



# Archaeology Today: Challenges, Approaches, Ethics

21<sup>st</sup> Archaeology & Theory Symposium

Date: 22<sup>nd</sup> of April 2014

Venue: Rijksdienst Cultureel Erfgoed (RCE), Amersfoort

Sponsored by ARCHON and the RCE

## Abstracts

### Session 1(a): Archaeology and Policy: challenges, responses, future outlook

#### **Archeologie is geschiedenis**

In mijn verhaal zal ik als regioarcheoloog en voorzitter van het Convent van Gemeentelijke Archeologen mijn visie geven op de positie van de Nederlandse archeologie van nu. Om het hedendaagse beeld te kunnen begrijpen, is kort achterom kijken wel noodzakelijk. Daarom blik ik terug op de pre Malta-periode en alles wat sindsdien over ons archeologen is heen gekomen. Wat is er geworden van de archeologie? Waar staan we nu?

Universiteiten, archeologische adviesbureaus, opgravingsbureaus, opdrachtgevers, gemeenten, Rijk, RUD's, Provincies, zzp-ers; het zijn allemaal spelers in het veld en hebben allen hun belangen. Hoe zijn die belangen met elkaar te rijmen en waar staan de belangen haaks op elkaar? Hoe houdt de archeologie zich staande binnen het spanningsveld van economische belangen, wetenschappelijke belangen, maatschappelijke belangen en politieke belangen? Is de archeologie stuurloos of draaien we allemaal aan het (vlieg-) wiel?

Wat is de rol van gemeenten in dit krachtveld? Kunnen zij de verantwoordelijkheid van het archeologisch erfgoed aan?

We staan aan de vooravond van de nieuwe Erfgoedwet. Daarin zal de kwaliteit van de archeologie geborgd moeten worden. Geen opgravingsvergunning meer, maar een certificaat. Regels, normen en eisen worden gesteld om de kwaliteit van archeologisch onderzoek te borgen. Waar doen we het allemaal voor?

Wat is er gebeurd met artikel 9 van het Verdrag van Valletta? Zijn wij ons zelf wel bewust van onze rol als archeoloog? Zonder een blik vooruit is het verhaal niet klaar.

drs. Maarten Wispelwey  
Regioarcheoloog Noord Veluwe  
Voorzitter, Convent van Gemeentelijke Archeologen  
[mwispelwey@regionoordveluwe.nl](mailto:mwispelwey@regionoordveluwe.nl)

## Original Footprint; de zoektocht naar nieuwe balans tussen kennis, behoud en gebruik

Het is zeer aannemelijk dat erfgoed en de archeologie in het bijzonder een andere positie verwerft in de toekomstige samenleving. Erfgoed zou een veel grotere bijdrage kunnen leveren aan het oplossen van brede maatschappelijke opgaven op het gebied van ruimte, economie en sociaal-cultureel beleid. In deze inleiding willen we onze methodiek die hiervoor ontwikkeld is bediscussiëren.

De benadering stoelt op 2 belangrijke pijlers:

- agenda van de plek (beleidsambities en/ of gebiedsontwikkeling) koppelen aan verhaal en de identiteit van de plek
- waarde van, en de wijze van omgang met, het erfgoed mede laten bepalen door de (toekomstige) gebruiker van de plek.

De methode bestaat uit drie stappen (zie afbeelding). 1-Eerst onderzoeken we de gebiedsgeschiedenis en destilleren daaruit een aantal onderscheidende thema's. Parallel daaraan inventariseren we de ambities met de plek (ruimtelijk, economisch en sociaal-cultureel). 2-Daarna bekijken we samen met alle betrokkenen welke historische thema's het beste aansluiten op de ambities. Dat resulteert in *verhaallijnen*. 3-Sluitstuk is een advies over het zichtbaar en beleefbaar en deelbaar maken van die thema's en de waarde ervan voor het behalen van uw bredere maatschappelijke doelstellingen. De eindproducten vereisen dat ze *crossmedial* zijn, in *co-creatie* gemaakt en een grote mate van *gebruiksgemak* bezitten. Voor de gebruikers kunnen de voordelen variëren van een eigen identiteit als kompas, ruimtelijke kwaliteit, duurzaam erfgoed, kostenbesparing een succesvolle ontwikkeling, sociale cohesie.

Discussie punt is of deze aanpak een wetenschappelijke concessie vereist.



drs. Boudewijn Goudswaard  
Senior Adviseur Erfgoed  
Director, The Missing Link  
[b.goudswaard@the-misinglink.nl](mailto:b.goudswaard@the-misinglink.nl)

## Heeft archeologie toekomst?

Er is een hoop veranderd in het archeologische bestel in de afgelopen 20 jaar. Elke verandering kent goede en minder goede kanten. Het archeologische belang is beter gewaarborgd dan ooit, maar is het daarmee ook maatschappelijk gewaarborgd? Vroeger deden we aan archeologie omdat het leuk was, nu omdat het een verplicht nummer is. De belangen zijn in archeologisch Nederland steeds verder opgeknipt. We hebben nu een opdrachtgever, een uitvoerende partij, een adviesgevende partij en een bevoegd gezag, dat weer verder opgesplitst wordt in een beleidsgevend orgaan en een uitvoerende dienst die enkel nog de rapporten toetst, en de deponhouders. Met de versnippering van belangen is er een hoop stroop gekomen in het archeologische proces waar veel tijd en geld in gaat zitten wat zich niet of nauwelijks vertaalt in het resultaat. En als er dan eindelijk een resultaat ligt in de vorm van een dik, maar voor de leek onleesbaar rapport van een definitief onderzoek met een beperkte synthese, stopt het proces. Waar blijft het synthetiserende onderzoek? Zouden de universiteiten hun rol hierin niet moeten oppakken? En waar blijven de verhalen? Door de versnippering van belangen is het veel lastiger geworden om snel door te kunnen pakken op leuke archeologische resultaten. Als we überhaupt nog gaan graven, want in de toekomst zal archeologievriendelijk bouwen steeds meer in zwang komen. Uitstekend voor het behoud van het bodemarchief. Het draagt echter niet bij aan het doel van archeologie: verhalen vertellen over vroeger. Vroeger toen we nog aan archeologie deden, simpelweg omdat het leuk was.....

In de lezing komt een terugblik, de huidige stand van zaken, actuele ontwikkelingen, en een vooruitblik aan de orde. De lezing zal besluiten met een aantal prikkelende stellingen en vragen. Hierbij alvast een paar om over na te denken: wat is het doel van archeologie? Voor wie doen we het? Wie is de grote winnaar van het huidige archeologische bestel? Bereiken we met het huidige bestel wel wat we beogen met archeologie? Zou het anders, beter kunnen?

drs. Tim de Ridder  
Stadsarcheoloog Vlaardingen  
[t.de.ridder@vlaardingen.nl](mailto:t.de.ridder@vlaardingen.nl)

### Session 1(b): Archaeology and Policy: challenges, responses, future outlook

#### **The pitfall of Dutch archaeology and re-establishing the societal relevance of archaeology in the Netherlands**

The crisis in Dutch archaeology is certainly partly the result of the economic crisis at large, but we all perceive it to be larger still. I will argue that this extra deep crisis is the result of the poorly developed friction surfaces with potential partners in society. While the Malta Treaty resulted in strong ties between our discipline and spatial planners, it also steered us away from our natural habitat: arts, heritage and culture in general. As a result archaeology was increasingly perceived as a problem to be dealt with, while its potential to produce new local or regional narratives has been neglected. The new legislation (2007) in which municipalities have a dominant position in both economic development and archaeological heritage management has proven to provide an

uncertain base for archaeology, in which economic development prevails, again and again.

In order to re-establish the societal relevance of our discipline we need not turn to others: if we find archaeology of relevance we should convince society at large. The lecture will provide several examples for re-conquering lost ground.

prof. dr. Daan Raemaekers  
Professor, Groningen University  
Director, Groningen Institute of Archaeology  
[d.c.m.raemaekers@rug.nl](mailto:d.c.m.raemaekers@rug.nl)

### **The postdoc application process: passing through the bottleneck**

Archaeologists who wish to stay on in Academia after completing their PhD will, most likely, do so through the process of postdoc applications. The range of available opportunities in this field varies considerably across nations and organisations, and so, accordingly, do the applications that are designed to appoint the right candidate. In this paper, I shall consider three European countries (the UK, the Netherlands and Germany) in order to assess this variation. In particular, I focus on requirements, assessment process, resources offered if successful, and successful project oversight. A central concern is the balance between these different aspects and their reciprocal interaction. The aim of the paper is twofold. First, I shall provide an accurate portrait of the current situation. Second, these data shall be analysed in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the application process. Finally, I shall discuss possible strategies to address the weaknesses that may have emerged.

Dr. Giulia Saltini Semerari  
Marie Curie Post-Doctoral Fellow, VU University Amsterdam  
[tulillas@gmail.com](mailto:tulillas@gmail.com)

### Session 2: Engaging the public: responsibilities, responses to problems, approaches

#### **Educational initiatives and public awareness of archaeology in Flanders**

One of the inherent obligations of archaeology is to disseminate accurate and useful information to the rest of society. This paper presents the outcome of an extensive evaluation of the policy in the Flemish Region regarding public support for archaeology and of educational initiatives in forty-two museums possessing archaeological collections in Flanders. Seven case studies were selected to examine more closely the internal functioning and cooperation between museums, teachers, archaeologists and other social players.<sup>1</sup>

The research was based on the following assumptions: Over the recent decades, the discipline of archaeology, both in the heritage sector and in academia, has been

---

<sup>1</sup> Pazmany 2012.

developed as a social actor.<sup>2</sup> To maintain and improve the positive role that archaeology plays in society, there is a need to formulate a proper educational outreach program. This need has been recognized internationally by the Valletta Convention,<sup>3</sup> which under Article 9 states that a well-informed public is one of the best ways to secure the support necessary to ensure good heritage management.<sup>4</sup> Young people in particular play an important role in this.<sup>5</sup>

The research identified a positive interest and willingness concerning this topic along the different institutions considered. However, the results of the survey also showed that currently, a certain lack of unity exists in approach across the different initiatives and policies. One of the difficulties is to convey a nuanced and understandable archaeological narrative to the general public without falling into the trap of oversimplification, or detracting from the scientific character of the data. Finally, some possible solutions and new approaches to this issue are suggested which can contribute to a broader debate about how best to share archaeological and heritage information with the public.

Karolien Pazmany MA  
PhD student, Leiden University  
[k.pazmany@hum.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:k.pazmany@hum.leidenuniv.nl)

#### Selected bibliography

- Council of Europe. 1992. 'Valletta Convention – European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage.' Valletta.
- Fairclough, G. J., Harrison, R., Jameson Jr., J. H., and Schofield, J. 2008, *The Heritage Reader*. London.
- Jameson Jr., J. 2008, 'Presenting Archaeology to the Public, Then and Now: An introduction.' In G.J. Fairclough *et al.* (ed.). *The Heritage Reader*. London: 427-456.
- Pazmany, K. 2012. *Educatieve Initiatieven voor het Leerplichtonderwijs in Vlaamse Musea met een Archeologische Collectie*. Archeologie, MA Thesis. KU Leuven. Unpublished.
- Scheerhout, D. 2004. 'Zonder publiek geen Malta.' *Archeologie en Publiek*: 3.
- Van der Auwera, S., Schramme, A., and Jeurissen, R. 2007. *Erfgoededucatie in het Vlaams Onderwijs, Erfgoed en Onderwijs in Dialoog*, Brussels.
- Van Der Leeuw, S., Wiek, A., Harlow, J., and Buizer, J. 2012. 'How much time do we have? Urgency and rhetoric in sustainable science.' *Sustainable Science* 7: 115-120.

### **Why is the situation in the UK so much better?**

Outside the United Kingdom there is a perception that the British have a stronger connection with their past than in most other parts of the world. This refers to a perceived mind set which helps to explain why for instance there is so much archaeology and history broadcasted and these programs are exported all over the globe - a climate which undoubtedly should lead to a broad base for the role of archaeology in society. Or does it?

This paper will look at the developments in British archaeology and the climate that helps to form it. The role of the policy maker and laws, the NGO institutions, the employability of archaeologists, the role of the universities, a short history of TV

---

<sup>2</sup> Fairclough *et al.* 2008.

<sup>3</sup> Europe 1992.

<sup>4</sup> Scheerhout 2004; van der Leeuw *et al.* 2012; Jameson Jr. 2008.

<sup>5</sup> Van der Auwera *et al.* 2007.

archaeology and the growth of archaeologists as public personae will also be examined. However the focus will mostly be placed on the growth of public archaeology. The UK is not the land of milk and honey for us archaeologists but a closer look at the growth of an archaeology that is engaging more with the needs of society is worthy of our time and attention. It is the aim of this paper to point out that we as archaeologists are not helping to achieve our self-declared aims. Maybe it is time to change our mind set. If so, maybe some of the answers and examples can be found across the North Sea.

drs. Marc Spanjer  
ARCADIS  
[m.spanjer@chello.nl](mailto:m.spanjer@chello.nl)

### **Searching for a dialogue**

Dutch archaeologists are engaging more than ever with the public, yet the archaeological community as well as the audience do not seem to be satisfied. What should or could we do differently? On the basis of some recent experiences with community involvement, I will look into some of the pros and cons of engaging with the public and give some reasons as to why we should compete for the attention of the public with popular science magazines, television, games etc. and how.

dr. Monique van den Dries  
Associate Professor, Leiden University  
[m.h.van.den.dries@arch.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:m.h.van.den.dries@arch.leidenuniv.nl)

### **Archaeology (back) to the people: towards building a reciprocal relationship with the public.**

When archaeologists are brought in to excavate a particular site, residents of nearby urban centres and villages mostly welcome them with enthusiasm (although there are some less fortunate cases). Eventually, locals help archaeologists not only in the practicalities of their work, but also in offering insights into the ecology, geomorphology or ethnoarchaeology of a site. Local informants are however often excluded from publication of research since our publications are targeted at a very specialized group of readers. Similarly, notwithstanding the strong motivation and archaeological interest of travellers, the information provided to them is often limited to outdated traveller's guides, short posters and signs. Lastly, schoolchildren frequently experience a rigid educational system in which historical and archaeological knowledge is passed on as a melange of too much information, often too abstract to comprehend.

In this paper, I draw from my experience as a young researcher, a former schoolchild and a resident of one of the most touristic islands of Greece, Crete, to argue that it is professional archaeologists who should remedy such inconsistencies. I propose an approach which embraces and encourages the enthusiasm of the general public and is aimed at fleshing out the ways in which archaeologists interact with it. This involves the co-organization of archaeological and cultural events with the local communities, educational school programmes and experience-based archaeological tourism. Such

attempts, will contribute to the development of a reciprocal relationship with non-specialists, the state and funding organizations on which we often rely for help, authorization and financing. Initiatives of this kind will also help us eliminate the pitfalls of misrepresentation of archaeological facts by popular science, dubious websites and other unreliable sources.

Samantha Ximeri MSc  
PhD Student, University of Amsterdam  
[s.ximeri@uva.nl](mailto:s.ximeri@uva.nl)

### Session 3: Ethics in the practice of archaeology

#### **Fiddling while Rome burns?**

This paper examines some underlying, metaphysical problems inherent in archaeology, which lead to conflicts between the aims of institutions, national traditions, sub-disciplines, research/academic vs. “rescue” excavation, etc. The result – a fragmented disciplinary landscape – is ultimately weak theoretically, economically, and politically because archaeologists have essentially made themselves all too easily subjected to a form of “divide and conquer” far more effective than any self-discipline Foucault may have imagined.

This fragmentation (related to that which Hodder has criticised) has obvious consequences for interactions between archaeologists and the public (both directly and through governments and legislation). That such dealings are filtered through various forms of media (which are themselves largely beyond the direct control of archaeologists) only complicates matters further.

A metaphysical framework – which finds parallels in communications theory and systems analysis – allows comparison of the aims of the various parties involved in the archaeological process, with the ultimate goal of reconciliation. It is an approach advocated by David Clarke, but largely overlooked and/or misunderstood, with the result that many archaeological debates – such as the current focus on such issues as phenomenology or hermeneutics – seem painfully trivial when set against such existential risks to the discipline as a whole, as this problem of fragmentation.

The extent of this problem can be highlighted by considering the fact that phenomenology and hermeneutics were already addressed by archaeologists in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and largely rejected; their return – resurrection? – only suggests that archaeologists are somehow failing to learn from the past they claim to study...

Geoff Carver MA  
Independent scholar  
[gjcarver@t-online.de](mailto:gjcarver@t-online.de)

## **Taking a stance in armed conflict: ethical obligations vs. the alleged legitimacy of 'expertise' in archaeological practice**

It is a truism that colonialism often entails cultural imperialism, wherein the definition, management and marketing of cultural heritage constitutes one of its pivotal aspects. Nowadays, the manipulation of cultural heritage for neo-colonialist/imperialist agendas emerges all too frequently and disconcertingly. As most of us, archaeologists and cultural heritage practitioners alike in 'western' states, states which often become enthralled in such enterprises, depend directly on the public sector or public-funded institutions for our work, what is the stance that we should be taking? And why has there not been a wider debate about this issue despite the flagrant use of archaeologists, anthropologists and cultural heritage practitioners in the appropriation, commodification and 'rehabilitation' of cultural heritage for the production and consumption of a cultural product, following ethically debatable (at best) military conflict? This paper addresses some of the commonly-heard arguments offered by those archaeologists/cultural heritage practitioners who actively collaborate with military structures during armed conflict. I attempt to countenance the disconcerting trend of taking increasingly for granted the collaboration of archaeologists with the armies of countries that are militarily active in foreign territories (as invading and/or occupying forces). I do so by sketching out its underlying ideological premises, machinations and consequences. In deconstructing the so-called 'pragmatic stance', I draw attention to some of the ethical norms which should guide decisions of this kind and which I argue should overwrite appeals to professional expertise or the protection of cultural heritage.

Dr. Eleftheria Pappa  
Researcher, VU University Amsterdam  
Lecturer, University of Groningen  
[e.pappa@vu.nl](mailto:e.pappa@vu.nl)

## **Ethics in the Eye of the 'Other': Archaeology Through the Looking Glass**

"Among individuals, as among nations, respect for the rights of others is peace."  
Benito Juarez – Zapotec Indian, President of Mexico

A main cause of conflict around the world is the refusal, rather than the inability, to respect the "Other's" rights. Rights can go from points of view, to body of work, in the case of academia, to the land ownership and decision-making in the case of politics. Archaeological academia has been slow to realize and accept that democratization of information and political status has given "Others" the right to decide whether or not to collaborate with foreign archaeologists. A case study will be presented to review ethical dilemmas involving repatriation and plagiarism, among others. Special emphasis will be placed on the ethical dilemmas regarding the sharing of information amongst colleagues from different countries, but especially the host country.

Pauline Kulstad MA  
PhD Student, Leiden University  
[p.m.kulstad@arch.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:p.m.kulstad@arch.leidenuniv.nl)