



## **European Archaeology Abroad** (Archaeological practices, Sub-theme II-D)

### **General presentation** **September 2008**

- 1 Background**
- 2 European Archaeology Abroad**
- 3 Scope**
- 4 Research Outline**
  - 4.1 Axis 1: Historic framework of European Archaeology Abroad**
    - 4.1.A Research Phases Axis 1
    - 4.1.B Planning overview Axis 1: 2008-10
    - 4.1.C Envisaged initial results for ACE session archaeology abroad at the EAA Conference 2010
  - 4.2 Axis 2: Contemporary and prospective frameworks of European Archaeology Abroad**
    - 4.2.A Research Phases Axis 2
    - 4.2.B Planning overview axis 1 and 2
- 5 Products Research Axis 1 & 2**

## 1 Background

As part of the ACE research theme 'Archaeological practices', subtheme II. D *European archaeology abroad* explores the impact and applicability of European policies and practice upon local circumstances in 'host countries' outside the respective national borders of European 'home countries'. It focuses in detail on how values and motivations in the socio-political context of European home countries change and impact in relation to dealing with archaeological resources and the interaction with (representatives) of the host country. The theme includes two main research axes, dealing with these issues in, respectively, a historical and a contemporary framework. The aim is to provide insights into an ethical and sustainable framework for undertaking archaeological heritage projects abroad, targeted at fostering benefits for archaeological resources and stakeholders alike.

## 2 European Archaeology Abroad

As a result of both the nature and history of international archaeological efforts, an important role is played by European heritage professionals and institutions in the research, management and development of archaeological sites around the world. Whilst archaeological heritage plays an important role in social, cultural and economic developments that influence people's identities and livelihoods in these countries, it is unfortunately the case that many stakeholders in the host country often remain alienated from the way their archaeological environments are managed and investigated. As such, an 'ethical' conduct of archaeological practice in such circumstances is becoming increasingly complicated.

Over the last few decades, ethical codes of conduct have appeared in Europe as a response to the professionalisation of the discipline and based upon the idea that contract archaeology can mediate the impacts of development and globalisation of the archaeological resources. However, the conduct of 'foreign' archaeology by European countries, especially in postcolonial contexts, is confronted with many other issues, such as indigenous claims to stewardship, public accountability, western hegemony in heritage management discourses, its relation to post-colonial and neo-colonial political realities, and the need to integrate its practice with wider heritage and development issues. In addition, the position of ethics within current archaeological practice is complicated even further because of the perceived differences between 'contract' and 'scientific' projects, and between sustainable spatial development and human development.

As such, questions arise regarding the impact and applicability of ethical frameworks and heritage discourses upon European archaeological practice and its interaction with communities and individuals in post-colonial contexts. Most ethical codes of conduct in Europe are at present formulated within national and intra-national contexts – but are the values and concepts behind these codes applicable to local circumstances in the host countries? How do current European professional standards and policies relate to ethical concerns in dealing with the legacy of specific European archaeologies? And how are the motivations and activities of European archaeologists influenced by the national and European socio-political frameworks in which they operate?

To assess the implications of these ethical considerations in foreign archaeology, one must start with historicizing and identifying the underlying theoretical notions and assumptions behind ethics and heritage thinking in the archaeological discourse, and with how these are translated into contemporary socio-political, theoretical and administrative frameworks of archaeology within Europe itself.

Acknowledging that archaeological conduct in foreign contexts has a range of different stakeholders with specific and socio-politically situated motivations and attitudes towards the process, it is fundamental to create an understanding of the different ways in which archaeological heritage and projects are valued and how these different values (which are subjective and changing, and often conflicting) interact. Only then can one hope to develop an ethical and sustainable framework for European archaeological abroad, targeted at fostering benefits for archaeological resources and stakeholders alike

### 3 Scope

- What are the historical and socio-political frameworks in which 'foreign' European archaeology is developed and utilized? What values and aspirations can be identified that drive foreign archaeology?
- What is the impact and applicability of archaeological heritage discourses and ethical frameworks on the operational level of European archaeological conduct abroad, both within historic and contemporary frameworks?
- What is the relationship with the needs and values of stakeholders in the host country?
- What lessons can be learned for a European postcolonial archaeology that seeks to foster sustainable benefits for heritage places and stakeholders alike?

### 4 Research Outline

**Note:** with 'archaeology abroad' we mean archaeological projects and fieldworks that have been undertaken in 'host countries' that are outside the current borders of the 'home country'. This can include countries outside Europe, former colonies, countries that were once part of the home country, and/or countries within European borders. After phase 1 we will focus on these (a)symmetrical links in more detail through dedicated case studies.

The research outline is divided in two research axes – 1: historical, and 2: contemporary – both of which follow phased approaches:

#### 4.1 Axis 1: Historic framework of European archaeology abroad

**Case studies:** All ACE countries

**Involvement:** All ACE partners

The first research axis is coordinated by Nina Schücker (RGK), Sonia Lévin (INRAP), Nathan Schlanger (INRAP) and Sjoerd van der Linde (Leiden University) and aims to develop a historical understanding of European archaeology abroad at the national level, building upon selected case studies from all ACE partners.

##### 4.1.A Research Phases Axis 1

###### 4.1.A.1 Phase 1.

[See the attached document "ACE-Theme IID-European Arch Abroad\\_Axis1-Questionnaire\\_sept2008"](#)

#### 4.1.A.2 Phase 2.

##### Leiden, RGK and INRAP

- Phase 2A Synthesise data of phase 1
- a. Indicate gaps in knowledge and encourage ACE partners that are not yet able to finish phase 1.
  - b. Identify interesting case studies within the theme Archaeology Abroad. Encourage ACE partners to work (with each other) on dedicated themes and comparative case studies in both the historic as well as the contemporary framework (see also axis 1).
- Phase 2B Establish a general historic overview of archaeology abroad, by focusing on a comparative historic frameworks for France, Germany and the Netherlands on the basis of the data of phase 1, with periodisations. Work out detailed questions on the degree of collaboration and interaction with the host country for the following countries:
- c. Host country which is a former colony or former part of home country (eg Carribean for the Netherlands and Northern Africa for France)
  - d. Host country where there is a long tradition in archaeological research by the home country on the basis of classical/religious/scientific interest (eg Jordan for the Netherlands)
  - e. Host country which doesn't fall under category 1 or 2, but where work has been initiated within the contemporary framework (eg Mali for the Netherlands)
  - f. Host country where all home countries have long archaeological links with to come to detailed comparisons in degrees of collaboration (on the basis of publication series etc), eg Egypt.
- Issues to focus on are cultural diplomacy policy frameworks, presences of local archaeologists, involvement of local communities, and publication policies (local authors and language).

Our main aim is here is to identify and compare how values and motivations in the socio-political context of the home country lead to changes in dealing with archaeological resources and representatives of the host country.

##### All ACE partners

- Phase 2A Continue with phase 01
- Phase 2B Work in collaboration with other ACE partners, on specific case studies within the theme Archaeology Abroad, eg. dedicated themes and comparative case studies in both the historic as well as the contemporary framework. Examples might include the impact of decolonisation on archaeology abroad in the home country, the impact of Malta archaeology in the home country on archaeology abroad, current policy frameworks on archaeology abroad and their impact upon local communities, current involvements in international development projects, conflicting values and motivations in the management of archaeological sites and projects, presences of local archaeologists, involvement of local communities, publication policies (local authors and language), etc.

Our main aim is here is to identify and compare how values and motivations in the socio-political context of the home country lead to changes in dealing with archaeological resources and representatives of the host country.

#### 4.1.B Planning overview Axis 1: 2008-10

##### Summer 2008

- draft of phase 1A institutional overview Germany, France and Netherlands
- Leiden, INRAP, RGK

##### End 2008

- phase 1A institutional overview other ACE countries - all ACE partners
- phase 1B bibliographies archaeology abroad - all ACE partners

##### 2009/2010

- phase 2 Selected case studies – all ACE partners
- phase 2 European historical overview - Leiden, INRAP, RGK

##### 2010

- Present results at EAA conference at The Hague 2010 – ACE
- See 4.1.4

##### 2011/12

- Expand on phase 2, and contribute to synthesis – all
- Integrate research axis 1 and 2 – Leiden, INRAP, RGK

#### 4.1.C Envisaged initial results for ACE session archaeology abroad at the EAA Conference 2010

- Historical and contemporary overview of national frameworks and institutions implicated in archaeology abroad for a range of ACE countries (all)
- General historic overview of European archaeology abroad
- Detailed historic comparison of changing values in archaeology abroad for France, Germany and the Netherlands. Identification and comparison of how values and motivations in the socio-political context of European home countries lead to changes in dealing with archaeological resources and representatives of the host country.
- Detailed case studies on a range of themes and topics by ACE partners, both within historic and contemporary frameworks.

## 4.2 Axis 2: Contemporary and prospective frameworks of European Archaeology abroad

**Case studies:** Netherlands, supported by case studies from axis 1

**Involvement:** Leiden, supported by partners implicated in case studies from axis 1

The second research axis is coordinated by Sjoerd van der Linde (Leiden) and deals with an analysis of current and prospective frameworks of improved collaborations between European archaeology and the countries, colleagues and communities where they practice. The focus is here mainly on the Netherlands. This axis will provide a theoretical framework for axis 1, but will also focus in detail at the local level, and as such can be seen as the 'parent' framework.

The proposed research takes a phased approach. By delving deeper into the question of how the objectives and activities of heritage professionals and operators are influenced by the legal, cultural and socio-political frameworks in which they operate (Theoretical and National Level), detailed conclusions will be drawn for a selection of projects in post-colonial contexts (Operational Level) and the way in which these interact with local communities (Local Level). Subsequently, more general conclusions will be given on the Operational and National level for the case study of the Netherlands, which will be critically compared to the Historic European level, so that potential European policy implications at the Political Level might be given.

#### 4.2.A Research Phases Axis 2

Since the research approach of axis 2 is considered to be the parent framework, the below phased approach of axis 2 will also show how research elements of axis 1 are integrated. The research phases are currently as follows:

##### **- Research phase 01 – Theoretical level**

To investigate how dominant values within European AHM discourses relate to ethical concerns over postcolonial archaeological practices.

Focus: European archaeology and policies in a global context

##### **- Research phase 02 - European historical level**

To develop a historical analysis of the institutional frameworks related to archaeology abroad in different European countries

Focus: All ACE countries, with a special focus on the Netherlands, France and Germany

##### **- Research phase 03 - Contemporary national level –**

To identify and historicize the contemporary legal, political and institutional frameworks of values in archaeological heritage discourses in several European countries,

Focus: The Netherlands (with France, Germany and possibly other case studies from ACE countries)

##### **- Research phase 04 – Operational level**

To assess how dominant values and frameworks shape the objectives, activities and perceived responsibilities of practitioners in post-colonial contexts.

Critical discourse analysis in Netherlands

##### **- Research phase 05 – Foreign/Local level**

To investigate how European objectives and values in projects relate to those of national and regional stakeholders, set against a background aim of fostering benefits for local communities and heritage resources alike.

Focus: The Dutch abroad

- case studies in Curacao, Mali and Jordan

##### **- Research phase 06 – European level**

To contextualize the lessons learnt for a Dutch postcolonial archaeological conduct in light of International and European comparative practices and policies

##### **- Research phase 07 – Theoretical/’Political’ level**

To propose an ethical and sustainable framework for European archaeological conduct in postcolonial contexts, targeted at fostering benefits for archaeological resources and stakeholders alike

## 5 Products Research Axis 1 & 2

### 2010: **ACE Session on Archaeology Abroad at EAA conference in Netherlands**

- Historical and contemporary overview of national frameworks and institutions implicated in archaeology abroad for a range of ACE countries
- General historic overview of European archaeology abroad
- Detailed historic comparison of changing values in archaeology abroad for France, Germany and the Netherlands. Identification and comparison of how values and motivations in the socio-political context of European home countries lead to changes in dealing with archaeological resources and representatives of the host country.
- Detailed case studies on a range of themes and topics by ACE partners, both within historic and contemporary frameworks.

2012: **Research Report 'European Archaeology Abroad'** – with recommendations and potential policy implications (*towards an ethical and sustainable framework for undertaking archaeological projects in postcolonial contexts*). This will combine results of research axis 1 and 2. Research axis 2 will consist of the PhD thesis of Sjoerd van der Linde.

### 2008-2012: **website updates, conferences, papers.**

e.g.: paper in CMAS, paper at WAC Dublin 2008, SAA, EAA, PanAF etc..

2008-2010: **The Heritage Handbook.** Research axis 1 and 2 will contribute the relevant elements at the Heritage Handbook, which will be developed under Theme II *comparative practices in Europe – legal, administrative and financial frameworks.*

Sjoerd J. van der Linde <s.j.van.der.linde@arch.leidenuniv.nl>