with the global marine isotope record.

Amongst the key issues to be identified so far are: How early is the *Upper Palaeolithic* in this region, does its appearance signify the arrival of new populations, is there any relationship between the *Upper Palaeolithic* and *Aterian*, what is the environmental context of the *Middle* and *Upper Palaeolithic*. The aim of the session is not to answer all of these questions but to stimulate further discussion and to act as an introduction to other contributions that will cover the themes described above in more detail.

C79 – Archaeological evidences of the Neolithic Demographic Transition

Indicateurs archéologiques de la transition démographique néolithique

(Jean-Pierre Bocquet-Appel – bocquet-appel@ivry.cnrs.fr, Ofer Bar-Yosef –, Miquel Molist – miquel.molist@uab.es)

Using cemetery data, the signature has been detected of a new demographic process, which is associated with the transition from a forager to an horticulturist/farmer economy. The process is characterized by a dramatic increase in the birth rate and of the population growth rate over a period of less than a millennium. It has been named the Neolithic Demographic Transition (NDT). The pattern of this NDT has been identified in data from North America, Mesoamerica and South America. The aim of this colloquia is to present and discuss new archaeological evidences (biological on health, emergence of new social practices as inferred from the data, indicators of economic intensification) in order to better understand its multidimensional aspects and their relationships.
C80 – The Pleistocene palaeoart of the world
Le paléoart du Pleistocène dans le monde

(Robert G. Bednarik – robertbednarik@hotmail.com, Derek Hodgson)

Recent advances in the study of human evolution have shown the need for greater attention to the cognitive and cultural development of humans. In the Pleistocene record, cognition and culture are primarily accessible through the study of palaeoart, which consists of rock art and portable art-like productions. Cognitive evolution, informed by recent advances in neuroscience and psychology, is increasingly becoming relevant to the understanding of Pleistocene palaeoart. The potential for gaining new insights into the significance of these items from the perspective of cognition is therefore immense. Correspondingly, archaeological finds from this period can provide evidence that may help substantiate particular models as to how human cognition may have eventuated. Collaboration between these disciplines can be viewed as mutually beneficial and sustaining. As research into cognition and brain functioning continues apace, the need to assimilate the various findings in relation to palaeoart becomes all the more imperative. Where Pleistocene artefacts are the subject of controversy, cognitive studies can supply useful suggestions as to interpretation, thereby providing the proper context for the determination of such items. It can also help to disentangle the complex ways by which culture and evolutionary factors interact so that a clearer understanding of their respective roles and influences can be gauged in relation to Pleistocene artefacts.

To render Pleistocene palaeoart scientifically useful, evidence needs to be studied as global rather than regional phenomena. Underlying principles and universals need to be identified, and the material of the Middle and Early Upper Pleistocene requires much more attention than has been evident in the 20th century. This symposium is intended to bring together much of the new evidence deriving from the archaeological record, cognitive studies and neuroscience to reflect the change from traditional preoccupations to new approaches. It will endeavour to place Pleistocene palaeoart into the context of cognitive evolution, explore its semiotic dimensions, consider implications for technology and culture during the Palaeolithic periods, present new empirical evidence of Pleistocene palaeoart from several continents, and review the methods of investigating this kind of evidence scientifically. Papers are invited on all aspects of Pleistocene palaeoart, including cognitive perspectives, and on palaeoart that has not been shown to be of such age but is considered likely to be so.

C81 – Spirals and Circular Forms: the most common rock art elements in the world?
Spirales et formes circulaires: les éléments d’art rupestre les plus communs dans le monde?

(Jane Kolber – jkolber@theriver.com, John Clegg – jclegg@MAIL.USYD.EDU.AU; Alicia Distel – distel@cootepal.com.ar)

Spirals and circular forms may be the most numerous non-representational rock art symbol in the world. They are found throughout the world. Interpretations for these images may be almost as numerous as there are examples of them. Some of these are fanciful and not based on scientific data. This session will explore the varied examples throughout the world and/or pose possibilities for their creation based ONLY on detailed research and substantiated studies.
Some suggested subjects (preferably focusing on only one of the forms): locations of spirals or circular forms in the world; comparison and contrasts of spirals or circular forms throughout the world; locations of spirals or circular forms in the landscape; the history of interpretations of spirals or circular forms; spirals or circular forms of a specific country; spirals or circular forms of a specific site containing many spirals; and spirals or circular forms and their significance to particular cultures.

C82 – The dating of Pleistocene petroglyphs
La datation des pétroglyphes du Pléistocène

(Robert G. Bednarik – robertbednarik@hotmail.com, Giriraj Kumar)

The estimation of the age of rock art remains one of the most problematic areas of archaeological research. Without the placement of rock art into a chronological framework, its archaeological research potential is seriously impaired. Not only is it then difficult to link it to archaeologically created cultural entities, without temporal separation of the components of sites featuring cumulative assemblages from different periods, their effective assessment is impossible. While some progress has been made with the analysis of rock paint residues for dating work, petroglyphs present very different difficulties. This symposium will endeavour to provide an overview of the methodology brought to this task so far, and it will present case studies from around the world. Pleistocene petroglyphs occur in most continents, and in at least three extend back to traditions of Middle Palaeolithic technologies, in one even to the Lower Palaeolithic. The great difficulties in estimating their ages will be explained and discussed in this session. Presentations are expected to include papers on open air sites as well as cave sites of various lithologies, a broad spectrum of the available methodologies and their relative merits under various conditions, and recent results of dating attempts from a variety of petroglyph sites. Proposals for presentations to be included in this symposium are invited from all researchers who have concerned themselves with these issues.

C83 – Current Issues on Projectile Tips Studies, from the Beginning of the Upper Palaeolithic to the End of the Neolithic
État des recherches sur les armatures de projectile, du début du Paléolithique supérieur à la fin du Néolithique

(Jean-Marc Pétillon – jeanmarc1@no-log.org, Marie-Hélène Dias-Meirinho, Pierre Cattelain, Matthieu Honegger, Christian Normand, Nicolas Valdeyron)

This Colloquium intends to bring together researchers concerned with the study of prehistoric weaponry. Most of our attention will be dedicated to projectile tips, which are our primary source of evidence relating to this topic. Participants can of course use this Colloquium to present new archaeological results. But above all, we wish it to be an opportunity for debate and exchange between specialists from different fields—lithic technology, bone and antler technology, archaeozoology, ethnoarchaeology, etc. For this reason, much time will be reserved for discussions. The papers will not be grouped by chronological periods, but organized in four thematic sessions of one half day. We selected
these four themes because they reflect the main questions addressed by the current researches on prehistoric projectile tips:

1) **Projectile tips: definition and identification**

The methods and criteria used to identify projectile tips among archaeological assemblages are they reliable? How do we make the distinction between *weapons* and *tools*? How, and under what conditions, can experimental archaeology help us to solve these problems?

2) **What is the use of projectile tips?**

How do projectile tips fit into the technical system of weaponry? E.g., is it possible to correlate a point type with a specific launching system (bow, spearthrower…) or a particular game? Is it possible to distinguish hunting weapons from weapons used in warfare?

3) **“Technical investment”: real topic or irrelevant question?**

To what extent is it possible to estimate the technical investment of prehistoric people in their weapons (*i.e.*, amount of time devoted to manufacture, complexity of the corresponding technical know-how…)? Does a low technical investment mean that the weapons were deserved only little interest? Is a high technical investment always the evidence of the object’s social importance? From what other point of view can we address the question of the projectile tips’ cultural status?

4) **Can we find out why projectile tips change over time?**

What are the factors causing projectile tips assemblages to change over time? Do these evolutions reflect a progressive rationalization and improvement of the weapon kit? Are they induced by environmental changes, or by the structural modifications (whether economic or symbolic) of the prehistoric societies? Can we even know it?

---

**C84 – Place Theory in Rock Art Studies**

*La théorie du lieu dans les études sur l’art pariétal*

(Denise Smith – hdsmith@scad.edu, Tertia Barnett – tbarnett@northumberland.gov.uk)

Space, place, center and boundary: rock art has been used to shape human-defined space, marking locations of memory or cultural inheritance, since time immemorial. Over the last decade, many new ideas have entered the scholarly literature on rock art, to include place theory (*aka* landscape theory). While individual papers have been presented at international conferences that employ place theory, there has been no focused discussion or criticism of these approaches. We invite international scholars whose research focuses on how rock art has been used to construct a cultural/ritual/aesthetic landscape, or those who critique this theoretical approach.

**C85 – European Cave Art**

(Jean Clottes – j.clottes@wanadoo.fr; Kevin Sharpe – kevin.sharpe@tui.edu)

Recent discoveries from the four quarters of Europe have fired the public and scholarly imagination. This symposium will focus on new findings, current research, emergent
methodologies, controversies, related sciences such as dating and geomorphology, the archaeological context of rock art and insights into interpretations of art found in caves in Europe. The symposium’s intention is to help current scholars in the field make new connections and to foster research.

C86 – Middle and Upper Palaeolithic bladelet productions: a diachronic perspective

Les productions lamellaires au Paléolithique moyen et supérieur: une perspective diachronique

(Nicolas Teyssandier – nicolas.teyssandier@mae.u-paris10.fr, Pierre Bodu, Marie-Isabelle Cattin, Laurent Klaric, Ludovic Slimak)

The Upper Palaeolithic is conventionally characterized by the seemingly sudden proliferation of some of the more distinctive features of fully modern cultural behaviour. One of the most noteworthy changes in material culture is the trend towards a significant reduction in size of lithic tools, combined with their increasing standardization. It is an acknowledged fact that the Upper Palaeolithic fully expressed the global systematisation of bladelet production. However, similar productions have lately been documented for the Middle Palaeolithic of Eurasia, thus widening the temporal scope of this phenomenon. These findings thus give rise to a series of questions about the chronology of Eurasian bladelet productions and the circumstances that surround their appearance.

Typological studies have already described the main characters and the large variability of bladelet tools. More recently, technological studies based on the concept of chaîne opératoire have proved fruitful for discussing the technical processes implemented in their production, as well as their techno-typological diversity and their functional purpose. Upper Palaeolithic bladelet productions in particular are known to be very fine chrono-cultural markers. In the Aurignacian and the Gravettian for instance, such productions have been efficiently used to monitor the internal diachronic evolution of these techno-complexes (XIVth UISPP Congress, Liège 2001, symposium 6.7. organized by F. Le Brun-Ricalens).

The aim of this session is to investigate the significance of the wide diachronic range and highly varied facets of bladelet productions, through a series of European and Near-Eastern case studies drawn from Middle and Upper Palaeolithic archaeological contexts.

The following issues are considered particularly relevant:

• The specific technologies of bladelet productions
• The typo-technical characters of bladelets and their functional purposes
• The chronological variation of bladelet production systems
• The production of bladelets in an economic perspective: transport of both cores and end-products

We are confident that this session can result in an updated synthesis on Middle and Upper Palaeolithic bladelet productions, which clearly played a determining part in the vast changes that took place in Eurasia between 50 and 30 ka BP.
C87 – Climatic Change and Social Evolution in the Arid Lands during the Holocene
(Daniel E. Olivera – deolivera@movi.com.ar, Hugo D. Yacobaccio – hdyacobaccio@gmail.com)

The Holocene is characterized by environmental fluctuations at both local and global scales. The human populations living in arid lands develop specific strategies to face this typical environmental risk and uncertainty of deserts. Furthermore, many archaeologists agree that economic and social modifications were correlated with those climatic changes. For that reason, it is absolutely necessary to study the environmental evolution as one of the main keys for understanding social and economic change, such as animal and plant domestication and social complexity. Our goal is to discuss new paleoenvironmental data in parallel with archaeological information to get an integrated panorama about resource use, land management, and technological responses that human societies devised during this time-period.

C88 – Rhythms and causalities of anthropisation dynamic in Europe between 6500 and 500 BC: sociocultural and/or climatic assumptions

(Rythmes et causalités des dynamiques de l’anthropisation en Europe entre 6500 et 500 bc: hypothèses socio-culturelles et/ou climatiques)

(Jean Carozza – laurent.carozza@wanadoo.fr, Didier Galop – didier.galop@univ-fcomte.fr, Jean Guilaine – iguilaine@wanadoo.fr, Michel Magny – michel.magny@univ-fcomte.fr – UISPP Comm.14)

The period between early Neolithic and Iron age is characterized by important social and environmental changes. In several regions of western Europe, relations have been evidenced between changes affecting societies and their environment.

Questions about settlement, development and impact of agro-pastoral activities on the environment, such as the evolution of agrarian systems or the exploitation of natural resources are problematic. These questions are related to a broader approach dealing with interactive mechanisms between societies and environmental systems including climate variability during the second half of the Holocene. This approach focuses mainly on the early Neolithic up to the beginning of our era. For the period considered a good knowledge of the mechanisms involved in the construction of territories is needed.

The objective of this conference is to present and discuss research topics focusing on evidence and manifestations of possible links between societies and environmental dynamics. The conference will focus on topics from the western part of Europe. However presentations from other parts of Europe are welcome.
C89 – Statue-menhir and anthropomorphic stelae in Europe, Asia and Mediterranean Sea

(Stefania Casini, Angelo Fossati – fossati@numerica.it)

Statue-menhir and anthropomorphic stelae are monuments widely diffused in Europe, Asia and Mediterranean Sea. The appearing of these monoliths in various and remote culture is for sure determined by different causes, be they linked to the Western Europe Megalithism, to the Copper/Bronze Age Mediterranean societies or to the Ancient Turkish peoples. The presence of such monuments from the Western Atlantic coasts of Portugal, to the Sardinia and Corsica Islands, in the Alps or Caucasus, until the steppes of Mongolia, needs to be better explained and studied. The symposium has the aim of introducing the state of the art on this subject. Papers discussing this matter are welcome, especially those taking in account new discoveries, distributions, cultural frames and interpretations of these particular manufacts. Particular attention will be requested to information and news regarding archaeological contexts in which these monuments are put, ethnographic sources to which they can be referred, and art history analysys to which can be subjected.

C90 – Rock art in the Alps

(Andrea Arcà – aa_arca@yahoo.it, Angelo Fossati – fossati@numerica.it)

Rock art in the Alps consists of petroglyphs on open air smoothed and polished rocks, painted and engraved wall in shelters, anthropomorphic stelae and carved boulders in ceremonial sites. If Valcamonica, Monte Bego and Valtellina represent the three main zones in the Alpine Range, small sites with historiated panels are also disseminated through slopes and valleys. The chronology of this art is wide: from the end of Palaeolithic (as the figures of elks in Valcamonica rock art), through the Neolithic-Copper Age (as shown by the topographic representations in Monte Bego) to the Iron Age (as in the warrior art of Valtellina), until the historical and Christian phases (as the Eastern Alps rock engravings). The symposium will discuss the state of the art in this wide area: papers focusing on new discoveries, chronology and interpretation of already known rock art traditions, are welcome, as well as ethnographic studies and historic-artistic contributions related to alpine rock art.

C91 – Transition from the Late Hallstatt to the Early La Tène Period

Transition entre l'Hallstatt final et le début de la période de La Tène

(Hrvoje Potrebica – hrvoje.potrebica@zg.htnet., Marko Dizdar – marko.dizdar@iarh.htnet.hr)

The transitional period from the Late Hallstatt to the Early La Tène is not just a question of chronological distinction between the Early and the Late Iron Age. It is more cultural process that in different areas of Europe followed different patterns. We are especially interested in problem of initial exposure of the Late Hallstatt communities to the La Tène cultural influences and consequent mechanisms of cultural transfer that developed in different areas, which did not necessarily include influx of new population. The aim of this colloquium id to establish diversity of such patterns on examples of several case studies and offer fresh models for interpretation of this process which is crucial for understanding of later prehistory of Europe.
ALREADY PROPOSED WORKSHOPS

(WS03, WS08, WS09, WS13, WS18, WS30 have been cancelled or merged other colloquia)

ATELIERS DÉJÀ PROPOSÉS (version française sur www.uispp.ipt.pt)

(WS03, WS08, WS09, WS13, WS18, WS30 ont été cancellés ou on rejoint d’autres colloques)

WS01 – Power and Archaeology
Pouvoir et Archéologie

(Mila Simões Abreu – msabreu@utad.pt)

Since its early days, Archaeology was sometimes seen by governments as another means to exercise power and justify their will. The power of the past can, on the other hand, influence present decisions. Nowadays we all agree archaeological finds, studies and achievements can be motors for sustainable development and influence jobs, tourism or quality of life, among others. In this colloquium we deal with all aspects that involve archaeology, power, governments and the future.

WS02 – Megalithic quarries/quarrying – the sources from which the stones were taken, and the way they have been manipulated

(Chris Scarre – cjs16@cam.ac.uk)

In his famous 1872 volume “Rude Stone Monuments” architect James Fergusson commented on the inherently peculiar nature of megalithic architecture, which chose to employ large stone slabs that were frequently unmodified and unshaped. Subsequent studies of the megalithic slabs themselves have focused mainly on their geological origin and the distances over which they had been transported. The materiality of the slabs and the way that they were extracted from their source material has been only rarely addressed, although megalithic ‘quarries’ have occasionally been identified, and the deployment of glacial boulders in North European monuments is a well-known phenomenon. The session proposed here will study the two ends of the megalithic process: starting with the extraction of the stones, and ending with the precise manner in which they were incorporated in the monuments. How far did the character and availability of certain types of material constrain and direct monument form? The presence or absence of shaping and smoothing, along with other aspects of selection in the choice and placement of the individual slabs, will also be addressed. This aim is to identify what it was about the ‘megalithic’ quality of the slabs that inspired this kind of construction.
WS04 – Men and volcanoes: to live, survive and relive

Hommes et volcans: vivre, survivre et revivre

(Claude Albore Livadie – alborelivadie@libero.it, J. P. Raynal – jpraynal@wanadoo.fr, UISPP Comm.31)

Volcanoes often had a devastating impact over civilizations and environment, revealed and documented by archaeological sites, in amore or less detailed way. Life in the immediate vicinity of active volcanoes was maintained or resumed whereas more distant civilizations were severely or completely affected by drastic modifications in the environment, governed by long distance phenomena. We wish to open a pluridisciplinary debate on the basis of resent research in this domain: volcanic eruptions have in fact affected Human-kind since its African origins! Numerous questions may be raised: have eruptions favoured human inter-groups competition? The abandonment of affected territories is inevitable or a survival is organised on-site? Different eruption styles, with different impacts, lead to different responses, and the distance to the phenomenon has an influence in them? Past societies have been able to protect themselves from volcanic activity? Have they organised economic strategies to face the phenomenon? How to detect this stress and the societies' responses in the archaeological data? Actualism, is it a good tool to proceed to those identifications?

WS05 – Roman occupation of Iron Age Iberian Southwest settlements

Occupation romaine des habitats de l’Âge du Fer du Sud-Ouest Ibérique

(Filomena Barata – mbarata@ippar.pt, Jorge Vilhena)

WS06 – Quality management of prehistoric sites: from research to dissemination

Qualité de la gestion de sites préhistoriques: de la recherche à la dissémination

(Maurizio Quagliuolo – qmauri@tiscali.it, Luiz Oosterbeek – loost@ipt.pt)

Our common Cultural Heritage, especially the prehistoric one, is subject to be rapidly deteriorated, needing to be preserved. On the other hand we have the responsibility to diffuse the knowledge of this Heritage to the public. Both of these activities have costs, sometimes expensive. The use of the Cultural heritage for tourism and other economic activities can help us to maintain it reducing costs and creating job opportunities. But there is a “break point” we have to study very well between “compatible development” (that take care of the context) and “sustainable development” (that is able to economically maintain itself). Our goal is to set an “equilibrium” between them. This session is aimed to discuss theoretical models and on-field experiences. The new HERITY International Registration for Quality Management of Cultural Heritage will also be introduced.
WS07 – Public Archaeology: participation of public power in managing memory generated through archaeological heritage, from the point of view of law and cultural policies

Archéologie Publique: participation du pouvoir publique dans la gestion de la mémoire générée par le patrimoine archéologique, du point de vue de la loi et des politiques culturelles

(Fábio Vergara Cerqueira – fabiovergara@uol.com.br, Laurent Caron – lcaron@ipt.pt; Tony Waegeman – tony.waegeman@phlimburg.be)

To debate archaeological research and heritage management within a wider cultural policy plan, managed by the public sphere. This includes both (1) the legal framework for regulations ruling archaeological activity (engaging the legislative action of modern democracies as well as the judicial action controlling the respect of such legislation by public and private social actors); (2) the inclusion, by the public authorities, of a programmed action of memory generated by archaeological heritage, from the points of view of preservation methods and of education and tourist use; (3) and Volunteering professionals in the world of archaeological heritage (the changing roles, contexts and added value of an important privat social actor in archaeological heritage management). One will present and assess reports on experiences of relation between public archaeology and public framework for research and heritage management, in order to foresee an international public archaeology updating.

(SAP)

WS10 – Natural Risks monitoring of Prehistoric Art sites

Risques naturels et monitorisation des sites d’Art Préhistorique

(Luiz Oosterbeek – loost@ipt.pt, Hipolito Collado – hipolitocollado@ozu.es, Mila Simões Abreu – mabreu@utad.pt, Dario Seglie – CeSMAP@cesmap.it)

The aim of the WS is to establish a common strategy to face those perils as fires, floods or seismic tribulations, both at predictive and rescue levels.

WS11 – Lithic technology in metal using societies

Technologie lithique dans les sociétés à métaux

(Berit Valentin Eriksen – berit.eriksen@hum.au.dk)

During several hundred thousand years of human prehistory siliceous rocks such as flint and chert were the most important raw materials used for tool production. Already in the 5th millennium BC, however, the use of copper is documented in many neolithic tool assemblages and in the course of the 3rd millennium BC metal technology is introduced in prehistoric societies all over Europe. With a few exceptions metal is largely superior to flint when it comes to the production of tools, yet there are regions throughout the world where flint craftsmanship thrived long after metallurgy had been introduced. There are numerous examples of copper and bronze implements being copied with great skill in flint, and in some areas simple flint tools would seem to be in common use even in early Iron Age societies.
Contextual technological analyses of lithic inventories from the Stone Age document, how lithic exploitation patterns change characteristically through time. Evidently, different cultural traditions are not only characterized by the well known typological succession of artefact types, but also to a very high degree by different technological and socio-economic processes pertaining to raw material use and procurement strategies, as well as by the idiosyncratic, technical or functional mode of exploitation, i.e. knapping and further modification, of nodules and blanks. Obviously, these considerations also pertain to lithic inventories from later prehistory, but so far very little have been published on these issues.

The aim of this workshop is to congregate lithic researchers working on (pre)historic sites in which lithic technology were of apparent subordinate importance. Presenters are encouraged to share knowledge, data and analytical results on lithic inventories from a global range of societies in which tool-stone is being replaced by metal. Papers providing methodological and theoretical insight pertinent to these issues are also welcomed.

WS12 – Experimental Archaeology: A source of knowledge for Paleolithic human occupations

Archéologie Expérimental: Une source de connaissance pour les occupations humaines au Paléolithique

(Isabel Cáceres Cuello de Oro, Andreu Ollé Cañellas, Ethel Allué Martí – calluc@romani.ixa.urv.es, Montse Esteban Nadal)

Experimental work on archaeology research is a tool to confirm working hypothesis based on the study of archaeological records. For the Paleolithic, the experiments can be directed to the knowledge of formation processes of sites and the interpretation of human occupations. Since the last decades it has been developed many experimental and ethnoarchaeological works focused on the knowledge and interpretation of prehistoric assemblages.

This workshop will permit to know and debate the most recent works and research approaches, with an special interest on the experimental integrated works and the interdisciplinary perspective. These includes lithic and fire technology and wood and animal processing.

WS14 – Humans, environment and chronology of the Late Glacial on the North European Plain

Hommes, environnements et chronologie du tardiglaciaire dans les plaines Nord Européennes

(Martin Street – street@rgzm.de, Nick Barton – nick.barton@arch.ox.ac.uk, Thomas Terberger – terberge@uni-greifswald.de, UISPP Comm. 32)

The session of commission XXXII will provide new important information on research on the Late Glacial of the North European Plain. The papers will present for example new evidence on the Hamburgian, the transitional period to the Mesolithic and the coloni-
zation process of Scandinavia. Talks dealing with comparative aspects of more southern areas will also be given. A limited number of papers can still be accepted. (If you are interested to participate, please directly contact Martin Street).

**WS15 – Technological analysis on quartzite exploitation**

*Analyse technologique de l’exploitation du quartzite*

(Sara Cura – saracura@portugalmail.pt, Stefano Grimaldi – stefano.grimaldi@lett.unirn.it)

Quartzite was frequently knapped by prehistoric human groups in several Pleistocene and Holocene sites. Sometimes, it represents the only raw material exploited in a site/region. Nevertheless scholars usually consider quartzite as an alternative raw material for prehistoric lithic production when “better quality” rocks (i.e. flint) are available in a given geographical area.

In this workshop we deal with all the aspects that involve technology and experimentation to discuss the adaptive implications for lithic industries made from quartzite.

**WS16 – Sharing Taphonomic approaches**

*Mise en commun des approches en Taphonomie*

(Marie-Pierre Coumont – marie-pierre.coumont@caramail.com, Céline Thiebaut – celine.thiebaut@wanadoo.fr, Aline Averbouh – averbouh@mmsh.univ-aix.fr)

In prehistoric archaeology, the reconstruction of human behaviour is in large part based on the study of material culture remains. This type of analysis must take into account the natural or accidental events that participate in the formation of archaeological assemblages. The study of these events developed punctually until it was finally established as a true discipline called Taphonomy. First conceived in the field of palaeontology, the field of Taphonomy now integrates the ensemble of analytical methods employed to identify the phenomena responsible for the modifications observed on remains.

Though these phenomena have been known for several years, the modifications they induce are, with rare exception (Texier *et al.* 1998, Bertran *et al.*), studied separately for each type of material (faunal remains, remains of lithic, bone and ceramic industries, *etc.*). Furthermore, the absence of common experimental protocols precludes comparison between different observations, thus preventing the promising possibility of sharing Taphonomic approaches.

Does a given phenomenon produce the same type of alteration regardless of the initial surface condition or material? Can the results of taphonomic studies of bone materials contribute to our knowledge of the taphonomic history of lithic materials? Does one type of trace always correspond to the same agent?

The aim of this Workshop is to promote discussion on this topic and to suggest guidelines for further work, particularly on: Trampling, Rain wash, Weathering, Solifluction, Geliturbation, Compaction, Bioturbation, Dissolution.
WS17 – “GIS – aided survey and other uses for predictive modelling in prehistory”

“SIG – prospection aide et autres usages pour la modélisation prédictive en Préhistoire”

(Ariane Burke – a.burke@umontreal.ca)

Geographic information systems (GIS) have been used in archaeological research for over a decade. Most of the uses for this technology within prehistoric research have been related to the construction of descriptive models. GIS can also assist in the design of survey strategies through the construction of predictive models, however. Models of land-use, developed using GIS, also have potential as a means of simulating processes such as the dispersal of hominid populations and the colonisation of new land masses. The archaeological potential of GIS-based models will be explored in this session, with particular emphasis on predictive modelling, GIS-aided survey and simulations.

WS19 – Rock Art and Museum

Art Rupestre et Musée

(Dario Seglie - CeSMAP@cesmap.it, Guillermo Muñoz, Giorgio Dimitriadis – giorgio.dimitriadis@cheapnet.it)

The name rock art is traditionally attributed to all non-utilitarian anthropic markings on rock surfaces; the term “art” is utilized *latu sensu*, without aesthetic implications, according to the Latin etymology that defines the human activity of producing artefacts, hence the derivation of the words artisan, artificer, artist.

Rock art is today only the “residue” of ancient cultural complexes, conserved over time, while songs, prayers, dances, gestures, votive offerings etc. are unrecoverable, but it displays the spiritual abundance of our oldest ancestors.

The keen interest in rock art derives from its relative rarity, as sites that testify the cognitive dimension of man; the main problem facing us now is conservation, protection and communication.

To identify the best procedures for a valid protection it is necessary to plan monitoring with instruments recording the variability in the environmental parameters and the impact on the rock monuments, in view of the primary conservational necessity.

The symposium will critically consider the propriety and feasibility of treating rock art of the past as a source of knowledge for the contemporary interpreter, examine the possibility that such knowledge may be distorted by subjective ethnocentric perceptions, and explore the necessity of evolving museological models, which can present and conserve rock art without reflecting current prejudices and predilections.

The symposium will also focus attention on the existing and pristine relation of the rock art landscapes with adjacent landscapes, humanized by local communities. An attempt will be made to assess the possibility of restoring the custodial interest, if any, of such communities in the rock art landscapes; and, to recognize the constructive, constitutive and creative role of rock art and the associated folklore in the conservation and replenishment of such landscapes.
The contributors may like to address themselves to the question of inter institutional cooperation across the globe for a quest into appropriate ways of documenting and presenting rock art within a museum, for inciting aesthetic, technical, ecological, cultural and touristic interest of visitors, and, for fulfilling convergent objectives of conservation, education, research or appreciation.

Rock art museums, projects or institutions, in open air or indoor, as cultural interpretation of reality, is a form of cultural heritage conservation technique.

Museology and museography of rock art should be sciences devoted to the survival of this spiritual legacy of humanity.

(GSA)

WS20 – Rock Art Data Base: New Methods and Guidelines in Archiviation and Catalogue

Base de données en art rupestre: nouvelles méthodes et lignes guide en archivage et catalogue

(Raffaella Poggiani-Keller, George Dimitriadis – giorgio.dimitriadis@cheapnet.it – Fernando Coimbra – facoimbra@yahoo.com, Carlo Liborio, Maria Giuseppina Ruggiero – mg.ruggiero@libero.it)

The workshop’s aim is to analyze the new methods for cataloguing rock art, by the use of modern technologies: typology of the data-collection (d-base), digital photos, photogrammetry, laser scanner, etc. Particularly attention will be also dedicated to the conservation aspects for rock art’s preservation, throughout special Art Risk Schedules (ARS) and sharing data by Internet. This last topic will be discussed in order to preserve the Intellectual Property Right (IPR), most of all for the public administration.

(GSA)

WS21 – Use of combustibles and site functions during the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic period: new tools, new interpretations

Gestion des combustibles, fonctions et fonctionnement des foyers au Paléolithique et au Mésolithique, fonctions de sites: nouveaux outils, nouvelles interprétations

(Théry-Parisot Isabelle – thery@cepm.cnrs.fr, Costamagno Sandrine)

Fire played a crucial part in the everyday life of Palaeolithic societies in relation with the varied function of fireplaces as well as the large number of activities closely related to them. The study of fires and their role was for a long time limited to typology. Over the last few years new studies have focused on the recognition of all kinds of burnt remains (phytoliths, charcoal, coal from bones, coke) and characterisation of combustibles properties, micromorphological studies, taphonomic analyses focusing on combustion processes and the differential conservation of burnt remains and ethnoarcheological studies. These approaches have considerably renewed our vision of the use of combustibles, the roles and the function of campsites during the Palaeolithic period. This workshop will enable us to find out and discuss the most recent researches on these topics.
WS22 – Theoretical and Methodological Issues In Evolutionary Archaeology: Toward an Unified Darwinian Paradigm

Questions théoriques et méthodologiques en archéologie évolutives: vers un paradigme darwinien unifié
(Hernán Juan Muscio – hmscio@ciudad.com.ar, Gabriel Eduardo López)

Asserting that artifacts and behaviors are part of the human phenotypes Evolutionary Archaeology explains the archaeological record in terms of the Darwinian theory of evolution. Sharing this common ground a great diversity of scopes has arisen, mainly from the approaches of the Human Behavioural Ecology, Sociobiology, and Cultural Transmission Theory. All these selectionist lines of reasoning expand the explanatory domain of the evolutionary research in a variety of topics, including social, technological, and biological evolution. However, a complete unified paradigm in Evolutionary Archaeology has not emerged. This demands the discussion of diverse epistemological, theoretical and methodological issues. At the core of the debate come out questions such as the units of selection, the role of the cultural transmission, the construction of cultural lineages, the documentation of neutral variation, the linkages between adaptive ecological behaviour and the broad time scale processes from which emerge archaeological patterns, between others. This workshop will bring together researchers working in a wide range of time periods and geographic areas, in order to generate a rich discussion ambience regarding the theoretical and methodological issues that could lead to an unified Evolutionary Archaeology paradigm.

WS23 – Raw material supply areas and food supply areas: integrated approach of the behaviours

Aires d’approvisionnement en matières premières et aires d’approvisionnement en ressources alimentaires: approche intégrée des comportements

(Mari-Hélène Moncel – moncel@mnhn.fr, Anne-Marie Moigne, Marta Arzarello – paleomarta@hotmail.com, Carlo Peretto – me4@unife.it)

Multidisciplinary analyses of the Palaeolithic sites provide more and more information on the origin of resources exploited by the occupants of a site and the sweep of land they move on in order to meet their needs of both food and raw materials. The overlapping of these two types of supply areas may greatly differ according to the situations.

In this workshop we would like first to draw up the state of knowledge in this field and then look at the evidences in their settings, in considering, for instance, the climate or season, the topography, the availability and quality of the raw materials, the wealth in big or small game (and in potential vegetal food), the site function, etc. Discussions shall aim at working out what specifically concerns the human behaviour, among the range of possible responses to the immediate vital requirements, given the environmental constraints.

Signs of inconsistency, in the course of time, between shifting environmental conditions and stable behaviours or inversely between changing behaviours and apparently stable conditions, may feed the debates regarding the traditions, the knowledge or ability ex-
changes, the people movements. Well documented studies may introduce socio-cultural notions, allowing to eventually making out particular behaviours that refer to the idea of feat (hunting) or masterpiece (implement) and that involve, among the human group, much wider interests than just the matter of day to day requirements.

**WS24 – Functional studies between East and West: are we finally closer?**

Études fonctionnels entre l’Est et l’Ouest: est-on, finalement, rapprochés?

(Natalia Skakun, Laura Longo – Laura_Longo@comune.verona.it, UISPP Comm.33)

Theoretical context of early development and acknowledgement of the discipline, theoretical and methodological split between Eastern and Western approaches, subsequently created two distinct “traditions” or “schools” of thought and practice. Recently, since the beginning of the 3rd millennium, 3 international conferences opened the debate and exchange of ideas on the discipline: is it time to walk in the same direction broadening horizons?

**WS25 – Pluridisciplinary provisional state of the art on the research conducted at cave Chauvet-Pont d’Arc, Ardèche, France**

Bilan pluridisciplinaire des recherches menées à la grotte Chauvet-Pont d’Arc, Ardèche, France

(Jean-Michel Geneste, jean-michel.geneste@culture.gouv.fr)

The various specialists constituting the scientific team in charge of the study of the Chauvet cave intervene in disciplinary fields which, besides the analysis of its parietal art, include the karstic geomorphology, the archaeozoology, the archaeology, the ichnology and the preservation of the cave. Our initial work has allowed us to set up a general chronological framework which becomes more and more refined in the course of our field work. The pooling of our results allows us to present a new assessment of the human and animal frequentations in the cave, of the succession of events in it be they natural or anthropological, of the Aurignaco-Gravettian cultural context, as well as of the management and preservation of such a site.

**WS26 – Babies Reborn: infant/children burials in prehistory**

Bébés renés: Sépultures des nouveau-nés/enfants dans la préhistoire

(Krum Bacvarov – krum_bacvarov@sofianet.net, Tatiana Mishina – tmishina@mail.ru)

As distinct age groups, babies and children have their special place in the archaeological record. The examination of the manifold manifestations of their presence in prehistoric contexts would attract scholarly attention with approaches varying from purely archaeological and bioarchaeological analyses of burial contexts through chronology observations to interpretations and reconstructions of ritual and symbolic systems. Cross-cultural comparisons and parallels as well as the multidisciplinarity of these considerations would contribute to a more complete picture of the social and ritual structures in prehistory.
WS27 – Global rock art protection

(Robert Bednarik – robertbednarik@hotmail.com, Ben Swartz)

Presently there are numerous conflicts worldwide in the areas of conservation, management and promotion of rock art. Recent examples include Côa, Dampier, Guadiana and examples in Brazil, Dominican Republic, Peru, Columbia and U.S.A. An assembled group of individuals of divergent backgrounds and interests will be invited to discuss and draft issues and establish specific guidelines for such conflicts. The establishment of impartial roving arbitrators and grassroots fund-raising advocacy groups will be considered. The idea and proper operation of the International Rock Art Preservation Fund, free of government control or influence, might be developed, and any other ideas and potential initiatives that would benefit the protection of global rock art and the establishment of mechanisms of resolving disputes involving the destruction of rock art.

WS28 – Defining a methodological approach to interpret structural evidences

(Fabio Cavulli – Fabio.Cavulli@lett.unitt.it)

This workshop aims to enlighten the role and relationship between different features such as, postholes, hearths, rubbish pits, silos, ditches, palisades and other similar features. Although every period has its specific circumstances due to variation in land exploitation or economic strategies, each period has a contribution to make regarding the functionality and relationship between structural evidences and between features and environment. We expect a comparison between difference scientific approaches, (including field archaeology, ethnoarchaeology, experimental archaeology, landscape analysis, architecture, anthropology…) to give new perspectives for the research of these features in archaeology.

Indeed, a commonly reoccurring problem in archaeological excavation is that there are several contexts which consist only of hollow features and no living floors; this is usually due to erosion or modern anthropic activity. The result is that the material culture is well known, but not the function of the area. This leads us to ask: is this a settlement? A working area linked to agricultural activities? Are they storage pits? Underground fire places? Clay mixing pits? Or simply rubbish pits? Simply put, what was the role of these features?

If understanding the stratigraphical nature and the actions that took place in and around the feature we are digging is the basis on which to interpret the function, then the correct excavation of these features is necessary to understand the possible purpose for which it was created. The first step is to establish a methodology for digging these features to be able to reach any interpretation of their function. In order to do this, it is necessary to consider all the evidence of similar features in prehistoric or historic periods by an archaeological and from an ethnographical point of view. The next step is, therefore, to find all the possible functions of these features.
WS29 – The idea of enclosure in Recent Iberian Prehistory

(António Carlos Valera – antoniovalera@era-arqueologia.pt, Lucy Shaw Evangelista)

In recent years, the archaeology of Recent Peninsular pre-history has gone through a truly empirical revolution. From North to South, from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, there are few regions that have not been the source of surprises. This fast rate of discovery is made even more interesting by the curious context in which it has occurred: the increasing theoretical diversity in approaches to peninsular Prehistory. The empirical “finds” are now accompanied by different types of interpretation, giving rise to passionate debates, generating resistance from the more orthodox and reckless approaches to the more avant-garde ones. All this not only gives rise to fascinating discussion but also really shows the ideologic and contingent character of the production (construction) of knowledge (in this case archaeological knowledge).

One of the focuses of this dynamic concerns the problems raised by ditched enclosures and their role in the development of the Neolithic and Chalcolithic communities of the Iberian Peninsula. Our ideas on this subject were radically changed in the last decade and the subject quickly took on a central role in theoretical discussion. Many questions relating to scale, meaning, to school, to the centrality of theory and to the growth and autonomy of archaeology make the debate on enclosures, in general, and ditches, in particular, one of the most fascinating areas of contemporary Iberian pre-history.

Ranging from models that are based on World System or Peer Polity Interaction, to the more holistic approaches to human behaviour; from the strictest empiricism and functionalism, to materialism, passing through the most daring (type of) phenomenology and the insufficiencies, indecisions and linguistic prejudices that all of this generates, today, turn the debate surrounding these contexts, is one of the liveliest areas in the production of knowledge and in reflexion on archaeology.

The main aim of this session, to be included in the UISPP program, is to gather researchers from different regions in Iberia, with different theoretical perspectives and for the first time to present together the data and most significant contexts and to compare the different approaches. And because the phenomenon, or the idea, as Chris Scarre puts it, is of European expression, it is essential that researchers who have dealt with this problem in other European regions should be included in this debate centered on the Iberian Peninsula.

WS31 – Middle to Upper Palaeolithic Transitional Industries: tecnological, typological and morfometrical characteristics

(Federico Bernaldo de Quiros – decfbq@unileon.es, Alvaro Arrizabalaga – fgparvaa@vc.ehu.es, Jose Manuel Maillo – jmaillo@geo.uned.es)

The ideas about Middle to Upper Transition have changed in the last decades, the idea of an abrupt replacement of the Mousterian by Upper Palaeolithic industries were challenged by the presence of the so called Transitional Industries.

The general form of this Transitional Industries was the presence of a strong Mousterian substrata and the presence of some Upper Palaeolithic elements. The coexistence of both
were explained in different ways, like acculturation to evolution. The aim of the colloquium is to point together the raw data of this Transitional Industries in order to best understand the complex process of the Middle to Upper Palaeolithic transition.

WS32 – Interdisciplinary Studies In Human Evolution

(Eugénia Cunha – cunhac@antrop.uc.pt; Group of Studies in Human Evolution – greevh@gmail.com)

Both the rock art either the more recent philosophical texts reveal a typically human characteristic: the man's reflection on himself and his role in the world. For that reason Man always worried to classify and systematize the elements that surround him. Following this logic, he also tried find his place in the natural world, and for that it is necessary to know his origins. However this evolutionary exercise, when applied to the human species, finds a series of difficulties and impediments difficult to overcome. In that sense, the understanding of the Human Evolution should have in consideration a multiplicity of approaches.

There are hiatuses that don't allow rebuild, with certainty, from beginning to end, the history of the human evolutionary past. The overcome of these hiatuses is only possible as a result completion of the complementarity that an interdisciplinary approach allows.

Taking into account all these elements, the Group of Studies of Human Evolution (GEEvH) tries to develop a body of research that demonstrates the importance of the crossing of perspectives coming from the most varied branches of the science, for knowledge of the Man's run since about 8 million years witch separate anatomically modern Human from our closer relatives, the chimpanzees. With that purpose, GEEvH has been developing investigations in the following areas: archeology, anthropology, biology of the skeleton, paleodemography, primatology, ethology and genetics. From this exchange of theories and methodologies can appear new insights that allow completing the gaps separating us of the complete knowledge of human history.

WS33 – Preservation and Protection of Indigenous Cultural Landscapes

(Valerie Magar, Mexico; Andrew Thorn, Austrália)

The engagement with paintings and engravings on rock surfaces can only exist while the object itself survives. The object is generally a site with both cultural and natural landscape components and these can only be comprehended, studied, and appreciated in the place. Recorded images neither capture spatial relationships or summon up the tangible and intangible sensory experiences of being in the place.

Preservation and protection of indigenous sites ensures that all the spatial and sensory components of a site, and the context of paintings, survive beyond the recorded image. To record a site is to remove it to another culture, to preserve and manage a site is to protect it for all cultures for all time. Preservation ensures it remains part of the culture that created, used and lived with the site.

This session will attract presentations that discuss the tangible material aspects of a painted or engraved site and consider its place in the landscape. Papers discussing preservation, protection and management of rock art sites will be encouraged.
Strikingly similar Rock Art Symbols – painted or engraved – have been found all over the world. Whatever types of symbols are considered, e.g.: iconical (such as: stroke, pubic triangle, hand, foot, horned head, orant, a.s.o.) or artifactiform (such as paddle, shoe print, horseshoe, metallic artifacts, a.s.o.), or those one could call “initiatic” (such as: cupmark, concentric circle, spiral, labyrinth, cruciform, yin-yang rose, pentagramme, snake-like, disk and crescent, a.s.o.), a comprehensive inventory remains to be made. The meaning of Rock Art Symbols can of course diverge or even be non unique. Those symbols bring unpalatable difficulties to the one who tries to decipher their meaning(s). Some researchers believe those difficulties too large to be dealt with, while others tend to imagine too much of subjective meanings.

Our point of view attempts to stay between those two extremes, based on the conviction that scientific conclusions of their interpretation are possible. In this respect, it is most important to notice that some symbols do not only appear in Rock Art but also on pottery, metal works or other artefacts and even on monuments. This presence on other materials may be a leading thread to analyze how a symbol works.

As Mircea Eliade used to say, “The danger of the studies about symbolism lays on hasty generalizations”. This researcher pointed out the importance of symbolism in the primitive thinking and its fundamental role in the life of traditional society. Since Rock Art is the oldest archive of Mankind activities, it is of prime importance to better understand the cognitive abilities of our ancestors through the symbols they carved onto the rocks.
SPECIAL THEMATIC CLUSTERS
SOUTHERN AMERICA ARCHAEOLOGICAL PANORAMA

Rationale

Southern America’s Archaeology is multifaceted and marked by geo-political divisions and scientific exchanges established with dominating countries, namely France, England and the United States. In some countries, the links with these knowledge producing centres are stronger than with their neighbouring countries, despite prehistoric remains crossing current national frontiers. The import of theories and methods was so enduring that it is difficult to compare and integrate the produced knowledge and to build interpretation models aiming at an account of Latin America’s Prehistory.

The environmental aspects, concerning both the natural resources that supported the different populations and the taphonomic specificities that characterise the archaeological record, have been scarcely investigated as a consequence of the dominance of imported models.

Recently, this situation is starting to experience a deep change and the creation of fora in Southern America is a strong evidence for this change. Mention must be made to the International Simposium of Tierras Bajas (1996), the International Meeting of Southern America Theoretical Archaeology (1998) and, lastly, the preparation of a Panorama of Southern America’s Archaeology for the next congress of UISPP (Lisbon, 2006) is an important step for the integration of professionals that take the study of America’s colonization process as their topic. This way, it is time for the establishment of a Scientific Commission on Latin America’s Archaeology, that will be a forum of scientific exchange having as a focus the specificities of the archaeological record in Latin America and the implementation of theories and methods adequate to the construction of interpretations on the process of colonization of this part of the American continent.

Co-ordination

Maria Dulce Gaspar
Saúl Eduardo S. Milder
Fábio Vergara Cerqueira

Sessions

C2 History of South America’s Archaeological Research
C21 Mounds Construction in the Americas
C22 Gardeners from South America
C23 Plant Use and Food Production in the Americas
C32 Contemporary issues in historical archaeology
C62 Coastal geoarchaeology: the research of shellmounds
IFRAO – GLOBAL STATE OF THE ART

An International Rock Art Meeting at the UISPP XV Congress
Lisbon, 4-9 September 2006

Rationale

The International Federation of Rock Art Organisations (IFRAO) is a federation of national and regional organisations promoting the study of palaeoart and cognitive archaeology globally. Nine members founded the federation in September 1988 in Darwin, Australia. Currently IFRAO has 42 regional member organizations covering most of the globe involving thousands of both professional and amateurs.

Over the last 18 years IFRAO has organized, supported or promoted dozens of local and regional meetings on all continents. As a world non-governmental organization, IFRAO, has also organized major international rock art congresses. These IRACs took place in countries as diverse as Australia, Bolivia, China, India, Italy Namibia, Portugal, South Africa and the United States.

In 2006 IFRAO will start a new kind of international meeting focusing on “The Global State of the Art” in the discipline of Rock Art.

An invitation to this three-day event is extended to researchers and members of the IFRAO organizations, who are warmly asked to present the most relevant discoveries, studies and trends in the field of rock art from the last decade. Our sessions will be concurrent with the other sessions and workshops of the UISPP XV Congress that will take place in Lisbon (Portugal) in September 2006.

Presentation of the event

Academic Committee

IFRAO President, Giriraj Kumar, India.
IFRAO Convener. Robert Bedanrik, (AURA – Australia)
UISPP General Secretary, Luiz Oosterbeek (IPT – Portugal)

Members

Abdelkhalek Lemjidi, Morocco; Alanah Woody, Nevada; Angelo Fossati, Italy; Anne Solomon, South Africa; Anne-Marie Pessis, Brazil; Ara Demirkhanian, Armenia; Arsen Faradjiev, Russia; B. K. Swartz Jr, IN – Usa; Carmen Sevillaño, Spain; Carol Díaz-Granados MO – USA; Charles Robert Bailey, MN – U.S.A. Chen Zhao Fu, P. R. China; Dario Seglie, Italy; David Coulson, Kenya; David Morris, South Africa; Edith da Silva Pereira, Brazil; Eileen C. Brownlie, United Kingdom; Fernando Javier Costas Goberna, Spain; Fidelis T. Masao, Tanzania; Freddy Taboada, Bolivia; Gabriela Martin Avila, Brazil; George
Organising Committee
João Carlos Baptista, Cláudia Cunha, Angelo Fossati, Ludwig Jaffe, Pierluigi Rosina

Meeting President
Jean Clottes (Association pour le Rayonnement de L’Art Pariétal Européen and Société Préhistorique Ariège-Pyrénéées – France)

Meeting Chairpersons
Mila Simões de Abreu (APAAR–Portugal) and Hipolito Collado (Colectivo Barbon) Spain

Sessions
The IFRAO Global State of the Art (IGSA) will be arranged in geographical or thematic sessions proposed both by the organisers (see proposed list) and by participants (see proposal).

Each session will be coordinated by at least two persons from two different countries. The coordinators will be responsible for the organization before, during and after their session. This includes invitations, call for papers and selection of papers, chairing the session and pre and post editing of material for the web site or book. The final date for acceptance of new sessions will be 30 September 2005.

Papers and posters
All aspects of global rock art studies will be addressed, with emphasis on current concerns and developments, the future direction of the discipline and its global priorities. The title, summary and keywords (see proposal) should be sent directly to the session coordinators or to the secretariat of IFRAO by 31 December 2005. Later arrivals may be considered, depending on the discretion of the session coordinators. Summaries will be published on the official web site prior to their presentation. Final texts should include congress feedback.
Languages

The official languages will be English, French, Spanish and Portuguese.

Venue

Lisbon is Portugal’s capital, a modern cosmopolitan city steeped in tradition. Inhabited since the Palaeolithic, Lisbon has a Roman past that can be seen in ruins like ones of the Roman Theater in the “Baixa” (downtown). Alfama and other surrounding quarters inherited an Arabic tradition and are among the few old areas that survived the devastating earthquake and tsunami of 1755. In the monument zone of Belém (UNESCO world heritage site), which includes the National Archaeological Museum in the monastery of Jerónimos, you can step back to the age of the first voyages around the oceans. The Parque das Nações is a new part of Lisbon, built for the remarkably successful EXPO 98. The surrounding beaches and seaside towns make of Lisbon a pleasant place to visit with all the family.

The UISPP congress and IFRAO sessions will take place in the Faculdade de Letras in the “City” of the University of Lisbon. The venue can be easily reached by public and private transport from all parts of town. It is close to the airport and places like the Colombo shopping centre and the football stadiums of Sporting and Benfica.

Excursions

Besides a free trip during the Congress, participants can take part in a selection of special excursions to rock art sites in Portugal and Spain covering different chronologies and techniques. Excursions, both before and after the UISPP congress, will be guided by researchers and include rock art sites in the Tejo/Tagus Valley, Douro/Côa, Spanish Extremadura and Paleolithic caves. A grand-tour will take in sites both in Portugal and Spain.

Registration

This will be through the UISPP congress. Please see general information in http://www.uispp.ipt.pt/en/inscri.html
For further information about the XV UISPP congress see the official web page http://www.uispp.ipt.pt/

Sessions

C26  Prehistoric Art – Signs, symbols, myth, ideology
C27  Prehistoric art and ideology
C28  Symbolic spaces in Prehistoric Art: territories, travels and site location
C29  Epipalaeolithic Rock Art
C45  “Arts and Cave printing among Tribals: An Ethno Archaeological Perspective”
C47  Animal representations in Prehistoric Art
C73  Aesthetics and Rock Art III Symposium
C74  Methods of art history tested against prehistory
C80  The Pleistocene palaeoart of the world
C81  Spirals and Circular Forms: the most common rock art elements…
C82  The dating of Pleistocene petroglyphs
C84  Place Theory in Rock Art Studies
C85  European cave art
C89  Statue-menhir and anthropomorphic stelae…
C90  Rock art in the Alps
WS10  Natural Risks
WS19  Rock Art and Museum
WS20  Rock Art Data Base: New Methods and Guidelines in Archiviation and Catalogue
WS25  Pluridisciplinary provisional state of the art on the research…
WS27  Global Rock Art protection
WS34  Symbolism in rock art
LIST OF SESSIONS PER MAIN AREAS

THEORY AND METHOD SESSIONS

C1 Status of Prehistoric studies in the twenty first century in India
C3 Theoretical Trends in South American Archaeology
C4 Technology and Methodology for Archaeological Practice: Practical applications…
C5 Re-construction, simulation, reconstitution – How real is our real, how fake is our past?
C26 Prehistoric Art – Signs, symbols, mith, ideology
C27 Prehistoric art and ideology
C28 Symbolic spaces in Prehistoric Art: territories, travels and site location
C45 Arts and Cave printing among Tribals: An Ethno Archaeological Perspective
C46 Empowerment of Man through social cultural: Archaeology – Micro study of the…
C47 Animal representations in Prehistoric Art
C51 History of Archaeology in the Iberian Peninsula
C52 Cognitive archaeology as symbolic archaeology
C54 On Shelter’s Ledge: Histories, Theories, and Methods of Rockshelter Research
C59 Pressure Flintknapping: Experiment, context of emergence and development. Papers in honour…
C65 Typology vs Technology
C73 Aesthetics and Rock Art III Symposium
C74 Methods of art history tested against prehistory
C75 “Archeologues sans frontieres”. Towards a history of international archeological congresses…
C76 Antiquarians at the Megaliths
C81 Spirals and Circular Forms: the most common rock art elements in the world?
C84 Place Theory in Rock Art Studies
C85 European Cave Art
C90 Rock art in the Alps
WS10 Natural Risks monitoring of Prehistoric Art sites
WS15 Technology analysis on quartzite exploitation
WS16 Sharing Taphonomic approaches
WS17 “GIS – aided survey and other uses for predictive modelling in prehistory”
WS20 Rock Art Data Base: New Methods and Guidelines in Archiviation and Catalogue
WS22 Theoretical and Methodological Issues In Evolutionary Archaeology: Toward…
WS24 functional studies between East and West: are we finally closer?
WS26 Babies Reborn: infant/children burials in prehistory
WS28 Defining a methodological approach to interpret structural evidences
WS34 Symbolism in Rock Art

ARCHAEO SCIENCES SESSIONS

C6 History of Human populations, palaeoecology and ancient DNA
C8 Bioarchaeology from the Midst of Shells
C9 Land snails as food: past and present
C11 Ancient Cultural Landscapes in South Europe – their ecological setting and evolution
C56 Archaeology of food: recovering evidences of past gastronomic heritage
C60 Paleopathology: Medical approach of the relations between man and environment in Prehistory
C69 Luminescence Dating Techniques: a User’s Perspective
C70 Archaeometry – Characterization Of Pottery. Sampling And Analytical Protocols,…
C71 The Contribution of Archaeometry to the Understanding of Bell Beakers Phenomenon
C82 The dating of Pleistocene petroglyphs
C87 Climatic Change and Social Evolution in the Arid Lands during the Holocene
WS32 Interdisciplinary Studies In Human Evolution

HUNTER-GATHERERS SESSIONS

C13 The earliest inhabitants in Europe
C14 Modern Humans origins in Eurasia
C15 Iran Palaeolithic
C16 Palaeolithic hunter-gatherers concept of territory
C17 Late Palaeolithic Environments and Cultural Relations around the Adriatic
C29 Epipalaeolithic Rock Art
C31 Mountain environments in prehistoric Europe: settlement and mobility...
C33 The Palaeolithic of the Balkans
C34 Settlement Systems of the Middle Paleolithic and Middle Stone Age
C37 Micoquien d’Europe Centrale et d’Europe Est avec la participation:....
C39 Lower Paleolithic: short and long chronologies, lithic industries linear evolution models,...
C57 Setting the Record Straight: Toward a Systematic Chronological Understanding...
C58 Come in...... and find out. Opening a new door into the analysis of hunter-gatherer...
C61 Animal exploitation by prehistoric hunter-gatherer societies: environment, subsistence...
C62 Coastal geoarchaeology: the research of shellmounds
C63 Transitions in the Palaeolithic
C64 Space And Time: Which Diachronies, Which Synchronies, Which Scales?
C66 Harvesting the Sea: current perspectives on hunter-gatherer coastal adaptations
C67 Settlement dynamics and Environment Resources in the Palaeolithic of South-west France...
C77 Non-flint Raw Material Use in Prehistory: Old Prejudices and New Direction
C78 Modern Human dispersals, environments and cultural change in the Late Pleistocene...
C80 The Pleistocene palaeoart of the world
C83 Current Issues on Projectile Tips Studies, from the Beginning of the Upper Palaeolithic...
C86 Middle and Upper Palaeolithic bladelet productions: a diachronic perspective
WS12 Experimental Archaeology: A source of knowledge for Paleolithic human occupations
WS14 Human, environment and chronology of the Late Glacial on the North European Plain
WS21 Use of combustibles and site functions during the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic period:....
WS23 Raw material supply areas and food supply areas: integrated approach of the behaviours
WS25  Pluridisciplinary provisional state of the art on the research conducted at cave Chauvet…

WS31  Middle to Upper Palaeolithic Transitional Industries: tecnological, typological…

AGRO-PASTORALISM SESSIONS

C18  Mesolithic/Neolithic interactions in the Balkans and in the middle Danube…
C21  Mounds Construction in the Americas
C22  Gardeners from South America
C23  Plant Use and Food Production in the Americas
C24  Material Mnemonics in European Prehistory
C35  Neolithic and Chalcolithic architecture in Europe and the near east:…
C38  European Megaliths and Black Sea hills: possibilities for comparative…
C42  Space and place construction within stateless lineages societies – the…
C43  Symbolic figurations in the 4rd and 3rd millennia in the South of the Iberian…
C44  Ancient Neolithic in the Iberian Peninsula: regional and transregional…
C68  Monumental Questions: Prehistoric Megaliths, Mounds, and Enclosures
C79  Archaeological evidences…
C87  Climatic change and social…
C88  Rhythms and causalities of anthropisation dynamic in Europe between…
WS2  Megalithic quarries/quarrying – the sources from which the stones were…
WS29  The idea of enclosure in Recent Iberian Prehistory

EARLY METTALURY SESSIONS

C25  The protohistoric iron age of South Asia
C36  The eastern Mediterranean in the west – Impacts and Influences
C40  The entities/identities of the Atlantic and Mediterranean Bronze age
C41  The creation of “significant places” and “landscapes” in the Northwestern…
C53  A New Dawn for the Dark Age? – Shifting Paradigms in Mediterranean Iron Age…
C72  Special Spaces, Memory and Identity in the European Bronze Age
C89  Statue-menhir and anthropomorphic stelae in Europe, Asia and Mediterranean Sea
Transition from the Late Hallstatt to the Early La Tène Period

Men and volcanoes: to live, survive and relive

Lithic technology in metal using societies

ARCHAEOLOGY AND SOCIETY SESSIONS

Symbolic Wars

Contemporary issues in historical archaeology

Postcolonialism and Archaeology: Studies

Romanization and Indigenous societies: rhythms, ruptures and continuities

Power and Archaeology

Roman occupation of Iron Age Iberian Southwest settlements

Quality management of prehistoric sites: from research to dissemination

Public Archaeology: participation of public power in managing memory…

Rock Art and Museum

Global rock art protection

Preservation and Protection of Indigenous Cultural Landscapes
Regional Archaeology has never been emphasized in India. This was because of the studies done in India during 1960 and 1970 were under the leadership of H.D. Sankalia, who had been incorporating the major finds of all regions within a format of chrono-cultural arrangement of the whole India (Sankalia 1974). G.R. Sharma and his colleagues carried out some very significant regional studies during this period, but these studies also remained basically descriptive in nature and could not develop a specific characteristics of the habitat and economy within this zone.

India is a vast country and comprises a large variety of distinct and diverse eco-zones. It is because of this reason that we require developing a regional archaeology for India (Bhattacharya 1996). Subbarao (1958) had tried his genius and borrowed the “Kulturkreis” model of the German Geographers to understand the cultural metamorphosis of our prehistoric past. However, these made no or little impact in the trend of researchers that followed in the next five decades.

It has been argued that as archaeologists, we are faced with the methodological task of isolating extinct socio-cultural systems, as the most appropriate unit for the study of evolutionary processes, which results in cultural similarities and differences. If we view that culture originates out of man’s attempt for extra somatic means of adaptation then, we must isolate and define the ecological setting of any given socio-cultural system and study in detail, with regards to the adaptive process or coping situation, which were presented during prehistoric time in terms of biological and social demensions (Binford 1964). I believe the isolation and study of cultural system rather than aggregates of cultural traits, is the only meaningful approach to understanding cultural processes (Steward 1960). A cultural system is a set of constant or cyclically repetitive articulations between the social, technological and ideological extrasomatic, adaptive means available to a human population (White 1959).

A decade after, it was suggested that the “Regional Approach” or the detailed and systematic study of the regions can be more appropriately expected to reflect cultural systems.
The extent of such regions will vary because, it is recognised that cultural systems differ greatly in the limits of their adaptive range and milieu. As cultural systems become more complex, they generally span greater ecological ranges and enter into more complex, widespread and extra-societal interactions. The isolation and definition of the content, the structure, and the range of a cultural system, together with its ecological relationship, may be viewed, as a research objective. The research design should be aimed at accomplishing this isolation, which is believed to be most profitably prosecuted within a “regional” unit of investigation (Binford 1972).

A large number of discoveries have been made during the last five decades (1950-2000) in Indian Palaeolithic Culture. But, the context of the discovered sites was mainly of secondary in nature. In such cases the archaeological materials are generally transported by the river over considerable distances from their original places of manufacture and or use before being deposited as a component element of the river sediments. In view of their secondary context, the artifact collections from river deposit do not give a complete picture of the nature and composition of lithic industries. Any elaborate statistical studies of such incomplete data can lead to dubious cultural inferences. We cannot be certain that, a gravel or silt deposit is the result of one cycle of sedimentation. It may have undergone several stages of reworking. In such cases there is immense scope for the admixture of materials belonging to different cultures. Hence, it is not always possible to equate stratigraphical successions with cultural sequences.

These shortcomings have given rise to a somewhat pessimistic attitude that nothing can be known about the Indian Palaeolithic Culture beyond stratigraphy and tool typology. It is precisely this attitude which has led the otherwise distinguished archaeologist like Wheeler (1960) to adopt such deritive titles as “Stones” and “More Stone” for chapters dealing with Stone Age Culture viewed in larger perspective. It is because of the pre-occupation with secondary sites that Indian Prehistory has not been able to win anything beyond passing references in works and talks dealing with world Prehistory. Yet, the discovery of relatively undisturbed surface sites and their importance as evidence for early habitation pattern have also been emphasized by some specialists (Jacobson 1970a, 1975, 1985; Bhattacharya and Singh 1997-1998; and Singh 2000-2001, 2004).

A stage has therefore been reached, when it is imperative to be clear about the ultimate goals of our research work stated in simple terms. Prehistoric research is aimed at the reconstruction of lifeways of prehistoric societies in the context of the then prevailing environmental conditions. If that is our aim, than a re-orientation of our research appears to be necessary, which in turn entails a different set of technique and methods. In this connection, it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the study of primary sites and all kind of phenomena associated with them.

From the Seventies of the last century, one can see, that the field research in Indian Palaeolithic was beginning to address issues of culture and lifeways of even the remotest cultural period. The excavation of Palaeolithic sites in caves of Adamgarh (Joshi 1978) and Bhimbhetka (Misra 1975-76) in Madhya Pradesh, Gudium in Tamilnadu (Allechin and Allchin 1968) and Kurnool district in Andhra Pradesh (Murthy 1974); could not only reveal the pattern of vertical successions, but also such other significant informations as the area of stone quarring and working floors. The pattern of dispersal of cultural features started attracting more attention in these series of Palaeolithic researches in India; like at Chirki-Nevasa in Maharastra(Corvinus 1968, 1968-69,1970b,1973), Hunsgi

It was felt that Prehistory of a specific geo-climatic zone without reference to world wide applicable chrono-cultural stages, might bring in more important cultural information. That is unlike using the micro to construct a macro, in such a way that micro looses its individual relevance beyond the point of being relevant to the macro. That’s why I propose regional archaeology for Indian Palaeolithic research, and this would enable us to construct the cultural reality in a much better way. The argument is similar to what is meant by the popular expression "To miss a tree for the sake of the forest". It is very important for Indian Palaeolithic studies that, we should look for an area which is more or less insular or closely near being insular as possible and study them according to that particular region (Singh 2002, Bhattacharya 2004).
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Address: _________________________________________________________________

City: ___________________________  Country: ___________________________  Postal Code: ___________________________

B ACCOMPANYING PERSON - Please fill in

Last Name: ___________________________  First Name: ___________________________

C REGISTRATION FEES - Please tick-off and fill in

Registration entities to be considered a member of the UISPP (except for accompanying people) until the following congress, to participate in the Congress events and to receive its pre congress general publications. Full membership entities also to receive the congress publications, the final programme and abstracts book, the excursions guides, one excursion during the congress and entries in some Museums. Accompanying people will not receive pre-congress general publications. Reduced fee is offered to Congress sessions’ organizers, students aged less than 30 years old and participants from countries with low or lower-middle economies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Until December 31st 2005</th>
<th>Until April 30th 2006</th>
<th>After April 30th 2006</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fee</td>
<td>€ 250,00</td>
<td>€ 280,00</td>
<td>€ 300,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced fee</td>
<td>€ 170,00</td>
<td>€ 200,00</td>
<td>€ 220,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying Person fee</td>
<td>€ 100,00</td>
<td>€ 210,00</td>
<td>€ 230,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total amount for Registration €

Note: Registration will only be considered if payment is also made, by credit card, certified bank check in the amount due or by bank transfer to our account (the name of the registered person must be mentioned).
D  ACCOMMODATION - Please tick-off and fill in

Arrival Date: ___________ Departure Date: ___________ Number of nights: ___________
Number of rooms required: _____ Single(s); _____ Double(s); _____ Double room(s) with extra bed;
Number of beds required in youth hostels: _____ Bed(s) in male rooms _____ Bed(s) in female rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel Category</th>
<th>Single Room</th>
<th>Double Room</th>
<th>Double room with extra bed</th>
<th>Deposit Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels *****</td>
<td>€ 103,00/177,00</td>
<td>€ 113,00/193,00</td>
<td>€ 147,00/236,00</td>
<td>€ 250,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels ****</td>
<td>€ 63,00/103,00</td>
<td>€ 73,00/123,00</td>
<td>€ 101,00/140,00</td>
<td>€ 150,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels ***</td>
<td>€ 62,00/ 90,00</td>
<td>€ 68,00/101,00</td>
<td>€ 97,00/117,00</td>
<td>€ 120,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Houses</td>
<td>€ 42,00/ 50,00</td>
<td>€ 52,00/ 59,00</td>
<td>€ 64,00/ 87,00</td>
<td>€ 100,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Hostels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Double Room</td>
<td>Multiple Beds (per bed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hotel Preferred: 1st Choice ___________ 2nd Choice ___________ 3rd Choice ___________

Total amount for accommodation €

All rates are per room, per night, in Euros (€), and include breakfast, all taxes and service charge (except multiple beds in youth hostels that prices are per person and breakfast in not included). These special rates are available only if booking is made and paid through Top Atlântico Operated by TopTours. Reservation requests will be confirmed on a first come, first serve basis. In case your choice is no longer available a similar alternative accommodation will be offered. A deposit is required to request the booking. Reservation requests received without deposit will not be considered. After the confirmation of availability, with the indication of the name of the hotel reserved, and acknowledging the receipt of the corresponding deposit, full prepayment of the balance is required in order to guarantee the reservation. Upon receipt of full payment a confirmation letter will be sent, to be presented at the hotel's reception desk at the time of check-in.

E  SIGHTSEEING TOURS - Please tick-off and fill in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tour 1 - Lisbon Tour</th>
<th>Tickets per person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half day</td>
<td>09:00 AM</td>
<td>Ticket(s) x € 31,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ticket(s) x € 31,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour 2 - Sintra / Estoril / Çaô da Roca</td>
<td>Ticket(s) x € 31,00</td>
<td>€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half day</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>Ticket(s) x € 51,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ticket(s) x € 81,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour 3 - Óbidos / Nazaré / Fátima (lunch Included)</td>
<td>Ticket(s) x € 76,00</td>
<td>€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full day</td>
<td>09:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour 4 - Evora (lunch included)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full day</td>
<td>09:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Évora Tour operates only on Tuesdays and Saturdays.

Total amount for sightseeing tours €
**F CANCELLATION POLICY**

Registration:
Registered delegates unable to attend will receive a full refund less € 50.00 administration fee provided that a written request is received by Top Atlântico Operated by TopTours on or before 15 June 2006. After this date no refunds will be made.

Accommodation and tours:
Cancellations received before 01 August 2006 shall be refunded after the congress, after deduction of bank expenses. After this date no refunds will be made.

All approved refunds will be processed and issued until 60 days after the Congress.

**G PAYMENT – Please fill in**

Total of sections C + D + E

**C**

**H FORM OF PAYMENT – Please tick-off and fill in**

- Certified Bank Cheque, made payable to Top Atlântico DMC Viagens Turismo, S.A.:
  
  Number: ___________________________ Bank: ___________________________ Amount: ___________________________

- Swift Bank Transfer (Please enclose copy of the bank order) to:
  
  Top Atlântico DMC – Viagens Turismo, S.A.
  
  Int. Bank Account Number: PT50 0033 0000 0000 8770 6440 5
  
  Swift Code: BCOMPTPL
  
  Bank: Banco Comercial Português
  
  Address: Rua Coronel Bento Roma, Lt. 942, Piso 3
  
  1749-088 Lisboa, Portugal

- Credit card:
  
  [ ] Visa  [ ] Amex  [ ] MasterCard  [ ] Other

  Cardholder’s Name
  
  __________________________________________________________________________

  Card number: ____________________________________________________________ Exp. Date __________

  Billing address: __________________________________________________________________________

  Cardholder’s birth date: __________

  Three last digits mentioned on the back of the card (Except AMEX): __________

  I herewith authorize Top Atlântico DMC – Viagens Turismo S.A. to debit this credit card for the amount of € __________

  I also authorize Top Atlântico DMC – Viagens Turismo, S.A. debiting or crediting my credit card account with the amount if any subsequent charge(s) to the items booked.

  Signature: ___________________________________________ Date: __________

**Liability:**

Personal travel insurance is strongly recommended, as the Organising Committee and Top Atlântico Operated by TopTours act as agents only in securing hotels, transport and travel services and in no event shall be liable for acts or defaults in case of injury, delays, loss, expense, delay or irregularity of any kind whatsoever during arrangements organised through contractors or the employees of such contractors in carrying out services. Hotel and transportation services are subject to the terms and conditions under which they are offered to the public in general. The Organising Committee reserves the right to make changes where deemed necessary, without prior notice to parties concerned. All disputes are subject to the Portuguese law.

**PLEASE FAX TO (+ 351) 218 925 406**
PERMISSION OF CREDIT CARD CHARGE FORM

Congress: XV UISPP Congress

Name of Participant: __________________________________________________________

I (name of the Credit Card Holder) ____________________________

authorize TopAtlântico Operated by TopTours to charge the amount of € (Euro)

_____________________________ to my credit card.

I also authorize that my credit card be debited or credited in the amount of any
subsequent changes.

Visa □   Amex □   Mastercard □   Other ________________________________

N.º | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Exp. date. | | / | |

The three last digits printed on the back of the card (except Amex) | | | |

Cardholder's birthdate __________/__________/__________

(Day) (Month) (Year)

Billing Address ______________________________________________________________

Date __________/__________/__________

(Day) (Month) (Year)

________________________________________________________________________

(Cardholder's signature, as on the card)

Please fax to (+351) 218 925 406

Top Atlântico – DMC, Viagens e Turismo S.A. – Congress Department
Av. Dom João II, Lote 1.16.1 | 1990-083 Lisboa
Tel: +(351) 218 925 405 | Fax: +(351) 218 925 406
E-mail: lisboa.congress@topatlantico.pt | Web: www.topatlantico.pt
ARTSIGNS
An European Project to promote an interaction involving Prehistoric Art, contemporary artists and communication experts

The planned activities follow different and complementary strategies: material movable products (exhibition, booklet) that may act as starting points for discussions engaging, in each country, archaeologists, artists and journalists; virtual products that may be used for further monitoring exercises elsewhere in Europe (web-site); the engagement of modern artists and journalists; a specific concentrated application of procedures, involving rock art study and documentation with artists and journalists, supported by a documentation and library data-base..

The project will be presented at the UISPP congress, in the framework of session C26. All colleagues interested in the project should address to:

Projecto ArtSigns
Museu de Arte Pré-Histórica e do Sagrado do Vale do Têjo
c/ Luiz Oosterbeek
Rua Padre António Pereira de Figueiredo
6120-750 Mação
Portugal
Partnership between TAP Portugal and IPT

– XV UISPP Congress –

TAP Portugal has agreed with IPT – in the ambit of the XV UISPP Congress to be held in Lisbon 4 to 09 September 2006, to offer a discount to the participants who make their flight booking and buy their ticket exclusively through TAP Portugal’s website.

The discounts offered are the following:

– 10% in economy class
– 20% in business class

The code IT6TPCG11 has been given to this congress and it must be mentioned when making the booking in order to benefit from the discount:

To make the booking, the participant should follow these steps:

– enter the website www.flytap.com and select the dates and cities of choice
– make a normal booking
– the conference code, as well as the registration/participant number must be inserted in the Congress Code Box

Example:

In case of questions, please contact TAP Portugal by the following email: congressos@tap.pt

Important Information

✔ The discount applicable to this event is only valid for online bookings made through TAP Portugal’s website and with payment by credit card. The ticket will always be an electronic ticket, except in cases of destinations where the electronic ticket is not possible.

✔ Bookings made previously by travel agencies or at our desks are not eligible for this discount.

✔ The final price shown at the end of the booking is the public fare available and applicable to the selected flights and dates, including taxes. The event discount does not appear on the online booking; it will be applied, only at issuing moment, over the fare available, excluding all taxes related to the voyage. The currency used will always be Euros.

✔ The discount only applies to TAP operated flights. Bookings on code-share flights operated by other airlines are not permitted. Code-share flights are identified on online bookings with the code OP (Example: TP6701 OP).

✔ The discount is not accumulative with fares for resident / student / child / infant / senior, etc.

✔ The discount applies to round trip journeys from any TAP destination to Portugal (Lisbon, Faro and Oporto).

✔ The booking can be made at any time. The travel dates must be comprehended in the period of 10 days before / 10 days after the event dates.

✔ The discount is also extended to the participants accompanying persons.

✔ The conditions and restrictions regarding changes and refunds are those of the applicable fare. Please check the fare details before ending your booking.
Volunteers collaboration at UISPP’s congress

The International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences held its 13th Congress in Forlì, Italy, in 1996. This event was characterised by the large numbers of organisations and participants in attendance. 3000 participants arrived in Forlì from more than 80 different countries. 1500 communications were held in dozens of different languages (Latin included!) during 18 sessions, 37 colloquiums, and 22 workshops. 2 volumes contained communication summaries, 18 volumes were printed for the introductory relations, 12 guides described excursion destinations before and during the Congress, and this is without counting the material printed after the event.

The enormous effort involved in the organisation was continued with the help received from volunteers, thanks to an agreement between the Secretariat of the Congress and the European Forum of Heritage Associations. This co-operation gave the 80 members of volunteers associations from Europe and outside Europe the possibility of taking part in the Congress with the status of “co-operator for the organisation”.

The volunteer’s help was very important for the realisation of the congress, both in the days before the official opening, and during the event itself. Their presence was fundamental in the initial stages where thousands of people gathered in Forlì. They helped to welcome all the participants and prepared for each of them, all the documents, press releases and publications to distribute at the registration.

During the Congress, volunteers did translations, assisted participants and speakers in congress rooms, distributed materials, helped with projectors and slides, and distributed materials for the live translations. Volunteers were also the guides for the excursions held during the congress for the participants and the accompanying people.

Forum volunteers didn’t just perform routine tasks, but dedicated themselves also to the inevitable last minute emergencies which can happen when such a big event is organised. They also gave their support during the cultural initiatives which took place in Forlì, and in the surroundings towns, during the Congress.

As a reward for their efforts, the Congress Secretariat provided accommodation for the volunteers during their stay in Forlì and allowed them to participate to the congress as “full inscription” members. Forum volunteers had the opportunity to attend all the sessions and the workshops, they visited the exhibitions, and especially they had the opportunity to meet personally the most important experts in the fields of archaeology, anthropology, prehistory and protohistory. During the congress, therefore, volunteers had access to an enormous amount of information and contacts which rewarded them for their efforts.
FORMULAIRE DE CONDIDATURE AU XV CONGRES UISPP
Réservée aux volontaires du Forum

APPLICATION FORM FOR THE XV UISPP CONGRESS
Reserved for the volunteers

FICHA DE PARTICIPAÇÃO NO XV CONGRESSO UISPP
Reservado aos Voluntários do Fórum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prénom</th>
<th>Nom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Family name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nome</td>
<td>Apelido</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lieu et date de naissance</th>
<th>Nationalité</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place and birthdate</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local e data de nascimento</td>
<td>Nacionalidade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adresse: rue, ville, code postal, pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: street, town, code, district, country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morada: rua, localidade, código postal, país</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nº téléphone</th>
<th>nº fax</th>
<th>e-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>telephone n°</td>
<td>fax n°</td>
<td>e-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nº telefone</td>
<td>nº fax</td>
<td>e-mail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>diplôme (obtenu et/ou en cours) et matière étudiée</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>educational qualification (completed and/or in process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diploma (obtido e/ou em frequência) e área de estudo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>profession</th>
<th>job</th>
<th>profissão</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quelles sont vos compétences techniques?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are your technical skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quais as tuas competências técnicas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes informatiques / software / informática:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipement technique / technical equipment / equipamento técnico:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presse et communication / Press and communication/ Imprensa e Comunicação:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sécurité / security / segurança:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourisme / tourism/ turismo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autre / other / outro:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>centres d’intérêt particuliers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>particular interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesses pessoais</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Quelles langues parlez-vous et à quel niveau?**

**Which languages do you know and at what level?**

**Quais as línguas que falas e a que nível?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>français</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>francés</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>anglais</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>russe</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>italien</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>chinois</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>espagnol</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>français</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>portugais</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>allemand</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>allemand</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>grec</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>grec</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>allemand</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>allemand</strong></td>
<td>A - B - C - D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A**  
Je peux traduire simultanément à l’oral de et vers cette langue et je connais du vocabulaire archéologique dans cette langue.

I can speak and make simultaneous translations into and from this language and I know archaeological vocabulary in this language.

Sou capaz de fazer uma tradução oral simultânea de e para esta língua e conheço o vocabulário de arqueologia nesta língua.

**B**  
Je peux traduire simultanément à l’oral de et vers cette langue mais je ne connais pas le vocabulaire archéologique dans cette langue.

I can speak and make simultaneous translations into and from this language but I don't know archaeological vocabulary in this language.

Sou capaz de fazer uma tradução oral simultânea de e para esta língua e não conheço o vocabulário de arqueologia nesta língua.

**C**  
Je parle cette langue mais ne sais pas traduire simultanément.

I can speak but not make simultaneous translation.

Falo esta língua, mas não consigo assegurar uma tradução simultânea.

**D**  
Je peux comprendre mais pas parler.

I can understand but I do not speak.

Compreendo, mas não consigo falar.

**1**  
Je peux effectuer des traductions écrites vers ma langue maternelle.

I can make written translations into my language.

Sou capaz de efectuar traduções escritas para a minha língua materna.

**2**  
Je peux effectuer des traductions écrites de et vers ma langue maternelle.

I can make written translations from and into my language.

Sou capaz de efectuar traduções escritas de e para a minha língua.
– Avez-vous déjà participé en tant que volontaire à l’organisation d’un congrès? Quand?
  Quel était votre rôle?
– Do you have any other congress experience as a volunteer? When? What kind of experience?
– Tens experiência de voluntariado em organização de congressos? Quando? Que função desempenhaste?

– Avez-vous été ou êtes-vous membre d’une (ou de plusieurs) association(s) culturelle(s)? si oui, laquelle (lesquelles)?
– Have you ever been or are you a member of one (or more) heritage associations? if yes, which one(s)?
– És membro de uma ou várias associações culturais?
  Se sim, qual ou quais?

– Avez-vous participé au congrès IUSPP de Forlì en 1996? si oui, quel était votre rôle?
– Did you take part in the UISPP congress in Forlì in 1996? if yes, in which role?
– Participaste no Congresso da UISPP em Forlì em 1996? Se sim, que função desempenhaste?

– Avez-vous déjà participé à un projet du Forum? si oui, lequel?
– Have you already taken part to previous of Forum initiatives or projects? if yes, which one(s)?
– Já participaste em algum projecto do Fórum?
  Se sim, em qual?

– Avez-vous déjà participé à une assemblée ou à un congrès organisé par le Forum? si oui, où et quand?
– Have you ever participated at Forum’s general assemblies or congresses? if yes, where and when?
– Já participaste em alguma assembleia ou congresso organizado pelo Fórum? Se sim, em qual e quando?

date
signature lisible

date
clear signature

data
assinatura legível

Send this form with your curriculum vitae to your euro-regional Forum delegate by January 15th 2006. In case of approval, please send a signed copy of this application form to the Forum address.

Reenvia esta ficha acompañada do teu curriculum vitae ao representante do fórum da tua zona geográfica (consulta lista abaixo) até 15 de Janeiro de 2006. Se a tua candidatura for aprovada, ser-te-à solicitado o envio de uma cópia original e assinada do formulário para o endereço do Fórum.

Contacts:

North Europe (Scandinavie, Danemark, Pays baltiques, Pologne): Eva-Liisa Jarvinen: eva@iisaja@hotmail.com

Great Britain and Ireland: Nick Chapman: nick.chapman28@virgin.net

Central West Europe (Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, France, Czeck Republik, Hungary): Tony Waegeman: tony.waegeman@phlimburg.be

Balkans: Violeta Chavdarova: violeta@ngolink.net

Central South Europe (Austria, Slovenia, Croatia, Italy, Greece): Adriana Martini: president@heritageforum.org

Spain and Portugal and rest of the world: Conceição Catroga: c.catroga@ipt.pt
Do not forget:

ENROL TODAY
Plan of the Congress area: University of Lisbon

1. Faculdade de Direito
2. Reitoria
3. Faculdade de Letras
4. Faculdade de Ciências
M. Metro (Underground)