<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Preprint

This is the submitted version of a paper published in *Heritage & Society*.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Colomer, L. (2012)

Archaeological heritage management and the post-Valetta scenario in The Netherlands.

Heritage & Society, 5(1): 125-131

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/hso.2012.5.1.125>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:lnu:diva-37696>

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT AND THE POST-VALETTA
SCENARIO IN THE NETHERLANDS.
RESPONSE TO GOUDSWAARD, BOS, van ROODE AND PAPE'S ARTICLE ON
'REVERSE ARCHAEOLOGY'**

Laia Colomer

DO NOT CITE IN ANY CONTEXT WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR

Abstract Reverse Archaeology proposes archaeological knowledge as a source of inspiration for spatial planning design, aiming to give a practical output to research paid by developers when an area is affected by archaeological resources not suitable for *in situ* preservation and public enhance. The response shows that it provides a tool for implementing Dutch Belvedere programme but does not actually give a comprehensive answer to the full management of archaeological heritage, as is stated by the authors. Nevertheless, some positive points asserted by Reverse Archaeology, such as decision-making process and stakeholder participation, are both critique commented and encouraged for further work moving the discussion from spatial planning utilizing the past, to a more general remark on the need of applying valued-based heritage management methods to the European post-Valetta scenario.

Resumen La Arqueología Inversa propone que el conocimiento arqueológico sea fuente de inspiración para proyectos arquitectónicos y paisajísticos, facilitando así una salida práctica a la generación de conocimiento arqueológico pagado por las constructoras en espacios patrimoniales afectados por la promoción urbanística. La replica a dicho argumento enfatiza que más que una propuesta de gestión patrimonial como se dice, la Arqueología Inversa es simplemente una herramienta para implementar el programa holandés Belvedere. Aún así, se enfatiza críticamente y se estimula una discusión más profunda sobre dos temas claves (el procesos de decisión y la participación de interesados), para así llevar el debate de fondo de la planificación espacial a la aplicación de metodologías de gestión centradas en el valor del patrimonio en la Europa pos-Valetta.

The signature of the 1992 European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (commonly known as the Malta Convention or Treaty of Valetta) had certainly changed completely the scenario of archaeological practice in Europe, although the pace of its implementation and development varies strongly depending on the different archaeological practices and each particular legal regimes (for a wide description and analysis see The Council of Europe's European Heritage Network website). After some years of long debate, Dutch archaeology was prepared for this substantial change in the organization and performance of archaeological works (Bloemers 2002; Deeben et al. 1999; van Dockum and Lauwerier 2004; Kristiansen 2009; Waugh 2008; Willems 2008, 2009; Willems and van Dries 2007; Willems et al. 1997). As a result of this debate, the model explicitly adopted for the archaeological management of cultural heritage follows the "market principles" under a certain governmental control, as far as it is acknowledged that archaeological results are of national interest:

- The valuation and selection of heritage places is defined by academics and local governmental institutions in order to assure a well-argued list of

heritage places to be researched, protected, preserved and enhanced;

- The obligation that local and regional councils adequately both assess the impact of proposed plans on existing archaeological remains and provide for the necessary mitigation within planning constraints;
- The introduction of the "developers pay" principle, whereby the cost of the archaeological mitigation are financed out the development budget and not from (local) government funds. In the application of market principles, the developer contract an archaeological company to carry out the necessary archaeological works;
- Archaeological excavation is regarded as both a service and a research activity; therefore there is a strict regulation on the quality of the works offered and a list of archaeological companies licensed for contracting.

Goudswaard, Bos, van Roode and Pape's article summarizes also this particular Dutch post-Valetta scenario. After, it analyses some tensions, noticed by the authors, between archaeological practice and spatial planning: an excessive weight of academic research

proceeds on spatial planning, the absence of application of this knowledge into the spatial developing itself, and consequently the negative interest of archaeology among developers due to its non efficient relation previous costs - final revenues. Reverse Archaeology, a method designed by the private Dutch company The Missing Link, wishes to overcome this situation viewing cultural heritage as a source of spatial inspiration for urban design, and proposing a much rational methodology based both on the definition of archaeological research's aims and project design *before* developing the area, and on more open (democratic) decision-making process of what *needs* to be investigated between the academics, the government agencies, the final users and the developers. It is to desired that this new method will better response to the archaeological expectations of all parties involved in spatial planning, and thus to enhance the public value of academic research.

Knowledge and spatial planning in NL

In 1999, Deeben, Groenewoudt, Hallewas and Willems described the Dutch system of significance's evaluation in archaeological heritage management (see also Groenewoudt and Bloemers 1997). Compared to valued-based heritage assessments, the Dutch

decision-making process on the *in situ* preservation of archaeological sites gives priorities only to archaeological/historical/research values as first and unique criteria (perception, physical quality and intrinsic quality). Only after passing this academic/professional valuation operation, a list of monuments or archeological sites worth preserving is proposed. The final selection list is done following two more arguments: policy considerations, and priority choices, which both revolve to local or regional government interests, and encompasses here economic and social factors. It is to be notice that this final stage of decision-making is always formulated with the primary objective of preserving archaeological monuments. Those archaeological sites that had not received a highly score during the initial valuation process will not pass to the following selection process, and thus they will never be preserved *in situ*. In licensed developing projects, the developer will pay the digging and the research in order to ensure the adequate recording of those archaeological sites that cannot be preserved. This new archaeological data and material will enlarge the research knowledge of the period, the region, and will address future archaeological agendas for future revisions of the list of valuated and selected archaeological monuments.

This is a common process on the heritage preservation-planning development: some sites are preserved, others just recorded, but all are excavated on developer's budget if they are affected by any new spatial design. However, it is strongly argued by developers, as described by the authors, that this new archaeological knowledge just enriches archaeology, and never their urban development investments. It is to assume that the interest of Reverse Archaeology in viewing cultural heritage as a source of spatial inspiration and urban design aims to give a practical output to research paid by the developer when an area is affected by archaeological resources not suitable for *in situ* preservation and public enhance.

On the other hand, The Netherlands is aware of the needs to face the future and accommodate the country to the latest demands of new homes, business areas, and infrastructures. But, at the same time, there is an increasing awareness that demands for space in a small and over-populated country means that cultural policies aimed to preserve and enhance heritage places cannot be successful in all (most!?) cases. It is necessary to balance heritage protection, monument restoration, and development, allowing the growing of the latest without losing the former. Having this in mind, from 1999 a different supplementary strategy had been designed

and acknowledge by the Dutch government on the principle of "preservation by development": a strategy that gives historic areas the best possible place within unavoidable spatial development. Named Belvedere, it designs a strategy to promote "to use the space in such a way that an object of cultural and/or historic importance is given a place and will contribute to the quality of this newly created surroundings (...). The heritage approach to be adopted in dynamic situations is one that centres on inspiring development rather than conservation or replacement". The Belvedere strategy aims to achieve this goal by "involving heritage experts early in planning processes and by providing architects, urban and rural planners, and administrators with effective, usable (and understandable!) information. This strategy requires acknowledging the legitimate importance of others in the planning process as well as the need for a give and take attitude. It also requires an awareness of the fact that the heritage experts have something to offer: making use of our cultural heritage, both physically and as a source of inspiration, offers planners and designers an opportunity to develop a plan with added value" (Belvedere Memorandum 2000).

In this context, Reverse Archaeology serves archaeological knowledge the opportunity of having a broader practical application, away from the academic realm. It turns historic

knowledge acquired through archaeological digging as a source of architect's imagination for their developing projects. Thus as a source of inspiration for spatial planning and design, not only answers developer's objections of paying non-revenue items such as archaeological works, but also provides a practical tool for architects, planners, developers and administrators to achieve Dutch government Belvedere's strategy of integrating historic information into developing designs for those places where the archaeological site will not to be preserved after digging. The novelty is the methodology proposed: first, the front-desk decision-making process on which archaeological research topics are to be included when contracting a development project; secondly, the figure of the stakeholder.

Developers and the decision-making process

After few years of experience with post-Valetta policies and the Belvedere programme, the Missing Link analyzed today's Dutch situation and realized the gap in between research programs defined by the academics and the development practice, and I guess it is better to describe as the break between archaeology's interests and developer's aims. The argument is that historic knowledge is another "to-do"

element in the long list of things to do in order to get permissions for developing: there are worker's security and health rules, standards of quality production, municipal permissions, environmental issues to account, and archaeological works to finish. Historic knowledge is not seen as developer's interest as much as there is little philanthropic interest in the safety of the workers beside the fact that, at the end, an accident costs more than avoiding it. Developer's aim in a market-oriented context is lowering costs, and archaeology is a cost as much as keeping high health & security standards. Archaeologists need to be aware of this fact and thus to be realistic when discussing archaeological goals, proceeds and decisions taken with non-archaeologists. Developers are certainly not the enemy to win, but in a negotiation table all actors should know beforehand the perfectly licit professional aims of those sitting in front, with empathy but not losing your professional position. It is not surprising that developers are reluctant to pay for products that they do not see *useful*, so the proposal of including archaeological knowledge as a source of inspiration, of using cultural heritage as an added valued within the spatial plan, is actually an effective and efficient way to create a win-win situation. Or at least, a more satisfactory and comfortable working context for perishable archaeological sites. Nevertheless, I guess this

will not move developers to more responsible positions towards heritage; for this purpose a deeper public educational work is needed.

On the other hand, I am not sure whether the solution of this gap between two opposite professional interests comes by defining research topics according to developer's types of project, as it seems that Reverse Archaeology is proposing. As reported by the case studies, research topics are defined according to the type of today's developing equipment, i.e. modern mall = commerce in past times; flats & residences = life of people in the past. In doing so, it seems that Reverse Archaeology endows developer's investment in archaeological works by defining heritage research according to developing interests. Noticing both the lowest heritage conscience and the market-driven situation in developing practice, such praxis may put the quality of the archaeological research in a dangerous situation, or at least in a difficult position. One issue is to offer historical knowledge to inspire spatial planners (i.e. Belvedere), and another completely different is to address research to fulfill developer's inspiration because we may prostate archaeology in a situation where research is defined only by spatial planning interests and developer's aims & goals. Instead, to have both research topics defined by scientific agendas and professionals quality assurances outside the developer's company

goals, assures that archaeological companies may provide standard services with certain independence from the payer.

On stakeholders participation

However, the most interesting Reverse Archaeology's proposal, at least for Dutch archaeology so far, is the introduction of the topic on stakeholder's participation in heritage decision-making processes. As it is mentioned in the article, "Heritage management in the Netherlands is organized *top-down*, focusing primarily on spatial development and embedded in legislation that is imposed upon inhabitants and developers alike". This top-down process affects also other related elements: only archaeologists (and presumably, conservators) define which heritage has to be preserved and how it is going to be preserved. Architectonic projects, spatial planning and heritage management are only topics discussed and decided among professionals, while developers are those commissioned to execute the plan designed and the inhabitants those with the right to enjoy (or suffer!) the final outputs. This describes a common situation in most western countries where the weight of professionals groups (or lobbies) is heavy and where there is a long tradition of academic reigns.

Nevertheless, for the last decades another working process is changing the local management scenario of public affairs. The European Union, UNESCO and other United Nations institutes, even both World Social Forum and the World Bank, are today talking about local governance and the evolving roles of democracy and community participation. Thought "community" and "participation" do not mean the same depending on which organization is implementing these "new" forms of democracy. For example, governmental organisms are more comfortable with actions that allow the public to decide on local proposed solutions in polling stations. Instead, grass-rooted associations see this form participation as a weak (or fake), and advocate for community participation even in the definition of the problem to be solved, and on the solutions addressed and set up. Therefore, in this new democratic management scenario it is important to be clear on the definition of stakeholder participation and its consequences. First of all, it is necessary to define who is the "community": the final users or the technicians?; the community is a stakeholder or there is different stakeholders inside a community?; aren't lobbies already stakeholders?; isn't better to talk about citizens rather than stakeholders?; should we create (designate) stakeholders when necessary to oppose/balance other's stakeholders

opinions?; do we define stakeholders or are defined by themselves?. And after on "participation": does participation mean only having the possibility of opinion expressed publically?; aren't opinion polls, voting by ballot or interactive online enough?; are different levels of participation such as public, final-user, concerned citizen, technician, politician, etc. according to their particular agendas and the topic under discussion?, do participants participate all as simple citizens, or as an interested group?. And more interesting to debate here, which are the topics that may actually be discussed by stakeholders in The Netherlands: the archaeological research agenda, the design of development projects, or the local spatial planning policy? In consequence, there are clear differences in concepts such as local governance, stakeholder participation, and participatory democracy depending on the responsiveness and accountability of the process of decision-making.

In heritage management a "bottom to top" participation process had been developed with the so-called valued-based heritage management methods, such as the one developed at the Getty Conservation Institute (inherited from the 1979 Australia ICOMOS's Burra Charter -revised version 1999), and today world-wide used thanks both to ICCROM's works and teachings, and

UNESCO's recommendations. Valued-based heritage design is a route map on heritage management to be compiled by all interested parties in order to assure the preservation of the heritage's significance of a place. Stakeholders are involved as far it is acknowledge that heritage places have other values rather than self-evident historical or archaeological ones. It is to be assumed that the significance of places is beyond relevant archaeological research, and may mean to other people beyond professionals. Moreover stakeholders not only acknowledge all the values of the heritage place, but also take informed decision involving its management or the developing plans affecting its management. It is in this context that stakeholders participate in the definition of values and management priorities; values upon which the technicians are going to set the heritage management plan (including the developing plan), and all participants will account for results.

Reverses archaeology approach ensures the participation of concerned stakeholders, but the field of concern is just the selection of relevant archaeological research values to address the following up archaeological works and to transform them in a spatial planning inspiration. Even this grass-root mechanism is a novelty in the Dutch context, it is not comparable to the valued-based heritage management method because only embraces

the definition of archaeological research for non preserved sites, and not the full developing project affecting an archaeological site (see also, APPEAR project 2006). Reverse Archaeology seems just to answer a little element of heritage management: what we do with all this knowledge besides keeping it for the academic circuit, while enhancing certain degree of decision-process in the definition of research aims. Nevertheless, it is to desire that matters pointed out by Reverse Archaeology such as stakeholder participation and decision-making process will open a deeper discussion on the application of the methodology on value-based heritage management and stakeholder participation to the full Dutch heritage process, and moreover to spatial national policy-making.

Conclusions

Reverse archaeology is a tool to enrich the Dutch Belvedere strategy, and consequently it enriches one part of the heritage management process, that related to the outputs of research of non-preserved sites. It offers effective and efficient appliance of academic knowledge to public interests, i.e. spatial planning. Moreover, it introduces a management tool that answer last decade's Dutch action programs to promote alliances between spatial planning and culture, giving positive answers to developer's uncomfortable payer position after

the Valetta Convention. But because its range of application does not affect all the heritage management *cyclical process* (after Willems 1997), I would rather like not to cite it as a heritage management plan but as research knowledge management. On the other hand, methodologically it introduces the interesting topic of decision-making, moving it from the exclusively professional realm to the public or stakeholder sphere. However, because the article lacks more information and analysis on this “painstaking” stakeholder process and methodology, it seems (even wrongly!) that all this deliberation process is to give weight on the developer’s voice.

The Valetta Convention certainly had moved European archaeology from research to heritage management, but there is still a lack of management tools to enforce this swift. Tools that accomplish digging, preservation, development and social use of heritage for a 21st century society more interested in local governance and democratic procedures.

Valued-base management approaches on heritage and spatial planning are still not very much in use in European archaeology, probably because of the fear of academics on stakeholder’s voice. Willems (2009: 94-96) noticed the new archaeological subdiscipline shaped after Valetta, requiring first a change of attitude on public discussion on heritage matters. He mentions the developing of public communication and the ethical dimension in relation to local population, but also the need of a good stakeholder’s management. As far as participatory techniques are certainly not easy to command, and they require sociologists well versed both on dynamics of group and techniques of participatory democracy, it is the time thus to seriously add these techniques of social science into heritage management. It certainly will help to relocate not only the public dimension of archaeology but also the public participation in archaeology, and thus to blur fears on stakeholder’s capacity on decision-making, and the weight of their voices in the management of heritage resources.

REFERENCES CITED

Appear Project

2006 *The Appear method. A practical guide for the management of enhancement projects on urban archaeological sites*. Electronic document, http://www.in-situ.be/guide_en.pdf , accessed September 16, 2011

European Commission, Brussels

Belvedere Memorandum

2000 *Belvedere Memorandum*. Electronic document, <http://www.belvedere.nu/>, accessed September 16, 2011.

The Hague, Netherlands Government.

Deeben, Joos, Bert J. Groenewoudt, Daan P. Hallewas and Willems, Willem H.J.

1999 Proposals for a practical system of significance evaluation in archaeological heritage management. *European Journal of Archaeology* 2(2): 177-199.

Groenewoudt, Bert J. and Tom H.F. Bloemers

1997 Dealing with significance. Concepts, strategies, and priorities for archaeological heritage management in The Netherlands. In *Archaeological Heritage Management in The Netherlands. Fifty Years of State Service for Archaeological Investigations*, edited by Willem.J.H., Willems, Henk Kars, and Daan P. Hallewas, pp. 119 - 172. ROB-Van Gorcum, Assen.

Kristiansen, Kristian

2009 Contract archaeology in Europe: an experiment in diversity. *World Archaeology* 41(4): 641 – 648.

van den Dries, Monique H. & Willems, Willem J.H.

2007. Quality assurance in archaeology: the Dutch perspective. In *Quality Management in Archaeology*, edited by Willem J.H. Willems and Monique H. van den Dries, pp. 50 – 65. Oxbow, Oxford.

van Dockum, Saskia G. and Roel. C.G.M. Lauwerier

2004 Archaeology in the Netherlands 2002: The National Archaeological Review and Outlook. *European Journal of Archaeology*, 7(2): 109-124.

Waugh, Karen E.

2008 *Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe: The Netherlands. Archaeological Labour Market Intelligence Survey: 2007-2008*. Vestigia BV, Amersfoort.

Willems, Willem J.H.

2008 "Archaeological resource management and preservation. In *Preserving Archaeological Remains in situ. Proceedings of the 3rd Conference, 2006, Amsterdam*. (Geoarchaeological and Bioarchaeological Studies, 10), pp. 253-260, edited by Henk Kars and R.M. van Heeringen. Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

Willems, Willem J.H.

2009 Archaeological resource management and academic archaeology in Europe: some observations. In *Quale futuro per l'archeologia*, edited by Anna L. D'Agata and Silvia Alaura, pp. 89 - 99. Gangemi Editore, Roma.

Willems, Willem.J.H., Henk Kars and Daan P. Hallewas (editors)

1997 *Archaeological Heritage Management in The Netherlands. Fifty Years of State Service for Archaeological Investigations*. ROB-Van Gorcum, Assen.

About the Author

Laia Colomer, PhD in Prehistoric Archaeology (UAB, Barcelona) and MA in Public Archaeology (UCL, London), works as heritage manager and museum curator, currently coordinating the Born Project for the city of Barcelona (ICUB-Ajuntament de Barcelona). Her areas of professional expertise include are politics in archaeology, urban heritage management policies, the socio-economics of heritage activity, gender archaeology and prehistoric pottery technology.

Contact e-mail: laiacolomer@gmail.com