

## SECOND BULLETIN

XVII World UISPP Congress  
Burgos, 1-7 September 2014

**President of Honour:**  
HM the Queen of Spain

**Congress President:**  
Dr. Emiliano Aguirre

**Secretary General:**  
Dr. Eudald Carbonell

**Organizer:**  
Atapuerca Foundation

**Local Congress Organizing Committee**  
Atapuerca Foundation, Carretera de Logroño 44, 09199 Ibeas de Juarros (Burgos)

**Science Deputy Secretary:**  
Dr. Robert Sala. Contact: [sci.uispp2014@fundacionatapuerca.es](mailto:sci.uispp2014@fundacionatapuerca.es)

**Organization Deputy Secretary:**  
José M. R-Ponga. Contact: [org.uispp2014@fundacionatapuerca.es](mailto:org.uispp2014@fundacionatapuerca.es)

**President of the Local Congress Scientific Committee:**  
Dr. Martín Almagro Gorbea

**Congress organization coordinator:**  
Dr. Marcos Terradillos. Contact: [uispp2014@fundacionatapuerca.es](mailto:uispp2014@fundacionatapuerca.es)

**Congress Technical Secretary:**  
Viajes El Corte Inglés. Contact: Tatiana Rodríguez [uispp2014@viajeseci.es](mailto:uispp2014@viajeseci.es)

**Venue:**  
Burgos (Spain). Atapuerca sites.  
*Burgos is a city in northern Spain with 200,000 inhabitants. It is 15 kilometres from the Atapuerca sites, 230 km from the French border in Irun-Hendaye, and 236 km from Madrid-Barajas international airport.*

**Congress venue:** University of Burgos

**Collaborating scientific bodies:**

- University of Burgos [www.ubu.es](http://www.ubu.es), Calle Hospital del Rey s/n, 09001 Burgos
- National Human Evolution Research Centre (CENIEH) [www.cenieh.es](http://www.cenieh.es), Paseo Sierra de Atapuerca s/n, 09002 Burgos
- UCM-ISCIH Centre for Human Evolution and Behaviour [www.atapuerca.tv](http://www.atapuerca.tv), Calle Sinesio Delgado 4-6, Pabellón 14, 28029 Madrid
- Catalan Institute of Human Palaeoecology and Social Evolution (IPHES) [www.iphes.cat](http://www.iphes.cat), Calle Escorxador s/n, 43003 Tarragona

---

### CONTENTS

- 1. INSTITUTIONAL WELCOME**
- 2. INTRODUCTION**
  - 2.1. A renovated UISPP
  - 2.2. Greetings from the Chairman of the XVII UISPP Congress
  - 2.3. Preliminary information from the Secretary General of the XVII UISPP Congress
  - 2.4. A brief history of the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences
- 3. REGISTRATION AND RESERVATIONS**
  - 3.1. How to register
  - 3.2. How to book accommodation
  - 3.3. How to join outings and supplementary programmes
- 4. SCIENTIFIC SESSIONS**
  - 4.1. Sessions proposed by the UISPP committees
  - 4.2. Sessions proposed outside the UISPP committees
- 5. RESERVATION FORM**
- 6. REGISTRATION FORM**
- 7. NOTICE**
- 8. CONGRESS POSTER**

#### **IMPORTANT NOTICES**

1. The deadline **to reserve** registrations is **15 July 2013**.
  2. The deadline for registrations is **28 August 2014**.
  3. The deadline for proposed debates and seminars is **15 May 2014**.
  4. Please distribute this convocation widely by:
    - Sending this bulletin to as many contacts as possible.
    - Printing and displaying the accompanying poster in a prominent place in academic and scientific centres.
- 

## **1. INSTITUTIONAL WELCOME**

Juan Vicente Herrera

*President of the Castilla y León Autonomous Government*

In September 2014, the city of Burgos will host the XVII Congress of the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences, an association attracting thousands of scientists, researchers and university lecturers from around the world concerned with this discipline. The outcomes of these Congresses extend to many more thousands of students, professionals and members of the general public interested in this field.

The choice of Burgos to host this important gathering is no coincidence. Experts around the world are keenly aware that the Sierra de Atapuerca, just outside this city, holds the planet's largest active group of palaeoanthropological sites -now included in the World Heritage-, the basis for one of the world's biggest scientific initiatives in this field, the Atapuerca Project, which has brought together every discipline and cutting edge technology required to study the earliest history of the human species.

Burgos has grasped the opportunities afforded by this incredible legacy. The city is being consolidated as a global benchmark in human evolution research, with major infrastructure and modern scientific and cultural research in this field now firmly installed, particularly at the only Museum of Human Evolution in the world, along with the most comprehensive and advanced scientific research centre in this field and a magnificent auditorium that can host the many groups attracted by the innovative potential of Burgos, destined to become one of its hallmarks.

The Government of Castilla y León is fully aware of the scientific importance of the

Atapuerca sites and their global significance, and consequently is firmly committed to preserving and enhancing this rich cultural heritage as well as making this a major resource that will benefit the entire Castilla y León Region, not only in its scientific and research aspects, but also as a clear driving force for the region's economic revitalization.

This conviction is reflected in our determined backing for the 2014 UISPP Congress. The theme "Burgos, Evolution Capital", will be borne out once again and see this city on the centre stage of world archaeology. For all of these reasons, I warmly invite all members of the international scientific community specialized in this exciting field to participate in this Congress and discover Burgos and the rest of the Castilla y León Region, its history, its heritage and above all, its firm commitment to modernity and the future.

I must not conclude these remarks without thanking Drs. Arsuaga, Bermúdez de Castro and Carbonell for their constant, tireless work on this exciting project, and especially for their efforts to ensure the choice of Burgos to host this World Congress. Of course, this gratitude must be extended to the Atapuerca Foundation, which has taken on the tremendous task of organizing the gathering.

---

## **2. INTRODUCTION**

### **2.1 A renovated UISPP**

Jean Bourgeois, Luiz Oosterbeek, François Djindjian  
*President, Secretary-General and Treasurer*

The UISPP is an institution with a long history. It has undergone many changes to make it what it is today.

Its origins date back to the establishment of the *International Palaeoethnological Congress* in 1865, a meeting which a few years later became the *International Congress of Prehistoric Anthropology and Archaeology*. The first major change came in the early 1930s, under the leadership of Gerhard Bersu, Raymond Lantier, Hugo Obermaier, Wilhelm Unverzagt and Pedro Bosch-Gimpera. The first *International Congress of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences* was held in Bern in 1931. Prehistory -and to a lesser extent at that time Protohistory as well-, formed the core of the organization. Since then a total of 17 international congresses have been held (including the next Burgos congress). Recognition of the UISPP by UNESCO and the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies (ICPHS) in 1955 was accompanied by a change of our organization's name to the one it has today, the International Union of Pre-and Protohistoric Sciences.

Despite its ups and downs, the UISPP has tried to steer the same course, placing great importance on the spirit of international scientific exchange and refusing to accept discrimination or intolerance of any kind whatsoever. This is clearly stated in the preamble of our Statutes. However, society changes and research evolves. Dominated for decades by European, American and Soviet countries, research into prehistory and early history is now wide open to the whole world. For a long time, this research has been the field of academics and scholars, but now protohistoric and prehistoric archaeology is the work of a much larger number of researchers with a broad range of experience, from young PhD students to archaeologists committed to emergency archaeology, from classic researchers to archaeologists closer to the field of heritage management.

The UISPP clearly needed to adapt to these fundamental changes, which could only be undertaken with a radical transformation. In recent years, the Executive Committee has worked on the renewal of our organization. Long discussions eventually led to a new set of statutes, which in part reflect the valuable experience built up in the long history of the UISPP, but also takes into account the evolution of the scientific world. These statutes and the changes they reflect were finally voted at the UISPP World Congress in 2011, in Florianópolis (Brazil).

In its concern to democratize the UISPP structures, we decided to elect an office composed of a President, a Secretary General and a Treasurer, all charged with the task of the organisation's day to day organization. The Executive Committee now consists of the chairpersons of the scientific committees, a clear sign of the importance placed by the UISPP on these committees, the central scientific bodies of our organization. The scientific committees now lie at the heart of the UISPP decision-making process, and they are responsible for its effective scientific activity through seminars, conferences and publications. A score of committees (old and new) were approved at the Ghent meeting in Belgium in April 2012, and they will undertake the work of the UISPP and draft its scientific programme.

Whereas at least a few of the UISPP structures were previously reserved for some, it has been decided that any researchers working in good faith, of any origin, race or philosophical conviction, may be a member of the UISPP. All they need to do is to express their intention to be a member, subscribe to the Statutes and pay an annual fee. By doing so, the UISPP hopes to show its democratic commitment. The former *Permanent* Council, which consisted of a maximum of four researchers per country, did not respond to this democratic concern. The UISPP took the courageous decision, in my opinion, to conclude the activities of the Permanent Council and open its doors to any researcher who wants to help us to achieve our goals.

The UISPP was for a long time a European 'concern' (only two world congresses have been held outside Europe, in 1981 in Mexico City and 2011 in Florianópolis, Brazil). This also did not reflect the globalizing trend in pre- and protohistoric archaeology. In order to respond to this concern for internationalization as well, the UISPP World Congress decided to choose sites alternately in and outside Europe, with a shortened interval of three years, making our world conferences more international and more numerous from now on.

In this context, the next Congress will be held in 2014 in Burgos (Spain), and the following Congress will be held in Melbourne in 2017.

The choice of Burgos makes much sense, given its magnificent scientific tradition, articulated in the research at the Atapuerca sites where the oldest Europeans have been discovered. The Museum of Human Evolution, the National Human Evolution Research Centre and the excavation sites themselves are highlights in the archaeological landscape of this part of Spain and Europe. Further ahead, the Congress in Melbourne in 2017 will clearly show that the UISPP is open to the world, particularly to the currently booming countries in the Asian-Pacific region.

The historical continuity of this institution is thus one of our concerns, alongside the need to keep in step with the evolution of scientific research around the world. This is the most radical transformation undergone by the UISPP since the 1930s. The historic continuity of our organisation is reflected in the name, but more particularly in the ethical foundations that underpin the UISPP, as clearly reflected in the new statutes, while at the same time there is a clear renewal in the option for openness and democratization. We can still wish a long life for the UISPP, a venerable maid more than a century old who is still not afraid to undergo

every now and then, a 'lifting', a rethinking.

## **2.2. Greetings from the XVII UISPP Congress President**

Emiliano Aguirre

*President of the XVII UISPP Congress*

I am extremely pleased at the idea of meeting you all in September 2014 in Burgos at the XVII UISPP Congress. I am also delighted that the World Congress UISPP will once again be held in Spain, 60 years after the previous event. I am sure that we will learn about the latest developments in research into our remote ancestors, as well as the difficult and surprising progress that all of you are making in every corner of our planet.

Your research is leading us to ever greater heights of knowledge, achieving much broader records, detailed and integrated information about our ancestors, as well as astonishing progress in intelligence and ability to design and use the latest tools, to communicate, and to integrate groups, societies and lifestyles. This is all being achieved by interdisciplinary projects that bring together the work of archaeologists, geologists, palaeontologists, ecologists, etc., who are sharing the results from a multitude of sites, regardless of whether they are nearby or distant in space and time.

The first written history, and the oral traditions that went before it, reflect the concepts of progress or evolution, but we can only gain access to the remote past of prehistory through scientific method, based on recorded signs, measurable effects with specific causes and remote yet identifiable actions, i.e., by experimental method. This method has been applied in the Sierra de Atapuerca project since its beginning over 30 years ago, one of the first scientific projects of our time to apply it. In closing, I would like to share with you a public acknowledgement of scientists who preceded us a century ago with their interdisciplinary approach, the Marquis of Cerralbo, Paul Wernert and Perez de Barradas, and commemorate their heritage on the occasion of this Congress to be held in Burgos, thanks to Atapuerca Foundation and my dear colleagues.

## **2.3. Preliminary information from the Secretary General of the XVII UISPP Congress**

Eudald Carbonell

*Secretary General of the XVII UISPP Congress*

The XVI World Congress of the International Scientific Association UISPP was held in Florianopolis Brazil, in September 2011. During the Congress, the city of Burgos was chosen to host the 17th UISPP Congress in 2014, following a proposal by Drs. Arsuaga, Bermudez de Castro and myself.

The decision was based on the international importance of the Sierra de Atapuerca sites, barely 15 kilometres from the city, which have been a global benchmark in the field of Human Evolution for more than 30 years. In recent years, Burgos has made great efforts to become a congress city and a cultural driving force. Burgos is also in an easily accessible location, conveniently placed to visit other major points of interest. I wish to thank the Castilla y León Autonomous Government and Burgos University for spearheading the support for the Burgos candidacy for this Congress.

The organisation of the 2014 Congress has been entrusted by the UISPP to the

Atapuerca Foundation, a non-profit organization based in Ibeas de Juarros, 3 km from the Sierra de Atapuerca sites. The main objective of this Foundation is to ensure the continuity of the excavations and the scientific research into the discoveries. As we all know, these sites comprise one of the world's most important archaeo-palaeontological complexes due to the relevance and uniqueness of the discoveries, the fact that they include a large number of active sites and an unspecified number of potential locations, and finally, the fact that over 1.5 million years of history of human evolution in Eurasia are concentrated into an area covering barely 12 km<sup>2</sup>, and that 90% of the world's human fossils dating back more than 300,000 years have been found at Atapuerca. The Atapuerca Research Group, composed of nearly 300 members from different disciplines, universities and research centres around the world, conducts digs at the sites every summer.

At the Atapuerca Foundation, we will work conscientiously to ensure that the organization of the UISPP Congress in 2014 meets the same standards of excellence and professionalism as its participants. I cordially invite you all to read this first bulletin and send us your suggestions and proposals. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the UISPP for the confidence entrusted in the Atapuerca Foundation to organize this very important meeting where scientific knowledge will be shared and disseminated.

#### **2.4. A brief history of the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences**

Jacques Nenquin†, Jean Bourgeois & Luiz Oosterbeek  
*Former UISPP Secretaries General, President and Secretary General*

The *International Palaeoethnological Congress* (ICC) was established in September 1865 in La Spezia during meeting of the *Società Italiana di Scienze Naturali*. A few years later, in 1867, the C.P.I. was given a new name, the *International Congress of Anthropology and Prehistoric Archaeology* (CIAAP). This organization is regarded as the direct predecessor of the Union. The origins of our organization thus date back about 145 years. The initial driving force behind this international initiative was Giovanni Capellini (Chair of the *Società Italiana di Scienze Naturali*) and French archaeologist Gabriel de Mortillet. No less than 14 meetings of this body were held between 1866 and 1912, and the Permanent Council was established at the session of the CIAAP held in Lisbon in 1880.

The First World War put an end to this series of fruitful and constructive meetings.

The International Institute of Anthropology (IIA), which was founded in 1921 and had tried -to some extent- to regroup archaeologists and anthropologists after the war, was nevertheless fully French-inspired. Indeed, all five members of its Executive Committee were French. This organization differed totally from the CIAAP on two fundamental issues: the balance was tilted heavily in favour of anthropology in a broad sense (the study of living human communities, comparative religion, folklore, etc.), while prehistoric archaeology was only a minor section of the assembly. Moreover, researchers from the "vanquished nations" of the First World War were excluded from IIA activities.

For these reasons, many specialists in anthropology and prehistory chose not to join the IIA and several of them, most notably Marcellin Boule, René Verneau, Hugo Obermaier and Pedro Bosch-Gimpera, tried to continue the truly international tradition of the CIAAP.

After several attempts at collaboration between members of the CIAAP Permanent Council and the Executive Committee of the IIA, we decided that the 15th meeting of CIAAP and the 4th session of I.I.A. should be held jointly in 1930 in Portugal, under the name of the

International Congress of Anthropology and Prehistoric Archaeology. Few specialists in prehistory attended this session because many of them felt that the role attributed to prehistory was negligible.

Some months later, in 1930, the regrouped "Committee of Five", Gerhard Bersu, Raymond Lantier, Hugo Obermaier, Wilhelm Unverzagt and Pedro Bosch-Gimpera (as Secretary), met in Berlin to discuss the organization of international conferences dedicated to prehistoric archaeology. These conferences had to have a truly international basis, with no exclusions. That is how a new organization bearing the name of the International Congress of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences (CISPP) was established in Bern, between 27 and 29 May 1931.

About 500 scholars met at the CISPP in *1<sup>st</sup> congress* in London in August 1932, under President Sir Charles Peers, Anton Wilhelm Brögger and John L. Myres, both Secretaries-General of the CISPP, and Vere Gordon Childe, C. F. Christopher Hawkes, H.S. Kingsfordet and C. Arthur Raleigh Radford, secretaries of the organizing committee. Archaeologists from 35 different nations formed the new Permanent Council.

The *2<sup>nd</sup> congress*, chaired by Anton Wilhelm Brögger, was held in 1936 in Oslo. Although 500 archaeologists participated in this conference, the political climate of the time was tumultuous, particularly as it affected some of our colleagues who lived in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. The proposal to hold the third congress in Budapest in 1940 under the presidency of F. de Tompa had been considered, but the War also prevented it from going ahead.

After a failed attempt to organize the congress in Budapest in 1949, the *3<sup>th</sup> congress* finally took place in Zürich in 1950, chaired by E. Vogt. The National Committee Secretary was W. Guyan. The absence of researchers from Eastern European countries certainly explains why less than 250 prehistory specialists attended on this occasion. This time, the Executive Committee was formed, with E. Vogt appointed as provisional Secretary. He was replaced by S. De Laet as Secretary-General of the Executive Committee in 1952.

The *4<sup>th</sup> congress* was held in Madrid in 1954, where the national chairman was L. Pericot following his replacement of the appointed President D. Blas Taracena Aguirre, who passed away shortly after the Zurich congress. Our colleague A. Beltrán-Martínez was the Secretary of the National Committee. Five hundred prehistory specialists gathered for this congress, and researchers from 51 countries were elected to the Permanent Council. After a long discussion process dating back to the 1948 Permanent Council meeting in Copenhagen, it was decided to join the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies (ICPHS), which permitted application for financial support from the UNESCO for the scientific initiatives undertaken by the Congress. This affiliation with the C.I.P.S.H. in September 1955 made it necessary to change the denomination of our organization to the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences (UISPP), its current name.

Subsequent congresses saw a steady increase in the number of participants, which reached a peak at the 1976 Congress in Nice, where roughly 3,500 researchers registered.

An increasing number of members were also elected to the Permanent Council, which now had some 250 scientists from more than 100 countries. The following Congresses were:

*5<sup>th</sup> Congress:* Hamburg, 1958 (President G. Bersu, Secretary W. Dehn);

*6<sup>th</sup> Congress:* Rome, 1962 (Presidents A.C. Blanc - M. Pallottino);

*7<sup>th</sup> Congress:* Prague, 1966 (Presidents J. Böhm - J. Filip). O. Klindt-Jensen was elected Secretary General at this congress.

*8<sup>th</sup> congress:* Belgrade, 1971 (President G. Novak). This congress was the first to be

held after a lapse of five years in order to adapt to the UNESCO rule of 5-year intervals for major conferences.

9<sup>th</sup> Congress: Nice, 1976 (President L. Balout, Secretary H. de Lumley);

10<sup>th</sup> Congress: Mexico City, 1981 (President J. García-Bárcena, Secretary J. Lorenzo).

At this Congress, J. Nenquin was elected Secretary-General, after taking on this role on a temporary basis following the death of O. Klindt-Jensen in 1980.

11<sup>th</sup> Congress: Mainz, 1987 (President K. Böhner, Secretary K. Weidemann).

The conference originally to be held in Southampton and London in 1986 under the presidency of J. Evans was moved to Mainz by the Permanent Council vote in 1986. The executive committee of the British organizing committee decided in late 1985 not to accept active researchers from South Africa at the Congress. This decision was unacceptable as it was contrary to the Statutes and the tradition of the Union. It was also completely contrary to the commitment undertaken by the British organizers to allow all bona fide researchers to participate in the conference, regardless of their nationality, religious beliefs, etc. This decision was taken without consulting the Permanent Council of the Union, the Executive Committee or its Secretary General. The conference held in Southampton was given the name "World Archaeological Congress" - a change of name also decided without consulting the UISPP, and a repetition of the mistake made by the International Institute of Anthropology when in 1921, for purely political reasons, it refused to register researchers from Germany, Austria, etc. The decision taken by the Council and the Permanent Executive Committee not to recognize the Southampton conference was conveyed to the International Council of Philosophy and Human Sciences, and confirmed by the General Meeting of the ICPHS and the UNESCO representative at this General Assembly. It was also reaffirmed that the UISPP is the only scientific organization active in the field of prehistory and the domain of protohistory that is officially recognized by these institutions.

A new politically-related problem also threatened to overshadow the organization of the 12<sup>th</sup> Congress in Bratislava in 1991 (President B. Chropovsky, Secretary J. Vldar) due to political and structural changes in what was still Czechoslovakia.

Fortunately, thanks to close collaboration by our local colleagues, all the problems were solved in time.

At the Bratislava conference, it was decided to hold the 13<sup>th</sup> Congress in 1996 in Forli (President A. Radmilli, Secretary C. Peretto). This Congress will be remembered as one of the great world conferences. More than 3,000 people registered and the numerous side events (film festival, exhibitions, etc.) enriched the proceedings. At the end of this Congress, Jacques Nenquin retired and was replaced by Jean Bourgeois as Secretary General.

It was not easy to find candidates to accept the challenge of organizing the 14<sup>th</sup> Congress in 2001, following the dimension acquired by the Forli Congress. At the Permanent Council meetings in Liege and Ghent in December 1998, it was decided to entrust the organization of this event to Liege (Belgium). This time, Pierre P. Bonenfant was elected President and Marcelo Otte as Secretary of the National Committee. This Congress, held in September 2001, proved to be a huge success. The publication of the session minutes, debates, symposia, etc. is ongoing.

The candidacy of Lisbon (Portugal) to organize the 15<sup>th</sup> Congress in 2006 was presented at the Liege meeting. Profs. Victor Oliveira Jorge and Luiz Oosterbeek were elected respectively as President and Secretary General of the organizing committee. Their reputation and talent as organizers augured well for the success of this great undertaking. Jean Bourgeois was again elected Secretary General.

The 15<sup>th</sup> Congress met in Lisbon in 2006, with roughly 2,500 researchers registered for more than 100 sessions and workshops, which generated 49 volumes of proceedings. It was agreed to organize the next congress in Brazil (Rossano Lopes Bastos chosen as Secretary and Peter Schmitz as President), and debate began about possible changes to the statutes. At the end of this Congress, Jean Bourgeois retired from his duties as Secretary General. He was replaced by Luiz Oosterbeek.

The 16<sup>th</sup> congress took place in Florianópolis, Brazil in 2011. It was attended by more than 1,000 researchers, many from Latin America. This time the Permanent Council confirmed the need to continue organizing conferences outside Europe, without an excessive time interval between congresses in Europe due to the continent's large number of scientists. This led to the decision to hold the next two meetings at an interval of three years, the following one, the 17<sup>th</sup> Congress, to be held in Burgos in 2014 (President Emiliano Aguirre, Secretary Eudald Carbonell) and the 18<sup>th</sup> Congress in Melbourne (Secretary Tim Denham). The new statutes were also approved, and a new Committee was elected: Jean Bourgeois (President), Luiz Oosterbeek (Secretary General) and François Djindjian (Treasurer).

This (excessively) brief history of the UISPP may give readers an idea of the evolution of our organization since its inception some 145 years ago, if they forgive us for such an audacious claim. The principle that has guided the UISPP over all these years has quite clearly been the desire by specialists in prehistory from many countries to meet, discuss - which today still seems just as necessary and useful-, and to collaborate wherever possible on numerous international projects. This desire is reflected in the administrative organization of the UISPP, and also in the recent revision of its Statutes, approved in 2011 by the Permanent Council in Florianópolis.

---

### **3. REGISTRATION AND RESERVATIONS**

#### **3.1. How to register**

You must register within the periods indicated in the table below, by visiting our website [www.burgos2014uispp.com](http://www.burgos2014uispp.com).

We recommend that you make your **REGISTRATION RESERVATION** not later than the **15<sup>th</sup> of July, 2013**, by transferring fifty (50) Euros to the Congress bank account. The amount is the same for all registration categories. The totals resulting from the fee schedule listed below may be increased (due to Congress financial requirements) after **July 15, 2013**, unless your REGISTRATION RESERVATION is paid prior to that date. For those who have made their REGISTRATION RESERVATION, the fees and discounts set out below will remain unchanged.

Registrations will be considered valid from the moment when the Congress organizers receive proof of payment of the full registration fee in the Congress bank account. The 50 Euro REGISTRATION RESERVATION will be deducted from the amount payable.

Payment may be made by bank transfer, credit card (Visa, MasterCard or Maestro), or via PayPal.

Registrations		1	2	3	4	
		Between 1 January 2013 & 30 June 2013	Between 1 July & 31 December 2013	Between 1 January & 30 April 2014	Between 30 April & 28 August 2014	
<b>A</b>	<b>UISPP members</b>	260	280	320	340	
<b>B</b>	<b>Non-members of the UISPP</b>	320	340	380	400	
<b>C</b>	<b>Master and/or Ph.D students</b>	<b>UISPP members</b>	155	170	190	205
<b>D</b>		<b>Non-members of the UISPP</b>	185	200	220	235

50 Euros will be deducted from this amount if a REGISTRATION RESERVATION has been made previously.

Bank payee: BBVA  
Congress bank account: 0182 3999 3702 0066 4662  
IBAN: ES97 0182 3999 3702 0066 4662  
SWIFT/BIC: BBVA ES MMXXX

**Notes:** Registration fees do not include costs outside the Congress itself, such as travel, accommodation, meals or outings.

The organizers of each session will get a 50% discount on the congress fees.

The organization intends to publish a book prior to the Congress about the major prehistoric and protohistoric sites in Spain. The book will be bilingual (Spanish and English).

### **3.2. How to book accommodation**

The Official Congress Agent, Viajes El Corte Inglés [uispp2014@viajeseci.es](mailto:uispp2014@viajeseci.es) will organize the details for your accommodation and, if required, transport as well. Our website will announce a centralized booking system in connection with the Official Agent. We recommend that those travelling from other countries should check to ensure that their passports and visas are in order.

### **3.3. How to participate in outings and complementary programs**

The Official Congress Agent will provide a list of outings and supplementary programs before and after the Congress. Booking information for these activities will be posted on the website: [www.burgos2014uispp.com](http://www.burgos2014uispp.com)

For visiting the Atapuerca sites, the Museum of Human Evolution (MEH) and the temporary exhibition at the Museum of Human Evolution ("The Cradle of Humanity"), it is compulsory to register at our website and indicate your preferred language- English, French or Spanish. Places are limited, and the order of registration will be respected.

#### **4. SCIENTIFIC SESSIONS**

Anyone interested in proposing symposia or seminars may send their proposals by e-mail to the Science Deputy Secretary of the XVII Congress, Dr. Robert Sala. All conference papers must be sent to our web [www.burgos2014uispp.com](http://www.burgos2014uispp.com) by May 15, 2014 with the following information (in English, French or Spanish): Title, author's name (or responsible when a team), mail, reference institution, abstract and keywords.

Congress participants must tell us in which sessions they want to include their communications and/or posters before May 31, 2014.

##### **4.1. Sessions proposed by the UISPP committees**

###### **A1-Silicious rock extraction and prehistoric lithic economies**

(**Jacek Lech** [lech@iaepan.edu.pl](mailto:lech@iaepan.edu.pl), Alan Saville, Xavier Terradas & Andreas Zimmermann)  
UISPP Comm. Flint Mining in Pre- and Protohistoric Europe

###### **A2a-The first peopling of Europe**

(**Eudald Carbonell** [eudald.carbonell@urv.cat](mailto:eudald.carbonell@urv.cat), Marina Mosquera, Andreu Ollé, Deborah Barsky, Xosé Pedro Rodríguez & Robert Sala. UISPP. Com. The first peopling of Europe)

The first peopling of Europe has been the focus of intense research over the last few decades. New discoveries and dates for several sites indicate that hominin occupations were established around 1.4–1.2 Mya. Most of the sites have yielded lithic assemblages ascribed to the technological Mode 1 and some have faunal remains bearing traces of butchery. What, if anything can these stone industries tell us about the behaviour and technology of the earliest inhabitants of Europe?

The earlier Dmanisi site, located in the Georgian Caucasus, was occupied by *Homo georgicus* by 1,85 Mya and is a key discovery that has validated evidence supporting the early chronology for the peopling of Eurasia. Among the European sites, Spain's Sierra de Atapuerca's Pleistocene sequence has yielded hominin remains ascribed to *Homo sp.* (Elefante level TE9) and *Homo antecessor* (Gran Dolina level TD6). It remains unclear whether these hominins originated in Africa or in Asia. Whether the occupation of Europe was continuous or punctual from this time is also a subject for debate.

Various routes into Europe could have been open during the Lower Pleistocene. Africa seems a plausible origin for the Dmanisi hominins and the Levantine corridor appears, geographically, as a likely steppingstone into Asia and Europe. Other pathways have been proposed, but archaeological evidence is still needed to validate them.

Concerning lithic technology, assemblages from some Lower Pleistocene sites such as Atapuerca's Elefante level TE9 and Gran Dolina level TD6 and Orce's Barranco León and Fuente Nueva 3 in Spain or Pont-de-Lavaud in France, contribute to defining the variability of core-flake assemblages in Western Europe at this time. These industries are distinguished by cores, heavy-duty tools and/or small, sharp-edged flakes.

The aim of this session will be to debate and update our knowledge about the origins for the earliest inhabitants of Europe in order to better ascertain similarities and differences in behaviour and technology compared with Africa, the Near-East and Asia.

## **A2b-Technological change during the Lower-Middle Pleistocene transition in Europe**

(**Eudald Carbonell** [eudald.carbonell@urv.cat](mailto:eudald.carbonell@urv.cat), Marina Mosquera, Andreu Ollé, Deborah Barsky, Xosé Pedro Rodríguez & Robert Sala. UISPP Comm. The first peopling of Europe)

Archaeological evidence dating to between 0,8 and 0,5 Mya in Europe is relatively scarce, leading some researchers to suggest that Europe was depopulated during the Lower-Middle Pleistocene transition. The lithics from a few sites dating to this period are assigned to the technological Mode 1. However, recent discoveries suggest that new technologies typically associated with the Acheulian or Mode 2 had also begun to appear around this time.

According to the African evidence, more complex toolkits typical of Mode 2 technical achievement appear and multiply from around 1,75-1,5 Mya at a number of sites; mostly situated along the Eastern Rift Valley. The large chronological and geographical gap separating Western Europe from these African sites raises questions about whether Mode 1 evolved into Mode 2 in Europe, or if it arrived from Africa.

We propose to debate about convergence and/or cultural diffusion as possible agents for technical transmission in order to ascertain how innovative technologies could have taken root in Europe long after their appearance in other areas of the globe (Africa, India).

Other topics related to this debate may be: whether different migrations of hominin populations are observable before this technology became generalized across Europe by *Homo heidelbergensis* around 0,5 Mya and whether one or more species of hominin can be linked to the manufacture of the technological Mode 2.

We propose this Session as a debate and strongly encourage participants to present only new data: results and ideas should be tightly linked to the topics outlined above. Contributions treating already known sites and hypothesis will be welcomed as posters or will be redirected towards other Sessions.

**A3-U. Dietz** UISPP Comm. Präistorische Bronzefunde special committee

**A4-F. Djindjian** Archaeology UISPP Comm. Methods and Theory

## **A5a-The Final Palaeolithic of Northern Eurasia**

(**B. V. Eriksen** [Berit.Eriksen@schloss-gottorf.de](mailto:Berit.Eriksen@schloss-gottorf.de), E. Rensink & M. Street UISPP Comm. The Final Palaeolithic of Northern Eurasia)

The purpose of this session is to discuss recent research on the Final Palaeolithic of Northern Eurasia. From a chronological perspective we are concerned with the emergence from an Upper Palaeolithic substrate of hunter-gatherers adapted to life in the more temperate conditions of the Late Glacial and Early Postglacial and their dispersal into previously unoccupied territories. We invite archaeological and palaeo-environmental researchers dealing with the diversity of man and environment relationships during the Late Glacial and Earliest Postglacial, i.e. the period from approximately 15,000 to 8,000 BP. Given the magnitude of changes in climate, landscape, vegetation and fauna during this period, the Final Palaeolithic cultures of Northern Eurasia were characterized by a variety of adaptive responses, reflected in technologies, settlement patterns, subsistence practices, social organizations and even ideologies. Underlying this regional diversity of specific

environmental and cultural changes were the fundamentals of climatic change in conditions that was relatively rapid and extreme and that clearly had major influence on contemporary hunter-gatherer land-use patterns. The general thematic focus of our session highlights all of these research questions.

### **A5b-From the Atlantic to beyond the Bug River– Finding and defining the Federmesser-Gruppen / Azilian on the North European Plain and adjacent areas**

(S. B. Grimm [grimm@rgzm.de](mailto:grimm@rgzm.de), L. I. Mevel, I. Sobkowiak-Tabaka & M. J. Weber UISPP Comm. The Final Palaeolithic of Northern Eurasia)

During recent decades, many ambitious excavation programmes have revived the research on the Lateglacial Federmesser and Azilian groups. Through the exceptional degree of preservation at some of these sites, very detailed studies of the activities that took place at these sites became possible. Moreover, the increasing number of reliable radiocarbon dates from archaeological contexts allowed for more precise chronological attributions of the sites in question. As a result, the potential complementarity of these sites became evaluable at a macro-regional level. Furthermore, the transformation of the archaeological inventories can now be compared in more detail, particularly from a technological and economic point of view, and on a diachronic level as well as over wide geographic ranges.

At the same time, the knowledge of the palaeo-climatic and palaeo-environmental changes during the Lateglacial, in particular of the faunal and floral developments, have increased significantly. Thus, the combination of the archaeological and the palaeo-environmental data have led to a better understanding of the relationship between the changes of the environments inhabited by Lateglacial human groups and the transformations of their equipments.

Although the lithic industries of the Federmesser and Azilian groups are often and rightly called simplified, it seems clear that this finding does not apply to the entire technical productions of these human groups. Elsewhere, detailed techno-economic studies of lithic industries have helped reveal the degree of interrelation of groups. Besides the Federmesser and Azilian groups, further groups such as the assemblages from the British penknife phase and, possibly, the Hengistbury Head industries or the Polish arched backed piece technocomplexes as well as some northern late Epigravettian assemblages may be mentioned. These related groups were dominant in Northwest and Central Europe for more than one millennium during the Lateglacial Interstadial. However, their precise relationship is still a matter of discussion.

Therefore, the session aims to approach the material in its entirety and with a focus on its development. Research questions relating from local to macro-regional levels are often focused on lithic industries. However, in this session we also explicitly welcome approaches combining multidisciplinary data, in particular deriving from archaeozoological, environmental, spatial, or chronological studies. We thereby wish to address the following questions:

By the use of this wide-ranging view, is it possible to observe variations in the archaeological material from different environmental contexts? And how can we interpret these variations? Are they due to different environmental adaptations? Or are they diachronic? Can an initial, an intermediate, and a final phase be identified? Or on the contrary, do these industries show comparable characteristics throughout the whole Lateglacial Interstadial?

Thus, in the scientific exchanges during this session, we hope to address and decipher the diversity of evolutionary mechanisms within the Final Palaeolithic societies of Northwest Europe.

**A6-S. Grimaldi** UISPP Comm. Mobility in mountain environment from Palaeolithic to Chalcolithic

**A7-G. Kaenel** UISPP Comm. Metal Ages in Europe

**A8-Lobbying for Archaeology (18th-21st centuries): Innovative alliances in the establishment of the archaeological discipline**

(**M. A. Kaeser** [Marc-Antoine.Kaeser@ne.ch](mailto:Marc-Antoine.Kaeser@ne.ch) & G. Delley. UISPP Comm. Historiography. History of the Archaeology)

From the outset, archaeological research has often benefited from the exploitation of its identity and ideology. For several decades, archaeology historians have been highlighting the involvement of our discipline in the affirmation of nationalisms, the construction of colonial empires and the legitimization of the major ideologies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

It is now important for historians' attention to shift towards other forms of lobbying, in particular technical and economic. Indeed, we can see that since the establishment of the modern state, archaeologists have sometimes tried to foster the interest of administrations and non-archaeological institutions in productive partnerships that strengthen their scientific practices, particularly during crises and periods of economic or structural change.

These are just a few examples of these "innovative partnerships": a) 18<sup>th</sup> century archaeological excavations by French bridge and road engineers, when the documentation of Roman constructions was used in the technical development of modern civil engineering; b) archaeology in the United States under the "New Deal" in the 1930's, and labour programmes for the unemployed; c) development of C14 dating, which showed the civil potential of post-WWII nuclear research.

The "Lobbying for archaeology" session will focus on cases where powerful allies (well-established state and institutional structures) are mobilised on the basis of practical scientific, technical and economic but not ideological reasons. Cases with a global impact are particularly interesting, when the alliances in question have given the go-ahead to research that has provided a long-lasting structural backbone to the archaeological discipline. In the current context of the global economic crisis and a liberal world order, the historiographical analysis of these 'new alliances' may help to stimulate discussion about research into new funding solutions for present and future archaeological research initiatives.

**A9-J. Kozłowski & M. Otte**, UISPP Comm. Upper Palaeolithic of the Western Eurasia

**A10-G. Lucarini** UISPP Comm. Art and Civilisations in the Sahara During Prehistoric Times

**A11a-The chronology of Palaeolithic cave art: new data, new debates**

(**Roberto Ontañón** [ontanon\\_r@cantabria.es](mailto:ontanon_r@cantabria.es), Pilar Utrilla Marcel Otte & François Djindjian  
UISPP Comm. Prehistoric art and Upper Paleolithic & UISPP Comm. Methods and

techniques)

After several decades in which evolution of Palaeolithic art seemed to be a resolved scientific matter, new findings have called into question the soundness of this construction apparently well established. Obtained by increasingly refined and precise radiometric dating techniques, new data have shaken the interpretive building erected on the postulates of A. Leroi-Gourhan and which had stood, virtually unchanged, over the last quarter century.

The first major debate is about the discovery, study and dating of the Grotte Chauvet, with an astounding parietal ensemble whose Aurignacian chronology clashes against the waterline of the proposed stylistic evolution and the acceptance of which, even today, is discussed by different scholars.

The second major impact on the prevailing paradigm has arrived in what some call the "post stylistic era": Some preliminary results of indirect dating of rock art by means of the Uranium series technique backdated the beginning of cave art beyond Aurignacian times, allowing even some colleagues claim the possibility of a Neanderthal cave art that could deprive our first ancestors of what until recently was thought one of his most significant hallmarks.

This session aims to contribute to the knowledge of the latest developments in this field discipline and serve for discussion of their historical and anthropological implications, considering radio chronological data obtained on rock art but also information from the material record of the archaeological sites in which these representations lie, that can provide interesting information for proper contextualization.

### **A11b-Late Pleistocene cave art in its context**

(A. Pastoors [pastoors@neanderthal.de](mailto:pastoors@neanderthal.de), P. Arias, T. Lenssen-Erz, R. Ontañón, G.-Ch. Weniger & M. Groenen UISPP Comm.Prehistoric art)

Art, as part of cultural expression, is first repeatedly visible in archaeological records in the Aurignacian (after a first 'flash' in Blombos). Even today, in spite of the long-standing research tradition in this field, the meaning of these images and the interpretation of the surrounding context are still extremely speculative and influenced by the intuition of the researcher. This deficit is due not least to the prevalent approaches, whereby individual figures are first described in great detail and subsequently interpreted on the basis of highly personal levels of experience.

The implementation of these graphical expressions into a wider frame of human behavior in caves is still pending, although the significance of caves as spaces with frequent human activities and cave art has been stressed by several researcher of the Palaeolithic. Research needs an integrative approach linking art and other forms of human activities embedded into the natural space of the entire cave site.

Under this perspective we will discuss in the session three major topics on the theoretical, empirical and methodological level:

- 1- What makes context of rock art an important field of information for the understanding of the pictures itself?
- 2- What kind of context is available, what is discernible?
- 3- How can the context be studied by researchers of prehistory? Which means of recording do we have?

### **A11c-New solutions for old problems: The use of new technologies for the documentation and conservation of prehistoric art**

(**R. Ontañón** [ontanon\\_r@gobcantabria.es](mailto:ontanon_r@gobcantabria.es), Vicente Bayarri & Luis Teira UISPP Comm. Prehistoric art)

**A12-A. Posluschny** [posluschny@rgk.dainst.de](mailto:posluschny@rgk.dainst.de) UISPP Comm. Archaeological Prospection

### **A13-Quality Management of Cultural Heritage: problems and good practices**

(**M. Quagliuolo** [mquagliuolo@aol.com](mailto:mquagliuolo@aol.com) UISPP Comm. Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sites' Cultural Heritage)

From Lascaux to Shanidar caves, from Malta temples to Stonenge, from Serra do Capivara to Foz Coa park, from Australia to North Africa's Rock Art, from Pechino to Isernia excavations, from the Musée de l'Homme in Paris to the Museum of Civilization in Québec, from Catal Hüyük to Varna village, from the Rift Valley to the Grand Canyon, most problems have to be fronted in a common perspective. UISPP Scientific Commission for the Quality Management of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sites, Monuments and Museums (UISPP-PPCHM) is aimed to this purpose.

The help of specialists from different Countries and the exchange of opinions with other colleagues from other fields and/or organizations is needed in order to:

- discuss the reasons and possibilities for preservation and use of Sites, Monuments and Museums;

- let the management of Rock Art Sites and Parks, Prehistoric excavations, Museums and Interpretations Centers and related structures open to the public to be made according to criteria agreed at an International level, both in normal and critical conditions;

- enhance standards in preserving, communicating and using Sites, Monuments and Museums;

- involve the public and diffuse awareness;

- analyze tourism benefits and risks at these destinations;

- introduce new opportunities for jobs and training;

- develop networks on these topics in connection with other specialized Organizations.

Which is your experience?

Which problems would you like to address?

Which solutions?

Please, tell us your story at the 2014 UISPP Meeting in Burgos!

### **A14-The water as generator of networks**

(**Sandrine Robert** [sandrine.robert@mae.u-paris10.fr](mailto:sandrine.robert@mae.u-paris10.fr) UISPP Comm. Theory and method in Landscape archaeology)

Through its functions as diverter (drainage) or collector (irrigation, water samplers) water management can be regarded as a powerful agent organizing the layout of the ancient

landscapes. Wide networks whose main structuring lines were set up before Antiquity in Europe developed in vast drained plains. Drainage and irrigation were directly involved in the transmission of patterns over a very long period.

In addition, the water acts also as an organizing agent for settlements.

The session will also include the relationships between the alluvial dynamics and the networks (settlement networks, but also roads systems related to rivers, field layouts that are shaped by the morphology of rivers).

The objective of the session is to assess how water management as a collective issue is important for societal communities

**A15-E. Robrahn-Gonzalez** UISPP Comm. Archaeological heritage policies and management structures

**A16-Aegean-Mediterranean imports and influences in the graves from continental Europe – Bronze and Iron Ages**

(**Valeriu Sîrbu** [valeriu\\_sirbu@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:valeriu_sirbu@yahoo.co.uk), Cristian Schuster. 30<sup>th</sup> Commission)  
UISPP Comm. Mortuary Practices in Prehistory and Protohistory

**A17a-Recent Trends and Aspects of Use-wear Analysis and their contributing to the Modernization of Archaeology**

(**Andreu Ollé Cañellas** [aolle@iphes.cat](mailto:aolle@iphes.cat) & Roberto Risch. UISPP Comm. Functional Studies of prehistoric artifacts and their socio-economical meaning on past societies studies)

**A17b-Traceological researches and experimental works**

(**Alfred Pawlik** [alfred.pawlik@up.edu.ph](mailto:alfred.pawlik@up.edu.ph), Mikhail Zhilin & Richard Yerkes. UISPP Comm. Functional Studies of prehistoric artifacts and their socio-economical meaning on past societies studies)

**A18-P. Woodman** UISPP Comm. Cultures, Economy and Ecology of Post-Palaeolithic Hunters

**A19- Underwater Archaeology**

(**Alexandra Figueiredo** [alexfiga@ipt.pt](mailto:alexfiga@ipt.pt) & Flavio Calippo)  
UISPP Comm. Underwater Archaeology. IV<sup>a</sup> Com.

The Underwater Archaeology has made great strides in the study of pre and proto-historic societies. Its importance is beginning to be reflected in the scientific community looking for new forms and data about the human past. The latest UISPP was the example of this, which was submitted about 15 papers.

The aims of this session:

- To promote the study and discussion of the archaeological sites from wet or submerged areas;
- To provide coexistence, dialogue and relationship between researchers, students and

personalities linked to various areas under discussion.

- To provide the ideal opportunity for exchanging ideas, experiences and new findings on the application of underwater archeology to the study of the human past.

In this sense we are open to receive proposals for presentation of case studies, methodological analyzes and theoretical reflexions in archeology and conservation (recognizing in this discipline a strong relationship) applied to the underwater heritage.

## **A20-The intellectual and spiritual expressions of non-literate peoples**

(**E. Anati** [emmanuel.anati@gmail.com](mailto:emmanuel.anati@gmail.com) UISPP Comm. The intellectual and spiritual expressions of non-literate peoples)

The main idea was that of considering various aspects of art, religion, cult structures and monuments, burial customs and funerary architecture, and other expressions of the spiritual and intellectual life of non-literate peoples as a cultural assemblage which could provide a dimension on the conceptual life of various horizons of human cultures. Rather than separating specialized sectors of rock art, mobiliary art, burials and other expressions of human creativity, as is sometimes customary, the Commission intended to invite experts to focus on a wider debate and create a permanent dialogue on the global phenomenon of the intellectual and spiritual manifestations of pre-literate and non-literate societies. The purpose is to explore the human soul, using the material outputs. “The material heritage as a source to discover the immaterial heritage”.

Another aspect of our goals is developing cooperation and joint studies between different disciplines in the humanities and social sciences.

## **A21a- Neanderthals on their own terms: new perspectives for the study of Middle Paleolithic behaviour**

(**M. Gema Chacón** [gchacon@iphes.cat](mailto:gchacon@iphes.cat) & Florent Rivals. UISPP Comm. Settlement Dynamics of the Middle Paleolithic and Middle Stone Age)

The origin and evolution of Neanderthal populations during the Middle and Late Pleistocene is a very relevant issue in the international scientific debate. No other species has produced such an intense discussion within Prehistoric Archaeology. Excavations carried out in recent years at archaeological sites with long stratigraphic sequences and the application of new scientific methods have provided information of high-resolution about Neanderthals behaviours and strategies in Eurasia. This interest was strengthened by the paleoanthropological and paleogenetical data obtained recently.

Neanderthals has been traditionally studied through the comparison with Anatomically Modern Humans (AMH). Consequently, the cognitive and social capacities of Neanderthals were always reported and described in relation to our species. Neanderthals have their own biological and cultural entity as species. For this reason we suggest to address the interdisciplinary analysis of the archaeological record resulting from their activities and compare it to other Neanderthal records, i.e. with themselves. Thus, it will provide the information required to generate hypotheses about their social complexity and their behavioural diversity without any necessity to compare with the first AMH. Only through this kind of studies it will be possible to evaluate the proper diversity of this population. Thus, we

will be able to understand their behavioural patterns in a more objective and scientific way.

This session will represent an ideal forum in which to generate and integrate research ideas cutting across various disciplines. Moreover, it will be an opportunity to update the current state of the research on Neanderthals with the presentation of evidences from different archaeological sites or geographic areas. The contributions selected will bring forward new data obtained through interdisciplinary studies and comparing Neanderthals inside Neanderthals.

### **A21b-Technological change and behavioral variability in the MSA**

(**Nicholas Conard** [nicholas.conard@uni-tuebingen.de](mailto:nicholas.conard@uni-tuebingen.de), Anne Delagnes & Guillaume Porraz. UISPP Comm. Settlement Dynamics of the Middle Paleolithic and Middle Stone Age)

Recent research in the MSA indicates that many of the previous models for technological and cultural taxonomy in Africa have been overly simplistic. In extreme cases specific artifact forms are viewed as pan-continental, or even intercontinental, markers of cultural identity that track movements of people and ideas. At the same time detailed cultural stratigraphic sequences from across the continent are providing new insights into the speed of cultural change and the scope of spatial-temporal variation in lithic assemblages and other behavioral signatures. These new data sets are moving MSA studies away from tradition of placing labels on assemblages and toward a more strongly contextualized reading of the complex history of MSA populations. Earlier concepts of largely static cultural-stratigraphic units are giving way to a more dynamic, more high-resolution understanding of spatial-temporal variation of MSA behavior. Scholars working in Africa and interested in the archaeology of early modern humans are invited to contribute papers to this session that aims to establishing a more nuanced, high-resolution understanding of technological change and behavioral variability in the MSA.

### **A21c-Movements in and Out for Africa: Assemblage variability and population dynamics in Northeast Africa and Southwest Asia during the MSA and Middle Paleolithic**

(**Knut Bretzke** [knut.bretzke@uni-tuebingen.de](mailto:knut.bretzke@uni-tuebingen.de) & Nicholas Conard. UISPP Comm. Settlement Dynamics of the Middle Paleolithic and Middle Stone Age)

In recent years much progress has been made in characterizing lithic and faunal assemblages in East and North Africa and southwestern Asia during the MSA and Middle Paleolithic. This research is an essential step toward documenting the movements of hominins between Africa and Eurasia and for better understanding the demographic developments that led to the expansion of modern humans out of Africa and the ultimate extinction of archaic hominins across the globe. In this context the role of Arabia as providing viable routes between Africa and Asia has begun to come into focus, and new discoveries are beginning to allow researchers to test models of movements into and out of Africa. Similarly, new fieldwork and the study of existing collections across East and North Africa, the Levant and Iran have made it possible to characterize regional archaeological variability. This session addresses the question of whether the archaeological variation documented reflects movements of populations across the region, local independent adaptations, or a combination of both phenomena. The session

aims to address these questions on the basis of new analyses of lithic and faunal assemblages within the contexts of the most up-to-date records of climatic change, fluctuations in sea levels and cultural chronostratigraphy. Papers may also address how topographic factors, hyper-aridity, monsoon patterns and other variables produced barriers and opened corridors for the expansion and contraction of populations. With this session we hope to move toward a better characterization of archaeological assemblages that document the adaptations of archaic and modern humans at the interface of the African and Eurasian continents.

#### **4.2. Sessions proposed outside the UISPP committees**

##### **B1- Task distribution in pre- and proto-historic societies**

(**Sophie A. de Beaune** [sophie.de-beaune@mae.cnrs.fr](mailto:sophie.de-beaune@mae.cnrs.fr), Haris Procopiou & François Sigaut †)

Understanding how pre- and protohistorical societies functioned, and more generally, so-called pre-industrial societies, entails examining how technical activities were divided up. Rather than broach this issue only from the standpoint of economics, as has been done too often, we approach it here in an anthropological perspective. We propose to bring together participants who have developed their thinking in two main directions.

According to the first, emphasis will be on the precise technical modes involved in assigning an activity to men or to women. It is a classic statement to say that feminine activities are linked to domestic needs and that, as soon as activities take on a ‘mercantile’ economic status, they leave that sphere and move into the hands of men. Hence, there would be no masculine or feminine tasks as such. On the other hand, in the same task, women and men do not use the same techniques – for example, women generally hand-shape pottery, whereas men use the potter’s wheel. Is it possible to make, or not, this sort of observation about more ancient peoples? And, for that matter, are archaeological methods available to do so? This ‘technographic’ approach is meant to enrich a debate that all too often remains tied to too general categories.

In societies termed undivided (Clastres), the only way tasks can be divided up is according to sex and age, which distinguishes them from more complex societies in which the growth of production and exchange leads to greater specialization. A second question thus arises about the way tasks are divided up within a particular group – family, social or other – specializing in a particular technical activity.

The concept of workshop, due to the Frédéric Le Play school and applied by Paul Descamps to the ‘savage peoples’ in the 1920s may prove to be useful here in considering this issue. It is not a question of simply the workshop seen as workplace, but of the workshop seen within a network of people collaborating in the same activity, within a broader network including the whole social group. Understood in this way, the structure of a workshop and the repertoire of activities may well enable us to understand the organization of the social group, as well as the repercussions on the group, should even minimal changes occur in one of the elements of the technical chain.

Case studies are welcome, not only in the fields of pre- and protohistory, but also in ethnography in so-called pre-industrial societies, to the extent they may elucidate the former. More technical communications on the reliability of our interpretations in this field will also enrich this discussion.

## **B2-Post-Palaeolithic filiform rock art in Western Europe**

(Fernando Coimbra [coimbra.rockart@yahoo.com](mailto:coimbra.rockart@yahoo.com) & Umberto Sansoni)

The so called filiform rock art is characterized by having very thin grooves, just scratched on the rock surfaces, being produced either by stone or metal tools. In Western Europe it appears with a similar typology of motives in countries like Portugal, Spain, Andorra, France and Italy. However, these very same motives are frequently found produced with larger grooves, after the use of a “polissoir” technique, being first incised on the rock surface and then polished with repeated movements. This way it’s crucial to distinguish engravings made with thin grooves (the true filiform carvings) and others done with medium/thick grooves, which often doesn’t happen in the published bibliography.

This kind of art can be found usually on open air schist greywacke surfaces, but it’s also present on the walls of several caves from central Spain, some of them with an archaeological context.

The already mentioned similarity of motives can result from possible contacts of different peoples in Late Prehistory. However, in the present level of knowledge about this art, it’s difficult to understand who influenced who, because there are also differences in the typological characteristics of the engravings from one country to another.

Regarding chronology there’s still a lot a work to be done about Post-Palaeolithic filiform rock art. Indeed, there are known examples dating from Late Neolithic, from all the Metal Ages, and even from historical periods, until the Middle Ages. Curiously, some of the motives carved on rocks even “survive” on the walls of some churches from the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries.

In this session we welcome papers about filiform rock art (with thin grooves or with “polissoir” technique), concerning aspects like new discoveries, typology of motives, chronology, possible contacts among different peoples, chronological survival, or, in another field of research, the contextual interpretation of particular cases like zig-zags, net-patterns, five pointed stars, “ladders”, tree like motives, among others.

In order to participate in this session please send a title (even provisory) and an abstract about 10 to 15 lines to both of us.

## **B3-Biochronology, biostratigraphy and palaeoecology of the European Quaternary**

(Gloria Cuenca [cuencag@unizar.es](mailto:cuencag@unizar.es), Juan Rofes, Juan Manuel López & Hugues-A. Blain)

The fossils of small vertebrates are the best tools for biochronological, biostratigraphical and palaeoecological reconstructions in the Quaternary of the European continent.

Europe has been the leader of the biostratigraphy and Palaeoecology with small mammals since the works of the early paleontologists at the end of the XIX century. In the Iberian Peninsula, the systematic works of Miquel Crusafont, and Nieves López laid the foundations of the modern biostratigraphy based on the correlation with small mammals.

## **B4-North-South connections and dis-connections in the prehistory and proto-history of the Levant**

(Ianir Milevski [ianirmilevski@gmail.com](mailto:ianirmilevski@gmail.com), Fanny Bocquentin & Miquel Molist)

The Levant, the westernmost of the Near East, is one of the areas with the largest concentration of prehistoric and protohistoric sites. It has witnessed radical changes in the history of mankind, and even in its "prehistory" -the evolution of hominins since the "out of Africa" processes, especially in the Great Rift valley. The Neolithic revolution, the emergence of metallurgy and the urban revolution in the Levant have been one of the greatest expressions of major changes in which humanity was involved. On these issues we have countless fieldwork and research works. However, the connections and disconnections between Northern and Southern Levant have been less studied. We assume that such comparisons will highlight those processes and will also promote better studies in each of the Levantine geographic areas. The goal of this workshop is to focus on those connections and differences and bring together researchers working in different areas of the Levant.

### **B5-Monumental earthen architecture in early societies: technology and power display**

(**Annick Daneels** [annickdaneels@hotmail.com](mailto:annickdaneels@hotmail.com))

The purpose of the symposium is the archaeology of earthen architecture in pre- and protohistoric cultures, with an emphasis on constructive techniques and systems, and diachronic changes in those aspects. The main interest is in monumental architecture (not domestic), where it is better possible to appreciate the building strategies that show raw earth to be as noble a material as stone or wood, but with its very own characteristics which required the development of original solutions and construction techniques. The scope on monumental buildings will also allow analyzing the political, social and economical factors that made such architecture a recognized expression of societal values and political power.

Due to the scope of the UISPP congresses, I would hope to gather researchers from the 5 continents, and from very diverse ecological and climatic settings, to compare on a macro scale the building of monumental earthen architecture, the range of constructions (pyramids, palaces, tombs, temples, warehouses, ramparts, causeways...), the architectural solutions for control of internal pressure, facings, roofing, drainage, ventilation, maintenance, etc., and the variety of sociopolitical contexts that produced it.

Up to now, we have candidates from America and Europe covering topics from Mexico, Perú, Morocco, Anatolia and Syria, and we are waiting for answers from researchers from China and Russia.

### **B6-Origin of dwellings. Habitation structures in Palaeolithic times**

(**J. Carlos Díez Fernández-Lomana** [clomana@ubu.es](mailto:clomana@ubu.es) & Marcos Terradillos Bernal)

As researchers, we know well the prehistoric technology before Neolithic and we had suggested hypotheses about their territorial movements and hunting strategies, but there is still considerable ignorance about the living spaces and the management of their habitation structures through the long Palaeolithic period.

This session aims to delve into the everyday prehistoric lifestyle on the basis of an analysis of the structures found at sites in Europe and Western Asia. The discovery (using several unpublished data) of postholes and pseudomorphs, stakes, material removal, fires and beds at several European sites will permit the first unified view about whether or not

prehistoric groups had dwellings in Europe. It requires a cohesive, integrated analysis (microspatial studies, biochemical analysis, phytoliths, environmental magnetism, traces of use, soil micromorphology and lithic technology, GIS, among others) of the evidence that denotes the domestic use -as a home base-, of sites with preserved, undisturbed anthropic structures.

The numerous sites that we have studied should enable us to ascertain whether mental and habitational complexity existed already at the start of the Middle and Upper Pleistocene, and whether or not it was exclusive to our species.

### **B7-Advances in the reconstruction of early hominin behavior at Olduvai Gorge**

(Manuel Domínguez-Rodrigo [manueldr@ghis.ucm.es](mailto:manueldr@ghis.ucm.es))

The Olduvai Paleoanthropology and Paleoecology Project (TOPPP) produced in its first research phase (2006-2010) a wealth of information which enabled a better understanding of the Bed I sites and their paleoecology. This was published in a special issue of Quaternary Research (2010). The on-going second phase has increased the amount of information of the activities carried out by hominins in the anthropogenic sites of Bed I (FLK Zinj) and Bed II (SHK, TK and BK). It has also increased the paleoecological information of key sites enabling a more detailed paleoecological reconstruction. For example the paleoecological reconstruction carried out at FLK Zinj incorporates a detailed geological and paleobotanical interpretation of almost 1 km of paleolandscape in which FLK Zinj was formed and adds a new site with the exact same stratigraphic provenience (PTK). Taphonomic analyses at sites in Bed I and Bed II reinforces the interpretation that passive scavenging was not a common strategy used by hominins at Olduvai. Hunting or small and medium-sized animals is well supported taphonomically. Finally, recent discoveries of plant exploitation by hominins are some of the oldest evidences of plant consumption by hominins in the archaeological record. This enables the understanding of hominin activities in palimpsests in which carnivores were the main accumulators of faunal remains.

### **B8-Public images, private readings: multi-perspective approaches to the post-Palaeolithic rock art**

(Ramón Fábregas Valcarce [ramon.fabregas@usc.es](mailto:ramon.fabregas@usc.es) & Carlos Rodríguez-Rellán)

A significant number of Holocene societies throughout the world have resorted at one time or another to the making of paintings or carvings on different places (tombs, rock-shelters or caves, open-air outcrops). The aim of this session is putting together the experiences of specialists from Europe and other regions of the world. The approaches may range from the archaeological definition of the artistic phenomena and their socioeconomic background to those concerning themselves with the symbolic and ritual nature of those practices, including the definition of the audience to which the graphic manifestations were addressed and the potential role of the latter in the making up of social identities and the enforcement of territorial claims. More empirical issues, such as new recording methodologies and data management or even dating will also be considered.

### **B9- Climate change and social change during the Late Holocene in arid and semiarid**

## **environments: archaeological and historical perspectives**

(**Rafael A. Goñi** [gonirafael@gmail.com](mailto:gonirafael@gmail.com) & Diego D. Rindel)

The general purpose of this symposium is to assess and discuss aspects of world archaeology from a perspective that includes environmental approaches in the study of the processes of human settlement during the final stage of the Holocene (last 2500 years BP) in arid and semiarid environments. The current debate about issues such as climate change and how it affects human populations has controversialized arguments about causes and effects in our disciplines. The analysis of past climatic fluctuations is therefore quite relevant, especially those with a global scope (e.g. Medieval Climate Anomaly, Little Ice Age) and the impact and responses to these climatic factors amongst human populations. The emphasis here is on case studies from arid and semiarid environments, since these types of habitat cover a large part of the Earth's land surface, and they are amongst the most difficult for human occupation.

The symposium debates will be open to multiple approaches concerning interactions between human societies and their natural environments, from environmental archaeology to approaches that interpret the environment as a social construct.

In this symposium, we propose to explore these issues from multiple lines of evidence. Within this broad range, some of the suggested, but by no means not exclusive, themes will be:

1-Environment/society relationships. Interaction, sustainability, economic development, etc. Production of correlated variations and mutual modifications.

2- Analysis of the relationship between climatic variations and sociocultural processes.

3-Change trends during the late Holocene. The internal variations in this period and its cultural correlations in different parts of the world.

4-Studies of resource structures and variability associated with climatic factors. Expansion and contraction of human niches and environmental zones.

5-Environmental models and their possible archaeological correlations.

6-Theoretical and methodological aspects: discussion of topics related to the concepts of causality, determinism, constraint, conditioning, role of the environment in shaping social structures, consistency of scales, etc.

A productive debate about human-environment interactions is expected, as well as new perspectives and the inclusion of the new flow of information generated in recent years as a result of concerns about climate change. This symposium will seek to define new models and frames of reference to contribute to an issue that has become particularly important on a global scale.

## **B10-New approaches to the study of Quartz lithic industries**

(**Arturo de Lombera-Hermida** [artulomb@gmail.com](mailto:artulomb@gmail.com) & Carlos Rodríguez-Rellán)

The aim of this session is to bring together the experience of researchers working with quartz industries as a method to advance in the overcoming of the problems that have affected the studies of this raw material in the last century. Quartz has traditionally been regarded as a second-rate raw material, which use by the prehistoric communities would have been strictly conditioned by the absence of flint resources. Nevertheless, new approaches appeared in the last decades, together with revisions of old lithic collections, have evidenced the complexity

and importance of the roles played by this raw material in the technology and economy of the prehistoric societies of many regions of the world. Many of these studies have focused on the characterization of quartz artefacts and varieties, dealing with the fracture mechanics and fragmentation processes, the use-wear analysis or the application of specific techniques to the knapping of quartz (vg. Bipolar-on anvil reduction); other approaches, in turn, have dealt with the role of this raw material in the subsistence and territorial strategies or the symbolic spheres.

### **B11-Education and dissemination strategies in museums and prehistoric Sites**

(Aurora Martín [amartin@museoevolucionhumana.com](mailto:amartin@museoevolucionhumana.com) & Rodrigo Alonso Alcalde)

Now a days more museums and prehistoric sites are increasingly willing to be part of the patrimonial reality understood as the spreading or diffusion places of scientific knowledge related to the study of our ancestors. For that reason, many museums and prehistoric sites are developing actions that expects to combine the following objectives:

1. To design educational programs to promote the study of the prehistory in all educational levels.
2. To formulate different actions in order to promote and attract visitors to these types of museums and archaeological sites.
3. To build activities to promote the revitalization of these centers and active participation of the citizens.
4. To design modern and attractive resources for museography, taking into account new technologies in order to enable a personal and active approach to the contents of the museum and to enable a unique personal experience to the visitor.
5. To develop applications to evaluate all activities for dissemination in the museums and cultural spaces and create protocols for procedure to facilitate the communication of the knowledge that the Cultural Heritage offers.

Sharing experiences about the actions developed by the museums and the archaeological sites is essential to facing the new challenges and necessities in popularizing and spreading knowledge about prehistoric societies in this century.

### **B12- Pleistocene human dispersals: climate, ecology and social behavior**

(Bienvenido Martínez-Navarro [bienvenido@icrea.es](mailto:bienvenido@icrea.es) & José Luis Lanata)

The modern history of thinking about the origin of species has been dominated by links between environments (and changes in them) and the process of speciation. Darwin's original argument for evolution by means of natural selection (Darwin 1859) is an ecological argument: species 'adapt' to their physical and biotic environments. Those best adapted to their environment survive and leave more descendants than those that are less adapted. This reasoning clearly works on biological, even paleontological terms. But, does it work on social and cultural ones? And, if it does, how? The proposed working session will evaluate this question in the context of human evolution, by discussing different cases in all the continents.

The research on the human dispersal out of Africa, into Eurasia, Australia and the Americas, has changed the ideas about chronologies and the ecological scenarios where humans were able to colonize new territories with new environments in different and,

sometimes, inhospitable climates with marked seasonality.

The oldest human record in Eurasia is found in Dmanisi (Georgia, Caucasus), dated 1.8 Ma, during the Olduvai normal chron. The fossil record of Eurasia reveals an important faunal turnover at this moment and also the arrival of several large mammals' species of African origin, chronologically coincidental with this human dispersal. Later, different speciation waves and other subsequent dispersals into Eurasia of fauna and hominins are coincidental during the Pleistocene. This geographic theatre increases when the megafaunal extinction around the planet -Eurasia, Australia and the Americas- can be related with the expansion of early modern humans, *Homo sapiens*, to these continents.

Climate changes, faunal turnovers, and human dispersals into new continents, seem to be coincidental. There is no doubt that climate and climate change interact with the biosphere and can therefore be expected to influence human activity as well, either directly or through paths leading from climate to plant cover to faunal resources. What is not so clear is how and to what degree the social and cultural human evolution interacted with them. At this sense, an important question is to explain the effect of the increasing of sociality in early and more recent humans in order to be more successful during the global dispersal process, in competence with other faunal species and/or human populations.

Participants in the workshop should contribute to the discussion from their own perspective and background, giving ideas or motivates discussions related to this general topic, which aims at identifying different perspectives to discuss the mechanisms involved in human dispersal and subsequent development across continents. Participants' expertise could include, among others, Prehistory, Paleontology, Paleoclimatic Sciences, Complex Analysis Systems, Social Networks Analysis, Cultural evolution and transmission, and all related topics in recent issues without disciplinary restrictions. The proceedings of the workshop will be published in a special volume.

### **B13-Standing stones and megalithic monuments in context**

(Terence Meaden [terence.meaden@torro.org.uk](mailto:terence.meaden@torro.org.uk))

In prehistoric times most standing stones probably had a symbolic meaning and importance deemed helpful to the communities who erected them. Such megaliths of the Neolithic Age and Bronze Age worldwide were raised singly or in pairs or arranged in multiple groups forming circles or rows, or otherwise set as structural parts of cells or galleries in circular and longitudinal monuments. Another group, of cromlech or dolmen type, has an open structure with elevated capstone. In many instances stones were chosen for their particular shape or else they were fashioned into the shapes desired. At times carvings were added in the form of symbols and images meaningful to the builders. These include spirals, lozenges, triangles, cup-shaped hollows, and markings some of which were anthropomorphic in character. In parts of the world devotion for such sites began in later epochs, and there are places where respect or worship continues to the present day. Also, where explanations have been forthcoming by interviewing tribal devotees, it is known that megaliths are sometimes painted or else bear other temporary markings or offerings.

Such matters continue to attract much archaeological attention. This session examines aspects that relate to improving our knowledge of these subject areas in identifiable contexts especially where there is new relevant research and discoveries. Discussions can include iconographic and other interpretations involving megaliths or their carvings relating to general

and specific worldviews. This can include situations where stones are positioned purposefully with respect to one another or to solar or lunar risings and settings, so explanations involving cosmological alignments of interpretable significance are welcome. Acceptable too are considerations of substantiated *traditional* ritual actions by native communities at particular megalithic sites. The stone settings discussed may range from minor ones—having only one or two standing stones—to major ones, as with Stonehenge and Newgrange among numerous possibilities. The common thread is exploring the meaning and usefulness of standing stones in the context of the lives of people past and present.

#### **B14-Discussing Variation, Transmission and Selection in Cultural Evolution: Current Trends in Evolutionary Archaeology**

(Hernán Muscio [hmusicio@gmail.com](mailto:hmusicio@gmail.com) & Federico Restifo)

Along the last decades, and after recognizing that human cultural evolution is Darwinian, the theoretical framework of Evolutionary Archeology was expanded in a straightforward manner by the integration of different selectionist approaches for explaining human behavior. These middle range theoretical frameworks include the human evolutionary ecology approach, the theory of cultural transmission and the neutral model of cultural evolution. This theoretical integration was followed by important advances in the methodologies used to document patterns of evolutionary change in the archaeological record. On this basis, this meeting seeks to discuss the evolutionary mechanisms implied in processes of transmission and differential retention of cultural variation which are traceable in the material record, and the way these mechanisms operated in the past producing patterning in the archaeological record. Of special interest is the discussion of how processes such as adaptive decision making, cultural transmission, selection and drift, can be related to other processes as demographic dynamics, environmental change, population geographic expansions and niche construction, among others. Also, an important issue is the comparative analysis of the patterns and processes of cultural evolution along time and space, discussed on the basis of particular case studies from different regions of the world and with different chronologies. In this way this symposia will bring together researchers working in a wide range of time periods and geographic areas, in order to generate a rich discussion ambience regarding current trends in Evolutionary Archaeology.

#### **B15-Cultural resources, management, public policy, peoples awareness and sustainable development**

(Ranjana Ray [prof.ranjana.ray@gmail.com](mailto:prof.ranjana.ray@gmail.com), & Vidula Jayswal)

Cultural diversity is enhanced through rich cultural heritage. The session will focus on the cultural resources and its management (CRM). It will look into the local traditional crafts, many of which are continuing from the prehistoric period to present day. The purpose of the session will be to look into the cultural resources of different countries, public policy for the preservation of such heritage, people's awareness of the cultural resources and its management with emphasis for sustainable development, especially in the background of changed world perspective.

## **B16- Megalithism in the north-west of the Iberian Peninsula**

(**Anton A. Rodríguez Casal** [antonabel.rodriquez@usc.es](mailto:antonabel.rodriquez@usc.es))

Studies of the megalithic and tumulus phenomenon in northwestern Iberia at the start of the 19th century: a critical analysis of the current archaeological situation.

Megalithic mapping in north-western Iberia and the new territorial context in the light of the latest archaeological surveys. Rock, soil and tumuli. Hitherto unpublished results of soil and petrographic analyses, conducted systematically for the first time in Galicia (NW Spain). Numbers and tumuli: Statistical analysis and archaeological interpretation, using a database of 4,000 tumuli. The Galician-Portuguese Baixo Miño area as an interregional model for the study of tumular and megalithic phenomena.

## **B17-Climate change and use of animals in South America during the Holocene**

(**Hugo Yacobaccio** [hdycobaccio@gmail.com](mailto:hdycobaccio@gmail.com) & Olivera Daniel)

This symposium will discuss the relationship between Holocene climate change and the use of animals in different social and temporal contexts in South America. With this objective in mind, we will look at the climate changes that took place in the Middle and Late Holocene (event 3700 BP; Medieval Climate Anomaly, Little Ice Age) and how these changes have shaped relations with the animal world, both wild and domesticated. Since the early settlement of the sub-continent, human groups forged deep relationships with animal species. While animals were a factor in human subsistence, their importance extended to social, economic, political and symbolic aspects as well. This debate focuses on one of the key aspects for understanding the environmental and the cultural processes present in this changing relationship. The proposed -but by no means closed- list of topics for discussion includes:

- Middle Holocene aridity and changes in hunting techniques
- Domestication of camelids and other species
- Economic management associated with different environmental dynamics.

These issues will be covered by archaeology with input from palaeoenvironmental sciences, but contributions from the areas of ethnobiology, history and geography will also be accepted.

## **B18-Hominid-bird interactions in Prehistory: The humankind and the avian world: archaeological and zooarchaeological evidence for inferring behavioural evolutionary signatures**

(**Ruth Blasco** [rblascolopez@gmail.com](mailto:rblascolopez@gmail.com) & Marco Peresani)

In the challenged reconstruction of human behavior and dietary habit alongside the evolution of the humankind, a role should have been played by the avifaunal complexes preserved in many and different contexts. Although many scholars assert that bird bones from archaeological sites cannot be considered the result of human activity unless obvious anthropogenic modifications are present, some bodies of evidence from across the continents predate definitive indications for the human exploitation of some species of birds from the

Upper Paleolithic onwards. So far, the oldest evidence identified in the Early Pleistocene and in more recent chronologies was subject to debate. As a consequence of this claims for a lack of obvious anthropogenic modification of the avian bones, it is important to look at the statistical indexes of body representation, spatial patterning and other taphonomically sourced data.

Archaeological findings and successful studies demonstrate that clear diagnostic elements may document the acquisition and use of avifaunal resources for food but also for symbolic purposes since the Middle Palaeolithic. A new challenge is now to strengthen the growing body of data about these archaic Hominids and their supposed sophisticated technologies used to capture birds, with the aim to provide data comparable with evidence from later times.

The topics of this session may range from methodological protocols encountered in paleontological and zooarchaeological contexts, to taphonomy and bias in skeletal composition. Experimental butchering and ethnographic examples are welcome, in order to support the reconstruction of how humans interacted with the avifaunal world.

### **B19-Variability and convergence in production systems and acquisition of resources between the Lower and Middle Paleolithic**

(Marta Arzarello [rzrmrt@unife.it](mailto:rzrmrt@unife.it), Marie-Hélène Moncel, Carlo Peretto & Anne Marie Moigne)

During the Lower and Middle Palaeolithic “transformation” of technical systems and supply methods are frequently described, but the unchanged component that remains rooted for environmental constraints or cultural reasons is often overlooked.

The workshop aims to analyze, through an interdisciplinary approach, what were exactly the changes that have occurred between the Lower and Middle Paleolithic in relation to the unchanged substrate.

### **B20-Transition from Lithic to Metal – appraisal on global changes**

(Rama Krishna Pisipaty [sramakrishna.pisipaty@gmail.com](mailto:sramakrishna.pisipaty@gmail.com))

Initiation of metal technology was a major breakthrough in the history of mankind. Because, the barbaric mode of living of the Stone Age had a turn towards successive stages of modification with the master over utility of metals like copper/bronze and iron for different purposes. Besides being technological attainment, the use of these metals improved general living patterns and also governed economic processes during the Early Bronze/Iron Age. Generally, in history the Metal (Early Bronze/Iron) Age refers to mainly the end of second millennium BCE, however, the dates and context vary depending on the geographical region. It may be true that the advent and adoption of such hard material which available in most of the geographical zones provided an opportunity with other changes in society, including differing agricultural practices, religious beliefs and artistic styles. It further indicates the condition as to civilization and culture of a people using iron as the material for their cutting tools and weapons. Such a major breakthrough in the history mankind, still is not in common conclusion in many areas.

There have been a call for and discussion about the recent discoveries from all corners

for some common conclusion related to - Environmental conditions, Settlement pattern, Technologies & industrial activities, Socio-cultural systems, Religious practices, After death rituals, Megalithic & eolith structures, Art & architecture, Literature, Regional contracts, Trade & commerce, Celestial & applied science, etc., developments along with survived earlier mode of life in the different societies during transitions from lithic to metal, Early Bronze/ Iron Age as a theme of the present session.

### **B21-The interglacial Holsteinian el dorado**

(Anne Marie Moigne [anne-marie.moigne@cerptautavel.com](mailto:anne-marie.moigne@cerptautavel.com), Marie-Hélène Moncel & Marta Arzarello)

The aim of the workshop is to focus on archaeological data and human activities for MIS 11 and MIS 9 all over Eurasia for a period of time where number of sites increased following the Glacial Elster crisis. This transitional period can be described from multiproxy analysis to integrate many aspects. For examples:

This period is characterized by a wide biodiversity, a large faunal dispersion associated to a regionalization of mammal communities and variability of human morphology.

Large behavioral variability is observed on the side of the techno complexes, but generalization of fire use and structured living places seems an overall phenomenon. Management of local resources leads to another type of land use with seasonal settlements into a territorial network.

### **B22-The Discoid technology, ten years on: an assessment of variability, functionality and the techno-economy**

(Marco Peresani [marco.peresani@unife.it](mailto:marco.peresani@unife.it) & Vincent Mourre)

The discoid method is one of the most widespread flaking techniques used by hominids in different periods and in various ecological, economic and functional situations. However, this interesting predisposition does not appear to have been adequately investigated in research to date. Although the literature has been enriched during the last ten years, several aspects still await analysis at various levels of interaction. If, on the one hand the generalization of the criteria defining this volumetric concept remains incomplete, on the other hand we see clear signs of a deepened understanding of the role of the discoid technology in adaptation.

This section considers several aspects of the technology. In addition to the conceptual-methodological dimension, we would also like to see discussion of new data and broad syntheses regarding the chronological and cultural distribution of the discoid industries, their variability, functioning and productivity, economy and the possible detection of indicators of mobility. Possibly in combination with new data achieved from experimentation, this assessment of the state of the art regarding discoid technology will increase our ability to interpret human behavior in a wide range of situations.

### **B23- Monumentality and territory: relationship between enclosures and necropolis in the European Neolithic**

(**Vincent Ard** [vincent.ard@univ-tlse2.fr](mailto:vincent.ard@univ-tlse2.fr) & Lucile Pillot)

In many European areas, the Neolithic period corresponds to the development of architectural monumentality which left important marks in the landscape, as well as the land clearing and the cultivation by the first agro-pastoral societies. This monumentality can be observed in the domestic sphere, particularly by the edification of enclosures with various functions and surfaces, and in the funeral and ritual sphere, by the development of many megalithic or pre-megalithic cemeteries.

It is noteworthy that the concomitant development of these monumental sites reveals the complexity of cultural, symbolic and socio-economic practices of Neolithic societies. These monumental sites probably reflect socio-cultural dynamic systems in which the notion of territory seems to be a fundamental concept. Obviously, in many areas of Europe, Neolithic people have appropriated their surrounding landscape, exploited or not, by the edification of these monumental sites. In this way, they probably sustain their control over a defined territory. That's why burial, domestic or even defensive monumental sites, must be jointly analyzed in order to understand the organization of these Neolithic spaces, in which enclosures and cemeteries can structure a territorial net.

This session will examine:

1-The various manifestations of the relationship between Neolithic enclosures and cemeteries in different contexts of Europe, notably through spatial analysis.

2-The concept of landscape appropriation, combining domestic, symbolic, economic or natural spaces.

3-The patterns of territorial organization, in which enclosures and cemeteries have a fundamental role in some Neolithic contexts.

## **B24-Six feet under: another look at "pit fields". A cross-cultural Iberian perspective**

(**José Antonio Rodríguez Marcos** [jrmarcos@ubu.es](mailto:jrmarcos@ubu.es) & José Enrique Márquez Romero)

Many archaeological reports on recent prehistory sites in Iberia refer to silo habitats or settlements. They are also known by a more aseptic term, "pit fields". Whatever the case, these are extensive sites with no other documented type of building apart from structures dug in the ground, with a seemingly random distribution and filled with large amounts of archaeological material, often including human remains.

Their widespread geographical distribution and their continuity from the Neolithic almost to the historic era makes them a central issue in Iberian archaeology. However, despite the similarities in "pit fields" between different regions and periods, this archaeological phenomenon has always been studied from highly specialized, local approaches, which has led to a lack of communication amongst specialists working on similar yet disconnected archaeological issues due to our discipline characteristic academic overspecialization.

In this context, this session of the 17<sup>th</sup> IUPPS World Congress will strive to overcome the methodological autism in the study of Iberian "pit fields" by convening a broad range of experts and teams who are all engaged in the study of these unique sites. We hope this novel approach will foster a cross-cultural vision of the phenomenon by seeking morphological similarities and differences in the archaeological record and in their formation, without avoiding the controversial issue of their use and chronology. Finally, we will encourage discussion about new prospection and excavation methods applied to such sites, and the

considerable difficulties from a heritage standpoint posed by their protection and their dissemination amongst the general public.

### **B25-Mathematical approaches for the study of Human-Fauna interactions in the Pleistocene**

(Ana Mateos [ana.mateos@cenieh.es](mailto:ana.mateos@cenieh.es) & Jesús Rodríguez)

Most recent hunter-gatherer societies have a high reliance on animal food, and it is generally accepted that animal resources were also essential to Pleistocene hominins. Moreover, competition with carnivores strongly influenced the survival opportunities of Palaeolithic hunter-gatherers. Thus, the study of human-fauna interactions in the Pleistocene is a highly relevant topic for the understanding of the viability and dispersion of human populations. Key research questions related to human-fauna interactions include, but are not restricted to, estimating the amount of resources that can be obtained from an ungulate population, evaluating the effect of human hunting on the extinction of some large mammal species, measuring the intensity of competition inside the carnivore guild, and understanding the role of humans in past food webs. All these research questions are amenable to quantitative analyses and most of them have been occasionally addressed using mathematical models. The aim of this session is to discuss and promote the use of mathematical tools, mainly through mathematical modeling, for the study of key topics in human evolution related to human-fauna interactions in the Pleistocene.

### **B26-An Archaeology of fuels: social and environmental factors in behavioural strategies of multi-resource management**

(Ethel Allué [eallue@iphes.cat](mailto:eallue@iphes.cat), Llorenç Picornell & Marie Agnès Courty)

The management of fuel resources by past societies has been mostly considered from the perspective of pyrotechnology and fire-related activities, all approached along the fire *chaîne opératoire*: combustible supply, energy production and fire use, and by-product disposal. Within this frame, combustible are widely assumed to have been for long mainly provided by fresh biomass resources (plant and animal). Therefore, the control of environmental factors on the availability of these resources is generally viewed to have exerted a major role on behavioural strategies of fuel management.

We intend here to debate how a comprehensive approach of fuel management in the archaeological record, through cultural periods and across cultural territories, can help to reach a holistic comprehension of energy control in the social spheres along to human evolution. The session will put together recent investigations of authors coming from a wide diversity of archaeological and environmental disciplines. We expect to generate a compilation of innovative research which will be published in an international high-profile scientific journal or monograph.

We seek contributions on the integrated characterization of fuel resources from all environmental related disciplines (archaeobotany, zooarchaeology and geoarchaeology, geochemistry) and their contextual interpretation in terms of energy production at all scales of occupation units within the frame of archaeological data. We request presentations that critically analyse the relevance of field-analytical procedures, experimental archaeology and

ethnoarchaeology to providing a comprehensive data base of indicators with respect to fuel sources, combustion processes, firing products and related residues.

Multidisciplinary attempts to decouple the complex interaction of environmental and social factors on fuel management deciphered from all archaeological records are most welcome. We suggest participants to particularly question our ability to tracing changes in the availability of fuel resources through time, and their repercussion on social behaviour for energy production and various uses (domestic households, manufactures, ritual and funeral practices).

### **B27-Social complexity in a long term perspective**

(Joaquina Soares [cea.maeds@mail.telepac.pt](mailto:cea.maeds@mail.telepac.pt))

The purpose of this session is to actualize the debate about social complexity mainly on the field of prehistoric societies, as well as on a broad scope of the pre-industrial social formations. So the ethnographic record can shed light on the archaeological domain.

Case studies and theoretical presentations are welcome to articulate regional processes of political and economical transformations seen from the archaeological record to more general trends of cultural change, with anthropological components. Researchers from different continents would enrich the discussion with contributions from a huge variety of socio-political contexts:

From the origins of inequalities inside the Neolithic family nucleus, where the studies of the gender labour division are still not entirely explored, to the development of social stratification, which involved the rise of the state. Discourses of power and its mechanisms of legitimation, like those displayed by the European Late Bronze Age societies are central issues to be addressed in order to explain social organization and the increase of social complexity. Another important theme that could engage an interesting discussion would be the revaluation of the Iberian Copper Age.

Finally, this session is proposed to develop specific analyses about the role played by local salt exploitation, textile work, metallurgy and long distant interactions as key-factors of social complexity.

### **B28-Social complexity in the third millennium BC in Southern Portugal**

(Joaquina Soares [cea.maeds@mail.telepac.pt](mailto:cea.maeds@mail.telepac.pt))

The author proposes a complex tribal organization model for communities that inherited their social kinship structure from the megalithic societies, at the first half of the III millennium BC, in Southern Portugal. This social and economical model began to collapse in the second half of the same millennium, as a result of the development of the arsenical copper metallurgy (copper-arsenic alloys) and craft specialisation. The control of metallurgy made it possible for the elites to legitimate the accumulation of the political power, and gave them a coercive capacity to impose an unequal and very hierarchical social structure based on chiefdom.

This theoretical construction has been tested in the analysis of the settlement system at Triângulo da Luz (in the middle Guadiana valley), during the III millennium BC.

The stratified social organization seems to be preceded by the chiefdom that raise in the second half of the III millennium BC and developed in the Bronze Age. By the end of this

period the chiefdom society reached it's most complex structure.

In opposition with other authors, that defend the emergence of the state in the III millennium BC with a centre based in the lower Guadalquivir region, this paper proposes that the state took place in the South of the Iberian Peninsula only at early Iron Age, in the context of the orientalisising process.

## **B29-Shepherds and caves**

(Josep Maria Vergès [jmverges@iphes.cat](mailto:jmverges@iphes.cat), Ethel Allué & Marta Fontanals)

Since the beginning of livestock farming, natural overhangs and caves were used by shepherds as shelters during their travels in search of pasture, as short-term pens for their herds and also for long stabling periods, when they were used as regular habitats for human groups. These activities built up a quite characteristic type of sedimentary deposit, mainly composed of livestock dung. The high rate of sediment build-up generated by livestock and the repeated use of the same spaces over hundreds or even thousands of years has left many of these sites with powerful sedimentary series that span broad chronological periods, making them prime sources of archaeological records and high-resolution data on the nature and evolution of prehistoric agropastoral communities. Today, many of these deposits, known as pen caves, are being excavated and studied, especially in the Mediterranean area, and some of them have already or will soon become reference sites.

This session aims to bring together the researchers working in/on these sites, regardless of their geographic location and discipline, in order to pool the main problems that affect their excavation and study. We will discuss the excavation and documentation methodologies used in this type of record, the wide range of studies that can be done and their potential. Key issues in the session will include, amongst others, herd composition and husbandry, the seasonal nature of the occupations, the human habitat-animal stable relationship, the impact of livestock husbandry on the environment and the identification of agricultural practices based on the study of these pens.

We intend to publish the articles based on the papers presented in this session in an international journal or a monograph.

## **B30-State of the art of the multidisciplinary research at Middle Pleistocene Qesem Cave, Israel**

(Ran Barkai [barkaran@post.tau.ac.il](mailto:barkaran@post.tau.ac.il))

Qesem Cave is a Middle Pleistocene site in Israel, dated to 420,000-200,000 years ago and assigned to the the Acheulo-Yabrudian cultural complex (AYCC) of the Lower Palaeolithic Levant. The cave reveals a rich and well-preserved array of lithic and faunal remains as well as human teeth. It provides a good context in which to test hypotheses concerning the intriguing liaison between the environment, culture, and biology in the Middle Pleistocene Levant. In this session we summarize a decade of research and present new studies in the fields of faunal analysis; lithic analysis; human dental remains; Absolute chronology; the human use of fire; Microvertebrate studies; sedimentology and stratigraphy and more in order to provide a better understanding of Qesem Cave in particular and the Acheulo-Yabrudian Cultural Complex in general.

### **B31-Aquatic resource consumption by prehistoric humans**

(**Dorothee G. Drucker** [dorothee.drucker@ifu.uni-tuebingen.de](mailto:dorothee.drucker@ifu.uni-tuebingen.de) & Yuichi I. Naito)

Aquatic resource procurement and consumption over the course of human evolution has raised an intense debate in regard to the cognitive capacities of prehistoric humans. Not only does the relative importance of aquatic resources as diet intakes shed light on the exploitation of aquatic ecosystems but also on the evolution of subsistence strategy of ancient hunter-gathers. However, detection of aquatic resource consumption is often challenging due to different archaeological and preservation biases. Effort to trace this type of food intake has led to the development of new approaches, including morphometric equations, stable isotope measurements, organic residue analyses, peptide mass fingerprinting, and ancient DNA analyses.

For this session, we would like to invite contributions that present significant case studies and technical developments in the fields of zooarchaeology (e.g., osteometry, skeletochronology), biogeochemical analysis (e.g., stable isotopes, trace elements, ZooMS, fatty acid analysis) and paleogenetics.

### **B32-The emergence of warrior societies and its economic, social and environmental consequences**

(**Fernando Coimbra** [coimbra.rockart@yahoo.com](mailto:coimbra.rockart@yahoo.com), Davide Delfino & Dragoş Gheorghiu)

It is well known that Neolithic was the first epoch of major changes of the landscape, modeled with fire to obtain lands for cultivation.

In a similar way the rise of warrior societies will generate environmental, as well as social and economic changes through the construction of strongholds, colonies, or the exploitation of open mines (*i.e.*, environmental changes), the new role of warriors within the society which created new myths and new funerary spaces (*i.e.*, social changes), or the technological and commercial development which increased the social contacts (*i.e.*, economic mutations).

In fact, the transformation of agricultural societies in warrior societies is a crucial moment in human history, resulting in a shift of local conflicts to large scale conflagrations, conducted after special laws and rules, alliances and trade over long distances, creating acculturations, which represent a major challenge addressed to anthropological archeology.

The Iliad, or Edda, reveal a world of symbols and important issues about the warlords, with weapons of prestige, monumental architecture built to impress and protect, with spectacular scenery and modeled mortuary rituals.

It seems that the art of war has imposed a deep cultural change to the world, with new myths and rituals, and especially the overall relationships among humans, between humans and new materials and between humans and animals.

With the discovery of metals a new materiality has changed the world and we are now witnessing the stratification of human societies (from the Chalcolithic period until the Iron Age), where the phenomenon of war has a central role, either in the social structure of human groups, which are designated as "warlike" societies, or in their interaction with the material culture and environment.

We invite therefore archaeologists and anthropologists to offer papers on the marks left by the warlike societies in the various manifestations of human culture: rituals, mythology, arts, commerce, technology and the space over the age of metals.

**B33-Contexts without definition, definitions without context. Arguments for the characterization of the (Pre)historic realities during the neolithisation of the western mediterranean**

(**Iñigo García-Martínez de Lagrán**, [contextosuispp2014@gmail.com](mailto:contextosuispp2014@gmail.com), Esther López-Montalvo, Claire Manen)

One of the main aspects in the discussion of the neolithisation of any territory is the definition of the concerned contexts. This difficulty can be explained by the fact that no archaeological element defines for itself the hunter-gatherer or farmer nature of the context. This is due to the fact that the presence / absence of certain archaeological elements respond to multiple factors: functionality of the deposits, interaction / exchanges between different groups, importance of the activities of subsistence ...

The main goal of this session deals with the definition and characterization of these criteria that allow to distinguish, in an objective way, the different socio-economic situations of every context: farmer communities of colons, Mesolithic communities with evidences of the Neolithic "package" due to the exchange, "mixed" communities, in which the weight of the predatory and producing activities is similar, etc.

Traditionally, this approach has been achieved from the pottery and the lithic industry. Nevertheless, the characterization of these pre-historic realities must be approached in an integral way taking into account all the elements of material, economic, cultural and symbolic production. In this sense, we try to integrate in the discussion other arguments, as the stratigraphic and taphonomic analysis of these deposits; the discussion related to the settlement, the economic exploitation of territory resources, the funerary context, the social organization or the place of the art in the communities involved in the process of neolithisation. Definitely, we pursue to offer a global vision of this historical process and to establish the criteria that define the different archaeological contexts, from an innovative approach. For that reason, we will give priority to the analyses that offer new methodological and theoretical points of view and approaches.

**B34-Man and the Animal World or on regional and / or figurative aspects of rock art, possibly in a joint form, e.g. Animal Depictions in Rock Art**

(**Thomas Wyrwoll** [t-w@gmx.com](mailto:t-w@gmx.com))

Since animals have been crucial to man during the entire course of evolution, animal depictions do naturally form a major subject of artistic expressions.

Such depictions provide a wealth of information that is not accessible by any other kind of evidence. For the archaeologist, they form a key pictorial source for basic human activity, ranging from hunting over domestication and husbandry to religion.

For the zoologist, they show morphological traits of animals which are not or almost not preserved osteologically, such as fur colour and a number of morphological traits. Therefore, animal depictions form a major source for cultural and natural history.

Papers on all aspects of animal depictions in archaeological art are welcome. Though a focus is likely to be given to “archaeotherioiconology”, i.e. depictions of mammals, as on the global scale they form the major animal group in regular contact with man, papers focusing on other kinds of animals are encouraged, too.

### **B35-The Role of Art in Prehistoric Societies**

(**Esther López-Montalvo** [emontalvo@unizar.es](mailto:emontalvo@unizar.es), Georges Sauvet & Carole Fritz)

The art answers vital needs for the society, allowing each individual to confront his(her) experience and affects to those of his(her) fellow men. The art produces symbols which take shape of actions in collective rituals and of images in plastic representations. These symbols allow the archaeologist to restore prehistoric cultures in their social, economic and ideological context. In this session, we want to put the artistic creation in disappeared societies in the heart of a multidisciplinary reflection involving psychological, sociological, cognitive and semiotic aspects. For this purpose, three main axes, going from the individual creative gesture to the collective behaviour and the inter-group relationships, will be examined in link with a current international research program entitled " *the Arts of Prehistory and the Cultural Dynamics of Societies before Writing* ". The aim is to gather experiences from various cultural and geographical environments, in particular those showing innovative theoretical or methodological approaches.

In this session are welcome communications concerning the following themes:

**-The characterization of the creative gesture:** the analysis of the operating or technical chain is the means by which the relationships between the artist and the society can be grasped. It allows us to understand the way the society conceives its relation to the work of art and how artworks take part in a system of collective representations.

**-Art as cultural marker:** the different aspects of the creative gesture (technical, formal/stylistic and thematic) and the spatial distribution of art can help us to define cultural territories. The simultaneous study of these variables offers a thorough knowledge of the prehistoric societies, of the cultural links between contemporaneous groups, as well as the diachronic evolution of these links, showing sometimes important breaking.

**-Art as a means of communication and symbolic expression:** the topic will be mainly devoted to the narration in rock art, and the graphic processes used for the building of compositions bearing a narrative intention. Attention will be paid to thematic changes over time as they can reveal meaningful societal mutations (socio-economic upheavals, periods of conflict, etc.).

### **B- Rock art and pigment analysis**

(**Martí Mas Cornella** [mmas@geo.uned.es](mailto:mmas@geo.uned.es), Mónica Solís & Racso Fernández)

---

## **5. RESERVATION FORM**

(Download from our website [www.burgos2014uispp.es](http://www.burgos2014uispp.es))

---

**6. REGISTRATION FORM**

(Download from our website [www.burgos2014uispp.es](http://www.burgos2014uispp.es))

---

**7. NOTICE**

**DEADLINE FOR PROPOSED COMMUNICATIONS AND POSTERS: 30 April 2014**

**Registrants must indicate which Congress sessions they will attend, before May 31, 2014, to allow the Technical Office to arrange the sessions and lecture rooms on the basis of participant numbers. Registrants who do not do so or do register later, will not be assured of a place in the session, and will be put on a waiting list for which priority will be given to the registration number.**

---

**8. CONGRESS POSTER (next page)**

# ***XVII CONGRESO UISPP*** **2014**

# **ATAPUERCA**

**Fecha/Date:** 1-7 Septiembre 2014

**Lugar/Place:** Burgos (España)

**Información:**

Técnica: [uispp2014@viajeseci.es](mailto:uispp2014@viajeseci.es)

Científica: [uispp2014@fundacionatapuerca.es](mailto:uispp2014@fundacionatapuerca.es)

[www.fundacionatapuerca.es](http://www.fundacionatapuerca.es)

[www.burgos2014uispp.com](http://www.burgos2014uispp.com)

**Organiza:**

 **fundación**  
**atapuerca**