



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

## 02

# Mentalities and perspectives in archaeological heritage management

by Marjolijn Kok & Heleen van Londen

### msco Introduction

Module 2 offers a scope on the plurality of mentalities and perspectives within archaeological heritage management (AHM), also referred to as public archaeology. In this branch archaeologists work with others for the public interests that goes beyond academic practice. In general terms it deals with the care for sites, monuments, artefacts and landscapes through legislation and policy like sustainable development (see module 10).

Because of the Treaty of Valletta (1992) and later European Landscape Convention (Florence 2000) much of the attention has been shifted towards landscapes and planning. The mentalities and perspectives offered here are narrowed down to AHM and landscape planning. Legislation and important policy measures are presented in depth in module 9. The variety stems for instance from different views on science but is also the result of the many disciplines that come together in this relatively new branch of archaeology. Among these disciplines are planning, landscape architecture, historical geography and tourism.

### Definitions

Landscape and planning are central concepts and in this module the definitions will be used that are proposed in the European Landscape Convention. It states that: 'Landscape means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors'.

Planning is defined as follows: 'Landscape planning deals with the difficult questions of how to solve land-use conflicts between different interest groups and proposed strategies for future development and organisation of a landscape.'

→ **LU** Characteristics of the proces by Marjolijn Kok & Heleen van Londen

### sco Characteristics of the process:

#### plurality of participants

Recent years show a rapid growth of people that work within AHM and landscape planning. The growth can be explained by the political awareness of the immense damage that is done through ongoing development as is stated in the Valletta treaty. Other driving forces are the need for the creation of cultural identities (see module 1) and the development of tourism.

One may say that archaeology and the management of our shared archaeological heritage have become firmly integrated into society throughout Europe, which means of course that people from different backgrounds participate in this field. The European treaties and national legislations state that archaeological heritage management should become integrated in planning. But who are addressed? Roughly three groups can be discerned. These are the experts, planners and the general public. They are interrelated as stakeholders. The way people perceive sustainable development and the way to go about it, is important for the interaction between the groups.

#### > Animation

Experts are defined as knowledge workers in the field of cultural history in the broadest sense. These are the people that are used to work within academia, but are now asked to cooperate with non-experts in their joint effort of sustainable development. Planners work to design and develop the future landscape and create value. They are used to meet interest groups of many colours and feathers that try to persuade them to swing their way.

The general public are usually defined by experts and the planners as user groups. The public is asked to participate in the planning process, but are often found very critical towards development or only partly interested in cultural heritage.

All three groups act from within their own perspectives that can be understood even apart from differences on an individual basis.

### sco Characteristics of the process:

#### plurality of perspectives

This module aims to introduce the richness of perspectives in



order to recognize, understand and respect different stand-points.

> **Animation**

First the expert's views on place management are introduced, proposing three perspectives on archaeological locations in the landscape. These perspectives are easily recognisable in the views of participants. The difference between the management of places and the management of landscapes dominates the views how AHM should be done and roles and responsibilities. In section 3 the perspective of place versus landscape is further elaborated in a positivistic and an interpretative framework. As the interpretative framework introduces the idea of landscape planning into AHM, the ideas and practice of planning become relevant as a precondition for successful heritage management.

Section four therefore goes into the planners' view. They present themselves as users of information generated in landscape research. The broad range of interests that planners have to deal with need to be integrated through research before political choices are made. This integration is a strategy for dealing with contested landscapes. The main research types chosen are then decisive for the outcome and possibilities.

In landscape planning one of the main issues is the active participation of the public. It is a choice between a top down and a bottom up approach. In the public's views the third perspective of heritage introduced in section 2 becomes important. How people perceive their environment, their past, their collective memories, determines their choices about what is seen as valuable in the landscape and should be preserved or highlighted.

This module concludes with a strategy for the improvement of AHM. It is proposed that not through legislation but through discourse and learning behaviour of participants will be influenced in favour of care for heritage. The participants are viewed as a community of practices.

> Exercise

→ **LU** Pluralities of perspectives by Marjolijn Kok & Heleen van Londen

**sco Expert views on place management strategies**

As an expert on heritage and tourism, Ashworth published three paradigms pertaining to the way in which cultural heritage managers perceive management of historical places.

According to Ashworth, these approaches lead to separate strategies.

> **Animation**

The first paradigm is preservation as the protection against harm that comes from human activity or natural processes. This view has a long history and is still dominant as is illustrated by the texts of the Valletta treaty of 1992. In this treaty the central problem of AHM is formulated as follows. 'The European archaeological heritage (...) is seriously threatened with deterioration because of the increasing number of major planning schemes, natural risks, clandestine or unscientific excavations and insufficient public awareness'. This perception has led to the institutionalisation of protective strategies in most European countries.

*Conservation paradigm*

The second paradigm that Ashworth presents is conservation. Conservation aims at ensembles rather than single objects and selects by intrinsic as well as extrinsic criteria, using different methods as a result of integrating preservation policies into land-use management. The integration of AHM into landscape planning as mentioned above falls according to Ashworth in the second category. Conservation is not opposed to preservation, but is rather an extension of it.

*Heritage paradigm*

The first two paradigms have in common that the historic places or ensembles are conceived as more or less objective remains of past, handed to us through time of which we need to take good care for the generations to come. The third however, the paradigm of heritage, is about historical places as a commodity. Heritage is the result of present day choices and exists only through present day use. In this sense, heritage is a construction of the past for present day consumption with a demand and supply side to it. The management strategies for historical places are the effect of demand and supply.

> Exercise

The representation of the past is something historians have been aware of for a long time. Archaeologists, certainly in The Netherlands, stay somewhat behind in this discussion although they not only produce stories about the past, but they are the suppliers of heritage in the form of material culture inside or outside the museum. It is mainly through heritage studies that archaeologists participate in this debate. One of the effects is that the Dutch term for AHM – literally 'the care





for archaeological monuments' – is rapidly being replaced by heritage management.

Of course, the construction of the past is not something that is reserved for cultural historians. Everybody does it. The perception of the past as a commodity is growing, not so much by tourism as by the need to create regional identities.

### ----- SCO Case study of Stonehenge

Try to think of some reasons against and for participation of diverse groups of people at Stonehenge. And link these arguments to the paradigms as proposed by Ashworth.

Stonehenge near Amesbury is a well-known tourist site that has been studied and described in great detail. As a protective measurement, visitors are not allowed to enter the stone circle itself, but are led around it. Much effort has been put in the management of the location, so much so that plans were made to conceal the motorway that runs close by. In this context, Stonehenge is perceived as an object of the past that through time has been passed on to us. We need to care of it for the sake of future generations. These plans have been recently aborted.

People interested in landscape archaeology are not so much focussed on the stone circle itself, but rather on its relation to the greater landscape to which Stonehenge belongs. The stone circle is surrounded by burial mounds and connected by an avenue to the river. Upstream a woodhenge is located, also connected to the river by an avenue. Recently, Neolithic houses were found close to the woodhenge. Researchers have interpreted the ensemble giving meaning to the different areas in the landscape, that of the living and that of the dead. The entire area is a World Heritage Site.

Stonehenge is a famous example of a contested landscape and as a result the discussion 'who owns the past'. Through time the stone circle has made an impact on many, including people who celebrate the solstice, such as the druids every

year. Fences and the dominant visions of experts have kept these participants out of a place they value and have generated a process of exclusion. Different groups create different meaning and construct heritage. The place is consumed by many in many ways. If one group is valued over the other contestation of place becomes immanent.

### SCO Expert views on archaeological heritage management and roles

In many European countries the first perspective introduced by Ashworth was the basis for the institutionalization of AHM that is still recognisable in the present day commercial archaeology as executed under the Convention of Valletta (see module 12). The table below gives an impression of the rules and regulations as organized in the Netherlands.

Organised by legal means	Organised by self regulation
Monuments act	Quality standard (KNA)
License	Certificate
Inspectorate	Professional register
Central information system	Research agenda

Furthermore the following roles are recognised.

#### > Animation

As we compare (click compare button) the participants involved in archaeological management cycle, it becomes clear that the perspective chosen differs markedly. By focussing on the legislative process and procedures instead of landscape and planning the public has been replaced by developers; experts by archaeological contractors and planners by authority. Essentially, it is about archaeological management instead of archaeological heritage management. Duineveld calls this a closed system in which the public has little to no influence.

The above way of dealing with archaeological heritage management Van der Valk and Bloemers have defined as positivis-

Figure 1 Stonehenge with a sign urging people to stay behind the rope



tic. They see the positivistic view as a defensive position in that it positions itself as guardians of archaeological monuments against the destruction of other users of space. Archaeological remains are seen as a finite resource that has to be protected and they are therefore sceptical towards planning and design. Rules and regulations determine the relations between the different participants involved.

#### sco Positivistic vs Interpretative perspective

Against this view Van der Valk and Bloemers define an interpretative way of dealing with the archaeological heritage management that is hopeful of new planning and design as a shift is taking place away from spatial planning towards cultural planning. Heritage is not only seen as physical objects, but consists also of memories, notions and sources of identification. Heritage management is no longer purely archaeological and focuses on the management of landscapes in a cultural and historical sustainable manner. The relations between the different participants involved (experts, planners, and public) is a common goal, e.g. the improvement of the quality of life through sustainable development of the landscape. As rules and regulations do not define the relations between the different participants in the interpretative view of archaeological heritage management it is much more intensive work in the sense that there has to be a constant communication between the different participants. This is a trait of all inter- and transdisciplinary work.

An extreme variant of the interpretative view on archaeological heritage can mean that cultural and historical values are seen as irrelevant for the present day landscape or that the focus shifts towards only relatively young cultural-historical remains. Therefore, there are many questions we can ask ourselves before we engage with cultural heritage management.

What is (archaeological) heritage? Is archaeological heritage finite? Whose heritage are we protecting? What is the aim

of protecting heritage? What is archaeological heritage severed from the landscape? What are our fears when sharing control over archaeological heritage? and Are these fears real and relevant?

#### sco Historical development of institutionalization of AHM in the Netherlands

##### > Animation

In the 18th and 19th century archaeological heritage was studied by a few professional archaeologist and a large group of non-professional archaeologist often organised in historical groups. When archaeological heritage management in the Netherlands became part of the legal system it became a more disciplinary exercise, involving mainly archaeologists and closely associated non-professional archaeologists.

Two weeks after the German invasion during the Second World War an initial attempt to form a State commission for Archaeology was made in a decree. Its main aim was to protect the Dutch heritage from German interests, hence the date of its release. At the same time the State commission for Archaeology had to ensure that excavations would contribute to archaeology as a science and that archaeological monuments were documented in an archive. Eventually after the war in 1947 this led to the formation of State Service for Archaeological Excavation (ROB, now RACM) with as its main goal to carry out excavations and document monuments in order for their protection and maintenance.

In 1961 a Monuments Act came into effect. At that time large scale developments in the Netherlands took over large parts of the landscape and rescue archaeology took provenance, not only at the State Service but also at the four universities with an archaeology department. The large scale of the construction works led also to a shift in archaeology from single monuments to settlements and

##### > Animation

Characteristics	Positivistic	Interpretative
Item to be conserved	Relic	Ensemble
Academic attitude and type of valuation	Quantification; reductionist	Qualitative; constructivist
Metaphor	Stock; archive	Genius loci; characteristics
Principal focus on	Preservation	Development
Attitude in policy	Specialist by sector	Integrated; focused on collaboration
Bearing upon disciplines	Mono-disciplinary	Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary
Societal	Elitist	Transdisciplinary
Attitude towards spatial planning	Sceptical	Expectant
Extreme variant	Historical econometric	Historical nihilism



their position in the landscape. A new Monuments Act in 1988, however, maintained the single monuments as its unit of legalisation and was mainly concerned with protection. Since the late 1980 archaeological maps and the national archive are developed as tools for the management of the archaeological heritage under the act of 1988. In 1992 the Treaty of Valletta was signed by the Dutch government, ratified in 1998 and put into legislation in 2006. Large construction projects led to new demands that needed a framework for selection, valuation and recommendations.

In 2001 commercial companies could perform a role in archaeology. As there were concerns about the quality of archaeological research a set of laws and self-regulated rules were put in place. These new rules and regulations left little room for non-professional archaeologists.

> sco Exercise

**sco Planners views on landscape research**

The integration of AHM in planning has given more impetus to research in the field of landscape archaeology. It seems only logical to produce information about the historic landscape that one would like to protect. In planning, landscape studies have been at the core of the business for many years and much experience is gathered. Planners deal with a growing attention for landscape by individuals and international bodies alike. Many disciplines are involved, archaeology or in a broader sense – cultural history – is only one them. It is now commonly stated that mono-disciplinary or even multi-disciplinary approaches hardly provide adequate answers for the social and political problems that planning deals with. From the scientist perspective an in-depth study of his or her discipline may be thought of as the way the communicate what is important, but from the users point of view the wide range of specialist reports are dysfunctional. The view in The Netherlands is emerging that for AHM much can be learned from the planners view on landscape research, because it seems that the way one may organise landscape research formulates a precondition to successful implementation in planning. Four types of research have been defined with their own sets of rules, roles and problems that have to be taken into account when starting a project (see box 3). Within landscape research the inter- and transdisciplinary research is seen as the main way forward. Many major funding bodies, such as national research councils and the European Commission, give priority to projects of these types. The first integrated research projects on cultural history and planning are presently experimented with.

> **Animation**

**Mono-disciplinarity:** projects that involve researchers that only operate within their own discipline to solve their own research goal. The theories and methods used are usually well-known and part of the researchers training. So there is little confusion over concepts and methods. But innovation can be more difficult as a disciplinary framework becomes too closed.

**Multidisciplinarity:** projects that involve researchers that use theories and methods from outside their discipline to solve their own research goal. Theories and methods from other disciplines broaden the scope of solutions. But insufficient knowledge or misunderstandings can lead to inappropriate use of theories and methods and thereby diminish the scientific value of a solution.

**Interdisciplinarity:** 'projects that involve several unrelated academic disciplines in a way that forces them to cross subject boundaries to solve a common research goal'. Theories and methods from other disciplines broaden the scope of solutions. Intensive communication between the researchers from different disciplines will lessen the danger of inappropriate use of theory and methods. But time needs to be invested in the defining of concepts and the sharing of information, otherwise the project may revert to becoming multidisciplinary.

**Transdisciplinarity:** 'projects that integrate both academic researchers from different unrelated disciplines and user-group participants to reach a common goal'. Scientific knowledge can be used to solve societal problems. Concepts should have bridging qualities that link the different interest groups. The roles and expectations of the participants should be made clear from the start to make the project successful. Otherwise there is a high risk of conflict within the project.

**sco Fundamental types of landscape research**

The main characteristics of landscape research are analysed and grouped. Jacobs (2006) distinguishes three fundamental types of landscape research based on how they claim validity after Habermas. These are the natural-, social- and experience sciences. Each of these types focuses on a landscape phenomenon that is explained below. Some disciplines will produce hard facts, others will give insight in values about the landscape. Decision making in planning is hardly a rational process. This means that facts will not automatically super-impose values.

As the validity claims between the different research types are not similar, it is not possible to translate statements on the landscape between the different groups. Knowledge generated

### > Animation

Landscape phenomenon	Matterscape	Powerscape	Mindscape
Mode of reality	Physical reality	Social reality	Inner reality
Validity claim	Truth	Justness	Truthfulness
Form	Object	Organization	Story
Representation	Facts	Norms	Values
Scientific field	Natural sciences	Social science	Experience sciences

within a specific type of research can only be used in other types of research in a supplementary manner. For example, research into matterscapes about the suitability for agricultural production can make statements about the ability to grow specific crops such as spelt or wheat. Research into powerscapes can make statements about eating habits within a specific society, like a prohibition on eating spelt. Taken together it can be decided that the agriculture of a specific region should concentrate on wheat production. But the statements made within the different research types can never be derived from each other.

This example shows that within inter- and transdisciplinary research it is of the utmost importance to know the (research) background of the participants. The type of validity claims participants make will determine where theories and methods can be defined or contested, and where concepts can have specific or bridging properties.

### SCO Fundamental types of landscape research-comparison

When we consider how these different types of landscape research are related to AHM we can use the division as proposed by Van der Valk and Bloemers.

#### > Animation

A positivistic outlook on AHM would especially be concerned with matterscapes, as heritage is associated with physical remains in the shape of archaeological monuments. In this view on AHM archaeological monuments are monitored to ensure that their physical quality doesn't deteriorate. A positivistic view would also be interested in powerscapes in the sense that it wants to regulate peoples behaviour towards archaeological monuments. This can be achieved by sets of rules and regulations, but also by the placing of fences around archaeological monuments. Mindscapes would be of little interest as the public is perceived as a generality. The past is preserved for all of us, regardless of background or interest.

In the interpretative view on AHM matterscapes would be of interest only in relation to powerscapes and mindscapes. The engagement of people with the physical reality of archaeological monuments through time is seen as

important. Powerscapes are studied in order to understand how people through time related to the landscape, including present day groups. By understanding who is involved in the present day landscape, strategies and interaction can be regulated so that a common goal can be achieved. Mindscapes are seen as important as the users of the landscape may have personal interests directly related to their quality of living.

When researchers get involved with AHM projects they have to be aware of the other participants' view of AHM as this will influence the expectations and type of alliances made. When at the start of landscape research projects the views are explicated it will be more easy to decide what type of researchers are needed. A common goal can lead to an end product that satisfies most of the members of the project team.

### SCO Case study of Dorp2000anno: De Hunze maakt geschiedenis

Try to think of a spatial development in your area and how the public participated or was informed. What did you think of the approach taken in your area and what would you have liked to have changed or would do the same if you should lead such a project?

This case study is a good example of inter- and transdisciplinary landscape research project in the Netherlands. In the project regional identity is used as an inspiration for developments expressed in a landscape-identity vision and local knowledge and views are used to shape village-surroundings plans.

The landscape-identity vision is created by a interdisciplinary team of researchers that use as a central concept 'landscape biography' that as a binding tool should deliver a history with many maps. They are explicit about their aim of the landscape-identity vision as it should inspire, lead to a better understanding of the area and give a useful input to spatial planning.

The village-surrounding plan has a transdisciplinary character as it combines the interests of local people,

researchers, spatial planners and policy makers. The village-surroundings plan is a spatial plan for the development of the villages and their immediate surroundings in which the views of the local inhabitants about the quality of their landscape and the landscape-identity vision are incorporated. The spatial planning also deals with issues such as quality of living, recreation and facilities.

The product of the project is a book full of pictures and maps, histories, spatial plans but also practical advice and schemes with roles and expectations. The costs of the book, due to the pictures, were so high that not every local inhabitant received a copy. A cheaper version for everyone or extra money could solve this. This is especially relevant as a large investment in communication between the different parties and a long term commitment by all participants was seen as essential for the success of the project. The success of the project can be measured by the fact that their approach is now part of local planning policies. From a research point of view what is missing from the evaluation of the project is how the interdisciplinary landscape-identity vision influenced the researchers their own scientific practice. Is there also continuation of interdisciplinary research and has it led to new insights, concepts and methods?

> sco Exercise

#### **sco public's views: introduction**

Public support is seen as an important factor for the success of archaeological heritage management. Although experts often press the idea that the preservation of archaeological heritage is of public interest, the public has often little involvement in heritage projects. In many countries this discrepancy is clear as, for example in England public groups like druids and free festivalers actively claim access to or participation at archaeological sites, for example at Stonehenge or at Seahenge. Or indigenous people in Australia or America who claim back their (living) heritage, which is often viewed as the past (or dead) by archaeologists. This has led to the realisation that the experts need to involve the public and the development of the concept of the community archaeologist. The explicit policy to involve the public in archaeological heritage management also plays at a European level as the many treaties and conferences concerned with this topic show.

In the Netherlands a similar trend can be seen in politics and planning. In 'the Belvedere Memorandum' cultural-historic identities seen as a determining factor in spatial design and private citizens and organizations are explicitly mentioned as sharing in the responsibility for the quality of their environment. The presence of many private organiza-

tions involved in cultural-historical themes is seen as indicative for the willingness of the public to participate. Further decentralisation of responsibilities in spatial planning is also seen as an incentive for the public to actively participate. The growing influence of the public in archaeological heritage management is a two-way development from demands by the public and national and European policies that want to further the democratic principles with more openness and participation of the public.

#### **sco Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society**

At a European level there are several conventions dealing with cultural heritage. In 2005 at Faro the 'Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society' took place which led to treaty no. 199. This convention focuses on the way cultural heritage could be used and valued instead of just conserved and protected as in previous conventions, such as at Valetta in 1992.

##### > **Animation**

The treaty has a total of 17 articles of which several dealt explicitly with the rights of the public. These rights are for a large part already existing human rights which now have been translated explicitly towards cultural heritage.

##### *Article 1 – Aims of the Convention*

The Parties to this Convention agree to:

- a recognise that rights relating to cultural heritage are inherent in the right to participate in cultural life, as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
- b recognise individual and collective responsibility towards cultural heritage;
- c emphasise that the conservation of cultural heritage and its sustainable use have human
- d take the necessary steps to apply the provisions of this

##### *Convention concerning:*

- > the role of cultural heritage in the construction of a peaceful and democratic society, and in the processes of sustainable development and the promotion of cultural diversity;
- > greater synergy of competencies among all the public, institutional and private actors concerned.

Article 1 is the most important in this respect as it claims that all individuals have a right to participate in cultural life, but that these rights also involve obligations towards cultural heritage, and that the ultimate purpose behind the conservation of cultural heritage and its sustainable use is

the development of a more democratic human society and the improvement of quality of life for everyone.

In the treaty heritage is seen as defined and redefined by human action and heritage is therefore seen as changing. And individuals have a right to participate and heritage is seen as interactive. There is also the right not to participate, but this has to be by choice. It is thought that when people value their own heritage they will also be willing to value other people's heritage.

*Article 4 Rights and responsibilities relating to cultural heritage*

The Parties recognise that:

- a everyone, alone or collectively, has the right to benefit from the cultural heritage and to contribute towards its enrichment;
- b everyone, alone or collectively, has the responsibility to respect the cultural heritage of others as much as their own heritage, and consequently the common heritage of Europe;
- c exercise of the right to cultural heritage may be subject only to those restrictions which are necessary in a democratic society for the protection of the public interest and the rights and freedoms of others.

Article 5 introduces the concept 'valorisation' it involves 'giving value to' the ethical, cultural, ecological, economic, social and political dimensions of a heritage. As a resource for personal and communal development, cultural heritage is an asset which requires preservation, and thus its valorisation can be considered as one factor of development.

Although the aim of the treaty is not protection, it is seen that due to its many roles cultural heritage does need protection. Conflict and differences are, however, not avoided but seen as part of the democratic process. The role of experts is valued as the process of conciliation must accord a role to all interested actors and make use of diverse specialist expertise, including at the international level if necessary.

Furthermore there is an emphasis on the role of private organisations as they have a right to participate and access to information on decision making and access to justice. This is extended as it is viewed that policy makers should not only be willing to hear parties, but to actively encourage participation to engage with the democratic process, who might otherwise feel excluded from cultural heritage.

As this is a treaty of the European Union the member nation states should make the different recommendation part of their

policies. It therefore affects all people of the European Union and makes them into active participants of cultural heritage management.

**scope the public's view: Who are the public?**

Transdisciplinary landscape projects in the Netherlands try to accommodate this new attention towards the involvement of the public and studies which focus on the public or participate with the public become more common. But who are the public? A distinction can be made between the individual citizen and private organisations.

> **Animation**

Individual citizens may be grouped by researchers into categories, such as, farmers, tourists or museum visitors, but who are not organized along these categories. Private organizations usually have a specific aim, such as the study of local history, the preservation of folktales or the advancement of non-professional archaeology. Although their size ranges from a few to thousands of members, organizations always represent a group and, if registered, have a structure with a president, secretary and treasurer. The influence of these organisations can therefore be substantial.

The public is as diverse as its members and that makes it into a difficult group to analyse in relation to cultural heritage. There will always be exceptions to general patterns. As the framework convention showed the public has a right not to be interested in cultural heritage. The number of people of the public that are involved with cultural heritage either in the shape of membership to an organization or as a private hobby is, however, substantial.

*Exercise*

The public interest in the recent past appears to be related to a sense of connection. These events took place within the life-span of people they knew, like grandparents or local old folks. This embodies these stories and makes them relevant. Stories about Iron Age farmers who have no (known) names or familiar habits are much more difficult to relate to by most people. Unknown makes unloved. The knowledge the public has of specific local areas is, however, often much more detailed and diverse than the knowledge of outside experts, such as archaeologists who sometimes only visit an area for a specific dig and have no little interaction with the local people.

The public as tourists also have a tremendous influence on cultural heritage as consumers. Again here the expectations of the public may differ markedly from the experts.

Recent studies have shown for example that authenticity is often not the most important expectation that the public has when visiting a heritage site. The experience they undergo is seen as more important. A sense of how it could have been becomes the important factor instead of how it was. The public can prefer replicas they can touch and experience above the authentic cultural objects.

As planners and experts propose that the living quality of landscapes is heightened with the inclusion of cultural heritage it is important to involve the public in the planning and decision making process. Awareness of differences in valorisation of specific elements of the cultural heritage will allow for a more diverse landscape when these different views are taken into account. By taking the views of the public serious, they may in their turn take the demands of the experts and planners more serious.

> sco Exercise

→ **LU** Policy of changing mentalities by *Marjolijn Kok & Heleen van Londen*

#### **sco Policy of changing mentalities: introduction**

Throughout Europe, the integration of AHM in planning, the enhancement of professionalism in excavations and the increase of public awareness is on the agenda. Apart from all the legal aspects, the solutions request new knowledge and practices in order to be effective. Also, the integration of cultural heritage and planning requires a high intensity of knowledge. Knowledge is the key word and will be looked in somewhat closer. All parties are concerned, not only the experts, although they may feel to be among the first to act. The community of practice needs to become knowledgeable in the field of sustainable development. Like the theory of learning, much has been done in the field of knowledge and knowledge management. For knowledge not only information but also experience, skills and attitude count. It is a priori linked to individuals as their ability to act. While the first three categories that build up knowledge seems logical, the fourth may come as a surprise. Attitude is directly influenced by personal values and norms that motivates action. It is the basis for the choice which information one wants to accept. It follows that the implementation of new practices must be addressed through emphasis on values. Change in values, will lead to change in actions. Therefore, strategies for the implementation of sustainable development are focussed on changing attitudes.

The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society issued by the Council of Europe in 2005 (Faro) marks a shift in focus from procedures to values and deals with questions why values should be enhanced and for whom. 'It is based on the idea that knowledge and use of heritage form part of the citizen's right to participate in cultural life as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The text presents heritage both as a resource for human development, the enhancement of cultural diversity and the promotion of intercultural dialogue, and as part of an economic development model based on the principles of sustainable resource use.' Member states are now in the process of signing the Convention.

An example of the importance that has presently been given to knowledge is the Ename charter of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), an international non-governmental organisation founded 1965. The charter states that 'interpretation of the meaning of [archaeological] sites is an integral part of the conservation process'. The dissemination of knowledge is seen as a precondition for conservation. Interpretation is defined as 'the carefully planned public explanation or discussion of a cultural heritage site, encompassing its full significance, multiple meanings and values'. Especially principle 6 is of interest. It states that the interpretation of sites must actively involve participation of all stakeholders and associated communities. Interpretation should not be the exclusive field of a few experts.

#### **sco Community of practice**

It is thought that successful integration of AHM and planning is generally lacking because it is new and should be learned. More and more the groups as a whole are defined as a community of practice in which new things can be adopted to become mainstream. In other words, it is not so much through legislation, but by learning that we can implement sustainable development.

The concept of community of practice derives from the theory of learning. Wenger (1998b) defines a community of practice as follows:

> **Animation**

Communities of practice are everywhere. We all belong to a number of them—at work, at school, at home, in our hobbies. Some have a name, some don't. We are core members of some and we belong to others more peripherally. You may be a member of a band, or you may just come to rehearsals to hang around with the group. You may lead a group of consultants who specialize in telecommunication strategies, or you may just stay in touch to keep informed about developments in the field. Or you



may have just joined a community and are still trying to find your place in it.

Whatever form our participation takes, most of us are familiar with the experience of belonging to a community of practice. Members of a community are informally bound by what they do together – from engaging in lunchtime discussions to solving difficult problems – and by what they have learned through their mutual engagement in these activities. A community of practice is thus different from a community of interest or a geographical community, neither of which implies a shared practice. A community of practice defines itself along three dimensions:

- > What it is about – its joint enterprise as understood and continually renegotiated by its members
- > How it functions mutual engagement that bind members together into a social entity
- > What capability it has produced – the shared repertoire of communal resources (routines, sensibilities, artifacts, vocabulary, styles, etc.) that members have developed over time.

Communities of practice also move through various stages of development characterized by different levels of interaction among the members and different kinds of activities (see ‘Stages of Development’).

Communities of practice develop around things that matter to people. As a result, their practices reflect the members' own understanding of what is important. Obviously, outside constraints or directives can influence this understanding, but even then, members develop practices that are their own response to these external influences. Even when a community's actions conform to an external mandate, it is the community—not the mandate—that produces the practice. In this sense, communities of practice are fundamentally self-organizing systems.

Cooperation between parties, the awareness and willingness to learn is seen as a precondition for success. In this view we – all three groups – need to acknowledge sustainable development as a joint venture and commit to it. We need to have a shared repertoire. We need to understand each other, where we come from and what drives us. We are bound and need to meet each other halfway, as it were, to bridge the distances between us.

But is it that simple? There are many problems known for instance in the encounter of science workers and policy makers (i.e. planners). Is science to serve policy? Or the other way around, should policy serve science? Should science remain independent? And what to think of the tensions between expert knowledge and local knowledge of the land-



scape. Is what is valued by experts more important than what is valued by locals?

In the last few years studies have been published on all three groups analysing perspectives and practices of cooperation, also looking for best practices. Case studies of the interaction between planning and cultural history in The Netherlands show that the process of decision making in spatial planning is far from rational and highly intuitive and emotional. There is no correlation between more knowledge and better resolutions. Politicians tend to make the right decision given a certain social context, that is seen as just at the time. In research, the expert acts within the domain of institutionalised knowledge and the experts opinion will be seen as true and objective while planners will base their decisions on subjectivity and justness. The meeting of experts, planners and the public can therefore be full of conflict.

-----  
**SCO CH Case study of the great market in Groningen (The Netherlands)**

Figure 2 Poster used in the campaign against the new parking

In February 2001, the municipality of the city of Groningen held a referendum to renovate the great market in the old historic centre to build a parking underneath the market square. The public responded en masse and the no-voters amounted to 81%. The no-votes were mostly angry at the city officials for their arrogance during the process. The officials were all in favour. It was a confrontation between the people and the city council.

The underground parking meant the return of cars in the centre that were mostly banned earlier. A different parking project in the vicinity was delayed and had cost a fortune. But the final and most influential argument against development was the slight chance that the old church tower, the Martini tower, would suffer some subsidence. Despite all the technical reports that this would hardly or not be the case, the chance of subsidence filled the public with great emotion and was not to be overcome. It became the very image of the protest movement. Posters were produced of a sliding Martini tower. The archaeologists were staggered. In their view the underground parking would have destroyed the old church yard from the early medieval period onwards containing thousands of burials and harbouring a treasure of information. But this argument played no role whatsoever. The reason was probably the lack of an archaeological lobby at the time. The renovation plan was cancelled. The city council had misjudged the public engagement and was blinded by the economic arguments. They had to start from scratch with a public debate.

> sco Exercise

#### MSCO References

- Aldred, O. & G. Fairclough, 2003. *Historic Landscape characterisation: Taking stock of the method*, London
- Ankersmit, F.R., 1990. *De navel van de geschiedenis: Over interpretatie, representatie en historische realiteit*, Groningen
- Antrop, M., 2006. From holistic landscape synthesis to transdisciplinary landscape management, in: Tress, B., G. Tress, G. Fry, P. Opdam, *From landscape research to Landscape Planning: Aspects of Integration, Education and Application*, Dordrecht: Springer, 27-50
- Ashworth G., 2005. Heritage and the consumption of places, in R. van der Laarse (eds.), *Bezeten van vroeger: Erfgoed, identiteit en musealisering*, Amsterdam, 193-207
- Bartels, Chr., J.H.F. Bloemers, H. van Londen, A. Orejas & M. Ruiz del Arbol, 2008. Introduction, in Chr. Bartels, M. Ruiz del Arbol, H. van Londen & A. Orejas, (eds). *Landmarks. Profiling Europe's historic landscapes*, COST A27, Bochum, 9-18
- Beek, R. van, J.H.F. Bloemers, L. Keunen, J. Kolen, H. van Londen & H. Renes, in press: Managing and protecting by developing the landscape in the Netherlands: an overview of current policy and research, in: P. Grau Möller, G. Fairclough (eds.), *Managing and Protecting Landscape in Europe*, (COST A27), Brussels
- Bender, B., 1998. *Stonehenge making space*. Oxford
- Bloemers J.H.F., 2002. Past- and future-oriented archaeology. Protecting and developing the archaeological-historical landscape in the Netherlands, in: G. Fairclough, S. Rippon, D. Bull (eds.), *Europe's Cultural Landscape: archaeologists and the management of change*, Exeter, 89-97
- Bloemers, J.H.F., M.H. Wijnen (eds.), 2001. *Bodemarchief in Behoud en Ontwikkeling, De conceptuele grondslagen*, Assen
- Carman, J. 2005. *Against Cultural Property: Archaeology, Heritage and Ownership*, London
- Chippendale, C., P. Deveraux, P. Fowler, R. Jones & T. Sebastian, 1990. *Who owns Stonehenge?*, London
- Dries, M.H. van den & W.J.H. Willems, 2007. Quality Assurance in archaeology, the Dutch perspective. In: W.J.H. Willems & M.H. van den Dries (eds.), *Quality Management in Archaeology*, Oxford, 50-65
- During, R., H. Elerie & H.A. Groenendijk, 2001. Denken en doen: verpachten van wijsheid of delen van kennis? Pleidooi voor de verbinding van cultuurhistorische kennis-eilanden en een relatie met de sociale wetenschappen, in: J.H.F. Bloemers & M.H. Wijnen (eds.), *Bodemarchief in Behoud en Ontwikkeling, De conceptuele grondslagen*, Assen, 111-157
- Duineveld, M., 2006. *Van oude dingen, de mensen die voorbij gaan. Over de voorwaarden meer recht te doen aan de door de burgers gewaardeerde cultuurhistories*, PhD Wageningen University, Delft
- Elerie, H. & W. Forthuis, eds., 2003. *Dorp2000anno: De Hunze maakt geschiedenis*, Bedum
- Es, W.A. van, 1972. The Origin and Development of the the ROB for Archaeological Investigation in the Netherlands. *Berichten Rijksdienst van het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek* 22, Amersfoort, 17-71
- European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised) Valletta, 16.I.1992, Council of Europe
- European Landscape Convention, Florence 2000, CETS No.: 176, Council of Europe

- Fairclough, G., 2002. Europe's landscape archaeology, sustainability and agriculture, in: G. Fairclough & S. Rippon (eds), *Europe's cultural landscape: archaeologists and the management of change*, Brussels: Council of Europe, 1-12
- Feddes, F., 2001. *The Belvedere Memorandum. A policy document examining the relationship between cultural history and spatial planning*, Nieuwegein
- Habermas, J., 1984. *The theory of communicative action 1: reason and the rationalization of society*, London
- Heeringen, R.M. van & R.C.G.M. Lauwerier, 2006. *Berichten Rijksdienst van het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek* 46, Amersfoort, 111-211
- Holtorf, C., 2007. *Archaeology is a brand. The meaning of archaeology in contemporary popular culture*, Oxford
- Hoppe R., 2002. Van flipperkast naar grensverkeer. Veranderende visies op de relatie tussen wetenschap en beleid, in: AWT-achtergrondstudie 25, Adviesraad voor het Wetenschaps- en Technologiebeleid, Twente
- Jacobs, 2006, *The production of Mindscapes: a comprehensive theory of landscape experience*. PhD thesis, Wageningen University
- Koedoot, M., 2003. *Het Neolithicum van nu. Over alledaagse betekenis van archeologisch erfgoed in de polder De Gouw en de Groetpolder*
- Kolen, J., 2005. *De biografie van het Landschap. Drie essays over landschap, geschiedenis en erfgoed*, thesis, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam
- Lovata, T., 2007. *Inauthentic archaeologies. Public uses and abuses of the past*
- Londen, H. van, 2004. *De culturele biografie van het landschap. Tussen kennisoverdracht en belangenbehartiging. Essay over de definitie en het toepassingsbereik van het concept*, Amsterdam, manuscript nwo congresdag, Universiteit van Amsterdam
- Londen, H. van, 2006. Cultural biography and the power of image, in: W. van der Knaap & A. van der Valk, (eds.), *Multiple Landscape. Merging Past and Present*, Wageningen, 171-181
- Lowenthal, D., 2005. Heritage and history, in R. van der Laarse (red.), *Bezeten van vroeger: Erfgoed, identiteit en musealisering*, Amsterdam, 29-39
- Rowlands, M., 2002, Heritage and cultural property, in: V. Büchli (ed), *The material culture reader*, 105-133
- Shanks, M, 2005. Public Archaeology/museology/conservation/heritage, in: C. Renfrew & P. Bahn, *Archaeology. The key Concepts*, 219-224
- Skeates, R., 2000. *Debating the Archaeological Heritage*, London
- Smeets, P., 2003. Preface, in: B. Tress, G. Tress, A. van der Valk & G. Fry (eds.), *Interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary landscape studies: Potential and Limitations. Delta Series 2*, Wageningen
- Smith, L., 2004. *Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage*, London
- Taylor, P., 2006. Merging past and present in landscape planning: the value question, in: W. van der Knaap & A. van der Valk (eds), *Multiple Landscape. Merging Past and Present*, 35-43
- Tress, B., G. Tress & A. van der Valk, 2003. Introduction. Interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity in landscape studies – the Wageningen Delta approach, in: Tress, B., G. Tress, A. van der Valk & G. Fry (eds.), 2003. *Interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary landscape studies: Potential and Limitations. Delta Series 2*, Wageningen
- Tress, B., G. Tress, A. van der Valk & G. Fry (eds.), 2003, *Interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary landscape studies: Potential and Limitations. Delta Series 2*, Wageningen
- Tress, B., G. Tress, G. Fry & P. Opdam, 2006. *From landscape research to Landscape Planning: Aspects of Integration, Education and Application*, Dordrecht: Springer
- Valk, A. van der & J.H.F. Bloemers, 2006. Multiple and sustainable landscapes: Linking heritage management and spatial planning in the Netherlands, in: W. van der Knaap & A. van der Valk (eds), *Multiple Landscape. Merging Past and Present*, 21-33
- Valk, A. van der & W. van der Knaap, 2006. Merging past and present in landscape planning: Introduction, in: W. van der Knaap and A. van der Valk (eds.), *Multiple Landscape. Merging Past and Present*, Wageningen, 9-19
- Weggeman, M., 1997. *Kennismanagement : inrichting en besturing van kennisintensieve organisaties*, Schiedam
- Wenger, E., 1998a. *Communities of practice. Learning, Meaning and Identity*, Cambridge
- Wenger, E., 1998b. *Communities of Practice. Learning as a social system, Systems Thinker*
- Willems, W.H.J., 1997. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands: Past, Present and Future*. In: W.J.H. Willems, H. Kars & D.P. Hallewas eds., *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands*, Assen, 3-34
- <http://www.co-i-l.com/coil/knowledge-garden/cop/lss.shtml>