Archaeological Heritage Conservation and Management

Brian J. Egloff

Front cover - Visitor pressure during an October day at Ephesus, Turkey.

Back cover - Ancient Greek ruins at Pergamon with a solitary visitor and the modern city of Bergama, Turkey, in the distance.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

"The farther backward you can look, the farther forward you are likely to see."
Winston Churchill[1]

Dedicated to the memory of

Willem J.H. Willems
1950-2014
'Archaeology is about the past, but archaeological heritage management is about
the role of the past in the present (Willems 2014).

Contents

Tables

Figures

All photographs are the author's, except where indicated.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Abbreviations have been kept to a minimum, as has jargon. In some instances acronyms have been used in the narrative or are found in quotes.

AACA - Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists
ACRA - American Cultural Resources Association
AHM - Archaeological Heritage Management
AHC - Australian Heritage Council
AIA - Archaeological Institute of America
AIATSIS - Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies
ANU – The Australian National University
ANUTEC - The Australian National University technical services company
ANZAAS - Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science
ARC - Australian Research Council
ARPA - *Archaeological Resources Protection Act* 1979
BLM - Bureau of Land Management
CBA- Council for British Archaeology
CRM - Cultural Resource Management
DCMS - Department of Conservation, Media and Sport
Docomomo - International Committee for Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites and Neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement
EIA - Environmental Impact Assessment
ESIA - Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
EU – European Union
EUJ – European Union Journal
GAO - General Accounting Office
H@R - Heritage at Risk
ICOMOS - International Council on Monuments and Sites
ICAHM - International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management
ICBS - International Committee of the Blue Shield
ICCROM - International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
ICTM - International Council for Traditional Music
IFC - International Finance Corporation
INRAP - Institut National de Recherches Archéologiques Preventives
IPPA - Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association
IOB - Principles of Good Governance
IUCN - International Union for the Conservation of Nature
IUPPS - International Union of Pre- and Proto-Historic Sciences
MoRPHE -Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment. The MoRPHE
NAGPRA - *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act* 1990
NAZI - Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei
NGO – non-governmental organisation
NMAI - National Museum of the American Indian
New Delhi Recommendation - UNESCO *Recommendation on International Principles Applicable to Archaeological Excavations*, New Delhi 1956

NSF - National Science Foundation
OUV - Outstanding Universal Value (World Heritage)
PFM - Public Financial Management Reform
PNG - Papua New Guinea
Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists
REAP – Rapid Ethnographic Assessment Procedures
RICPP - Return of Indigenous Cultural Property Program
RTIO - Rio Tinto Iron Ore
RMGC - Rosia Montana Gold Corporation
SAA - Society for American Archaeology
Salalah Guidelines - ICAHM, ICOMOS *Salalah Guidelines for the Management of Public Archaeological Sites*,
    New Delhi 2017
SHM - Historical Sanctuary of Machu Picchu
TCP - Traditional Cultural Properties
UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
US - United States of America
VERP - Visitor Experience and Resource Protection Process
WA – Western Australia
WAC - World Archaeology Congress
WHC - *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, also World Heritage
    Committee
WHS - World Heritage Site

Acknowledgements

Chapter 1 Introduction

*Writing is a form of therapy; sometimes I wonder how all those, who do not write,
compose, or paint can manage to escape the madness, the melancholia, the panic fear,
which is inherent in a human condition. Graham Greene[2]*

'The Abyss: an Academic Archaeologist looks at the future' (Kelly 2014) provides a launching pad for a reflection on archaeological heritage conservation and management. As an Internet broadcast, it is available at no cost to all viewers worldwide thus facilitating the transfer of knowledge that so marks this century. In an entertaining mode, complete with 'clever coyote' cartoons, Kelly brings across the view that academic archaeology is languishing far behind commercial cultural heritage resource management that has virtually unlimited funding and projects that in some cases are funded for twenty years. While in his view the funds for academic archaeology are miserly to say the least, the relative poverty causes archaeologists to do 'drive-by' research. Kelly reminds us that many countries are not part of the international conversation and that there is a need to move out of North America, build capacity abroad and look towards making a contribution to the problems that face the world such as poverty, state violence, racism and climate change to name but a few of the many. Kelly asserts that the focus should be on places where the resource can expand our knowledge and where what data archaeologists recover is valued, and research is not regarded as a self-serving adventure in treasure hunting.

1.1 As an adventure

Kelly (2014) describes archaeology as an adventure and it is the kindred spirit of exploration that has led me to many archaeological places, some of which lie forgotten, others are known but not visited and all too frequently I toured iconic places that were assaulted by thousand of tourists. These experiences have led me to believe that archaeology is not at the edge of an abyss, but that the conservation and management of the world's archaeological heritage is! I wish to share reflections as an archaeologists that sharpened his first trowel in northern Wisconsin excavating a Late Archaic site (Hruska 1967), then mapped and studied historic Cherokee villages in western North Carolina, followed by ethnoarchaeology in Papua and six years facilitating the capacity and capabilities of the National Museum of Papua New Guinea, then on to Aboriginal 'landrights' in New South Wales,[3] historic site conservation and management in Tasmania and teaching Cultural Resource Management at the University of Canberra while undertaking the conservation of Buddhist heritage in Laos and a British colonial fortress in Mauritius. For the most part the archaeology, conservation and management was undertaken by both small and large teams as well as a few solo adventures. But there are many kinds of archaeology.

1.2 Not one, but many archaeologies

A broad and sweeping statement in the 'Introduction to the *Charter of the International Committee for Archaeological Heritage Management'* asserts that 'archaeological heritage constitutes the basic record of past human activities' (ICAHM 1990). Depending upon the archaeologist's position in the conservation process, this phrase has different meanings and does not alert the reader to the diverse range of

---

[2] http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/95994-writing-is-a-form-of-therapy-sometimes-i-wonder-how. Accessed 24 May 2016.
[3] Following on from Smith and Ward (2000:190), upper case is used for Indigenous and Aboriginal when referring to Aboriginal Australians and Torres Strait Islanders.

perspectives that characterize the archaeological community. Article 1 of the charter considerably narrows the definition to:

> The "archaeological heritage" is that part of the material heritage in respect of which archaeological methods provide primary information. It comprises all vestiges of human existence and consists of places relating to all manifestations of human activity, abandoned structures, and remains of all kinds (including subterranean and underwater sites), together with all the portable cultural material associated with them.

A definition without reference to living communities is not particularly useful for the archaeologist whose primary interests lies in linking the remains of the past with descendent communities, or communities that have a particular living association with the place; a practice that is important to some but not all archaeologists (McDavid 2004). Nor does such a definition do service to the heritage specialist that seeks out the values that contemporary societies hold for a heritage that may not be comprised of material things but might be a sacred place that evidences no perceptible modification by human activity.

Modern media portray archaeologists in a variety of guises from explorers and adventurers to dedicated laboratory scientists, and kings and lords of the realm. The National Science Foundation has created a web page that compares 'reel' archaeology with 'real' archaeology.[4] Biblical, astronomical, historical and cultural subject matter to name but a few, with activities like the excavation of battlefields from the far distant classical past to those of the World War One trenches of Flanders are the metier of archaeologists. Perhaps it is easier to describe archaeologists by what they are not, than by what they are! To some extent that is what the ICAHM Charter of 1990 does when it states that 'the archaeological heritage is that part of the material heritage in respect of which archaeological methods provide primary information'.

Although there can be strength in diversity, differences can be perplexing as well as divisive. Traditionally the methodologies of archaeologists are grounded in particular schools of academic thought and practice. As such the past is viewed from the perspective of various disciplines, each of which directs the focus of that specific archaeology in a particular way to selected subject matter. Archaeology taught in a Greek or Roman classics department is different from that studied in an anthropology class or in American or African studies. Each requires a specific mind-set, as well as reference points and a common as well as a different set of intellectual foundations. An archaeologist excavating a Roman villa will be well served by having a command of Latin, or an expert in classical languages on the team, such that they can interpret ancient landownership records and understand the grammar of the construction of Roman buildings. While an archaeologists with an anthropological perspective that undertakes a study in South America will find that they benefit from a thorough grounding in local history and language while interrogating the social customs of not only the civilization that they are exploring, but also of the descendent community. One of the archaeologists will be employed in a classics department while the other will be in an anthropology department. Most likely neither will regularly attend the same archaeological conferences, subscribe to like academic journals or belong to matching professional associations (McDonald 1991:830). The classical archaeologist versus the anthropological archaeologists is but one of the great divides of current archaeology. Critical is the expertise required of the leader of the team to comprehend previous studies in the research field, pursue questions remaining unanswered, and have the ability to identify appropriate skills required of a multidisciplinary effort.

---

[4] http://www.saa.org/publicftp/public/fun/movies.html. Accessed 25 May 2016.

An archaeologist may decide not to conduct excavations, once considered to be the hallmark of archaeology, but choose to study the material culture of contemporary villagers (Hodder 1982) or read classical texts to obtain clues to the habits of past communities. Or, the archaeologist may conserve the remains from the past with an emphasis on the social values of the day as they relate to the material culture of the past. Discomfort can arise when archaeologists undertake research activities that other disciplines claim exclusive title to. An example is the field of building archaeology that involves the recording of relatively intact structures in a detailed fashion in order to understand the

Type of Archaeology	Focus	Methodology
Prehistoric	Past cultures that did not leave a written record of their activities	Excavation coupled at times with ethnographic analogy
Historic	Cultures that left a written record and may still be extant	Excavation, anthropology, ethnography and archival research that may be linked to religious, classical or other disciplines such as medieval studies
Underwater	Can span all of the types of archaeology and includes maritime, shipwrecks, submerged coastlines and cities	Diverse range of approaches including remote sensing, archival research and may require compliance with the *Convention of the Law of the Sea*
Urban archaeology	Investigation of past and present communities	Large and small scale excavation, remote aerial sensing and if contemporary, overlays of historic periods of development
Industrial archaeology	Material and intangible evidence of industrial processes	Can require single site or broad landscape approaches, archival and social inquiries
Bio archaeology	Forensic inquiries into past and present human remains in field or laboratory	Extreme sensitivity is required to treat relatives and descendent groups
Cultural resource management	Archaeology to comply with legislation	Can involve all of the above methodologies

Table 1.1 Society of American Archaeology list of the 'types' of archaeology.[5] Each 'kind' of archaeology is not necessarily unique and all require a mix of methodologies, as there is a shift from a single site focus to a larger landscape approach that includes both living communities and inquiries into past civilisations.

---

[5]http://www.saa.org/ForthePublic/Resources/EducationalResources/ForEducators/ArchaeologyforEducators/ WhatisArchaeology/tabid/1346/Default.aspx. Accessed 11 June 2016.

process of construction and modification throughout the life of the building. A trained architectural-historian will lay claim to the same terrain as the classical archaeologist (Schuller 2002). After all, architects, classical scholars and historians all record in detail and study standing structures. There will be a minor if not a major difference in the emphasis and the methodology of the inquiry with the building archaeologist perhaps favouring the built form of the structure, the classical scholar focusing upon the historical influences that acted upon that building style and the anthropologically trained archaeologist, that exist in some academic traditions, regarding the building as an envelope that encapsulates material evidence of the use of the place.

Material culture specialists often work together in teams in order to provide an interpretation of the archaeological materials. Fields that emphasize discovery of material culture are rapidly changing as new technologies come to hand such as in the field of 'aerial archaeology'.[6] The use of drones and satellite imagery has added considerably to one of the earliest remote sensing techniques employed in archaeology, aerial photography by plane or by box kite (Comer 2013). As mapping and remote sensing have expanded their geographical capabilities so too have the demands on heritage managers to coherently conserve extensive cultural and natural places and landscapes (Figs. 1.1, 1.2). Docomomo has working groups in more than thirty countries that contribute recordings to a register of Modern Movement architecture and campaign to conserve significant examples (Ferguson, Harrison and Weinbren 2010:282).

Figure 1.1 Villa Romana del Casale, Sicily, built in the first quarter of the 4th century demonstrates the measures that can be taken to shelter fragile classical Roman archaeological remains.

---

[6] http://www.archeologia-aerea.it/eng.html. Accessed 11 June 2016.

Figure 1.2 Shelter on the town square at the Museo Romano de Astorga, Spain, on the World Heritage listed Camino de Santiago.

There are other kinds of archaeologies, so many that I wonder if the old saying that is used to typify Protestant religious groups should also be applied to archaeologists: 'where there are two archaeologists there are at least three archaeologies'. The 'New Archaeology', also referred to as 'Processual Archaeology', had in part its genesis in 'The Study of Archaeology' by W. W. Taylor (1948). Taylor's work was widely recognized by colleagues as being pivotal, but it was not until the more widely recognized publication of *Method and Theory in American Archaeology* (Willey and Phillips 1958:2) that the platform for the new archaeology was firmly established with a statement that 'American archaeology is anthropology or it is nothing'. The 'new archaeology', is described as evidencing a self-critical aspect while stating that 'archaeology is what archaeologists do' (Clarke 1973:6). This statement has been taken, certainly mistakenly, as suggesting that only archaeologists should do archaeology (Graves-Brown et al. 2013: 4).

By the 1980s critiques of the new archaeology stated that it had failed to take into account the variability in past human behaviour (Earle and Purcel 1987:501) and that 'postprocessual archaeology' will address those shortcomings. The complexity of the arguments defy a brief description but Antonio Gilman (1987: 515-16) in a review of Earl and Purcel makes an interesting observation that no doubt applies just as much today as it did in the 1980s to the proponents of new archaeological disciplines:

> The sharpness of postprocessualist polemics reflects not political indignation but the need of younger scholars to establish distinctive niches in the academic struggle for survival.

For Ian Hodder (1995) and co-authors *Interpreting Archaeology* is of considerable importance, as they perceive that the 'postprocessual archaeology' of the 1980s and 1990s embodies a transformation of the residues of human activities through the process of interpretation into an understanding of the past (Shanks and Hodder 1995:3-5). Those remains of the past need not be buried materials but might be surficial standing structures, or an understanding of the past held in the minds and memories of the inhabitants of a place. Bruce G. Trigger (1989:371) comments that 'Most archaeologists continue to regard archaeology as a means to study human behaviour and culture change in the past, although they are far from agreed about what is involved in doing so.' Jeremy A. Sabloff (1981b:2) was concerned with the lack of rigorous methodologies. That apprehension, as we will see, has become even more strident with the rise of commercial archaeology.

There were at least two mainstream archaeologies in the 1970s that often as not flowed together. One approach was the commercial and the other was the academic, and there was another seldom discussed today and that is the efforts of amateur archaeologist. Thomas F. King (1971:256) points out that:

> The elements of conflict between an explicitly theoretical approach to archaeology and the organisation of salvage programs that support much of America's prehistoric research can be characterized as follows: the central argument of theory-oriented archaeology . . . is the call for a deductive approach to research . . . In other words we are to pursue questions generated out of the body of anthropological (or other) theory via archaeological research . . . The salvage support agency, on the other hand, distributes its funds . . . to the quite well-founded assumption that archaeology is an inductive 'science'.

Trigger emphasises a close relationship between anthropology and archaeology particularly with the development in the 1960s and 1970s of ethnoarchaeology, 'the collection of original ethnographic data in order to aid archaeological interpretation' (Hodder 1982:28). Hodder (1982:210) paying due respect to his predecessors notes that 'ethnology' is defined by Jesse Walter Fewkes in 1900 as:

> . . . reliance by archaeologists on the present as a model for the past has been demonstrated in many spheres from settlement and burial to ritual and art. As much as the past informs the present so the present informs the past. The proper use of analogy is the central issue of archaeology interpretation.

A rigorous use of analogy within an historical perspective is sought through the application of ethnoarchaeology. Epitomized by the work of Lewis R. Binford (1978; 1980), as an ethnoarchaeologist he sought to look at the patterning of archaeological remains as the product of human relationships with the environment. Binford lived with the Nunamiut of north Alaska recording their hunting practices so that these customs could by analogy illuminate the archaeological record of hunters and gathers. The search for comparative patterning was conducted though the study of living ethnographic communities that have a close or near relationship to the prehistoric or historic technology and environment being studied. Ethnoarchaeology, the comparison of archaeological and ethnographic information, as a sub discipline of anthropology came to be an important distinct field of research in the 1970s particularly with North American researchers (Stiles 1977). Christopher Gosden (1999:7) points out that at one time British archaeologists wanted nothing to do with anthropology, what David Shankland (2012:1; also Hodder 2012) terms 'divorce and partial reconciliation', while in North America I was taught archaeology within an anthropology faculty.

Ethnoarchaeology as a dominant paradigm in the 1960s through to the 1980s brought archaeologists into direct and prolonged contact with living communities. At first it was through the search for situations that were represented both in living communities and in archaeological deposits. Archaeologists came to be spokespersons for the economic and political aspirations of the living communities that they worked with, much in the same way as anthropologists had done for decades (Mair 1984). Polly Wiessner (1982), in a critique of Binford's work, points out that although archaeologists, particularly North American, were trained in anthropology and had linked prehistoric societies with environmental factors, they may not have been able to break out of a traditional almost environmental deterministic perspective. What was needed was a more holistic paradigm that embraced the full range of social relations and studied the mechanisms employed by societies to reduce both environmental and social risks (Wiessner 1982).

Ian Hodder (1982:215) states that '. . . material symbols are value-laden, ambiguous, multi-focal and are often not organized at a conscious or discursive level, lead to the implication that they have particular importance in ideological and social strategies'. The bringing together of information relating to how a particular society was constructed, differed from the pre 1960s approach that looked at societies on a broader comparative scale through taxonomic studies of the material remains. W. W. Taylor (1948:7), writing following the Second World War, fostered an approach that later became know as ethnoarchaeology and laid a foundation stone for the New Archaeology; as discussed above. Although searching for analogies in the material culture of the past always has been a part of archaeology, it was not an established approach until the 1960s.

One of the more fascinating ways of testing analogies is through experimental archaeology where prehistoric settlements are reconstructed and ancient crafts are resurrected and practiced such as at the 'Early Iron Age Homestead' at Little Woodbury, Wiltshire, reported by Sir Mortimer Wheeler (1954:243). In a similar fashion, since it was founded in 1972, Buster Ancient Farm in Hampshire has been a centre for education and research into the past through experimental processes. The primary focus has been on the agricultural economy of the later Iron Age (Reynolds 1999:130). Similar experimental Iron Age places are found in Scandinavia (Steensberg 1979) where recreated farms are used as valuable interactive learning tool for archaeology students and as a vibrant way of presenting information about the past to heritage visitors. M. Rasmussen and B. Grønnow (1999:136) describe the burning down of Iron Age structures at the experimental village of Lejre in Denmark. *The Constructed Past: Experimental archaeology, education and the public* (Stone and Planel 1999; also Stone 2005) is a consideration of the many issues and challenges archaeological based reconstructions designed for educational purposes face.

Use of computing facilities by archaeologists in the late 1960s had a widespread impact in that the new technology was regarded as a tool that could be used to add respectability and shift archaeology from the nebulous world of art to that of the hard-core sciences (Wiseman 1980:281). What scientists in other disciplines did, archaeologists sought to do also. By the 1960s, archaeology had mastered the application of radiocarbon dating. Although then as it is today, it was misused and abused in that the dated material may have been contaminated and the resultant dates incorrect or in fact the date may not necessarily refer to the phenomena allegedly being dating (Spriggs 1989). Through the use of computers, taxonomic studies could be expanded in their scope and the number of attributes-features dealt with multiplied (Egloff 1973). To some extent, like radiocarbon dating, the ease of which taxonomic studies could be undertaken with computers, freed archaeologists so that they could search for ethnographic analogies. The search was certainly aided by the newfound mobility of archaeologists, as international air travel became a commonplace practice.

Archaeology quickly employed computers not only to facilitate the analysis of artefacts but also to simulate and construct models of past behaviour patterns and the relationship of prehistoric

populations to the social and physical landscape (Sabloff 1981a). Archaeologists were thus reasonably well prepared for the advent of archaeological heritage management with its need to develop predictive models of site distribution for 'heritage clearance' purposes (Canning 2005). Development of predictive models was made a more powerful instrument when linked with geophysical remote sensing tools that employed measures of ground-electrical resistance and ground-penetrating radar.

In the 1960s, along with ethnoarchaeology came the establishment of historical archaeology as a substantial body of inquiry that searched for a theoretical basis and was stimulated by cultural resource management and material culture studies (Green and Doershuk 1998:121). At times the theory behind the archaeology was little more than asserting that a group of hunters and gathers in the central desert of Australia, the Alyawara, had structured process for butchering kills and surprisingly the technique was different than that of the hunter gathers of the Nunamiut, but both were socially structured activities. This approach was referred to as middle-range theory and left many archaeologists wondering how could the predictable difference in comparative ethnographic data lead to theory formation. Michael Schiffer comments that 'Binford, his colleagues and students, had just issued programmatic statements, some comprehensible, some not' and that 'the new archaeology became everybody's archaeology' (Schiffer 1979:1). Mark P. Leone and Constance A. Crosby (1987:398), in the context of a discussion of the historical archaeology of African American settlements, provides reassurance for the sceptical:

> The crucial element in middle range theory, as Binford sets it up, is the discrepancy between the expectation produced by using an analogy and the patterns actually found archaeologically. This discrepancy he calls ambiguity; it is one of the keys to distinguishing between analogy and the situation it is used to illuminate. The ambiguities need to be dealt with, not explained as exceptions, for they provide clues to the context of use and meaning in the case being worked on, and when dealt with, they preserve the integrity of the particular example.

James Deetz (1977) points out that historical archaeologists are ordained to assume a command of the small things that have been forgotten through time and perhaps considered to be inconsequential to historians. Historical archaeology has played an important role in documenting not only the small things but also at looking closely at those kinds of activities that were not recorded. As Deetz (1977) wrote in *Small Things forgotten: The archaeology of early American life*, it often is small and apparently insignificant objects that add the personal touch such as the World War I remains of a German harmonica or the tobacco pipe of a British soldier. The same year, Leland Ferguson (1977) edited *Historical Archaeology and the Importance of Material Things*, emphasizing the link between the material culture of the past, the present and into the future.

The intersection of ethnology and historical archaeology has been employed over the past decades to explore the nature of contemporary material culture (Fewster 2013). Of particular interest is the research of William L. Rathje (1977) with the every-day garbage of Tucson, Arizona. Mark Leon applies the tools of structural analysis to an investigation of the 'New Mormon Temple, Washington D.C'. Leone (1977:59, 43) describes the Mormons as:

> . . . living in a world of high ambiguity, incoherence and arbitrariness. They live in it in such a way that they exploit these very features of it and build success by utilizing them.

Leone points out that the tools of historical archaeology are appropriate as the temple is a material object and the Mormons are literate. There is some uncertainty in my mind if archaeology is the most appropriate tool to delve into a complex and rich society. The *Modern Material Culture: The Archaeology of Us* (Gould and Schiffer eds. 1981) includes articles that feature a contemporary supermarket, the community store, the making of stone vases in Egypt and hide tanning in Ethiopia. Of particular

concern is the observation that archaeology when presented to the public can be boring and that the past should be relevant as well as relate to the present and to ourselves (Leone 1981:12).

Leland Ferguson (1992) looks at the immediate past of the slavery of African-Americans and how archaeology expands our knowledge of people whose life-ways were in material terms restricted and not fully documented by historians. British forts, imperial prisons, entire medieval townscapes and field systems became the metier of the historical archaeologists. Along with this vast field of research, came professional contracts and permanent employment as site management and conservation officers. Salvage projects brought one-off economic and academic opportunities and management obtained full-time and long-term employment in a range of varied situations (Schiffer 1979). Take for instance the work of Edward Harris (1977), who studies the fortifications of Bermuda, in developing the 'Harris Matrix'[7] to record complex site formations such as those found in historical archaeology deposits (Buckley and Davies 1987; Davies 1987; Davies and Egloff 1986). Archaeological emphasis on a critical evaluation of the values represented in material culture (Gould and Schiffer 1981) means that any form of debris from cultural activities is of interest to archaeologists including the garbage of contemporary Tucson, Arizona (Rathje 1974; Rathje and Murphy 2001). Victor Buchli and Gavin Lucas (2001:3) remind us that Rathje emphasises the relationship between material culture and human behaviour regardless of whether the material is old or contemporary.

1.3 Indigenous rights

Wybalena, on Flinders Island in the Bass Strait to the north of Tasmania, is an example of a British colonial period site that has been explored through archaeological research (Birmingham 1992). It was at Wybalena in the 1830s, that many, but definitely not all, of the surviving Tasmanian Aboriginal population was incarcerated in a row of Georgian-style cottages. Archaeologists initially sought to explore the impact of colonial encounters on the original inhabitants of Tasmania. The report was published in 1992 when the site was of continued archaeological interest but was highly significant to the aspirations of Tasmanian Aboriginal Australians in their quest for recognition, land rights and native title. Situations change, and just as the tempo was increasing with respect to the registration of historic Aboriginal places it became apparent that Indigenous people in some instances were deeply hurt by being excluded from the archaeological process (refer to Langford 1983, 'Our Heritage - Your Playground').

Not all known Aboriginal sites are listed on government inventories, as communities and individuals may assert that the establishment-controlled lists impinge upon their sovereignty (McNiven and Russell 2008:430). Jane Lydon (2009) explores who owns the past in *Fantastic Dreaming: The archaeology of an Aboriginal mission*. Intellectual property challenges emerge in a range of situations particularly when dealing with indigenous heritage. Australia and New Zealand are regarded as making great strides forward in the recognition of indigenous intellectual property (Bruchac 2010:367). Since the 1960s, archaeologist and anthropologists undertaking ethnographic studies were aware of the sensitive nature of photographic material depicting indigenous rituals. Archaeologists undertaking research in communities have had to be aware of the needs of their hosts or else they were likely to be asked to leave. Robert Ritzenthaler and Frederick A. Peterson (1956:9) of the Milwaukee Public Museum document one of the few published accounts of when ethnographers were asked to leave a Native American community. The researchers had received permission to undertake fieldwork from the established leader of the Mexican Kickapoo not realizing that there was another faction of the community that did not want any outsiders staying in the village. As an added complication the team arrived during the preparations for a ceremonial cycle to be led by the traditional elders.

---

[7] www.Harrismatrix.com. Accessed 15 March 2016.

A decade later, after the archaeologist had completed the fieldwork, problems arose with the contents of the publication. In 'The Changing Photographic Contract: Aborigines and Image Ethics', Nicolas Peterson (2003:135-36) writes:

> In 1969 an archaeologist published a very well written, popular book, *Yiowara: Foragers of the Australian Desert* (Gould 1969), about the Aboriginal bands of the Warburton area. Aimed at an audience of upper-secondary students and first-year undergraduates, it found its way into a number of school libraries. The cover showed a head-and-shoulders portrait of an Aboriginal woman from Warburton. It appears that around 15 May 1971, an Aboriginal schoolgirl from the town of Laverton (the regional centre for Warburton) who had been on a school trip to Perth returned home with a copy of the book, which had attracted her attention because the woman on the cover was a close relative. She had shown the book to her father who became very angry because eleven of the fifty-two photographs showed restricted ceremonial objects and activities.

Gould obviously did not intend to offend the Aboriginal community members. Most certainly in the 1960s there was not the widespread sensitivity in Australia to the use of images of Indigenous people as there is today.

Protocols for relating to communities closely associated with archaeological remains as decedents or nearest neighbours vary greatly from country to country and from one context to another. The general rule is to 'ask first' and that the more the findings impact upon the well being of others, the more the researcher must take ethical and legal concerns into account (Australian Heritage Commission 2002). Archaeologists working in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States have been particularly concerned with the ownership of the indigenous past over the past three decades or more (Trigger 1985; Wilmont 1985). A global perspective of intellectual property rights has been prepared for the World Intellectual Property Organization (Torsen and Anderson 2010:2). An informative case study included in the report is when a husband and wife team record an Aboriginal ceremony. The material found its way into an institution where it was provided to descendants of the community who used it in part in a commercial music video. In this instance, both the community and the recorder assert that that the recording is their property while the latter holds the copyright. Intellectual property may appear to be a complex issues but there are clear-cut precedents (Fig. 1.3).

In the case Yumbulul vs. Reserve Bank of Australia (1991) the 'Court noted that Australia's copyright law does not provide adequate recognition of Aboriginal community claims to regulate the reproduction and use of works which are essentially communal in origin' (Janke 1998:58). In 'Copyrighting the Past? Emerging Rights Issues in Archaeology' the authors (Nicholas and Bannister 2004:342) 'advocate a more active role for archaeologists working with indigenous peoples (or on indigenous territory) in considering the implications of their research'.

From the perspective of an archaeologist practicing in Australia, this is a rather mild statement. The Code of Ethics of the Australian Archaeological Association requires that Aboriginal stakeholders be identified and negotiated with, and reports provided to the community. As Nicholas and Bannister (2004) and colleagues (Nicholas et al. 2010) point out, it is both the physical and the intellectual aspects of property ownership that need to be addressed in a coherent manner. This has led Michael F. Brown (2004:342-43), in a comment on the article, to stress that 'there is little concern for how these arrangements might spill over into information policies elsewhere in society' and 'I am also uneasy about the upbeat belief that collaboration between archaeologists and Indigenous communities will resolve all questions about the ownership and control of archaeological information'.

Figure 1.3 Team from AIATSIS and Kanamakek-Yale Ngala Museum, Wadeye, Northern Territory, Australia, recording meanings of recent rock-paintings at Papa Ngalla east of Wadeye. Margaret, relative of senior Traditional Owner Camilla, pointing out features of painting to museum honorary curator, Mark Crocombe Image courtesy of Graeme K Ward (AIATSIS) with permission of community.

Since the founding of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies in 1964, it has acted for a repository for intellectual property. Researchers place original field notes, photographs, audio-visual recordings and theses on deposit and can specify who has access to that material in accordance with the wishes of the elders of the affiliated Aboriginal Australians. One of the most useful sources of information on Aboriginal land rights and the linking of individuals and families are the maps of 'tribal' boundaries, the portrait photographs and family genealogies collected by Norman Tindale prior to 1940 that are now held in the South Australia Museum and at other cultural institutions throughout Australia (Jones 1995; Tindale 1940, 1974). Photographs and genealogies are available to family members such that when undertaking research it is not unusual for Aboriginal family members to have information that is not readily available to the archaeological researcher.

Issues have emerged and protocols have been developed to deal with zones of discomfort. For instance, in Aboriginal land claims and native title proceedings sensitive information has to be laid before the tribunals. All reports are vetted by community members and proscriptions placed upon the distribution of some reports. Like all compromises, the context-specific agreements are a double-edged sword. On the one hand, vital information is recorded and held in confidence while legal security is maintained. However, privacy proscriptions can have the unfortunate outcome of making it extremely difficult to obtain what are in some cases extraordinarily insightful research reports.

Traditional cultural expression has proven to be difficult to deal with in contemporary legal systems that require specific forms of authorship, public access to art and published works, and individual property ownership. International conventions provide guidelines for respecting traditional rights and practices but the instruments may not be supported by national regulations. It is not clear if international instruments constitute 'a vague political principle or genuine right' (Graber 2009:291; also Veth 2010:280-81). Australian Aboriginal groups, in order to claim native title rights, must demonstrate connection with the land in a European-based legal system that only partially acknowledges native title, restricts public access to places and in the past suppressed adherence to customs that included religious practices. The paradox is that Aboriginal groups are required to

demonstrate adherence to traditional practices, yet those activities such as the exclusion of uninitiated youths, specific genders and others from sacred places and restrictions on the reproduction and display of sacred art forms are not support by the Australian common law legal system. Grabner's (2009:285) 'Wanjina and Wunggurr: The Propertisation of Aboriginal Rock Art under Australian Law', discusses the over-arching discretionary powers of the minister. In the Australian legal system, matters are referred to federal and state ministers for a final decision. Although the ministers may have to call for advice and reports, the minister is not required to follow that advice. Statutory planning documents can be readily changed if the minister chooses to do so by simply advertising that a change is to take place, calling for public comment and then redrafting the plan to suit the immediate interests of the government.

The state of rock art conservation and management can be employed as an indicator of how fragile our heritage is when under assault from a plethora of forces and is not actively defended by the government. Studies in Australia conclude that the situation could well be worsening and that much of the vibrant rock art heritage, from the far west coast to the north-east of the continent, is under threat from forces such as (Australian Heritage Council 2011:3; Cole and Buhrich 2012; also Agnew et al. 2005):
> Industrial development;
> Secondary impacts from industrial development;
> Recreation, tourism and vandalism; and
> Knowledge, management and engagement of caretaker communities

This list serves as a reminder that development and tourism coupled with a distancing of caretaker communities contribute to the threats encountered in archaeological heritage conservation and management. Add to this list extreme events and cumulative natural forces such as the melting of ice fields as well as direct cultural factors such as purposeful vandalism and there is no doubt that only focused and well-directed efforts will mitigate these threats.

There is no doubt in my mind that some highly contested aspects of Aboriginal heritage in Australia will be more widely and routinely accepted in the immediate future; such as the rights of descendent communities and the principle of continuity with change in traditional activities that in turn will facilitate community involvement in conservation. Bruchac (2010:368) believes that in the future indigenous archaeologies will have a far greater range of participants than it has had in the past as political nuances, intellectual property and an increasing engagement with descendent communities come in to play.

1.4 Communities

Over recent decades archaeology has been regarded as tainted with post-colonial values (Lydon and Rizvi 2010). In response, some researchers have come to focus upon the needs of the community rather than upon the requirements of the archaeologist (González-Ruibal 2014:11-12). Those researchers not only maintained their traditional ties to the material remains of the past but also found their work inextricably linked to the values and aspirations of descendent communities. Community archaeology is regarded as a mechanism for situating the public in the position of contributing to the archaeological process. However, an assessment needs to be made if indeed the outcomes of community archaeology lead to betterment, in particular with respect to indigenous or disadvantaged communities seeking rights. Faye Simpson (2008:6) offers a review of projects represented as being community archaeology:

> To date, discussion about community archaeology has failed to move beyond the theory and methods to assess the effectiveness of community projects. Recent studies have attempted to quantify the responses of communities to archaeological projects through visitor and

participant . . . These have provided some important generalizations about how different groups respond to community projects, but do not provide rich and textured insights into what people are getting out of them. Consequently, while there is a growing consensus that community archaeology is a 'good thing', the literature remains vague concerning how, and to what extent, community archaeology is currently being effective in achieving its aims. In other words, does archaeology affect community values? Alternatively, is community archaeology simply a means for archaeologists to successfully secure funding for their excavations by meeting self-defined criteria or matching those of funding bodies?

Simpson states that on the whole there was some contribution to social values when the community was directly involved in the project.

For generations archaeologists have in one way or another involved communities in their archaeological efforts. Communities throughout the world will have differing inclinations and capacities to participate in the archaeological process. Perhaps involvement need be nothing more than the objectives of The Hampden Community Archaeology Program (Gadsby and Chidester 2007) that sought to empower the emerging community by enhancing the recent memory-bank of newly arrived residents.

1.5 An international forum

Archaeological heritage management as it unfolded in the 1970s, in the words of Ian Hodder (1992:275-79), was very much a product of post-modernism, the consumer society and what once had been an academic pursuit but was in the process of being transformed into a commercial enterprise. The year following the publication of Hodder's observation, Henry Cleere (1993a) edited *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World.* Cleere's work appears be the first broad attempt to look at the manifestations of archaeological heritage management on the international scene. Cleere (1989:1) considers that the academic discipline of archaeology and the administrative function of archaeological heritage management are twins but have developed at different rates. Embryonic prior to the Second World War, archaeological heritage management became an integral part of government planning and in some jurisdictions is a required component of developmental projects. My first full-time employment as an archaeologist, in the 1960s, was as an assistant to Joffre Coe, professor of archaeology at the University of North Carolina, who also served as the state archaeologist. The state of North Carolina paid my wages as an assistant to the state archaeologist. Earlier, Coe's ground breaking field work was at the prehistoric Native American site of Town Creek, in North Carolina, supported by the Works Progress Administration of the Great Depression that across the nation employed thousands of unemployed workers (refer to Fagette 1996). *Town Creek Indian Mound: A Native American Legacy* (Coe 1995) describes the joining together of administration, research and management of archaeological resources at Town Creek from the 1930s to the 1990s.

Sites were the focus of management in the 1930s while academics looked towards investigating entire landscapes, an ambition not fully realized until after the interruption of World War Two that took archaeologists out of civilian life and placed them in the military. Coe learned valuable skills as an aerial photographic interpreter in the Pacific theatre of the war. Aerial photography became an essential component of cultural landscape studies that previously were too broad for heritage managers to deal with. Today, archaeological heritage managers study landscapes on a global scale with satellite imagery within a context set by international organizations and protocols (Comer and Harrower 2013).

Archaeology, now more than ever before, has assumed importance at the international, national and local levels if for no other reason than its attraction to visitors and the financial contribution tourists make to economies. Some of the attraction of archaeology may well lie in its romancing of the past

(Hall 2004). Pressure is increasing to make difficult choices to allow communities to flourish and develop alongside keeping things from the past that are of particular value. Archaeological heritage has been divided into categories by international and national agencies that at times are perplexing and divisive to associated and descendent communities, and at other times serve to bring societies together. For example, World Heritage is comprised of the stories that nations want to tell about themselves, except in instances like Auschwitz-Birkenau German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp where there once was a reluctance to disinter the dark past but survivors and relatives of the murdered holocaust victims prevailed over national interests (Young 2009). At the very local level, archaeology through its materiality now provides power to subordinate groups to derive advantage from developmental projects that in the past would have lead to further marginalization, dispossession of lands and cultural fragmentation.

The notion that heritage belongs to a cultural context on the surface is relatively straightforward. But, and this is a big but, not all heritage belongs to an on-going cultural tradition that has respect for it. Given that cultural values and cultural contexts change, there will be many instances where contemporary communities may not wish to admit to, or promote what today are perceived of as alien images from the past. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996:267) in *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict* discuss specific cases were heritage is alien and unacceptable to, or outside of the comfort zone of, the contemporary community – an example being the 'German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945)' Auschwitz-Birkenau versus the readily accepted artistic heritage of the Weimar republic as represented by the listing of the 'Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau'. Within the same genre of 'dark heritage', Olwen Beasley (2010:45; also Utaka 2009) writes about the politization of the nomination of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome or A-Bomb Dome) to the World Heritage List in 1996:

> . . . while all eyes were on the US trying to silence the Japanese nomination at the global level, no attention was paid to how the nomination at the local level served to silence voices . . .

In closing, Beasley (2010:62)argues that it is not that World Heritage Committee that standardises heritage but the State parties and ICOMOS in order to meet national and international imperatives.

Authors speak of the 'opposition to the trivialization of historical pain for tourist entertainment such as a mock slave auction at the reconstructed and deified Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia (Figs. 1.4 and 1.5), the hallmark of the colonial revival in the United States' (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996:265; also Hume 1999:99). As Mark D. Bograd and Theresa Singleton (1997:198-203) point out, it took some time before slavery was part of the Colonial Williamsburg historic site interpretation (Greenspan 2002:15; Handler and Gable 1997:68-69). Criticism by Bograd and Singleton may be unfair as the contribution of African Americans to the plantation industry of colonial Virginia is presented in a highly intelligent and empathetic way by 'people of color' at the slave quarters at Carter's Grove Plantation that was developed as an adjunct to Colonial Williamsburg and opened to the public in 1989 (Greenspan 2002:133, 151, 156-157, 160, 166). Earlier archaeological work at Carter's Grove by Ivor Noël Hume (1982) led to the discovery of the remains of Wolstenholme Towne and the settlement of Martin's Hundred that was largely destroyed in the massacre of 1622. The archaeology revealed the remains of murdered settlers, burned features of a fort and dwellings that added the dimension of the Native American past and their interaction with the English settlers to the interpretation program (Greenspan 2002:133). The earth integration of the visitor's information centre is another strong feature of the archaeological heritage management of Carter's Grove and Wolstenholme Towne that unfortunately closed in 2007.

Archaeologists must balance local needs with those of a global internationalized heritage industry that is highly competitive. As heritage managers act within an aggressive commercial setting there

must be an ethical approach. Not only does the commercial and academic world of archaeology require scrutiny but also as part of that process a close look at the key conventions and charters is in order. There is a quality of universality in heritage along the lines of which Henry Cleere (2001) spoke of in 'The uneasy bedfellows: universality and cultural heritage' that transcends local, regional and more importantly specific national cultural values. Cleere (2000b:105) has argued that one of the reasons that cultural heritage is so vulnerable on the international stage is that it has its strongest most pronounced value at the national level unlike wildlife values that seem to transcend national and regional values, perhaps because unlike humans birds and animals do not require passports to cross boundaries. World Heritage listing is a national government and World Heritage Commission process. Due to confidentiality that is imposed during the nomination process, it is difficult to maintain the ethical requirement that the communities that will be impacted by the outcomes of the deliberations have access in a timely and continuous fashion to the decision making process (James et al. 2013).

Figure 1.4 Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia, served as an early focal point of historical archaeology in America. Here a colonial period cellar is re-excavated as part of a university training program.

ICOMOS is an advisor to UNESCO on the implementation of the World Heritage convention and ICAHM and its charter have a role in that process. As already noted, the Institute of Architects and ICOMOS *Venice Charter* of 1965 does not consider the conservation and management of archaeological resources. Consideration of those values falls to the ICAHM charter. Gustaf Trotzig, of the Central Board of State Antiquities, Sweden chaired the working group that prepared the draft ICAHM Charter (Cleere 1993b:401) while Carsten Lund of Denmark took a leading role in the preparation of the

document (refer also to Pickard 2011). Lund briefly outlines the history of the charter starting with the founding of ICAHM during the 1984 General Assembly of ICOMOS in Rostock. A primary objective of the committee was the drafting of a charter, as none of the then current instruments pertaining to either archaeology or conservation clearly articulated a set of principles that could be employed to guide in situ or non-destructive archaeological conservation (Fig. 1.6). Lund (1989:19) reflects that:

> The main objective of the charter is the protection of the archaeological heritage, giving priority to the site-protection, because even carefully conducted archaeological excavations ensure some data at the expense of others. The charter therefore also gives priorities to the development and application of non-destructive methods of investigation.

Figure 1.5 The idyllic setting of Colonial Williamsburg guided in part by archaeological inquiry to inform the reconstruction.

A commitment that was never fulfilled was that 'The Icahm Managing Group will consider writing supplementary comments to the text, giving some guidelines for its interpretation' (Lund 1989:19). Henry Cleere (1993b:400) asserts that a hallmark of the ICAHM charter is its focus on 'protection policies that are integrated with general planning'.

The ICAHM Charter has an emphasis that met with a widespread consensus and dealt as much as was practical with contemporary issues (Stanley-Price 1984a). Some archaeologists wished to go further, but for the sake of a speedy acceptance of the instrument they pulled-back from pressing ahead with divisive issues. For instance, the charter makes no mention of the voluntary sector, but the need for

cooperation from the general public is acknowledged. This is a major shortcoming as is the weak stance on the principal that developers should pay for the costs of archaeological salvage, the use of metal detectors by amateurs and the trade in illicit antiquities (Cleere 1993b:401). The illicit trade artefacts is well and truly incorporated in to the 1970 UNESCO convention, but the ICAHM charter would have been an excellent vehicle to emphasize the growing concerns of archaeologists at the destruction of heritage places by looters. Other issues loom large at international archaeological congresses particularly ethical and social responsibilities, actions during times of military conflict and a healthy suspicion of commercial archaeological activities that may not lead to a conservation of the resource or any knowledge or understanding of past societies.

Figure 1.6 In situ excavation and display of the Neolithic Hemudu culture (5500 to 3300 BCE) in Zhejiang, China, showing the remains of timber framed buildings, wells and pools. The site is important for the early domestication of rice.

Nicholas Stanley-Price (1984a:145) asserts that the ICAHM Charter was an influential document in regulating the archaeological conservation of the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern region. The *Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage* received international prominence in 1993 in a special heritage issue of *Antiquity*. Articles by Henry Cleere and Recardo Elia consider the ICAHM charter of 1990 while offerings by Patrick O'Keefe and Gustaf Trotzig focus on the *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage* (Valletta 1992). The charter and the convention were products of the same minds, with the ICAHM Charter having the added contribution of Australian archaeologists. The ICAHM charter is inclusive of indigenous issues while the word

indigenous does not occur in the European archaeological convention, the *New Delhi Recommendation* 1956 or the *Salalah Guidelines* New Delhi 2017.

Throughout most of the world there is a need to adhere to the *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* 1972/1975. The substance and application of the convention is widely discussed in the literature. In the course of its implementation, the guidelines have been reviewed and following the ICOMOS *Declaration of San Antonio* in 1996,[8] markedly changed to take into account living cultural landscapes. Unfortunately there is no international archaeological heritage management instrument that has prompted a similar body of discussion. Aside from the articles in the 1993 *Antiquity*, there are few instances in the academic literature that offer a consideration of the ICAHM charter. One of the key volumes supporting the charter is the collected series of papers presented at the Proceedings of the Second ICAHM International Conference, 'Archaeological Remains In Situ Preservation' that was held in Montreal in 1994 (Mousseau 1996). Although site conservation through in situ preservation is foremost in the writings of the archaeological heritage managers that contributed to the papers, not surprisingly each contribution places conservation as a priority within the perspective of other management needs (Fig. 1.6). Papers at that conference presented positive outcomes describing diverse situations including archaeological site management and planning for sustainability development in Guatemala (Juarez 1996), negotiating with indigenous communities over the presentation of rock painting sites to the Australian public (Horsfall 1996) and heritage 1996). As an example of the changing nature of archaeological heritage management, if a similar conference were to be held today it might well choose to focus on the reburial of archaeological sites as a cost-effective means of conservation.

Thomas King (1998:242-44) reviews the future of cultural resource management and the kinds of positions that will need to be filled. Although not necessarily a statement of future directions, it does specify that archaeologists will be employed in agencies dealing with compliance; local government within planning agencies; museums at all levels of government; contract work; and, advocacy with organization such as national trusts. King emphasizes that it is important that archaeologists learn more than one specialty, know the laws and instruments that guide archaeological activities and come to cultural resource management with a pragmatic approach while trying not to be purists. It is interesting that King stresses a need to learn more than one specialty. Some would argue with good cause that there are grounds for concern that archaeological graduates may not be thoroughly conversant with the broad study of archaeology and may not know how to wrench objects and information from the soil, much less have mastered a second specialty. Process is important but do not take too much comfort in it, as one can be lulled into a false sense of institutional security. King's warning applies to processes that rely on technology and forget about the 'people factor' or for that matter just the opposite where there is too much reliance on what the stakeholders want and no real way of achieving those needs without severely compromising the conservation of the resource (Greer et al. 2003:46).

John Hunter and Ian Ralston (1993) bring together a series of papers that take into account databases, legislation, antiquities, underwater archaeology, local government, contracting and acting as a consultant, the broader field of heritage, museology, links to land use and dissemination of information. The need for objectivity is readily apparent when excavating and presenting the outcomes of archaeological research. Archaeological heritage management must be value driven and address inequalities and disparities in the wherewithal of communities to participate in the conservation process. The power of heritage discourse and the presence of discipline directed and state sanctioned propaganda has been known for many years with its most publicized application

---

[8] http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/188-the-declaration-of-san-antonio. Accessed 22 February 2016.

being that of the national socialist government of Germany in the 1930s and early 1940s (Arnold 2004, 2006).

1.6 A narrative
This volume seeks to explore the need to preserve both the integrity of international archaeological heritage and to conserve its significance while trying to understand its transformations through time, and its potential contribution to our understanding of the past as it can be applied to the future. With that in mind, under the direction of Ellen Lee of Parks Canada and with the encouragement of Senake Bandaranayake, then President of ICAHM, a review of the charter was initiated. The review was hastened when the author, while the Chair of ICAHM, received a residential fellowship in 2007 from the Getty Conservation Institute to develop guidelines for the charter. At first glance, it looked relatively easy but the extensive resources available at the Getty Conservation Institute soon painted a picture of considerable complexity and depth.

The ICOMOS International Committee for Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM) has been concerned with the degree to which the charter of 1990 reflects best heritage practice as well as forecasts future pressure points. The literature to be reviewed in order to assess the past, present and future directions of archaeological heritage conservation and management is prodigious even when considering that only materials published or translated into English were reviewed. Publications in the nexus between archaeology and heritage have proliferated over the past one and a half decades at an increasing pace. This volume has an Anglo – North American – Australasian – European centric bias but does include reference to African, Asian, Middle East, Mediterranean, Pacific island and South American publications.

As an introduction, this chapter sets the scene for a consideration of those studies that have influenced my own thoughts on archaeological heritage management and conservation. What the reader will quickly perceive is that the author is firstly a 'dirt' archaeologist and then a resource manager charged with heritage site conservation. Chapter two of this international study sets the context for a discussion of the nature of archaeological heritage management from an historical perspective. The chapter incorporates an investigation, with an historical perspective, of the acts, guidelines, charters and conventions that seek to inform archaeological practice; in particular the World Heritage convention. Chapter three sketches the history of the internationalization of archaeology. Chapters four, five and six are compilations of contemporary and contentious challenges that have been identified by international practitioners. As the nature of archaeological heritage management all too often is highly conflicted and fraught with pitfalls. The seventh chapter is devoted to linking best practice with the field of international governance and the risks to heritage sites. Chapter eight reflects on archaeological heritage management with a focus on recent literature and seeks to draw together the various threads of contemporary thought. Appendix 1 lists international treaty, conventions, charters and recommendation that are referred to in the text while Appendix comprises the text of the 2007 ICAHM *Salalah Guidelines for the Management of Public Archaeological Sites.*

After forty years of experience, when it came to describing and documenting how archaeological heritage management is undertaken on a global scale, it is clear to me that the Asian, Australian, American, European and the United Kingdom experiences with cultural resource management are similar in some respects but they are different in other ways particularly with regard to focal points of interest. As is to be expected, European systems of archaeological heritage management are considerably older than they are in the New Worlds. In Australasia and the Americas, substantial concern is expressed with respect to indigenous social interests and participation, the role of archaeologists in community processes and the on-going negotiating of who owns the past.

Repatriation and landrights are presented in the European literature only when they reflect on practice in Africa, the Americas and the Pacific.

I have chosen to draw not only upon the literature that directly reflects upon archaeological heritage conservation, with an emphasis on place rather than object preservation, but to include an eclectic range of sources that touch upon material culture, heritage, archaeology, place management and governance from an international viewpoint. These are my choices and of course may not reflect the interests of other archaeological heritage advocates, but are those that have guided me in my archaeological heritage endeavours between 1960 and 2018. These are works that have impressed me as both an archaeologist and as a heritage manager, and that I understand to have made contributions to the wider field of archaeological heritage management. I take an historical perspective that is somewhat sceptical of assertions that announce that a new field of inquiry has been born, when I seem to have experienced that same line of inquiry decades earlier. It is apparent that each generation of archaeologists has a need to create a niche for themselves and primarily that is done through theory rather than practice.

Archaeological heritage literature is growing exponentially when one takes into consideration not only academic and professional contributions but likewise the offerings of national agencies that in many countries publish both as hard copy and through the World Wide Web. I have a cautionary tale for you. APPEAR (Accessibility Projects Sustainable Preservation of Urban Subsoil Archaeological Remains) is a major European initiative to enhance urban archaeological sites.[9] From 2008 to 2013, there were numerous web sites that carried detailed information about the project as a whole and about the treatment of individual places, including a *Guide on Managing Archaeological Remains in Towns & Cities* (265 pages) and a 'Report on socio-cultural impact of accessibility projects'. A summary by Asensio (et al. 2006) is no longer available on the web, and in 2016 only a brief review was found on the ICOMOS web site (Teller et al. n.d.). It is not unusual for web sites to disappear, but if the title or author of the document is known, then from my experience, the material can be searched for and most likely will appear someplace on the www.

Generally speaking, the administrators of government archaeological heritage management programs believe that their systems are adequate, if fully funded and staffed, while heritage practitioners may be less than satisfied with both the process and the outcomes. Given the importance of maintaining effective and reliable systems, it is interesting to note how few independent reviews there are of the archaeological heritage management process. The few reviews that there are, do not lead me to believe that best practice is as common as we have been lead to believe. My overall impression is that heritage occupies a considerable proportion of our social, academic and economic endeavours and without an archaeological heritage that is well-managed and conserved, future generations will not have the opportunities that we enjoy when meeting with the past as it situates us in the present and leads into the future.

---

[9] http://appearfr.english-heritage.org.uk/reports/6.pdf. Accessed 2 June 2016.