



Report on the Inaugural Meeting of Challenges for European Archaeology of the Europae Archaeologiae Consilium at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, France, on 25 and 26 November 1999

Report on the Inaugural Meeting of the Europae Archaeologiae Consilium at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg France, on 25 and 26 November 1999

Challenges for European Archaeology

Report on the Inaugural Meeting of the Europae Archaeologiae Consilium at the Council of Europe
in Strasbourg, France, on 25 and 26 November 1999

editor

Willem J.H. Willems

Zoetermeer 2000



Contents

Preface	5
W.J.H. Willems	
Introduction	7
A. Olivier	
The Europae Archaeologiae Consilium	13
W.J.H. Willems	
A Strategic Plan for the EAC	19
F. Lüth, A. Olivier, W.J.H. Willems & K. Wollák	
The role and significance of archaeology in the integrated Europe of the 21st century	27
Z. Visy	
L'archéologie et le Conseil de l'Europe	33
R. Weber	
Heritage for all	37
A. Howarth CBE MP	
The management of the archaeological heritage	45
F. van der Ploeg	
A future for European Archaeology	53
G. Wainwright MBE FSA	

1 • The EAC-Board and speakers at the inaugural meeting on 25 November 1999 in Strasbourg. From left to right: professor G. Söchtlone (Italy), professor W.J.H. Willens (Netherlands), dr. A. Olivier (UK), A. Howarth (Minister for the Arts of the UK), R. Weber (Director General of the CoE), dr. K. Mollak (Hungary) and dr. F. Lüth (Germany).



Preface

Willem J.H. Willems

On 25 November 1999, the *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium* (EAC) came into existence at an Inaugural Meeting in Strasbourg, France, at the Council of Europe. The event was attended by the directors and many representatives of the organisations charged by law with the management of the archaeological heritage from most of the European countries. The EAC is intended to be their forum for discussion and co-operation at the European level. Significantly, however, the event was also attended by several ministers responsible for the cultural heritage in their countries and by representatives from the Council of Europe and the European Union.

This political interest clearly demonstrates the changing role of archaeology – and especially the management of the archaeological heritage – all over Europe. In many countries, new and greatly improved legislation on archaeological resources is currently being implemented, in many cases as a result of the ratification of the revised European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, better known as the Malta Convention.

It is evident that the successful management of our archaeological heritage depends not only on such improvements, but also on many other factors such as integration with the processes of spatial planning, interaction with official policies on agriculture, urban development or infrastructure, and public benefit. All these areas are increasingly influenced by pan-European developments and, for countries of the European Union, by EU legislation and policy, and it is vital that heritage managers across Europe work together to discuss issues of mutual concern in a pan-European context. This has been the reason for founding the EAC, in order to open a forum for co-operation at an official level, in addition and complementary to the activities of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA).

The Board of the EAC has decided to publish the speeches delivered at the Inaugural Meeting, because they will undoubtedly be of interest to a wider audience than that present in Strasbourg. In addition, this publication includes the EAC's strategic plan, which was adopted at the meeting. The papers delivered on 26 November at the first 'European Heritage Management Symposium', on the subject of the archaeological heritage management of wetlands, will be published as a separate book.

Acknowledgements

The inaugural meeting of the EAC and this book are the result of the efforts of many people. I would like to thank especially the following persons: W. Elbert (Council of Europe), J.-K. Hagers and Mrs. A. van den Burg (Dutch State Archaeological Service) for their help in preparing the event, mr. Stefan Zintel (Staatliches Konservatoramt Saarbrücken) who took the photographs in Strasbourg, H. Cleere (Icomos) and A. Olivier (English Heritage and EAC president) for their help in editing, and L. Wijnhoven (OCenW) for his help in the production of this book.

Zoetermeer, 23 March 2000



Introduction

Adrian Olivier



In 1997, in his address to the annual conference of the United Kingdom Institute of Field Archaeologists, Willem Willems set out the case for an association of organisations that are legally responsible for archaeological heritage management at the national level. Although the need for such an organisation was clear, Willems expressed some doubts about its viability; he was particularly concerned about how long it might take to establish effective and efficient co-operation, or indeed whether such an idea could work in practice. The collective power of such an association, and the influence that it might wield on behalf of the cultural heritage, is obvious. Whether professional archaeologists working in Europe share sufficiently similar views about the challenges facing our discipline during the next decade, to rise above local concerns and exploit that collective potential was, however, a question that could not be answered in 1997.

Today, these challenges are very familiar to archaeologists working as heritage managers in regional and national governments or in non-governmental organisations. A number of fundamental issues form a critical and central part of wide-ranging political agendas and policies being set for the new millennium, which will have a far-reaching impact on how we perceive our collective cultural heritage, and how we manage it for the benefit of all.

Resources available to the cultural heritage have always been, and always will be, significantly lower than perceived needs. For many years, archaeologists in Europe have used various mechanisms to establish priorities for their work. Such mechanisms deploy many different selection criteria according to local or national circumstances in order to judge the merits of particular activities. In English Heritage these include, for example, the contribution work makes to the public benefit by advancing understanding, securing conservation, supporting research, promoting public appreciation and enjoyment, supporting local knowledge and expertise, and supporting the needs of the archaeological discipline. However they are expressed, such mechanisms must always remain flexible and appropriate in local, regional, and national contexts. Today, heritage managers are increasingly having to operate in a transnational context, and must in future consider their work more often within an evolving framework of Europe-wide values. Establishing a consistent approach to questions of European significance will emphasise the importance of our common heritage but will also help to express the value of cultural diversity, as well as helping to make better and more effective use of available resources.

There are already many different networks of archaeologists and heritage managers working on the European and world-wide stage, but if we are to rise to the challenges facing us, we must continue to broaden not just individual but organisational perspectives and horizons. Despite the easy and informal international fellowship of archaeologists in evidence at so many meetings and conferences, there is still a need to develop simple, effective, and lasting mechanisms for future co-operation in the sphere of heritage management. This is not just a matter of establishing better Information and Communication Technology networks (although this is critically important if organisations are to realise the potential advantages of better communication across the length and breadth of the Continent), but of developing lasting and meaningful co-operation between partners working in cultural heritage management. The development of common approaches to subjects of mutual interest such as urban and rural landscapes, science-based archaeology, education and outreach, and project development, will be of immense benefit to all. Existing mechanisms for such partnerships already exist (sharing experience by staff exchange and exploiting education and training programmes), but have yet to make a major impact on our work, and require a more structured mechanism for co-operation than has existed hitherto.

As we develop better mechanisms to manage the archaeological resource and to protect our cultural heritage, so we need to develop a much better understanding of the nature of that resource in order to inform decisions about its conservation and presentation. Management




2 • President A. Olivier presents the certificate of honorary membership to professor G. Mainwright, the former chief archaeologist of English Heritage.

research is needed to respond to specific threats and damage so that we can take a proactive role as ‘champions’ of the cultural heritage. As we begin to operate in an increasingly pan-European context, it becomes necessary to reconsider our approaches to concepts of importance and significance. Decisions by cultural heritage managers working in the planning environment (whether locally, regionally, or nationally) always relate to notions of perceived importance. Our knowledge of sites and monuments, however, is more often biased towards those at the top of site hierarchies (generally those which are structure and artefact rich), and much more care needs to be given to ensure that the significance of other parts of the archaeological record is not overlooked.

We are all justly proud of advances in the methods and techniques of archaeology, which allow us to extract far more information from our source material than has previously been possible. However, the exponential increase in archaeological data is not without its own dangers, as it becomes increasingly difficult to assimilate ever-increasing volumes of information into our thinking - and more importantly to underpin the better care of the archaeological resource. We must work together to develop realistic European-wide solutions to this problem to ensure that the recording, analysis, and publication of archaeological material not only increases our understanding of the past, but also feeds into and articulates more directly with the process of cultural heritage management.

Although national organisations for the care and protection of ancient monuments have existed in most European countries since the nineteenth century, the concept of proactive heritage management is relatively new. The techniques and methodologies available to heritage managers are undergoing a constant process of development and discovery in different contexts across the world. There is a critical need for systematic research into appropriate management techniques to inform day to day decisions about the preservation, management, and presentation of the cultural heritage resource. The array of available techniques is growing all the time. We must ensure that organisations (and individual managers) throughout Europe are properly equipped with as extensive an armoury as possible, so that we can all respond with confidence to the numerous pressures which threaten to damage the archaeological resource.

2 • *Waiting for the meeting to start. From left to right: Dr. H. Koschik (Germany, Rheinland), professor S. von Schurbein (Germany, Römisch-Germanische Kommission), professor G. de Boe (Belgium, Vlaanderen), dr. I. Plumier (Belgium, Wallonie), dr. R. Ten Carné (Spain, Catalunya).*



It is particularly vital that we articulate better the relationship between the management of the resource through the planning process and our underlying research objectives. It is universally accepted that appropriate research values should underpin all archaeological work. It is important to ensure that the reciprocal relationship between research output and fieldwork functions properly - research and fieldwork must be made mutually relevant if the dangers of developing gulfs within the discipline are to be overcome. Cultural heritage resource managers must work together to ensure the identification and implementation of research objectives in developer led fieldwork, and persuade commercial concerns of their responsibilities in this sphere. We will only succeed in our management objectives and advance our real understanding of the local, regional, national, and transnational resource if we work proactively to find collective solutions to the various problems which we all face.

Archaeology in Europe today is in a healthy and strong position. Our conservation legislation and developing policies, methods and techniques are increasingly sophisticated and are highly regarded throughout the world. As we work more frequently on the international stage, in a pan-European and indeed global context, it is essential that we continue to recognise the need to develop a transnational framework not just for the practical mechanisms of cultural heritage resource management, but also for the underlying research objectives of our discipline. To this end we need to encourage collaborative arrangements and partnerships across Europe, connected with local networks that are the essential components of a research culture, so that we create for ourselves an appropriate European context to promote research as a statement of what is valuable to the archaeological community.

In the context of the cultural objectives of the European Union there are any number of suitable themes for collaborative international research within a European framework, and we need to encourage the development of such projects with practical measures of support. We must also develop national and international strategies to convert the results of such research into coherent and achievable conservation strategies. In this way, we can make the long-term objectives of our discipline sustainable, and ensure that the results of our endeavours have a practical application and relevance to the wider political issues of social inclusion (a heritage for all) and regeneration (modernisation through heritage).

The gestation of the *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium* over the past two years has been an extremely interesting period. Even within the small and like-minded membership of the Provisional Board it is clear that the same views are not shared on many of the issues that we will have to face. Indeed,

in some instances the board members could not even agree on what should be considered as 'archaeology'. This pluralism and diversity of opinion is of course absolutely essential for the continuing health and well being of our discipline, and long may it persist! In coming years there will be many more debates within the *Consilium* about where the boundaries and borders of our ever-changing discipline are, and how we will deal with the challenges that confront us. However, despite, or perhaps because of our diversity, the Board has been single-minded in its willingness to discuss relevant (and sometimes difficult) issues, and in its determined co-operation to find common ground that will unite our endeavours.

The inaugural meeting of the *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium* was without doubt one of the most significant events in the history of cultural heritage management for many years. We were extremely privileged that our first meeting was attended in person by Mr A. Howarth (Minister for the Arts, the United Kingdom), Professor Dr Z. Visy (Deputy Secretary of State for Culture, Hungary), and Monsieur R. Weber (Director for Culture and Cultural Heritage, the Council of Europe), who all gave important key-note speeches to mark this auspicious occasion. A fourth address was delivered on behalf of Dr R. van der Ploeg (Secretary of State for Culture, the Netherlands), who unfortunately was unable to attend on the day.

During the course of the proceedings we were also extremely pleased to honour the outstanding contribution made by Dr G. Wainwright (the former Chief Archaeologist of English Heritage) to the development of cultural heritage management by installing him as the first Honorary Member of the *Consilium*. Throughout his career Dr Wainwright has been a tireless champion for the cause of European archaeology, and his achievements speak for themselves. Certainly, without his unstinting commitment and support, the labour and birth of the *Consilium* would have been much more prolonged and difficult. To mark this occasion Dr. Wainwright delivered a keynote address on A Future for European Archaeology.

The final element of the inaugural meeting was a symposium on the Archaeological heritage management of the wetlands, which reviewed the nature of the management problems facing archaeologists throughout Europe working in this particular environment. Speakers showed that although there are clear similarities in the wetland archaeological resource, the critical issues relating to its management vary considerably from region to region. This provides the *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium* with an immediate and most appropriate objective. We intend to publish an extended collection of papers related to this topic as a 'body of evidence' to be submitted to the forthcoming reconsideration of the RAMSAR convention. In this way we will be taking positive steps to ensure that in future appropriate archaeological considerations are properly integrated with the concerns of the natural environment in the management of wetland habitats.

All the key-note speeches delivered during the course of the inaugural meeting are published here in full, together with a brief history of the development of the organisation from its earliest and informal beginnings, and a summary of our strategic plan. We believe that the foundation of the *Consilium* marks a major milestone in the development and growing maturity of our discipline, and that the papers contained here will be of considerable interest to colleagues throughout the Continent. That so many organisations concerned with cultural heritage management in so many countries were represented at our inaugural meeting in Strasbourg, is testament to the need for such an organisation, and to our determination to make a lasting and positive contribution to the conservation and management of our collective cultural heritage.

- 1 • Dr. A. Olivier is Head of Archaeological Policy at English Heritage, UK.
- 2 • W.J.H. Willems, *The future of European archaeology*, Oxbow Lecture 3, Oxford 1997, 14-5.
- 3 • Willems, W J H, 'Europae Archaeologiae Consilium', *The European Archaeologist* 11, 1999, 7-8.



The Europae Archaeologiae Consilium

Willem J.H. Willems ¹



The agenda for the meeting of the *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium* in Strasbourg on 25 November 1999 includes an item on the 'history of the association'. Although at first sight this is curious for an inaugural meeting, the formation of the EAC has been the result of a long process, which goes back a decade.²

The roots of the EAC lie in 1988 and 1989, when the Council of Europe convened a Committee of Experts to work on a revision of the outdated European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (London 1969). This committee, under the chairmanship of dr. Gustav Trotzig from the Swedish *Riksentvarieämbetet*, consisted largely of directors or senior officials from national organisations for archaeological heritage management and leading European archaeologists such as professor Geoffrey Wainwright from the UK and professor Marc Gautier from France.

The need for a new convention arose from developments during the 1980's, when it was increasingly realised that the management of the heritage needed to be placed in the context of town and country planning procedures. Through the discussions in the committee, all of us that were involved in its work learned a great deal from each other and from the experiences we all brought from our own work at home. It became very clear during the 3 year drafting process of what was to become the Malta Convention, that there was a lot we could continue to learn by pooling our experience. We realised that, while legal systems are different, solutions that work in one country can be useful to another, and also that theoretical and methodological advances in heritage management or knowledge about successful policies, were not as easily distributed as the results of academic work in archaeology. In short, it was concluded on several occasions that we should come together and discuss such matters.

Although the need was felt, no immediate further steps were taken to organise regular meetings, in part because work in the context of the Council of Europe continued in connection with the decision to start the 'Bronze Age campaign'. This was meant primarily as a campaign to raise public awareness of a common European heritage. The reason to choose the Bronze Age as a theme came out of the rather curious decision that knowledge about the Bronze Age was sufficiently vague to make it truly pan-European, while at the same time this was the earliest period from which attractive finds were available from all over Europe. Vikings, Slavs or Romans were considered unsuitable because they would not convey the sense of a common heritage.

Although this campaign was not primarily about heritage management, contacts continued at its margin in the years from 1993 to 1995. Following informal discussions on a boat-trip on the Danube in 1994, in which several heads of national services participated, two initiatives were taken to set up some form of regular contact that would be independent of other activities. In 1995, Prof. D. Planck – the president of the German *Landesarchäologen*, invited his colleagues to a meeting in Stuttgart, but this meeting never took place because of timetable problems. However, that same year the Norwegian *riksantikvar*, Dr. Øivind Lunde, succeeded in organising a round table at the first Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) in Santiago de Compostella, Spain.

This was in fact the first meeting of what was to become the EAC. Many countries were represented there, and all felt the need to set up a regular meeting. As dr. Lunde left his office that same year, I was asked to take over the organisation of Round Tables, which continued to take place in the context of the Annual Meeting of the EAA. A mixed group of representatives from between 15 to as many as 21 different countries met in 1996 in Riga, 1997 in Ravenna and 1998 in Gothenburg. These Round Tables were used to exchange all sorts of information on relevant themes, and to discuss in detail how we might achieve closer and more structured co-operation to serve the needs of all the national archaeological heritage management organisations.



4 • EAC-secretary professor W. Willems (Netherlands) showing to the Consilium a recent Polish publication on archaeological heritage management in Europe. On the right is the Hungarian deputy state Secretary of Culture, the archaeologist dr. Zsolt Visky.

In 1997, all directors from neighbouring countries were invited to Germany, to a colloquium connected to the Annual Meeting of the German State Archaeologists (Verband der Landesarchäologen) in Saarbrücken.³ On the basis of discussion there, the subsequent Round Table in Ravenna later that year decided to set up a formal organisation. Informal meetings were considered to be not effective enough in the face of the unification process in Europe, and it was realised that structured co-operation requires an infrastructure (secretariat etc.) to do the necessary preparatory work and to implement any decision taken. After all, one of the dilemmas ever since the first meetings in the late 1980's had been that, for co-operation to be effective, many activities have to involve the directors themselves, but they are also the people which have least time to spare. The example provided by the German colleagues, who have always needed to co-ordinate their work at the federal level because of the cultural autonomy of the German states, was accepted as a suitable organisational model. This concluded the discussion about continuing informal meetings in the context of the EAA, although it was realised that the new organisation should be complementary to the EAA. The EAA provides a forum for all archaeologists in Europe, but it is an association of individuals. Because its members represent the official national organisations charged by law with the management of the archaeological heritage, the EAC can work where the EAA is less effective and vice versa.⁴ The EAC may contribute to the implementation of some of the initiatives taken by the EAA, such as the code of practice or the principles of conduct for contract work, and the EAA can follow up on EAC-initiatives by political lobbying at the European level.

After Ravenna, the informal Round Table thus became an association in the process of formation. Financial support was provided by the Netherlands Ministry of Culture, English Heritage, the Dutch State Archaeological Service ROB, the German Landesarchäologen, and from Duchás, the Irish Heritage Service, and helped to establish a secretariat at the ROB in Amersfoort. The following year, preparations were made to find the most suitable formal structure for the new organisation and statutes were drafted. A provisional board (committee) was formed, with members from France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Poland and the Netherlands. At the invitation of its director, professor Sigmar von Schnurbein, this group met at one of the most important centres of European Archaeology, the Römisch Germanische Kommission in Frankfurt.

5 • A view of the meeting room. From left to right on the front row: Dr. D. Jankovich-Bécsai (Hungary), Dr. M. Rubinowicz (Poland), Mrs. H. van der Linden (the Netherlands), professor D. Planck (Germany), Mrs. Dr. C. Farka (Austria). On the right hand side part of the UK delegation: Dr. R. Avent (Wales) and Dr. D. Miles (England).



This preparatory work proved to be sufficient to be able to take the next step at the Round Table in Gothenburg,⁵ Sweden, in 1998. There, the decision was taken to adopt the legal form of an ‘International not-for-profit Association’ under Belgian law, because as yet no international (EU) legal form exists. A provisional board was elected, in which I was succeeded as president by Dr. Olivier from English Heritage, taking up the role of secretary myself, while Dr. Lüth from the Landesamt für Bodendenkmalpflege in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern took up the task of treasurer. The provisional board was completed by Prof. Scichilone from the Italian Ufficio Centrale per i Beni Archeologici, Architettonici, Artistici e Storici and Mrs. Dr. Wollák from the Hungarian Cultural Heritage Directorate. In view of continuing discussions about language, a decision was taken to choose a Latin name for the association, which was to be called ‘Europae Archaeologiae Consilium’ (EAC), to avoid different acronyms in modern languages. CENPO, the Centre of European not-for-profit Organisations in Brussels was enlisted to assist with the drafting of the statutes, which had to conform to the Belgian legal system.

At this meeting, the objectives and aims of the EAC were also agreed upon, and the provisional board was charged with the task of drafting a strategic plan.⁶ In March 1999, the draft statutes were signed by members of the provisional board to be submitted to the Belgian Ministry of Justice and in June the final statutes were submitted for approval by Royal decree, which was gazetted in October 1999. At long last, in November 1999, the inaugural meeting of the Europae Archaeologiae Consilium was held in Strasbourg, hosted by the Council of Europe.

I am very grateful to all who have helped to bring this about,⁷ and I am sure it will prove to have been an important step for European archaeology.

The reason for starting the EAC was the need we all felt, for closer and more structured

co-operation and exchange of information in a rapidly changing Europe. In all European countries archaeological heritage management is a legal concern of the state based on scientific research. It is quite evident, however, that a successful management of archaeological resources also depends on other factors, such as its public benefit and its integration in processes of spatial planning and the degree to which interaction with policies on agriculture, infrastructure, urban development and the like, can be established.

It is precisely in these fields, which are vital to modern heritage management that, through the process of unification in Europe, the national level is increasingly influenced by pan-European developments and for countries of the European Union by EU-legislation and recommendations. Therefore, and although the cultural autonomy of states in Europe is well protected, archaeological heritage management is - and will in the future be even more strongly - affected by the European level. Influencing these developments is of crucial importance, and can more effectively be done by co-operating institutes for archaeological heritage management that have a legal task and position. To influence developments at a European scale, not just formal co-operation is required. Fruitful co-operation entails active discussion of relevant topics and an exchange of ideas. I sincerely hope the EAC will prove to be an adequate forum for all of this, and I congratulate us all with its creation.

- 1 • Professor W.J.H. Willems is Director for archaeological heritage management, Netherlands Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and former director of the Dutch State Archaeological Service.
- 2 • See also F. Lüth, A.Olivier & W. Willems: Europas Landesarchäologen rücken zusammen, *Archäologie in Deutschland* 2, 2000, 4 - 5.
- 3 • The proceedings of the colloquy "Archäologische Denkmalpflege im vereinten Europa: Situation – Probleme – Ziele" have been published in the *Archäologisches Nachrichtenblatt* 3.2, 1998.
- 4 • See also W.J.H. Willems, Archaeology and heritage management in Europe, trends and developments, *European Journal of Archaeology* 1.3, 1998, 293-311.
- 5 • See W.J.H. Willems, Europae Archaeologiae Consilium, *The European Archaeologist* 12, 1999, 7-8.
- 6 • This has been included below in abbreviated form.
- 7 • In addition to the individuals already mentioned, I should name four more: Mr. D. Théron and especially his successor dr. W. Elbert from the Council of Europe's Cultural Heritage Department, who have provided support and helpful advise since 1994, Mr. D. Wedgwood from CENPO, who agreed to become the Belgian board-member required by the statutes, and in particular Drs. J.-K. Hagers from the ROB, who has manned the secretariat since 1998 and does so much of the essential preparatory work.



A Strategic Plan for the EAC

Friedrich Lüth¹, Adrian Olivier, Willem J.H. Willems & Katalin Wollák²

The primary mission of the *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium* is to support the management of the archaeological heritage throughout Europe and to serve the needs of national archaeological heritage management agencies by providing a forum for organisations to establish closer and more structured co-operation and exchange of information.

Membership of the Council is open to all national bodies charged with the management of the archaeological heritage throughout Europe, including where appropriate agencies in a federal context (e.g. German *Länder*, Spanish Autonomous Regions etc). Membership is corporate rather than individual and subscriptions will follow the contribution system employed by the Council of Europe. Each member state is to contribute to the EAC's target budget according to the percentage share of that country's contribution to the Council of Europe.



6 • A corridor chat: mrs. L. Krusínová (Czech Republic), left, in conversation with EAC vice-president mrs. K. Woliák (Hungary), centre, and director M. Rubnikowicz (Poland), right.

Aims and objectives

The aims and objectives of the council are:

- to promote the exchange of information and co-operation between the bodies charged by law with the management of the archaeological heritage of the countries of Europe;
- to provide archaeological heritage management agencies with a forum for discussion and exchange of information;
- to assist working towards common goals and to act as a monitoring and advisory body on all issues relevant to the management of the archaeological heritage in Europe (particularly in relation to the European Union and the Council of Europe);
- to promote the management, protection, scientific interpretation, publication, presentation, and public enjoyment and understanding of the archaeological heritage in Europe;
- to work together with other bodies which share its aims;
- to watch over, and act for, the well-being of archaeology, in Europe and anywhere in the world.

The Consilium intends to develop mechanisms to help its members achieve these objectives. It will set up an information service to co-ordinate information about European Union and Council of Europe programmes and projects. We intend to provide access to information about heritage management practices throughout Europe by creating a forum for the discussion and exchange of information through mailings, regular meetings, an annual heritage management symposium, a web site, and appropriate publications. The Consilium will provide a single co-ordinated voice to speak out on specific issues that impact on archaeological heritage management, and to influence the development of policies by European agencies. We will develop strong links to enable joint transnational projects on specific and relevant research themes and transfrontier development plans and infrastructure.

We will establish links with international and national Institutes of Professional Archaeology, and associated special interest groups and associations. The work of the EAC and the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) is complementary. The activities of the EAC are restricted to the field of heritage management, whilst the EAA has broader aims; the EAC will undoubtedly contribute to the implementation of various EAA initiatives.

Key themes

Four key themes have been identified which follow the EAC aims and objectives, and we will develop mechanisms (including the establishment of special working groups) to advance our interests in each of these spheres:

Political

There is a need to express the values of archaeological heritage management in a political context, in order to ensure that its concerns are properly articulated. This must be achieved by influencing the development of pan-European policies and ensuring awareness, at the highest levels of European structures, of the impact of new policies on the archaeological heritage.

Social

There is a need to express forcefully the social value of archaeology, and to raise awareness of that value with the public. We must explore and promote the contribution that archaeology makes to improving the general quality of life, and to increase the understanding of this process with national, regional, and local government and with the public at large.

Professional

There is a need to promulgate consistent standards in the field of archaeological heritage management, particularly relating to issues of quality and quality management and other practical issues of general concern to the EAC (including illegal excavation and the illegal trade in antiquities).

Academic

There is a need to develop a broader understanding of the archaeological resource in a European context, exploring common subjects of particular concern (trade, housing, pottery etc). We will advance and enable pan-European research programmes by developing mechanisms (with appropriate partners) to promote training, networking, and information exchange.

Critical policy issues

The EAC has already identified a wide range of critical policy issues that are of direct concern to its membership.

Political influence and response

We need to create an active mechanism (such as a think-tank) to develop and co-ordinate a collective political response on specific issues (for example the impact of 'Agenda 2000' on archaeological heritage management), and to influence the development of various EU policies and programmes.

Social awareness

We need to explore and emphasise the contribution that archaeology makes to the development of a common European cultural identity, and to demonstrate how archaeology contributes to cultural identity, cultural context, and quality of life. We need to be able to identify and promote features and monuments of European significance and relevance, as a means upholding the public and social aspirations of the EAC. We intend to set up pan-European mechanisms to develop education and outreach programmes that are specifically designed to raise public awareness of the importance of the archaeological heritage, and increase public understanding, enjoyment, and support for the heritage. We need to identify and encourage specific awareness programmes that will contribute to all these objectives across Europe (linked public events and exhibitions on European themes, and European Heritage days).

Professional, methodological, and technical infrastructure

We must continue to develop a coherent theory and philosophy for the management, care, and protection of the archaeological heritage. At the same time we should examine different approaches to the implementation of the Malta Convention, in different countries, and encourage, where necessary, the use of more consistent procedures across Europe. There is a need to development European-wide standards in the practice of archaeology as it relates to archaeological heritage management and we should agree and promulgate appropriate guidelines and quality assurance mechanisms, to ensure a broadly consistent approach. The development and implementation of professional ethics and the associated development of common policies to counter illegal excavation and illegal trade in antiquities are particularly significant issues facing the discipline today. It is also important to develop common approaches and methodologies for the identification, recording, management, and protection, of pan-European components of the archaeological resource, including those that may be especially vulnerable to natural erosion or transnational development pressures resulting from the policies or programmes of the European Union. We must also pay particular attention to the dissemination of information about relevant technical developments across Europe, the identification of particular training needs in different regions and countries, and the provision of appropriate training by developing pan-European courses, secondments, staff exchanges etc.

Academic

It will be important to establish an efficient network for information exchange on relevant topics. The identification and establishment of infrastructure projects that will increase understanding of the pan-European resource will contribute to the positive management of that resource (e.g. linking local regional or national databases on specific topics to create pan-European reference collections). European-wide programmes to understand aspects of the more recent archaeological resource that are particularly relevant to the shared European archaeological heritage and which are vulnerable to development pressures (e.g. Industrial, Military, and 20th century archaeology) will be an especially effective means of extending the immediacy and accessibility of the heritage.

Operations

The Annual General Assembly of the Consilium executes the legal responsibilities of the EAC as expressed in the statutes. The Annual meeting of the Consilium takes decisions on all matters not reserved to the competence of the General Assembly within the framework expressed in the internal regulations. The Board will meet regularly to implement the decisions of the Consilium.

An Annual Heritage Management Symposium will be held to discuss and disseminate information on subjects of general interest to the membership.

Special working groups will be established to explore key policy issues and specific themes and topics (some of which are summarised above). Information will be disseminated through distribution of Board minutes and the papers of the working groups and the proceedings of the annual heritage management symposium will be published regularly. We also intend to establish an information service for archaeological heritage management, and will implement the web page structure, and provide facilities for discussion groups to enable widespread access to workings of the special working groups.



7 • An Iberian circle: A. Morge Soares (Portugal), centre, in discussion with mrs. M. C. Escribano Velasco (Spain, Castilla y León), left, and director R. Ten Carmé (Spain, Catalunya), right.

Special working groups will be set up by the Board or by the membership to discuss specific issues (in co-operation with other relevant bodies and programmes as appropriate) to inform the development of policy, and to progress the aims and objectives of EAC. The special working groups will be convened to address specific issues. To maintain maximum flexibility it is intended that groups will have a finite existence related to their objectives. Each group will have clearly defined timetabled and set of objectives which will lead to the preparation of draft guidance, information, standards, or policy papers for consideration by the Consilium. The number of special working groups in existence at any one time should remain flexible to reflect the needs of the membership and the available resources required to service their needs. Having defined a particular problem, each working group will create an action plan to identify the key issues and to define what needs to be done at a European level to ensure the better management of those components of the archaeological resource under consideration. Each group should then go on to formulate proposals to address these issues, which, after ratification by the Consilium, can then be taken forward by the EAC board and the relevant national agencies.

One of the primary objectives of the EAC is to provide a mechanism for the exchange of information on the very wide range of topics relevant to the interests of its membership. This must represent a very high priority short-term goal for the association. Business material (meetings agenda and minutes, proceedings of special working groups, briefing notes, and other information, including papers derived from other sources) can all be distributed manually by post to all members bodies of the association. Most internal business material (meetings agenda and minutes, proceedings of special working groups, & briefing notes) can also be distributed by email; other information (papers derived from secondary sources) can only be distributed by email if it can be obtained in digital form or if it can be converted to digital form (using a scanner). Material (including conventional publication and 'grey literature' can also be widely disseminated for information exchange, public consultation and peer group review and feedback using the WorldWideWeb. Some preliminary work has already been undertaken on the design of an EAC web site, and we intend to implement this on-line as soon as is practical.

The user base for conventional publication remains markedly different from that of the WorldWideWeb. Although material can be disseminated very extensively on the WWW, there is still a perceived need to publish some material (e.g. proceedings of the annual symposium) using conventional means in order to achieve maximum impact. Conventional publications can be used as prestigious publicity material for the EAC in a variety of different professional and non-professional circumstances. This is particularly relevant in the context of helping to form direct relationships with national governments as well as the EU, the European Parliament, and the Council of Europe.

Summary three year plan (1999-2002)

1999/2000: Phase 1 Set-up

Develop and implement initial structure and establish preliminary mechanisms. Agree draft strategic plan and proposed budget, and agree prioritisation of critical issues and creation of first cycle of special working groups to explore those issues. Confirm arrangements for secretariat and establish preliminary mechanisms for information exchange (post/email). Implement the EAC WWW page and provision of commercial data service. Formulate detailed action plan.

2000/2001: Phase 2 Develop infrastructure

Establish full-time executive secretariat in permanent office. Raise additional resources necessary for infrastructure costs (secretariat, office, and information exchange) and develop proposals for full time executive secretariat and permanent office. Agree and implement mechanisms for information exchange. Review and agree prioritisation of critical issues. Special working groups (cycle 1) prepare policy action plans; set up new special working groups (cycle 2) to explore second set of critical issues. Review three year plan progress, adjust as necessary. Publish proceedings of first annual heritage management symposium and hold second symposium.

2001/2002: Phase 3 Consolidation

Establish full time secretariat, permanent office, and support services; network and information exchange services implemented. Develop proposals for ancillary services to meet requirements of membership. Implement action plans of special working groups (cycle 1); special working groups (cycle 2) prepare policy action plans; set up new special working groups (cycle 3) to explore third set of critical issues. Review three year plan progress, adjust as necessary. Publish proceedings of second annual heritage management symposium and hold third symposium.

2002/2003: Phase 4 EAC fully established

Permanent secretariat and support; network and information exchange; policy development and implementation (special working groups); liaison with EU. Implement action plans of special working groups (cycle 2); special working groups (cycle 3) prepare policy action plans. Review key themes and critical issues preparatory to redefining EAC priorities. Publish proceedings of third annual heritage management symposium and hold fourth symposium. Initiate development of new three-year plan.

- 1 • Dr. F. Lüth is Director of the Landesamt für Bodendenkmalpflege Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Germany.
- 2 • Dr. K. Wollák is deputy Director of the Hungarian Cultural Heritage Directorate.



The role and significance of archaeology in the integrated Europe of the 21st century

Zsolt Visy¹



8 • The Hungarian deputy state Secretary of Culture dr. Z. Vasy on his way to the meeting room, accompanied by the German Landesarchäologen dr. A. Miron (Saarland), dr. J. Biel (Baden-Württemberg) and dr. H. Koschik (Rhineland).

Humanity has always been deeply concerned with the knowledge and awareness of passing time, both the past and the future. Respect for parents and predecessors, the significance of *gerusia*, *senatus* or whatever name the group of the older generation as a consulting body may be given, testify to the strong connection with traditions. Traditions, the inherited knowledge of how to live in a community, passed from generation to generation through families, smaller or larger groups of societies in organised or unorganised form, have facilitated the accumulation of the immense experience and knowledge of thousands of generations up to our times.

In this process, the consciously gathered memory of *res gestae* of predecessors has played an important role, beginning with the heroic tales in the sagas through written history up to the complex historical investigations of today. Different sources have contributed to it, as both oral and written tradition, and progressively the testimony of artefacts, the relics of human activity. Archaeology, as we call it, has its roots on the one hand in ancient times, and on the other hand over more recent centuries, and even more in the 20th century, when we can speak about it as a science, as a strong and special branch of historical science. The most change took place as historical concepts and scientific methods relegated the acquisition of precious finds and the poor aesthetic approach to the background.

As a result of these changes and the confirmation of archaeology as an historical science, the horizons of history have been able to go back to the beginnings of humanity and life on the Earth, a perspective never possible before, when only written sources were available. Now the situation has changed. It has become apparent that we can have access to 99 % of the history of mankind only through archaeology; moreover, for the last thousand years, where written sources are available, archaeology can provide extremely important data.

Nowadays, archaeology has become an exact science. It has its own research methods and logistic for gathering and evaluating finds in the context of their surroundings, and many methods and instruments have been developed in the natural and social sciences which help in obtaining more accurate results. This development is progressing quickly and its impact is enormous, so it can be asserted that the effectiveness of archaeological investigations will soon be at a much higher level than today. The difference between the scientific approach of the latest generation of archaeologists and that of my old professors in the 1960's is about as significant as that between them and the archaeologists of the 19th century. I chose to study archaeology as a child, partly because of my deep interest in history and the desire to know something about archaeology, but primarily because I realised that in this field I could be to some extent free from ideological matters that I did not want to study. But I would not be right to say that I had a clear idea about the growing importance of archaeology as a historical science.



With the growing significance of archaeology as a science, its role has also reached a higher level of recognition in society. Formerly an archaeologist would face immense difficulties in getting approval for his statements, and later he could play no more than a peripheral role in society, working on excavations or in the storage facilities of museums. However, our science has by now achieved a level of social appreciation that existed never before.

What are the reasons for this? The first element is the growing accuracy of its scientific statements. This is clear evidence of its significance for historical research. The second is the fact that archaeology, working in its own way, found its competence and its place in science and in society. Through gathering and arranging the sources it achieved responsibility for the preservation of archaeological sites and finds, and also made the importance of this work clear to society. It was a long struggle in Hungary, first in the 1960's and 1970's, which brought victory to science and to the defenders of the cultural heritage.

One of the first battles took place in Dunaújváros, and I took part in it. Although we did have a Monuments Act, which stipulated that all underground remains are the property of the state, giving museums and archaeologists the right to preserve this heritage by rescue excavations, this law was ineffective. The authorities in charge of major projects such as securing the edge of the high loess plateau or urban developments were for many years unwilling to allocate enough money and time for archaeological work to take place. The problem of financing these works was not solved until in the 1970's. The satisfactory outcome should not be attributed to the successful arguments put forward by the museum but rather to the slowly changing attitude towards archaeology itself: its social value attained a much higher level than before and that development can be seen to be continuing up to the present day.

It is connected with international developments in the cultural field, first in Europe, and this is the third element affecting the greater respect accorded to archaeology. In short, after the modernism of the first half of the 20th century and after the terrible devastation of World War II a new cultural movement emerged which placed a higher value on the elements of the cultural heritage. In the 1950's and 1960's, under the banner of modernisation, old buildings, parts of our cultural heritage, could be destroyed in Hungarian towns. However, attitudes began to change and nowadays such destruction would be quite impossible. This is not only because their defenders became stronger but also because architects and politicians no longer think that the only way to immortalise their activity is to create something totally new. I hope that this high appreciation of our cultural heritage will prove not to be an ephemeral phenomenon, a fashion, and that it will prove to be a long – or even better – a permanent change in attitude.

This higher level of appreciation is connected with the international character of archaeology. There are no – or perhaps no more than a few – archaeological cultures which lie within the boundary of a single country. The big population movements of the Neolithic covered continents, the cultures of the steppe region reached from China to Hungary, and the classical culture has its origins in Mesopotamia and Egypt. One of the most important cultures, Roman civilisation, gave Europe its roots, its origins. Many countries inherited the remnants of classical antiquity, and there are people in Europe whose predecessors are to be found in the peoples of the Roman Empire. Archaeological research would be impossible without taking into account the research done in other countries. Archaeologists are conscious of this, and they organise international scientific projects to co-ordinate the research of different cultures. But it is also important for other people, so there is a transnational programme in the “Europe: our Common Heritage” campaign under the title: “Reunited by History: The Common Heritage of the Roman Empire” which it is hoped many people will join.

Let me give another example. The technique of aerial archaeology is quite new, but it has brought about an immense extension of the scope of archaeological research. It contributes a great deal to our knowledge, sometimes within a few minutes. In part, this contribution yields the same results (only in an extended manner) as those that can be achieved through conventional methods. New research in aerial archaeology, however, has shown that there are some aspects that could never be detected completely in another way. I am referring to the identification of old field boundaries and estates. We would not have an exact idea about the cadastres of the Greeks and the Romans without aerial archaeology. What is more surprising is that the boundaries of Iron Age settlements have also been identified in England from the air. Its immense significance becomes clear for other countries and for Hungary, when we realise that intensive methods of agriculture have almost totally destroyed these detectable remains. Now, on the basis of similarity and analogy, we can conclude they must have been present elsewhere as well. Thus European archaeologists have to cooperate and work closely together.

The importance of archaeology and the significance of preservation of archaeological sites and finds are given expression in the more recent laws of European countries, in conferences, and in international agreements. Hungary took part in these activities and after the big political change a new cultural law was passed in 1997, which on the one hand introduced new elements and on the other tried to make clear distinctions among the partners involved. Since all elements of an archaeological site are considered to be owned by the state, reports on every archaeological find are obligatory. The registration and assessment of possible work to be done is the task of museums all over the country; however, because formerly state ownership was divided between the state and the communities, different responsibilities could not be clearly distinguished. As a result, although a new institute, the Cultural Heritage Directorate, was established, some tasks, such as the official responsibility and decision making about archaeological sites, were not assigned to it. This remained with the territorial organisations of the museums, together with the task of executing all archaeological work (excavation, conservation, preservation).

A new situation has started in 1998 when the new government was elected. A new ministry was established for the cultural heritage, which united every part of the heritage, both movable and non-movable, and within the latter the archaeological and the built heritage. This decision is of immense importance. Apart for a few years in the early 1950's, it is the first time in Hungary that every aspect of heritage has been the responsibility of a single Ministry. It was clear from the outset that the cultural heritage was to be dealt with uniformly, using the same methods and in the same way, so we have initiated the harmonisation of the three laws relating to the cultural heritage (law for archives 1995, law for built heritage 1997, law for culture – archaeological sites, museums, libraries, cultural activities – 1997) and now we are ready to present them. However, as the position of archaeology has become stronger, it is intended that a separate law for the archaeological sites will be introduced.

I want here to speak only about the points regarding archaeology. Some elements were taken over from the international agreements that have been partly signed by Hungary, such as the Malta Convention and the World Heritage Convention, or from the initiatives of the Council of Europe or other organisations. The main objective was to make a clear distinction between the museums and the Directorate. We believe that official responsibilities and decision-making about archaeological sites must belong to the owner, that is to say, the state, and so according to this logic these tasks have been given to the Directorate, but only these, not the scientific work. The maintenance and management of archaeological sites should run parallel with that of the built heritage, since there is an organic and scientific connection between them. Through changing both laws they will be harmonised both officially and scientifically. Since the authorities for the non-movable heritage

are to be closely linked and the effort is being made to locate decision-making at the lowest level possible (the principle of subsidiarity), seven new joint offices of the Cultural Heritage Directorate and the National Board for the Protection of Historic Monuments will be established in accordance with the principle of regionality proposed by the European Union. We are convinced that, through these and some other changes, supervision of all kinds of cultural heritage will be managed in the best possible way. These changes will bring the organisation and institutes responsible for the Hungarian national cultural heritage into line with most of comparable organisations in Europe.

The last statement is of great importance, because the initiatives coming from the European Union, from UNESCO, and from the Council of Europe are seeking to create a cultural union which is indistinguishable from the common heritage. This is in accordance with the growing importance of the cultural heritage, of the archaeology as described above, which met the political initiatives to produce a uniting instrument in culture, and above all in common heritage, in the traditions. We can see the significance of these initiatives for our science: archaeology has become a much more international study than hitherto, and scientists agree that maintenance, inventarisation, preservation, and evaluation of sources should be done through internationally harmonised, or even identical, methods and efforts. The World Heritage Convention and the multiplication of World Heritage sites in every category, the programmes and applications proposed by the European Union testify to the significance of the cultural heritage. The “Europe: Our Common Heritage” campaign initiated by the Council of Europe clearly demonstrates the same thing: if the countries of Europe want to build a common Europe, they have to begin this work in the past, searching for connecting elements in the past, which they will find in culture, religion, tradition, in our common heritage.

On the threshold of the third millennium AD, one of the biggest challenges is how to find a middle course between globalisation and the maintenance of different cultures, languages and traditions, how to unite Europe without unifying the cultures of its different nations. This can be achieved through the involvement of cultural traditions: the cultural heritage provides the best methods for it, giving a historical perspective and demonstrating the feasibility of the common existence of different cultures.

Archaeology also has an important contribution to make; I want to see this new organisation acting as an initiator and a manager of common scientific projects, and at the same time as an important scientific board, helping to build a common Europe through the special methods of archaeology.

1 • Dr. Z. Visy is Deputy State Secretary of Culture of Hungary. Authorised text March 2000.



9 • Listening to the speech. On the front row are Mrs. S. van Dookum (Netherlands), I. Radman Liveja (Croatia) and S. von Schnurbein (Germany)



L'archéologie et le Conseil de l'Europe

Raymond Weber¹



Je suis heureux de pouvoir vous accueillir au nom du Secrétaire Général du Conseil de l'Europe, ici, dans notre maison de l'Europe qui est devenue la maison de toute l'Europe et de tous les peuples d'Europe. En effet, le Conseil de l'Europe qui vous reçoit aujourd'hui dans sa partie culturelle, regroupe aujourd'hui 47 démocraties de l'Europe, le seul pays manquant étant la Fédération de Yougoslavie qui, lui aussi, je pense, dès qu'un certain nombre de changements politiques seront intervenus, pourra nous rejoindre du moins dans sa convention culturelle.

Nous suivons avec intérêt ce que vous faites. L'archéologie fait partie de notre programme d'activités depuis un certain nombre d'années: La Convention européenne pour la protection du patrimoine archéologique,² ouverte à la signature en 1992 en Malte, est base et cadre général de notre coopération. Nous avons, à partir de cette Convention, développé un Plan européen pour l'archéologie qui s'est développé tout au long des dernières années avec quatre volets principaux:

Le premier volet était la Campagne "L'Age du Bronze, première âge d'or de l'Europe" qui a vu, parmi d'autres, un nombre impressionnant de d'événements, de conférences, de publications et d'expositions dont l'une, "L'Europe au temps d'Ulysse" que vous pouvez voir en ce moment au Grand Palais à Paris, après Copenhague et Bonn et avant de pouvoir la voir en Athènes. Un glossaire multilingue "Monuments de l'Age du Bronze" a été publié dont plusieurs auteurs sont parmi nous aujourd'hui.³

Le deuxième volet était la promotion des techniques d'inventaire. Là aussi, toute une série de travaux concrets ont été faits. Signalons les trois séminaires de formation organisés, ces dernières années dans trois pays différents, et la publication, par nos services, de la "Fiche d'indexation minimale pour les sites archéologiques" qui doit sa naissance également à l'engagement de beaucoup de vos collègues.⁴

Le troisième volet est le "Rapport sur la situation de l'archéologie urbaine en Europe".⁵ Je m'arrête un moment sur ce dernier thème qui nous semble particulièrement important, parce que, quand nous posons aujourd'hui la question de l'archéologie, c'est souvent par rapport à la ville, à la qualité de la vie à l'intérieur de la ville, aux projets urbains et nous avons effectivement pu développer, tant dans le domaine strictu sensu de l'archéologie que dans le domaine culturel plus large, un certain nombre d'idées à travers une série de projets concernant les quartiers et les banlieues.

En plus, un certain nombre de textes plus théoriques ou plus juridiques sont nés par ailleurs, je fais référence notamment à la Charte de Ségeste, liée à la Déclaration de Vérone, toutes les deux concernant l'avenir des lieux antiques de spectacle.

Mais l'archéologie ne se situe pas uniquement par rapport au projet urbain, elle se situe aussi, et l'exposition que vous allez inaugurer tout à l'heure le montre, par rapport à l'environnement, par rapport à la qualité de la vie. Depuis un certain nombre d'années, nous avons entrepris toute une réflexion, autour de la notion de développement durable, aujourd'hui devenue une notion essentielle que nous pouvons encore renforcer dans les années qui viennent. Récemment le Secrétariat du Conseil de l'Europe a été restructuré. A l'intérieur de la même Direction Générale nous avons maintenant à la fois donc ma Direction de la Culture et du Patrimoine Culturel, mais aussi la Direction de l'Environnement, ce qui nous permettra donc de lancer un certain nombre d'opérations en commun, notamment concernant un projet de Convention européenne du paysage que nous sommes actuellement en train de discuter avec des experts avant de le soumettre au Comité des Ministres.

Voilà en quelques mots où nous en sommes. Nous sommes prêts à toutes les actions de partenariat que vous souhaiteriez entreprendre avec nous et c'est avec une très grande curiosité, avec beaucoup d'enthousiasme, que nous suivrons l'ensemble de vos travaux.

- 1 • Director of Culture and the Cultural Heritage Department, Council of Europe. Authorised text February 2000.
- 2 • *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (revised)*, European Treaty Series 143, Strasbourg 1992.
- 3 • *European Bronze Age Monuments, Glossary / Monuments de l'Age du Bronze, Glossaire*, Strasbourg 1999.
- 4 • *Core data standard for archaeological sites and monuments / Fiche d'indexation minimale pour les sites archéologiques*, Strasbourg 1999.
- 5 • *Report on the situation of urban archaeology in Europe*, Strasbourg 1999.



10 • Director General Raymond Weber of the Council of Europe welcomes the Consilium.



Heritage for all

Alan Howarth CBE MP¹



It is a great pleasure and privilege to join you on this remarkable and important occasion. I wish most warmly to congratulate the heads of the national organisations charged with the management of Europe's archaeological heritage on coming together to form this new *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium*. I speak as I was taught to pronounce Latin at my school, which had a great tradition of teaching the classics. I hope you will not, therefore, take my pronunciation as barbaric. Though I come from the outer edge of Europe I, like all of us, am the legatee of the Hellenic and Roman tradition, which is fundamental to my heritage as a European, and my sense of identity.

Having recently had the privilege of addressing the European Association of Archaeologists Conference in Bournemouth, I am delighted, and honoured, to be able so soon to address this inaugural meeting of the *Consilium* in Strasbourg.

As the Minister with responsibility for the historic environment in England, I know the very real public interest in archaeology and the historic environment and the passions it raises. As the impact of technological change becomes ever more seismic, and the dynamics of social modernisation ever more intensive, so the desire among our people for connections, for anchorage, for roots in our heritage becomes ever more urgent. Every story in the national press about a threat to a historic site unleashes an avalanche of letters, faxes and e-mails to my office. We are witnessing not just nostalgic or antiquarian curiosity, but a powerful psychosocial need. The letters do not just come from people in this country, but from all parts of the world. Of course, the archaeological fraternity is international in its outlook and practices, which makes it all the more important that expertise is shared on a European level as you intend through your *Consilium* and indeed globally.

The recent success in Britain of Heritage Open Days, part of the Council of Europe's wonderful European Heritage Days scheme, at which some 2000 historic sites and monuments around Britain are open to the public illustrates again the degree of public interest in our heritage.

I always welcome the chance to meet practitioners in the field and that is one among the reasons why I was so glad to receive your kind invitation. Strasbourg is a most appropriate place for archaeologists from across Europe to meet. Strasbourg's cathedral, its ancient churches and the Palais Rohan are the prime elements a World Heritage Site. Alsace has a rich archaeological history, with five thousand years of agricultural development, and two thousand years of metallurgy. Before the establishment of *Castrum Argentoratum* by the Romans in 12 BC, there had been movements of people to the area from across Europe. Their presence is attested by the fabulous collection of objects they left, which can be found here in the Archaeological Museum. The greater our ambitions as Europeans for the future of Europe the more important it is that we understand Europe's past.

Following in the footsteps of those early migrants, today parliamentarians from the countries which form the Council of Europe meet in Strasbourg, and let me express my appreciation not just of the welcome which the Council of Europe has given us here at this inaugural event of the *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium*, but of all the important work which the Council of Europe does to support culture in Europe, and archaeology in particular. Now in the footsteps of the politicians come the archaeologists.

Strasbourg is a perfectly appropriate place for you to promote the dissemination of knowledge. Gutenberg was resident here in the 15th century. Whether or not he actually invented his printing process whilst in Strasbourg, the first important work to be printed, the Latin Bible was printed here in 1450. Subsequently, Strasbourg became the centre of printing, exporting the new technique to the rest of Europe with all the infinite implications that were to ensure. In the new age of the internet let me insistently affirm the continuing value of print and the continuing life of the book and indeed of the learned journal.

Council of Europe

Meeting under the auspices of the Council of Europe, as I just noted, is a timely reminder of the major role it has played in setting and raising standards for the protection of the cultural heritage among the

47 states who have signed the European Cultural Convention. Among the important contributions of the Council of Europe have been:

- 1992 Malta Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, which gives guidelines for the integrated conservation of archaeological assets, based on the principles of mutual assistance and exchange of knowledge;
- the 500 plus missions of the *Technical Co-operation and Consultancy Programme*, which responds to requests for technical assistance from Central and Eastern Europe on the conservation of the cultural heritage; and
- the *European Foundation for Heritage Skills*, that was set up on the initiative of the Council to foster in-service training of cultural heritage specialists right across Europe.

And now, the campaign, “Europe: a Common Heritage” is gaining momentum, with an enhanced European Heritage Days this year and the establishment of the European Association of Historic Towns and Regions in October. Last week I spoke at a conference of the English Historic Towns Forum which of course is in membership of the new European Association. I am sure that the Campaign will demonstrate that there is a European wide commitment to our historic environment, cultural heritage and ‘living heritage’ of traditional skills and crafts, and will encourage mutual understanding and recognition between the peoples and communities that make up our continent. With the perennial pressures of change and, this year, the tragedy of Kosovo all of us who believe in the importance of our heritage and care deeply about it are acutely mindful both of the fragility of the historical legacy of the past and of the waywardness of Europe’s historical memory.

Developments in archaeology: the EAC

But we need of course to look at technological change positively, and archaeologists can readily do so. The science of archaeology is developing rapidly, with techniques available to us now which were inconceivable only 20 or 30 years ago. Geophysical techniques have enabled English Heritage’s archaeologists to establish the layout of sites such as the Roman town of Wroxeter without having to resort to spade and trowel. And archaeologists of only 30 years ago would have given anything for access to the information that is now available from the techniques of DNA analysis. These rapid changes make it all the more important for archaeologists to have fora, such as this Consilium, in which they can share and discuss the latest developments.

I have read your Strategic Plan with great interest; and I am impressed by the ambitious aims and objectives you have set for yourselves. Clearly the Consilium, working in partnership with the European Association of Archaeologists, will have much to offer in the interests of developing and sharing best practice in the management of the archaeological heritage of Europe.

You have identified the need to improve the exchange of information between archaeological bodies across Europe, and you can indeed provide a forum for organisations to establish closer links and to encourage more structured co-operation. With the countries of Europe having such varied approaches to archaeological conservation, the need for this is obvious. We need, I think, to develop European wide



11 • President Olivier introduces Alan Howarth, the UK Minister for the Arts.

thematic programmes to advance understanding of aspects of archaeology that are of relevance to us all. These include industrial sites, and sites vulnerable to development pressures. There is a need to develop common approaches for the identification, recording and protection of archaeological sites, including those that are vulnerable to natural erosion or transnational development pressures.

I am especially glad that the UK is a founder member of the Consilium: I know how much the UK members are committed to its success. May I also say how delighted I am that you have chosen to make Dr. Geoffrey Wainwright an Honorary Member: Dr. Wainwright has been a remarkable leader in the development of public policy for archaeology in Britain, and notwithstanding his recent retirement from English Heritage, he is continuing to work with us on the development of Management Plans for Stonehenge and the Tower of London. I know how passionately he believes that our common heritage demands collaborative solutions at a European level. Perhaps I could say a few words about legislation and practice in the UK, and reflect on how our experience may benefit other countries.

Legislation and practice in the UK

In the UK, our protection for Ancient Monuments goes back to 1882 when Parliament gave protection to 50 sites, including Stonehenge and Hadrian's Wall. Further Acts followed and now, five Acts of Parliament later, statutory protection is given to some 30,000 archaeological sites - and this number will increase considerably as English Heritage and my Department take forward our Monuments Protection Programme.

But our legislation can only help protect those sites, which are of national importance: thousands of other sites can also be threatened by development. During development booms in Britain in the 1980's, new building projects frequently exposed unknown archaeological sites, and the Government came under increasing pressure to intervene and fund rescue excavations. Many sites were destroyed. Much of this could have been avoided if planning authorities and developers had taken a better informed, more thoughtful and balanced view of the archaeological significance of sites at an early stage - especially in our historic cities, such as London, Chester, Canterbury or York.

In 1990, the Government responded to the crisis by issuing guidance for the benefit of all those involved in development. Our Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning stressed the importance of archaeological remains and made the obvious but necessary point that once they are gone they can never be replaced. The Guidance said that there should be a presumption in favour of their preservation *in situ*. Planning authorities should employ archaeologists to maintain records of sites, and advise on the potential impact of development proposals. I am pleased to say that the dissemination of this guidance across the country has drastically reduced the need for last minute rescue operations. It has also had the benefit of stimulating the growth of commercially run archaeological contracting firms, to compete for projects. The industry is said now to be worth about £ 50 million a year. Moreover, the money freed from Rescue projects is now available for archaeological research.

The introduction of the guidance was the most important innovation in archaeological protection in Britain for almost 80 years. It embodied a switch from reliance on site-specific protection to the use of the planning system to ensure that all archaeological remains are properly considered and that their importance is weighed against the merits of development. Good prior knowledge has led to the development of better techniques for the cost effective assessment of the archaeological potential of a site.

Earlier this year, I saw an exhilarating example of the guidance being used effectively in practice, when I visited an excavation at Spitalfields in East London. There a major office development is planned on a site which is known to contain remains from many historic periods from Roman times, through the middle ages when a hospital was on the site, to the 17th century when the area became a home for Huguenot refugees. The site has become well known and caused intense public interest because of the discovery of a Roman sarcophagus (brilliantly publicised by the Museum of London), but it also contained one of the largest assemblies of the skeletal remains of a medieval population ever excavated. The health, age at

death, dietary differences and burial practices of all strata of medieval society will be revealed through the current study. Together with information on the buildings and other activities, we will be able to build up a full picture of life in the medieval Priory and hospital. The information being painstakingly gathered will provide an important contribution to our knowledge and understanding of the history of London. The methods and techniques used will also be of benefit to a wider international audience. Spitalfields has been, I feel, an excellent model of collaboration between planning authorities, developers and archaeologists in the museum and academic communities.

Little of the information could have been gathered about this fascinating history would be possible without the active support of the developers of this site, who, aware of its archaeological potential, followed the guidance and gave archaeologists from the Museum of London team so much scope for carrying out their investigation. The value of our guidance has once again been proved.

I should also mention two other issues:

The Monuments at Risk Survey carried out for English Heritage by Bournemouth University drew our attention to the threats which thousands of sites face. The survey provided the first ever census of the state of our archaeological heritage; it will provide a benchmark by which future generations will chart the condition of England's archaeological heritage. English Heritage has drawn up a very thorough programme of follow-up action, covering measures needed in both the short and the longer term, and I will personally be following progress with close interest.

I hope it may be of assistance to colleagues in other countries to study this project, in terms of the methods used and the possible implications for their sites.

Another significant recent development has been my Government's decision to amalgamate English Heritage and the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England. The resulting organisation now constitutes a comprehensive and strong lead body for the historic environment in England. The amalgamation reflects our belief that there are major advantages for the heritage sector in bringing together the complementary expertise and experience of these two organisations, one whose role was to record the heritage and one whose role was to conserve and present their heritage, so as to create a strong, unified body to act as its champion.

For its part, over the last 90 years, the Royal Commission has devoted itself to surveying and recording England's heritage. Its particular strengths – in statutory recording, national archaeological and architectural projects, survey work, the National Mapping Programme and other aerial survey functions, maritime archaeology recording and other research analysis and publication work – are at the core of the new combined organisation's Archaeology and Survey Division's integrated programmes.

Among its diverse responsibilities, English Heritage has acted as a centre of excellence in promulgating best archaeological practice. It has worked to advance understanding of England's archaeology; secured the conservation of archaeological sites, landscapes and collections; supported the development of national and local research frameworks; promoted public appreciation and enjoyment of the subject; and supported the development of professional infrastructure and skills.

I believe that bringing the RCHME and EH together has achieved a whole which is greater than the sum of the parts. We now have a solid base of knowledge across the spread of the historic environment sector, upon which to develop public understanding, and encourage good management and stewardship.

World Heritage Sites

I would like to say something about Britain's activities on the international front, and in particular our increasingly active role in UNESCO's World Heritage Convention. The Convention provides, as we all know, for the identification and protection of natural and cultural sites that are, by definition, of outstanding universal value. Of the 582 World Heritage Sites, 17 have been nominated by the UK, including Stonehenge, Avebury, Hadrian's Wall, and Ironbridge Gorge; our most recent nomination was the Neolithic sites on Orkney.

One of our first steps after rejoining UNESCO was to launch a review of our Tentative List of future nominations: over 500 bodies and individuals took part in a public consultation – a new procedure that was beneficial educatively and in raising public consciousness of heritage issues – leading to the publication last April of a list of 25 sites for possible nomination over the next 5-10 years. The list took full account of UNESCO's Global Strategy, in particular its wish for a more representative World Heritage List, to counter the current predominance of historic towns and cathedrals in Western Europe. Accordingly, we focussed on the UK's distinctive contributions to world culture. The new Tentative List comprises sites representing our industrial heritage - such as the Cornish Mining Industry and Arkwright's Mill at Cromford; and our global influence - such as Chatham Dockyard and the Liverpool Waterfront. I am pleased to say that the new Tentative List, and the thoroughness with which it has been produced, have attracted some very kind comments from UNESCO's World Heritage Centre.

But inscribing sites on the World Heritage List is only the end of the beginning. We must continue by ensuring that they are cared for in a way that is worthy of their international significance and value. UNESCO now very properly requires that Management Plans should be drawn up for each site, to the highest standards, in advance of nomination. A key feature of these Plans is sustainability: the need to balance the impacts on sites arising from pressures such as tourism, with the need to ensure that the character and fabric of the sites themselves are not eroded.

We were naturally disappointed not to be elected to the World Heritage Committee at the recent elections. However, we felt it right to stand down in the third round of voting in favour of Egypt, to ensure a better balanced representation of countries from each continent on the Committee. We are committed to the Convention and will be sending a full strength team, as Observers, to future meetings of the Committee and related fora. I will also take advantage of this opportunity to tell you that the UK will be a candidate again at the next elections, in 2001.

Urban archaeology

There has been another recent Council of Europe initiative, which is relevant to us today: the publication in February this year of the report on Urban Archaeology in Europe. The publication painted a very interesting picture, and was instructive (at least to me) about the differences between the legislation in various European Countries. In many countries, all archaeological sites are protected by law; in some all discoveries must be reported. In Greece, all antiquities in the soil are *ipso facto* the property of the state. In Turkey, recent changes have given urban archaeology a locus in the planning legislation. In some countries, especially in Eastern Europe where there is currently a great increase in development, there is a recognised need to introduce new legislation.

Increasingly, decisions are being taken to preserve archaeological remains in the face of development proposals. In Ireland, underground car parks are now discouraged, and there is an insistence on widely spaced foundations for new buildings, in order to skirt archaeological deposits as much as possible. In the Netherlands, decisions on recording and long-term preservation have been successfully linked to development schemes in individual towns, such as at Delft, Maastricht, and Utrecht, where an evaluation is required in advance of development. Similar practices have been introduced in Slovenia.

Another clear trend is the increasing importance across Europe of funding by developers themselves. This is significantly the case in the UK, where we have found that developers may well prefer to fund an excavation to ensure that the ensuing development may proceed without hindrance.

Some countries have achieved considerable success in a positive integration of archaeological remains with modern developments. In France, I am told, urban archaeology is now seen as a positive opportunity to provide a basis and an inspiration for modern urban development. In Greece, the new metro for Athens will incorporate in various stations the finds from excavations along the route of the railway. In Italy, I would venture to say as a part of a continuing tradition, it has sometimes been possible to preserve a monument harmoniously within a modern context, as at the Roman theatre at Bologna. In the Netherlands, many archaeological features are incorporated into modern townscapes, and showcases with



12 • Britain meets France: minister Howarth in conversation with
mrs. dr. M. Guillaume of the Sous-Direction de l'Archeologie in Paris.
EAC secretary Willems (left) and president Olivier (right) are listening.

archaeological finds are often included within new developments. In the UK, preservation of archaeological features has been combined with the preservation of the historic above-ground structures.

The very successes of archaeologists may, ironically, compound the problems they face. Pressures of tourism entail a difficult balance between preservation and making monuments accessible to the public. Archaeology is often seen as making a direct contribution to cultural tourism, and through it to economic growth, but a balance between preservation and other present day needs is never easily achieved.

The Council of Europe's report offers much for archaeologists - and indeed Governments and developers - to reflect on and learn from. In the UK, an important tenet of our guidance on archaeology is that local planning bodies are usually best placed to make decisions, albeit that English Heritage, at national level and now with a strengthened regional presence, is always available to give advice, and help, where appropriate, with funding. Likewise in Europe: individual countries are of course responsible for their own archaeological decisions, but we are all conscious of our common heritage and responsibilities, and your Council and the European Association of Archaeologists can act to ensure that archaeologists can share their experiences and offer guidance on solving difficult problems.

Those of you who attended the Bournemouth Conference of the European Association of Archaeologists will recall that I reflected on the activities of European archaeological pioneers such as Heinrich Schliemann, Jean Francois Champollion, Boucher de Perthes, the Englishmen Sir John Prestwich and Sir John Evans who converted the sceptics to de Perthes' theories about the great antiquity of man, and of the geologist Sir Charles Lyell whose writings on the geological evidence reinforced this radical alteration of humanity's sense of timescale and of itself. Scandinavian archaeologists established the Three-Age system, which subsequently became the corner-stone of archaeology. These forerunners to the great 19th century debate between creationists and evolutionists demonstrate the role that archaeology can play in challenging, if not undermining, received wisdom on fundamental issues. They show how central your discipline is to pushing forward the boundaries of our understanding of mankind's origins, our cultural development and our place in the world. Arguably, few intellectual activities are more important. The sense of such a challenge and such responsibility underpins the objectives and aims of your Consilium. Your eminent predecessors did so much to share knowledge about new sites, and the implications of their discovery, and you can build on this through sharing new information about the old.

Mister President, may I conclude by wishing the Consilium every success. Whether we are politicians or administrators or archaeologists, all of us have a duty to preserve the European archaeological heritage. We will all seek to play our part.

1 • Minister for the Arts of the United Kingdom. Authorised text December 1999



The management of the archaeological heritage

Rick van der Ploeg¹



I am Secretary of State for Culture in the Netherlands. That may seem interesting. In fact, it is interesting: media, the arts and literature, architecture, museums and cultural heritage, all are part of my portfolio. Upon acceptance of my post, I discovered that I would also be responsible for archaeology. Although in relative terms this is only a small portion of my responsibilities, I also quickly discovered that it is a very interesting one, because it evokes all sorts of emotions. For some it will bring to mind the pyramids of Egypt or the Roman Empire, for others it can be the study and exploration of the past in one's own town or region, visiting a museum, or even the adventures of Indiana Jones.

As for myself, I would like to make the connection between archaeology and economy. In part, that has to do with my own past as Professor of Economics at a Dutch university. This past experience does not, of course, disappear when you become responsible for a field such as culture. In fact, in my view, it has considerable advantages to have such experience especially in the cultural field. As far as archaeology is concerned, I like to make this link because I believe that approaching archaeology from an economic perspective can indeed be helpful, and in particular where the management of the archaeological heritage is concerned. I will offer some of my observations and conclusions in a moment. I don't know if you will share my opinions, but at the very least it is already important that we talk about these matters in a European context.

For this reason, I thought it was important to be here today, because I do support the idea of an association that is intended to bring together all organisations from European countries that are involved in managing the archaeological heritage. We are all confronted with similar problems, and the organisations can learn from each other, exchange experiences, and work together at the European level. This is absolutely necessary when we want to provide a real future for the European past - not only because of the process of unification, which is primarily motivated by politics and, of course, economics. Archaeology itself is in fact also European and, when you think about it, it doesn't really make any sense to talk about the archaeological past of the Netherlands, or of any other country. The concept of the nation state is a comparatively recent invention and I would rather prefer to see the present-day nations as stewards of a territorial portion of a larger and common, European heritage.



13 • Dr. F. van der Ploeg, the Dutch Secretary of State for Culture.

Good stewardship does imply that you look after the legacy from the past as best you can, and in doing so we can profit from different viewpoints. An economic perspective is one, and some of the things I have observed are related to that. Even though the annual expenditure on archaeology has now reached a level of about 40 million Euro in the Netherlands, the archaeological world is still very much a 'black box', although I should add that is changing rapidly now.

What needs to be changed as well, is what we do with the results of archaeological work. So far, that has mostly been regarded as a scientific process. I don't contest the scientific nature of archaeological research, but the results of that work must be communicated to the general public. The information about our history should not remain within a select group, and by that I don't necessarily mean just the professionals. For me, this select group also includes the well educated, relatively wealthy and generally middle aged, native Dutch part of the population, which – as polls show - is normally reached by archaeologists. Categories such as our youth and the new immigrant population should be able to get in touch with the heritage more easily and more often. Education is the clue to that, and this is why I have made heritage education one of the spearheads of my policy. In addition, cultural tourism is also a field where archaeology in the Netherlands could be more developed. In this respect we can learn from other countries and new ideas such as the use of virtual technology in presenting the heritage.

Of course, we can only educate and broaden public participation in archaeological heritage when we see to it that it is available for consumption and that it remains so in the future. This requires other changes, because archaeological heritage is only one dimension of the past. It is part of cultural history, and what we need is a more integrated approach by the three cultural history disciplines - archaeology, the history of architecture, and historical geography. In turn cultural history, the chronicle of our culture, is the unfolding story of spatial organisation in the past, present, and future. The time is ripe for us to link cultural history and environmental planning more closely together, which will require a complete change of attitude on the part of all concerned - the public, government, planners and cultural historians. More effective and creative efforts must be made to find real and innovative solutions.

When I look at my own country, it is clear that the Netherlands is changing dramatically as far as its spatial development is concerned, and these changes are both necessary and welcome. There is a demand for new housing, countryside conservation and infrastructure. At the same time, the cultural identity of the human environment occupies a higher place than ever before on the political and social agendas. The greatest concern is that rural areas will suffer in terms of both quality and diversity.

Both trends call for an entirely new policy, aligning conservationist interests with a dynamic, development-oriented approach rooted in cultural history. Conservationist interests and environmental planning can be reconciled more effectively and creatively. Protecting places of cultural and historical importance and putting them to creative use must be an intrinsic part of the dynamics of innovation.

This is why planners and developers must be more sensitive to the value of culture and history as a source of inspiration for design, and why the cultural-historical sector must do more to anticipate trends in environmental planning.

What is needed is a coherent and consistent central government policy that allows our cultural and historical identity to play a more important role in determining how we organise our physical environment. The first steps have already been taken towards a policy of this kind and it is now possible to stride ahead. Together with my colleagues in the cabinet, responsible for Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, for Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment and for Transport, Public Works and Water Management I have recently produced a policy paper on these issues, and we have initiated a 10-year programme with a substantial budget to implement it.²

Changes within the cultural-historical disciplines, of which archaeological heritage management is only one, are a necessary precondition for this new policy to succeed. Fortunately, we don't have to start from scratch, because at least some changes were set in motion years ago. In fact, I do believe that it is the changed perspective on how the archaeological heritage should be managed that has brought us here together this afternoon. Ten years ago, it was the Council of Europe that took the initiative to set a new standard on how to deal with archaeology in the face of important changes in land-use patterns, major public works, or increasing pollution of the environment all over Europe. This initiative led to a new treaty that we all know as the Malta Convention.

14 • Director J. Moisanen (Finland), left, in discussion with mrs. S. van Dockum (Netherlands), centre, and mrs. D. Eugénidou (Greece), left.



The Dutch Parliament approved ratification of the Malta Convention about one year ago. The reason why we have not yet actually ratified the treaty with the Council of Europe is simply because we like to put our money where our mouth is. In the Dutch law-making process it is customary to wait for the actual ratification until legislation to implement a treaty has been fully prepared. In the case of the Malta Convention, that is more easily said than done. As I indicated above, the management of the archaeological heritage needs to be tied in to the planning process. This, of course, is one of the cornerstones of the Convention, but from a legislative point of view it's not such an easy task. Also, you can imagine that the introduction of the principle that the developer should pay for archaeological work raises many questions – not just from the developers themselves, but also from local and regional authorities (which in many cases are at the same time developers), from the archaeological community, from members of parliament and last but not least, from me. We need to ascertain that limited archaeological resources are preserved, or at least properly excavated, without putting an unrealistic burden on economic development. This has triggered a prolonged discussion, but I believe there is sufficient information now to take a decision. I intend to do that early next year in a policy document to be discussed in parliament, so that the necessary legislation can be submitted immediately afterwards. I am convinced we shall have a new law on archaeology soon thereafter: a law that

meets the requirements of the Convention but also a law that provides a new framework for a flexible and future-oriented heritage management.

In this respect I should mention that the delay in ratification has not only been caused by the far-reaching implications of the Convention itself. A second major reason is that I decided to use the opportunity to change the entire system of archaeological heritage management in the Netherlands. I don't intend to bore you with the details of the current system, which was introduced only in 1988 when we last changed our Monuments Act.³ It was in that same year, by the way, that the first meeting was convened by the Council of Europe, here in this building, of the Committee of Experts that drafted the new Convention. Suffice it to say that the 1988 law was already an old-fashioned piece of legislation when it was adopted: it does not stimulate a flexible approach to heritage management in modern society, it retained the centralised system that was created after World War II and it has a very strict definition of who can be involved in archaeological excavation. In fact, the law was created to accommodate structures and procedures that had been developed in the past. It was looking backwards, therefore, and did not have a vision of the future. This is precisely what I want to avoid this time. I intend to reform the law on two major points: the centralised system should disappear and the emerging market for archaeological work should indeed become a market. I think it is useful, in present company, to elaborate on these two points.

First, the centralised system, which is rapidly eroding anyway, needs to be abolished so that municipal and provincial authorities will be able to set their own policies, and responsibility for the management of the archaeological heritage will rest with the most appropriate level of government. Sometimes, especially in the case of major public works, that will still be the state, but more often it should be the provincial level, which is responsible for the town and country planning process. In the majority of cases, heritage management can be most effectively done at the local, municipal, level. I expect that most of you will share this opinion, which conforms to widely shared views on the need for decentralisation of government.

I do, however, not intend to throw out the baby with the bath water. For one, the ROB, the State Archaeological Service, will remain a central institute at the national level. It will, however, no longer be responsible for almost all rescue excavations as it was in the past.

Instead, its new role will be that of a centre of expertise that is available to all parties involved in the archaeological process. It will be the central facility where sufficient diverse knowledge is assembled to develop new scientific and other tools for all to use. And, of course, it will be the instrument for me and my successors to monitor future developments at all levels and to propose and implement adequate policies to deal with those. It will remain the state agency that organises the legal protection of important sites and, last but by no means least, the State Service will maintain a central information system.

This last element is of crucial importance. I am sure I don't need to explain to the archaeologists among you how vital it is for an effective management of normally invisible resources that all available information must be reported and made accessible. In the past, like everywhere else in Europe, we already had the obligation to report chance finds. Now, however, this will be extended to a legal obligation to report all relevant information about sites or find-spots that is obtained during all stages of the archaeological process, from inventories and prospecting to excavation and analysis. Please do not misunderstand me in the sense that, of course, we don't intend to store all available archaeological data centrally. That would rapidly become unmanageable and, more important, it would violate the principle of decentralisation of responsibilities. I am talking, of course, about all the relevant information for management purposes which can point the way to more detailed data needed for scientific studies that are stored elsewhere. Modern technology does allow such a unified system to be partially decentralised, but it should be centrally organised, maintained and developed. And, most importantly, anybody doing any kind of work in archaeology that produces

new data will be legally obliged to deliver the required information.

I realise that in larger countries such an approach will be more difficult to put into practice, but I would nevertheless strongly recommend it. Not only is it a vital tool in modern heritage management, which requires a high-quality input in the planning process. At least as important is the fact that it prevents unnecessary economic damage and improves everyone's equality before the law. In addition, it allows all levels of government to improve their policies and to gear them to one another. From another perspective, the implication of the legal obligation to provide information implies that higher levels of government are able to monitor and, if necessary, to intervene in decisions taken at a lower level. In particular, it will allow the State to ascertain that national policies are respected whenever decisions concerning sites of major archaeological importance are taken.

I believe the archaeological community at large, and the EAC in particular, should already start thinking about the requirements of some kind of information system at a European scale. In the EU, the foundations for a European Spatial Development Perspective have been laid and where planners go, archaeological heritage managers have to follow! The cultural autonomy of member states is not at stake here, but the survival of the cultural heritage is.

I turn now to the second major change that I intend to introduce in the Dutch archaeological system: the introduction of market principles and of what I like to call a form of "cultural entrepreneurship". I'm aware that the Netherlands are far from leading when it comes to introducing market principles as such. That may not be so bad, because I have also been made aware of the heavy toll the archaeological heritage has had to pay in some countries, due to unrestrained privatisation and the introduction of commercial archaeology. On the other hand, it is clear that state monopolies won't be able to survive in Europe and that the introduction of market principles under carefully controlled circumstances has many and major advantages.

I have decided that the existing potential market for archaeological services shall be opened up, but when I talk about "cultural entrepreneurship", I don't intend this to be a simple matter of privatisation and introducing economic competition. What I want to achieve is not that irreplaceable cultural heritage is dealt with as cheaply and rapidly as possible. I do want, however, to stimulate the archaeological community to work cost-effectively, to think about the quality of their work and how to improve it in such a way that the end-result is an improvement in the way the heritage is being dealt with and at the same time no undue burden is placed on those that have to pay for it all. Competition stimulates creativity and generates new ideas, it provides a pressure cooker that is not functioning when all is state-controlled.

The basic problem is, of course, that archaeologists have to work for two clients simultaneously: on the one hand the government, acting on behalf of the public to safeguard the heritage, and on the other the developers, whose primary interest is time and money. Therefore, market principles should be allowed to operate under controlled circumstances. I intend, therefore, to liberalise the archaeological sector on condition that this will be accompanied by the introduction of a system of quality control with a legal basis.

This cannot be done by simply changing the law or taking executive measures. It can only be done in co-operation with the archaeological community which, I am satisfied to see, has broadly accepted my ideas. Earlier this year, I appointed an advisory committee to develop a comprehensive set of standards for archaeology that can be used to define how work should be done and also to set up a system of certification. In principle, this can all be self-regulating although the system will obviously need my approval before becoming effective. To ensure broad acceptance, I have appointed committee members from all parties – not just the different groups

in the archaeological world, but developers as well. And I have seen to it that not just the archaeological establishment is represented on the committee, but also the younger generation. The committee will report to me next month, and I expect it to finish the work next year; the system has to be in place before the law is changed.

I have given you a brief outline of how I intend to change the management of the archaeological heritage in the Netherlands so that we may meet the challenges of the new millennium better equipped than before. I don't know if my vision appeals to you. The socio-economic and, perhaps more relevantly, the legal situation can be quite different in European countries, so some of my solutions may not be appropriate elsewhere. The general approach, however, should appeal to you because the challenges we face are very similar. In fact, I am sure that elements of what I have said in terms of policy are already implemented elsewhere.

It is up to you, however, as heritage managers of Europe to explore such matters further and to learn from one another. On the one hand you are specialists, and on the other you are the advisors of those such as me who have the political responsibility at the national level. We have our own priorities and concerns, and sometimes we have good reasons for not taking your advice or not giving in to your requests. But in the end all of us are there to serve the public interest, and any responsible politician will seek the best possible advice. It is your job to give that advice, and you all know that by working together with your colleagues in Europe you can do a better job: if you didn't, you wouldn't be here. The EAC seems to me to be an adequate way to achieve this objective, and I hope and expect that it will successfully serve the purpose for which it has been created.

- 1 • Dr. F. van der Ploeg is Secretary of State for Culture of the Netherlands. Authorised text December 1999.
- 2 • See *Belvedere. Beleidsnota over de relatie cultuurhistorie en ruimtelijke inrichting*, Den Haag 1999.
- 3 • An English translation of the Act has been published in W.J.H. Willems a.o., *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands*, Assen/Amersfoort 1997.



A future for European archaeology

Geoffrey Wainwright¹





As we approach the new Millennium the centrality of cultural heritage for social and economic progress around the globe is increasingly recognised as a vital element in creating the kind of world we all seek and an essential building block in the social and economic well-being of people. The World Bank funds cultural heritage projects as a means of alleviating poverty. Indeed, Archaeology and its allied disciplines are more important than its practitioners care to admit. In Europe today we start from the proposition that we simply cannot have social and economic development without recognition of our cultural heritage and history. It is widely recognised by international bodies, national and local governments; the international world of commerce; academia; the media and non-governmental bodies that society cannot move forward into the future unless it understands and acknowledges the past from which we come. This view of the relationship between cultural heritage and socio-economic development is not controversial nor is it solely the view of an elitist practitioner. It is a view that will be found in towns and villages throughout Europe, who cherish their sense of place and provide the fuel for many debates regarding its future.

In the new Millennium, our search for origins and desire to recollect the past will reflect an urgent need in Europe to rediscover its identity in the face of the upheavals experienced in our society. The impact of the Council of Europe will continue to be crucial in the development of a European awareness based around a common heritage and on an increased understanding of that of the various European communities. This is a difficult path to tread and archaeologists have a heavy responsibility to ensure that the proper emphasis on the cultural heritage of the national, regional or local communities to which we all belong should not serve as pretext for an obsession with identity or divergencies which could be used to provoke conflict. In late twentieth century Europe and elsewhere the cultural heritage of communities has been destroyed and the evidence from them distorted precisely to devalue and deface memories of their past. All archaeologists owe it to themselves and to society to speak out loudly in the face of any such cultural genocide in the twenty first century - regardless of its origin.

The European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Valletta 1992) now ratified by 18 countries, defines not only a minimum legal system for the protection of cultural property but also provides a framework for professional co-operation in Europe. It provides a sound basis for the future and we must all encourage our governments to ratify this Convention which is proving to be so influential in promoting international collaboration. Several programmes produced by the Council of Europe are contributing to the promotion of a better mutual understanding. The 'First Golden Age' programme on Bronze Age Europe includes both a framework for professional co-operation and a public awareness campaign and will be followed by others, which demonstrate a convergence of European heritage as well as individual characteristics.

The archaeology profession is organised at a European level through the European Association of Archaeologists chaired initially by Kristian Kristiansen and latterly by Willem Willems. We have our own journal, newsletter and annual conferences, held this year at Bournemouth with 700 attendees from 25 countries. National cultural resource managers have also organised themselves at a European level - initially under the presidency of Willem Willems and latterly Adrian Olivier - and this inaugural meeting in Strasbourg is a powerful symbol for future international collaboration. I am delighted by the invitation to become your first honorary member.

In return I have been asked to speak briefly on the challenges which I see facing European archaeology in the next Millennium. I have already referred to the political and socio-economic impact of our work and I wish to focus now on what I see as four primary goals, which present us with great opportunities.

Advancing the understanding of our Past

We must never forget that advancing the understanding of our past lies at the core of what we do. It involves the quantification of the material remains; assessing their importance and the degree of survival; synthesising the current state of knowledge and identifying the gaps. All this must be recorded in a compatible and retrievable fashion, employing the latest technologies. National and local records should be linked to a European index, which will enable our assessments of significance to transcend national boundaries and enter a European dimension. This is the platform from which we will achieve the other goals.

Communication and Dissemination

Mechanisms must be developed to enable the dissemination of this information not just to the few but to the many. Not only must we share our understanding with others, but also we must stop patrolling the boundaries of our discipline in misguided attempts to exclude what many perceive as undesirable fringe interests. Communication is the key to enlisting the collaboration of a largely willing audience in the implementation of what archaeology is and what it can contribute to the betterment of human existence. The importance of the past means that it is no longer a private discipline - we are public property with more adherents than we might expect from the small size of our disciplinary core. At the same time we must explore new ways of ensuring that the impact of research is rapidly assimilated within our discipline.

Promotion of public enjoyment and appreciation of our past

The protection and future viability of heritage places will be dependent in the next millennium on understanding European aspirations for an identity; national concerns for self esteem and above all the wishes of local communities which are embedded in a sense of place and local distinctiveness. There is



16 • Board member Giovanni Scichilone (Italy) and David Miles (England) are having a coffee break.

considerable enthusiasm for the understanding of our past at a local level and this must be supported and encouraged. The archaeological heritage must be part of local, living communities and the promotion of this will enable all of us to take part in both its appreciation and protection. Controversy in the cultural heritage world is universal and hugely reassuring. A society that is not passionate about its past is in danger of losing its identity.

Development of professional infrastructure and methodologies

There are universal issues regarding training, staff mobility and career structures which should be dealt with at a European as well as a national level. There can be no doubt that the infrastructure of our discipline has not kept pace with its success in establishing itself on the national and international stage. It will require a concerted effort to put that right and I hope that this new organisation will play a central role in that process. Salaries paid to archaeologists lag behind our national averages; our disciplinary structure requires review; and considerable investment needs to be directed at the infrastructure - particularly in respect of training schemes. This improved structure which we seek is only a means to an end which will enable our discipline to find the confidence to create the right environment to develop a range of collaborative projects at a European level. The progress to maturity made by our discipline over the past decade must be realised in joint projects related to methodological and technical issues - aerial photography, geoprospecting, sampling and retrieval, site formation processes and modelling strategies demand collaborative solutions at a European level. It is my vehement hope that this new European grouping of cultural heritage managers will establish such projects to the great benefit of us all.

Mr President, I first addressed an audience in Strasbourg some 15 years ago and am as committed as anyone could be to the European ideal represented by the Archaeologiae Consilium and through bonds of friendship to many individuals present today at this most important inaugural meeting. I am convinced that it will achieve great things and am delighted beyond measure in accepting honorary membership.

- 1 • Professor Wainwright is the former Chief Archaeologist of English Heritage. He was installed as honorary member of the EAC in Strasbourg.

17 • During the meeting, national representatives signed an official declaration of membership. Here, dr. Artis Kraut is signing as member for Estonia.





A publication of the Netherlands
ministry of Education, Culture and
Science

editor
Willem J.H. Willems

design
Studio Raster, Rijswijk

photography
Foto Gressung

druk
SCTeam, Rotterdam

edition
june, 2000

Price: f 25,- / € 11,35

This publication is obtainable from
Sdu-servicecentrum
P.O. Box 20014
NL-2500 EA The Hague

Telephone +31 70 - 378.98.30
Telefax +31 70 - 378.97.83

ISBN 90 346 38316

This publication is also available by internet:
www.minocw.nl/english/archaeology