



Themata 5 E-learning Archaeology, the Heritage Handbook





Programme

Lifelong Learning Programme 2010-2012, Leonardo da Vinci

Editors

Marjolijn Kok, Heleen van Londen and Arkadiusz Marciniak

Design

Susan de Loor, KANTOORDELOOR, Haarlem

Print


Koopmans' drukkerij, Hoorn

ISBN 978 90 78863 76 2

© University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the editors.





E-learning Archaeology

the Heritage Handbook

Marjolijn Kok
Heleen van Londen
Arkadiusz Marciniak (eds.)

THEMATA 5
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM • 2012

Table of Contents

6	PART 1		
7	E-learning resources in the vocational training system in archaeological heritage by Arkadiusz Marciniak	132	11 Management cycle and information system in archaeological heritage sector by Andris Šne
16	Organizing effective distance training using e-learning content and the content repository by Jacek Marciniak	142	12 Commercial archaeology by Marjolijn Kok & Heleen van Londen
24	Short user guide for the book by Marjolijn Kok	149	13 A single voice? Archaeological heritage, information boards and the public dialogue by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson
25	PART 2 COURSE CONTENT	158	14 Digital public outreach by Francois Bertemes & Peter F. Biehl
26	01 Theorizing cultural heritage by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson	167	15 Methods and engagement, publicity and media relationships by Francois Bertemes & Peter F. Biehl
38	02 Mentalities and perspectives in archaeological heritage management by Marjolijn Kok & Heleen van Londen	175	16 Introduction to archaeology for construction engineers by Kenneth Aitchison
50	03 Concepts of understanding spatial valorization of archaeological heritage resources by Włodzimierz Raczkowski	190	17 Introduction to construction engineering for archaeologists by Kenneth Aitchison
58	04 Aerial survey in archaeology protection and management system by Włodzimierz Raczkowski	204	18 Archaeology and politics by Heleen van Londen
70	05 Geographic Information System as a method of management of spatial data by Christopher Sevara	208	19 Public archaeology by Monique van den Dries
82	06 Geophysical prospection in archaeological protection and management by Robert Hook with cooperation of Arkadiusz Marciniak & Włodzimierz Raczkowski	218	20 Urban archaeology by Andrzej Gołębniak
94	07 Images of the past by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson	236	21 Perspectives on looting, illicit antiquities trade, art and heritage by Staffan Lundén
106	08 Cultural biography of landscape by Marjolijn Kok & Heleen van Londen	250	22 Problematic heritage by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson
116	09 International convention and legal frameworks by Arkadiusz Marciniak	260	23 Maritime archaeology by Andrzej Pydyn
125	10 Sustainable development in archaeological heritage sector by Marjolijn Kok & Heleen van Londen		
			CASE STUDIES See dvd in the back sleeve of the book

22

Problematic heritage

by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson

→ **LU** Problematic cultural heritage in memory processes and politics – basic concepts by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson

sco Introduction

When filling the concept of cultural heritage with content and meaning one is confronted with a number of questions – for instance: what kind of common culture constitutes a part of cultural heritage, a cultural heritage that is worth remembering in the future? Which parts of our common past shall be constricted and forgotten? Is cultural heritage something that is fixed once and for all – a canonised agenda of things, monuments and narratives that we shall take care of and deliver untouched to the generations to come, or is cultural heritage never fixed, and instead something that is connected to complex, open, dynamic, and always continuing cultural and political processes – processes wherein the collective memory is materialised and constructed, and which therefore affects the whole of society? Present and continuous processes wherein contents and meanings of cultural heritage are constantly renewed and reconstructed since meanings, values, opinions and claims are directed – from different horizons – towards material and immaterial phenomena?

Personally we lean towards the later interpretation and in this module we will approach and discuss the issue of problematic cultural heritage - the material and immaterial remains and memories of the past, or of the near present, that by various reasons have either been hard to handle since they remind us of fearful, painful and/or shameful episodes of our history, or that have been neglected and forgotten since they are not considered as being worth remembering in the future. Often, but far from always, these two categories, fearsome- and neglected cultural heritage are also intertwined. The problematic cultural heritage forces us as cultural heritage managers to reflect twice since: the fearsome cultural heritage is often connected to feelings of fear and anxiety as well as in political agendas, and the neglected cultural heritage force us to discuss and decide which material and immaterial forms there are in our contemporary society that ought to be a part of the future's cultural heritage.

Of course, the theme of problematic cultural heritage can be discussed and presented from a number of directions but here we have chosen to present the issue under the headings of fearsome- and neglected cultural heritage. However, we raise no claims whatsoever of covering all aspects of this issue. Rather the text shall be seen as a presentation of some themes, issues and dimensions that can help the reader to find more information as well as to reflect critically around his or her own situation as a cultural heritage manager irrespective of which European country he or she is active in. Before approaching the issues of problematic cultural heritage in the forms of fearsome- and neglected cultural heritage we start out with a brief background concerning the issues of collective memories and cultural heritage as well as the relationship between politics and cultural heritage.

sco Memories and cultural heritage

Initially it can be concluded that every single individual has individual memories and that all societies has collective memories. Our individual memories are stretched backwards in time and are aided in their construction by material things such as photo-albums, souvenirs, furniture etc., but also by immaterial things such as family traditions, anecdotes, narratives etc. These things and phenomena are ordered within the framework of our cognitive memory and our cognitive construction in accordance with how we want to be remembered in the future. Thus, these things and phenomena – but also the meaning created by the ordering – can be said to constitute our individual cultural heritage (cf. Lowenthal 1985; Middleton & Edwards eds. 1990; Fentres & Wickham 1992; Halbwachs 1992; Kwint et al. 1999; Burström 2001; Shackel 2002; Van Dyke & Alcock eds. 2003; Jones 2007; Mills & Walker eds. 2008; Boric, ed. 2010). On the societal level these individual methods of ordering the memories are moved to higher levels in the form of collective memories – collective memories that in their materialised forms are highlighted at museums, stored in archives or that can be found as monuments, buildings, landscapes etc. at various places in the society. Thus, these collective memories can be in the material form of artefacts as well as large areas of landscape, but they can also have the immaterial form of narratives, myths etc. On a general level these things and phenomena – but also the meaning created by the ordering – can be said to constitute the society's common cultural heritage (ibid.). It is thus interesting to underline that the individual memories (and individual forgetfulness) are organised and constructed by ourselves within the framework of a continuous process. That this is the same process when it takes place on a societal level – that influences how the society

wants to be remembered by the future – creates some problematic dimensions. Not least because the society's memories and the writing of its history are intimately connected and intertwined with present political and ideological decisions and dimensions. This means, amongst other things, that the past has created and neglected identities and that cultural heritage can be viewed as a society's common collective (material and immaterial) identity-creating memory (cf. Layton & Ucko 1999; Gellner 1983; Anderson 1983; Atkinson, Banks & O'Sullivan (eds) 1996; Díaz-Andreu & Champion (eds) 1996; Skeates 2000; Smith 2004; Kohl, Kozelsky & Ben-Yehuda eds. 2007).

When filling collective memories, i.e. cultural heritage, with content and meaning one is confronted by a number of questions, for instance: what kind of common culture constitutes a cultural heritage, a cultural heritage that is worth remembering in the future? Which parts of our common past shall be constricted and forgotten? Is cultural heritage something that is fixed once and for all – a canonized agenda of things, monuments and narratives that we shall take care of and deliver untouched to the generations to come, or is cultural heritage never fixed, and instead something that is connected to complex, open, dynamic, and always continuing cultural processes – processes wherein the collective memory is materialised and constructed, and which therefore affects the whole of society? Present and continuous processes wherein contents and meanings of cultural heritage are constantly renewed and reconstructed since meanings, values, opinions and claims are directed, from different perspectives, towards material and immaterial phenomena? (cf. Shore 1996; Lowenthal 1997; Burström 2001; Smith 2004, 2006). Not surprisingly, there are a number of ways to answer these questions since there are various – and sometimes contrasting – meanings concerning the content of the concept of 'cultural heritage', meanings that differ according to the temporal/historical, geographical and social context of the interpreter. It can be stressed that the meaning inherent in the concept of 'cultural heritage' is always ambiguous, flexible and contextual dependent and there is no single interpretation of the content of the concept that can be pinned down once and for ever. However, this – flexible and partly constructivist – view of cultural heritage is not embraced by everyone and still there exists heritage management milieus where the content of the concept is viewed as quite unproblematic. In this perspective, since the cultural heritage is viewed as a number of canonized – and pinned down – objects, monuments, buildings, landscapes etc. that in a simple way can be identified with older traditions and a number of current juridical documents. From the positions presented above

(let us in a simplified manner label them flexible and traditional) follows – needless to say – different views of the present societal and political role of the cultural heritage. Let us also state that with the concepts of heritage management, and the heritage management sector we refer to museums, county-boards, county antiquarians, and national heritage boards etc. that are responsible for the handling of the cultural heritage and that are financed by the taxpayers. Let us now turn to the connection between cultural heritage and politics.

References

- Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, Verso.
- Atkinson, J.A., Banks, J. & O'Sullivan, J. eds. 1996. *Nationalism and archaeology*. Glasgow, Cruithne Press.
- Boric, D. ed. 2010. *Archaeology and memory*. Oxford, Oxbow Books.
- Burström, M. 2001. Cultural heritage and antiquarian attitude. *Current Swedish archaeology* 2001/9. pp. 39-44.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & Champion, T. eds. 1996. *Nationalism and archaeology in Europe*. London, UCL Press.
- Fentress, J. & Wickham, C. 1992. *Social Memory*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Halbwachs, M. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, A. 2007. *Memory and material culture*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kohl, P.L., Kozelsky, M. & Ben-Yehuda, N. eds. 2007. *Selective remembrances. Archaeology in the construction, commemoration, and consecration of national pasts*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Lowenthal, D. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Middleton, D. & Edwards, D. eds. 1990. *Collective remembering*. London, Sage.
- Mills, B.J. & Walker, W.H. eds. 2008. *Memory Work. Archaeologies of Material Practices*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Kwint, M., Breward, C. & Aynsley, J. eds. 1999. *Material memories. Design and evocation*. Oxford, Berg.
- Shackel, P.A. 2002. *Archaeology and created memory. Public history in a national park*. New York, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Shackel, P.A. & Chambers, E.J. ed. 2004. *Places in mind. Public archaeology as applied anthropology*. London, Routledge.
- Shore, B. 1996. *Culture in mind. Cognition, culture, and the problem of meaning*. New York, Oxford Univ. Press.
- Skeates, R. 2000. *Debating the Archaeological Heritage*. London, Duckworth.
- Smith, L. 2004. *Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage*. London, Routledge.
- Ucko, P.J. & Layton, R. eds. 1999. *The archaeology and anthropology of landscape. Shaping your landscape*. London, Routledge.
- Van Dyke, R.M. & Alcock, S.E. eds. 2003. *Archaeologies of Memory*. Oxford, Blackwell.

→ **LU** Problematic cultural heritage in memory processes and politics – basic concepts *by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson*

sco Further reading

- Lowenthal, D. 1997. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. London, Viking.
- Shackel, P.A. & Chambers, E.J. ed. 2004. *Places in mind. Public archaeology as applied anthropology*. London, Routledge.
- Graves-Brown, P., Jones, S. & Gamble, C. eds. 1996. *Cultural identity and archaeology. The construction of European communities*. London, Routledge.
- Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of heritage*. New York, Routledge.
- Smith, L. & Waterton, E. 2009. *Heritage, communities and archaeology*. London, Duckworth.

→ **LU** Politics and cultural heritage *by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson*

sco Introduction

Despite whether one views cultural heritage as fixed or as a process it is necessary to approach the fact that cultural heritage and the construction of collective memories always are connected to various forms of political agendas. This is the case for the traditional forms of cultural heritage as well as for various types of problematic (fearsome- and neglected) cultural heritage. The connection between archaeology, cultural heritage and politics seems to be a never ending story. During recent decades archaeological research, not at least the field of history of archaeology, has shown that antiquarianism, the discipline of archaeology, and cultural heritage management always have been influenced by, and influenced, politics in one way or another. This connection is so strong that the question is if the discipline of archaeology and its activities should have been born, developed and existing until today if it was not for this strong bond (cf. Trigger 1989; Atkinson, Banks & O'Sullivan eds. 1996; Díaz-Andreu 2007; Murray & Evans 2008; Díaz-Andreu & Champion eds. 1996; Skeates 2000; Smith 2004; Kohl, Kozelsky & Ben-Yehuda eds. 2007). It is easy to accept the connection between archaeology and politics when examining the history of the discipline and its activities but it is not always as easy to be aware of, and accept its existence, in ones present situation. However, on a general level the bond is always there! During history it has taken on a variety of forms and sometimes; for instance, in Nazi-Germany it is easy to trace the connection (cf. Arnold 1990) while in other contexts, such as in Sweden until the last election, it is more complicated. However, if approaching this bond in retrospect one can easily conclude that a more

profound political (and economical) support to disciplines and activities that handle the past and cultural heritage solely exists in situations where political forces strive for a control over the interpretations of the past for various political agendas. Most often this reason implies a situation where a constructed identity or community is wanted in a certain society. This community can be constructed on local, regional or (most often at) national levels to implement a 'we' and a 'them' and it can, for instance, be used for gathering, and in the end to force, people to act towards an imagined inner or outer societal threat, i.e. constructed and/or imagined threats that can consist either of other nations or of ethnical groups or classes within the own society (cf. Anderson 1983; Gellner 1983). In short, this means that times of prosperity for archaeology are synonymous with times of unpleasant, xenophobic and/or nationalistic, societal and political conditions. The list of examples of this circumstance from different times, political agendas and places around the world is long. In this context it is perhaps interesting to note that the most profound 'all time high' for archaeology (at least when it comes to political and economical support) existed in Nazi Germany. Here past cultural remains, historical greatness and the present Germans and their culture were connected in uncomplicated and simplified manners that led to the construction of an imagined national identity/community where culture and ethnicity (i.e. race) became both the link to the past and the cultural heritage as well as the evidence for arguments concerning territory and racial superiority (cf. Arnold 1990; Härke ed. 2002).

The German example and the political use of the past and archaeology in Nazi propaganda are also interesting from another point of view, namely its influences on the handling of the question of archaeology and politics after WW11. The theoretical and methodological development that took place in Anglo-American archaeology between the 1950s and the 1970s can at least partly be ascribed to a search for politically neutral scientific procedures that could secure that the idealistic abuse of the past and archaeology could never again be repeated (cf. Binford 1987, 1989). Thus, one reason for the scientific orientation, on behalf of the traditional cultural historical approach, as well as the rigorous methodological procedures within the processualism of the New Archaeology was – at least partly – a constructive way trying to handle the relationship between archaeology and politics (ibid.). Of course, this orientation, its interpretations and its production of knowledge was in itself political (and from a political standpoint) and it soon became evident that it had some undesired scientific as well as political implications. One of the trajectories of criticism that was/is directed towards

processualism from the mid-1970s until today, from critical Marxists and post-structuralist researchers, is that the wish for, and search for, an apolitical archaeology that through its scientific methods can produce neutral and objective knowledge is an impossibility (cf. Shanks & Tilley 1987a-b). From these standpoints it was/is instead argued that it is better to accept that archaeology always is political in its nature and to act thereafter, i.e. clearly declare why the past is interpreted and understood in one way and not in another and to accept the political implications of different interpretations. This means that the political bond is unavoidable and that archaeology – as all science – always is a form of politics and that we must decide which kind of politics we want to support (ibid.). During recent decades European archaeology and cultural heritage management have been influenced by these different theoretical discussions in various ways and to various degrees. Even if the traditional cultural historical approach has continued to be dominant in all sectors of European archaeology, academic research and education have at the same time been influenced by various theoretical and methodological perspectives. From a Swedish horizon it can be stressed that within the rescue-excavation activities, for instance, as carried out by the National Heritage Board and various county museums, the methodological ideas within processualism had, in a ‘soft’ version a rather rapid impact from the beginning of the 1970s and onwards since these ideas went hand-in-hand with the development of the technical and instrumental part of the excavation activities. Within the framework of cultural heritage management traditional ideas mainly continued to reign until the 1990s when various ideas concerning the interpretative dimensions inherent in the understanding of cultural heritage were developed, and from the beginning of the 21st century this field has seen the search for a clear political standpoint concerning the use of cultural heritage in the service of democracy and multiculturalism (RAÄ 2004a-c, 2005). In short then, this implies that during the last four decades there has been a reawakened interest in, and awareness of, the political dimensions of archaeology and cultural heritage management. Today nobody working within these fields can be unaware of the political and constructivist dimensions inherent in the interpretation and understanding of the past. At this point it shall just be concluded that there seems to be a general acceptance of the connection between archaeology and politics within Swedish archaeology but there are, as we shall see below profound differences between the standpoints when it comes to questions concerning whether this connection is unavoidable or not, if archaeology and the cultural heritage shall be used to support specific political ideas in contemporary society, and, if so, what kind of ideas?

Following this brief introduction let us move on to our two main categories of problematic cultural heritage, i.e. fearsome heritage and neglected heritage.

> sco Self test

sco References

- Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, Verso.
- Arnold, B. 1990. 1990 The past as propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity* 64(244):464-478.
- Atkinson, J.A., Banks, J. & O’Sullivan, J. eds. 1996. *Nationalism and archaeology*. Glasgow, Cruithne Press.
- Binford, L. 1987. Data, Relativism and Archaeological Science. *Man (N.S.)* 22. pp. 391-404.
- Binford, L. 1989. The New Archaeology, Then and Now. In: Binford, L. (ed) *Debating Archaeology*. San Diego, Academic Press. pp. 12-23.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & Champion, T. eds. 1996. *Nationalism and archaeology in Europe*. London, UCL Press.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. 2007. *A world history of nineteenth-century archaeology. Nationalism, colonialism, and the past*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Härke, H. ed. 2002. *Archaeology, ideology and society. The German experience*. Frankfurt am Main, Lang.
- Murray, T. & Evans, C. eds. 2008. *Histories of archaeology. A reader in the history of archaeology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- RAÄ (Riksantikvarieämbetet). 2004a. *Agenda kulturarv. Slutrapport*, Stockholm.
- RAÄ (Riksantikvarieämbetet). 2004b. *Människan i centrum. Agenda kulturarvs programförklaring*, Stockholm.
- RAÄ (Riksantikvarieämbetet). 2004c. *Kulturarv är mångfald. Fördjupad omvärldsanalys för kulturmiljöområdet 2004*. Stockholm, Riksantikvarieämbetet.
- RAÄ (Riksantikvarieämbetet). 2005. *Kulturarv ger livskraft. Fördjupad omvärldsanalys för kulturmiljöområdet 2005*. Stockholm, Riksantikvarieämbetet.
- Shanks, M. & Tilley, C. 1987a. *Social Theory and Archaeology*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Shanks, M. & Tilley, C. 1987b. *Re-Constructing Archaeology. Theory and Practice*. London, Routledge.
- Skeates, R. 2000. *Debating the Archaeological Heritage*. London, Duckworth.
- Smith, L. 2004. *Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage*. London, Routledge.
- Trigger, B.C. 1989. *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.

→ LU Politics and cultural heritage by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson

sco Further reading

- Graves-Brown, P., Jones, S. & Gamble, C. eds. 1996. *Cultural identity and*

archaeology. The construction of European communities. London, Routledge.

Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of heritage*. New York, Routledge.

Smith, L. & Waterton, E. 2009. *Heritage, communities and archaeology*. London, Duckworth.

→ **LU Fearsome cultural heritage** by *Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson*

sco Introduction

The history of our so called 'civilisation' is partly a dark one, full of cruelty and destruction. Thus there exist a number of sites and memories that represent fearful, painful and/or shameful episodes in local, regional or national history. This at the same time as governmental agencies, cultural heritage managers and the communities seek to remember commemorate and conserve these sites and/or memories – or, conversely, choose to forget them. These sites can for instance consist of concentration-camps and other genocide sites, slave-trade stations, Cold War installations, battlefields, mental asylums, political prisons etc. (cf. Calveiro 1998; Logan & Reeves ed. 2008; Lennon & Foley 2000; Ashworth & Hartmann 2005; Schmidt & von Preuschen eds. 2005; Schofield & Cocroft 2007; MacDonald 2008).

The material and immaterial remains from these and similar happenings have at least three things in common: Firstly, they are part of a problematic cultural heritage and the question is if sites, material remains and memories of these episodes shall be remembered or forgotten, and why? Secondly, they do not represent the traditional type of cultural heritage, such as the monuments, castles and cathedrals that remind us of the greatness and splendour of the past since instead they remind us of the opposite. Thirdly, they connect the present society, or specific groups, with its or their roots in the past. Thus, with all other forms of cultural heritage the fearsome heritage contains a political dimension in the present. They have political functions and can be used or abused in line with various political agendas in the present (cf. Graham et al 2000). This means that in some cases fearsome cultural heritage is adopted in the service of traditional chauvinistic nationalism as well as in postcolonial situations where the creation of a national identity is necessary for the creation of political and cultural cohesion. One example of the later is the case of Robben Island in South Africa, the site of Nelson Mandela's imprisonment. After profound discussions in post-Apartheid South Africa whether this shameful place should be destroyed since it memorialised Apartheid oppression or if it should be preserved as a symbol for a new South Africa where people could live together

despite differences in ethnicity, religion etc. it was decided that the site should be preserved (Nuttall & Coetzee eds. 1998). Another political theme can be seen in cases where the fearsome cultural heritage is preserved as warnings of the potential we as humans have for inhumane actions towards one another and as a remainder and a statement that specific happenings should never be admitted to happen again. Examples of this use of the fearsome heritage are for instance, Holocaust sites such as Auschwitz, the Hiroshima Atomic Bomb dome and the remains of Club Atlético in Buenos Aires that was used as a torture-central during Argentina's 'dirty war' 1976-1983. However, it is also necessary to realise that at the same time that the examples mentioned above are functioning in this political way on the general level they are also at the same time important places for people and/or relatives, that once experienced the barbarism taking place at them and that use them in various therapeutic manners. To visit the places functions as a way to remember and existentially handle the past events. This at the same time as other people that have experienced the same events are more interested in forgetting them and thus also are not interested in preservation of the sites. This presents us as heritage managers with problematic questions when taking decisions regarding the preservation of these kinds of sites as well as deciding, if they are to be preserved, how they shall be presented. The examples mentioned above are a part of a fearsome heritage that contains strong feelings but that have been conserved and that are used in the present for various aims, which may be political or personal. However, at the other end we also have the fearsome heritage that is neglected since it contains no strong feelings and/or they have been considered to have no political use on the national level. Examples of this are remains from the cold war in the form of bunkers, missile installations, radar stations etc. (Schofield & Cocroft 2007). Here we will look closer at one such site, namely the former Soviet nuclear missile site at Santa Cruz de los Pinos, Cuba.

> **sco Self test**

sco References

- Ashworth, G.J. & Hartmann, R. 2005. *Horror and Human Tragedy Revisited. The management of sites of atrocities for tourism*. New York, Cognizant Communication.
- Calveiro, P. 1998. *Poder y desaparición. Los campos de concentración en Argentina*. Buenos Aires, Colihue.
- Graham, B. Ashworth, G.J. & Tunbridge, J. 2000. *A Geography of Heritage, Power, Culture and Economy*. London, Arnold.
- Lennon, J. & Foley, M. 2000. *Dark tourism*. London, Continuum.
- Logan, W.S. & Keir, R. eds. 2009. *Places of pain and shame. Dealing with 'difficult heritage'*. Abingdon, Routledge.

MacDonald, S. 2008. *Difficult Heritage. Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond*. London, Taylor & Francis.

Nuttall, S. & Coetzee, C. eds. 1998. *Negotiating the Past. The making of memory in South Africa*. Cape Town, Oxford University Press.

Schofield, J. & Cocroft, W. eds. 2007. *A fearsome heritage. Diverse legacies of the Cold War*. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press.

Schmidt, L. & von Preuschen, H. eds. 2005. *On Both Sides of the Wall. Preserving Monuments and Sites of the Cold War*. Berlin, Westkreuz-Verlag.

 → **LU Case study:** the former soviet missile bases on Cuba by *Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson*

sco Introduction

The 1962 Missile Crisis is a well-known episode of the Cold War and 20th century history. It is well documented in a rich variety of sources, and has been the subject of extensive historical research. This is dominated by the political motives behind the development at large, the military strategy, the leaders of the two superpowers and their personalities, and the top-level diplomacy that took place in order to resolve the crisis (Blight, 1990; Blight and Welch, 1989; Dobbs, 2008; Fursenko and Naftali, 1997). So what about other perspectives on the Missile Crisis? In an attempt to find and give voice to stories other than those dominating 'big history' we have studied the crisis from an archaeological perspective. We want to find out what material remains the Missile Crisis generated and explore whether archaeology can be used to begin a remembering process and attract interest to a past that otherwise would not be discussed. Our point of departure is one of the former Soviet nuclear missile bases in Cuba. Our results strongly suggest that doing archaeology is in many ways as important, if not more important, than what actually emerges from the ground. The project is a co-operation between a group of Swedish archaeologists and Cuban anthropologists, archaeologists, and historians.

> Animation

On 14 October 1962, us air reconnaissance discovered what the following day were interpreted as Soviet launching sites for nuclear missiles. This was the immediate trigger of the Missile Crisis.

The us military was eager to launch an immediate and direct attack on Cuba with the aim of getting rid of the missiles as well as overthrowing the revolutionary government (Allison, 1994; May and Zelikow, 1997; Acosta 2002, 2008). However, President John F. Kennedy excluded this solution and a week later he gave his famous speech to the

nation where he announced the establishment of a naval blockade against Cuba.

This meant that the world was now on the threshold to the unthinkable – full-scale nuclear war (Kahn, 1962). All over the world people anxiously awaited news about the development of the crisis. On 28 October Khrushchev accepted an offer from Kennedy, including a secret promise to withdraw us nuclear missiles from Turkey, and he ordered the dismantling and return of all offensive weapons back to the USSR. After 13 days 'when the world stood still' (Kennedy, 1969) the crisis finally came to an end.

The Missile Crisis can be considered to have had a happy ending; there was no Armageddon. But the solution of the crisis created great political tension in the relationship between Cuba and the Soviet Union. The reason was that all the important negotiations during the crisis had taken place directly between Washington and Moscow, without involving Havana. As a consequence, in Cuba the Missile Crisis is considered to be something of a national disgrace. Although they were the epicentre of the conflict, they had no say in the matter. The national humiliation felt by the Cuban leadership has led to the Missile Crisis being an under-communicated part of Cuban history. So, while it is one of the most well-known episodes in modern Cuban history to most people outside Cuba, it is given paradoxically little attention in Cuba. The exhibition at the Museum of the Revolution in Havana is a good example of this. Although the museum contains a seemingly endless number of exhibition cases, there is only one that briefly touches on the Missile Crisis.

We approached the former Soviet missile sites with the following questions:

- > What remains today, in the ground and in people's minds, of the missile sites that were once a focus of world interest?
- > Can digging in the ground be a way to uncover memories and generate conversations about a silenced past?
- > What kind of memories do people have of the missile sites?

The purpose of our archaeological fieldwork at Santa Cruz de los Pinos was not only to search for material remains. We also wanted to create an arena where we could meet with local people and arouse their interest to talk about their experiences of the former Soviet base in particular and their memories of the Missile Crisis in general. Their stories are of a different kind than those dominating 'big history'. Thus, within the project we have discussed how a site that once stood at the

centre of the world's attention has left memories in the form of material remains and in the minds of people living adjacent to it. In the history of the recent past, well-documented large-scale happenings and meta-narratives dominate over small-scale and more specific histories (Burström et al 2009). This means that something is lost, since the latter histories are usually more tangible and give a human dimension to the past. In this case we have chosen to draw attention and give voice to narratives and memories that are usually left out from 'big history'. We have also explored how archaeology can initiate a remembering process. It is obvious that material remains from the missile site – both the ones found during excavation and the ones that are being reused in different ways at farmsteads and other places – bring forth memories. To dig in the ground is also to dig in the memories of the recent past. Working together with local inhabitants creates new thoughts, focusing the specific historical happening and its aftermath as well as general questions concerning the writing of history. In this context, archaeology is as much an arena for dialogue and reflection as it is a search for material remains. This also means that the rather low number of artefacts found at the site that can be directly associated with the Missile Crisis is not a problem. It is the low-voiced, from-below histories that are called forth, and the human dimension these give to the history of the Missile Crisis, that are most important. When we started our fieldwork in Santa Cruz de los Pinos there was no local interest in the missile site as an historical place. This was well in line with the Missile Crisis being a kind of under-communicated part of Cuban history. This has now changed and the former Soviet base is locally recognized as a resource of historical interest as well as a place of economic potential. The local museum has been renovated and was re-opened in May 2008 with the history of the missile site as an important part of the exhibition. A collection of material about the site has begun; one example is photographs showing Cubans on a picnic at the deserted base in 1963. Since Cubans were not allowed to visit the base when it was in use they were curious to see what the site looked like when the Russians had left. Later, the site was gradually forgotten as people were busy coping with everyday life. The local government has now discovered the economic potential of the missile site. It lies within range for a one-day visit from Havana and could therefore be of interest to tourists. People all over the world have memories of the Missile Crisis and may want to see one of the sites that they remember from back then. The old missile site could very well become a World Heritage Site. The authorities have started to educate some of the small farmers living closest to the site in how to guide visitors and keep watch over the area. Another expression of

this new interest in the site is the inauguration of a commemorative plaque, which took place in October 2007 on the 45th anniversary of the Missile Crisis. The plaque is placed at the site of one of the launch pads. Our archaeological interest in the former Soviet nuclear missile site initially aroused some surprise and scepticism among academic colleagues and local people in Santa Cruz de los Pinos. However, to excavate in the intense heat is hard work and this actually helped us to convince people of the sincerity of our interest in how the Missile Crisis was experienced from a local perspective. As a result of our digging in the ground, stories of a silenced past have begun to surface. These stories are, of course, influenced by the present context and we may very well have created an interest that was not there before (ibid.). Undoubtedly, more material remains need to be uncovered and more voices need to be heard in order to get a more fully down-to-earth perspective on the Missile Crisis.

> **Animation**

But let us summarise the most important results we have achieved so far:

New knowledge has been produced about the precise locations of various structures of the missile base in Santa Cruz de los Pinos and the reuse of material remains.

Using archaeological fieldwork as an arena for dialogue with local people has, together with the material remains found, triggered memories and stories about how the Missile Crisis was experienced from a local perspective. These histories from below give a new and human dimension to the history of the crisis. It has also generated important discussions about the writing of history in general.

The former Soviet nuclear missile bases in Cuba are now beginning to be recognized as sites of historical importance both locally and nationally.

A local project is underway to take care of and develop the former missile site in Santa Cruz de los Pinos as a heritage site.

In the above case-study we have met with remains of a fearful cultural heritage that has been forgotten since it contains strong feelings and/or it has been considered to have no political use on the national level. We will now turn towards the other type of problematic heritage, namely the neglected cultural heritage.

sco References

- Acosta, T. 2002. October 1962. The 'Missile' Crisis as Seen from Cuba. New York: Pathfinder.
- Acosta, T. 2008. Octubre de 1962. A un paso de holocaust. La Habana, Editora Política.
- Allison, G.T. 1994. The Secret Cuban Missile Crisis Documents. Washington, CIA/Brassey's.
- Blight, J.G. 1990. The Shattered Crystal Ball: Fear and Learning in the Cuban Missile Crisis. Savage, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Blight, J.G. & Welch, D.A. eds. 1989. On the Brink: Americans and Soviets Reexamine the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York, Hill & Wang.
- Burström, M, Diez Acosta, T., González Noriega, E., Gustafsson, A., Hernández, I., Karlsson, H., Pajón, J. M., Robaina Jaramillo, J. R., & Westergaard, B. 2009. Memories of a World Crisis. The archaeology of a former Soviet nuclear missile site in Cuba. *Journal of Social Archaeology*. pp.295-318.
- Dobbs, M. 2008. One Minute to Midnight. Kennedy, Khrushchev, and Castro on the Brink of Nuclear War. New York, Knopf.
- Fursenko, A. & Naftali, T. 1997. One Hell of a Gamble. Khrushchev, Castro, and Kennedy 1958–1964. New York, W.W. Norton.
- Kahn, H. 1962. Thinking about the Unthinkable. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Kennedy, R.F. 1969. Thirteen Days. A Memoir of the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York, The New American Library.
- May, E.R. & Zelikow, P.D. eds. 1997. The Kennedy Tapes: Inside the White House During the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York, W.W. Norton.

→ **LU** Neglected cultural heritage by *Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson*

The neglected cultural heritage can consist of fearsome heritage but it is most commonly neglected and forgotten since it is not considered to be worth remembering in the future by cultural heritage management. This kind of heritage takes on a number of forms such as, for instance, the remains of sport activities. Here we will concentrate on remains of the heritage of sports and especially football.

> **Animation**

Without the aid of any scientific methods it can be concluded that sport in its various forms engages many people around the world, whether they themselves are practicing it or if they follow the athletes in arenas or in front of the TV set. This understatement has a universal character even if it ought to be stressed that which sport activities that engage most people in different parts of the world are determined by history, context and culture. There are sports that are limited to specific areas and contexts such as, for instance, horse-polo or curling. However, at the same time there are sports that transcend all borders and therefore are interesting to, and also practiced by, people all around the world. Football (soccer), which can be

practiced everywhere and with a minimum of equipment, is probably the most widespread sport with 200,000,000 registered practitioners worldwide (www.fifa.com). It is a global sport that is huge not just when it comes to the number of practitioners but also when it comes to the profound levels of public interest. For example a simple search on Google for the Spanish club FC Barcelona on the 28th of February 2011 gave 31,900,000 hits. In some places this sport has dimensions that come close to religious ones since it constructs and carries on social norms and values at the same time as it creates identities as well as social and existential security (cf. Prebish 1993; Kuper 1994; Duke & Crolley 1996; Dunning 1999; Bramham & Wagg 2009).

There is much to be said, for instance, about the social, psychological, economical and political dimensions of football but this is not the right place. Let us instead conclude that football has existed in its present form since the beginning of the 1860s and that it has left a number of immaterial and material cultural heritages of various natures. Concerning immaterial remains it is, for instance, a question about stories, anecdotes and cognitive memories and when it comes to material remains these can be found in the forms of: protocols and annual reports from associations, game-sheets, awards, player-equipment, photos etc., and not at least the physical remains of football arenas. At a general level it can be concluded that the formal juridical responsibility to handle the cultural heritage of sports falls on the traditional cultural heritage management sector but that the heritage of football – as well as the heritage of other sports – (regardless of whether the cultural heritage is immaterial or material in its nature) with few exceptions have been neglected and forgotten since it has not been considered as worth remembering in the future by the cultural heritage management. This means, for instance, that we do not find this cultural heritage at cultural-historical directed museums. In some countries, for instance Sweden, there exists local sport-historical museums but these are driven on low-budgets with a minimum of personnel and are often placed outside city centres. Their situations shall be compared with the (economical) conditions for the traditional cultural-historical museums that present the regional or national meta-narration. Beside these sport-historical museums (that does not exist in all countries in Europe) it is primarily various forms of sport-historical associations, as well as the clubs themselves, that ideally stand for the primary handling and preservation of this cultural heritage. When it comes to the handling of the cultural heritage of sports in the form of places, these associations and clubs do not have the opportunity to take action since it falls outside their (economic

and juridical) possibilities. Thus, the neglect of the cultural heritage of sports is a question of a situation where this heritage has not been considered to be worth remembering in the future due to decisions and practices within cultural heritage management. It is worth reflecting for a moment upon this situation since the cultural heritage of sports probably, for the majority of people in the European societies, is considered to be more interesting and important than the cultural heritage traditionally handled by cultural heritage management. Here we come close to the question of who is taking the decisions concerning which cultural heritage shall be preserved and handled and which shall be forgotten and how the content of the collective memories are constructed? (see further reading below).

Here we will look closer at a case study consisting of three abandoned football arenas from different parts of Europe that have been neglected by heritage managements and that are left to their fates.

> sco Self test

sco References

- Bramham, P. & Wagg, S. eds. 2009. Sport, leisure and culture in the postmodern city. Farnham, Ashgate.
- Duke, V. & Crolley, L. 1996. Football, nationality and the state. New York, Longman.
- Dunning, E. 1999. Sport Matters. Sociological studies of sport, violence and civilization. London, Routledge.
- Kuper, S. 1994. Football Against the Enemy. London, Orion.
- Prebish, C.S. 1993. Religion and Sport. The meeting of sacred and profane. Connecticut, Greenwood Press.
- www.fifa.com

→ LU Neglected cultural heritage by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson

sco Further reading

- Alzén, A. & Aronsson, P. (red.) 2006. Demokratiskt kulturarv? Nationella institutioner, universella värden, lokala praktiker. Norrköping, Tema Kultur och samhälle, Linköpings universitet.
- Aronsson Peter 2004. Historiebruk. Att använda det förflutna. Lund, Studentlitteratur.
- Burström Mats. 1997. 'Disciplinating the Past. The Antiquarian Striving for Interpretative Supremacy'. Current Swedish Archaeology Vol 5, pp. 41-47.
- Burström Mats. 2007. Samtidsarkeologi. Introduktion till ett forskningsfält, Lund, Studentlitteratur.
- Carman, J. 2005. Against Cultural Property. Archaeology, heritage and ownership. London, Duckworth.
- Grundberg Jonas. 2000. Kulturarvsförvaltningens samhällsuppdrag. En introduktion till kulturarvsförvaltningens teori och praktik. Gotarc Serie

- C. Arkeologiska skrifter No 33. Göteborg, Institutionen för arkeologi, Göteborgs universitet.
- Grundberg Jonas. 2004. Historiebruk, Globalisering och Kulturarvsförvaltning. Utveckling eller konflikt. Gotarc Series B. Gothenburg Archaeological Theses, No 28. Göteborg, Institutionen för arkeologi, Göteborgs universitet.
- Gustafsson Anders & Karlsson Håkan. 2004. Plats på scen. Kring beskrivning och förmedling av Bohusläns fasta fornlämningar genom tiderna. Bohusläns museum, Uddevalla.
- Hems, A. & Blockley, M. eds. 2006. Heritage Interpretation. Routledge, London.
- Holtorf, C. 2005. From Stonehenge to Las Vegas. Archaeology as popular culture. Lanham, Altamira Press.
- Jameson, J. H. eds. 1997. Presenting Archaeology to the Public. Digging For Truths. Walnut Creek, Altamira Press.
- Jones, S. 2006. They made it a living thing didn't they. The growth of things and the fossilisation of heritage. I: Layton, R, Shennan, S. & Stone, P G. (red.). A future for archaeology: the past in the present. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press.
- Jones, S. 2005. That stone was born here and that's where it belongs. Hilton of Cadboll and the negotiation of identity, ownership and belonging, I: Foster, Sally M. & Cross, Morag (red.). Able minds and practised hands: Scotland's early medieval sculpture in the 21st century. Leeds, Maney.
- Karlsson, H. 2004. Försummat kulturarv. Det närliggande förflutna och fotbollens platser. Lindome, Bricoleur.
- Karlsson, H. 2008. Mellan kanon dialog och fotboll. Kulturarvets demokratiska potential. I Jönsson, L-E., Wallete, A. & Wienberg, J. (red.), Kanon och kulturarv. Historia och samtid i Danmark och Sverige. Centrum för Danmarksstudier 19, Stockholm, Makadam förlag.
- Merriman, N. (ed.) 2004. Public Archaeology. London, Routledge.
- Pettersson Richard. 2004. Den svenska kulturmiljövårdens värdegrunder. En idéhistorisk bakgrund och analys. Skrifter från forskningsprojektet 'Landskapet som arena' No 7, Umeå.
- Riksantikvarieämbetet. 2004. Agenda kulturarv. Slutrapport, Stockholm.
- Riksantikvarieämbetet. 2004. Människan i centrum. Agenda kulturarvs programförklaring, Stockholm.
- Skeates, R. 2000. Debating the Archaeological Heritage. London, Duckworth.
- Smith, L. 2004. Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage. London, Routledge.
- Smith, L. 2006. Uses of heritage. New York, Routledge.

LU Case study the three neglected former football arenas in Gothenburg, Valletta and Poznan by Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson

> Animation

Carlsrofältet, Gothenburg, Sweden

The football arena Carlsrofältet, Gothenburg, Sweden, was constructed in 1904 and it was the first home-ground for the club IFK Göteborg (UEFA-Cup winners in 1982 and 1987,

and on 18 occasions Swedish league winners). The arena never had galleries but the spectators could stand in the slopes surrounding the northern and western parts of the pitch.

During the 21st century the area of the arena shrank due to the construction of infrastructure in the form of roads etc. but it is interesting to note that it was used for its original purpose until 2002 when its use changed to parking. Today it is used as an overgrown fringe area for people living in the nearby area and the future for the place is insecure. Despite this it can be concluded that the arena is part of a central cultural heritage not just for the actual club but also for Swedish football, as well as Swedish cultural-history in general.

> **Animation**

Gzira stadium, Valletta, Malta

The football arena Gzira was a multi-purpose stadium in Gzira, Malta constructed in 1922. It was used mostly for football matches and hosted the home matches of the Maltese national football team, including the very first international match for Malta in 1957 against Austria. In addition, it also hosted the final of the Maltese Cup. The arena was able to hold 30,000 spectators and originally opened in 1922. It was notorious for its sandy pitch. The stadium hosted its final game in 1981. Today the arena is in a state of total decay, it is overgrown with weeds and the future of the place is uncertain. Undoubtedly the arena is central part of the cultural heritage of Maltese football and for Maltese cultural-history in general.

> **Animation**

Stadium im. Edmunda Szyca, Poznan, Poland

The football arena Stadium im. Edmunda Szyca was a multi-purpose stadium in Poznan, Poland constructed in 1929. It was used mostly for football matches and hosted the home matches of Lech Poznan and Warta Poznan. At two occasions the Polish cup final was played at the stadium and at 10 occasions it also hosted home matches of the Polish national team. The arena was able to hold 60,000 spectators and this was the case on the 25th of June 1972 when Lech Poznan played Zawisza Bydgoszcz. Today the arena is in a state of total decay and its future is uncertain. Undoubtedly the arena is central to the cultural heritage of Polish football and for Polish cultural-history in general. This arena also holds dark memories since during the Nazi-German occupation it was used as a place for the execution of Jews.

Through the examples above derived from the cultural heritage of sports we can conclude that the neglect of the cultural heritage of sports is a question of a situation where this heritage has not been considered to be worth remembering in the future due to decisions and practices within cultural heritage management.

Problematic cultural heritage in memory processes and politics – Concluding remarks

(Anders Gustafsson & Håkan Karlsson)

sco Conclusion

In this module we have approached and discussed the issue of problematic cultural heritage – the material and immaterial remains and memories of the past, or of the near present – that for various reasons have been either hard to handle since they remind us of fearful, painful and/or shameful episodes of our history, or that have been neglected and forgotten since they are not considered to be worth remembering in the future. However, we raise no claims whatsoever of having covered all aspects of this issue. Rather, the module has presented some themes, issues and dimensions that can help the reader to find more information as well as to reflect critically around his or her own situation as a cultural heritage manager irrespective of which European country he or she is active in.

