

copy.

Ancient Monuments Dep.

3. Mar. 83

Secretary,

In reply to your minute of the 28 Feb  
requesting me to state how I should propose  
to word the notices to be placarded on each  
of the ~~one~~ monuments therein specified I beg  
to say that these monuments are of different  
kinds, liable to different kinds of damage &  
requiring different kinds of protection.

Some, as Stanton Drew, are collections of  
isolated stones between which the public or  
cattle will be allowed to circulate freely. These  
stones cannot conveniently have marks placed  
round them, or fences to define the area  
to be protected.

Others, such as West Kennet Long Barrow consist of  
mounds of earth rising gradually and  
almost imperceptibly from the level ground  
around and liable to damage from encroachments  
of the plough. These can have marks placed  
round them to define <sup>the</sup> area to be protected.

I consider that it is a matter for the  
Solicitor to the Treasury to decide whether one  
form of notice (such as <sup>that</sup> herewith annexed) is  
sufficient to apply to them all, and whether  
such a notice would suffice to enable him  
to prosecute in case of damage of any kind being

simplify matters to have one form of notice  
for all the monuments.

But if it is considered that each monument  
according to the peculiarities of its construction  
must have a notice defining the kind of  
injury which will render the public liable to  
prosecution, in that case I should not be  
able to word the notice for each case until  
the office of works has decided what  
protection is to be placed round each monument.  
On the receipt of your reply to this communication I  
will return the enclosure to your records.

A. Pitt Rivers

(For form of notice see under King's City

House) 29. 3. Mar/83

Ancient Monuments

Inspector to Secretary

or

Notice to be placed

on monuments

3. Mar. 83

The Solicitor

Please advise upon this

CPM. 4 Mar: 84

General Pitt Rivers,

Will you be good enough to return the previous  
papers referred to in the last paragraph of your  
memo: They will be required by the Solicitor

R. P. 4/3/84

# Ancient Monuments

## Notices to be placarded

This margin may not  
be written on.

### MEMORANDA.

The Solicitor

Please advise upon this. The previous papers annexed are 8098, 8270, 7943, 6980, 6892, and 7453 (A/83) ARM.

Mar: 4-83

Recd. 10. Mar: 83.

The Secretary, there does not appear to me to be any legal question involved in this reference.

The object of the notice is to warn the Public that the act provides a punishment for persons injuring or defacing monuments. There is no legal necessity for any notice being put up at all but I quite agree as to the expediency of such a course, as in the absence of any notice the Court would be disinclined to impose any substantial penalty.

If I were settling the notice I should follow the words of the act (Sec. 6 of 45 & 46 v. Cap. 73) and say "injuring or defacing" instead of "damaging" and I should say "prosecuted according to law" instead of "liable to a penalty of £5, an offender being

PA Box 2 Misc

Annex 11.

Mon:  
Proposed  
Notice Board  
on descriptive  
notices of each  
Mon:

Secretary

Sir John Lubbock has suggested to me that the documents placed under the protection of the Museum should not have a description <sup>appended</sup> ~~attached~~ to them as at present the usual notice of preservation to be affixed for damage. I think that coming from him this suggestion is worthy of attention. If adopted the notice board should have been facing ~~to~~ the description ~~with~~ <sup>on the opposite side to</sup> placed opposite the cabinet.

If this course is approved of I could supply descriptions of some of them which might be printed or painted <sup>and</sup> I would suggest that the ~~descriptions~~ <sup>they</sup> should be referred to a list of the results of any diggings made in the site & of the objects found & should contain nothing that is open to controversy, as also to the name of the person who placed it under their care & that

it should contain <sup>no description</sup> ~~nothing~~ that is open  
to controversy. however ~~such~~ <sup>such</sup> ~~could~~ <sup>could</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>established</sup>  
the authority ~~cannot~~ <sup>for such descriptions might be</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>considered</sup>.

It will also need the <sup>proper</sup> ~~proper~~ <sup>qualifications</sup> ~~qualifications~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>be</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>made</sup> ~~made~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the <sup>persons</sup> ~~persons~~ <sup>who</sup> ~~who~~ <sup>are</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>be</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>employed</sup> ~~employed~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>such</sup> ~~such <sup>cases</sup> ~~cases~~.~~~~

It follows from this that some of the  
principal arguments ~~that~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~have~~ <sup>been</sup> ~~used~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~description~~ <sup>description</sup> ~~attached~~ <sup>attached</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~them~~ <sup>them</sup> ~~like~~ <sup>like</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~name~~ <sup>name</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~same~~ <sup>same</sup>.