



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Digging holes abroad. An ethnography of Dutch archaeological research projects abroad.

Linde, S.J. van der

Citation

Linde, S. J. van der. (2012, December 18). *Digging holes abroad. An ethnography of Dutch archaeological research projects abroad*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20406>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20406>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20406> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Linde, Sjoerd Jaap van der

Title: Digging holes abroad. An ethnography of Dutch archaeological research projects abroad

Issue Date: 2012-12-18

Digging Holes Abroad: An Ethnography of Dutch Archaeological Research Projects Abroad



Leiden University Press

Archaeological Studies Leiden University
is published by Leiden University Press, the Netherlands

Series editors: C.C. Bakels and H. Kamermans

Cover design: Joanne Porck

Lay out: Sjoerd van der Linde

Illustrations: David de Bruijne & Sjoerd van der Linde

ISBN 978 90 8728 191 5

e-ISBN 978 94 0060 142 0

NUR 682

© Sjoerd Jaap van der Linde / Leiden University Press, 2012

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Digging Holes Abroad

An Ethnography of Dutch Archaeological Research Projects Abroad

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. P.F. van der Heijden,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 18 december 2012
klokke 16.15 uur

door

Sjoerd Jaap van der Linde

geboren te Heerenveen
in 1979

Promotiecommissie

Promotores: Prof. Dr. W.J.H. Willems
Prof. Dr. J. Lengkeek

Overige Leden: Prof. Dr. C.L. Hofman
Prof. Dr. P.J. Pels
Prof. Dr. I. Lilley
Dr. M.H. van den Dries
Dr. M. Duineveld

This publication was made possible with grants from NWO MaGW, 'Archaeology in Contemporary Europe' EU Culture 2007*, and Leiden University.



Universiteit Leiden



Education and Culture DG
Culture Programme

*This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Voor Pa

Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1	Introduction	11
1.2	The social context of archaeology	12
1.3	Digging holes abroad	14
1.4	Current perspectives and their relationship with Dutch practices	15
1.5	An ethnographic approach to archaeological research projects abroad	19
1.6	A critical and reflexive account	21
1.7	Relevance	22
1.8	Structure	22

Chapter Two: An Ethnographic Approach to Archaeological Research Projects Abroad

2.1	Ethnographies of archaeology	25
2.2	Multivocality and community collaboration	27
	2.2.1 Multivocality and the decolonisation of archaeological practice	27
	2.2.2 Community and collaborative archaeology	28
2.3	Values and archaeological heritage management	32
2.4	Politics and power in archaeology	38
2.5	The value of discourse analysis for ethnographic research	44
	2.5.1 Discourses	44
	2.5.2 An ethnographic approach to policy and practice	46
2.6	Towards an ethnography of archaeological research projects abroad	47

Chapter Three: Asking Foreign Questions

3.1	Research approach	51
	3.1.1 Introduction	51
	3.1.2 Methods and analysis	52
3.2	Research design	54
	3.2.1 Choice of case studies	54
	3.2.2 Research design and fieldwork	57
3.3	Positionality	61

Chapter Four: The Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project

4.1	Introduction	65
4.1.1	Introduction	65
4.1.2	Structure of chapter	66
4.2	Background	67
4.2.1	The Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project	67
4.2.2	The Jordan Valley	69
4.2.3	Deir Alla	70
4.2.4	Tell Deir Alla	72
4.3	The Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project	73
4.3.1	Perceptions of success and failure	73
4.3.2	Archaeological theory and practice	79
4.4	The Authorised Archaeological Discourse	83
4.4.1	The Authorised Archaeological Discourse	83
4.4.2	All values are equal, but some values are more equal than others	86
4.5	Policy negotiations	93
4.5.1	The translation of values	93
4.5.2	The Department of Antiquities	98
4.5.3	The (foreign) archaeologist as expert	100
4.5.4	The DoA and the Ministry of Tourism	102
4.5.5	Local perspectives	107
4.6	Project policy and practical outcomes	113
4.6.1	Introduction	113
4.6.2	Project representations	114
4.6.3	The uncertain future of the Joint Project	119
4.6.4	Jordanian policy negotiations: maintaining ownership and access	126
4.7	The role and responsibility of foreign archaeologists	130

Chapter Five: The Santa Barbara Project

5.1	Introduction	135
5.1.1	Introduction	135
5.1.2	Structure of chapter	136
5.2	Background	137
5.2.1	Curaçao	137
5.2.2	Dutch archaeological research in Curaçao	139
5.2.3	Archaeological heritage management in Curaçao	140
5.2.4	Santa Barbara Plantation	147
5.3	The Santa Barbara Project	151
5.3.1	The Santa Barbara Project	151
5.3.2	Perceptions of success and failure	158
5.4	The Authorised Archaeological Discourse	161
5.4.1	Introduction	161
5.4.2	Archaeological heritage as a fragile scientific resource under threat	162
5.4.3	The primacy of science and excavation	163

5.4.4	Archaeological heritage as a professional concern of the state	164
5.4.5	Participation and education as to advance research and protection	165
5.5	Project policy negotiations and the translation of values	165
5.5.1	Alternative values and discourses	165
5.5.2	Policy negotiations and the translation of values	169
5.5.3	Mechanisms of exclusion	177
5.5.4	Project benefits	181
5.6	Project policy and practical outcomes	185
5.6.1	The (re-)production of heritage values and discourses	185
5.6.2	Policy, practice and access	186
5.6.3	Project contextualisation	190
5.7	The role and responsibility of archaeologists	192

Chapter Six: Digging Holes Abroad

6.1	Introduction	195
6.2	Archaeological values and discourses	196
6.3	Project negotiations	197
6.4	Policy and practice	200
6.5	Concluding thoughts	204

Appendix	207
-----------------	-----

References	209
-------------------	-----

Abbreviations and Acronyms	231
-----------------------------------	-----

List of Figures and Tables	233
-----------------------------------	-----

Dutch and English Summary	235
----------------------------------	-----

Acknowledgements	243
-------------------------	-----

Curriculum Vitae	245
-------------------------	-----

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 INTRODUCTION

As a result of both the nature and history of international archaeological efforts, western academic archaeologists and institutions play a substantial role in the research, management and development of archaeological heritage around the world. Over the last few decades, this ‘archaeology abroad’¹ has increasingly had to abandon its ‘ivory tower’ position in order to investigate, negotiate and develop its position and role in global society. This has led to considerable changes and demands to the undertaking of academic research projects abroad. The way in which the conduct and discourse of research archaeology abroad relates to the values and interests of others in society, and the processes by which archaeologists negotiate and construct their role and responsibility within archaeological, heritage and broader social contexts, are the main issues under investigation in this study. Specific attention will be given to the relationship between ‘collaborative’ policies and approaches with actual field practice.

This study is contextualized within the ‘Archaeology in Contemporary Europe’ project.² It brings forward an ethnographic and discursive analysis of two Dutch archaeological research projects abroad undertaken by the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University – notably the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Santa Barbara Project in Curaçao. By focusing on the ways and extents to which these research projects are influenced by different policy and funding programs for distinct social contexts abroad, and by investigating the operational systems, social relationships and dominating values and discourses that determine project practices, this study explores *how* archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context. As an ethnography, my interest is therefore not so much in archaeological research outcomes, but rather in project processes.

As part of the ethnography, I will also reflect upon the role and responsibility of archaeologists in relation to the values and demands of others when working abroad. Taken together, I therefore hope that this research can contribute to critical debates in archaeology that call for a self-reflexive collaborative archaeology that actively and ethically engages with community concerns – in the sense of facilitating and engaging their wishes and values in processes of archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration.

¹ With ‘archaeology abroad’, I refer in this study to archaeological research and heritage management projects undertaken by European practitioners and institutions that take place in areas that lie outside the geographic metropolitan borders of European nation states, and outside the direct sphere of enforcement of their national cultural and archaeological policies. For a detailed discussion on this terminology, please refer to section 3.2.1.

² ‘Archaeology in Contemporary Europe’ (ACE) is an international research project funded by the Culture 2007 Program of the European Commission, in which the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University is participating. The author was responsible in this project for the research theme ‘European Archaeology Abroad’, which has led to an edited volume (Van der Linde *et al.* forthcoming) that entails a comparative analysis of the historical and contemporary frameworks of European collaborative practices in foreign contexts. This study is contextualised in this research framework, particularly in relation to the article ‘Dutch Archaeology Abroad’ (Slappendel *et al.* forthcoming), which outlines the historical overview of Dutch practices abroad.

1.2 THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Investigations into the social context of archaeology have changed our discipline considerably – both as a topic of research, as well as through its influence on the conduct and discourse of the discipline. Although self-reflexive accounts of archaeology already appeared around the mid 20th century (Trigger 2008, 188), it was especially during the 1980's that investigations into the social context of archaeology took flight (see for example Leone *et al.* 1987; Shanks & Tilley 1988; Trigger 1984a; Ucko 1983). Since then, attempts to incorporate the social context more explicitly into the theory and conduct of archaeology – most notably by taking into account the values and interests of other groups in society – have been met with differing degrees of acceptance and rejection (Geurds 2007, 45).

The ways in which archaeology has dealt with, or was influenced by its social context has subsequently seen many forms. In line with the research undertaken by Kathryn Lafrenz Samuels (2008) on the central role of the concept of heritage value within archaeology, heritage management and society, I distinguish the following three interrelated themes within investigations of the social context of archaeology; a) multivocality and community collaboration, b) archaeological heritage management, and c) politics and power in archaeological decision-making.

The first process through which the social context of archaeology came into play, was within discussions on the interpretation of archaeological materials, most notably by means of the concept of 'multivocality'. This concept, which appeared from the 1980's onwards in post-processual and interpretive archaeology (see section 2.2), generally refers to the idea that people with different social backgrounds and interests will construct, or interpret, the meaning of the past differently (Hodder 2005). Questioning the idea that narratives about the past could be tested against objective data, and coupled with a concern for power inequalities and social injustice, this contributed to calls within the archaeological discipline in predominantly 'Anglo-American' contexts to better accommodate alternative, subaltern and multivocal perspectives into archaeological interpretations (Fawcett *et al.* 2008; Habu *et al.* 2008). Since then, archaeologists across the world have increasingly tried to take the values and interests of descendant peoples, local communities and other members of the general public towards the interpretation and investigation of the past into account, leading to concepts and methodologies such as 'public archaeology', 'community archaeology', 'indigenous archaeology', and, more recently, 'collaborative archaeology' (Hollowell & Nicholas 2009, 142).

Another process through which archaeologists have been confronted to deal with the values and interests of others in society, is that in the field of heritage management. Presently, it is probably safe to assume that the conduct and discourse of archaeology in western contexts has become increasingly governed and regulated by policies and theories of archaeological heritage management (Smith 2001; 2004). The implementation of the Malta Convention (Council of Europe 1992) in Europe, a result of the perceived need to mitigate the impacts of development on archaeological sites and materials, for instance meant that the undertaking of research-driven excavation projects by academic institutions became less apparent (Van der Linde *et al.* forthcoming). Not only did the emphasis on in-situ preservation in these policies mean that excavation projects guided purely by research questions at unthreatened sites became problematic, but the call for the inclusion of a developer-funded archaeology in the planning process also meant that governmental and research institutions in many western countries have had to abandon their monopoly on archaeological fieldwork. Presently, contract archaeologists in Western Europe are vastly outnumbering academic archaeologists, and many academic institutions have had to adapt to the demands of commercialisation, professionalisation, accountability and quality assurance.

Now that these ‘western’ theories and practices of archaeological heritage management are slowly being transferred to the global scale through scholarly debates, overseas policies, and international heritage agencies (Lafrenz Samuels 2008; and see for example Naffé *et al.* 2009), research traditions of European academic institutions are also becoming confronted with the concerns and practicalities of these heritage management policies when working abroad. The same can be said in relation to international commercial and extractive industries, which have increasingly started to incorporate heritage management guidelines in their own development activities – the ‘resource guide for integrating cultural heritage in communities work’ by the mining corporation Rio Tinto constituting a recent example (Rio Tinto 2011).

The social context of archaeology in the field of heritage management is however not solely limited to managing the processes by which the archaeological record is investigated and preserved. The past few decades, organisations such as UNESCO, the Getty Conservation Institute and ICOMOS have increasingly brought forward the idea that the archaeological process is just one element in an integrated and holistic approach to managing heritage sites and cultural landscapes in society, and that archaeological interventions should be intrinsically linked to other heritage management issues such as conservation, cultural tourism, education, urban planning and community development (Williams & Van der Linde 2006). Underlying most of these approaches and policies is the idea that not only the past, but also the definition and valorisation of cultural heritage is socially constructed (Smith 2006; Ashworth & Tunbridge 1996; Duineveld 2006; Van Assche 2004),³ which has contributed to calls to take the values and interests of other stakeholders into account as well – an idea perhaps most clearly brought forward by the Australian ICOMOS ‘Burra Charter’ (1999). In this sense, it should be noted that archaeological research practice and heritage management are part of the same process in terms of identifying and producing heritage values (Lafrenz Samuels 2008).⁴ In other words, archaeology is inherently linked to heritage-making and heritage discourses, which means that archaeological practitioners can no longer hide behind a notion of a value-free, neutral science.

Coupled with the emphasis within critical archaeology on the motivations and power of archaeological researchers in the interpretive process, this idea of archaeological interpretations as social constructions in contemporary discourses has strengthened the awareness that claims and narratives of the past are intrinsically linked to political and ideological influences.⁵ The third theme in archaeology along which social context can be approached, is therefore about investigations into the power and politics of the past. These include for instance those into the ideological, historical and political entanglements of archaeology with nationalism, colonialism, globalism or capitalism (see for example Diaz-Andreu & Champion 1996; García Diaz-Andreu 2007; Hamilakis & Duke 2007; Meskell 1998; Kohl 1998; Kohl & Fawcett 1995; Silberman & Small 1997; Trigger 2006), as well as into the hegemony of western values in archaeology and heritage management (see for example Byrne 1991; Cleere 1989a; 1989b; Smith 2006; Ucko 1995; and see Fienieg *et al.* 2008, 32-36).⁶ More recently, this has also included a focus on existing (unequal) power relationships in archaeological decision-making. The newly emerging field of ‘postcolonial archaeology’ has thereby actively called for ‘decolonizing’ the discourse and conduct of archaeology by challenging essentialism and colonial discourses in archaeology (for a recent overview, see Liebmann & Rizvi 2008), and by trying to break down existing power structures in the management and investigation of the past through applying community-based, participatory approaches (Greer *et al.* 2002;

³ See sections 2.4 and 2.5.

⁴ See section 2.3.

⁵ After Geurds (2007, 45).

⁶ These pages refer specifically to the contribution by the author in this book section.

Hollowell & Nicholas 2009; Moser *et al.* 2002; Marshall 2002), as well as through legislation such as ‘NAGPRA’, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (Liebmann 2008b).⁷

All of the three above mentioned themes are of course strongly interrelated, and all have played an important role in developing new archaeological policies, theories and methodologies that aim to better accommodate the needs and wishes of other demands in society. As I will discuss below, there remains however a widespread discussion and disagreement over what exactly ‘community-based’ (Moser *et al.* 2002; Marshall 2002; Geurds 2007), ‘collaborative’ (LaSalle 2010; Geurds 2011), ‘ethical’ (Meskell & Pels 2005a; Scarre & Scarre 2007; Tarlow 2001; Zimmerman *et al.* 2003), or ‘postcolonial’ archaeology (Pagán Jiménez & Rodríguez Ramos 2008; Liebmann & Rizvi 2008) entails, and how it relates to actual practice. Nevertheless, it can be summarised for now that the three themes have illustrated at least that the social context of our practices matter. The way in which we deal with other peoples views, values and interests in the interpretation and investigation of archaeological pasts and materials, the way in which we integrate our archaeological narratives and practices with other demands in the heritage field and with processes of heritage-making, and the way in which we deal with power differences in both these processes; all remain as challenging issues when undertaking archaeological projects in society.

1.3 DIGGING HOLES ABROAD

Although most of the above-mentioned critiques and issues have been addressed and developed mostly within western contexts (and arguably primarily within the ‘Anglo-American’ contexts of Australia, the UK and the USA), they also form the framework along which the ethics and socio-political and cultural contexts of European archaeological practice in non-western contexts are currently investigated and understood. Indeed, challenges deriving from the social context of archaeology arguably become even more paramount and pressing when western academics are ‘digging holes abroad’. Differences in legislative frameworks, historical power relationships, education, language, religion, political infrastructure, living standards and/or cultural identity, especially when coupled with the issue of “who gets to interpret whose history” (Geurds 2007, 45) are some of the contributing factors to this. Another complicating issue that many archaeologists are faced with in such contexts, is when less-developed economies do not have sufficient legislative, financial and professional means to deal with the threats of looting, illicit trade and the increasing globalisation of development and tourism pressures on archaeological resources (Lilley 2011, 1; Breen & Rhodes 2010).⁸ When western academics are confronted with the legacy of former colonialist institutional frameworks, with newly developing archaeological infrastructures, and/or with communities in extreme poverty it is therefore also not uncommon for archaeological projects to become entangled with overseas cultural policies and aid programmes that see cultural heritage primarily as a path towards progress, applying concepts such as ‘sustainable development’, ‘poverty reduction’ and ‘capacity building’ (Cernea 2001; Williams & Van der Linde 2006; see Van der Linde & Van den Dries forthcoming and Fienieg *et al.* 2008 for examples of such European international cultural policies). Simultaneously, archaeology in such circumstances is increasingly confronted with the spread of heritage management concerns in the context of activities by international development industries and policies of international organisations such as the World Bank (Lilley 2008; 2011; Lafrenz Samuels 2010), which brings with it both dangers and opportunities with regards to ethical

⁷ See U.S. National Parks Service, National NAGPRA. Available at: www.cr.nps.gov/nagpra [Accessed July 02, 2012].

⁸ Such contexts – often, but not exclusively situated in postcolonial nations – have brought forward archaeological frameworks that have by some been described as ‘Third World Archaeologies’ (Chakrabarti 2001, 1191-1193).

conduct in relation to community involvement, economic development and capacity building (Van der Linde 2011).

Taken together, the total of demands, interests, needs and responsibilities that the social context asks of individual archaeologists working abroad is – admittedly – enormous. The need to balance ethical, moral and responsible behaviour towards other groups in society, towards the archaeological record and towards science,⁹ whilst simultaneously trying to make a living in a context of decreasing financial opportunities for purely academic archaeological research,¹⁰ can therefore be a challenge, to say the least.

1.4 CURRENT PERSPECTIVES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH DUTCH PRACTICES

I have already mentioned several policies, methodologies and critiques that have been brought forward in order to guide the practice of archaeologists in society. Below, I will discuss the relationship of these policies, methodologies and critiques with actual practice, in particular in relation to my personal experience as an archaeological and heritage practitioner in the context of Dutch archaeology abroad. In order to do so, I will continue this introduction by dividing the current critiques, policies and theories not only along the lines of the three above-mentioned themes, but also on the basis of their (often implicit) perspective on the relationship between social context and actual archaeological practice.

Critiques in the theme of ‘multivocality and community collaboration’ have traditionally focused on ‘improving’ the theoretical and epistemological frameworks of archaeology in order to better accommodate for alternative, subaltern and local views in the interpretation and investigation of archaeological pasts and materials. Together, these have brought forward a range of new archaeological paradigms and methodologies, such as ‘postcolonial archaeology’, ‘indigenous archaeology’, ‘community archaeology’, and more recently, ‘collaborative archaeology’. Critiques in the theme of ‘archaeological heritage management’ traditionally focused on improving and designing new policy guidelines, models and ‘ethical’ guidelines. These have led to a huge array of professional and ethical codes of conduct on how to interact for example with developers and/or descendant communities (such as those by the World Archaeological Congress (1990) and the Society for American Archaeologists (1996)), cultural policies (such as NAGPRA 1990), and charters and conventions (such as the 1999 Australian ICOMOS ‘Burra Charter’ and the 1990 ICAHM Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage). Building loosely upon distinctions made between opposing views on the relationship between policy and practice in development sociology (cf Mosse 2005, 2-6; Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005, 85-87),¹¹ I label both these types of critiques as *instrumental perspectives*.

Critiques in the theme of ‘power and politics in archaeology’ are concerned mostly with differences in decision-making power, political uses of archaeological knowledge and interpretations, and with the hegemony of western values and perspectives in archaeological heritage practices. Such critiques often work from the idea that archaeology is ‘western’, ‘imperialist’, ‘nationalist’ or ‘colonial’ by nature, bringing forward works and critiques that expose the socio-political impact of archaeological research on local and descendent minority groups. Fundamental critical accounts in these include studies into the

⁹ As will be discussed in chapter 4, some archaeologists even feel this responsibility towards the people of the past, by trying to reconstruct the lives of past people as correctly as possible.

¹⁰ Decreasing financial opportunities for purely research-led archaeology abroad can be distilled for instance in relation to European archaeology abroad (see Van der Linde *et al.* forthcoming), and also in the Netherlands (KNAW 2007).

¹¹ See section 2.5.

hegemony of western values in heritage management (such as for example Byrne 1991; Cleere 1989a; 1989b, Hamilakis & Duke 2007; Trigger 1984b; Ucko 1995) as well as into ‘authorised’ heritage discourses that favour professional, governmental, objective and expert approaches to the past over subaltern and alternative heritage discourses and historical narratives (Smith 2006; Smith & Waterton 2009; Waterton *et al.* 2006).¹² These I refer to as the *critical perspectives*.

Many of these theories, policies and critiques that the above-discussed instrumental and critical perspectives brought forward, I learned about during my MA Managing Archaeological Sites at University College London (2004). When I returned several years later to the Netherlands, they also gave rise to my original ambition to undertake a PhD research on the ethics of Dutch archaeological practice in foreign social contexts. As a country without a specific national government institution that regulates and prescribes overseas archaeology directly, without specific enforceable codes of conduct in foreign contexts, without a strong tradition of post-processual archaeology and without a strong – if any – history of local indigenous resistance to archaeological heritage management (Slappendel *et al.* forthcoming; Willems 2009), I easily (and perhaps naively I might add with hindsight) convinced myself that Dutch archaeology abroad must be devoid of a firm awareness of other interests and responsibilities in its social context – and that illustrating this, and developing a proper ethical policy would be sufficient to change this. However, I soon realised that the practices and intentions of many Dutch archaeologists working abroad were of course not devoid of an awareness of their impact upon socio-cultural and economic local contexts. In addition, I realised that none of the above-discussed codes, theories or critiques could be regarded as prerequisites for ethical relationships between archaeologists and others in society, and that the labelling of projects as ‘postcolonial’, ‘ethical’ or ‘successful’ was much more problematic than simply evaluating the degree to which policies were implemented. In short, the policies, theories and strategies behind archaeological research projects abroad did not seem to have a simple one-to-one relationship with practice.

As such, I felt that there were several assumptions and preconceptions behind the theories, policies and critiques that were produced in the current three themes in archaeology that investigated social context, and that they did not match my experiences and encounters with the actual practice of Dutch archaeology abroad. I also realised that these assumptions could lead to incomplete and/or incorrect understandings of the social context of archaeology when left unquestioned, and as such, even to difficulties when attempting to implement these perspectives in daily archaeological practice.

The first of these is the (often implicitly) assumed universal applicability and enforceability of many contemporary archaeological codes, laws and regulations (Tarlow 2001; Meskell & Pels 2005a).¹³ Whilst my experience of contract archaeology in the UK and in the Netherlands for example leaves me in no doubt that “codes of practice, however dreary and unreflexive, have helped extend professional practitioners beyond their comfort zone and denied space to the blatantly unethical”, there are many problems to be faced in advancing and enforcing such policies and codes beyond the national borders of their sponsoring organisations (Perring & Van der Linde 2009, 204-205).

Codes of professional conduct such as those by the Society for American Archaeologists (1996), the UK Institute for Archaeologists (2010 - revised), and the Dutch NVvA (2001), have mostly been developed to address the conflicts of interest that arise in the conduct of commercially funded

¹² I will look at these issues in more detail in section 2.4

¹³ In the coming two paragraphs, I draw on previous work by the author, published elsewhere during the course of this study; see Perring & Van der Linde 2009.

archaeological work by private and profit-making bodies (cf Lynott & Wylie 2000, 35). However, many of my Dutch archaeological colleagues working abroad had not (consciously) signed up to such codes,¹⁴ not in the least because they were not enforceable and obligatory outside the Netherlands. International codes such as the Code of Ethics by the World Archaeology Congress, first adopted in 1990 (World Archaeology Congress 1990), are also not obligatory for Dutch archaeologists to adhere to when conducting archaeology anywhere in the world. As Tarlow has pointed out, there are also problems within these codes when concepts and approaches are translated from one context to another: concepts of indigeness that might be progressive in some post-colonial circumstances can become reactionary in others, where they can be perceived as xenophobic and nationalistic (Tarlow 2001; cf Perring & Van der Linde 2009, 204). These issues make it not only difficult, and potentially dangerous, to universalise codes of ethics – but also worthwhile investigating what the impact is of current ethical codes on archaeological practitioners, and what the underlying values and concepts are behind these. In addition, heritage legislation such as NAGPRA 1990,¹⁵ and national charters such as the 1999 Australian ICOMOS ‘Burra Charter’, have been primarily developed in the USA and in Australia respectively, countries where postcolonial and indigenous issues play a role within the national and legal scope of these countries themselves. The same is true for the critiques on the entanglement between politics, power and decision-making in critical, interpretive and social archaeologies, which by and large have been developed under the influence of post-processual, social and critical archaeological movements in Anglo-American contexts. It is therefore worth exploring how these relate to archaeological traditions in north-western Europe, such as those by the Netherlands.¹⁶ Here, local indigenous issues do not play a direct role in legislation and theory, and legislation as such has rather been developed to deal with the relationship between archaeologists and developers, where heritage preservation is often seen as a responsibility of the state. One can wonder however if these are applicable guidelines when legislations are confronted with ‘postcolonial’ issues in social contexts abroad, where ethical considerations are often much more geared towards relationships between archaeologists and descendant communities, and towards accommodating calls for alternative conceptions and ownership of heritage as opposed to a ‘stewardship’ by the state.¹⁷ Such things matter, especially now that the European ‘Malta Convention’ (Council of Europe 1992) is also being transferred to for instance the African continent (Naffé *et al.* 2009), and to overseas territories of European nation states such as in the Caribbean – an issue that I will look at in much more detail in chapter 5.

A second assumption is the idea that archaeological practice is driven mainly by single heritage policies and discourses. However, in the case of the Netherlands, there is no specific cultural policy that directs and oversees archaeological conduct abroad; archaeological projects are often rather the result of a myriad of funding policies, institutional policies, and governmental policies in the field of culture, science and foreign affairs (Slappendel *et al.* forthcoming). In addition, most of the above-mentioned critiques in the critical perspectives, often work from the basis that archaeology is western, imperialist and colonial by nature, and that field practice is the logical result of a single hegemonic discursive process. Both these notions seem to forego the role that individual practitioners play in designing, negotiating and determining practice; in reality, project outcomes are the result of negotiations between opposing, sometimes conflicting values, motivations and discourses between archaeologists and other stakeholders, often

¹⁴ This view was distilled through informal conversations with Dutch colleagues during the early years of my PhD research (2008-2010).

¹⁵ See U.S. National Parks Service, National NAGPRA. Available at: www.cr.nps.gov/nagpra [Accessed July 02, 2012].

¹⁶ For a discussion on ‘European Archaeology’, see Archaeological Dialogues 2008, Special Issue: Archaeology of Europe, the 2007 EAA Archaeological Dialogues Forum. *Archaeological Dialogues* (15)1.

¹⁷ See discussion section 2.4.

embedded within strict historical institutional and power relationships. Investigating the processes by which such negotiations and heritage discourses are shaped seems therefore worthwhile.

There is another problem related to the assumption that practice is driven by policy, and that is the idea that there somehow is a one-to-one relationship between theory and policy on the one hand, with actual practice on the other. As a result, ‘failures’ of archaeological projects (in terms of unethical behaviour, destruction of archaeological resources, or low quality science for instance) are often regarded as being the result of having the wrong theories, policies and regulations. But as any practitioner knows, successful implementation of a project is dependent on many other issues. From my own experience through working at archaeological sites in Mali, Palestine and Turkmenistan, I know that the (often rather vague) concepts such as ‘community archaeology’, ‘capacity building’, ‘sustainability’, ‘quality management’ and ‘joint partnerships’ are much harder to implement than theory or the best of intentions want us to believe. During my own fieldwork, I have also experienced how the power base in research, management, decision-making and benefits often continued to be skewed towards the outside researchers - to us, archaeologists from the Netherlands and the UK – despite our best of intentions to ‘decolonize’ our practices. Scarcity of available time, expertise and resources, but especially competing, more powerful demands to the archaeological process and miscommunication about each others expectations were the most pressing contributing factors in this. Our ‘failure’ to come to shared benefits and power in decision-making in these instances was therefore not so much a matter of having the wrong theory or policy, but rather one of implementation and competing demands and power struggles over the archaeological and heritage process. The way in which these ‘good intentions’ behind ‘community’ and ‘collaborative’ archaeology relate to actual practice, and the way in which these outcomes are influenced by the historical, political and funding frameworks of academic archaeology (La Salle 2010), are therefore topics worthwhile exploring in this study.

We could therefore also ask ourselves if the way in which projects are planned and represented in literature and project policies and reports, reliably reflect actual practice. In my initial research and experience, I came across Dutch projects that were actively advocating indigenous archaeologies and spending time and energy on conservation, training and education – without being driven by dedicated heritage policies and theories, and without representing their methods and theories as post-processual and postcolonial archaeology. On the other hand, I encountered an archaeological project that had been criticised for not giving enough attention to poverty alleviation – even though I knew that it was regarded and represented as an example of international collaboration and of ethical heritage practice by several Dutch governmental organisations. As such, it became clear to me that perceptions of success and failure could be conflicting and change rapidly, often despite a continuation of actual field practices.

Finally, I came to realise that binary oppositions and dichotomies such as western versus non-western, global versus local, processual versus post-processual, coloniser versus colonised, archaeologist versus developer and policy versus practice were often impractical when faced with the shades of grey of daily practice (cf Hodder 2008, 197-199). Local archaeologists who want to learn how to *do* processual and technical archaeology, instead of having to attend workshops and listening to western academics and consultants talking about participatory post-modern planning approaches; government representatives who actively limit our intentions to empower local archaeologists; communities in oppressed regimes who are not used to being asked anything and instead expect us to act as experts; archaeologists that are faced with a choice to combat destruction through working together with the military; local communities that expect us to address poverty issues whilst our funders are only willing to pay for research; or western archaeologists that are supporting imbalanced power structures in host communities because they are afraid of being accused of neo-colonialism - these are just a few examples of the complex social situations in which archaeologists have to negotiate their practices.

1.5 AN ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH PROJECTS ABROAD

To summarise, I believe that the current perspectives on the social context of archaeology often look either to the future – by trying to devise better policies, better theories and better ethical codes, trusting that these are neutral problem-solving mechanisms that will lead to better practice (cf Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005, 86), or critically to the past, through “show-and-tell ethical confessionary books” (Doeser 2008, 131) that see western archaeological projects and policies in the context of a colonial and hegemonic order that automatically favours western values over other values.¹⁸

But even though all of these critiques, theories and policies have contributed to awareness, debate and orientating practice, they pay little attention to the complex relationship between project policy, discourse and practice.¹⁹ As a result, little attention is often being paid to analysing the underlying processes by which archaeological research projects are developed, negotiated and implemented in social contexts abroad, and to the impact of the motivations, interests and personal backgrounds of archaeologists and other actors on project outcomes. In this sense, it is good to remember that “ultimately, archaeology is practiced by individuals making their own decisions, evaluations and ethical judgements, and expressing the intentions and motivations for their work through interactions and relationships with other individuals and communities” (Viner *et al.* 2008).

The difficulties to implement policies and theories, the huge array of competing demands that practitioners are facing when undertaking archaeological projects abroad, and a general belief amongst many archaeologists that too often, critiques constructed from moral theoretical high-grounds by ‘desk-based academics’ has overshadowed the best of their intentions, are therefore probably some of the reasons why some of my Dutch archaeological colleagues were initially acting reserved and defensively when I explained to them that my research dealt with the ethics and social context of archaeological projects.²⁰ Realising that there was a gap between the current archaeological perspectives on social context and my encounters with Dutch archaeology abroad, I decided that I would not try to develop new ethical guidelines, management models or new archaeological theory and systems of interpretation, as inherent in the ‘instrumental’ perspectives outlined above. Nor would I position myself solely within the ‘critical’ perspective, in the sense of evaluating archaeological project outcomes as being the automatic result of colonial, hegemonic and western processes of power (cf Mosse 2005, 2). Rather, I use in this study an *ethnographic* perspective towards archaeology (cf Castañeda & Matthews 2008; Edgeworth 2006; Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulis 2009; LaSalle 2010; Meskell 2005a) that investigates what archaeology does ‘outside academia’ (Smith 2004, 1), and that focuses on the “disjuncture of what we do and what we say we do” (Witmore 2006, 1). Primarily, this study therefore aims to investigate *how* Dutch archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context. Secondly, it aims to reflect on the role and responsibility of Dutch archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of others when working abroad.

¹⁸ The line of argumentation in this paragraph and the next was inspired by the work of Mosse (2005, 1-7) and Van Gastel & Nuijten (2005, 85-90) on the policy-practice nexus in western development aid.

¹⁹ With ‘project policy’ I broadly refer to project proposals and programs as developed by archaeological actors – as a specific reflection of a myriad of funding programs in the field of culture, research and foreign affairs, institutional policies, cultural and archaeological policies, ethical codes, management models, archaeological theory, and so on (see section 2.6).

²⁰ During the early phase of my research (2008-2009), I encountered several such cautious and almost defensive critiques during informal discussions with colleagues from Leiden University.

I have addressed these two research aims by undertaking an ethnography of Dutch archaeological research projects abroad. I explored the way in which the values and discourses of archaeological practitioners, institutions and policies relate to those of others in society, and how archaeological heritage policies, theories and aspirations relate to actual practice. In addition, I examined the processes by which archaeologists negotiate and construct their role, place and decision-making power within archaeological, heritage and broader social contexts, especially with regards to community involvement and collaboration.²¹

In particular, this study analyses and describes two research projects undertaken by the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University – one of them undertaken in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and one of them in Curaçao, now an autonomous country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands, but before 10 October 2010 part of the Netherlands Antilles. Both of these projects can be placed within long but distinctively different geographical research traditions in the Netherlands (notably ‘Near Eastern Archaeology’ and ‘Caribbean Archaeology’), and both of these projects operate within different political, legislative and financial frameworks. In addition, the concept of ‘archaeology abroad’ is obviously different - whilst the project in Jordan could be described as ‘transcultural’ and ‘transnational’, such a definition is less suitable for Curaçao, due to the strong historical and contemporary political and cultural influence of the Netherlands. However, it is precisely because of these differences and nuances that these projects were selected as case studies, as I will discuss in more detail in section 3.2.1.

Within this ethnographic study, archaeological research projects abroad²² are considered as networks of interlinked and sometimes contested interests, values and discourses towards the investigation and management of archaeological ‘heritage’ sites between archaeologists and other actors in a broad spatial and temporal scale. By following for example the motivations of those who fund archaeological research in government offices in the Hague, all the way to the perception of benefits by a local imam in a village in Jordan, this study focuses on the processes by which different values and discourses are negotiated through space and time, and how through this, certain discourses are given prevalence over others. A central argument that will be developed is the idea that these interrelations can be made explicit through applying an ethnographic approach in which the concepts of value and discourse are brought forward as analytical tools. The concept of value will be considered as an appropriate analytic because it currently plays a central role in both the practice and theory of several interconnected fields of the archaeological discipline that are relevant for understanding the social contexts of archaeological conduct (cf Lafrenz Samuels 2008),²³ but also because a theoretical and conceptual exploration of value in relation to heritage discourses can help us bring to light the diverse and conflicting beliefs, motivations and perceived responsibilities of actors. It should be noted that discussions on values within this study do not refer so much to values in the sense of guiding principles on what is moral, ethical or just, but rather to value in the sense of those qualities that are ascribed by actors to archaeological materials, sites and projects (Mason & Avrami 2002, 15-16). The analysis of the way in which projects work in their social context will as such be inspired by looking at value-based stakeholder models in heritage management literature (see for example Avrami *et al.* 2000; De la Torre 2002; Truscott & Young 2000; Teutonico & Palumbo 2002).

²¹ For a detailed description of the research aims and questions, please refer to the end of section 2.6

²² For a description of ‘archaeological research projects abroad’, please refer to section 3.2.1. as well as to note 1 in this chapter.

²³ See section 2.3.

This research has been undertaken from an interpretive perspective, based upon a social constructivist view towards society, heritage and the past (inspired by for example Ashworth *et al.* 2007; Duineveld 2006; Van Assche 2004). It combines ethnographic research with a discursive approach towards heritage policies and processes, which is inspired by approaches in archaeology, heritage studies, development sociology, the anthropology of policy and political sciences, drawing notably on the works by Smith (2004; 2006), Mosse (2004; 2005), Latour (1996; 2005) and Hajer (1995; 2005).

Dutch research archaeology abroad, from the point of view of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, has been my point of departure – it can be considered as the ‘culture’ that this ethnography investigates, focusing in particular on the two case studies as mentioned above. The methodology has been based upon fieldwork, semi-structured and open interviews, written documents, and participant observation – which will all be considered as qualitative data in this study.

This ethnography will go further than mere description by building arguments on the basis of discursive analysis of archaeological project policies and practices and on the basis of an ethnographic analysis that is informed by sensitising themes and concepts, as inspired by instances of constructivist grounded theory (see Charmaz 2000; 2006). As such, this ‘reflexive’ account of archaeological practice will include an analysis of my own positionality in relation to “project members and the social dynamics and processes in which research is embedded” (Castañeda 2008, 48), as well as of the literature that influenced my argumentations. The latter will be investigated in chapter 2, bringing forward a range of issues and ideas that together inform the conceptual framework that will support the analysis throughout this study.

1.6 A CRITICAL AND REFLEXIVE ACCOUNT

I wish to stress that I took this approach not to *judge* whether the two Dutch research projects are ‘ethical’, ‘successful’, or even ‘(post-)colonial’; rather, I wish to understand *how* the project worked within wider social and political frameworks. It is therefore not my intention to provide an analysis that can be read as a negative criticism. In line with Mosse’s clarification of his ethnographic analysis of aid policy and practice (2005, x-xi), I want to clarify here that first of all, as an ethnographic study, my aim was not to provide a full historical evaluation of the two Dutch projects and their accomplishments, nor do I wish to provide a judgement of success. It should rather be regarded as a contribution to the understanding of the role of the personal, historical and institutional frameworks and discourses of academic archaeological projects in social contexts abroad, contributing to the field of archaeological heritage management and to the emerging body of work that deal with ethnographies of archaeology in particular.

This interpretive research is influenced by my personal perspectives and background. I accept that I might have influenced the activities, events and views of those actors that I worked with and interviewed as part of my research. I also want to stress, again in agreement with Mosse (2005, xi), that I do not question the sincere commitment, hopes and desires of the actors involved. Just as I, the actors in relation to the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project and the Santa Barbara Project might have made mistakes. Some of the actors have admitted such perceived mistakes as personal failures, but more importantly, I think most ‘mistakes’ could be regarded mostly in light of the discursive conditions and value-networks of Dutch archaeological heritage and research policies, and in light of the historical developments of the archaeological discipline and the institutional relationships that shaped the projects. I will delve in more detail into my ‘research-positioning’ in section 3.3.

1.7 RELEVANCE

Ultimately, this research seeks to inform critical debates in archaeology that call for a self-reflexive archaeological practice that actively and ethically engages with community concerns. As such, this study is relevant to the intersection of the emerging field of archaeological ethnographies with other areas of research that seek to understand the social context of archaeology, such as social archaeology, critical archaeology, interpretive archaeology, postcolonial archaeology and archaeological heritage management – most notably by focusing explicitly on the motivations, discursive practices and relationships of archaeological operators and other actors in society. In addition, it seeks to bring several disciplines together by borrowing insights from the fields of heritage studies, social anthropology, the anthropology of policy and development sociology, and applying these explicitly into an ethnographic and discursive analysis of archaeological practice.

As discussed above, it can also be noted that most ethnographic approaches towards understanding the socio-political contexts of archaeology and heritage management are at present mostly originating from Australia and the USA, with important, although still too few, contributions by non-western and/or indigenous scholars on the more local ramifications of western archaeologies. I hope that this research can contribute to this body of work by providing a view from the Netherlands against the background of continental European archaeology.

Another relevance of this study lies in the potential implications for the institutional and political ramifications of Dutch academic archaeology, and the subsequent impact this might have towards the scope, development and funding of archaeological research projects abroad. Although the translation of this ethnography into specific policy goals lies outside the scope of this study (see section 3.2.1), I will touch upon some of these issues as part of my conclusion in chapter 6.

1.8 STRUCTURE

What remains in this introduction, is to provide an overview of the general structure of this study. Detailed descriptions of the specific structure of the argument will be provided at the start of each individual chapter.

Chapter 2 will deal with the conceptual framework of this study. The first part of the chapter will examine how recent work under the header of ‘ethnographies of archaeology’ can contribute to an understanding of how archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context. The second part of this chapter will discuss the value of combining discursive analysis with ethnographic research, as a way to examine the delicate nexus between policy, discourse, practice and the agency of actors. The end of chapter 2 will tie the conceptual framework together, through describing the analytical tools and sensitising concepts that form the basis of an ethnographic practice approach towards investigating archaeological research projects abroad. This will also bring forward the specific research questions that will be addressed in the two case studies.

Chapter 3 sets out the methodological framework of this study by describing the research approach, methods and modes of analysis. This chapter will also deal with the scope and research design of the two case studies, describing in detail how they were approached, investigated and analysed ‘in the field’, and how they relate to the general research aims and specific research questions. The chapter ends with an investigation into the ‘positionality’ of the researcher. Chapter 4 and 5 will investigate how the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project and the Santa Barbara Project respectively worked in their social contexts, the description of which will follow the order of the research questions as outlined at the end of

chapter 2. As such, they will identify the values and discourses of actors in archaeological project policies with respect to research, heritage management and collaboration, investigate how archaeological actors negotiate these values and discourses in relation to those of others, and explore the influence of this process of policy negotiation upon project outcomes.

The conclusion in chapter 6 will return to the general research aims. As such, it will summarise and discuss the research questions and findings as to be able to understand how Dutch archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context. The study will end with a reflection upon the role and responsibility of archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of others in society, which will include a discussion on the value of ethnographies for future practices of archaeological research abroad.

Chapter Two: An Ethnographic Approach to Archaeological Research Projects Abroad

2.1 ETHNOGRAPHIES OF ARCHAEOLOGY

‘Ethnographies of archaeology’ constitute a relatively new phenomenon. It arguably is best understood as a reflexive method of investigating what archaeology *does* in society (cf Smith 2004, 1), rather than conceiving of it as a specific field within the archaeological discipline (Castañeda & Matthews 2008). As a reflexive method, it has its roots mostly within the interpretive postprocessual archaeologies of the 80’s and 90’s and in the idea that interpretations of the past are socially constructed, multivocal and politically influenced²⁴. The last decade in particular has seen the emergence of several studies that placed the ethnographic method within archaeology in a historical perspective (Castañeda & Matthews 2008; Edgeworth 2006; Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulis 2009; Hollowell & Nicholas 2008; Pyburn 2008; 2009).

In an extensive categorisation of the intersections between ethnography and archaeology, Castañeda (2008) made an important distinction between ‘ethno-archaeology’ and ‘ethnographies of archaeology’.²⁵ Ethno-archaeology in this respect can be summarised as the use by archaeologists of ethnographic methods “for the sake of archaeology”, where “the use of ethnography is limited as a method aimed primarily to produce knowledge that will contribute to understanding the past as a given, material reality that is epistemologically, but not ontologically, separate from the present” (Castañeda 2008, 28). These studies by and large had their origin in processual/new archaeology of the 70’ (see e.g. Binford 1978; Gould 1974), whereby ethnography was used as a method to focus on the “behavioural patterns in association to material culture” of contemporary communities, as to inform the interpretation of archaeological records and site formation processes (Castañeda 2008, 28).

The other intersection of archaeology and ethnography can be labelled as ‘ethnographies of archaeology’. These studies by and large applied ethnography and socio-cultural anthropology to understand the political, historical and discursive working of archaeology in contemporary social contexts – that is, rather as a way to explain the present. Although some of the more socio-political and critical historic studies under this category were done without using a clear ethnographic method at all, Castañeda considers them as part of ‘ethnographies of archaeology’ because of their distinct reflexive critiques on the social and political nature of archaeology (ibid., 33). These studies include for instance socio-political histories of archaeological knowledge in relation to nationalism and colonialism (e.g. Trigger 1984a; 1984b; Diaz-Andreu & Champion 1996; García Diaz-Andreu 2007; Kohl 1998; Kohl & Fawcett 1995), as well as more ‘inward looking’ investigations into the political nature of archaeology and knowledge production in relation to for example indigenous and gender issues (Shanks & Tilley 1988; Meskell 1998; 2002; 2005b; Leone *et al.* 1987). More recently, this category also includes studies that draw explicitly on ethnographic methods, such as those that investigate the epistemological nature of archaeological methodology, practice and knowledge production (Edgeworth 2006; Van Reybrouck & Jacobs 2006; Holtorf 2006; Goodwin 2006). In contrast to the categorisation by Castañeda (2008), I also place the well-

²⁴ See section 2.2

²⁵ Castañeda (2008) also brought forward the notion of ‘ethnographic archaeology’, to refer to an archaeological practice that continuously and reflexively uses ethnographic methods as to enhance stakeholder participation during fieldwork. I will come back to this issue in chapter 6.

known reflexive and interpretive methods of Ian Hodder and his colleagues at Çatalhöyük (Hodder 2000; Bartu 2000) under this heading. Even though they arguably sought to primarily serve the archaeological agenda by trying to increase the understanding of the archaeological past (Castañeda 2008, 29), I suggest that their focus on the epistemological nature of understanding the past by investigating how contemporary communities give different meanings toward archaeological materials, merits this categorisation (see section 2.2.1. for a more detailed description of this issue). Other ‘ethnographies of practice’ that used ethnographic methods specifically, and that looked over the boundaries of archaeological sites and projects into the broader social-political context of archaeology, include those studies that investigated the discursive practices of archaeology, and in particular the impact of western heritage discourses and policies on descendant and stakeholder communities (see especially Smith 2004; 2006; Waterton *et al.* 2006).

As an ethnographic and discursive analysis of Dutch research projects and practices abroad, this study can be placed firmly in the second category, that of ‘ethnographies of archaeology’. I will therefore not focus on those ethno-archaeologies that seek to inform archaeological interpretations of past materials. Rather, the first part of this chapter will examine the way in which recent work under the header of ‘ethnographies of archaeology’ can contribute to an understanding of how archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context, by delving deeper into the three interrelated themes as outlined in the introduction (section 1.2).²⁶ Section 2.2 ‘multivocality and community collaboration’ will examine how the ‘reflexive’ and ‘interpretive’ methods of post-processual archaeology have informed our understanding of the past as being socially constructed, and how different groups of people give different meanings towards archaeological sites and materials. This section will end with a discussion on the difficulty of implementing concepts such as ‘multivocality’, ‘community archaeology’ and ‘decolonisation’ in practice, focusing on the need for critically engaging with the social position of stakeholder groups. In particular, I will argue how an ethnographic analysis of archaeological projects could achieve this by moving away from simple dichotomies such as ‘global’ versus ‘local’, and by bringing forward a conception of archaeological projects as multi-spatial, multi-temporal, multi-vocal and contested sites of knowledge, practice and power. In section 2.3 ‘values and archaeological heritage management’, I will hold this ‘multivocal’ and ‘multi-sited’ approach to the past against the idea of a constructivist notion of heritage, after which its implications in relation to current ‘value-based’ heritage management models will be discussed. A fundamental notion in this is that archaeological research practice and heritage management should be considered as part of the same process in terms of identifying and producing heritage values. Section 2.4 ‘politics and power in archaeology’, subsequently investigates how certain western heritage values became dominant within the socio-political and historical frameworks of archaeology. In particular, it will draw attention to the utility of discourse analysis for examining the social context of archaeological projects abroad, by highlighting studies that identified the socio-political impact of official, modernist and authorising heritage discourses on descendant and local communities.

The second part of this chapter will discuss the value of combining discursive analysis with ethnographic research (section 2.5), as a way to examine the delicate nexus between policy, discourse and practice. As we will see, such a method can draw attention to the agency of actors, by investigating how they negotiate their values and discourses in archaeological practices. Section 2.6 will tie the conceptual framework together, which, through providing analytical tools and sensitising concepts, will inform my methodology and analysis in this study (see chapter 3). I will end this chapter by formulating the specific

²⁶ Although this study will not ignore ethnographies that look into the epistemological nature of archaeological knowledge production (see chapter 4), it will underplay such elements as their primary strength lies not in increasing the understanding of how archaeological projects work in their social context in relation to others in society – for an overview, see e.g. Edgeworth (2006).

research questions that can inform an ethnographic investigation into the role of Dutch research projects and practitioners in social contexts abroad.

2.2 MULTIVOCALITY AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION

2.2.1 MULTIVOCALITY AND THE DECOLONISATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRACTICE

An important recent volume that investigates the complex relationship between archaeological practice and contemporary society, is ‘Evaluating Multiple Narratives’ (Habu *et al.* 2008). Drawing in particular on the work by Trigger (1984a; 1984b) and Hodder (1999; 2000), it provides a global evaluation of the concept of ‘multivocality’.²⁷ Calling for the adoption of this notion in relation to ‘community collaboration’ and the general ‘decolonisation’ of the archaeological discipline, the authors generally approach archaeological multivocality as a concept that “gives voice to underrepresented groups and individuals by providing alternative interpretations of the past” (Habu *et al.* 2008, 222).

Following closely the historic overview of the origins of the concept of ‘multivocality’ within this volume (Fawcett *et al.* 2008, 1-5), the work by Trigger (1984a; 1984b) can indeed be regarded as a very influential writing that investigated the socio-political and historical context of archaeology. Trigger argued that the nature of archaeological research is dependent on the economic, cultural and historic role that specific nation-states play in the world, and that three alternative ‘archaeologies’ could be distinguished; ‘nationalist’, ‘colonialist’, and ‘imperialist’. Nationalist archaeologies were in his view those archaeological practices that were carried out and supported by nation states as to enhance their national identity and self-esteem, with compelling case studies around the world including Germany, China and Israel (Fawcett *et al.* 2008, 1). Since then, such nationalist archaeologies have continuously been identified in for example the Middle East (Meskell 1998) and the Americas (Zimmerman *et al.* 2003). Colonialist archaeologies were, according to Trigger (1984a; 1984b), those archaeological practices carried out by archaeologists working on behalf of the state in colonised areas, such as historically in the USA and by European nation states in Sub-Saharan Africa (cf Fawcett *et al.* 2008, 1-2; Thiaw forthcoming). Such archaeological practices often worked, either explicitly or unconsciously, to justify colonisation and discrimination by emphasising ‘primitiveness’ and they can often be connected to a colonial project that sought to explain global western dominance in terms of an ongoing process of ‘cultural evolution’;

In these models Europe was commonly depicted as being at the ‘civilised’ pinnacle, whereas the ‘savage’ or ‘barbarian’ colonised peoples were usually seen through a culture-historical lens which interpreted their cultural innovations as a result of external diffusion rather than the product of indigenous development and initiation (Fienieg *et al.* 2008, 33).

Imperialist archaeologies, then, refer to the archaeological traditions of countries such as the UK, USA and the former Soviet Union, which brought forward an often inherently perceived superiority and universal applicability of its theoretical models and theories. Of course, these categories often overlap, as the work on the imperialist influences of archaeological traditions by European nation states in former colonies illustrates (Ucko 1995; Gnecco forthcoming).

²⁷ See also Meskell (2005).

In general, the work by Trigger has inspired a body of literature within the archaeological discipline that worked from the basis that archaeological interpretations are never objective, and that they are dependent on their social-political and historical context. Such a view was enhanced from the mid-1980's onwards under the influence of postmodernism and post-structuralism – for instance through the work of anthropologists such as Bourdieu (1977) and Sahlins (1976) –, leading to the advent of post-processual archaeology (see for example Hodder 1985; Shanks & Tilley 1987). By and large, such bodies of work applied concepts such as meaning, agency and symbolism, and argued for a notion that material culture was active – that it was used and manipulated by people to achieve social ends (Hodder 2005, 211). In addition, post-processualism sought to criticise the positivism and scientific objectivism of processual archaeology, and as such put increasing attention to the relationship between the archaeologist and the research process, by focusing upon the subjective nature of their interpretations.

Coupled with predominantly Anglo-American critiques from 'social archaeology' (which sought attention for the social responsibilities and impacts of archaeological practice on contemporary communities, see e.g. Meskell 2005b; 2002), and 'critical archaeology' (which effectively turned the influence of social contexts and research interests upon archaeological practice into its focus of analysis; cf Geurds 2007, 45; Leone *et al.* 1987) this contributed to a realisation that interpretations of material cultures of the past can't, and shouldn't be excluded from contemporary values and social contexts. Underlying this, was the growth of global social movements supporting the rights of previously underrepresented and marginalised groups, such as Afro-Americans, Native Americans and women, as well as global processes of decolonisation that saw the rise of alternative voices and claims to archaeological heritage (Fawcett *et al.* 2008, 3). Ultimately, these critiques led to critical awareness amongst predominantly historical archaeologists in the USA and Australia that the histories and values of indigenous communities should actively be heard in the archaeological process, to changing legislation such as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act²⁸ (see section 1.2) and to the rise of ethical codes such as those by the Society for American Archaeology (1996) or the Australian Archaeological Association (1991).²⁹

All of these insights and critiques then influenced the development of 'interpretive' archaeological methods and theories from the 90's onwards, which argued that "different people with different social interests will construct the past differently" (Hodder 2005, 209). The work by Hodder (1999; 2000) and his colleagues at Çatalhöyük is one of the most clear examples of this, where the concept of 'multivocality' was brought forwards as a central argument that stated that archaeologists had the ethical responsibility to acknowledge the 'voices' of underrepresented groups, by facilitating and empowering them to create their own, alternative interpretations of the past. The translation of this concept into practice through 'community' and 'collaborative' methodological approaches has however been far more complex than its ideals in theory suggested. This will be investigated in the next section.

2.2.2 COMMUNITY AND COLLABORATIVE ARCHAEOLOGY

The concept of multivocality has perhaps most clearly contributed to a call for 'community archaeology' and 'collaborative archaeology', which together could be conceived as a means "to bring archaeology closer to those people who actually live near to and/or relate in some way to the site" (Geurds 2007, 46). Since its appearance in the early 90's, such concepts have become an important part of the archaeological discipline, appearing not only in the UK, USA and Australia, but all over the world (Marshall 2002). But

²⁸ See U.S. National Parks Service, National NAGPRA. Available at: www.cr.nps.gov/nagpra [Accessed July 02, 2012].

²⁹ See sections 1.4 and 2.4.

despite its wide appearance in archaeological literature, there still are remarkably few works that methodologically outline exactly *how* community collaboration can be achieved in practice. The well-known work at Quseir in Egypt constitutes one of a few rare exceptions in the field of community archaeology (Moser *et al.* 2002), which generally emphasises the importance of oral history, outreach, communication, training and employment. The same can be said with regards to ‘collaboration’, where the work by Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008) remains an important example of how such a concept might be implemented in practice. As a result, there seems to be little consensus on what community collaboration actually means or how its aspirations can be accomplished in practice, leading to a continuum of work under this header which ranges from ‘informing people’ or ‘working together’ with local community members as labourers on the one hand (cf La Salle 2010, 406), to collaborative work that actively seeks to relinquish control to indigenous people on the other hand (Nicholas & Hollowell 2009, Colwell-Chanthaphonh & Ferguson 2008).³⁰

Most notably, this latter understanding has formed the basis of collaborative approaches as advanced under the umbrella of the ‘decolonisation’ of archaeology (for a concise overview, see Liebmann & Rizvi 2008) which entails not only the deconstruction of systems of power in archaeological history and theory through highlighting colonial discourses and essentialism, but also “possibly most importantly, a willingness among archaeologists to fundamentally relinquish power in the field” (Liebmann 2008a, 17).

In this respect, it is worth exploring if there are perhaps “discrepancies between how researchers ‘sell’ the collaborative endeavour in theory and how it is actually practised” (LaSalle 2010, 401). Indeed, implementing such collaborative projects in practice is often far more difficult than the ideals of its theory would suggest. Apart from the practical challenges such as limited resources, available funds, and communication (see section 1.3 and 1.4), there are perhaps more fundamental issues at play.

In this sense, it is important to realise that most writings on community archaeology have often focused on the ‘decolonisation of archaeology’ through the calling for greater equity and participation of descendant communities in those countries traditionally defined as postcolonial – the indigenous issue thereby often colouring the debate on the value of community-based archaeology (cf Smith 2006, 36). Whilst I endorse the value of such ‘indigenous archaeology’ – because it has the potential to break down discriminating and/or oppressing power structures in archaeology and heritage management, and because it can challenge the authority of western, colonial and essentialist ways of knowing the past (cf Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulis 2009, 81), it is important to realise that not all communities are made up (entirely or at all) of descendant groups, and that collaborative approaches also have their value in relation to ‘local communities’. In addition, it should be kept in mind that the practical claims that local communities bring to the archaeological process are not necessarily different from those of descendant and indigenous communities (Geurds 2007), and, in turning to the scope of this study, that definitely not all Dutch research projects abroad are faced *per se* with the need to incorporate ‘indigenous issues’ and challenging essentialism (cf Willems 2009, 653). In this sense, it has been argued that “in principle, all contemporary inhabitants close to an archaeological site, qualify in this set of practices as a community that can interact with the archaeological investigation” (Geurds 2007, 48; and see Marshall 2002 and Moser *et al.* 2002). For the purpose of this study, I therefore define ‘local community’ on the basis of the work by Gould; meaning simply “all of the residents of a heritage asset locale <who are affected by the archaeological project>, whether or not they are a culturally homogenous group and whether or not individuals have competing traditional, economic or political claims to the site” (cf Gould 2009, 4). With such an understanding in place, it becomes clear that communities are not made up of homogeneous groups with

³⁰ After Geurds (2011).

single agendas, motivations and identity – indeed, archaeological projects can get caught up in local politics, and the question of who represents the community remains a crucial challenge.

Another issue is that collaborative archaeological projects not only have to deal with local communities, but also with a wider range of regional, national and global stakeholders, each with their distinct views and wishes towards the archaeological process. This issue becomes for example clear when collaborative approaches are intersecting with national heritage management initiatives and discourses. Recently, Geurds (2011) has for instance illustrated how a Dutch collaborative project in Nicaragua got caught up in competing claims over stewardship between national archaeological authorities and local groups, where fundamentally different ideas towards ‘heritage’ existed at the core of the friction. I will look at the political and social impact of such ‘authorised heritage discourses’ later on in much more detail (Smith 2006; see section 2.4), but is important here to stress that national management authorities the world over have often prioritised the material remains of heritage locales as to advance ideas of national identity in opposition to more alternative heritage discourses that prioritised alternative, more ‘intangible’ ways of seeing the past.

On the other hand, it has been noted that ‘indigenous’ and ‘community’ claims should not be taken at face value by archaeologists in their desire to ‘do good’, since promoting such ‘alternative archaeology’ without caution has led in several instances to opposite effects (Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulis 2009). Case studies from Korea for example have illustrated how the empowerment of previously marginalised groups under colonisation have led to national archaeologies that in turn marginalised other groups in society, as well as expressions of “superiority of previously oppressed groups in relation to foreigners” (Kim 2008, 118). Indeed, “the ‘local’ is not necessarily right” (Hodder 2008, 199), and indigenous groups are as capable of essentialist and nationalist claims as any other (Fawcett *et al.* 2008; Colwell-Chanthphonh 2006).

Collaborative approaches and ‘multivocality’ therefore entails much more than simply “providing people with a stage on which they can speak”, but should rather ask questions such as ‘whose values and interests are prioritised?’, and most importantly, ‘who decides?’ (Hodder 2008, 196-199). In order to be able to address such reflexive issues, I believe it useful to return to the above mentioned work at Çatalhöyük, which advanced a conception of the archaeological site as being a socially constructed entity consisting of a multitude of spatial and temporal scales, where different groups and interrelations of groups bring different meanings, interpretations and agendas to processes of archaeological knowledge production and consumption (Bartu 2000; Shankland 2005); but see also Yarrow 2006; Witmore 2006). A fundamental issue in this, was the idea that these different groups and individuals (including for instance local inhabitants, tourists, archaeologists, national heritage officials, and even international fashion designers) influenced the archaeological process itself (Bartu 2000). In this sense, I believe that if we wish to approach ‘community collaboration’ reflexively, we should move away from a single focus on ‘local communities’. Rather, I propose to build upon a notion of ‘communities’, referring to all those stakeholder or groups that affect, or are affected by the archaeological project, independent of their residency or locale, and independent of their background, claims and demands. Here, I built explicitly on the idea that communities can be geographically dispersed (Smith & Waterton 2009, 19), and on the idea that a ‘site’ is not a culturally or spatially bound entity (Gupta & Ferguson 1997).

In addition to such a notion of the multi-locality of archaeological sites, we can also conceive of them as multi-temporal. Material artefacts and/or archaeological sites can play different roles in socio-political contexts over time, attracting different meanings and interpretations by people throughout history – an understanding that lies at the core of the work by for example Appadurai (1986). Such interpretations in relation to different timescales however come together in the present when archaeological projects are

dealing with the issue of community collaboration, because archaeological sites can be conceived of as having “multiple, coexisting times enacted by the presence of materiality”, evoking “often conflicting social practices and political strategies” in contemporary settings (Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulis 2009, 78-79).




Figure 01. Visual conceptualisation of the multi-vocal, multi-spatial and multi-temporal character of archaeological projects and sites (see also figures 02 and 03).

When approaching archaeological sites and projects in such a way (see Figure 01), it is then also needed to focus on the ways in which archaeological research and heritage discourses can lead to an “asymmetrical impact of the archaeological project upon different social and economic groups” (Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulis 2009, 70) – illustrated for example by the discursive use of dichotomies such as ‘alternative’ or ‘local’ interpretations versus ‘professional’ interpretations. Indeed, sites and projects are not only ‘multiple’ (Hodder 2000; 2008; Bartu 2000) in the sense of having a multivocal, multi-temporal, and multi-spatial character, but also in the sense of a socially constructed and dispersed “field of power, practice and knowledge” (Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulis 2009, 70), potentially being “fraught with contending claims of ownership, identity and use rights” (Castañeda 2008, 37).³¹

Ethnographies of archaeological projects should therefore bring forward a reflexive and nuanced understanding of concepts such as ‘multivocality’, ‘decolonisation’ and ‘community collaboration’, by looking into the social position of stakeholder groups (Hodder 2008; Castañeda 2008; Geurds 2007; 2011; Pyburn 2009). The postcolonial notion of ‘hybridity’ can perhaps play an important role here (Atalay 2008; Rizvi 2008; Liebman 2008b; and see Bhabha 1994), since it allows for a nuanced understanding of the complex alliances between stakeholders, discourses and practices at multiple levels (Fawcett *et al.* 2008,

³¹ Indeed, the ethnographic focus on ‘sites’ should also include the “discourses associated with the archaeological project or with the archaeological heritage of the region/nation, whether these are produced by archaeologists or other social agents” (Castañeda 2008, 38) . This will be investigated in sections 2.3 and 2.4.

6), and for the ‘blurring’ of archaeological practices (Silliman 2009) by opposing simple dichotomies such as ‘local’ versus ‘global’, ‘good’ versus ‘right’ and ‘professional’ versus ‘alternative’ interpretations.

To summarise, this section has argued how ‘multivocality’, ‘decolonisation’ and ‘community collaboration’ are complex notions that are crucial factors in understanding the social context of transnational and/or transcultural archaeological projects. In addition, this section has illustrated that the translation of such concepts into practice is not without difficulties, and that its analysis can benefit from a reflexive, ethnographic approach that looks at the social position of stakeholders, and that allows for a more ‘hybrid’ and nuanced understanding of project processes and their actors. Such an ethnographic approach should then build upon a broad definition of the concept of ‘site’ and ‘community’, as to allow for the multi-sited, multi-vocal, multi-temporal relationships and alliances of different groups and individuals in society that are affected by – and affect – archaeological projects. We have also seen how the relationship between ‘collaborative’ archaeological projects and wider global and national heritage management policies and discourses seems crucial for an understanding of how archaeological projects work in their social context. This will be investigated in the following two sections.

2.3 VALUES AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT

In this section, I will argue how the concept of *value* can be brought forward as a central element for investigating the motivations, needs and perspectives of social actors towards collaborative archaeological projects as well as heritage management issues more broadly. Central to this argument is the idea that archaeological research practice and heritage management are part of the same process in terms of their interaction with archaeological resources, and that they are both intertwined with processes in which actors identify and produce value (Lafrenz Samuels (2008); on whose work I will draw repeatedly in this section).

In the last two decades, increasing attention has been given to the central role that the concept of value can play in understanding processes of archaeological research, heritage management and self-reflexive investigations on the social context of archaeology (see for example Lafrenz Samuels 2008; Mathers *et al.* 2005; Smith *et al.* 2010b; Lilley 2005; Avrami *et al.* 2000; De la Torre 2002; Truscott & Young 2000). In relation to the theme of ‘multivocality and community collaboration’ as discussed above, the concept of value has illustrated how different people with different backgrounds and agendas interpret the past differently – in other words, that reconstructions of the past are not free from value-judgements of the researcher (Lafrenz Samuels 2008, 80). We have also seen how archaeological interpretations are linked to the agendas and motivations of actors, and how it can be inherently linked to political frameworks and motivations that prioritise certain narratives and histories over others.

What this means, is that the underlying assignment of values in archaeological interpretations and research can not be seen separately from political issues of identity and property, and with wider processes of ‘heritage’ identification and construction (see below). The way in which certain places have been identified to national and religious histories on the expense of other narratives, has for instance clearly been argued by research into Israeli archaeology in its relation to Palestine (see e.g. El-Haj 2001; Greenberg 2009). The process of archaeological research and interpretation of past materials can as such be considered as being part of the same process as heritage management and ‘heritage-making’;

All archaeological practices, whether managerial or interpretative, should be understood as producing value. Moreover, the practices in one arena of archaeology – whether academic,

heritage management or sub-disciplinary – affect the way that value is produced in other arenas of archaeology and how the discipline of archaeology is perceived, therefore influencing our dialogical modes of engagement with the world (Lafrenz Samuels 2008, 91).

Indeed, values in archaeological heritage management can presently be seen as a fundamental concern in the investigation and management of archaeological materials, since they shape almost every decision in the field:

The assignment of value to material heritage is, in the end, seen at all stages of a project: value prefigures the kinds of research questions being asked, the choices made in what is conserved and what is destroyed (whether for development or research programmes), how we categorise the heritage, how we manage it and mitigate impacts, and whether the material is deemed heritage at all. However, while the assignment of significance is a singular step within the process of determining how to manage a specific material heritage, it nevertheless affects and dominates the whole process (*ibid.*, 72-73).

Over the last few decades, the concept of value has therefore become a fundamental concern in the practice and theory of archaeological heritage management in terms of assessing the ‘significance’ of archaeological and cultural resources, most notably in the USA, Australia and the European continent. Value-based significance assessment in this sense determines what should be investigated, excavated, developed, preserved or restored. The concept of ‘significance’ in archaeological heritage management is important in this sense, since the related value assessments often preclude ethical issues such as who has the right to decide whose values are to be upheld in the archaeological process.

Lafrenz Samuels has subsequently given a concise and sharp overview of the ‘genealogy’ of this significance concept, illustrating how its meaning and use has changed over the last few decades, and how it subsequently has moved to the global scale through translation into international heritage policies and through scholarly debates. In North America and Australia, the meaning and use of ‘value’ has changed in broad terms from meaning ‘uniqueness’ in terms of the potential contribution of archaeological materials to archaeological research design and data production in the 60’s and 70’s, through to considering the wider meaning and value of archaeological materials in social contexts as being important to significance (*ibid.*, 90; but see for example Darvill 1994 and Cleere 1989a; 1989b). At present, significance assessments in Anglo-American contexts increasingly take spiritual and social values within the social context into account. In continental Europe, where contract archaeology is a comparative recent introduction with the Malta Convention in 1992 (Council of Europe 1992), significance assessments are mostly based upon assigning values of the archaeological record as functions of potential contributions towards archaeological research, with discussions mostly centring upon how best to assess values scientifically and objectively in order to mitigate the impacts of development and destruction. Value assessment in the Netherlands for instance, still centres around the ‘uniqueness’ of archaeological material resources and their potential to inform interpretations of the past as ‘scientific data’ (Groenewoudt & Bloemers 1997; Deeben *et al.* 1999).

In addition, the epistemological understanding of the concept of value has changed, from an inherent characteristic of material heritage that could be objectively assessed, through to an understanding of values as being subjective, dynamic and related to the aims and goals of actors in the wider social context. In this sense, it has been increasingly argued that apart from the scientific, architectural and aesthetic values that archaeologists and heritage professionals often prioritise in the assessment of significance (see section 2.4), other stakeholder’s values, such as educational, religious, natural or economic values, should also be taken into account when assessing significance. Calls to take the broader context of such material heritage into account have appeared from the 80’s onwards in the USA and the UK

(Lafrenz Samuels 2008, 74-75; see e.g. Mathers *et al.* 2005; Clark 2005), although this has not always been covered very explicitly in regulations and policies.

This has happened perhaps most clearly in for instance the Australian ICOMOS ‘Burra Charter’ (1999), and in the ‘Faro’ Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, in Europe (Council of Europe, 2005). Especially the first has since acquired wide currency internationally, mainly for its approach to the issue of community participation and the ideological concept of valuing the resource (see Truscott & Young 2000). This model does not see the preservation of the material remains of a heritage site as the fundamental objective, nor does it regard archaeological material as having intrinsic qualities that can be assessed objectively (although the discursive construction of this charter has been critiqued for undermining its own intentions (Waterton *et al.* 2006; see for a discussion below). Rather, it argues for managing its ‘cultural significance’, which is seen as the multitude of sometimes conflicting values (including aesthetic, social, religious and historical values) that are ascribed to the site by a range of stakeholders.

It should however be noted, that the Burra Charter distances itself from an incorporation of economic values in significance assessment, since it sees this as non-compatible with the cultural and social values of heritage. Such a general reticence to engage in discussions about the economic value of heritage is not an exception to the field of heritage management models (Lafrenz Samuels 2008, 76-78), as it can also, perhaps more fiercely, be recognised in archaeological academia:

contentious issues of commodification, ownership and responsibility are intrinsic components of this reticence, with the archaeological community largely seeing themselves in a guardianship and interpretive role rather than an exploitative and commercial one. Even when archaeologists are engaged in the commercial development process there is still a tendency to paint this activity as environmental protection and as an investigative research process rather than as a business enterprise (Breen & Rhodes 2010, 115).

The economic value of archaeological and cultural heritage has however a large impact upon the management of archaeological resources. The economic impact of globalising trends such as cultural tourism on the management, preservation and interpretation of archaeological resources can be seen as one of the most pressing examples of this (for an overview, see e.g. Klamer & Zuidhof 1999; Cernea 2001; Labadi & Long 2010; Groot in prep). The close relationship between archaeological heritage management and development planning in the field of ‘commercial’ and ‘contract archaeology’ in Anglo-American and European is another example. The increasing global adoption of policies such as the Malta Convention (Council of Europe 1992) for instance (see e.g. Naffé *et al.* 2009 for Africa), has meant that a focus on the economic value of archaeology has become a world wide concern. Recently, this has become even more apparent now that global development corporations are incorporating a concern for cultural heritage management explicitly in their practices, which can be seen for instance in the development of cultural heritage guidelines such as those by Rio Tinto (2011).³²

A complex relationship between development and archaeology can also be seen in for instance Africa, especially where they relate to contexts of extreme poverty. As discussed in section 1.3, it is therefore also not uncommon for archaeological projects to become integrated with overseas cultural policies, international economic development, and development aid programmes (Cernea 2001; Fienieg *et al.* 2008; Lilley 2008; 2011; Van der Linde & Van den Dries forthcoming). In this regard, some

³² For a fierce discussion on the perceived ethical implications of Rio Tinto’s engagement with the World Archaeological Congress, see Shepherd & Haber (2011) and especially the response by Claire Smith (2011).

archaeologists have called for a holistic approach towards archaeological heritage management, whose primary aim is not the preservation of heritage and the production of knowledge for future generations, but rather addressing the needs of contemporary generations (Breen & Rhodes 2010; Williams & Van der Linde 2006).

The potential value of archaeology for economic growth is however not without problems. The emphasis by for example the World Bank on poverty reduction is intrinsically linked to a focus on economic values and ‘good governance’ (Cernea 2001), which has led to the need for postcolonial governments to adopt value-based approaches that subsequently privilege the preservation of those archaeological sites that are considered to have potential for economic growth through its appeal to the (predominantly western) tourism industry, thereby often neglecting non-western and local histories and values (Lafrenz Samuels 2008; 2010);

procedures for assessing significance travelled to the global stage – retaining the authoritative procedural structures and formal modes of accountability for managing material heritage – but translated to an agenda for the reduction of poverty. The implications of this translation include the privileging of specific histories that have the potential to promote economic growth, in particular those narratives most appealing to tourists (2008; 79-80).

A more in-depth discussion on the question whether to accommodate economic values in significance assessments lies outside the scope of this study (for an overview see e.g. Groot in prep; Klammer & Zuidhof 1999; Mathers *et al.* 2005). Indeed, there have been many suggestions as to what kind of categories of values should be taken into account in heritage management models. Rather, my point here is that value-based significance assessment models can form the basis for an analytical framework for investigating the social context of archaeology. For this reason, I will continue my argument with a discussion on the conceptual idea of the value-based model, as it was clearly brought forward by scholars related to the Getty Conservation Institute (Avrami *et al.* 2000; De la Torre 2002; Mason 2002; Mason & Avrami 2002; Teutonico & Palumbo 2002).

According to these models, a heritage management model should approach a site as a conceptualisation of a network of actors (or stakeholders), that ascribe specific values to the heritage site – these can range from e.g. scientific values, cultural values, architectural values, religious values, economic values, educational values, and so on. According to this model, a heritage management approach should start to ascertain and identify these actors and their values in order to make sustainable and integrated decisions, and to make sure that certain values are not destroyed, simply because they were not recognised. A ‘good’ management decision in this sense does not try to necessarily manage the material fabric of a site, but rather the multitude of values ascribed to it (Mason & Avrami 2002); which is often called the ‘significance’, or ‘cultural significance’, of a heritage site (Avrami *et al.* 2000; De la Torre 2002; and see the Australian ICOMOS ‘Burra Charter’ 1999; Truscott & Young 2000). In this sense, it is important to realise that the archaeological value of a heritage site is just one of the possible values, but also, that archaeological investigation is just one possible management option; at the least, it should be integrated with other management decisions and activities (such as tourism development, maintenance, conservation, education, urban planning and so on), in order to come to a sustainable and holistic approach that manages the significance of a site.

Such a conception of a value-based management model can function as a basis for an analytical framework in ethnographies of archaeology (see Figure 02), since it closely links to the above-discussed idea of an archaeological heritage site or project as a social construction to which a range of stakeholders ascribe different meanings and agendas. It is important then to subsequently clarify what is meant with the

concept of ‘value’ in in this sense, because it is upon the basis of this meaning that the concept of value as an analytical tool in examining the social context of archaeological projects can contribute.

Discussions on values within this study do not refer so much to values in the sense of guiding principles on what is moral, ethical or just. This does not mean that discussions of values have overlooked the importance of ethics and morals – indeed, values can help us to understand the ethical practice of archaeology (see below for a discussion, and please refer to for example Lipe 1974; Lynott & Wylie 2000; Meskell & Pels 2005a; 2005b; Scarre & Scarre 2007; Zimmerman *et al.* 2003). Debates on the role of differing perceptions on the issue of moral values, and whether they are the result of free will, responsibilities and actions, has for instance been given by George Smith *et al.* (2010a, 15-17). What is important for this study, is that all such discussions share the belief that “value is assigned and influences the quality of life for individuals, communities, and nations and that choosing whether or not to value the past has important consequences” (Smith *et al.* 2010a, 16.)




Figure 02. Visual conceptualisation of a value-based analytical framework.

For the purpose of this study, I therefore built upon the notion of values as it was brought forward in the management models as discussed above, which see value rather in the sense of those qualities that are ascribed by actors to archaeological materials and sites (Mason & Avrami 2000, 15-16). Values in this perspective are therefore closely related to the *verb* value in the sense of valuing archaeological projects, materials and sites, which in turn points to the subjective, conflictive, contextual and dynamic nature of values because they are inherently linked to the motivations, opinions and goals that actors bring to the archaeological process. It has been argued in this respect that values have a means-to-an-end character (Darvill 1994; 1995; 2005); people put a value on something, because they ‘desire’ to do something with it

(Darvill 1994, 53). Such an approach to values is practice-oriented, which provides a good starting point for an ethnography of archaeology that seeks to analyse the social position of stakeholders as discussed above.

More recently, Lafrenz Samuels has build on this notion of an ‘action-oriented’ conception of values, by drawing on the work of the anthropologists Graeber (2001) and Weiner (1985; 1992), illustrating that values are produced through all actions that “engage with temporal relationships via material heritage” (2008, 91) and on the work by Appadurai (1986), illustrating how the trajectories of material heritage can show the social contexts and the values that are ascribed to it through discursive practices.

What this means, is that “values can transfer, or translate things into heritage” (Williams 2010).³³ Such an understanding is in line with an increasing idea in heritage studies and archaeological heritage management that the concept of heritage is socially constructed within discourse (see section 2.5, and see e.g. Ashworth *et al.* 2007; Duineveld 2006; Van Assche 2004). From a social constructivist epistemological standpoint, heritage is in this sense not an intrinsic ‘quality’ of archaeological and material remains – rather, it is the assignment of value and significance to material remains, places or practices by actors and discourses that decides what heritage is, and what is not. The construction of heritage is therefore also related to to agendas and motivations of organisations, peoples and policies involved in such discursive assessments (Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming).³⁴ As was discussed above, ‘heritage’ can as such be used for political and social reasons through ideologies, control, and the legitimisation of practices. In summary, we could therefore argue that “there is no such *thing* as heritage. Rather, it exists as a range of competing discourses that have significant and powerful cultural and political consequences and uses” (Smith & Waterton 2009, 12-13).

Because values are linked to such subjective interpretations of actors, this means that the “assignment of value to heritage is both fraught with difficulty and highly contentious” (Breen & Rhodes 2010, 113; see also Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996). Indeed, heritage values can be in conflict and are therefore contested values (Smith 2010, 10). This is however not always as simple as ‘good or bad’ values and decisions, an issue that comes clearly to the front in archaeology in (post-)conflict areas, where different perceptions exist on how to engage with the military over the protection of archaeological sites (see e.g. Perring & Van der Linde 2009),³⁵ as well as in the kind of ‘decolonizing’ community approaches towards indigenous archaeology as described above. Nevertheless, this has even led some authors to argue that all assignment of values is contested, and that this ‘dissonance’ is an inherent and fundamental characteristic of heritage (Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996; Ashworth *et al.* 2007).

In section 2.5, I will look in more detail at how the concept of ‘heritage’ can be conceived of as socially constructed. For now, my point is that the assessment of values matters, and that there are certain discourses and values on what heritage entails and how it should be treated and by whom, that have gained more ‘authority’ and widespread integration in theories, policies and practices than others. These issues will be examined in more detail in the following section.

³³ Tim Williams, pers. comm. during a lecture for the MA Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context, Leiden University, 10 October 2010.

³⁴ However, such a conception of ‘heritage’ does not mean that it is purely a result of our imagination – physical reality exists, but it simply does not decide for itself that it should be labeled as ‘heritage’; “A few piled rocks, for example, can be interpreted as a dolmen, but also as a ‘megalithic construction’ or a ‘few piled rocks’. However, matter cannot be ‘thought away’. One could bump into it..” (Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming).

³⁵ See the 2009 special issue ‘Archaeology in Conflict’ of *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* (11:3-4) for a concise overview.

2.4 POLITICS AND POWER IN ARCHAEOLOGY

Elsewhere, I have given a brief account of the historical development of archaeological heritage management in Europe (Fienieg *et al.* 2008, 32-36). In this section, I will draw and build upon this overview by focusing on the way in which an inherent western hegemony of heritage values has become embedded in global scientific and political discourses.

In general, it can be argued that it took until the last few decades of the 20th century before heritage management developed as a profession in its own right. But even though the academic archaeological discipline had by then started to consider its social implications in relation to accommodating alternative, indigenous and non-western ways of interpreting the past more generally (see section 2.2), this was arguably less true for the rise of heritage management – which led, in the early 90's, to increasing critiques on the “remarkably coherent style of archaeological heritage management practiced throughout the world with almost no discussion of how it came about” (Byrne 1991, 272). Such critiques appeared soon after, most notably under the influence of the rise of indigenous movements and postmodern critiques that called for greater attention to regionally and culturally different forms of heritage research and management (cf Fienieg *et al.* 2008, 34; and see above section 2.2). Such critiques centred primarily upon the unquestioned ‘conservation ethic’ that was underlying the heritage management approaches in the western world and that was embedded in dominant international heritage policies and scholarly debates (see e.g. Ucko 1995; Cleere 1989a; 1989b; Trigger 1984a; 1984b).

By and large, the ‘conservation ethic’ can be regarded as a paradigm that primarily advocates the primacy of preservation of archaeological resources as material and scientific markers of the past – in the sense of sustaining the resource for future generations. The roots of this conservation ethic have been traced to the European Enlightenment and to the idea of ‘cultural continuity’ in particular (Cleere 1989a; 1989b), and can be seen as underlying the development of both the archaeological discipline as well as early forms of antiquity laws in Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth century in Europe. Concerns about the preservation of and research on cultural remains of the past were in this sense mostly embedded within nationalist ideological frameworks of collection and documentation (see e.g. García Díaz-Andreu 2007; and Eickhoff 2007 for a Dutch example), perhaps most notably in relation to the need for (re-)establishing national identities in post-Napoleonic Europe (Willems 2002). Important as well, is the fact that in this same period, archaeological thought and concerns over the care of cultural remains came to be exported globally as part of colonialism and imperialism (Byrne 1991; Trigger 2006), which can be linked to a European project that sought to explain its global financial and cultural dominance in terms of a continuous process of ‘cultural evolution’. The establishment of heritage and monument laws in overseas territories, which appeared for example in the early twentieth century in the Dutch East Indies and in British Indo-China and India (Soejono 1984; Toebosch 2003), can be seen here as a case in point, since they were often;

aimed at selecting and interpreting indigenous heritage and values within ‘western’ frameworks of understanding and categorisation, <...> they focused mostly on preserving or restoring monuments for the educational or scientific benefit of a public at home in Europe, with little regard for the monuments’ real and potential local significance (Fienieg *et al.* 2008, 33; but see Tanudirjo 1995 and Ucko 1995 for further examples).

As such, the interests of indigenous people’s histories and cultures were often neglected, or perhaps dominated, by western archaeological endeavours that were underpinned by the values of cultural continuity and hierarchy.

As several authors have illustrated, this western notion of cultural continuity and the primacy of a preservation of material markers of the past has continued to drive the development of archaeological heritage management during the twentieth century (Cleere 1989a; 1989b; Byrne 1991; Smith 2008). Nostalgia and a 'fear of loss' over identity and traditions in an insecure present have in this respect been mentioned as crucial elements of a western concern to archive the past (for an overview, see e.g. Fairclough *et al.* 2007),³⁶ whilst such notions can also be linked to the rise of cultural tourism and the 'heritage industry' since the 50's onwards more generally (Smith 2006). Coupled with the appearance of environmental concerns in the 60's and 70's, and with a general awareness in the 80's that archaeological remains were under threat from development forces, the 'conservation ethic' became a fundamental part of an institutionalised heritage management discourse and political and legal frameworks in Europe.

By and large, it can be argued that the conservation ethic considered the preservation of cultural remains as markers of a continuous past as 'obvious', whilst regarding a combination of state policies, professional expertise and supposedly objective valuations of archaeological materials as appropriate vehicles for making decisions on the care of cultural remains. The idea of a 'cultural continuity' in relation to material markers of the past was however often in sharp contrast with a notion of 'spiritual continuity' as brought forward by predominantly non-western perspectives, where archaeological heritage was often more valued for its 'spirit of place', and where less emphasis was placed upon the actual preservation of material remains of the past (Cleere 1989a; 1989b).³⁷ As a result, an increasing awareness appeared that heritage management was not so much about dealing with the preservation of archaeological and architectural remains, but even more so about the social values attributed to them (Fienieg *et al.* 2008, 35).

It was in this frame of thought that new charters and policies started to appear which tried to accommodate different approaches to heritage management. In the USA for example, this led to policies such as the before-mentioned Native American Graves Protection Act of 1990, and to ethical codes such as those of the SAA which tried to incorporate the values of others in society into professional archaeological conduct. In Australia, similar developments led to the above discussed Burra Charter (1999) with its emphasis on value-based planning. In general, it might be argued that two fundamental characteristics of these Australian and American heritage policies were subsequently transferred to the global scale, and to the management of cultural heritage issues more broadly. The first one concerns the emphasis on heritage diversity and community participation, the second one the ideological concept of valuing the resources through identifying and assessing significance and stakeholder values (cf Lafrenz Samuels 2008). As a result, such value-based management models are currently also at the basis of the policies, charters and guidelines of international organisations such as ICOMOS, UNESCO, the World Bank and ICROM (Smith 2006). The adoption of the Nara Document on Authenticity of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS 1994), which explicitly recognised cultural and heritage diversity, is one good example of this; the set of UNESCO guidelines for managing World Heritage Sites by means of value-based planning another.³⁸

³⁶ See especially chapter 1.

³⁷ By the early 90's, such heritage notions of spiritual continuity were however not widely embedded in the heritage legislation of non-western countries. Rather, the western notion of a conservation ethic had become dominant on the global scale by means of an 'inappropriate ideology transfer' as the result of historical, economic, political, and scientific international frameworks (Byrne 1991, 274). Especially the heritage management approaches in post-colonial states had often been developed under the influence of former European powers, and continued to approach the preservation of archaeological remains as a medium to stress cultural continuity of an ideological conceived past within frameworks of national identity (cf Fienieg *et al.* 2008, 35; and see Byrne 1991 and Ucko 1995).

³⁸ For an overview of these value-based guidelines and recommendations for site managers, see for example the UNESCO World Heritage Centre Resource Manuals, available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/resourcemanuals> [Accessed July 11, 2011].

In Europe, value-based significance assessments have also flourished, especially in the framework of the new legislative measures taken as a result of the Malta Convention of 1992 (Council of Europe 1992). However, these initially paid less attention to issues of community participation and alternative heritage values, an issue well reflected in European professional codes of conduct which are primarily aimed at the ethical concerns in relation to contract archaeology, and less upon issues such as repatriation, human remains, and the involvement of indigenous voices and values (Aitchison 2007). Nevertheless, the last decade has witnessed important moves in this direction, illustrated for instance by the rise of community archaeology in European countries such as the UK (although, arguably, much less in the Netherlands, where more emphasis is laid upon public outreach – see Van den Dries & Van der Linde forthcoming), and by the ‘Faro’ Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society by the Council of Europe (2005).

However, such moves are becoming increasingly important now that ‘western’ policies such as the Malta Convention (Council of Europe 1992) and relating ethical codes are transferred to the global scale through scholarly debates and overseas practice. This is not only because countries in for instance Africa and the Near East are adopting ‘Malta’-like policies (see e.g. Naffé *et al.* 2009), but also because international commercial enterprises are actively developing their own policies in this regard (Lilley 2011; Van der Linde 2011; and see Rio Tinto 2011). Taken together, it is probably fair to say that many archaeological professionals and organisations continue to work, either willingly or unwillingly, within policies and practices that transfer western notions of archaeological theory and heritage management policies upon local circumstances. But now that these value-based approaches are presently endorsed on the global scale, the question remains which values receive priority in the decision-making process, and related to this, which stakeholders actually perform the ‘valuing’ of the heritage resource.

For the purpose of this study, such a question has probably most clearly been addressed by Laurajane Smith (2006), who identified a continuation of the previous conservation ethic and relating western heritage values in international practices and discourses. Smith summarises this view through the identification of an “Authorised Heritage Discourse” (AHD) existent in western archaeological heritage management policies and practices (Smith 2006, 4), which she describes as a professional discourse that privileges expert values and knowledge of the past and that focuses on preserving the monumental, material manifestations of cultural heritage. One of the main characteristics of the AHD is the unquestioned place of the before-mentioned ‘conservation ethic’ (Smith 2004; 2006; Smith & Waterton 2009), which advocates the primacy of preservation of the visually attractive, archaeological and monumental material values of the past as its core task. In this sense the AHD came to define heritage as material sites, objects and/or landscapes that should be preserved for its ability to provide educational benefits as well as a sense of national collective identity (Smith & Waterton 2009, 12-13). More recently, this also fitted well with the idea that the resource could provide national cultural tourism benefits.

Heritage in this sense is often advocated as having an intrinsic ‘universal’ value that should be preserved for the future generations of all humankind – thereby placing less emphasis on the use of heritage in the present by local communities. Such a notion is also clearly advanced by the concept of ‘universal outstanding value’ as advanced by the 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO 1972):

Underlying the notion of monumentality is the idea of its universal applicability, that is has a universal audience. Embedded in the idea of the monumentality of heritage lies the ideology and perceptions of cultural evolution, wherein monuments are identified as representing, or more

to the point as ‘being’, the pinnacle of cultural achievement. This, by its own logic, must be universally relevant and applicable (Smith 2006, 109).

However, such a perceived materiality and universality of heritage can be in conflict with the more local ramifications and values attributed to intangible heritage aspects, and has even lead to critique by some indigenous groups as being an attempt to colonise and appropriate their heritage (Blake 2001, 11-14). It is interesting to note that similar observations have been made in relation the archaeological discourses used by practitioners in the USA, where the use of concepts such as ‘archaeological resources’ and ‘property’ continues to contrast with the values and perspectives of indigenous communities in relation to human remains and grave goods (Smith 2010).³⁹

I have already discussed that a sole focus on the preservation of material archaeological and architectural values of heritage can be inappropriate when compared to sub-altern and/or alternative definitions of cultural heritage, especially in relation to aspects such as ethnicity, tradition, religion and/or other socio-cultural values (cf Fienieg *et al.* 2008, 35). Indeed, national management authorities the world over have often prioritised the material remains of heritage locales as to advance ideas of national identity in opposition to more alternative heritage discourses that prioritised alternative, more ‘intangible’ ways of seeing the past;

of particular note is the issue that traditional and authorised definitions of heritage tell nationalising stories that simply do not reflect the cultural or social experiences of subaltern groups. This is problematic as it discounts the historical legitimacy of the experiences of these communities and thus the social, cultural and/or political roles they play in the present are ignored or trivialised. <...> In addition, definitions of heritage that stress materiality also fail to acknowledge non-material or intangible forms of heritage, and thus the resources or processes used in sub-national group identity work are denied or marginalised (Smith 2006, 36).

In addition, the result of a prevailing notion of preservation for future generations can be that the vital role heritage can play in meeting the needs of the current generation is overlooked; with subsequent exclusion of addressing local voices and needs towards the archaeological process, and with issues such as poverty relief, capacity building or education being given insufficient attention when actions and resources are to be prioritised by heritage professionals (Williams & Van der Linde 2006). Recent writings in cultural heritage studies have for example called for a notion of heritage that is not focused upon ‘curation’, but instead encompasses ‘care’ (Rowlands & Butler 2007) – and that such a notion might be able to include the idea of a heritage that cares for personal lives, and that allows people to engage with cultural heritage in order to provide sustainable benefits for themselves. In this sense, it is interesting to note that the AHD primarily approaches ‘community collaboration’ as a means to enhance the preservation of archaeological materials. From the literature research in this chapter however, it must be clear that participation can also be seen as an appropriate remedy for political and social exclusion, and that participatory approaches to policy-making, education and local development should be considered as being equally important.

Another important aspect of the AHD is that of privileging expert values and knowledge of the past over alternative and local values and histories. Underlying such a notion, is the idea that “the value of material culture is innate, rather than associate” and that heritage is “fragile, finite and non-renewable. It is thus

³⁹ George Smith, pers. comm., during a lecture for the MA Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context, Leiden University, 13 December 2010.

placed, <...> rightly within the care of those experts best positioned to stand in as stewards for the past, and to understand and communicate the value of heritage to the nation” (Smith & Waterton 2009, 13). This idea of archaeological experts as ‘stewards’ or ‘caretakers of the past’ who can unlock the ‘vague’, ‘inherent value’ of the past to society at large, subsequently works to legitimise their privileged position in assessing the significance of the past, thereby granting them intellectual and physical access to archaeological sites (Smith 2006; 29; Holtorf 2002; Lynott & Wylie 2000; Meskell & Pels 2005a).

Related to this is the belief that values can be assessed more or less objectively, reflected in the dominant technical and scientific discourses that frame these approaches (cf Williams & Van der Linde 2006). However, this believe in assessing values scientifically can have real implications in society, as it can provide governments with the ‘scientific facts’ to make political decisions about cultural minorities – an issue well illustrated in relation to claims of cultural ownership of material remains by Native Americans and Aboriginals (Smith 2004; 2006).

Another indicator of the way in which the professional’s role has been perceived in relation to value assignments, can be found in the content and scope of the ‘ethical’ codes of conduct of professional associations in archaeology, which have emerged in the context of heritage management from the 60’s onwards (for an overview, see e.g. Aitchison 2007; Scarre & Scarre 2007; Meskell & Pels 2005b; Lynott & Wylie 2000). In all of these codes, the role of the archaeologist as a professional that is suited best to assign values is stressed either implicitly or explicitly, where archaeologists are considered to be “the principal advisors on the value of heritage” (Okamura 2010, 58). However, recent critics have described the way in which such professional codes of conduct can lead to the bureaucratisation and instrumentalisation of ethics, whereby they are exteriorized from practice, becoming a matter of professional and governmental organisations, and that of ‘experts’ in particular (Meskell & Pels 2005a, 17; Hamilakis 2007, 20; Perring & Van der Linde 2009, 204). Through working within national heritage management policies under a system of ‘governmentality’ (Meskell & Pels 2005a; Smith 2006), this potentially leads to conflicts with other stakeholders, precisely because it promotes situations where the values of archaeologists, and through them, the state policies in which they operate, are given priority when decisions need to be made, potentially excluding those stakeholders that they often advocate to involve in the first place (Waterton *et al.* 2006). But if we accept the above discussed idea that heritage is socially constructed within discourse, and that community collaboration in relation to heritage management should take into account the often contested range of values that stakeholder ascribe to archaeological sites and projects, it might be better to conceive of ethics as being embedded in practice and in how we negotiate our values with others in society (Meskell & Pels 2005a, 17; Moshenska 2008, 162): “Instead, all activities of scientists are characterised by negotiations of values; with superiors, funding agencies, (local) governments, developers, inhabitants, and many members of the wider public” (Pels 2011).⁴⁰ What this means, is that perhaps “a rule-book can not be put in place of our personal responsibilities to act virtuously and morally” (Perring & Van der Linde 2009, 205).

In summary, the AHD can be seen as prioritising the role of archaeologists and heritage professionals as caretakers of the past, who can decide on the value and authenticity of material remains, and on the related question of what heritage entails in the first place. According to Smith (2004; 2006), a combination of state policies and archaeological expertise can thereby be brought to control the alternative, unauthorised approaches and interpretations of the past of other groups in society. The emphasis within the AHD on

⁴⁰ Prof. Peter Pels, pers. comm. during a lecture for the MA Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context, Leiden University, 26 September 2011.

heritage as material, archaeological and scientific markers of the past thereby stands in contrast to the idea that heritage is primarily a cultural process of social constructions in the present. What this means, is that alternative heritage discourses, such as for instance those that see heritage primarily as a cultural process that celebrates intangible values such as commemoration, spirit of place, identity and experience, are often excluded from the assessment processes, and thereby from the subsequent interpretation and management in society (Smith 2006, 83). In this sense, it is striking to note that even the discursive formations of for instance the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO 2003) continue to endorse the primacy of preservation, the concept of universality, and of the role of the expert (Smith 2006; 102-114). Likewise, Waterton *et al.* (2006) have illustrated that the intentions behind the notions of community participation and multivocality are undermined by the discursive construction of the Australian ICOMOS ‘Burra Charter’ (1999), by placing emphasis on the role of the ‘expert’ to assess and preserve the ‘cultural significance’ of heritage, which it sees as being embedded inherently within the ‘fabric’, that is, “all the physical material of a place” (article 1.1.3).

The above discussions have illustrated the potential utility of discourse analysis in examining the social context of archaeological projects, and in highlighting the dominating values of archaeological research and management processes. But again, it can be noted that most of the critiques on heritage ethics, discourses and values have been undertaken in Anglo-American contexts, most notably in relation to the archaeological heritage policies in postcolonial nation-states themselves. An exception in relation to Dutch archaeology lies in the work of Duineveld (2006), although this study focuses exclusively on archaeological management practice in the Netherlands itself. How such issues relate to the undertaking of Dutch foreign research projects abroad where archaeological practice is confronted with distinct socio-political and cultural contexts, is however – to the best of my knowledge – not investigated in detail. In addition, it should be remembered that archaeological projects in practice are the result of a multitude of policies, as is the case with for instance the conduct of Dutch archaeological research projects abroad – these include for instance archaeological, cultural and development policies in both the ‘home’ as well as the ‘host’ countries, as well institutional policies, project proposals, ethical codes and funding policies (see section 2.6). What this means, is that archaeological practices should not necessarily be regarded as being the result of single policy discourses, nor of simple hegemonic discursive workings in which there is no place for the intricate relationships between policy, practice, discourse and stakeholders. In addition, Waterton *et al.* (2006) raise an important issue by contemplating if the construction and use of the AHD constitutes an “active attempt to maintain the privileged position of expertise in management and conservation processes, or is an unintended outcome of a naturalised and self-referential approach” (2006, 351). Such a question is relevant for this study, as it draws attention to the idea that ethnographic accounts of heritage projects can provide a nuanced and in-depth analysis of the relationship between policies and practices, and of the role and intentions of actors in constructing, altering and translating heritage values and discourses in relation to those of others in society.

In the following section, I will investigate these issues by discussing how a combination of ethnographic research and discourse analysis can examine the delicate nexus between policy, discourse and practice, and how it can draw attention to the agency and intentions of stakeholders in archaeological project practices.

2.5 THE VALUE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR ETHNOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

2.5.1 DISCOURSES

In order to explore the utility of discourse analysis for ethnographies of archaeological practice, it is necessary first to focus upon the concept of discourse in a little more detail.⁴¹ Discourses might be loosely described as institutionalised and politicised ways of thinking, that establishes boundaries to what can be said about the world. Discourses in this sense should not be seen solely as language, discussion or texts, but rather as a set of both linguistic facts as well as strategic facts (Foucault 1994). What this means is that there is no ontological difference between linguistic and behavioural aspects of practice, and that discourses both determine and are determined by power struggles in society over access to knowledge, resources and politics (Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming). Building upon this notion of discourse, Hajer (2005, 302-303) has argued that discourses should be conceived of as ensembles of ideas, concepts and categories that collectively produce meaning to social and physical phenomena, and that a discourse can only “be conceived of in interrelation with the practices in which it is produced, reproduced and transformed.” From this view, linguistic expressions do not necessarily make up the sole core of discourse, but should rather be regarded as one element in a multiple range of ‘practices’ of a given discourses (Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming) – these can include for instance heritage policies, academic articles, conferences, museum displays, site tours, and, as will be discussed in sections 4 and 5, also archaeological research practices such as surveys and excavations. In line with the above mentioned constructivist standpoint (but see section 3.1 for a more detailed discussion), the concept of discourse opposes the idea that the physical world solely determines what can be known about it. In this sense, knowledge and truth are not made up of ‘facts’ that can be objectively discovered; rather they should be thought of as concepts that are subjectively constructed within discourse (*ibid.*). As such, it is the interplay between discourses, institutions, groups and people that collectively determine what knowledge is – in other words, how certain things can be ‘made real’ (Latour 1996; 2005). Knowledge and power are as such mutually intertwined – within a discourse, power can be given to certain people because their statements can be considered as ‘true’, while on the other hand, those in power can uphold or influence discourses as to decide what knowledge is in the first place. According to Foucault (1982), discourses are therefore inherently linked to processes of social exclusion, a concept which can be summarised as comprising of all intentional and unintentional power mechanisms that place people, ideas and knowledge outside a certain discourse (Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming).

At the end of section 2.3, I have already touched upon the idea that heritage, from such a perspective, can also be regarded as a social construction within discourse. Heritage was argued here to be a social construct that is explicitly linked to the assignation of values and to the agendas and motivations of organisations, peoples and policies involved in such processes. I have also discussed (in section 2.4) how several authors in the field of heritage studies are making use of the utility of discourse analysis in investigating what archaeology ‘does’ in society – most notably through the identification of the above discussed ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ which was argued to reveal competing and conflicting discourses and power relations between ‘expert’ and community interests in the field of archaeology (Waterton *et al.* 2006, 339; Smith 2004; 2006; Smith & Waterton 2009).

By and large, these authors have mostly applied Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a way to turn these mechanisms of social exclusion at the heart of their studies, accepting not only that there are

⁴¹ The discussion on discourses in this paragraph follows the argumentative structure as set out in the article by Duineveld *et al.* (forthcoming).

dominant discourses, but also that there are alternative discourses, and that the interplay between these has real, sometimes discriminatory or oppressing consequences in reality. Indeed, this emphasis on actively pursuing an agenda of social change, is at the core of CDA (Fairclough 2001; Van Dijk 1993). From this perspective, heritage could be understood as a “range of competing discourses that have significant and powerful cultural and political consequences and uses” (Smith & Waterton 2009, 12-13). Important for this conception of heritage as well, is that ‘archaeology’ in this sense is intrinsically linked to heritage-making and management processes (see section 2.3), which has lead some authors to argue that archaeology could be defined as “discourses and practices on things from another time, it <...> accepts that there are multiple archaeologies, some official modernist ones, and many other popular, unofficial, vernacular, alternative, indigenous ones” (Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulis 2009, 73).

Although I can find myself in the critiques on the social implications of ‘authorised’ discourses on subaltern and indigenous communities (see section 2.2 and 3.3), and although ethnographies of archaeological projects abroad should identify the existence of different discourses on heritage and archaeology, I argue they do not necessarily have to follow the method of CDA. This is because not all archaeological research projects abroad are inherently linked to indigenous issues in postcolonial settings – as I explained in section 2.2, my conception of archaeological projects is rather concerned with a broader definition of communities. In addition, I believe (see section 1.4) that current critical heritage discourse studies in the field of archaeology pay too little attention to the complex and nuanced relationships between discourses, policies and practices, most notably in the form of potentially overlooking the intentions and passions of the actors involved.⁴²

As such, it might be fruitful to explore an approach to discursive analysis as informed by the work of Hajer (2005; and see Hajer & Wagenaar 2003), by placing emphasis on the idea that discourses exist of ‘practices’ (see above), and by placing emphasis on the utility of ethnographic research as to investigate how social agents produce, transform and negotiate policies and discourses within archaeological processes. Hajer has defined discourse as “an ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categories through which meaning is given to phenomena, and which is produced and reproduced through an identifiable set of practices” (2005, 303). From this perspective, discourses do not only refer to discursive texts and utterances, but also to the practices in which such discursive arguments are taking place. These can for instance include the writing of a scientific article, a tourist visit to a heritage site, or an archaeological excavation. Such an approach to discourses therefore draws attention to the socio-political and cultural context in which these practices are taking place, to the actors involved, as well as to the ‘site’ at which a discourse analysis is conducted.

It also works from the assumption that there can be several discourses on a given phenomenon, and that certain statements can contain several elements of different, even competing discourses. We can understand this by breaking down discourses as consisting of story-lines, which can be seen as condensed forms of narratives and metaphors, in other words, as summaries of elements of a certain discourse (Hajer 2005). As will be discussed in this study, such story-lines can for instance consist of the idea that professional expertise is needed in order to mitigate the threat of development upon a fragile and non-renewable archaeological resource. Such a concept is particularly useful as it allows for the investigation of why certain groups, individuals and institutions can come to shared practices even though they do not necessarily share the same discourses and values. Hajer refers to this as ‘discourse-coalitions’, identifying them as “a group of actors that, *in the context of an identifiable set of practices*, shares the usage of a

⁴² Related more to my own choice of methodology for this specific research (see chapter 3), I also would like to point out that I do not actively wish to place a pursuit of social change at the core of my research intention – rather, my aim is to understand how archaeological research projects work in their social context.

particular set of story-lines over a particular period of time” (Hajer 2005, 302).⁴³ In relation to the focus of this study, such a concept might help in understanding archaeological projects, by coming to terms with the idea that actors might bring forward contradictory statements, or even produce or reproduce different discourse-coalitions (Hajer 1995). The concepts of story-lines and discourse-coalitions also can help us to understand how actors with different values towards heritage processes might form strong temporary coalitions during a certain period within a certain practice (for example an archaeological excavation), even though they do not necessarily share and understand each others values and discourses. On the contrary, it has been argued in relation to policy, that this misunderstanding might even enhance the effectivity of policy, as ‘vague’ concepts allow actors to adhere to temporary coalitions more easily (Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005; Mosse 2004; 2005; Hajer 2005; Hajer & Wagenaar 2003; Latour 1996; Vos 2011). This issue will be investigated in more detail below.

To summarise, this mode of discourse analysis allows us to investigate several important elements when trying to investigate the social context of archaeological research projects abroad. First, it can help analyse how discourses and values are negotiated and played out by actors in specific sites and practices. Secondly, it can assist us in understanding how actors can form temporary alliances without necessarily sharing values. Thirdly, it draws attention to the historical and socio-political context of discourses as well as actors. These issues will be investigated in more detail now, by drawing more attention to the utility of ethnographic research for understanding the social position and role of actors in policy processes.

2.5.2 AN ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH TO POLICY AND PRACTICE

Studies on the role of actors and discourses within transnational and transcultural projects have recently seen increased attention within the fields of anthropology of policy and development sociology, and have then notably been linked to a strong analytical emphasis on the way in which the implementation of such projects relate to the processes of policy making. Within these fields, an ethnographic approach that makes use of a ‘practice perspective’ towards policy discourse analysis (cf Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005; Mosse 2005; Hajer & Wagenaar 2003 and see Hajer 2005 as discussed above) has been brought forward as an appealing alternative to the *instrumental* and *critical* perspectives towards policy-making. As I have already mentioned in my introduction (section 1.4),⁴⁴ the problem with both these instrumental and critical approaches is that they do not satisfactorily explain the relationship between policy and practice and the role of actors herein. Whilst the instrumental approach regards the effects of policymaking as outcomes of rational decision-making, and whilst the critical approach often replaces this instead with the outcome of an anonymous, hegemonic dominating process (Mosse 2005, 5) they generally “fail to examine how policy is socially produced and transformed at the different sites and levels” of socio-political and institutional contexts (Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005, 86).

⁴³ Original emphasis by Hajer 2005.

⁴⁴ In broad terms, two opposing views on development policy can be distinguished; the instrumental and the critical approach (Mosse 2005; 2). The instrumental approach, which considers policy as a neutral, technical and ‘problem-solving instrument’, aims for the generation of new knowledge and policy solutions by emphasising the application of scientific, linear and rational research, planning and evaluation (Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005, 86). This approach mirrors those policies and studies in the field of archaeological heritage management that seek to contribute to value-based planning models by providing new models for assessing significance scientifically and objectively (see section 1.4, and compare for instance with Groenewoudt & Bloemers 1997 and Deeben *et al.* 1999 for a Dutch example). In contrast, critical approaches to policy making generally analyse development projects and aid policies in the context of a hegemonic order and a rationalising technical discourse – rather than trying to make new policies and models, they try to reveal the “hidden purposes of bureaucratic power or dominance” of development policies and organisations” (Mosse 2004, 641: quoted in Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005, 86). These critiques mirror those within the fields of archaeological heritage management that focus on the entanglements of archaeology with ‘western’ discourses and political governance about identities (see section 2.4).

An ethnographic approach that makes use of a ‘practice perspective’ (cf Hajer 2005; Hajer & Wagenaar 2003; Mosse 2005) can be seen as an appealing alternative, as it “places the historical development of discourses and the stories of practitioners at its centre” (Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005, 85). Within such an ethnographic approach, policy-effects in practice are not regarded as the outcome of a rational, linear decision-making process, nor as the outcome of an anonymous, rationalising and technical discourse; rather, policy outcomes can be regarded as ‘embedded practices’ which are the result of “both national and international politics and by negotiations and networks that cross-cut formal institutional boundaries” (Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005, 88; and see Yanow 1996).

Because policy exists of embedded practices – that is, of both discursive and non-discursive practices in which power and knowledge are mutually intertwined and reinforcing (Foucault 1979; Hajer 2005), it can serve a function which is broader than purely guiding the implementation of effects and activities ‘on the ground’. According to Latour (1996; but see also Mosse 2004; 2005), the success of policy does therefore not so much depend on its ability to guide practice, but rather on its ability to connect actors, inspire allegiance, and maintain institutional support by providing coherent interpretations of practice. This idea can help us understand how the use of vague discursive concepts such as ‘capacity building’, ‘collaboration’ and/or ‘heritage management’, can bring forward the legitimisation and continuation of political and institutional support for projects. Such concepts, or ‘mobilising metaphors’ (Shore & Wright 1997; Vos 2011, 36; and see Hajer 2005, 301-301) allow actors, groups and institutions to adhere to policy programs and project networks more easily by forming temporary discourse coalitions, constantly ‘translating’ such concepts into the values and interests of their supporters (Latour 1996; Mosse 2005; Lewis & Mosse 2006). This vagueness of policy discourses should however not necessarily be seen as problematic – “on the contrary, this disjuncture between policy and practice can be seen as a necessity, that is actively maintained and reproduced” (Vos 2011, 37).

An ethnographic practice approach towards policy programs and project networks can therefore help explain how certain actors with diverse and even contradictory values and interests can be brought together. It also allows us to investigate the social context and agency of actors in such networks and programs, as it draws attention to the fact that actors, through processes of translation and negotiation, might “seek to monopolise resources, reproduce insider advantages, control gatekeeper access to important actors or forums, or discursively dominate weaker players through the strategic development of ideas and values” (Favell 2006, 127).

2.6 TOWARDS AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH PROJECTS ABROAD

As Van Gastel and Nuijten point out, an ethnographic approach that takes a ‘practice perspective’ towards policy discourses and programs should focus “on the ways in which relations between actors, institutions and discourses are created across time and space” in multiple sites (2005, 88), and on how the different and conflicting perspectives and values of actors within different sites are negotiated – “even where actors in these different sites do not know each other” (Shore & Wright 1997, 14).⁴⁵

Such an ethnographic approach offers potential for examining the workings of archaeological research projects in social contexts abroad because of its focus on the historic development of discourses and the agency and personal circumstances of the actors involved. The emphasis within such an ethnographic approach upon the conflicting perspectives and discourses of actors within different spatial

⁴⁵ Quoted in Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005, 88.

and temporal spaces is deemed applicable, since it resembles the previously discussed conception of archaeological projects as a network of actors with interlinked and often conflicting values and discourses, the conception of values as being of a dynamic, subjective and actor-oriented nature, and the conception of archaeological sites as multi-vocal, multi-temporal, multi-spatial and contested sites of knowledge, practice and power. It is worth mentioning that the ethnographic practice approach has been mostly applied to specifically analysing international development policy discourses and programs. However, it is considered as applicable as well to an examination of archaeological research projects abroad that are only indirectly influenced by policies from the ‘home country’, which is the case for many of the archaeological research projects that are undertaken by the Netherlands, as I have discussed in section 1.4. This is because all archaeological projects abroad are influenced by policies and political discourses at a certain point in its development – through for example funding policies in the field of research and development, international guidelines and ethical standards, and/or the transfer of heritage policies to former colonies such as the Netherlands Antilles (see chapter 5).




Figure 03. Visual summary of a conceptual framework as it applies to an ethnographic practice approach towards archaeological research projects abroad.

In this sense, I suggest that an ethnography of archaeological research projects abroad should therefore better bring forward the broad notion of ‘project policies’, which can then be conceived of as project proposals and programs as developed by archaeological actors, as a specific reflection of a myriad of funding programs in the field of culture, research and foreign affairs, institutional policies, cultural and archaeological policies, ethical codes, management models, archaeological theory, and so on. These project policies should then be seen as ‘embedded practices’, that is, as an interplay between policy discourses, actors, values and practices, which brings our attention to the intentions, needs and aspirations of individual actors, to the way in which actors negotiate, manipulate and represent project discourses and values in society, as well as to a possible discrepancy between project policies and actual project outcomes.

Figure 03 shows a visual summary of the conceptual framework as discussed in this chapter, as it applies to an ethnographic practice approach towards investigating archaeological research projects abroad. It is my belief that such an approach can help to address the two main *research aims* of this study as discussed in the introduction, which are A) to investigate how Dutch archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context, as well as B) to reflect on the role and responsibility of Dutch archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of others when working abroad.

In summary, I propose that this can be accomplished through applying the ethnographic approach and conceptual framework towards specific case studies (see chapter 3), by addressing the following *research questions* in relation to Dutch archaeological research projects abroad;

1. What are the values and discourses of actors in archaeological project policies with respect to research, heritage management and collaboration?
2. How do archaeological actors negotiate these values and discourses in relation to those of others in society abroad?
3. What is the influence of this process of policy negotiation upon project outcomes?

Despite the above mentioned ambivalent, multiple and contested nature of archaeological projects, it is worth noting that many ethnographies of archaeological projects have often focused primarily on the geographic locality of the archaeological site (cf Castañeda 2008, 37; see e.g. Bartu 2000; Meskell 2005a; El-Haj 2001; Chiang 2012). This focus on the locality of ‘heritage sites’ makes sense, because this is often the ‘place’ or ‘social interface’ (Long 2003) where the multitude of interpretations and agendas come together in practice, but also because they lend themselves to ethnographic methods such as participant observation (Castañeda 2008, 37). Nevertheless, I propose that ethnographies of archaeological projects abroad should take into account the broader conceptualisation of sites and communities by adding a few other ‘layers’ of ethnographic research focus. These include for instance other ‘sites’ where archaeology is undertaken, ‘consumed’ and discursively produced, such as in the classes of educational ‘home’ institutions, policy offices, laboratories, the internet, tourism initiatives, etc. In addition, the multi-temporality of sites means that it is worthwhile exploring as well the way in which archaeological projects have developed over time, by focusing on the historical, institutional and socio-political frameworks of projects, and of the changing values, discursive practices and policies associated with them.

With this ethnographic approach, conceptual framework and research questions in relation to archaeological research projects abroad in place, I will now discuss in more detail how these were applied to this specific study by discussing its methodology and research design.

Chapter Three: Asking Foreign Questions

“I really enjoy these questions. Can I go now?”⁴⁶

3.1 RESEARCH APPROACH

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter sets out the methodological framework of this study. The research has been undertaken from an interpretive perspective, based upon a constructivist view towards society, heritage and the past. As such, it works from the epistemological assumption that complex social phenomena can only be understood within their context, and that the (co-)construction of meaning is the result of a subjective interrelationship between the researcher and its subject of research (Mills *et al.* 2006, 2). It challenges the ontological realism of positivist science, in the sense of opposing the idea that (knowledge about) the world exists of entities which are outside of human thought, analysis and perception, and that its ‘truth’ can be discovered by applying neutral, objective research methods (Oliver 2004, 28-30). Instead, the constructivist standpoint acknowledges the co-existence of ‘multiple’ realities – in other words, that different people with different social backgrounds, values and interests will understand and interpret their experiences of the world differently (Long 2003, 49).

This interpretive, constructivist standpoint lies at the basis of the issues and topics as discussed within the conceptual framework of chapter 2 – it can be identified within the multi-vocal approaches to the past (section 2.2), within the concept of the ‘multiplicity’ of archaeological sites, communities and heritage values (sections 2.2 and 2.3), as well as within the idea that heritage is a social construction within discourse (sections 2.4 and 2.5). Methodologically, this standpoint has led to a qualitative research approach in which the researcher becomes immersed within the social phenomenon under investigation (cf Trochim 2000).⁴⁷

As was discussed in chapter 2, an ethnographic approach seems therefore appropriate if one wishes to investigate how Dutch research projects abroad work in their social context, and if one wants to reflect upon the role and responsibilities of archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of others in society when working abroad. In order to be able to explore these general research aims, this study then takes the foreign research practices of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University as its point of departure, approaching this as the ethnographic ‘culture’ under investigation. Specifically, it does this by bringing two of its research projects forward as case studies which will address the specific research questions that were mentioned at the end of chapter 2 – these are the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Santa Barbara Project in Curaçao.

With these general remarks in relation to the qualitative research approach in place, the second part of this section will continue by discussing the methods used and the modes of analysis that have been followed. The subsequent section (3.2) will touch upon the scope and research context of this study, by delving deeper into the choice of case studies. This section will also deal with the research design of these two case

⁴⁶ Interview with a local farmer from Deir Alla at the Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies (Deir Alla, June 2009).

⁴⁷ Available at, and quoted from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/qualapp.php> [Accessed June 10, 2012].

studies, describing in detail how they were approached, investigated and analysed ‘in the field’, and how they relate to the general research aims and specific research questions. The chapter will end with an investigation into the ‘positionality’ of the researcher (3.3).

3.1.2 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

With regards to the case studies, this study has applied other qualitative methods – notably semi-structured and open interviews (with over 100 respondents), participant observation (both as an academic researcher situated at the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, as well as part of the fieldwork seasons and/or visits of the case studies under scrutiny), and document analysis (including policy documents, academic publications, newspaper articles and magazines, correspondence, research proposals and websites).⁴⁸

This ethnography of Dutch archaeology abroad will go further than mere description by regarding these methods as yielding qualitative data that can inform an inductive development of arguments. This will be done by bringing forward a combination of ethnographic research with discursive analysis, following the approach as set out in section 2.6. In summary, such an approach combines a method of discursive analysis that regards discourses as existing of ‘practices’, with ethnographic research that investigates how social agents produce, transform and negotiate values, discourses and policies within archaeological research projects. The inductive analysis of this resulting qualitative data, is subsequently inspired by drawing upon the analytical use of ‘sensitising concepts’ as well as upon the specific research questions, as brought forward in the conceptual framework of chapter 2.

According to Blumer (1954), sensitising concepts should be regarded in opposition to definitive concepts or hypotheses, and as providing a “general sense of reference and guidance” to the researcher:

- sensitising concepts merely suggest directions along which to look. The hundreds of our concepts like culture, institutions, social structure, mores, and personality – are not definitive concepts but are sensitising in nature. They lack precise reference and have no bench marks which allow a clean-cut identification of a specific instance and of its content (Blumer 1954, 7)

In line with Charmaz (2000), the complete array of sensitising concepts, or ‘conceptual framework’, can as such be regarded as forming the background ideas against which the specific research methodology and analysis is formed. What this means, is that the literature review along the lines of the three major themes in chapter 2 has inspired and informed the type of issues, topics and questions in my methodology and inductive analysis, by bringing forward a wide range of concepts as ‘interpretive devices’ that formed the starting point for my qualitative study (cf Bowen 2006, 2-3). These sensitising concepts consist first of all of those concepts that play an important role in the social context of archaeology abroad, and that can help to investigate how archaeological projects relate to other demands in society. Important – often overlapping – concepts here for instance included ‘multivocality’, ‘community collaboration’, ‘heritage’, ‘expertise’, ‘significance’, ‘ownership’, ‘empowerment’ and ‘decolonisation’. Secondly, there are those sensitising concepts that were brought forward in order to investigate how projects worked in terms of processes – these include those concepts which were brought together in the framework of a ‘value-based’ management model, where the idea was put forward that the concepts of ‘value’, ‘actors’ and ‘networks’ could function as an interpretive device for illustrating the different motivations, interests and world-views of a range of stakeholders in archaeological projects processes. Another concept that can be included here

⁴⁸ This will be discussed in more detail in section 3.2.2.

is the concept of ‘discourse’, which, in combination with the conceptual framework of the value-based heritage management model and the discussion on ethnographic ‘practice approaches’ towards discourses in section 2.5, drew our attention to sensitising concepts such as ‘power’, ‘policy’, ‘practice’, ‘discourse-coalitions’ and ‘exclusion’.

Taken together, this qualitative approach explicitly draws upon both these types of sensitising concepts through a methodological process whereby data collection, research questions and methods are constantly re-informing each other as to come to inductive analysis of arguments. Although such an approach mirrors the traditional idea of ‘grounded theory’ (Glaser & Strauss 1967), it differs in several ways. Indeed, grounded theory acknowledges the continuing process of data formation and analysis, seeking to build theories inductively out of data derived from studying complex social phenomena (Mills *et al.* 2006). According to especially Glaser (2001), such inductive analysis however has to be undertaken without the ‘contamination’ of literature research prior to data collection as to make sure that analysis is free from pre-conceived notions and categories of analysis (Thornberg 2010). The later work of Strauss (see e.g. Strauss & Corbin 1998) distances itself from such a notion by proposing that literature research can be undertaken prior to the early phases of fieldwork provided it does not lead to overlooking alternative analytical categories. I adhere to such a view on the usability of literature research, by explicitly acknowledging the literature, experiences and sensitising concepts that informed my study as a whole through stressing the relativist and social-constructivist stance as outlined in section 3.1 – acknowledging the idea that reality, and thereby the arguments and theories advanced in analysis, are socially constructed by the researcher. Such an approach therefore mirrors, more precisely, instances of ‘constructivist grounded theory’ as it was brought forward most notably by Charmaz (2000; 2006).

Constructivist grounded theory advocates making the pre-conceived notions, concepts and experiences of the researcher and his/her literature review explicit, most notably by emphasising the continuing interaction between the researcher, his/her ‘research participants’ (that is, the actors and/or respondents that are part of the social phenomenon under investigation), data formation and analysis. Although my inductive analysis in this research is not pre-occupied with developing a ‘grand theory’ but rather by developing arguments in relation to the research questions that stay close to original research data, my research can be said to follow the broad frame of thought of constructivist grounded theory. This is because it lies at the basis of my combination between ethnographic research and discourse analysis, where the sensitising concepts as discussed above have guided my interpretation through treating them as elements and categories of coding, memo-writing and analysis (for a practical overview of the constructivist grounded method, see Charmaz 2006). Most importantly, such an approach acknowledges the call that the analysis should be presented as a written narrative in which the original statements and ideas of the research participants are made clear (Charmaz 2000). This approach, which deals with “the tension that exists between developing a conceptual analysis of participants’ stories and still creating a sense of their presence in the final text” (Mills *et al.* 2006, 7), ultimately acknowledges the influence of the scientific, cultural and social background of the researcher on the subjective interpretation. This issue will be discussed in section 3.3.

With these remarks in relation to the general research approach and methodology in place, I now wish to describe how the research aims, questions, methods and analysis came together in the design and fieldwork of the two case studies (see section 3.2.2). I will begin, however, the next section by delving deeper into the background, scope and relevance of the two case studies under investigation.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

3.2.1 CHOICE OF CASE STUDIES

This study deals with the socio-political, institutional and discursive contexts in which actors construct, negotiate and implement Dutch archaeological research projects in social contexts abroad. Because the Netherlands do not have a specific policy or national government institution that regulates and prescribes overseas archaeology directly (unlike for instance France, see Lévin forthcoming), and because most Dutch archaeology abroad still is (and was) undertaken by knowledge institutions such as universities and museums (Slappendel *et al.* forthcoming), I will focus in this study on the ways and extents to which research projects are influenced by different policy and funding programs for distinct social contexts abroad. With ‘Dutch archaeological research projects abroad’, I refer to archaeological projects that are (primarily) conducted outside the national borders of the Netherlands, that are formulated on the basis of research questions and interests by Dutch archaeological scholars and knowledge institutions, and that can be placed within a historically defined research tradition that focuses on the archaeology of an area which lies outside the current European borders of the Netherlands in a geographic sense, and outside the direct sphere of enforcement of Dutch national cultural and archaeological policies and governmental bodies.

Accordingly, the two case studies have been selected on the prerequisite that they constitute projects that can be placed within different geographical research traditions and within different political, legislative and financial frameworks of Dutch archaeology abroad. As such, this research focuses on two research projects undertaken by Leiden University; one of them undertaken in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (with additional comparisons and field practices in the Palestinian Territories, see below), and one of them in Curaçao, now an autonomous country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands, but before 10 October 2010 part of the Netherlands Antilles.

These case-studies are considered as relevant, and to a certain degree, exemplary for Dutch foreign research projects abroad since both of these projects can be placed within long but distinctively different geographical research traditions in the Netherlands – notably Near Eastern Archaeology and Caribbean Archaeology (see Louwe Kooijmans 2000, 21; Slappendel *et al.* forthcoming)-, and both of these projects operate within different political, legislative and financial frameworks.

Although these projects are undertaken outside the current European borders of the Netherlands in a geographic sense, and outside the direct influence of Dutch national cultural and archaeological policies and governmental bodies, the nuances of the concept of ‘abroad’ are very different – whilst the project in Jordan can be described as ‘abroad’ in the sense of being ‘transcultural’ and ‘transnational’, such a definition is less suitable for Curaçao, due to the strong historical and contemporary political and cultural influence of the Netherlands (see for example Van Oostindie 2008). However, it is precisely because of these differences and nuances that these projects were selected as case studies, since they bring forward different issues in the social context of archaeological projects.

The Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project in Jordan can be placed within one of the longest archaeological research traditions in the Netherlands, which originated out of religious, humanist and scholarly motivations in the late 19th century (Slappendel *et al.* forthcoming). It can be characterised by a strong influence of scholarly actors and academic research and funding programs, which more recently has become confronted with the need to accommodate local community issues and national heritage management concerns, and with the need to integrate itself with foreign policies of the Netherlands in order to secure funding. In this respect, it is worth noting that the scope of the Deir Alla Joint

Archaeological Project has been influenced in recent years by the Tell Balata Archaeological Park Project in the Palestinian Territories – a project undertaken by the same Dutch archaeological actors, and one in which the author himself has also become involved as a result of this research (I will draw upon this more extensively in chapter 4).⁴⁹

The Santa Barbara Project in Curaçao constitutes a project in a former colony of the Netherlands where the archaeological investigations have become confronted with conflicting actor perspectives over the need and practicalities of integrating itself within the overseas transferral of archaeological heritage management policies by the Netherlands and the Council of Europe. The project is funded by both the private as well as the research sector, and can be placed within a Dutch research tradition that originated in the early 20th century, with a more specific and extensive role for Leiden University since the 1980's. The position of Curaçao in relation to the Netherlands could arguably be described as neither completely 'foreign' nor 'national' (see section 5.2.3) – as part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Curaçao did not fall under the direct influence of Dutch national cultural policies, nor under foreign cultural policies such as the 'Common Cultural Heritage Policy'.⁵⁰

Several other arguments played a role in the choice of case studies. In order for the case studies to allow for an investigation of actor negotiations in the social context of archaeology, they had to constitute projects where a wide range of both global and local actors interact within the 'social interface' (cf Long 2003; see above). Also, the case studies had to constitute research projects that are confronted with the three major issues as brought forward by the themes along which the social context of archaeology has been identified in the introduction, and which were further investigated in the conceptual framework of chapter 2. To rephrase these slightly differently, these are the way in which we deal with the views, values and interests of communities in the investigations and interpretations of the past, the way in which we integrate our archaeological narratives and practices with other demands and with processes of heritage management, and the way in which we deal with power differences in both these processes. In order to investigate these issues, case studies were chosen that bring to the fore the different types of social relationships on which discussions of archaeological ethics and professional codes have traditionally been focusing (see section 2.4). As summarised by Aitchison (2007), this is on the one hand the relationship between archaeologists, the research process and developers, focusing on ethical concerns that arise out of the need to mitigate the impact of globalisation and development within contract archaeology (including issues such as quality control and accountability), and on the other hand, the relationship between archaeologists and local communities and project partners – which traditionally focused on repatriation, illicit trade and the treatment of human remains, but which more recently also includes postcolonial dilemmas such as the involvement of local voices, values and research partners in the management and interpretation of

⁴⁹ The Tell Balata Archaeological Park Project has been funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs in a 'priority country' for Dutch development aid, and is as such much more strongly situated in a discourse of archaeology as development as opposed to archaeology as knowledge – an important distinction that resonates strongly in the scope and conduct of the Joint Deir Alla Project as well (see chapter 4).

⁵⁰ Neither the projects in Jordan nor Curaçao fall under the Dutch 'Common Cultural Heritage Policy'. This policy framework, one of the priorities of Dutch foreign cultural policy, focuses primarily on the preservation and management of 'shared', or 'mutual' colonial heritage – a highly contested, sensitive and complex notion that can be criticised for inherently prioritising Dutch approaches towards heritage in opposition to local and non-western notions and wishes (Fienieg *et al.* 2008). The reason why this study does not include case studies in the 'priority countries' of this policy (including the former colonies Indonesia, Ghana, Surinam, India, South Africa and Sri Lanka) lies primarily in the fact that at the start of my research, no large archaeological research projects were undertaken under this policy framework by the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University. Only more recently, with established links between the Dutch Centre for International Heritage (CIE) and the Faculty of Archaeology, has the latter become involved with archaeological investigations as part of wider management programs in notably Sri Lanka and South Africa (please refer to the website of CIE: <http://www.heritage-activities.org/> [Accessed July 05, 2012]). Comparing the case studies of Jordan and Curaçao with these projects will undoubtedly be an interesting line for future research (for a critique on the Common Cultural Heritage Policy, see Fienieg *et al.* 2008).

archaeological materials (Aitchison 2007; Pels 2011).⁵¹ The project in Curaçao is an example where the first relationship, that between archaeologists and developers, plays a fundamental role – this will subsequently be held against the background of the way in which the project intersects and interacts with local community concerns and with the values and interests of other actors in the public domain. The Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project constitutes an example where the second relationship, that between archaeologists, research partners and local communities, plays the most crucial role – this will be held against the background of heritage management discourses, cultural tourism and development aid policies and, again, the values and interests of other actors in the public domain.

Finally, I want to stress that the choice of projects was also made on the basis of practical and pragmatic choices. Both case studies concern projects that are undertaken, at least partially, by academic scholars of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, and with whom the researcher has close links. The choice for the Faculty of Archaeology could however be seen as exemplary for the exploration of Dutch archaeological research projects abroad by a knowledge institution, since it is the biggest archaeological research institution in the Netherlands with the longest and widest range of international research projects abroad. In addition, it should be noted that it was only natural for me to turn the ethnographic eye on the Faculty of Archaeology in Leiden – after all, as the place where I work with my colleagues, it was the faculty that primarily functioned as the context in which I have built a narrative of my experiences and observations about Dutch archaeology abroad. I will touch upon this issue in more detail in section 3.3.

This leaves me with discussing the way in which Dutch archaeology is transferable as an example of ‘western’ or ‘European’ archaeology abroad. Whilst I endorse the use of the term ‘European’ in the sense of Gosden’s concept “around which orders of difference were created in the early years of the colonial encounter and then exported to other colonial countries in the form of notions of the west and western civilisation, where these latter terms have historical and cultural, rather than geographical, meanings” (Gosden 1999, 16), I rather refer to his as ‘western’ instead of ‘European’ archaeology in order to avoid confusion. In this sense, I use the term ‘western archaeology’ as referring to a body of archaeological practice, theory and policies that has a historical and cultural, rather than a geographical meaning – admitting that it has a strong origin in Europe, and that it has subsequently been exported and applied to former European colonies and/or non-western contexts (see also Ucko 1995 and Trigger 1984a; 1984b; 2006). As such, it is different from my use of the term ‘European archaeology’ – with this, I refer to the same body of archaeological practice, theory and policies, but limited to those originating from within nation states that are currently part of the Council of Europe.⁵²

As a European country with a colonial past and a strong tradition in archaeological research, archaeological heritage management and developing cooperation abroad (Slappendel *et al.* forthcoming), the choice for the Netherlands as a case-study for western archaeology abroad is therefore deemed appropriate. The choice for the Netherlands as a case study for a European archaeology abroad, then, is further contextualized within the *Archaeology in Contemporary Europe* (ACE) research project,⁵³ from which this particular study originated. Within the ACE research project, a comparative study on the historic and institutional contexts of several European national archaeologies in foreign contexts is investigated, notably France, Germany, Poland, Belgium, Spain and the Netherlands (Van der Linde *et al.* forthcoming).

⁵¹ Thanks to Prof. Peter Pels for bringing my attention to this issue during a seminar for the MA Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context, Leiden University, 26 September 2011.

⁵² For a detailed discussion on the issues of ‘European archaeology’, see Willems (2009) and *Archaeological Dialogues* (2007).

⁵³ See note 2, chapter 1.

Consequently, this research seeks to build upon this comparative study of the historic and institutional context of Dutch archaeology abroad, by delving deeper into the way in which archaeological research projects actually *work* within contemporary socio-political contexts. At the end of section 3.2.2, I will return briefly to the scope and relevance of the case studies when debating their possible transferability to other research settings.

3.2.2 RESEARCH DESIGN AND FIELDWORK

This study has been designed to explore the two research aims by following the structure of the three research questions for the two case studies (see section 2.6). Below, I will present this research design by describing the ‘ethnographic path’ that I have undertaken, whereby it must be realised that actual fieldwork was often of a more fluid character in the sense of research methods, questions, data formation and analysis constantly informing and overlapping each other (cf Sanjek 1990). Fieldwork in an ethnographic sense was undertaken in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (which included a visit to the Palestinian Territories) and Curaçao (which included visits to Bonaire and Aruba). These two case studies were contextualised and further investigated during ‘field’ research in the Netherlands, consisting of document analysis, interviews and participant observation – which were all undertaken as part of my position as a researcher at the Faculty of Archaeology in Leiden University (2008 - 2012).

Fieldwork in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan consisted of two research periods; the first as a researcher as part of the excavation season in the 50th year of the Deir Alla Archaeological Joint Project (May - July 2009), which consisted of extensive participant observation in the research process, document analysis and interviews. This was followed upon by a second field visit undertaken on my own (November 2009).

Fieldwork in Curaçao was undertaken from the end of May till early August 2010. Initially, I joined the Dutch co-directors of the Santa Barbara Project during meetings undertaken in the former Netherlands Antilles, which was followed upon by a longer period of document analysis and the undertaking of semi-structured and open interviews. Due to the overlap in field-season with the Deir Alla Archaeological Joint Project, I did not participate with and observe the Dutch archaeological team during their field-seasons of 2008 and 2009. Rather, my ethnographic emphasis of this case study was aimed at collecting information of relevant actors one year after the excavations at Santa Barbara had finished (2010), and to contextualise these findings within wider socio-political events that brought with it, in varying degrees, the arrival of Dutch and European archaeological policies to the islands of the Netherlands Antilles. Differences between these case studies in terms of research focus, positionality and relevance will be discussed in more detail throughout this chapter.

Both case studies started in the Netherlands with desk-based research into project documents, academic publications, media coverage, websites and background literature, aimed to provide a general idea of the chronology of events, social context, involved stakeholders and challenges and issues that had arisen as a result of the project’s implementation. This phase also involved the initial collection of project correspondence from Leiden University, which allowed for a more detailed understanding of the chronology of events and processes of project negotiation. This was then supported by the undertaking of ‘helicopter interviews’ (cf Hajer 2005, 306), entailing open interviews with several main actors that could provide an overarching view on the events and issues surrounding the implementation of the case studies. These actors consisted initially out of the Dutch directors of the projects, but also included several

‘external’ experts with a knowledge of the archaeological and heritage field in the specific research settings.⁵⁴

This phase was followed upon by more detailed document analysis (including project reports, institutional, cultural and funding policies, media coverage, academic articles and websites), allowing for the initial identification of discursive elements, attributed values, story-lines, key events as well as the ‘sites of discursive production’ (see section 2.5, and refer to Hajer 2005, 306). This analysis was supported by coding these documents along the lines of the sensitising concepts as mentioned in section 3.1.2, which provided a first insight into the main values and discourses of Dutch archaeological practitioners in project policies with respect to research, heritage management and community collaboration (research question 1).

This initial discursive analysis was investigated in much more detail throughout the fieldwork periods in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and in Curaçao. This started with similar helicopter interviews with the main partners of the research projects, as well as with several local anthropologists, journalists and government officials. The combination of these interviews with additional desk-based research ‘on location’ provided a first glimpse of the way in which the identified ‘Dutch’ values and discourses related to those of other stakeholders (research question 2).

These studies were then strengthened and deepened by ethnographic research, which included further document analysis, participant observation (although in differing degrees, see below) and the undertaking of open and semi-structured interviews. These interviews were held with a wide range of stakeholders and actors of the project and the archaeological site, including representatives of the main project partner institutions, amateur archaeologists, field workers, government officials, project developers, students, community members, religious representatives, tourists, teachers, local project staff, and so on. In general, an iterative approach towards the interview process was followed, whereby interviews were adapted in the field in relation to specific respondents and/or research issues (cf Rubin & Rubin 2005). Although initially my interviews were semi-structured along the lines of the major themes of research, heritage management and collaboration (see appendix), they soon became more open interviews, or sometimes rather spontaneous discussions as part of my position as a participant observant (see below). Primarily, this was because such open interviews (although structured on the basis of previous experiences with other interviewees) contributed to a more focused and fluent discussion.

Interviews with main actors of the project were as such initially geared towards increasing the understanding of the ‘causal chains’, a.i. ‘which led to what’ (Hajer 2005, 306), which was used as an opportunity to discuss the interpretation of key events in more detail. Another important element focused on the way in which actor’s original motivations and expectations related to their interpretation of project outcomes. In addition, most interviews were steered by the researcher to come to discussions on the way in which actors related to the archaeological site and the project as a whole, increasing the identification of their attributed values and discourses in respect to research, heritage and collaboration. Taken together, these interviews provided a more detailed understanding of the way in which the main values and discourses of Dutch operators related to those of other stakeholders, and what their role was in project negotiations and outcomes (research questions 1 and 2). It should be noted here that this research element included important interviews with those actors that were not part of the official project negotiations and partnerships, as to investigate the wider social impact of the case studies. This included a focus on community members, as well as other actors in the sphere of tourism, spatial planning, education and socio-economic development schemes.

Especially the semi-structured and open interviews that were arranged beforehand were recorded by a digital voice-recorder – although only when respondents had given their prior consent to do so. During

⁵⁴ These respondents will be identified as such throughout the case studies where relevant.

the interviews, notes were also taken as to identify the most important themes, issues and quotes. As it was foreseen that some interviews could only be completely transcribed after fieldwork, this allowed for the specific transcription of important quotes and issues as were deemed necessary for further research and interviews in the field. Informal discussions as part of participant observation were all worked out in the field, together with my first initial attempts at interpretation and analysis.

All interviews were embedded in ethnographic research where (participant) observation provided further insight into the social positions and personal motivations of individual actors. This part of the research allowed for a much better understanding of the agency and personal roles of actors in project negotiations, discussions and conflicts, drawing attention to the embedded practices of the project as a whole. The way in which project outcomes and policies were represented, discussed and utilised was further investigated by visiting a range of conferences, seminars and public events in Jordan, Curaçao and the Netherlands.⁵⁵ Together, this contributed to the investigation into research question 3, which focused upon the complex relationship between project policy and practice.

As discussed above, the combination of ethnographic research and discourse analysis was considered as providing qualitative data that could be interpreted inductively by following instances of constructivist grounded theory. The coding of data was supported and analysed by drawing upon the sensitising concepts (such as ‘research’, ‘multivocality’, ‘community collaboration’, ‘heritage’, ‘expertise’, ‘significance’, ‘ownership’, ‘empowerment’ and ‘decolonisation’, and by bringing the concepts of value and discourse forward as an analytical tools (see section 3.1.2). This led to the development of initial arguments and strands of analysis in relation to the three research questions, which were summarised in short memos (cf Charmaz 2006) – together, these provided a first glimpse of how archaeological research projects abroad worked in their social context (research aim 1). The second research aim, which deals with the role and responsibility of Dutch archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of others when working abroad, was only partly dealt with in this phase, as I would primarily deal with this issue as part of a discussion that drew upon data from both case studies (see below).

The general analysis of the two case studies were subsequently ‘tested’ by mirroring a process described by Charmaz (2006) as ‘theoretical sampling’. This included re-visiting my qualitative data as to look for potential supporting and conflicting arguments. This process also involved discussing the analysis with a range of external experts – most notably consisting of several anthropologists in both research settings,⁵⁶ as well as with several main actors as to increase their potential to object to what was said about them (Mosse 2005, ix; cf Latour 2000; see 3.3 for a more detailed discussion). This phase subsequently informed the refinement of research questions and analysis, as well as the collection of additional data.

In order to provide for an effective ‘sampling’ of my initial analysis and the collection of further data, a second, short fieldwork visit to Jordan was deemed necessary in November 2009 – primarily to be able to discuss my initial discourse analysis with the main actors of the Jordanian counterparts of the Joint Project. A second field visit to Curaçao was not deemed necessary – this was partly because its analysis could build upon the insights gained during the earlier fieldwork in Jordan, partly because additional data and commentary could be derived from interviews via Skype as well as during visits of several actors to Leiden University.

The last phase of the research design consisted of writing the ethnographic narratives of the two case studies. In this respect, it is worth stressing that the Deir Alla Archaeological Joint Project was undertaken prior to the Santa Barbara Project – together with my research positioning in relation to these case studies (see section 3.3), this contributed to a difference in research focus and emphasis.

⁵⁵ These are mentioned throughout the case-studies where relevant.

⁵⁶ Specific actors will be mentioned throughout the case studies where relevant.

My first phase of fieldwork at the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project can be characterised by a full period of participant observation as part of the Dutch research team. Throughout this period, I stayed at the Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies (DASAS), where I participated in surveying, excavations, finds analysis, field visits, meetings, coffee drinking, parties and even weddings. In addition, visits were made to governmental departments and foreign archaeological research schools in Amman, as well as to a range of archaeological museums, tourist sites and university departments throughout the country.

During the research project over 50 interviews were undertaken. My inability to speak or write fluent Arabic, added here to a stronger emphasis on the discourses and embedded practices of the main institutional partners and of middle and higher class Jordanian actors, all of which spoke fluent English. Such analysis also drew upon research reports, correspondence, academic articles and legislative documents that were available in English – or translated from Arabic in the field by my informant and research colleagues.

Data derived from interviews with local community members was mostly used for an ethnographic understanding of their social position, wishes and motivations in relation to the project. Most of these interviews were translated from Arabic in the field by my informant (a male English teacher from a neighbouring village with previous experience of translation in the Jordan Valley). This meant that my analysis in relation to community members focused not so much upon discursive formations, linguistic elements or story-lines, but rather upon the way in which the dominating values and motivations inherent in the official discourses by the project partners related to the values, motivations and practices of local actors. It also meant that less emphasis could be placed on detailed processes of project negotiation and representation, as internal correspondence and discussions between Jordanian actors could not always be analysed. I have tried to mitigate this by means of participant observation during excavation work, project meetings and social events, as well as through focused interviews with several key informants.

My fieldwork in Curaçao consisted initially of attending archaeological meetings, surveys, museum and site visits with the Dutch co-directors in Curaçao, Aruba and Bonaire. This was followed upon by a longer period on my own, whereby interviews were held in governmental, institutional and commercial offices, hotels, schools, at people's homes, and – admittedly – at several local bars. I participated in local tourist visits, walking trails, golf activities, conferences, vocational archaeological surveys, beach visits, and visited many museums and archaeological sites around the island – although my focus was primarily aimed around the Santa Barbara Plantation. Further interviews were held, often spontaneously, with local community members throughout my stay at Willemstad.

For the case study of the Santa Barbara Plantation, the general use of Dutch language meant that I could draw to a larger degree on project documents, legislation and internal correspondences of all partners – the latter of which kindly provided to me by several local institutions and partners of the project. It also meant that I could interview all actors, including local community members, without a translator – although my inability to speak the vernacular language *Papiamentu* had an impact upon both my position as a researcher as well as upon the retrieval and interpretation of data (see section 3.3). Nonetheless, this meant that I could focus in more detail on processes of project negotiation, representation and discursive constructions than was the case at the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project. On the other hand, my ethnographic focus on understanding the impact of the excavation project one year after the field-season, meant that I could pay less emphasis on embedded practices in relation to the interaction between Dutch researchers and the local community. This interaction was therefore primarily investigated through interviews, as there was no participant observation during the actual excavation seasons.

In general, it can as such be noted that whilst local community views and values have been investigated as an important part of the social network of both case studies, this study shows a stronger emphasis upon the official, governmental and institutional partners and discourses of the two projects.

Apart from issues of field method and language, this emphasis is also the result of my position as a researcher at Leiden University. Before I will look at this in more detail in section 3.3, I wish to make a final remark in relation to the relevance of the two case studies.

In section 1.7, I have touched upon the general relevance of this study in relation to the intersection of the emerging field of ‘ethnographies of archaeology’ with other research fields that seek to investigate the social context of archaeology. At the end of this section, I wish to delve a little deeper into the possible generalisation of the analysis of the case studies to other research settings. First of all, it should be noted that though comparisons between the case-studies will be given in the conclusion, the research is not comparative in a strict sense. As such, my research could be aligned with the body of literature within postcolonial critiques of archaeology that call for investigating social context not through “homogenising the diversity of experiences”, but rather through a variety of case studies around the world, acknowledging that all cross-cultural and trans-national encounters should be placed within their specific historical and geographical particularities (Liebmann 2008a, 11). In relation to the inductive formation of arguments through a method of analysis that was inspired by constructivist grounded theory (see above), it should further be noted that “there always remains the possibility of extending and adapting the theory, so that it reflects more accurately the nature of newly collected data” (Oliver 2004, 31).

When debating the possible generalisation of the two case studies to other, or additional research settings, I find it therefore useful to refer to the concept of transferability – brought forward by Guba and Lincoln (1989) as one of four possible criteria for judging the value of qualitative research, and summarised by Trochim (2000) as referring to “the degree to which the results of qualitative research can be generalised or transferred to other contexts or settings”.⁵⁷ From such a perspective, the transferability of this study should primarily be regarded as the responsibility of the one who wishes to transfer, or generalise, the research results to another context (*ibid.*). Accordingly, I have tried to enhance the potential of transferability through a description of the research context and scope, by situating the two case studies within the historical and institutional frameworks of the Netherlands (Slappendel *et al.* forthcoming, and see section 3.2.1), and by framing the case study of the Netherlands within a European wide perspective elsewhere (Van der Linde *et al.* forthcoming; Schlanger *et al.* forthcoming). In addition, I have tried to enhance this by describing my own background and assumptions that were central to this research – this was done in sections 1.4 and 1.6, and will be further described in the following section.

3.3 POSITIONALITY

Depending on the setting of my fieldwork, I have constantly been positioned differently throughout my research. This changing ‘positionality’ has influenced the interactions with actors throughout my case studies, and coupled with my own background, has had an influence on the retrieval of data, the co-construction of arguments between researcher and researched (cf Charmaz 2006), and the final analysis. A few general observations can be made in this respect.

Throughout the course of this study (2008-2012), I have worked as a researcher at the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, both as a PhD student as well as a researcher taking part in the Archaeology in Contemporary Europe project.⁵⁸ All this time I have been situated as a (participant) observant in relation to the undertaking of Dutch archaeological research projects abroad, being positioned mainly as a fellow colleague and researcher. This position allowed me on the one hand to take part in the

⁵⁷ Available at, and quoted from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/qualval.php> [Accessed June 10, 2012].

⁵⁸ See note 2 of chapter 1.

case studies as an ethnographic researcher, a heritage specialist, a student and/or a field archaeologist (although in differing degrees), and on the other hand provided me with a degree of independency through which I could observe how the case studies were presented and discussed in meetings, conferences and seminars.

At the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project, I was an integral part of the Dutch excavation team participating in the fieldwork season of 2009. In the eyes of the academic counterparts of the Joint Project, I was often positioned as an anthropologist or heritage management specialist, both interviewing and documenting the voices and opinions of project stakeholders, as well as taking part in heritage meetings, workshops and discussions. In relation to 'external' Jordanian experts and government officials, I was sometimes regarded as an independent researcher that was part of a large-scale European research project, and in the eyes of the local community, I was probably just another member of the Dutch archaeological team.

As a white, middle-class, male researcher with strong ties to the Dutch project network, contacts were often easily facilitated with middle- and higher class government and academic officials, both male and female, whereby all interviews took place in English. This same network also allowed me to interview ambassadors, and even a member of the Jordanian royal family.

In relation to the local community, my general background and inability to speak fluent Arabic meant that I was often more regarded as an 'outsider', which made it more difficult to undertake interviews – especially with women. This was however mitigated to a certain degree through the fact that the local community of Deir Alla was used to Dutch archaeologists in the village, often strengthened by ties of friendship and trust that had grown over several decades. The interviews with community members were as such often based upon the contacts through local fieldworkers and the manager of the Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies, although this made it sometimes difficult to gain open and unbiased critique on the project – an issue that became especially clear when respondents would provide contrary or additional information as soon as the digital voice recorder had been put away. In order to get around this bias, I worked with a translator and informant of a neighbouring village (see above), which allowed me to speak to village members that were outside the normal 'circle' of the project team, and which allowed me to visit neighbouring villages and towns outside of the immediate impact area of the Joint Project. In addition, I revisited the Jordan valley half a year after the Dutch excavation team had left, which meant that I could speak more freely with respondents and collect additional data from stakeholders that were unavailable in the summer season.

At the Santa Barbara Project in Curaçao, my position and focus was different. In the initial phase of my fieldwork, I travelled with the Dutch project directors throughout Curaçao, Aruba and Bonaire, taking part in several meetings with partners of the Santa Barbara project. In the second, more extensive phase, I undertook a wide range of interviews with relevant stakeholders in Curaçao and Bonaire, through contacts mainly facilitated through the network of the Dutch archaeologists and local heritage institutions. As a Dutch researcher affiliated with Leiden University, this meant that I had relatively easy access to representatives of (non-)governmental organisations, project developers, and local academic networks. On the other hand, it also meant that I was initially seen as part of the Santa Barbara Project itself, although this identification became less during my research stay that was spent on my own.

Contacts with local community members were made primarily by following up contacts through persons who had been affiliated to the project, and by means of independent visits in the neighbourhood of Santa Barbara. Although, in contrast to Jordan, I could undertake the interviews without a translator, the necessity of speaking Dutch and not the vernacular language *Papiamentu*, meant that I was often even stronger positioned as a white, middle-class Dutch outsider – this was specifically the case when trying to

talk to young male adolescents, in which I not always succeeded. As such, a certain bias can be seen in my group of respondents, being made up primarily of adults and especially women. In addition, the “strong association of colour with class had implications for the ‘landscape of power’ in which a white researcher can be interpreted as some kind of authority figure, particularly in Curaçao” (Jaffe 2006, 20). The impact of my affiliation, age, gender and skin colour in relation to the colonial, cultural and social background of the Antilles, was therefore repeatedly discussed with several local anthropologists and journalists – whereby I was fortunate to draw upon some of their experiences and fieldwork (see e.g. Allen 2001; Sluis 2008). In this sense, it should be noted that the general issue of skin colour and social inequality has been taken into account in my analysis only indirectly – this will not be drawn upon explicitly in the text.

Now that I have touched upon some general issues in relation to my research positioning, I wish to focus in a little more detail on the way in which my own viewpoints and experiences might have influenced data formation and analysis. I have touched upon some of these experiences within my introduction (see especially section 1.4 and 1.6), but I wish to repeat that my study can be placed within the emerging field of ethnographies of archaeology that stress the importance of stakeholder analysis and that seek to contribute towards ‘postcolonial’ western archaeological practices (cf Edgeworth 2006; Castañeda 2008; Geurds 2007; 2011; Liebmann & Rizvi 2008). In addition, I place myself within the growing body of literature that investigates the discursive practices of archaeological heritage management, by distancing myself from an understanding of heritage as something static and monumental, but rather as an active process that has the power to change lives – including a range of activities such as “remembering, commemoration, communicating and passing on knowledge and memories, asserting and expressing identity and social and cultural values and meanings” (Smith 2006; 83). Finally, I support the conceptualisation of cultural heritage as a path towards progress and of ‘heritage as care’ (Rowlands & Butler 2007; Perring & Van der Linde 2009, Van der Linde 2011) – having actively supported and instigated demand-driven research projects whose primary aim was not the preservation of material heritage and the production of knowledge for future generations, but rather addressing the needs of contemporary generations through advancing concepts and methodologies such as poverty reduction, capacity building and empowerment (Williams & Van der Linde 2006). Of course, a reflexive ethnography also has to look into such preconceptions and motivations. Indeed, these concepts and discourses might hint at inherent western biases towards archaeology and heritage management, if we would accept that concepts as ‘poverty’, ‘empowerment’, ‘aid’ and ‘community collaboration’ in themselves can problematize the local and prioritise the role of a western researchers as experts and beneficiaries (see e.g. Shepherd & Haber 2011; Lafrenz Samuels 2010; La Salle 2010). Some of these issues will be dealt with as part of the case studies as well as the discussion in chapter 6.

Nevertheless, it can be noted that I started this ethnographic study with the hope that it could not only develop an explanatory argument of the way in which Dutch archaeological research projects abroad operate within their social contexts, but also that it could contribute towards a more self-reflexive and perhaps ‘decolonized’ form of Dutch archaeology that actively engages with community concerns – in the sense of facilitating and involving their wishes and values in the archaeological process and the management of archaeological resources (cf Rizvi 2008, 121).

The above lies at the core of my reasons to include the second research aim, which entails a brief reflection on the role and responsibility of archaeologists in research projects abroad. As this research aim will include a short discussion on the possible institutional and policy implications for achieving ethical, equal and collaborative archaeological heritage practices around the world, it will be dealt with to a large degree as part of the discussion in the concluding chapter. In this sense, this second research aim could perhaps be regarded as an example of my study being of a partial pragmatic nature. If an un-reflexive archaeology is

indeed ‘a threat to the past’ (Shanks 1997), then this reflexive ethnography could perhaps be regarded as a way to the future.

At the end of this chapter, I wish to make a final note on the credibility and validity of the study (see also 3.2.2), which relates to some of the ethical considerations surrounding ethnographic research. In this sense, I have tried to make sure that the research results are credible from the perspective of the individual actors that were the subject of investigation. As such, I have tried to increase the ability of actors to ‘object’ to what was said about them by providing them with opportunities to react during fieldwork to statements made by other actors, or to initial analytical observations by the author (cf Latour 2000; Mosse 2005, ix). Such a method was supported by following the line of grounded theory (see above).

All actors and interviewees have been informed beforehand of the general outline and future publication plans of this ethnographic research. I have however not circulated my final drafts for comments to the more than 100 actors that I interviewed. Although this might have increased the opportunity for actors to object even further, I have not followed this line – not only out of practical restraints of time and financial resources, but also because I felt that this might compromise the validity of the analysis in relation to the original fieldwork data.

Within the final narrative, I have chosen not to include the names of the respondents. Rather, I refer to the position, affiliation, employment, age and/or social background of actors where deemed relevant. Whilst the names of certain actors could be distilled through their affiliation and job positions, this general approach was chosen in line with my perceived ethical responsibility towards informants and respondents. On the one hand, this allowed for a detailed written account of project processes and actor negotiations, whilst on the other hand, it allowed for making certain claims and comments anonymous. Decisions as to which and whose comments to include anonymously, were done on the basis of my own assessment, whereby I have tried to minimise potential negative social impacts of the published research results. Other sensitive comments were either cleared before publication with respondents that had specifically asked for this, or not incorporated at all.

Taken together, the interpretation and narratives of the case studies should be regarded as being my own – an interpretive, coherence-giving account from myself as part of a reflexive ethnographic research.

Chapter Four: The Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project

4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Deir Alla Joint Project is not a joint project. It is a Dutch project.⁵⁹

Archaeologists do their research, not for the development of universal knowledge, nor for local development. They might use the rhetoric of knowledge, shared projects, capacity building and so on – but they do it for themselves.⁶⁰

The above are rather harsh perceptions of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project. They were made, respectively, by the Head of Excavation and Research of the Department of Antiquities (DoA) at the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities, and by an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology of Yarmouk University (YU), both in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. I don't necessarily believe that these perceptions are a correct description of the current archaeological conduct in the Jordan Valley, nor entirely fair in light of the successes and intentions of the individual archaeologists of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project; rather, my aim here will be to try to understand why certain actors in the project could have come to such perceptions.

The above statements are particularly worth exploring considering the intentions and dedication of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project (hereafter also referred to as the 'Joint Project'), which has, for over 50 years, committed itself to the 'decolonisation' of the foreign, biblically oriented archaeological conduct in Jordan. As such, the Joint Project has promoted international collaboration, the development of an independent archaeological institutional capacity in Jordan, and, more recently, the integration of archaeological research with locally sensitive heritage management solutions as well as the development of a 'Regional Research Centre and Museum'.

In order to understand the discrepancy between such policy intentions in relation to the above perceptions of project outcomes, we need a much more detailed understanding of project processes and of the way in which judgments and valorisations of projects are given shape. As discussed in previous chapters, such an understanding would entail an ethnographic and discursive approach of the archaeological process, its actors and their values, of the historic, socio-political and financial frameworks in which these take place, and of the relationship between project policy and representation on the one hand, and actual field-practices on the other.

⁵⁹ Head of Excavation and Research of the Department of Antiquities (Amman, June 2009).

⁶⁰ Associate Professor and Head of Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Irbid, November 2009).

4.1.2 STRUCTURE OF CHAPTER

The first part of this chapter (section 4.2) will provide a general background to the case study, covering the historical and socio-political context of the Jordan Valley and the village of Deir Alla in particular. This section will not provide an extensive overview of the national, historical and archaeological heritage management framework of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan at large (hereafter also referred to as ‘Jordan’). I have chosen this approach as to be able to delve straight into the workings of the Joint Project on a regional and local level – instead, wider issues in relation to archaeology, heritage management, tourism and identity formation in Jordan will be dealt with throughout this chapter.⁶¹

Section 4.3 will outline the history and practice of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project, highlighting the differing perceptions of success and some conflicts and problems that arose over the implementation of the project. It will also provide an overview of the main intentions and policies of the Joint Project towards archaeological research, international collaboration, capacity building, community participation and heritage management. The remaining chapters will then delve deeper into understanding the archaeological project processes within its wider social context, the description of which will follow the order of the research questions as outlined in sections 2.6 and 3.2.2.

Section 4.4 will explore the main values and discourses of the archaeological actors in the project policies of the Joint Project with respect to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration. It will identify the existence of an *Authorised Archaeology Discourse* (AAD) (cf Smith 2006; see section 2.4) in the field of foreign archaeology in Jordan, which is prominent in the academic institutional frameworks and in the practices and policies of the Joint Project in particular.

Section 4.5 will explore how the Dutch archaeological actors negotiated these values and discourses in relation to local institutional counterparts, government bodies and local communities when developing and implementing the Joint Project. It will illustrate how the AAD, in combination with socio-political and economic power structures in archaeological heritage frameworks and the agency of individual actors, limited opportunities for achieving a sustainable form of collaborative archaeology by prioritising scientific and archaeological values over other values, and by (often unintentionally) postponing and excluding the involvement of other actors in society.

Section 4.6 will focus in more detail on the relationship between processes of policy negotiation with actual project outcomes. It will illustrate how archaeological interventions abroad are not only driven by project policy discourses, institutional agreements, antiquity laws and archaeological theory, but also by the interests, needs and personal histories of the actors involved (cf Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005; Long 2003; see section 2.5). In addition, it will illustrate how ‘project policy’ (see section 2.6) functions not only to orientate practice but also to legitimise practice (cf Mosse 2005, 14; 2004; and see Latour 1996; 42-43). Whilst the scientific and archaeological values of the AAD have a major impact on project outcomes in terms of a prioritisation of research resources and activities, and whilst especially academic institutional and funding policies play a substantial role in this, we will also see how archaeological practitioners are constantly (re-)producing story-lines and discourse-coalitions in order to mobilise and maintain relationships, support and access to archaeological sites and practices. Processes of ‘representation’ (whereby certain project outcomes and activities are interpreted so that they appear the result of deliberate policy), and processes of ‘contextualisation’ (whereby projects are produced as either successes or failures through networks of support and validation) play a major role in this (ibid.).

Section 4.7 will tie together some observations on the role, responsibility and power of Dutch archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of other actors in the social context of Jordan. It will

⁶¹ This is in contrast to the case study of the Santa Barbara Project in Curaçao, where the difference in scale and context benefitted from starting with a ‘national’ background approach.

discuss how because of the dominant, institutionalised AAD, the related need for brokering, translation and representation, and the inherent, historical power discrepancies, foreign archaeologists in Jordan are attributed a certain amount of expertise and ownership that puts them in a position in which they have to make management decisions that are broader than their remit of archaeological field research. This does not imply that the foreign archaeologists themselves believe they have this expertise, nor does it imply that they want this role; rather, he or she is attributed expertise in the context of Jordanian archaeology, and this, I believe, brings certain responsibilities.

4.2 BACKGROUND

4.2.1 THE DEIR ALLA JOINT ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROJECT

The ‘Deir Alla Project’ was initiated in 1959 by the late Professor Henk Franken of the Faculty of Theology of Leiden University in the Netherlands. With the first field season in 1960 at the site of Tell Deir Alla in the Jordan Valley in Jordan, and the latest one conducted in 2009, the Joint Project has run for 50 years with a total of 17 field seasons. As such, it can be regarded as one of the longest archaeological projects that have taken place from both the perspective of Jordan as well as from the Netherlands. At its conception in 1959, the project was one of a handful of foreign projects in Jordan, and only one of two archaeological projects in the Jordan Valley.⁶² In 2008/2009, the Joint Project was only one of approximately 70 archaeological projects in Jordan (AlGhazawi 2011, 14), one of seven archaeological projects in the Jordan Valley, and the only Dutch project in Jordan – whereby a large part of these projects were undertaken by foreign expeditions, most notably by archaeological teams from France, Germany and the USA.⁶³ Still, due to its long-term involvement, it might be regarded as one of the best known archaeological projects in Jordan.

On the basis of its fieldwork practice, the partnerships involved and the wider socio-political events in the region, the project can be divided in four separate phases; phase 1 (1960-67); phase 2 (1976-1980), phase 3 (1980-1987), and phase 4 (1994-2009). Although these periods distinguish themselves in terms of research focus, field methodology, funding schemes and partnerships, the project has always been (co)-directed by archaeologists from Leiden University (with later partnerships with the Department of Antiquities in Jordan and the Faculty of Archaeology & Anthropology of Yarmouk University), including a research focus based upon archaeological excavations at Tell Deir Alla, as well as a certain element of academic education in the sense of training and the transferral of archaeological skills and knowledge.

The first phase of the project started in 1959. During this phase, the project can best be described as a Dutch project, in the sense that there were no official Jordanian institutional counterparts to Leiden University – except the essential representative of the Department of Antiquities (DoA). In 1976, the project was developed into a *Joint Project*, undertaken by Leiden University and the DoA, and it was the first international cooperation project in Jordan with a Jordanian Institution. Since then, it has often been presented by Dutch and Jordanian archaeologists as a success in terms of its contribution to the archaeological field in Jordan, not only because of its long-term involvement and the established

⁶² According to the Jordanian Representative to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and President of the ‘Friends of Archaeology and Heritage’ in Jordan. Former Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1976 till 1996 (Amman, May 2009).

⁶³ These statistics have been distilled by looking at the annual journals of the Department of Antiquities, ‘Munjazat’, from 2001 - 2008 (see for example Alkhaysheh 2007), and were confirmed during interviews with the Head of Excavation and Research of the Department of Antiquities (Amman, June 2009) as well as by the Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009).

partnerships, but also because it was actively challenging the contemporary biblical interpretations of that time, providing an independent chrono-stratigraphical approach to the archaeology of the Jordan Valley (see below). The start of the subsequent phase, in 1980, witnessed the strengthening of the Joint project with a third partner, in the form of Yarmouk University (YU) in Irbid. Soon after, the three partners established the Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies (DASAS) in the village of Deir Alla at the southwest foot of the site, which greatly facilitated the research by all three partners in the subsequent decades, and which gave access to a small site museum. In the final phase, from 1994 till 2009, the Joint Project consisted basically of the same three institutions, although with a slight change in funding framework, and it increasingly reflected contemporary thinking in archaeological theory and heritage management. The research approach was broadened with regional surveys and a landscape perspective through the research project ‘Settling the Steppe’, and the project witnessed some initial heritage management work in the form of protection and consolidation measures undertaken at the top of the Tell. Another significant project element of this phase, is that since 1991 the Dutch co-director, in collaboration with his partners, tried to set up a Regional Research Centre and Museum in the Jordan Valley, which was supposed to combine a multi- disciplinary research facility with a museum function, thereby attracting tourism and benefiting the local community. At present, this Regional Research Centre and Museum was however still not established. Before we delve deeper into a more detailed overview of the project, I wish to provide some general background on the Jordan Valley and the village of Deir Alla in particular.



Figure 04. Deir Alla excavation team, 1960 (Deir Alla Archive, Leiden University; courtesy Gerrit van der Kooij).



Figure 05. Map of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan showing the location of Deir Alla.

4.2.2 THE JORDAN VALLEY

The Jordan Valley is characterised by a distinctive geographic setting, a rich archaeological and historical past, and a poor socio-economic development (Tarawneh in press). The Valley is situated ca 200-400m below sea-level, 1000m lower than the two stretches of hills that run from north-to-south alongside it. Because of this, the Jordan Valley is both warmer and drier than its surroundings, and characterised by a semi-arid climate and scarce vegetation growth. The area is suitable for cattle in winter, and even in summer the lower hillsides can sustain modest agriculture. At present, almost all of the valley is suitable for agriculture through intensive irrigation, although until 1950, when the East Ghor Canal was constructed, there were only localised irrigation systems (Van der Kooij 2001b; 2007a; 2007b; Kaptijn 2009; Tarawneh in press). Since the 1980's, the area has witnessed the introduction of portable greenhouses that have increased the productivity and

export of large amounts of fruits and vegetables (Khouri 1981; Elmusa 1994), often within the framework of major international and national development schemes that aimed to increase the agricultural and economic development of the Jordan valley (Van Aken 2003).

The population of the Jordan Valley consists mainly of Bedouin and Palestinians, the latter having fled historic Palestine after the Arab-Israeli wars of 1948 and 1967 (Khouri 1981). Next to a few other ethnic groups, one can find increasing amounts of immigration workers from Egypt and Pakistan (Van Aken 2003, 5). Prior to the 1967 Arab-Israeli conflict, the population of the Jordan Valley was about 60,000 – largely involved in pastoralism and agriculture. By 1971, this number had dropped to ca 5,000 (Khouri 1981). Presently, the population of the Jordan Valley is around 100.000, most of whom are now considered to be farmers – whereby 80% of the farms are constituted of small family farms (Charkasi 2000). The Jordan Valley is one of the poorest and most underdeveloped regions of Jordan. According to the former Jordanian Minister of Water and Irrigation and the Minister of Agriculture for the period 2001-2005, who has also been responsible for all studies related to the development of the Jordan Valley together with Israel since 1997, the main obstacles for development of the region are “a lack of access to water, a lack of regional cooperation, and finally, a lack of investors who are hesitant to come to such a troubled area where peace is constantly under threat”.⁶⁴

⁶⁴ Email correspondence, November 2009.

Although tourism continues to contribute to a substantial amount of the country's gross national product, tourism and tourism infrastructure is still less developed in the Jordan Valley. Some of the reasons for this are the above-mentioned general underdeveloped state of the Jordan Valley and the area's reputation as a troubled area; still, the area's rich historic, religious and natural resources as opportunities to develop international tourism are increasingly on the agenda of the Jordanian Tourism Board,⁶⁵ and it even has been described as "the future backbone of the development of the Jordan Valley".⁶⁶

Having seen changing densities of population since ca 10,000 years ago, the amount of archaeological sites in the Jordan Valley is extensive, with estimates ranging from 15,000 to 30,000 – a number that is increasingly growing with recent surveys and studies undertaken by both the Department of Antiquities,⁶⁷ as well as by foreign archaeological surveys (such as Kaptijn 2009). Nevertheless, factors of agriculture, horticulture, infrastructure, housing development, looting, as well as a general lack of awareness of the historic and economic value of these sites, have all been named as some of the major threats to the survival of the rich archaeological and historic resources in the valley, seriously challenging the future development of tourism, scientific research, historic education and local development.⁶⁸

4.2.3 DEIR ALLA

The village of Deir Alla, with at its heart the Tell of Deir Alla, is a small community of ca 500 inhabitants in the middle of the Jordan Valley, slightly to the east of the Jordan River (Van der Kooij 2007b, 10). Today, the village is part of the municipality ('Department') of Deir Alla, which consists of several villages surrounding the administrative centre of the small town Swalha. At the time of research, the municipality of Deir Alla was one of a select few 'priority-areas' by the government in terms of socio-economic development.⁶⁹ The population of the municipality of Deir Alla consists of ca 40,000⁷⁰ and is comprised mainly of original Bedouin and Palestinians. The village of Deir Alla however, consists mainly of Palestinians that settled around Tell Deir Alla after the Arab-Israeli conflict in 1948. According to the administration of the municipality of Deir Alla, most of these inhabitants work in farming, mirroring the same overall statistics as those for the entire Jordan Valley. It should be noted however, that the – often external – identification of this community as 'local farmers' sometimes sits uneasily with the self-identification of these Palestinian community members, which is often more related to one of refugees 'facing home' (Van Aken 2003).

⁶⁵ Lecturer in Cultural Tourism at the Jordan Applied University College for Hospitality and Tourism Education. Former member of the Jordan Tourism Board (Amman, June 2009).

⁶⁶ Former Jordanian Minister of Water and Irrigation and the Minister of Agriculture for the period 2001-2005. Email correspondence, November 2009.

⁶⁷ According to the Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009); the Jordanian Representative to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and President of the 'Friends of Archaeology and Heritage' in Jordan (Amman, May 2009); and the Director of Archaeological Conservation for Africa, Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia of the World Monument Fund (Amman, July 2009).

⁶⁸ According to interviews with the Jordanian Representative to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and President of the 'Friends of Archaeology and Heritage' in Jordan (Amman, May 2009); Lecturer in Cultural Tourism at the Jordan Applied University College for Hospitality and Tourism Education, a former member of the Jordan Tourism Board (Amman, June 2009); and the former Jordanian Minister of Water and Irrigation and the Minister of Agriculture for the period 2001-2005 (email correspondence, November 2009). See also Van der Kooij (2007b).

⁶⁹ Van der Kooij, pers. comm. (Leiden University, November 2011).

⁷⁰ Based upon an estimate by a local municipal administration officer (Swalha, Deir Alla municipality, July 2009). An internet search on official figures ranges from 35,000-46,000.



Figure 06. View from Tell Deir Alla towards the south-west (photograph by author, June 2009).

The houses of Deir Alla are located around the Tell, with some of the houses actually located on the foot of the Tell itself. The majority of the houses were built during the second half of the 20th century at primarily the south-foot of the Tell – to the north of the Tell is currently no occupation, only agricultural lands. To the east of the Tell runs the main north-south road through the Jordan Valley, alongside which a petrol station and several small shops are located; the people working here are mainly from Egyptian descent. The regional Deir Alla office of the Department of Antiquities is situated across the road right in front of the official entrance to the Tell, where a small shelter and a stone stairway give access to the top of the Tell. Located at the western edge of the village, is the Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies (DASAS), which has been built in 1982 by the Joint Project. Located a hundred meter south-east from the Archaeological Station, is the Deir Alla Agricultural Station, a research station of the Ministry of Agriculture, established in the 1950's.

Especially the inhabitants of the village of Deir Alla have been employed in the Joint Project in different functions since its first fieldwork in 1960, with long employment traditions in several families – today, it is not unlikely that people are working at the same project as their grandparents. Similarly, it can be confidently said that all occupants of Deir Alla have grown up familiar with the sight not only of the Tell,

but also of archaeologists working in the heart of their village. In this sense, the Tell is considered by many as being an important part of their personal lives.

4.2.4 TELL DEIR ALLA

Tell Deir Alla is located in the middle of the village of Deir Alla. It measures circa 250 by 200m and is max. 30 meters in height, and used to be provided with water from the river Zerqa (Van der Kooij 2007b, 11; Kaptijn 2009). The archaeological work at Tell Deir Alla has uncovered several layers of occupation dating from ca 1700 BC (for an overview, see Van der Kooij & Ibrahim 1989; Kafafi & Van der Kooij 2010). The first occupation that has been uncovered archaeologically consists of a (large-scale) urban setting in the Middle Bronze Age (around ca 1700 BC). In the Late Bronze Age the settlement has been interpreted as including a religious centre in the north as well as crafts- and trading-centres in the south. Some of the more noticeable finds that were uncovered during the so-called ‘phase E’ in this period, which consists of a burnt occupation layer, includes a temple-complex with luxury goods such as a faience vase of the pharaoh Tausert, Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery, as well as clay-tablets with as-of-yet un-deciphered writing (Van der Kooij 2007b).

The subsequent Iron Age settlement was smaller in size. The stratigraphic ‘phase ix’ consisted of small-scale architecture, and is noticeable for archaeological finds that point to trading connections with the Mediterranean coast, but especially for the uncovering of the so-called ‘Balaam text’ in 1967 (Franken 1991; Hoftijzer & Van der Kooij 1991); an ink-wall inscription which tells of the same Balaam as mentioned in the Old Testament, who prophesised the destruction of the area. Soon after, the village was, noticeably, destroyed by an earthquake, followed by scarce occupation until the 4th century BC. After that time, the Tell has, at least, functioned as the place for a local Islamic cemetery in Mamluk and later times, as well as for sporadic and small-scale military purposes since the 1967 war.

The site of Deir Alla is often identified with either biblical Succoth or Penuel, even though such an identification has not been confirmed by the Joint Project. Still, the identification of Deir Alla with these biblical cities, together with the finding of the Balaam text, has subsequently attracted a relatively small amount of biblical tourists to the site. In addition, the biblical identification of the site is reflected and repeated in several biblical websites as well as in most of the popular tourism guides to Deir Alla. Although the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan moved away from primarily marketing and identifying its tourism assets as part of a ‘Holy Land’ since the loss of the West Bank in 1967, it has continued, in principle, to support such biblical connotations as to improve foreign tourism (Groot 2008). Importantly, Deir Alla has however never been a major priority in this sense, nor has the biblical connotation been actively sought after by the Joint Project.

Traditionally, the Joint Project has rather focused its archaeological research on the Middle Bronze Age, Late Bronze Age and Iron Age periods through large-scale settlement approaches. A more multi-disciplinary and regionally focused approach was added in research phase 4, centred on the use of the steppe landscape in the Jordan Valley (with surveys conducted in the vicinity of Tell Deir Alla) and on early iron-production (with surveys and excavations undertaken at Tell Hammeh, located 2.2 km to the east of Tell Deir Alla). Due to this general research focus and the ‘non-monumental’ archaeological remains, coupled with a lack of emphasis on Nabataean, Roman/Byzantine, or ‘Hashemite’ archaeological

interpretations, the Joint Project has never been heavily involved and utilised in national politics in relation to tourism and identity.⁷¹

4.3 THE DEIR ALLA JOINT ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROJECT

4.3.1 PERCEPTIONS OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE

In 1976, after five excavations seasons since 1960, Leiden University signed an agreement with the Jordanian Department of Antiquities to start a 'Joint Project'. At that time, the co-directors of both sides were very enthusiastic and hopeful about the possible mutual benefits such an agreement would foster. From a Jordanian perspective, a formal research collaboration with the Deir Alla project was highly desirable, due to the fact that the methodological and historical focus of the project fitted those of the Jordanian scholar responsible for the initiation of the Joint Project, and because a collaboration would foster the much-needed transferral of skills to an understaffed and under-skilled department. More importantly, the processual methodology and archaeological interpretations of the Deir Alla project were actively distancing themselves from the more orthodox biblical archaeology, in contrast to some of the other archaeological projects in the region. According to the Jordanian co-director of that time, who then was Head of Excavations and Research at the DoA; "on the personal level we needed this type of cooperation for the training of our staff; more importantly, it was not biblical archaeology, it was proper archaeology".⁷²

In 1979, the Joint Project was strengthened by a third partner, the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology of Yarmouk University in Irbid, which soon led to the signing of a formal contract between the three partners for collaboration in research, and subsequently to the establishment of the Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies (DASAS) in 1982. The following 27 years, the Joint Project saw a collaboration that produced many archaeological discoveries, led to publications and dissertations, trained many students, had been concerned about mitigating the impacts of development on the destruction of the archaeological resources of Deir Alla, carried out several rescue excavations, conducted conservation and management work at the Tell, and established a small interpretive centre at the archaeological station. In addition, it had contributed to a large exhibition on the archaeology of the Jordan Valley at the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden in 1989 (Van der Kooij & Ibrahim 1989), opened by Princess Sarwath acting on behalf of her husband Crown Prince Hassan, under presence of Prince Claus of the Netherlands. At this celebration, the late Henk Franken was awarded with the Jordanian Order of Independence.

The Joint Project had also been dedicated to try and develop a Regional Research Centre and Museum in Deir Alla since the early 1990's, which explicitly addressed a desire to promote the research, tourism, and understanding of the Deir Alla region, and to provide more benefits for the local community. Specifically, it aimed to rehabilitate the pride and connection of local people to the Jordan Valley by appreciating the local way of life in a landscape characterised by special, hard circumstances.⁷³

In addition, project actors all emphasised the mutual and strong feelings of friendship that existed between the local community and the members of the Joint Project; something that I witnessed, and felt, during my own fieldwork as well. In a recent opinion piece in a Jordanian newspaper, the Jordanian co-

⁷¹ See Groot 2008 for a comprehensive overview of the role of archaeological heritage in relation to the construction of national identity in Jordan.

⁷² Amman, November 2009.

⁷³ Such aims were articulated in the unpublished proposal documents 'Regional Museum at Deir Alla' (1991) and 'Jordan Valley Research Centre and Museum' (2001) by the Joint Deir Alla Archaeological Project. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

director also argued how the Joint Project had provided socio-economic and educational benefits for the local community,⁷⁴ using the Joint Project as an example to illustrate the fact that academic projects yield more public benefits than the illegal excavations that were going on in Jordan at that time; a view which he expanded upon in an interview during the excavation season;

I think the project since the time of Franken played a major role in the local community. If you ask some of the people here around the Tell <...> then you can see the people based their life mostly around this dig. For example, in this local community, <the men> were waiting for the archaeological project seasons, to get some money to fund a whole new year <...> This year for example, one of the sons of the old technicians told me that he is studying English literature in the University <...> Since it is a university holiday, he grasped the opportunity to work at the excavation to finance his studies. This means the excavations also help in educating people, not only in schools, but also in universities.⁷⁵

In 2009, the Joint Project was still only one of three international collaborations with Jordanian Universities, out of the 30 foreign archaeological research projects undertaken in Jordan.⁷⁶ Together with its long-standing commitment of 50 years, the quality of the archaeological research, and the establishment of an archaeological research station in Deir Alla, the Joint Project has been, and still is, often appreciated on a national level according to Jordanian researchers;

I liked the way they took people seriously, that they were genuinely interested in our concerns. <...> I'm saying this, because in other occasions when dealing with foreign excavators, you get the impression that they just want to keep you happy. <...> The Deir Alla project was perceived, and still is perceived, as a very positive example of collaboration. It is prestigious mainly because of their long-term involvement and seriousness, it's one of the longest projects in the Near East. They started in the early 1960's, and we now have perhaps the third generation of Dutch scholars working in Deir Alla. This shows seriousness, because in some other cases, we have some foreign professors working here or there, only interested in making a career, excavating in the Near East, getting a better position in Europe, and so on. . <...> The fact that the Dutch take it seriously, gives it weight. Their involvement in building the station, the renovation of the station, the diplomatic involvement – like the ambassador visiting the site – you have students, professors and money coming, and publications being done, and this for 50 years.⁷⁷

In line with these stories of success of the Joint Project, the Dutch co-director was awarded a 'Medal of Honour' by the president of the Yarmouk University at the end of the fieldwork season of 2009 for his (and those of the Leiden University and The Netherlands at large) efforts, contribution and commitment to the

⁷⁴ Pers. comm. by the Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1996 - 2009, Professor of Archaeology at the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University. This newspaper article, in Arabic, was kindly translated to me by this co-director during the fieldseason (Deir Alla, June 2009).

⁷⁵ Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1996 - 2009, Professor of Archaeology at the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Deir Alla, June 2009).

⁷⁶ This statistic has been distilled by looking at the annual journal of the Department of Antiquities, 'Munjazat 2010', and was confirmed during interviews with the Head of Excavation and Research of the Department of Antiquities (Amman, June 2009) as well as by the Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009). See also AlGhazawi (2011, 14).

⁷⁷ Deputy Dean of Research and Science, Yarmouk University (Irbid, July 2009). Previously involved with the Joint Project (for example during the early 2000's) as a representative of Yarmouk University.

archaeology and people of Jordan. During this ceremony at the DASAS, the Joint Project was described as an “outstanding example of international archaeological collaboration”.⁷⁸

What is noticeable about these representations of the Joint Project as a success is that they are built around concepts such as ‘joint collaboration’, ‘shared responsibility’, ‘local community benefits’, ‘proper archaeology’ and ‘heritage management’. It was, more recently, also labelled as being of ‘post-colonial value’ during a conference in honour of the retirement of the Dutch co-director of the Joint Project from Leiden University.⁷⁹ Such an idea for establishing a shared archaeological project that contributes to wider heritage management issues such as conservation, capacity building, presentation and public involvement, is not only used widely in current literature and policies on the ethics of sustainable postcolonial archaeology and heritage management (see chapter 2), but it is also increasingly mirrored in the project policy discourses of the Joint Project, particularly in the proposals and evaluation reports since the 1990’s (see below).

However, not everything is as it seems. Despite the attendance of the ceremony by many high-ranking officials of Yarmouk University and diplomatic representatives such as the Ambassador of the Netherlands, several crucial actors were missing at the ceremony at the DASAS. Most of the invited local representatives, including the local mayor, were absent, as well as the director of the DoA, the third partner of the Joint Project – something to the dismay of the Dutch co-director. Unaware of the honorary ceremony, he had invited the representatives of YU, DoA and the local municipality to hold a meeting on the ‘future of the Joint Project’; “now half of the reason, or perhaps the most important reason, for this meeting has gone. It should be about the future management of Deir Alla, involving the local community; not about personal networking.”⁸⁰

When looking back at the representations of success, it struck me that whilst the above-mentioned concepts were used abundantly in project policy discourses (such as project proposals, evaluations, grant proposals, and publications), they did not always seem to reflect actual practice – sometimes, they rather seemed to reflect actor’s aspirations and policy intentions. In addition, these concepts sometimes obfuscated some of the critiques on the relationship, role and perceived responsibilities between the project actors (see below), as well as some of the actual activities that were undertaken such as integrating the site within its local context in terms of local community involvement and heritage management.

According to the views of some Jordanian partners in the project themselves, and despite its many successes, the Joint Project had for example not ‘achieved enough’ in terms of conservation, interpretation and presentation to both visitors and the local community, nor was it believed that the Tell is currently protected sufficiently against the threat from infrastructure development;

Let me say it like this: after 50 years, this site should have been well known around the world. But it isn’t <...> Look, 50 years of this project represents a lot of money, if you count all the salaries, excavations and publications. But the site is still not restored and interpreted.⁸¹

What did the Deir Alla project bring to the cultural identity of Jordan, locally, regionally, internationally? Did it bring any benefits to the local community? Did it provide dialogue between

⁷⁸ President of Yarmouk University (Deir Alla, July 2009).

⁷⁹ Archaeologist of the Faculty of Archaeology, speaking at the conference at Leiden University (December 2009).

⁸⁰ Dutch co-director of the Joint Project, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Deir Alla, July 2009).

⁸¹ Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009).

cultures? Did it really answer the big questions? I don't see it. Yes, we know a little more about the history of the region. But what good does that do when it sits in university libraries? ⁸²

Many of the sites in the Jordan Valley have disappeared. There is not a single site that is not threatened in one way or another, including Deir Alla and its surroundings. It's not only due to the illegal excavations and infrastructure development; it's also that the sites are under threat because of the lack of community work, and understanding of the local community.⁸³

The local community was, according to the perception of some of its inhabitants, as of the time of research also not sufficiently benefiting socio-economically nor educationally from the project, nor were they actively involved in decision-making processes. Interestingly, this is despite the expressed wishes and efforts by the Joint Project to achieve this, and despite the commitment of several local agencies and actors;

They only come for one month, and not every year, so we don't know what they are doing <...> When I was working there, I was 18. I only used the tools, I didn't learn anything. They also didn't pay us enough. It was two dinars a day, now it is six. It is still not enough. Some of the boys who work there now have told me that it's not enough. They have to take the bus in the morning, and they have to pay for their lunch.⁸⁴

There is not enough contact between the archaeologists and the local community. Only with those who work there. The rest of the village does not meet them, nor do they know what they do. You are the first from the archaeologists to come and visit our school. We never had any visits before – but it is very important. We need more information.⁸⁵

I don't know the history of the Tell. I don't know which people lived here. I only went to primary school <...> I also don't know why I have to wash the pottery. I see them looking at it. My father was good in working at the site, but he didn't know the history I think. He never told me.⁸⁶

People sometimes ask for information, but I need books <for our library>. I don't have any books on archaeology, or on the history of Deir Alla and the Jordan Valley. I have nothing. <...> There is no relationship between the team and the community. They work separately.⁸⁷

Similar critiques and perceptions of exclusion were also expressed by the current mayor of the Deir Alla municipality:

We are not an official partner in the project, but we should be. <...> Right now, I don't have any power of what happens at the site <...> We should increase the cooperation between the Department

⁸² Associate Professor and Head of Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Irbid, November 2009).

⁸³ Jordanian Representative to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and President of the 'Friends of Archaeology and Heritage' in Jordan. Former Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1976 till 1996 (Amman, November 2009).

⁸⁴ Imam of one of the four mosques in the Municipality of Deir Alla (Deir Alla, July 2009).

⁸⁵ Headmistress of the Deir Alla Primary School for Girls (Deir Alla, June 2009).

⁸⁶ Local elderly woman of Deir Alla, employed as household lady at the DASAS for many years. Her house is located on the slope of the Tell (Deir Alla, June 2009).

⁸⁷ Director of the Deir Alla Municipal Library (Swalha, July 2009).

of Antiquities, Yarmouk University, Leiden and the Municipality, to have a museum here, and to give more attention to these sites. Many times I talked and wrote to the formal people who are concerned with this, to involve the municipality in this work.⁸⁸

Accordingly, the representation that the local community has benefited both socio-economically as well as in terms of education seems to sit uneasily with the perception of some community members. Such a view also seems to be in line with the critiques of some of the major project actors themselves. According to the former Jordanian co-director of the project from 1976-1996, the Joint Project did not produce enough benefits for the local community of Deir Alla, despite their efforts;

We were developing all kind of ideas for the local community on the local level and macro level, we were thinking of starting a regional museum, and we thought the community at large could benefit from projects in the Jordan Valley. <...> The archaeology of the Jordan Valley is very important for the whole region, but it is not appreciated by the visitors and the local community simply because the nature of the archaeology is different, and because the targets of the archaeologists and the teams who were working there was concentrated too much on their own research, not involving the local community and thinking of the long term benefits.⁸⁹

The establishment of the Regional Research Centre and Museum, as well as many of the increased conservation, interpretation and tourism facilities of the site that were envisaged in project policy documents and discussions since the early 1990's did however never come to fruition, despite the efforts of the co-directors at that time. Although the development of the Regional Research Centre and Museum was formally supported by a range of actors in Jordan (for instance through the handing over by the Ministry of Agriculture of a piece of land near to the Agricultural Station in Deir Alla to the DoA and YU on which the envisaged Regional Research Centre and Museum could be build), the envisaged building and maintenance remained financially dependent on external funding sources. Despite some initial informal support for match-funding by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the early 1990's, this support however never materialised, partly due to changing funding priorities within this Ministry in the late 1990's (see section 4.6).

In addition, the idea of attracting tourism and bringing economic benefits to the community through the development of a Regional Research Centre and Museum, was also met with scepticism by several representatives from the Ministry of Tourism as well as by academic tourism experts in Jordan.⁹⁰ Generally, it was felt that the tourism development of the site was not challenged by the lack of a museum, but rather by a general lack of investment in the social and spatial infrastructure of the Deir Alla region. As an example, the site now attracts around 5000 international visitors per year, mostly of whom come and visit the site for its religious or archaeological connotations, but none of these visitors make actual stops in the Deir Alla village due to lack of local tourism infrastructure, and due to a lack of available time in relation to other, more popular destinations. Such destinations normally consist of monumental, visually attractive sites with tourism potential in 'untroubled' regions of Jordan, especially when these exist of sites with histories relating to Nabataean or Bedouin heritage such as Petra, which better fit the rather pragmatic approach towards identity politics and economic development as supported by the Ministry of Tourism (cf

⁸⁸ Mayor of the Municipality ('Department') of Deir Alla (Swalha, July 2009).

⁸⁹ Amman, November 2009.

⁹⁰ Senior staff member of Ministry of Tourism (Amman, July 2009); Assistant Professor Conservation and Heritage Management at the Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, June 2009); Lecturer in Cultural Tourism at the Jordan Applied University College for Hospitality and Tourism Education. Former member of the Jordan Tourism Board (Amman, June 2009).

Nasser 2000; Groot 2008). In this sense, it was felt that the Joint Project should communicate more with the Ministry of Tourism and with international tourism operators, since the Jordan Valley was not regarded as a priority for tourism at all.

What is also noticeable is that several local and regional governmental representatives expressed feelings of exclusion, such as from the above-mentioned Deir Alla municipality, in addition to actors from the Regional Authority and the Ministry of Education. However, it is exactly these actors that would have been important to include if one aims to develop a locally relevant, sustainable regional museum and if one aims to challenge the destruction of the archaeological resources in and surrounding the environment of Tell Deir Alla through infrastructure development, farming, looting and damage.⁹¹

In general, I wish to point out that these critiques on project outcomes were not the result of a lack of dedication and intentions by the Joint Project per se – indeed, the Joint Project was for instance not allowed by the DoA to raise local salaries as not to compete with the need for agricultural workforce in the Valley,⁹² and the lack of integration and communication between the DoA, the Ministry of Tourism, the Ministry of Education and local community concerns is a more often debated issue (Berriane 1999; Gray 2002; Groot 2008; Maffi 2002; Nasser 2000). For example, the difficulties of developing local support through bottom-up approaches in the tourism and heritage field in Jordan is well documented, such as at the site of Umm Qays where local communities were forced to abandon their livelihoods in advance of tourism development (Brand 2000). We will look at these issues in more detail below, but my point here is to illustrate the different perceptions of success and failure pertaining the implementation of the Joint Project.

Perhaps most illustrative of this, is the fact that not all project partners seem to find themselves in the representation of the Joint Project as a shared collaboration. During a personal interview, the Director of the DoA criticised the Joint Project, and especially its partners Leiden University and Yarmouk University, as being just one of the examples of academic research projects that failed to address the needs of the Jordanian archaeological department and the general public, whilst the Head of Excavation and Research of the DoA expressed similar feelings;

Archaeologists try to take benefits of everything. <...> They mostly think of their own benefits, not ours. They come here to publish their findings for themselves and to train their students. They see it only as this.⁹³

We as a department, we are giving them everything. It is time they start to think about Jordan. <...> If you look at the amount of students that are trained from Leiden University, Yarmouk University and the DoA, and at the salaries, you can see that it is not in balance, at all.⁹⁴

Several months later, during my second visit to Jordan, it struck me how notions of success and collaboration had changed also dramatically within Yarmouk University. The Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project, now Dean of the Faculty of Anthropology and Archaeology of YU, expressed to me that neither he, nor the president of YU were invited to the conference in Leiden in honour of the retirement of

⁹¹ cf Assistant Professor Conservation and Heritage Management at the Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, June 2009); Director of Archaeological Conservation for Africa, Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia of the World Monument Fund (Amman, July 2009); Assistant Professor Conservation and Heritage Management at the Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, June 2009).

⁹² Dutch co-director of the Joint Project, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (pers. comm. Leiden, November 2011).

⁹³ Head of Excavation and Research of the Department of Antiquities, Jordan (Amman, June 2009).

⁹⁴ Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009).

the Dutch co-director, something which they regarded as an insult to the Joint Project; “now this is the end of the Project, but it should have been a new beginning.”⁹⁵ Soon after, the Head of the Anthropology Department of the Faculty of Anthropology and Archaeology of YU gave such feelings of resentment a more dramatic touch by informally stressing out the new intentions of both YU and the DoA to renew their agreement, without Leiden, and to support the re-birth of the local DASAS with the following words; “I believe in the public domain, in Jordan – not in foreigners.”⁹⁶

In order to understand why the Joint Project, despite its many successes, and despite its dedication, could not fully achieve its desire for equal partnerships, public archaeology, local community involvement and sustainable heritage management, and in order to understand how the perspectives of success and collaboration could differ and change so drastically, it is necessary to look in detail to the historic development, the socio-economic and institutional frameworks, the discursive practices, and the value-negotiations between the actors in the Joint Project. But before I do this, I briefly wish to focus on the relationship of archaeological theory with its practice, since it helps us in problematizing the notion that the limitations of the Joint Project are simply the result of the applied archaeological theory and methodology, a view that can sometimes be heard in the instrumental critiques on the social context of archaeology (see sections 1.4 and 2.5). In addition, it illustrates the influence of the personal backgrounds of actors on the scope and implementation of archaeological activities.

4.3.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

If one would analyse the Joint Project purely from the theoretical and instrumental perspective without challenging the implicit assumptions within these perspectives of a one-to-one relationship between theory and practice, and without taking into account the personal and historical backgrounds of the actors involved (see sections 1.4, 2.5 and 2.6), one might come to a conclusion that the Joint Project would be un-sensitive to local collaborative issues. I say this, because the major theoretical framework in which the Dutch archaeologists in the project operate, has always been very much processual in terms of actual field-methodology and interpretation. Postcolonial, post-processual and indigenous archaeologies that call for increasing multi-vocality and local participation (see chapter 2) were not actively sought after in the interpretation of archaeological data, nor were such approaches mentioned in any of the publications since 1960 – which is, in relation to the earliest phases of the project, not so strange considering most of these approaches and methodologies developed from roughly the 1980’s and 1990’s onwards.

The theoretical and methodological framework in which the Deir Alla Project and later the Joint Project operated, had always at its core a strong positivistic, scientific and chrono-stratigraphic approach to the interpretation of archaeological data, as well as an aim to provide for an independent, neutral, and scientifically ‘objective’ archaeological science in Jordan. This approach can be traced back to the first initiator of the project (the late Henk Franken), is reflected in the theoretical ramifications of his former student who became the next co-director, and in the writings of those Jordanian academic archaeologists that became involved in the Joint Project. This belief in a ‘value-free’, neutral archaeology, has however been named as lying at the basis of several marginalising and colonial archaeological heritage practices in post-colonial contexts (see sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4). Indeed, one might argue that it is actually the anchor stone against which post-processual, post-modern, post-colonial, social, critical and indigenous archaeological theories have developed. The question at stake therefore, is whether a processual archaeology, and a belief in a neutral archaeological science, is by definition ‘un-sensitive’ to local

⁹⁵ Amman, November 2009.

⁹⁶ Irbid, November 2009.

collaborative issues if it does not actively and discursively acknowledge the notion of subjectivity of archaeological interpretations, and the need for encouraging and facilitating multivocal and subaltern views of the past. In other words, does it automatically exclude decolonizing methodologies such as collaborative archaeology?

When Henk Franken (1917-2005) started the project in 1959 out of the Faculty of Theology at Leiden University, he set out to illustrate that the contemporary biblical archaeology was too much dependent, and influenced, by biblical history (Franken 1970; 1976; Van der Kooij 2007b, 10). In response to his critique on the archaeological practice of that time, Henk Franken developed a stratigraphic approach for relative chronology, and an independent type of pottery studies to understand changes and thus to justify pottery-chronology (Van der Kooij 2006, 12; Franken 1969). Franken's critical ideas about the value of archaeology, are probably best reflected in his inaugural speech as Professor at Leiden University in 1964. For him, "biblical archaeology .. would consist of capita selecta from the archaeology of greater Syria, not chosen to throw light upon passages from the bible, but chosen to get an image of the cultures from biblical times" (quoted in Van der Kooij 2006, 11). His approach could probably be defined as an early form of processual archaeology with cultural-historic elements, and one which strongly believed in archaeology as a neutral science as an answer to more religious and politically influenced interpretations. This approach taken by Franken is probably best understood by looking not simply at his archaeological beliefs, but also at his personal background.



Figure 07. Deir Alla excavations, 1960's (Deir Alla Archive, Leiden University; courtesy Gerrit van der Kooij).

Henk Franken studied Theology and Ancient Hebrew at Amsterdam University, after which he undertook courses in Anthropology in advance of becoming a missionary for a protestant church on Bali (ibid., 11). His encounters with local belief systems in a non-western society, together with his background as an active member of the Dutch resistance during WWII, was a period that strongly defined his life. This personal background, together with his interest in the German Critical phenomenological approach to the Old Testament, and in combination with his “sceptic or critical attitude to some established authorities and opinions” (ibid., 11) made him not only a creative archaeologist but were probably also at the basis of his increasingly clear opinions about the political connections of archaeology in the Near East; “Franken’s critical attitude towards conservative biblical approaches and the political impact of it and justification of it became stronger when the social effects of this approach became visible in the Palestinian drama during and after the 1967 war” (ibid., 12). These views were expressed clearly in Franken’s publications such as ‘The other side of the Jordan’ (Franken 1970), and ‘The problem of identification in Biblical Archaeology’ (Franken 1976).

Franken’s approach had important implications for the Joint Project. His emphasis on an independence from conservative biblical approaches also meant for him, because of its connection with western interests in the region, contributing to the development of an independent national archaeology in Jordan. As such, it was his alternative approach to biblical archaeology that played an important role in the forming of a Joint Project with the DoA in 1976:

we started the joint project in 1976. <...> The Deir Alla project was noticeably different from the other projects of that time <...> Most projects were concentrated on the Iron Age, to explore the biblical history or the relationship of archaeology with the biblical account <...> I thought Henk Franken was trying to divert from that line, he was trying to do proper archaeology, proper stratigraphy, proper pottery typology and stratigraphy.⁹⁷

The idea of a ‘proper archaeology’ that is independent from overly political connotations or biblical interpretations is still an important reason why the Project is appreciated;

Clearly, many foreigners, like the Germans and Americans, are working with biblical questions. <...> But I can’t see this as academic. We have the task to understand the human past. This should be the concern of everybody working in archaeology. Now, it is evident, that most of the teams that work in Jordan, they are not working with academic questions. They dig according to the law, but their interpretations are done by themselves, from a theological perspective. I think this is wrong. Unfortunately, when we give licenses, we can’t influence their interpretations. It is just that these teams, they are not concerned with the Jordanian side. So, the Jordanians give them permissions, send representatives on the site to look if everything is done according to the law, but they are not involved in the interpretations, so we are not a partner. We can only be a real Jordanian partner if we are actually really involved, not only in excavation, but also in the interpretation. I think there are only a very few examples of that, like the project in Deir Alla.⁹⁸

The early form of a processual approach by Franken, combined with his aim for an independent archaeology in Jordan, was also reflected in the approaches by his followers. In the words of the current

⁹⁷ Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project and Head of Excavation and Research at the Department of Antiquities in 1976 (Amman, November 2009).

⁹⁸ Deputy Dean of Research and Science, Yarmouk University (Irbid, July 2009). Previously involved with the Joint Project (for example during the early 2000’s) as a representative of Yarmouk University.

co-director of the Joint Project from Leiden University, his field-practices and interpretations can best be described as positivistic and processual; “the hypothetical deductive method is holy to me, but I also consider myself as post-modern”.⁹⁹ The reference to the ‘post-modernity’ in here, then relates to the belief in how an objective, processual and non-biblical archaeological method can support the creation of an independent Jordanian archaeology “in the fight against irrational, socially damaging views of archaeological ‘populists’ to claim, or colonise, history for themselves”.¹⁰⁰ Influenced not by direct ethical codes, nor reflected in his direct interpretations of the archaeological data in his publications, is the fact that the Dutch co-director combines the processual method with a strong dedication for an independent Jordanian archaeology, without actively seeking a multivocal or post-processual approach.¹⁰¹

The use of a processual archaeology has subsequently been regarded by the academic archaeologists from both the Dutch side as well as from the Jordanian side, as a ‘decolonizing’ methodology that provides a value-free interpretation of the past, disconnected from political or religious connotations. Indeed, it is the ‘neutral’ and ‘proper’ processual archaeology that is sought after and appreciated by the Jordanian academic counterparts, that was at the basis of the Joint Project, and that played an historic role in the attempts by the Dutch archaeologists to form an independent Jordanian archaeology. In addition, the application of the processual methodology by the Dutch archaeologists has been a fundament of the training of the students and archaeologists of Jordan, something that was, and is, actively sought after by both YU as well as the DoA.

Still, from a critical, theoretical archaeological perspective it would be difficult to label the archaeological theory, practice and methodology of the Joint Project as entirely ‘postcolonial’, due to its lack of focus on encouraging and facilitating multivocal and local, subaltern views of the past and the active dismantling of power structures in the research process. What is striking in this sense, is that the archaeological interpretation is presently mostly undertaken by academic experts; as of today, the local community is not involved in the interpretation of the data, nor in the active (re-) writing of history, which would be necessary from especially the indigenous, subaltern and multivocal theoretical approaches to archaeology. However, this does not necessarily form an ethical problem from the perspective of identity politics, since the local Palestinian community at Deir Alla is not marginalised by the Jordanian State through means of archaeological interpretations, and since the local community does not identify itself in the first place with the history of the Tell, but rather with its status of a refugee and its desires and hopes of ‘facing home’ (Van Aken 2003).

However, it is worth repeating here some of the discussions in section 2.2.1 on the issue of community collaboration, where it was proposed that the practical claims that local communities bring to the archaeological process are not necessarily different from those of descendant and indigenous communities. What this means, is that whilst community-based archaeology can be regarded as a ‘useful point of entry for a decolonizing methodology’ due to its proven capacity to challenge and dismantle research-based power structures (Rizvi 2008, 120; but see also Greer *et al.* 2002; Marshall 2002; Moser *et al.* 2002), this does not always have to include the idea that community-based archaeology should entail the active re-writing of local histories (see e.g. Hollowell & Nicholas 2009; Moser *et al.* 2002). However, what it *does* entail, I believe, is that such a methodology necessitates the active engagement with community concerns;

⁹⁹ Dutch co-director of the Joint Project, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, April 2009).

¹⁰⁰ Dutch co-director of the Joint Project, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (pers. comm. Leiden, November 2011).

¹⁰¹ This view was extensively discussed with the Dutch co-director during an interview in Leiden (January 2009).

“in other words, simultaneous to the archaeological project is a development of heritage, identity, and, in most cases, tourism” (Rizvi 2008, 120-121).

In this sense, it is worth noting that the Joint Project has tried to take this ‘decolonisation’ on board by stressing the marginalised position of local communities in a wider, socio-economic sense, most notably through its intentions to develop a Regional Research Centre and Museum as to facilitate the appreciation of the local way of life in special, hard circumstances in the Jordan Valley, and by bringing pride and tourism benefits amongst local people. As such, the Joint Project has arguably brought forward a different approach to a postcolonial archaeological conduct, one that combines the belief in a value-free processual archaeology as a form of capacity building with an equal wish, since the early 1990’s, for heritage management issues such as presentation, the protection of archaeological resources, and tourism development.

As we will see however, the approach by the Joint Project towards the ‘decolonisation’ of archaeological practice has focused primarily on institutional collaboration and capacity building with Jordanian counterparts. As such, it is worth noting that the dedication for the development of an independent, Jordanian archaeology has lead primarily to a situation in which academic experts are part of the interpretations and research process. In addition, these experts mostly consist of academic archaeologists from Leiden University and Yarmouk University, and less of archaeologists of the DoA, whose main contribution remains in the field of facilitation and administration.

As we will see, the success of implementing this combined vision of a neutral, independent and ‘value-free’ archaeology with institutional collaboration and heritage management, was hampered by the fact that it resulted mostly into a situation in which research benefits continued to be geared towards academic archaeologists of LU and YU, and in which the values, desires and needs of other actors in society, such as the DoA and the local community, were (often unintentionally) excluded from the archaeological project process. The underlying reason for this should, partly, be sought in a discourse on archaeology and heritage management that prioritises the archaeological, universal and scientific value of the archaeological record, and that is based upon a notion of archaeological heritage as a material scientific resource, of local community benefits and involvement as an end-product, and of the (foreign) archaeologist as an ‘expert’ decision-maker.

4.4 THE AUTHORISED ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

4.4.1 THE AUTHORISED ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

This section will look in more detail at the values and discourses of actors in the project policies of the Joint Project. I will argue that the main project policies and actors bring forward a dominating discourse that inherently favours scientific and archaeological values over other values. I will also illustrate how this discourse, in combination with institutional, historical and political frameworks and the agency of actors, contributes to a project network and value-system whereby other stakeholders’ values are excluded and postponed, despite the intentions by the Joint Project to achieve an integrated and holistic collaborative archaeological conduct. Finally, I will illustrate how the discourse works to maintain the privileged position of archaeologists as experts for identifying values of a place, thereby ensuring intellectual and physical access and ownership.

I will generalise the characterisation of this discourse, for practical matters, as the ‘Authorised Archaeological Discourse’ (AAD) (cf Smith 2006; Waterton *et al.* 2006; see below). It should however be kept in mind that an abbreviation like the ‘AAD’ does not imply a fixed discourse through both space and time that orientates practice like some ‘dictatorial’ organising structure in which actors are simply reduced to radars in a tight network. As I have discussed in chapter 2.6, such a notion does not comply with my views on discourses, nor with my interpretations and descriptions of the network realities, nor does it do justice to the intentions and motivations of individual actors. As will be illustrated below, the workings of discourses are far more complex than this.

I wish to stress here that the AAD closely resembles the ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (AHD) of Laurajane Smith (2006; see section 2.4), and that it shares many of its story-lines, but that it differs in several ways. The AHD focuses primarily on policy discourses in terms of the preservation and conservation of (cultural) heritage, and the way in which archaeologists and politicians have used such a discourse to claim ‘expert’ privilege over its management, and on how through the hegemony of the AHD over alternative, competing, subaltern discourses, social inequalities have arisen over the interpretation and management of ‘heritage’ (Smith 2006). Such a discourse will be heavily integrated in my description of the AAD, (in fact, it incorporates many of its values and story-lines, and I wholeheartedly acknowledge the way in which the work by Smith has influenced my interpretations), but my use of the AAD differs in that it primarily focuses not so much on ‘heritage policies’, but rather on ‘archaeological project policies’ – that is, more specifically, on the policy discourses surrounding the undertaking of archaeological research projects. As such, the AAD could be regarded as being comprised of a set of discursive story-lines and values; on archaeological research, on heritage (management), and on project collaboration.

I hereby wish to distance myself from a reading of the work of Smith, that archaeologists necessarily would intentionally seek the attribution of ownership and expertise – I think such a reading ignores the personal and historical backgrounds of archaeologists, and the dedication, hopes and desires by these archaeologists to achieve an ethical and public archaeology. Rather, I think that such ‘good intentions’ (cf LaSalle 2010) are partly limited by a discursive process that is institutionalised in the different organisations, government bodies, funding schemes and policies that frame archaeological research projects abroad. Still, the AAD could also be found in the policies, writings, discussions and practices of the students and archaeologists of the Joint Project – and then sometimes connected to a need to maintain institutional relationships, access and ownership to archaeological research benefits and resources, something that I will illustrate below. First, however, I will summarise the AAD as it appears in the project policies of the Joint Project; subsequently, I will delve deeper into the way in which this discourse relates to alternative values and discourses, by describing the processes by which actors construct, negotiate and translate values and discourses in relation to those of others in society. After this, I will describe how this process of policy negotiation contributed to a system of (often unintended) ‘exclusionary mechanisms’ (Duineveld *et al.* 2012) that supported a prioritisation of scientific and archaeological values and a relative closure of the project network towards certain governmental and local actors.

The Authorised Archaeology Discourse (AAD) basically prioritises the archaeological and scientific values of a site and/or project over possible other ascribed values – be it social values, tourism values, natural values, educational values, economic values and so on. It does this by bringing forward a discursive story-line that approaches sites with material remains of the past as a fragile, non-renewable resource under threat that has the potential to yield scientific, objective interpretations and knowledge of the past. It is in




Figure 08. Visual conceptualisation of the Authorised Archaeological Discourse.

line with this view, that the concept of ‘heritage’ is discursively constructed in the AAD; material remains of the past are regarded as ‘archaeological heritage’, and in turn, ‘heritage’ is thought of to be constituted of material manifestations of the past. The ascribing of the archaeological value to the site then works in such a way, that it is advocated that such an archaeological value can only be brought to light, ‘unearthed’ if you like, by undertaking active scientific research, often implicitly favouring archaeological fieldwork. What is noticeable, then, is the belief that the results of such research yield knowledge that is of ‘universal value’, thereby justifying the resources and activities spent on the archaeological process, and regarding the archaeological process as such as something that yields public benefit. The AAD proposes that an increase in knowledge not only enhances the archaeological value of the resource, but also that knowledge irrevocably raises more research questions, that have to be answered in order to increase the universal value of knowledge for the greater public – a process, that often works in a cyclical fashion until it is agreed that the archaeological value of the resource has reached a ‘finished’ stage. This stage should, of course, be considered a subjective notion, often ignored during the archaeologist’s dedication and heartfelt thirst for more fieldwork, interpretations and analyses. Still, the belief is that once the archaeological value of a resource has been established, it then becomes important to protect, consolidate and manage the site, after which this ‘heritage site’ as a source of knowledge of the past, can be presented, interpreted and attract visitors, thereby providing even more ‘public benefit’. If done correctly, such interaction of the public with the archaeological value of the site will then ideally lead to enlarge their support, awareness and care for ‘their archaeological heritage’, thereby ensuring the survival of the scientific data set from ignorance, destruction and development.

But what the AAD does (see Figure 08), is effectively excluding other values and actors from the beginning, such as for example educational and social values, because these are regarded as values that should be addressed after the archaeological value and knowledge is produced and the site is protected and presented. The involvement of other actors and values, and the protection, conservation, interpretation and tourism development of the site are hereby often postponed to the final stages of archaeological fieldwork. Unfortunately, as we will see, this can be a phase in which the limited amount of available resources, time and expertise are sometimes not sufficient to do these other values and actors justice – leading, in the worst scenario, to an abandoned, destroyed, perhaps even ‘value-less’ archaeological site. Secondly, the AAD brings forward a story-line that sees the archaeologist as an expert to identify the archaeological value in the first phases of the cycle, since he or she can ‘unearth’ the archaeological value. Because archaeologists work at a site for a certain time, because they are dedicated to it, because they are the ones who know much about the history and archaeology of the site, and because they have the most access to the knowledge produced, they are regarded by the AAD as the experts to speak for the past, and are attributed a certain amount of ownership to the site and decision-making power over which values to include and at what stage of the project process. This does not necessarily mean that the individual archaeologist wants this attribution of expertise and ownership – rather, my point here is that they are attributed this through the discursive processes in which they operate. Taken together, the AAD prioritises expert values, knowledge of a universally significant past, and objective scientific research over alternative values when investigating and/or managing a heritage site in a collaborative project.

Again, I don’t uphold that all archaeologists advocate this discourse. Rather, I will illustrate that the AAD is embedded in the project policies of the Joint Project; it constitutes a dominant value-system and set of story-lines that are also reflected within the policies of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, of Yarmouk University (and to a certain degree also the DoA), as well as within the statements and actions of many project actors. As we will see, it is therefore very difficult for individual actors to ‘break out’ of this discursive process, particularly in relation to the attribution of expertise. We will now look at some examples from the Joint Project to illustrate the existence and workings of the AAD.

4.4.2 ALL VALUES ARE EQUAL, BUT SOME VALUES ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS

This section will provide some examples of the AAD within the Joint Project, focusing in particular on how this leads to discursive processes and practices whereby the academic archaeologists from both the LU and YU ascribe and prioritise mainly the archaeological and scientific values to the Joint Project, to Tell Deir Alla and to archaeological heritage matters in Jordan more generally. In the following sections, I will focus in more detail on how these actors subsequently negotiate, translate and represent the AAD and related value-systems in relation to other actors in society.

In general, the AAD brings forward a story-line that sites with material remains of the past are ‘value-less’ until archaeological research is undertaken, and that such sites exist primarily of archaeological resources in the form of scientific data as a fragile resource under constant threat. Elements of such a story-line could for example be found in statements by archaeologists from the Joint Project;

Virgin sites do not mean anything. We need more excavations.¹⁰²

¹⁰² Senior archaeologist of the Joint Project (Deir Alla, May 2009).

A Tell without archaeology is a dead mountain.¹⁰³

Further research on Tell-Hammeh is urgent and highly desirable due to the scientific value of research and the threatened situation of the heritage site.¹⁰⁴

The prioritisation of archaeological and scientific values can also be seen in the definition of an archaeological site or monument in the official institutional policy of the Department of Antiquities in Jordan;

Archaeological remains are both sites and buildings of archaeological significance. <...> There are also sites that are well known but have not yet had the attention of scholarly research. Finally, there are hundreds of sites <...> whose significance cannot be assessed until they are studied.¹⁰⁵

The idea that a site is mainly significant because of its archaeological and scientific value, seems perhaps logical when seen from the perspective of the DoA – however, it must be realised that the DoA falls under the Ministry of Tourism, and is, by law, also responsible for the protection and presentation of the archaeological resources in Jordan for tourism, economic development and national identity purposes. I will look at the difficult relationship between the DoA and the Ministry of Tourism, and the complex use of the AAD within the DoA, later in further detail.

Through the prioritisation of scientific and archaeological values, the AAD also inherently favours more excavations, more research and more publications. This is already hinted at within for example the definition of an archaeological site above, but can for example also be found in the project proposals by the Joint Project of 1998 and 2000, which were submitted by LU and YU to the DoA. In these proposals, the ‘importance’ of the Joint Project and the site of Deir Alla is specifically mentioned;

The importance of the project, and the site, so far, is shown, <...> in the following fields; – archaeological method; <...> ecological and agricultural archaeology; <...> cultural and social archaeology; <...> history and philology; <...> To this scholarly importance may be added the importance of the project for multidisciplinary teaching and training purposes, both in field-work and study.¹⁰⁶

The main aims of the Joint Project are as such discursively constructed through stressing the archaeological and scientific values, and by framing further training benefits that can be derived from this. Inherently, this emphasis automatically assumes that benefits will be produced in the form of publications, which will then lead to a necessity of further fieldwork. What is striking about the discourse used in these proposals is the inherent story-line that archaeological and scientific values attributed to the site lead seamlessly to research aims, to necessary excavation, to publications, which then automatically make further research aims and excavations and publications necessary again. According to the 1994 project proposal by the Joint Project,

¹⁰³ Representative of the Department of Antiquities for the Joint Project (Deir Alla, June 2009).

¹⁰⁴ On page 3 of the unpublished Joint Project Project Proposal for the 2000 fieldwork season, handed in to the DoA in 2000. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹⁰⁵ Institutional policy, Department of Antiquities. Available at: <http://www.doa.jo/daa1.htm> [Accessed 6 January 2010].

¹⁰⁶ Unpublished Joint Project Project Proposal for the 1998 fieldwork season, handed in to the DoA in 1998, pp. 4-5. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

the main aim <of the work in the 1960's> was the establishment of a new method of pottery studies <...> This aim resulted in the publications <...> This last publication shows that <...> For that reason the excavated area was extended <...> resulting in the publication of the Balaam text from Deir Alla <which> made it necessary to extend the research area again.¹⁰⁷

Similar perspectives can be found in other proposals as well, where a story-line is used which implies that research results 'demand', or 'make necessary' further excavations and research; "The Deir Alla results demanded <...> a research-branch of intensive surveying of the neighbourhood .. with site-probing", and "Iron-production data from Tell-Hammeh studies <...> made additional studies necessary".¹⁰⁸

An emphasis on the production of knowledge can not only be seen in the amount of publications that derived from the Joint Project, but also in the amount of MA-dissertations, PhD's and institutional promotions that followed through this. As stated by a Dutch archaeological supervisor of the Joint Project;

In 1996 I went for the first time to Deir Alla. I wanted to do something with Iron-production for my MA thesis, so I went to Tell Hammeh. It has been my life since, and it was at the centre of my PhD, and now, as a post-doc, again.¹⁰⁹

The emphasis on publications as research benefits, as well as on the training of students, is – as we will discuss in more detail in section 4.6 – encouraged by the fact that the institutional and external funding policies of the Joint Project are especially geared toward this, dealing with a notion of archaeology mainly from a scientific disciplinary perspective.

The undertaking of archaeological excavations for scientific benefits is often accompanied by the story-line that knowledge has an inherent, universal public value. The AAD thereby favours short-term research benefits as a means of providing universal, long-term public benefits in the form of knowledge production; "Archaeology produces knowledge, and knowledge is of universal value",¹¹⁰ according to a senior Jordanian archaeologist of YU related to the Joint Project. Similarly, it was often mentioned by the co-directors and other archaeologists of the Joint Project, that archaeological knowledge belongs to 'the whole world' or 'to all people'. Such a belief in the universal value of knowledge was then often linked to the previously discussed aim of the Joint Project to undertake objective, neutral and scientific research, illustrating its belief in processual archaeology as a valuable means of archaeological collaboration.

The discursive notion of a 'shared universal benefit' deriving out of scientific reports in terms of contributing to the writing of Jordanian history was however not perceived as such by everyone. To understand this, we have to look at the actual beneficiaries of such work.¹¹¹ For example, in the perspective of the DoA the process of archaeological knowledge production was not benefiting the writing of Jordanian history;

¹⁰⁷ Unpublished Joint Project Project Proposal for the 1994 fieldwork season, handed in to the DoA in 1994, pp. 1. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹⁰⁸ Unpublished Joint Project Project Proposal for the 2000 fieldwork season, handed in to the DoA in 2000. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹⁰⁹ Dutch Supervisor of Tell Hammeh of the Joint Project (Tell Hammeh, June 2009).

¹¹⁰ Senior Archaeologist and Surveyor of the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology of Yarmouk University (Deir Alla, July 2009).

¹¹¹ I will touch upon some perceptions related to this now, but will discuss this in more detail throughout this chapter.

Publications are not their best side. But they are never in archaeology. We are still waiting for a lot of reports from the project – without them, what is the benefit for the Jordanian public? Also, all of their publications are academic. There is no public dissemination and awareness.¹¹²

The possible benefits of archaeological interpretations and research are also, as of yet, not filtering through effectively to the local community in the form of knowledge transfer or educational programmes. We have touched upon this above, where local school teachers, librarians and local workmen of the Deir Alla region mentioned that they had no access to the knowledge produced – a process relating to the fact that ‘local’ archaeology does not play a significant role in Jordanian curricula (Al-Husban 2006; Badran 2006).

Interestingly, it was mentioned by several Jordanian archaeologists that were not part of the Joint Project, that the present utility of archaeological knowledge in Jordan should also be seen in the personal and institutional benefits that publications yield for the author; “Why do Jordanian archaeologists dig? Because when they dig, they get reports, they get material, they can write articles, they can get promoted. It is an individual thing”.¹¹³ Supporting this perspective, is the situation that some Jordanian archaeologists criticised the Joint Project for not yielding equal scientific benefits. Indeed, the amount of publications by Dutch archaeologists deriving out of the Joint Project are greater than those of Jordanian scholars. Unfortunately, the same could be said for the amount of students trained by the Joint Project.¹¹⁴

The perception that benefits deriving from research were mainly favouring archaeologists, and not the Jordanian public at large, was also brought forward by the Head of Excavations and Research of the DoA, when he mentioned that archaeologists are only concerned with publishing their findings and training their students.¹¹⁵ The Director of the DoA brought forward a similar perspective, when he referred to this as “selfish academic interests”.¹¹⁶ We will see below, that such perceptions should be seen in relation to the fact that the DoA felt excluded from these benefits after a certain powerful individual left the DoA – thereby taking the research benefits of the Joint Project with him to YU. Still, it shows how the story-line of the AAD that emphasises knowledge production as a shared universal valued sits in contrast to a perception that the archaeological process primarily creates personal academic benefits. When asked what he thought the main aim of the Joint Project was, the local manager of DASAS in Deir Alla, who has worked at the project for over 15 years, said: “The aim is clear. You bring students, they become doctors and professors.”¹¹⁷

The project policies also mention the need for conservation and developing the site for tourist purposes, aims that fit the values and discourse of the DoA, as we will discuss below;

On the other hand care should also be taken of the preservation of the site. This season some consolidations will be prepared, but plans are being made to restore several houses of the phase IX settlement, and some remains of the later phases, as well as buildings of the late Bronze Age

¹¹² Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009)

¹¹³ Associate Professor of Anthropology, Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Irbid, November 2009).

¹¹⁴ This statement was based upon a global survey of mentioned publications and project staff members in the Joint Project reports. Since this showed an incomplete picture from especially the Jordanian institutional partners, this statement was subsequently discussed, and confirmed, by the main archaeological actors of the DoA, YU and LU.

¹¹⁵ Head of Excavation and Research of the Department of Antiquities (Amman, June 2009).

¹¹⁶ Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009).

¹¹⁷ Local DASAS manager, inhabitant of Deir Alla (Deir Alla, July 2009).

(temple) complex. This is going together with the care taken by the Department of Antiquities to protect the site and prepare it for extensive tourism visits.¹¹⁸

What is striking, is that the emphasis here is not just on future planning, but rather that the same passages were re-used almost unchanged in all project proposals of the 1990's – not only illustrating that it is difficult to implement such heritage management activities, but also inherently emphasising, in my opinion, the idea that site conservation, presentation and tourism development is an end-product rather than an inherent process. The idea in the management proposals of the Joint Project, and one that is reflected in the AAD and in the prioritisation of activities by the DoA (see section 4.5.2), is that first the archaeological value of the site needs to be produced, or enhanced by means of knowledge production, after which the site can be restored – only then can the public be brought into the process. As mentioned by a member of the Joint Project; “We need to know more about history, then we should protect and develop tourism.”¹¹⁹

The story-line of creating public benefit through education and tourism, after the archaeologists have done their work, is also implicit in the ideas for developing an archaeological interpretation centre at DASAS, as well as in the ideas for establishing the Regional Research Centre and Museum. In this sense, it is worth noting that DASAS was set up in the early 80's with the aim that it might be turned into a museum after 2000. These plans changed however in the early 90's, when it was felt that the vision of a museum would be better served by dedicating the Joint Project's efforts to the establishment of a separate, larger and more holistic Regional Research Centre and Museum. As we have seen, this museum has unfortunately, and despite years of dedication, not come to fruition. Still, it can be noted that, firstly, the production of these interpretive facilities is postponed to the future, and secondly, that it is implicitly assumed that these are the most effective way of ensuring public benefit. That this is not felt per se as such by the local community, could therefore be seen as a critique on the AAD. In the words of a local fieldworker for example; “We don't go to museums – for that, you need time and money. We have other concerns”.¹²⁰

Currently, visitors to the small interpretation centre at DASAS mostly exist of a handful of international tourists and archaeological specialists. Still, from a public archaeological perspective, there are other options available, such as involving the community in the actual archaeological process and interpretation, involving them in the formulation of research questions, and in a management approach that continuously provides interpretive materials to the public whilst the archaeological work is in process (cf Williams & Van der Linde 2006). Current insights in archaeological education literature, also call for an interactive, hands-on and evidence-based approach to education by means of involving school groups in the actual process of archaeology (see for example Corbishley *et al.* 2004; Henson 2004; Smardz 2004). The postponing of the public benefit of archaeology after the excavations and publications have been written, has, in contrast, in the case of the Joint Project unfortunately led to a situation where the interpretive and educational opportunities are still underdeveloped after 50 years of excavations.

A related story-line in the AAD is the perception of education of the local community as a means to protect the site, instead of providing educational benefits for the community per se. I believe that this hints at an understanding that the archaeological sites or resources must be protected mainly for their archaeological and scientific value (cf Oliva 1994), which is clearly mentioned in the project proposals of 2000; here it

¹¹⁸ Unpublished Joint Project Project Proposal for the 1998 fieldwork season, handed in to the DoA in 1998, p. 5. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹¹⁹ Representative of the Department of Antiquities for the Joint Project (Deir Alla, June 2009).

¹²⁰ Local field worker of the Joint Project at the Deir Alla excavations (Deir Alla, July 2009)

was mentioned that the project aims “to educate local people to appreciate and protect antiquities”.¹²¹ This could also be heard during some of the interviews I had with the Jordanian co-director; “I think the involvement of the local community in Deir Alla helped a lot. There is no illicit excavation on the site, whilst it is happening all over Jordan.”¹²² Similar perspectives could also be heard by a Dutch senior archaeologist, when discussing the reasons as for why the Joint Project was not allowed to undertake surveys in neighbouring land due to a lack of permission by the local land owners; “These farmers should be educated by the Department of Antiquities – they think we are looking for gold, they always think that. But we want to do surveys, and these are non-destructive. We should educate the community to protect their heritage”.¹²³ I do not want to suggest here that creating a sense of care within the local community and the visitors to an archaeological site can not be an important effect of educational and interpretive programmes; rather, I wish to point out that it is regarded as the main aim of outreach in the AAD, instead of as a by-product of creating educational and socio-economic benefits for the public. Although I will look at this later, it might be interesting to refer to a statement by the mayor of the Deir Alla municipality in this regard;

I don't think archaeology is one of the highest priorities for the people here, because in their circumstances, and the global crisis now, people are now looking for opportunities, jobs, careers; archaeology comes as a last priority. The first thing people think about is to get a job, the second thing is to get a house, then to get married, to have a family, to organise themselves, then maybe to visit something, then maybe to be concerned about it, this is the last thing.¹²⁴

The postponing of public benefits, and the emphasis on preserving archaeological significance, can, I believe, also be clearly seen in the repeated story-line of the AAD that states that ‘archaeological heritage should be preserved for future generations’. This story-line was used by many archaeologists of the Joint Project, but is also reflected in the policies, conventions and charters of heritage organisations worldwide (cf Lafrenz Samuels 2008; Smith 2006; Waterton *et al.* 2006). This story-line could often be heard during my interviews, and I think is reflected in the prioritisation of activities of the Joint Project, where the creation of knowledge and the preservation of archaeological resources gain priority over the education and/or enjoyment of knowledge and the active use of archaeological resources by the public at large. Inherently, this story-line of the AAD also means, by its own logic, that the emphasis on ‘future generations’ might refer to future generations of ‘archaeologists’. In addition, a discursive emphasis on future generations means that the needs and wishes of contemporary generations can become overlooked.¹²⁵ In general, my point here is to illustrate how this story-line has become embedded in the AAD, and how it can lead to a situation where short-term archaeological and scientific benefits for archaeologists and future generations becomes prioritised over the educational and socio-economic benefits of the present generations of the Jordanian public at large.

It was discussed above how the AAD implicitly excludes the involvement of other values and actors in the first steps of the archaeological process cycle, effectively postponing the interaction with other values to the final stages of the archaeological process. Inherent to this is the story-line in the AAD that

¹²¹ Unpublished Joint Project Project Proposal for the 2000 fieldwork season, handed in to the DoA in 2000, page 6. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹²² Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1996 - 2009, Professor of Archaeology at the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Deir Alla, June 2009).

¹²³ Dutch senior archaeologist of the Joint Project (Deir Alla, May 2009).

¹²⁴ Mayor of the Municipality ('Department') of Deir Alla (Swalha, July 2009).

¹²⁵ See section 5.5 for a discussion on these issues in relation to the case study in Curaçao.

archaeologists are the prime experts to act on behalf of the public when dealing with archaeological ‘heritage’ matters. The Jordanian co-director of the 2009 season for instance questioned; “Why should we include the local mayor? To do what? He does not know anything about archaeology”.¹²⁶ Such statements are the result of the fact that sites with material remains of the past are regarded as fragile scientific resources (or data) under threat, that takes objective, neutral and professional merit to investigate. Because of the prioritisation of the archaeological value over other values, and because of the belief that an archaeological site’s significance can only be assessed by increasing the archaeological knowledge that the resources can yield, the archaeologist is as such often regarded as the actor with the necessary expertise to identify this archaeological value. Inherently, it also puts the archaeological expert into a position where he or she is given a position in which to decide which actions, values and steps in the management of archaeological sites should be given priority; the director of the regional Jordan Valley Office of the DoA for instance mentioned that “we should wait for <the Dutch co-director> to tell us what to do here, what to protect and present, and how to do it”.¹²⁷ As a consequence, this contributes to a situation in which archaeologists are also given a certain intellectual and physical ownership over the site. The identification of the archaeologist with the archaeological site, and the granting of ownership, access and expertise, is, I believe, not necessarily a deliberate and conscious process by the archaeologists themselves. Rather, I believe that because of this specific story-line of the AAD, the archaeologist is granted this position, despite his or her own views and wishes in this regard – something that became very clear when discussing this issue with the current Dutch co-director.

During my fieldwork in Jordan, but strengthened by my experiences in other countries and archaeological institutions (see section 1.4), I often encountered the fact that archaeologists and students have a tendency to identify themselves with the specific site, square or collection that they work on, but also with the subsequent data and knowledge deriving from such fieldwork. The archaeologists of the Joint Project, for example, often used phrases such as “On my site, Tell Hammeh, my data showed that..”.¹²⁸ This seems, at first, rather innocent, but it also works through in actual fieldwork practices to a situation in which students and archaeologists felt uneasy to interpret, or deal with archaeological data that ‘belongs to someone else’. On a larger scale, and when discussing the Joint Project with other European archaeologists, it was often mentioned that Tell Deir Alla was ‘a Dutch site’, and that the findings were ‘Dutch discoveries’. However, this is not just a European phenomenon – such statements could also be heard by the Jordanian members of the Joint Project. Similarly, during an archaeological field-trip through Jordan, specific Tells were also often identified with the nationalities of the specific archaeological teams working there; “This here, is a French site. That Tell over there is German”.¹²⁹ I believe however, that such thinking also works through on a more fundamental level, in which certain archaeologists feel uneasy to work on, or interpret, the archaeological resources and findings of other archaeologists; “How could I do anything at Deir Alla? It is the Tell of the Dutch”.¹³⁰ Likewise, during a short presentation about the Joint Project at a meeting of the ‘Friends of Archaeology and Heritage in Jordan’ in Amman in the summer of 2009, it was remarked by one archaeologist that another was “interfering with the interpretations of our Tell”.¹³¹

¹²⁶ Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1996 - 2009, Professor of Archaeology at the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Deir Alla, June 2009).

¹²⁷ Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009).

¹²⁸ Dutch archaeologist of the Joint Project (Deir Alla, May 2009).

¹²⁹ Dutch MA student of the Faculty of Archaeology Leiden University (May 2009).

¹³⁰ English archaeologist at the British Institute in Amman (Amman, November 2009).

¹³¹ Dutch archaeologist of the Joint Project (Deir Alla, June 2009).

Throughout this chapter, I will return in more detail on the impact of this element of the AAD whereby archaeologists, as experts, are tied to archaeological resources and scientific by-products. Part of this is due to the way in which actors negotiate, translate and construct the AAD in relation to other actors in society. This will be investigated in the coming section.

4.5 POLICY NEGOTIATIONS

4.5.1 THE TRANSLATION OF VALUES

During the first phase of the project, the site of Tell Deir Alla was valued mainly because of its scientific and archaeological potential. It is difficult to retrieve the exact motivations by Franken for the choice of location of Deir Alla due to a lack of available written personal reflections, but from interviews with some of his former students, I believe it safe to conclude that Franken chose the site of Deir Alla because he believed that it would provide abundant archaeological data that fitted his scientific interest. The pottery found during archaeological surveys in 1960 and 1961, coupled with several small test trenches, together with the size of the Tell, would have provided enough potential to start an archaeological investigation aimed at investigating the transition of the Late-Bronze Age to Early-Iron age (ca 1200BC). In addition, as a ‘mudbrick-site’, Deir Alla offered the potential for an archaeological methodology that followed a strict chrono-stratigraphical approach based on pottery. The close distance to Tell Es-Sultan, where Franken worked during the 1950’s with Kathleen Kenyon, and the relative easy access to the site, coupled with his desire to initiate his own, Dutch research tradition in the Jordan Valley, probably strengthened this choice.¹³²

Although Franken never confirmed this explicitly in his writings, some of his former students and colleagues believe that he also chose the site, and the transition period between the Late-Bronze Age to Early-Iron age, as a possible location where the Israelites entered ‘the promised land’ (Van der Kooij 2007b, 10). However, religious values seem to have played a more significant role in the sense that Franken wanted to provide a critical-historical and scientific approach towards the more orthodox biblical archaeological interpretations of that time. The main choice for the site should therefore be seen as a combination of its scientific and archaeological value in advancing the understanding of cultures of biblical times in this part of the world (see also 4.3.2). As such, the values attributed by Franken to an archaeological project in Deir Alla fitted the motivations and desires of the national governmental research funding body Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO),¹³³ which saw the Deir Alla project as a means to fulfil its aims of promoting ‘pure scientific research’. Franken also succeeded in translating the archaeological and scientific values into that of the Faculty of Theology of Leiden University, where he was a lecturer at that time, by stressing how his approach could fit the Faculty’s aims of promoting academic research into biblical times with a teaching element. Soon after, this led to the training of several students of the Faculty, amongst which the present Dutch co-director of the Joint Project.

With ‘translation’ I refer to the transformation of policy goals into practical interests and vice versa. Similar to the use of the concept of translation by Mosse (2005, 9; Lewis & Mosse 2006), I use it here,

¹³² Dutch co-director of the Joint Project of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University (pers. comm. Leiden, November 2011).

¹³³ Currently the NWO, Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research.

more specifically, as referring to a process of interpretation by actors of one set of values into another set of values that fit the policy discourses, story-lines and motivations of other stakeholders, organisations and actors; constantly creating interest, ‘making real’ (cf Latour 1996, 86). From such a view, archaeological projects can only succeed if actors can effectively translate their values into other actors’ values, and the more values are incorporated into a project, the stronger it gets, since more actors can align themselves through the process of translation. As discussed in section 2.5, this allocation of different values by actors can then lead to the formation of strong, shared ‘discourse-coalitions’, which refers to a group of actors that shares the usage of a particular set of story-lines over a particular period of time (cf Hajer 2005, 302).

The collaboration between the Faculty of Theology in Leiden and ZWO, was further strengthened because of the friendship that developed in the 1960’s between Henk Franken and the chief administrator of ZWO, both of whom shared a passion for furthering not only the archaeological understanding of the Near East, but also for contributing to an independent archaeology in Jordan and Palestine (Franken 1991; 1970; 1976) – an issue that is illustrated by the dedication and resources spent by the chief administrator of ZWO in the safeguarding, restoration and repatriation of the Balaam text in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s (Franken 1991). A discursive story-line that emphasised the value of pure, scientific research for the creation of an independent, scientific Jordanian archaeology, thereby allowed the effective translation of archaeological, scientific and politically motivated values, and the formation of a discourse-coalition between ZWO and the Faculty of Theology.

The early phases of the Deir Alla project, covering four years of excavation in the 1960’s, were undertaken mainly by scholars from the Netherlands, with several workmen from Jericho that were brought to Deir Alla from Franken’s earlier fieldwork at Tell es-Sultan (Franken 1991). The permit for excavation was granted by the DoA, who also sent a representative to oversee the quality of the work. However, the role of the DoA in this period consisted mainly of the administrative facilitation of the Dutch project. It was only with the arrival of the Head of Excavation and Research of the DoA at the project in 1976, that the DoA became a real partner in the scientific aspect of the Project. This led, subsequently, to the formation of a ‘Joint Project’. This formation of the project was the result of the friendship, shared scientific interests and subsequent successful translation of values between Henk Franken and the Head of Research and Excavation at that time, who had been influenced during his university degree in Berlin by neo-marxist and critical views on biblical archaeology;

I discovered that Henk Franken and I had a lot in common in terms of methodology, in terms of thinking, in terms of understanding the archaeology of the region – in contrast with the traditional biblical archaeology that was taking place not only in Palestine but also in Jordan. <...> I already had a comprehensive idea of the archaeology of the area, and I thought it would be good to undertake stratigraphy at a key site like Deir Alla, which was explored and we knew about the periods and the representations of certain major periods of the region.¹³⁴

The scientific and archaeological value attributed to the project by the Head of Research and Excavation, led to the fact that a collaboration was made possible. In addition, the methodology of Franken, which was aimed at challenging the current biblical interpretations of that time, was also seen as an important value by the Head of Research and Excavation, since it contributed to an independent archaeology in Jordan. As such, he succeeded in translating the scientific, archaeological and political values of the Dutch actors of the project into ‘training’ and financial values for the DoA, by using the Joint Project as an opportunity for training the DoA staff in archaeological skills and research techniques;

¹³⁴ Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project and Head of Excavation and Research at the Department of Antiquities in 1976 (Amman, November 2009).

I had the feeling Henk Franken was interested in teaming up with locals. It was not possible in the 1960's, when he was working here because there were <almost>¹³⁵ no archaeologists to work independently or to research at a proper scale at that time. The Deir Alla project was the first joint project for the DoA. <...> The main problem that we had at that time, was that there were very few people that were capable of doing archaeology, and secondly, the budget for independent archaeological projects was not there, so we needed partners to support us in a technical way and to help financing the project. Taking the methodology and also the goals into consideration, we thought working in Deir Alla could be a right step for a joint project. <...> On the personal level we needed this type of cooperation for the capacity building and training of our people.¹³⁶

This fitted the official aims of the DoA of that time to develop a scientific and independent capacity. As can be read on the website of the DoA:

Since 1951, the Department of Antiquities was aware of the national and scientific responsibilities that it had to live up to. It was also aware that archaeology was a science that was new to the Arab region, and that it dated back to the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. Based on the realisation of these facts, the Department of Antiquities started working on the infrastructure that is necessary for archaeological work. <...> The development in infrastructure went hand in hand with the endeavours to train the employees of the Department, so as to ensure their capacity to carry out their work. <...> This was possible thanks to the training courses that were held both in Jordan and in other countries, and by means of the participation of the Department's employees in archaeological excavation missions organised by the universities and by the foreign scientific institutions operating in Jordan.¹³⁷

The collaboration in this time soon became a success for the actors involved, not only because the values by the actors could be mutually translated, but also because the values themselves became strengthened by the archaeological finds. Especially the discovery of the Balaam-text in 1967 played a significant role in the widespread awareness of the Joint Project, which soon became a well-known site in both academic as well as in biblical, and more modestly, tourism circles. But the Balaam text also allowed the individual archaeologists to increase their academic standing, leading to important publications by several members of the Joint Project (see for an overview Hoftijzer & Van der Kooij 1991). I would therefore argue that we should not only perceive of values as certain qualities that are attributed to an archaeological site by an actor, but rather as the result of the interplay between the actor and the archaeological resource itself (cf section 2.4). In this instance, value-attribution is a two-way process; through the creation and uncovering of the archaeological data and finds, the archaeologist also needs the archaeological finds to become a successful archaeologist, and the greater the perceived significance of the archaeological finds, the greater the benefits for the individual archaeologist (cf Van Reybrouck & Jacobs 2006). For the Joint Project, the archaeological finds played an important role in the perception of the project as a successful collaboration, adding to a perceived need to maintain personal and institutional relationships – something played in hand

¹³⁵ According to the Dutch co-director of the Joint Project of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University (pers. comm. Leiden, February 2012), there were a handful of Jordanian scholars interested in archaeology during this period, although they were not actively following fieldwork methodologies.

¹³⁶ Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project and Head of Excavation and Research at the Department of Antiquities in 1976 (Amman, November 2009).

¹³⁷ Available at: http://images.jordan.gov.jo/wps/wcm/connect/gov/eGov/Government+Ministries+_+Entities/Department+of+Antiquities/General+Information/ [Accessed 3 February 2012].

by the aforementioned story-line of the AAD that identifies archaeologists with archaeological sites and subsequent research outcomes.

In this sense, it is worthwhile pointing out that the scientific benefits by the partners were not perceived as equal – most of the research benefits were geared towards academic scholars, and less to the DoA at large. Although financial resources and access to international knowledge institutes and networks played an important role in this, it also came because the Head of Research and Excavation, one of the individuals who personally benefited from the scientific publications and training of the project, could not always successfully translate this scientific value into meaningful values for the DoA at large. In fact, the DoA had traditionally been more concerned with administration and the protection of antiquities, and only more recently had started to focus on its aims to develop scientific capacity (see above).¹³⁸ In the words of the former Head of Research and Excavation of the DoA;

When we were working on behalf of the Department, we always had to justify the continuation of the project. In the sense of, we had all kind of directors at that time, directors of antiquities that had nothing to do with archaeology and nothing to do with antiquities, they were just administrators, they didn't see any benefit, and they didn't see also the role of the Department as such. They were often not cooperative in terms of doing archaeology, I always had to fight.¹³⁹



Figure 09. Joint Project team members on top of Tell Deir Alla, late 1970's (Deir Alla Archive, Leiden University; courtesy Gerrit van der Kooij).

¹³⁸ See also the website of the DoA (*ibid.*)

¹³⁹ Former Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1976 till 1996 (Amman, November 2009). Head of Excavations and Research at the Department of Antiquities in 1976, and Director of the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University in 1979.

Soon after, the Head of Research and Excavation of the DoA moved to Yarmouk University in 1979. As a result of the fact that personal and scholarly relationships were maintained, the Joint Project now was strengthened by a third partner in the form of the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology of YU, which was set up by the former Head of Research and Excavation, now the first Director of the Institute. The result of this move was that the Joint Project became stronger and even more successful in the perception of some of the main Jordanian actors, since the scientific and training values of the project could now easier be translated to the aims and wishes of the YU in the field of science and academic training, which it could further facilitate with a financial contribution to the project. However, it also had as a result that the values of the Joint Project were now even less effectively translated within the DoA, since the former beneficiary actor responsible for this, had now left to YU;

I was hoping that the Joint Project would be with the Department, but unfortunately it did not develop like that, it was more or less connected to both Henk Franken and myself. I had some personal and budgetary problems in terms of continuity with the Department and Leiden, and I thought it would be more effective and more successful if I could carry on with Yarmouk University and still keep the Department involved. But although the Department was assisting in terms of personnel, and some finances, it was not personnel in the scientific level I would say, but on the technical level, representatives and other staff members. The project was on a more founded level at YU, because we had two academic institutions dealing with a project.¹⁴⁰

Because there was no archaeologist left at the DoA that translated the scientific and archaeological values into training and public values, and nobody that benefited personally from the archaeological and scientific results of the publications and excavations, the DoA eventually started to feel excluded from the Joint Project, since it no longer could see how the Joint Project fitted their values in terms of a need for training and accessible knowledge production for the Jordanian public;

If you look at the motivations of the universities, it is all about publications and training. No matter if they call it collaborations; they are selfish academic interests. They focus their training too much on the universities and their students, and too little on building capacity at the DoA.¹⁴¹

Interestingly, the actual field practices did not change that much since the early 1970's when the Joint Project was set up. Rather, I believe that because of the transfer of a single archaeologist from DoA to YU, the process of value translation could not be undertaken successfully anymore, which gradually led to a changed perception of the Joint Project within the DoA as one of 'success', to a 'failure'.

Underlying these feelings are, I believe, lingering power discrepancies between the DoA and YU. In general, it was felt by all the Jordanian archaeologists that YU had more resources and administrative capacity to deal with the scientific and archaeological values of the Joint Project; "we had more means for financial support, in the Department we really had to find funds together, at YU they had more understanding for supporting research projects."¹⁴² This view was shared by the current Deputy Dean of Research and Science of Yarmouk University, who was responsible for attributing funds to the Joint Project in the early 2000's; "Money is not, as it may seem, the main obstacle <...> we have more money available

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009)

¹⁴² Former Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1976 till 1996 (Amman, November 2009). Head of Excavations and Research at the Department of Antiquities in 1976, and Director of the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University in 1979.

than the Department, and in many cases, we have more money available than universities in other parts of the world, than the institutions in for example Leiden.”¹⁴³

During my fieldwork, it also became clear that many Jordanian students of archaeology generally prefer a career within Jordanian universities, than within the DoA. The main reason that was mentioned in this context, was the fact that the universities were considered to offer better career opportunities, and to offer better salary and ‘family’ conditions – a position at a university for example means that children of staff members can pay reduced fees to start university careers. In addition, an informal survey during my fieldwork showed a picture in which staff members of YU earned substantially more than those of the DoA.¹⁴⁴

In general, the DoA is believed to be under-skilled and under-resourced to deal with the pressures of implementing archaeological policies and values in comparison with Jordanian universities, which was often seen as underlying the administrative role they adapted;

If you are so limited with your abilities and human resources, this is the only approach you can take. For years now, they are not allowed to hire good people due to current agreements in the government, which is to cut down on hiring external specialists. Now, the university, their role is to have PhD’s, highly qualified people have to teach, they have to do research, publish and so on. The DoA does not have this pressure; their role is to find employees to perform the daily duties, which is different. Perhaps the foreign teams could change this, by focusing their capacity building not only on universities, but also on the Department. The universities make money, through delivering students, so they have bigger salaries – the Department can not do that.¹⁴⁵

It is in this context, I believe, that the critical comments by the Director of the DoA should be placed. The need for training of DoA staff should therefore be regarded as one of the major values that are ascribed by the DoA to foreign projects, not in the least because it provides economic and educational benefits to individual staff members – something that was emphasised explicitly by the current Head of Research and Excavation of the DoA.¹⁴⁶

As I will discuss later, this perception was also influenced by the fact that the new Director of the DoA (since 1999) tried to live up more strictly to the aims of the protection of antiquities and the handing out of excavation permits as a means to regain ownership in relation to national and foreign academic research aspirations (see section 4.5.3) as well as in relation to the aims for tourism development by the Ministry of Tourism, of which it became a part in 1989 (see section 4.5.4).

4.5.2 THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTIQUITIES

During an archaeological field-trip with Dutch students around Jordan in the initial phases of my fieldwork, I repeatedly heard critical remarks that the DoA showed a lack of concern over the protection and presentation of the archaeological heritage in the country. However, my subsequent experiences, interviews and observations made me believe that it was no so much a lack of concern that was to account

¹⁴³ Irbid, July 2009.

¹⁴⁴ This was held throughout my first fieldwork season between May-July 2009, and consisted mainly of observations and informal discussions at the DASAS with Jordanian members of the project team.

¹⁴⁵ Former Head of the Queen Rania Institute of Tourism and Heritage, Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, November 2009).

¹⁴⁶ Head of Excavation and Research of the Department of Antiquities, Jordan (Amman, June 2009).

for the poor state of some of the archaeological resources, but rather the fact that the DoA as an institution was understaffed and under-resourced to cope with the multitude of pressures and demands on archaeological sites, and faced with little agency and power in negotiations with (foreign) academic archaeological projects and internal state politics (see also section 4.6.4). Such an impression was shared by several directors of European archaeological institutions in Jordan, as well as by Jordanian university staff members; “Legally, the government represented by the Department of Antiquities is the owner of the archaeological resources. Culturally, and in reality, they are not – it is the archaeologists who work there”.¹⁴⁷

I have already touched upon the conflicts and inherent power discrepancy between academic archaeologists of YU and the DoA, whereby a certain disagreement over the responsibility and ownership over archaeological excavations and its finds can be distilled: “Basically, the Jordanian universities want to excavate, and the DoA wants to protect, and increasingly makes it more difficult to acquire permits. This tense relationship resembles the problems that European archaeology faced two decades ago”.¹⁴⁸

To understand this in more detail, it is worth highlighting the prioritisation of protection of archaeological resources by the DoA, which is also embedded in the (amended) Antiquity Law of 1988 (see AlGhazawi 2011 for an english translation). In the statutes of the DoA it is written that; “The principal policy of the Department of Antiquities is the protection of antiquities” and that “The second policy is for the presentation of antiquities, including research, survey, excavation and site management”.¹⁴⁹ If one looks at the actual type of projects undertaken under the supervision of the DoA in Jordan, a different picture emerges that illustrates the prioritisation of excavation over protection, and of protection over presentation. In these same statutes, the DoA differentiates the following projects;

1. Systematic archaeological field surveys (usually implemented by the DoA or by Jordanian and foreign academic institutions in cooperation and collaboration with the DoA).
2. Rescue archaeological surveys (implemented by the DoA- CRM team).
3. Systematic excavations (usually implemented by either by the DoA teams, or by foreign and Jordanian academic institutions in cooperation and collaboration with the DoA).
4. Projects of restoration and conservation (implemented by the DoA with contributions from some local and friendly foreign academic and other concerned institutions).
5. Presentation of archaeological sites to the public (implemented by the DoA with some contribution from local and foreign academic institutions).¹⁵⁰

If one looks at the actual archaeological projects undertaken for the years 2001-2008 in the annual journal of the DoA (‘Munjazat’), it can first of all be noted that the amount of projects in Jordan is increasing constantly, and secondly, that about half of these projects are still undertaken by foreign missions (AlGhazawi 2011, 13-14; Alkhaysheh 2007). If one takes a closer look at the actual field practices of these foreign missions, of which only 5% has collaborations with Jordanian Universities (AlGhazawi 2011, 13-14), the outcomes of the institutionalised AAD in foreign archaeological project policies emerges. For

¹⁴⁷ Associate Professor and Head of Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Irbid, November 2009).

¹⁴⁸ Director of the Council for British Research in the Levant (Amman, November 2009).

¹⁴⁹ Statutes of the Department of Antiquities, available at: <http://www.doa.jo/doa1.htm> [Accessed 5 May 2012].

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

the year 2007 for example (Alkhaysheh 2007), the following amount of projects were undertaken in the different fields;

1. Excavations	29 projects
2. Surveys	14 projects
3. Restoration and Conservation	5 projects
4. Documentation	1 projects
5. Presentation	0 projects

Table 01. Type of foreign archaeological projects undertaken in Jordan in the year 2007.

From this example of figures it can be distilled that excavations and research projects are still undertaken more frequently over conservation and presentation. This prioritisation of excavation and research over other heritage activities by foreign archaeological projects, but interestingly also by Jordanian universities, is also hinted at in the language used in the categorisations of projects; whilst excavations are “implemented by either by the DoA teams, or by foreign and Jordanian academic institutions in cooperation and collaboration with the DoA”, presentation and conservation projects are “implemented by the DoA with some contribution from local and <friendly> foreign academic institutions”.¹⁵¹

It was already discussed how Jordanian and foreign academic archaeologists and institutions can develop strong discourse-coalitions that prefer archaeological excavations over protection as this provides benefits in the field of training, research and knowledge production. In addition to the access to economic resources and international knowledge networks that foreign and Jordanian academic institutions bring to the table in relation to the DoA, there are two other factors that play a role in the idea that (foreign) academic archaeologists are controlling the ownership over archaeological resources in Jordan. The first is the story-line in the AAD that archaeologists are the suitable experts to assess and investigate the value of fragile archaeological resources on behalf of the public, which is supported by an identification of individual archaeologists with archaeological sites and research outcomes. The second factor relates to the historical, economic and political context of foreign archaeology in Jordan.

4.5.3 THE (FOREIGN) ARCHAEOLOGIST AS EXPERT

In section 4.4.2 I discussed some examples of the attribution of expertise and ownership to archaeologists in the research of archaeological sites. In addition, I touched upon the identification between archaeological sites, research outcomes and archaeologists. Taken together, this contributes to the situation that archaeologists are given a position in which to make decisions over what happens at the site in terms of heritage management issues. When I asked the local representatives of the DoA in Deir Alla about what their plans were for the site, something over which the DoA actually has the legal power to make decisions, it was mentioned that he was waiting for the Dutch co-director to tell them what to do at the sites, what to protect and present.¹⁵² This is striking, because the Dutch co-director himself did not feel he had this

¹⁵¹ Statutes of the Department of Antiquities, available at: <http://www.doa.jo/doa1.htm> [Accessed 5 May 2012].

¹⁵² Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009)

expertise, nor did he actively seek this attribution of decision-making power. When I asked the representatives of the Joint Project why the director of the DoA could not make these decision, it was mentioned that “he was not a real archaeologist”¹⁵³— even though the decisions had to deal with protection, education and tourism development, all issues that archaeologists are not necessarily trained in. There are of course other reasons why the Dutch co-director of the Joint Project was seen as the main actor with expertise to make decisions about the future management planning of the site, such as his personal dedication to the Tell and the community, his long-term involvement with the project and his access to international financial and academic networks. For now, however, my point here is that the AAD implicitly identifies archaeologists with archaeological resources, and that through this process, the archaeologist is attributed expertise, ownership and decision-making power, regardless of the individual wishes and aims by the archaeologist himself.

Another result of the attribution of expertise and the identification of archaeologists with archaeological resources and research outcomes, is that this combines to the perception that it is primarily academic archaeologists who benefit from publication benefits;

Academics deal with sites as if they are their private property <...> Private property in the sense that they consider all byproducts as their property as well, such as data, publications, even interpretations. You can’t do any research on a site without the permission of the main archaeologist – why is that? It’s a scientific robbery, a moral robbery, an ethical robbery.¹⁵⁴

I have already looked at this in section 4.4.2, so this issue will not be explored here any further. For now, my point is that a discourse-coalition between YU and LU, which emphasised the identification of archaeologists with sites and expertise, lead to not only the attribution of access and ownership as well as to a perceived difference in research benefits, and thereby to feelings of exclusion by especially the DoA.

Another reason for this is the idea that foreigners bring status and power to academic research projects, which makes collaborations attractive for individual Jordanian scholars in relation to institutional and personal career motivations. Through their position as foreigners with easy access to international knowledge, resources and political networks, the Dutch archaeologists for example were also attributed a certain power in decision-making in the context of Jordanian archaeology. This was strengthened by the historical power and colonial relationships in archaeology in the region (Maffi 2009; Meskell 1998; Silberman & Small 1997), as well as through the abundance of the archaeological sites in Jordan that the DoA is understaffed and under-resourced to cope with, which means it is often the foreign archaeological teams that have the capacity to invest resources and time in archaeological sites. In this sense, it is worth advancing here some perspectives on the inherent power structures of foreign archaeological projects in relation to the DoA by both Jordanian as well as foreign researchers themselves;

I know that foreign projects have put in low estimates so as to make sure the preservation fee stays low. <The DoA director> then becomes angry, but can not do anything about it, even though he is in charge <But these foreigners> played out their influence over his head, and the Ministry of Tourism then tells <the director> to stop making problems because these foreigners pay for tourism.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ Similar perspectives could be heard from Dutch members of the Joint Project, as well as by several other European archaeologists when discussing matters of excavation licensing in front of the DoA office (Amman, July 2009).

¹⁵⁴ Associate Professor and Head of Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Irbid, November 2009).

¹⁵⁵ Senior British archaeologist (Amman, November 2009).

We still allow foreigners permits, even though we sometimes are not happy with it. But we as Jordanians have a tradition of being friendly. We need to be friendly and respectful. If we do, that helps the international view of Jordan, so they will visit our country. We need tourism. The DoA helps in this sense.¹⁵⁶

Look at the amount of foreign missions in Jordan. Look at who has the most projects, and you will know who makes the decisions in this country, you can see who control the Ministry of Tourism and the Department of Antiquities. These are the people who are controlling even the internal decisions about <archaeology>.¹⁵⁷

Although I will look below at the power relationship between the DoA and the Ministry of Tourism in more detail, I can unfortunately not go into detail about the specific details and rumours of which foreign institutions and embassies were implicated in these statements due to promised confidentiality. However, it must be clear that there is a strong perception that the DoA does not have the full control over the ownership and responsibility of the archaeological resources and projects in Jordan, especially not when faced with foreign archaeological and political pressures.

In the coming sections it will be explored how the Dutch co-director has tried to take on this attributed expertise and broader heritage management responsibility by trying to accommodate and develop socio-economic and tourism values from the Joint Project, most notably through the aim of developing a Regional Research Centre and Museum at Deir Alla. As mentioned before, the establishment of this museum has unfortunately not come to fruition yet – below, I will discuss some of the reasons behind this, which can, next to a shift in Dutch funding policies which will be discussed in section 4.6, be found in a strict value and power discrepancy between the DoA and the Ministry of Tourism, as well as in broader discursive practices by the institutions and actors involved in the Joint Project. As a result, we will see how in the end the scientific and archaeological values of the Joint Project continue to be prioritised, with an exclusion of local values as a consequence.

4.5.4 THE DOA AND THE MINISTRY OF TOURISM

Integrated and holistic archaeological heritage management approaches are difficult to implement in Jordan. The reason for this must partly be sought in the particular relationship between the DoA and the Ministry of Tourism, of which the DoA is a department since 1989. This relationship is characterised by a firm distinction of priorities and activities as well as by power discrepancies. During my interviews with Jordanian tourism experts and heritage researchers, it struck me that all stressed that the DoA and the Ministry of Tourism were not working closely together, and that different management approaches, such as presentation, restoration, education, local community development, archaeological research and tourism development were not integrated (cf Berriane 1999; Brand 2000; Nasser 2000; Groot 2008). In general, it was believed there exists no such overall integrated strategy, nor an institution that facilitates such an approach effectively. During the time of research, the task and priority of the DoA was one of protection and research, as we have seen above, and that of the Ministry of Tourism was to attract tourism and economic growth – but unfortunately, not in an integrated way according to tourism specialists; “The problem is that nobody is looking at the whole process. The Ministry of Tourism is doing one thing, the

¹⁵⁶ Head of Excavation and Research of the Department of Antiquities, Jordan (Amman, June 2009).

¹⁵⁷ Assistant Professor Conservation and Heritage Management at the Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, June 2009).

DoA is doing another thing. There is no integration.”¹⁵⁸ This view on cultural tourism in Jordan has also been described by Princess Sharifa Nofa Bint Nasser (Nasser 2000), at the time of interviewing a lecturer in cultural tourism at the Jordan Applied University College for Hospitality and Tourism Education, as well as a former member of the Jordan Tourism Board.

The value distinction between protection and tourism development of archaeological sites is also reflected in the way in which some staff members of the DoA talked about the Ministry of Tourism; “The tasks of the Department and the Ministry of Tourism are contradictory. They want to destroy, we want to protect”.¹⁵⁹ The result of this perceived strict division, is that the DoA is presently responsible for protection and research, whilst the Ministry of Tourism is responsible for attracting tourism. This has not only contributed to the destruction of archaeological resources and materials at tourism sites such as Jerash (Berriane 1999, 63), but also to a lack of involvement of tourism specialists in archaeological sites which fall outside the current ideological and economic priorities that are laid by the Ministry of Tourism on archaeological resources deemed relevant for tourism development – such as Deir Alla. In general, the Ministry of Tourism seems to prioritise monumental, visually attractive sites that have a national identity and/or an international tourism potential, such as Jerash, Petra and Umm Qays. In fact, some scholars have even gone so far as to suggest that the emphasis on for example Nabataean history as part of a national Bedouin identity for the Hashemite Kingdom, might likely have developed differently if the site of Petra would have been less suitable for international tourism attraction (Groot 2008). A strict emphasis on the economic development of archaeological sites deemed worthy of international tourism has also, in combination with an unusual high level of state control and financing of the tourism industry (Gray 2002) led to a lack of support for bottom-up approaches that favour the needs, wishes and governmentality of local communities (cf Brand 2000) – a view that was also shared by some people in the village of Deir Alla: “The Ministry of Tourism doesn’t work for us. They are only interested in Petra en Jerash, in Roman sites. They are only interested in money from foreign tourists.”¹⁶⁰ At present, heritage management approaches that call for the reduction of poverty and the inclusion of local community concerns (see for example Cernea 2001; Williams & Van der Linde 2006) are difficult to implement in Jordan, of which the relocation and exclusion of the local community at Umm Qays remains a striking example (see above, and Brand 2001). For a further contextualisation of the problems of sustainability and the exclusion of local communities in Jordanian tourism projects, see for example Berriane (1999), Gray (2002) and (Joffé 2002).

In effect, the prioritisation of sites within the Ministry of Tourism is done by valuating archaeological sites mainly for their potential and ease with which tourists can be attracted – the protection, research and care for the site, are then considered values and responsibilities of the DoA. But the DoA has a relatively small amount of money with which to protect, research and document the more than 100,000 archaeological sites in the country, whilst the Ministry of Tourism has a far larger budget with which to attract tourism to only a hundred sites at most.¹⁶¹ In addition, the system of the aforementioned preservation fees by the the DoA, where an additional 10% of the total budget of an archaeological project is charged to the operator so as to finance the protection of the site, does not guarantee that this money goes into protection; according to the Director of the DoA himself, this money is also used to work away the backlog in publications of previous archaeological research.

¹⁵⁸ Assistant Professor Conservation and Heritage Management at the Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, June 2009).

¹⁵⁹ Staff member of the Department of Antiquities (Amman, July 2009).

¹⁶⁰ Jordanian teacher of English at a Primary School in the Jordan Valley (Swalha, July 2009).

¹⁶¹ Former Head of the Queen Rania Institute of Tourism and Heritage, Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, November 2009)

In general, the DoA and the Ministry of Tourism are perceived as not working together as closely as one would desire from an integrated archaeological perspective. The recently established Cultural Heritage Management division in the Ministry of Tourism, created to deal with this issue, and initiated after consultation with several tourism experts in Jordan that I had interviewed, did however, again, reflect this division in perceived responsibilities. Within this division, the tasks of research and protection are still given to an understaffed and under-resourced DoA; “But that is a contradiction in terms. Cultural heritage management involves archaeology and protection – otherwise they should call it tourism resource management <...> It is the problem of separating something that should be the same thing.”¹⁶²

The impact of this division on the Joint Project, is that the Ministry of Tourism, were not involved in the actual archaeological work, nor in the process of developing management plans for the site of Deir Alla. This would, however, especially have been important in light of the initial desires by the Joint Project to establish a Regional Museum, and to attract more tourism to the region as to enhance the need for economic growth by the local community.

Regional Research Centre and Museum

On 31 October 1981, an agreement was signed by YU, DoA and LU with the aim to “co-operate in archaeological prospecting in the Deir Alla region and the digging and study of antiquities in the said region <...> and whereas the parties are desirous of constructing a house in that region for the use of the excavation by study teams relating to the parties hereto.”¹⁶³ In subsequent years, the Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies (DASAS) was built successfully with financial contributions from all three partners, whereby the larger sums of money were donated by Leiden University and Yarmouk University. It was furnished by LU, the ground belonged to the DoA, and the maintenance of the building and furniture was under the responsibility of YU. Subsequently, it was decided that Leiden University could make free use of the station at least till 2000, when the agreement could be revised.

In the following two decades, the building greatly facilitated the scientific and archaeological values of the site, thereby strengthening the Joint Project. In addition, there was also, albeit minor, mentioning of the public and tourist value of the site, and it was decided that the DASAS could later be used as a museum – reflecting the AAD in postponing the educational and tourism benefits to the future in favour of short-term archaeological research. Nevertheless, right from the beginning, a small room was dedicated to the interpretation and presentation of the archaeology of Deir Alla and its wider region; “The Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies greatly facilitated archaeological work as a dig-house, field school, and material study and ‘first-aid’ centre (main storage of Deir Alla objects), as well as provided the public with an access to the archaeological results by an exhibition room”.¹⁶⁴

However, the representation of this educational and interpretive facility was not always perceived as such by local visitors – sometimes even referring to this small ‘exhibition’ as a ‘storage room’; “I went to Deir Alla with my family to enjoy the view on such a historical place. We also visited the museum, but this is not a museum, it is a storage space. It’s not really accessible, and we didn’t learn much”.¹⁶⁵ In addition, it is clear from discussions with the local manager of the station, as well as from the visitor’s book entrances at the station, that this interpretive facility was (and still is) mostly visited by archaeological experts and students, as well as by some international tourists – even though most of these

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ ‘Agreement to establish an archaeological Center at Deir Alla for the purpose of mutual excavation and archaeological research’ (1981). Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹⁶⁴ Unpublished Joint Project Project Proposal for the 2009 fieldwork season, handed in to the DoA in 2009, pp 1. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹⁶⁵ Inhabitant of Swalha (Swalha, July 2009).

visitors often stay in the bus, or at best, visit the top of the Tell, in favour of visiting other, better preserved and presented archaeological sites in the region.

From the early 1990's, the co-directors of the Joint Project expressed a desire to take on board the preservation, presentation and local community values of the site in a more structured way. This desire was best formulated in the attempts to develop a Deir Alla Regional Museum;

I thought, not at the very beginning but at a later stage, we should look at the community as partners, rather than just workers. We wanted to develop a sense of pride for the local community of the site and understanding, and I think that aspect was covered a little by the people who participated in the project <...> So we tried to explain to them what we found, the interpretations of the finds that sort of thing, it was on a individual level, but we did not do enough to achieve this goal. We thought of having a display in the station, where also the locals could come and view what we had been doing, and the plans and the section drawings, so that they could have a better understanding of the site. <...> But it was not clear <...> on the agenda of the team, from all the three partners, we did not plan for it in a systematic way. But later on we thought that the museum could cover a major part of that.¹⁶⁶

Interestingly, this idea for a regional museum was a response to a belief that the archaeology and local community of Deir Alla and the wider Jordan Valley deserved a larger, more holistic and integrated approach to site interpretation than the small on-site exhibition in the archaeological station could provide. This was also related to the fact that the station's main aim was that of promoting scientific research; "The Deir Alla Station houses a small museum concerning the archaeology of the site of Deir Alla but there is no possibility to enlarge this facility inside the building during its use as a dig-house <...> Conclusion: a regional museum has to be housed separately".¹⁶⁷

The aim of the Deir Alla Regional Museum was subsequently to promote the research, tourism, and understanding of the Deir Alla region, and to provide more benefits for the local community. Specifically, it aimed to rehabilitate the pride and connection of local people to the Jordan Valley by appreciating the local way of life in a landscape characterised by special, hard circumstances, as well as to attract economic benefits through tourism. An emphasis on presenting archaeological research in the multidisciplinary, regional context of the Jordan Valley was thought to support this aim, especially by focusing on the daily lives, circumstances and agricultural and cultural contexts of past peoples in the valley.

Indeed, such an emphasis did partly seem to be in line with some of the interpretive wishes and desires of local community members that I interviewed. When respondents stated that they were interested in the history of the Tell, it was focused primarily on the past lives of the people who lived there, how they made their houses, their bread, irrigated their fields, and so on – not on grand cultural and historic narratives. Such a view was also in line with that of an assistant professor in 'Conservation and Heritage Management' at the Hashemite University in Zarqa, who explored such issues in his studies on cultural tourism in the Jordan Valley;

¹⁶⁶ Former Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1976 till 1996 (Amman, November 2009).

¹⁶⁷ Unpublished proposal document 'Regional Museum at Deir Alla' (1991) by the Joint Deir Alla Archaeological Project. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

People are interested how they made their bricks, if it looks like what their grandfathers used for instance. What the city used to look like. The daily life is what interests people. Many people who looked at biblical archaeology were trying to prove something, but people here are less interested in proving something.¹⁶⁸

What is striking also, is that some local community members placed a rather negative self-identification on the past of the Tell; “The people who lived here were poor, just like us. Not like the Romans you see in Jerash – they were rich, just as today. Just like you see in the movies; they had gold, big horses and caravans.”¹⁶⁹ In addition, many community members that I interviewed expressed a wish for attracting tourism as to gain economic benefits, although this was often accompanied by a concern that an involvement of the Ministry of Tourism would not automatically lead to benefits on the local level, as discussed previously. As such, an interpretive and tourism plan for the site should therefore not only focus on understanding and interacting with the values and views of the local community, but also with those of the tourism sector.

Representatives of the tourism sector were however not part of the development of the Joint Project. A closer integration with their perspectives and concerns can however throw light upon some of the reasons as for why the viability of the interpretive plans and the Deir Alla Regional Museum in particular were challenged.

First of all, the idea that a museum would automatically provide economic growth, was seriously questioned by several Jordanian tourism specialists and governmental representatives, since it would first require a large investment in wider tourism infrastructure in the region – at present, there are almost no restaurants, roads, car-parks, hotels and other such tourism facilities that were considered to be suitable from a tourism perspective – a situation which is not likely to change rapidly according to Jordanian governmental studies relating to the development of the Jordan Valley.¹⁷⁰

Secondly, it was mentioned that the Jordan Valley was not a priority at all for tourism development from the perspective of the Ministry of Tourism, nor was an emphasis on the scientific and archaeological perspectives towards a Bronze and Iron Age site such as Deir Alla considered to match the priorities for selection by the Ministry of Tourism in terms of national identity and tourism attraction (see above). In short, it would require a large amount of investment in conservation, restoration, presentation and infrastructure in order for Deir Alla to become a successful tourism attraction.¹⁷¹

In this sense, it is interesting to note that the plans for heritage management and the development of the regional museum do not explicitly consider which types of tourist should be attracted, and which values and narratives should be prioritised. Rather, it is automatically assumed that an emphasis on the scientific archaeological understanding of the Tell, together with a historic narrative based on the cultures of the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age – which had been prioritised by the Joint Project in their fieldwork – will suffice to attract international tourism. However, most tourists who presently come to Deir Alla are visiting for its biblical connotations. It is noteworthy that the archaeological find of the Balaam inscription, and the biblical connotations of the site at large with Succoth – an identification that has never been made

¹⁶⁸ Amman, June 2009.

¹⁶⁹ Local field worker at the Joint Project (Deir Alla, July 2009).

¹⁷⁰ According to the former Jordanian Minister of Water and Irrigation and the Minister of Agriculture for the period 2001-2005 (Email correspondence, November 17, 2009).

¹⁷¹ According to interviews with the Jordanian Representative to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee (Amman, May 2009); a Lecturer in Cultural Tourism at the Jordan Applied University College for Hospitality and Tourism Education and former member of the Jordan Tourism Board (Amman, June 2009); a senior staff member of Ministry of Tourism (Amman, July 2009); and the Former Head of the Queen Rania Institute of Tourism and Heritage, Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, November 2009).

nor published by the Joint Project –, are presently one of the main reasons why the site attracts international visitors. As can be read on a website with information on the ‘biblical history’ of Jordan, “archaeologists believe that the Jordanian hill called Tel Deir Alla is the site of biblical Succoth. And, it was here in Tel Deir Alla that evidence of Balaam was found.”¹⁷² In short, any interpretive and tourism development plan for the Deir Alla region would have to include the perspectives and needs by tourism representatives and visitors – not just assume that by emphasising the archaeological value and by building an archaeological museum, tourism benefits will follow automatically in the end (Nasser 2000).

This general concern and low attributed priority from a tourism perspective could, in my opinion, contribute to an understanding as of why the Ministry of Tourism did support the establishment of a regional museum formally,¹⁷³ but not actively or financially. In fact, the only financial contribution in the 1990’s from a Jordanian side were made through the handing over of a piece of land near the Agricultural Research Station by the Ministry of Agriculture to the DoA, and through the expressed dedication by YU to take care of future refurbishment.

A result of this, is that the aims behind the regional museum changed over time. First of all, the function of the centre as a museum was geared more explicitly to a combination with a research function as to accommodate the institutional motivations of the partners involved better, as well as to cope with the increasing ‘seriousness of the environmental situation’ and development pressure on the perceived fragile cultural and natural resources, leading to the rephrasing of the ‘Deir Alla Regional Museum’ proposal into the ‘Jordan Valley Research Centre and Museum’.¹⁷⁴

Secondly, it can be noted – perhaps ironically – that the aim by the co-directors of the Joint Project to abandon the idea of a small on-site exhibition – as well as the turning over of the DASAS archaeological station into a full museum in 2000 – in favour of a separate regional museum has lead to a situation in which the station continued to function as an archaeological research facility, whilst the aim for tourism attraction, site presentation and local community development were never realised. This illustrates how the delicate workings of the AAD within the institutional policies and practices of the Joint Project, as well as within the DoA and the Ministry of Tourism, eventually contributed to (often unintended) exclusionary project mechanisms that saw the prioritisation of archaeological and scientific values over local tourism and socio-economic values.

4.5.5 LOCAL PERSPECTIVES

So far, I have discussed some examples of the AAD within the Joint Project policies, and how it related to the values of other actors that could be identified within the social context of the archaeological project at Tell Deir Alla. I now wish to contextualise these discussions by exploring the location of the attributed values of the Joint Project in the framework of a significance assessment of Tell Deir Alla that could be derived from applying a value-based management approach (see section 2.3 and 2.6). I want to be clear here, by stressing once again that the values that I have identified during my fieldwork are by no means exhaustive, nor static, nor intrinsic – since values are dynamic and subjective, they also depended on my specific assessment of the management framework of Tell Deir Alla. My point here is, rather, to illustrate

¹⁷² ‘Biblical Archaeology: Prophet and the Earthquake’. Available at: www.aish.com/ci/sam/48965991.html [Accessed 26 November 2009].

¹⁷³ See for example correspondence by the Director General of the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (December 1993). Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹⁷⁴ This becomes particularly clear when looking at the titles of the proposal documents ‘Regional Museum at Deir Alla’ (1991) and ‘Jordan Valley Research Centre and Museum’ (2001) by the Joint Deir Alla Archaeological Project (Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University).

further that the current workings of the AAD in the Joint Project do only cover some of the possible values that could be identified, hereby effectively excluding a range of local values and actors within the process.

The site of Tell Deir Alla presently has a small tourist value, in the sense that the site attracts ca 5000 international visitors a year. In general, the international visitors to Deir Alla consist of biblical tourists from France, Germany, the USA and Japan, who generally seem to value Tell Deir Alla for the connotations of the site with biblical Succoth.¹⁷⁵ In addition, the Tell attracts archaeological tourists, which visit the site because of the long-standing archaeological research that has been undertaken at the Tell, and because of the historical and archaeological interpretations that have been offered by the Joint Project.¹⁷⁶ However, most of these visitors seem to be disappointed with the fact that there is no interpretive material, and that the stratigraphy and the archaeological remains are presently not restored, conserved nor presented – leading to short visitor stops as well as a low visitor experience;¹⁷⁷

In spring, you sometimes get maybe 30 people a day. But most buses go to Pella, they do not stop at Deir Alla. They only do small stops. Some people do not even get out of the bus. There is nothing now to see.¹⁷⁸

Importantly, this has often been mentioned as a problem from a local perspective as these short visits provide little economic benefits for the local community; “Things like panels, or information, that would be good for us – then they might stop and have coffee, or buy our drinks. But it would also be good for them – now they can learn nothing.”¹⁷⁹ The desire for increased tourist visits by the local community, is indeed closely related to their wish to attract more economic benefits to the municipality of Deir Alla. In addition, it can be noted that next to the discussed need to develop economic values in communication with stakeholders from the (governmental) tourism sector, there also is an expressed need for the inclusion of other regional and local government authorities, as well as with the private sector;

From time to time (we) send a memorandum to remember the government that they should not forget the archaeological site here. We are concerned and we need a partnership from the government and the private sector to try and get benefits and to attract more tourists from outside, to see the sites especially in the winter. We have other sites that tourists come to see like Pella, but we want them to see also the archaeological site in Deir Alla. The Department of Antiquities is part of the Ministry of Tourism, but it works alone in terms of management, but we need all the ministries.

¹⁷⁵ This is according to interviews with the local DASAS manager, inhabitant of Deir Alla (Deir Alla, July 2009) and the Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009). An example of this could be distilled through several informal discussions that I had with American and German tourists that visited Tell Deir Alla during the field-season as part of a ‘Biblical Tour’ (June 2009).

¹⁷⁶ This view was distilled through informal conversations with some German archaeologists that visited the Tell during the field-season (Deir Alla, July 2009), as well as with interviews with the local DASAS manager, inhabitant of Deir Alla (Deir Alla, July 2009) and the Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009). A similar perspective was also distilled through looking into the ‘visitor books’ at the local exhibition room at the DASAS.

¹⁷⁷ This view was brought forward by the Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009), and confirmed through several informal discussions that I had with American and German tourists that visited Tell Deir Alla during the field-season as part of a ‘Biblical Tour’ (June 2009). A telephone interview with the German Biblical tour operator behind this visit completed this picture (October 2009).

¹⁷⁸ Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009).

¹⁷⁹ Local owner of grocery shop and restaurant, located at the main road through the Jordan Valley, at the east-side of Tell Deir Alla (Deir Alla, July 2009).

<...> Till this moment, we didn't get any formal reply that something will be done, but we are trying to get the attention from all these ministries to the importance of these sites.¹⁸⁰

If you want to accomplish something like this, you need all the ministries, non-governmental organisations and the private sector, all of them. Otherwise you will accomplish nothing. There is value to be had in archaeology, as well as in tourism. We need to bridge the gap between the two, by emphasising the economic benefits for the local community. People here have five kids and no jobs – you first have to stress the economic benefits.¹⁸¹

Although the above discussed intentions by the Joint Project to develop a regional museum explicitly mentioned potential economic benefits for the local community through tourism development, this has unfortunately not lead to practical outcomes. As a result, the Joint Project presently offers only a relatively small local economic impact in terms of archaeological seasonal employment, whilst, in addition, there is a feeling within the community that this only benefits a handful of individuals. This is particularly worthwhile stressing in light of the fact that most inhabitants in the municipality of Deir Alla have a very low economic living standard.

It can also be noted that local governmental representatives were not involved in the Joint Project. The attribution of expertise by local DoA representatives to the foreign archaeological expert, in addition to remarks by the latest co-director from YU that the local major would not have to be involved as he was not an archaeological expert, are just some examples of this. An identification and involvement of local actors and values could however have thrown some interesting perspectives on the attributed significance to Tell Deir Alla in a local context. In this sense, it is worth noting that whilst local community members welcomed the idea of increased economic value through the development of the envisaged Regional Research Centre and Museum, they were far less interested in the presentation objectives of a museum per se. An emphasis on archaeological finds, multidisciplinary research and heritage awareness might well suit international tourists and archaeologists, but it was much more difficult to align with the views on interpretation and access by local community members themselves. During my interviews, it became clear for instance that local respondents did not feel comfortable with the idea of accessing a museum due to limited educational backgrounds, resources and available free time; “To visit a museum, you need time, education and money. We do not have this. People who have this, people from the city, they can come and visit.”¹⁸²

In general, their interest in visiting, understanding and identification with Tell Deir Alla was different. First of all, most people in the village did not seem to identify themselves with the Bronze Age and Iron Age history of the site, in contrast to the views by senior archaeologists of YU in the Joint Project; “The people who lived here at the Tell, I don't know who they are. They were not our grandfathers. My history is in Palestine”¹⁸³. My point here is not necessarily that the Joint Project should focus upon the local histories and historical identifications of the Palestinian refugees that came to Deir Alla in 1950 (although this is an important issue in light of the marginalised emphasis this receives in the process of national identity

¹⁸⁰ Mayor of the Municipality ('Department') of Deir Alla (Swalha, July 2009).

¹⁸¹ Lecturer in Cultural Tourism at the Jordan Applied University College for Hospitality and Tourism Education. Former member of the Jordan Tourism Board (Amman, June 2009).

¹⁸² Local inhabitant of Deir Alla (Deir Alla, June 2009).

¹⁸³ Local inhabitant of Deir Alla, wife of the local manager of DASAS (Deir Alla, June 2009).

formation by the State of Jordan (Groot 2008), but rather, that cultural identification of the local community with the history of the Tell can not be assumed.

The aim within the Joint Project to establish a local sense of pride, appreciation and cultural identification with the history and archaeology of the Jordan Valley through the establishment of a regional museum could therefore be questioned for its viability. As pointed out by Van Aken (2003) in his ethnography of economically disadvantaged Palestinian refugees in the Jordan Valley and in the Deir Alla region in particular, many national and international development programs failed in their attempt to place new agricultural and cultural landscape identities on these communities, as their primary cultural identification was that of a refugee ‘facing home’. Similar remarks could also be found by a Jordanian anthropologist who noted that “people here are very clear about their identity. They know who they are and where their families come from, its part of their life.”¹⁸⁴

Instead, I suggest that the identification of the local community with the Tell exists not so much with the history as interpreted by the archaeologists, but rather with the location and existence of the Tell in the heart of their village, and with the history of the archaeological excavations and the Joint Project itself. This is not only because the municipality carries the same name as the Tell, but also because of the fact that many inhabitants of Deir Alla identify themselves with the fact that there have been archaeological teams visiting the tell for 50 years. As a result, many families in Deir Alla have had members that worked at the Tell, which has lead to several long-standing feelings of personal friendships with the archaeologists. From this perspective, it was noticeable that many interviewees were more interested in old photographs and stories of the Joint Project than they were in the actual archaeological results.

Related to this, is the fact that Deir Alla was often mentioned by many archaeologists as an outstanding example of an archaeological Tell in the Jordan Valley. Belonging to the largest examples of such archaeological Tells in the valley, and situated within a rich cultural landscape (which has been an important archaeological research element in the ‘Settling the Steppe Project’ of the Joint Project), the Tell offers a very clear view of the cultural, natural and geographic setting of the Jordan Valley – something that, according to archaeologists of the Joint Project, should definitely be taken into account when formulating future presentation plans for the site of Deir Alla.¹⁸⁵ But whilst the scale and setting of the Tell within its landscape has played an enormous role in the way in which the local community valued the Tell, this was often mentioned in a different context – for them, the reason for visiting the top of the Tell was rather to be found in having family picnics, as well as in a place where children could play.

Such perspectives also help in understanding the critiques of several professionals in the field of Jordanian tourism management on the idea that protection of an archaeological site automatically yields public benefit, implicit in the AAD and in the following quotes by the Joint Project; “The recently made site-fencing ..., together with a guard, as well as the protecting mudbrick-and-plaster cover of the old sections are favouring the visiting possibilities already”.¹⁸⁶ From the perspective of these Jordanian cultural tourism experts, protection should however always be integrated with the presentation and interpretation of the site – a site that is protected, but not presented, has, in their opinion, no use at all. The fence that was created in

¹⁸⁴ Lecturer at the Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Irbid, November 2009).

¹⁸⁵ Such ideas were articulated in the unpublished proposal documents ‘Regional Museum at Deir Alla’ (1991) and ‘Jordan Valley Research Centre and Museum’ (2001) by the Joint Deir Alla Archaeological Project. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹⁸⁶ Unpublished Joint Project Project Proposal for the 2000 fieldwork season, handed in to the DoA in 2000, p. 5. See also the 1998 “Consolidation and Restauration” report. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

the late 1990's at Deir Alla is, most likely, indeed protecting the site from some damage by visitors, looters and animals. But the idea that a fence surrounding the Tell is a viable management option that would also enhance the (local) visitor experience, is questionable; "the DoA does not fully understand cultural heritage management – they think fencing, and doing some consolidation of the excavation, is enough. This is nonsense", according to the former Head of the Queen Rania Institute for Heritage and Tourism.¹⁸⁷ Such an approach is believed to be 'nonsense', since it limits access to the site whilst not enhancing its interpretive potential, and since it limits the active use of the site by the local community. The idea that a fence, although protecting the site, actually limits the feeling of ownership by the community to the Tell, could probably best be illustrated by the perception of the fence as simultaneously saying 'keep off, here are archaeological experts at work'. During my interviews with the inhabitants surrounding the Tell, it became clear that most villagers indeed regarded the fence as a boundary of the archaeological expert, with its main function being to stop children playing on the Tell;

The fence is there so that children can't play. <...> In springtime, we used to go to the top of the tell and have picnics. We sometimes still do that, but I don't like it that the fence is there, we now cannot just simply go there anymore.¹⁸⁸

Although local inhabitants can visit the Tell through the access gate on the eastern side, and that as such, actual physical access might not a problem, it became clear to me that the fence particularly played a role in limiting mental access, since it denoted clearly the boundary between the village, and that of the archaeological expert and the DoA; "I know why the fence is there. It is so that children cannot play there and damage the things you study."¹⁸⁹

The story-line in the AAD that cultural heritage management is similar to the protection of fragile and non-renewable archaeological resources, could also be found clearly in the language used by a Jordanian student of archaeology on the project;

We need to protect the sites. Children that play on the site are not good, they do damage. It should be better controlled. <...> We don't need courses in management. If it's important, we just protect it, we just put a fence around it. A fence is enough.¹⁹⁰

Another value that was attributed locally to Tell Deir Alla, related more to the use of the surrounding landscape. The surroundings of the Tell should in this sense not only be considered as very important from an archaeological research perspective of the cultural and social landscape (cf the 'Settling the Steppe' project), but also in relation to other demands and values that are placed on the immediate landscape. The land that was for instance handed over by the Ministry of Agriculture to the DoA in the late 1990's for the potential construction of the regional museum, is currently not used, although it is viable land that could be used for agriculture in the Jordan Valley;

¹⁸⁷ Amman, November 2009.

¹⁸⁸ Local inhabitant of Deir Alla since 1950, and cook for the Joint Project since 1984. Her house is opposite the west side of the Tell (Deir Alla, June 2009)

¹⁸⁹ Local inhabitant of Deir Alla, employed as household lady at the DASAS for many years. Her house is located on the slope of the Tell (Deir Alla, June 2009).

¹⁹⁰ MA Student of the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University, intern at the Joint Project (Deir Alla, July 2009).

We have given them land, planted trees, built a road, and looked after it – but nothing has happened since. I’m disappointed – it seems like they are only interested in excavating and excavating more <...> It has been years <since we gave them the land>, and we could have used the land for other purposes. Inshallah.¹⁹¹

The site is presently also valued by local community members for its educational potential;

They should translate some of their books in Arabic. Not only in museums or exhibitions, we don’t go there. Most people don’t go there. It’s very expensive. But most people can read. They should put it in the school library, local libraries. We have a library, you know.¹⁹²

Related to the educational value and the need for translation of research results, is the fact that many schools in the region visit the site at least once a year. However, some representatives of local schools mentioned that there are not sufficient interpretive and educational materials available at the site, nor did they regard the current exhibition room within DASAS as suitable for children. That the site is considered to be of educational value by teachers, can for example be illustrated by the fact that the current Head Mistress of the Deir Alla Primary School for Girls has translated and/or summarised the archaeological reports through a visit to the departmental library of the DoA in Amman into an official plaque at the entrance of the school, and through the fact that she brings students to the top of the Tell at least twice a year¹⁹³ – despite the fact that such local archaeology does not appear in the national curriculum (see for example Al-Husban 2006; Badran 2006). According to her, there was a real need for educational visits and programmes to the Tell, based upon evidence-based and hands-on learning – approaches that she already applies in her school in the framework of a World Bank initiated project. It is interesting to note in this respect that the DoA has recently set up an educational departmental facility, and that in the early years of 2000 a visit was made by the local DoA representative and the Jordanian co-director to one school in the municipality of Deir Alla. However, such visits were not considered to offer enough educational value by the teachers that I interviewed, since these were aimed mainly at providing a large historical overview of Jordan, and at emphasising the fact that children should not damage the archaeological resources – mirroring the previous discussed story-line in the AAD of education as a means to protect fragile resources. In summary, according to a local teacher of history, local schools “would love to visit the site, but there is no information in Arabic available, and we can’t access the site easily – children are not allowed to touch anything.”¹⁹⁴

Despite these examples of values that are attributed to the tell and its surroundings by a range of local actors, we have seen how the AAD, in combination with local and international institutional power structures and policies, inherently favoured scientific and archaeological values over other values, leading to a situation in which the development of other stakeholders’ values and benefits are postponed and excluded, despite the intentions by some of the Joint Project actors themselves. This process is however also dependent on the interests and agency by individual actors themselves. We will look at such processes in more detail below, by focusing in detail on the relationship between project policy and project outcomes.

¹⁹¹ Assistant Manager of the National Centre for Agricultural Research and Extension (Deir Alla, June 2009).

¹⁹² Local inhabitant of Deir Alla (Deir Alla, June 2009).

¹⁹³ Headmistress of the Deir Alla Primary School for Girls (Deir Alla, June 2009).

¹⁹⁴ History teacher at the Deir Alla Primary School for Girls (Deir Alla, June 2009).

4.6 PROJECT POLICY AND PRACTICAL OUTCOMES

4.6.1 INTRODUCTION

Table 02 shows the different values that have been brought forward in the project proposals, excavation reports and evaluation reports of the Joint Project since its early beginnings in 1959. I have tried to capture these values by looking at the main aims, visions and practices undertaken.

Phase 1 (1960-1967):	Scientific, Archaeological
Phase 2 (1976-1980):	Scientific, Archaeological, Collaboration
Phase 3 (1980-1987):	Scientific, Archaeological, Collaboration, Training
Phase 4 (1994-2009):	Scientific, Archaeological, Collaboration, Training, Tourism, Educational, Local, Socio-Economic

Table 02. The historic development of the main values as mentioned in the project policies of the Joint Project.

What can be seen in the historic development of values, is that the archaeological and scientific values have always formed the backbone of the Joint Project, increasingly incorporating collaboration, training and tourism values, leading to the explicit aim of providing sustainable socio-economic benefits for the local community in the 2000's.

Another trend that can be distilled is the spatial development of the scales of context in which the values were initiated. The early values (scientific, archaeological) were initiated and formulated in the Netherlands by Dutch actors, and reflected mainly the value of the project for the Dutch context whilst stressing the universal and global significance of archaeological research and knowledge. The second and third phases included values that were developed and attributed in partnership with the DoA and YU, and reflected mainly training and collaboration values by means of an aim to contribute to an independent Jordanian archaeology. It took till the mid 1990's, when for the first time local values were explicitly advocated in the project, by emphasising the socio-economic and educational benefits that could be derived from enhancing the tourism potential of Tell Deir Alla. This was advocated for primarily by the Dutch and Jordanian co-directors of that time, something that was strengthened by discussions between the Joint Project and with anthropologists that were undertaking research into the historical and social identities of the people in the Jordan Valley (see for example Tarawneh in press; Elmusa 1994; Van Aken 2003). Still, after the retirement from the project of the Jordanian co-director in 1996, the main driving force behind the call for local community benefits in the Joint Project was at the global scale in the Netherlands, since it was foremost the Dutch co-director that formulated these values, and that tried to involve local partners in the project – such values and involvement were arguably seen as less important by the Jordanian project actors of the DoA and YU in Jordan, as will be discussed below.

According to the Dutch co-director of the Joint Project, this reflected not only the increasing influence of the emphasis on the social and political contexts of archaeology in global academic debates in the 1990's, but also the fact that the Dutch co-director was heavily influenced by discussions that he had

with the Palestinian Director of Antiquities during additional projects in the West Bank in the late 1990's; "from him, I learned that there was a difference between archaeological and public benefit, and that the latter should always be kept in the foreground of what we do as archaeologists."¹⁹⁵ We will see below, however, that the mentioning of values in the project proposals and evaluations not always reflects the actual archaeological conduct of the Joint Project, illustrating the rather difficult relationship between project policy and outcomes, and the need for maintaining coherent project representations regardless of field practices.



Figure 10. Team meeting at the DASAS during the 2009 fieldseason (photograph by author).

4.6.2 PROJECT REPRESENTATIONS

It took till 1996, before a first 'consolidation and restoration report' appeared in the project proposals, which explicitly mentioned that "erosion should be prevented to preserve as much as possible of the

¹⁹⁵ Leiden, April 2009.

ancient site.”¹⁹⁶ The resulting years indeed witnessed some conservation and management work at the Tell, such as fencing off the Tell, the protection of several archaeological trenches, and some first visitor facilities in the sense of shelter at the base of the Tell (although this was not supported with maintenance strategies, and not explicitly integrated with the interpretive impact; several visitors that I interviewed interpreted the consolidated excavation trenches on the top of the Tell as a wall with a gate, a mistake easy to make for someone not trained in archaeology).¹⁹⁷ In any case, if one looks at the project policies of that time, the representation of the Joint Project increasingly included not only archaeological and collaboration values, but also the tourism values of the site.

But despite the new values in the project policy discourse of the Joint Project, and despite some work on the conservation and protection of the site, the actual project practice did not change that much – something that can best be illustrated through the fact that the project proposals and evaluations during the second half of the 1990’s and the early 2000’s largely stayed the same. What is noticeable however is that the policy discourses of the Joint Project, now more clearly geared towards heritage management values and the creation of tourism, allowed the different partners to continue to align themselves with the Joint Project, and to see it as a successful collaboration, despite its lack of clear practical outcomes in this respect. Story-lines that emphasised the protection and tourism development for instance fitted those of the DoA and the wider Ministry of Tourism, and story-lines that stressed local community values through socio-economic development fitted those of possible Dutch funders for the regional museum such as the Dutch Embassy (see below). It was therefore not so much the practices, but rather the policy discourses, or perhaps even intentions, to accomplish such outcomes that allowed for a successful collaboration and representation of the project. This could, interestingly, also be seen more recently when the former Honorary Consul General of the Netherlands (a Jordanian) mentioned, perhaps mistakenly,¹⁹⁸ that the Regional Research Centre and Museum was “the most important accomplishment of the whole project”, and even that it was a “wonderful example of scientific and financial co-operation” (AbuJaber 2009, 12-13).

Another example is provided by the representation of the Joint Project as an ‘archaeological rescue operation’, which was used explicitly in the project policies of the Joint Project from the mid 1990’s onwards, such as when referring to the archaeological excavations carried out at the nearby Tell Hammeh. In this regard, both the Jordanian co-directors of the 1990’s and 2000’s mentioned that the Joint Project was now not undertaken as a research project, but that all excavations in Deir Alla should be seen as a form of ‘rescue archaeology’ since the site was under increasing threat from infrastructure pressures, and that by doing so, the Joint Project was also contributing to the management and protection of Jordanian cultural heritage.

However, the labelling of the archaeological research work purely as ‘rescue archaeology’, something which the DoA increasingly regarded as a priority, is perhaps questionable. Although the Joint Project played an important role in making sure that the local municipality stopped with bulldozing parts away from both Tell Deir Alla and Tell Hammeh for infrastructure development in the 1990’s, it can be noted that archaeological work at Deir Alla and Tell Hammeh has continued since. As such, I believe that the

¹⁹⁶ ‘Tell Deir Alla: Consolidation and Restoration’, unpublished report (1996). Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

¹⁹⁷ This misinterpretation came to the fore during conversations that I had with American and German tourists that visited Tell Deir Alla during the field-season as part of a ‘Biblical Tour’ (June 2009).

¹⁹⁸ It might be possible that the former Honorary Consul General of the Netherlands confused the Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies (DASAS) with the Regional Research Centre and Museum.

excavations could be regarded mostly as a continuation of the research archaeology undertaken at the site since the 1960's, but now framed and represented to suit current insights and critiques better - all in line with the AAD story-line that regards archaeological excavations as a necessary response in relation to fragile heritage resources under threat (see section 4.4.2). The excavations at Tell Hammeh, for instance, were represented as being rescue archaeological projects, as such projects were 'explicitly asked for by the director of the DoA'.¹⁹⁹ Still, excavations at Tell Hammeh have continued ever since, up to the 2009 season; the main reason for archaeological research here should therefore, I believe, be regarded primarily in the research aims of the Dutch field supervisor, who has acquired his MA thesis and PhD on the back of the work, as well as in those of Jordanian students who were writing their MA theses on this topic. My point here is not that the excavations did not retrieve important archaeological information in the face of initial imminent threats of looting and destruction at the site, but rather that the original and main scientific aims became effectively represented as 'rescue archaeology'. In addition, it must be noted that other necessary activities in the field of conservation and management, such as the acquisition of land, consolidation of the excavated remains, and public presentation and awareness, had during the time of fieldwork not been undertaken.

Such issues become especially relevant when relating them to statements by several 'external' interviewees of the DoA that were not part of the Joint Project, as well as heritage tourism specialists, which regarded the continuation of archaeological research projects as a 'pollution';

Foreign archaeologists should take care of proper presentation, conservation and storage. Why? Well, because they are the ones that come and dig holes here, right? In Europe, you have the same system, when the polluter pays if a site is excavated but not threatened.²⁰⁰

It's better not to get a site in trouble, by just excavating and going, when it is not threatened. We have had enough research archaeology now. We now have to preserve and present.²⁰¹

As was discussed before, several senior Jordanian archaeologists also emphasised that the Joint Project was contributing to the local community with socio-economic and educational benefits, mentioning that the people in Deir Alla had 'based their lives around the excavations at the Tell', that they 'identified themselves with the history of the Tell', and that they were benefiting also 'economically and educationally';

I have the feeling that other joint projects are continuing just for a limited period of time with some strict limitations, where the local community did not benefit very much, and the sites also didn't benefit either. But at Deir Alla the community benefits.²⁰²

I have already looked above at some of the statements by people from the local community, which suggested that the educational and socio-economic benefits of the Project were actually not perceived as great, that the cultural identification of the local community with the history of the Tell is limited, and that there is a perception in the local community that the project benefits, and involves, only certain individuals

¹⁹⁹ Such statements were made in the unpublished Joint Project Project Proposals for the 1994 and 1996 fieldwork seasons. Joint Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

²⁰⁰ Assistant Professor Conservation and Heritage Management at the Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, June 2009).

²⁰¹ Staff member of the Department of Antiquities (Amman, July 2009).

²⁰² Former Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1976 till 1996 (Amman, May 2009).

and not the community at large. Previous sections have also dealt with how misinterpretations have been made through stressing the fact that the Joint Project was an equal partnership, although this was questioned by several partners and members of the project themselves. Based on the work of Mosse (2004; 2005; cf Latour 1996), I refer to this process as ‘representation’, whereby project practices are interpreted so that they appear the result of deliberate project policies – in this sense, interpreting some of the by-products of the archaeological fieldwork (such as developed friendships, minor job employment and initial rescue work) as deliberate results of an integrated collaborative archaeological approach.

This process of representation was also noticeable during the events and discourses surrounding the ceremony at DASAS in the summer of 2009, when the Dutch co-director was awarded a Medal of Honor by the president of Yarmouk University. What I thought was striking, was that the day on which the ceremony took place, was actually planned by the Dutch co-director as a day on which to bring together the major stakeholders of the Joint Project in order to hold a meeting on the future management of the Joint Project. In order to achieve this, not only the current partners of the Joint Project were invited, such as officials from YU and the DoA, but also local and regional governmental representatives, such as the mayor of Deir Alla and the governor of the Salt District. In addition, the Dutch Embassy was invited, as well as further experts and individuals that could strengthen the Joint Project, such as a representative of the Jordanian royal family with strong ties to the wider archaeological and tourism field. In my interviews with the people involved with the organisation of this day, I noticed that the meeting was soon used not for its abilities to strengthen the envisaged partnership by the Dutch co-director, but rather for more personal and institutional gains.

The DoA representative in charge of inviting the local representatives soon started referring to the meeting not as a ‘meeting’ anymore, but rather as ‘the party’. Using the meeting as an opportunity to strengthen his personal bonds with the project network, he soon after pressed for a more luxurious event that would also enhance his own status – something he openly admitted during a talk we had in his car, and something witnessed by myself when he continuously stressed for my presence when meeting local representatives.²⁰³ Not surprisingly, this led to some critique by the Dutch co-director, when he mentioned that “there will be no personal networking on my behalf.”²⁰⁴ Surprising, however, was that the Jordanian archaeologists of YU did not seem to express reservations over this – to the contrary, they also soon after started referring to the meeting as a ‘party’. When news arrived on the morning of the meeting that two of the major stakeholders, the mayor of Deir Alla and the director of the DoA were not coming, the reaction of the Dutch co-director was one of dismay, whilst the reactions of the Jordanian archaeologists of YU were rather ambivalent. The reason for this, I believe, should be sought in the fact that YU was planning the day as a ceremony whereby it could strengthen its relationship with Leiden University, and less with the DoA or with local representatives, despite its expressed intentions in this direction.

What was noticeable during the ceremony, and the accompanying field-trips and speeches, was a strong emphasis by the archaeological representatives of YU on the socio-economic and educational benefits that the Joint Project had provided to the local community, and on the further need for conservation, presentation, local community involvement, and tourism development.

²⁰³ Deir Alla, July 2009.

²⁰⁴ Deir Alla, July 2009.



Figure 11. Guided tour on Tell Hammeh during the 2009 ceremony at DASAS (photograph by author, 2009).

Despite being a likely reflection of their future intentions, I believe that the use of a discourse based on local community involvement and socio-economic benefits functioned primarily as to maintain political, scientific and financial support by strengthening the ties with Leiden University, since especially the Dutch actors had called for such values to be incorporated in the project – something reflected not only in the statements made by the current Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden during his visit to Deir Alla earlier during the 2009 excavation season, but also by that of the Dutch Ambassador. In addition, such a discourse fitted the values of other representatives of Embassies and NGO's present during the field-trip, and might even be placed in the fact that the Jordan Valley as a whole has a long history of (international) development programs (cf Van Aken 2003). What struck me was that a situation could develop in which a lot of visitors to the ceremony were talking about the need for community involvement whilst sitting in a bus on a field-trip to Tell Hammeh, whilst none of these local representatives were actually present. In addition, I had in mind the fact that several Jordanian archaeologists of the Joint Project had previously expressed that they did not see any reason to involve the local community in decision-making, as 'they were not archaeologists'. I also knew that the meeting overshadowed some feelings of exclusion by the DoA; "I feel the role of the DoA was not represented well at this meeting. Our role is much bigger. But I could not say anything, it is not my place <...> Something is destroyed now."²⁰⁵ The under-representation of the DoA was perhaps made most clear, when the DoA representative asked me to write several words of

²⁰⁵ Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009).

thanks to the Dutch co-director, that he presented to the Dutch co-director together with a small gift on behalf of the DoA – not publicly, but in private, after the ceremony.

What this means, I believe, is that a story-line in which archaeological projects were seen as a way to enhance community benefits through tourism development was used effectively as a means to strengthen and maintain project relationships and ownership by wishing to form a strong discourse-coalition with the LU and (Dutch) Embassy actors, rather than to actually orientate immediate practice. At the end of 2009, a meeting with local and regional actors, as well as with representatives of the tourism industry, had not happened yet, nor were they actively sought after by certain members of the Joint Project. In this sense, the Joint Project was produced and represented as being the result of a successful equal and local partnership through the creation of a network of supporting actors – a process which Latour has referred to as ‘contextualisation’ (cf Latour 1996, 137). At the ceremony, this success was produced by stressing the intentions of community and tourism development, as well as pointing to the fact that the Joint Project had resulted in many shared academic archaeological benefits. However, whilst such a success easily fitted the values of both YU and LU, it was more complicated to produce this in relation to the values and aims of the local community and the DoA.

4.6.3 THE UNCERTAIN FUTURE OF THE JOINT PROJECT

But why exactly was such an event needed at this time, in the presence of so many officials? I think the reason for this should be sought mainly in the idea that the fate of archaeological projects is tied not only to project policies, but also to individual actors, especially in relation to their capacity to acquire financial support from broader funding policies – perhaps best illustrated by focusing upon the events and perspectives during the recent retirement of the Dutch co-director of the Joint Project.

The news that the Dutch co-director would retire soon from Leiden University, seriously impacted upon the perceived chances by Jordanian actors of the survival of the Joint Project. This was especially so, because it had not escaped attention by the Jordanian counterparts that the Dutch Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of LU, together with the Dutch co-director and with myself, had made a visit a few weeks earlier to the West Bank to sign a new memorandum of understanding for joint collaboration with the Palestinian Department of Antiquities. This was often interpreted, I believe, as a deliberate move by Leiden University, and the Netherlands at large, to shift its archaeological focus westwards, to the West Bank;

After Jordan signed the peace treaty with Israel <in 1994> the Dutch government increasingly spend more money on the West Bank, and not on Jordan. That’s why we might have to stop the project.²⁰⁶

The uncertainty over the continuation of LU’s involvement in the Joint Project after the co-director’s imminent retirement was for example expressed to me during talks with senior archaeologists of YU and the local DoA representative after we came back from the West Bank. I was asked if I knew what the vision of our Dean was on this, and why we were ‘abandoning’ Jordan in favour of the West Bank. The weeks after our trip to the West Bank, and leading up to the ceremony, the Jordanian co-director thereby increasingly made open statements in front of the whole archaeological team in the dig-house, where he stressed the mutual friendship and collaboration of the Joint Project; “We have a wonderful project. We

²⁰⁶ Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1996 - 2009 (Deir Alla, November 2009).

have found the Balaam text, and the earliest iron-smelting. But it is not enough. We need to continue. <...> you are stuck to this. Leiden has an obligation to continue.”²⁰⁷

The ceremony where the Dutch co-director was awarded a Medal of Honour by the president of YU, during which the Joint Project was presented as a successful and equal partnership, was therefore regarded as a success by Yarmouk University representatives, the more so because the Dutch Ambassador had publicly stated that “the Dutch will and have to continue”²⁰⁸. The imminent danger of a dis-continuation of the Joint Project, became however once again visible a few months later during my second visit to Jordan. The Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project, now Dean of the Faculty of Anthropology and Archaeology of YU, expressed his distress to me over the fact that neither he, the President of YU, nor the Director of the DoA were invited to the retirement conference of the Dutch co-director in Leiden, something which they regarded as an insult to the Joint Project, but especially as a sign that Leiden University would end the collaboration.²⁰⁹ Such feelings were elaborated upon during a subsequent dinner at the house of the former Honorary General Consul of the Netherlands for Jordan (a Jordanian). Here, it was stressed repeatedly that Leiden University abandoned Jordan and the Joint Project;

Welcome to our world. Foreign institutions do not take their collaborations serious <...> In many cases, foreign teams come with their agenda, they make us an offer, we accept it, we join them, but actually it's their project, they are doing what they want to do, and at best, we are coping with that. But the main drive for the project remains in most cases the drive given by the foreign archaeologist.²¹⁰

To make a point to the contrary, the Jordanian Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology stressed that YU had always taken the Joint Project serious; “we always made sure that there would be someone in charge of the Joint Project – when I was not available for several years, YU appointed somebody else to take over the project.”²¹¹

What struck me however, is that the possible dis-continuation of the Joint Project was not only sought in the imminent retirement of the Dutch co-director, but also in a general shift in ‘Dutch policy’, despite the fact that the Joint Project had already been framed within several historical agreements and institutional collaborations (such as the contract for the DASAS between LU, DoA and YU) and the Memorandum of Understanding between Leiden and YU). This brings to the fore rather different expectations of the way in which project policies, institutions and individual actors relate to each other. In my interviews in Leiden with the Dutch co-director and the Dean of the Faculty,²¹² it became clear that the invitation process for the retirement conference, and the setting up of a memorandum of understanding with the Palestinian Authority, was not the result of a deliberate shift in institutional policy, but rather of the academic interest, personal friendships and financial opportunities of the individual archaeologists (see below). Moreover, it was felt that precisely because of the institutional agreements, the Joint Project would continue to exist.

²⁰⁷ Deir Alla, July 2009.

²⁰⁸ Deir Alla, July 2009.

²⁰⁹ Irbid, November 2009.

²¹⁰ Senior official of Yarmouk University (Amman, November 2009).

²¹¹ Amman, November 2009.

²¹² Leiden, October 2009.

This was however not interpreted as such by the Jordanian counterparts: “I saw that the Director of the Palestinian Department of Antiquities was invited, and that he will speak. So, Leiden is moving its focus to the West Bank and the future, not to Jordan and their history”.²¹³ A similar interpretation could also be seen in the perceived reasons as for why Leiden University, or ‘the Dutch’ had not succeeded in finding financial resources for the development of the Regional Research Centre and Museum, which some Jordanian actors saw as the result of a deliberate shift in focus towards the West Bank.

Implicit in these interpretations is the idea that the project policies of the Joint Project, as initiated by the Dutch archaeologists, were a direct reflection of a broader, over-all Dutch policy, or strategy, that administers the undertaking of archaeological projects abroad. In sections 1.4 and 3.2.1, where I touched upon the institutional and political framework of Dutch archaeology abroad (see also Slappendel *et al.* forthcoming), it was discussed that this is not the case. Although the Joint Project has always been undertaken by Leiden University, and framed within several historical institutional collaborations (see above), it has been undertaken by a range of individuals, of different faculties, and with different funding resources, initiating institutional collaborations and agreements when opportunities arose. The funding resources thereby have mostly been derived from the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO) in the 1960’s, to faculty funding in the 1970’s, 1980’s, and 1990’s, to a combination of faculty, university and government funding by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) in the 2000’s – all of which stressed the importance of academic research and the provision of curriculum teaching.²¹⁴ The idea of a singular ‘Dutch policy’ on archaeology in the Near East is therefore misinterpreted – it was the individual archaeologist that initiates and looks for funding sources to facilitate the project vision and policy, instead of the other way around. This is an important point, since several stakeholders in Jordan have expressed their views that ‘the Dutch’ have an historical obligation to develop the site of Deir Alla;

Deir Alla is the baby of the Dutch, and I thought the Dutch would have a certain loyalty to their baby. But they don’t <...> There is this curse of not really wanting to be generous. ²¹⁵

The instigation, outline and funding of the Joint Project was therefore heavily influenced by the individual Dutch archaeologists. The project policies thereby reflected the specific values and discourses of the individual researchers, in response to those of a myriad of funding programs in the field of culture, research and foreign affairs, institutional policies, cultural and archaeological policies and archaeological theory. As we will see, combined with the subsequent processes of value translation and policy negotiation with other actors in the socio-economic and cultural field, this contributed to the fact that Dutch funding and institutional policies do not have a simple one to one relationship with actual project outcomes – let alone that there is a single, overall Dutch strategy behind undertaking archaeological research abroad.

²¹³ Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1996 - 2009, now Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Deir Alla, November 2009).

²¹⁴ The Joint Project has never been funded within the framework of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, although the Dutch-co-director has tried to retrieve funds from this source for the development of the Regional Research Centre and Museum in the 1990’s.

²¹⁵ Honorary General Consul of the Netherlands for Jordan (Amman, November 2009)

Dutch financial policy negotiations

However, this does not imply that project outcomes were not influenced by such wider policies. When asked if the perceived shift in focus of Dutch archaeology from Jordan to the West Bank was the result of a deliberate shift in policy or strategy by Leiden University, the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology answered: “no, I guess the archaeologists are just following funding opportunities”.²¹⁶ The Dutch co-director for instance, has had increasing problems since the 1990’s to finance the Joint Project due to an increasing shift in internal policies by the Faculty of Archaeology in Leiden, which prohibited the transferral of funds from one financial year to another – a shift that became official policy in 2009. This meant not only that the funds needed to undertake large archaeological fieldworks seasons were not available easily, so that external financing had to be sought – it also meant that activities that were not linked to immediate scholarly research or student teaching could not easily be funded anymore.²¹⁷ In short, the instigation of all ‘extra-archaeological’ activities such as preservation, community development and outreach were all dependent on the individual researcher’s desire and his or her available resources. Coupled with the fact that most other funding opportunities for archaeological research in the Netherlands (such as those from wider academic university funds and NWO) were set apart for short-term projects with an increasing demand for accountability, scientific output and student training, this meant that long-term involvement of collaborative academic research projects and the undertaking of extra-archaeological activities became dependent on the individual’s commitment and desires.

The increasing attention by the Dutch co-director to the archaeology of the West Bank, was not a deliberate shift in policy of Leiden University – according to his own accounts, this was rather the result of personal friendships that developed, along with a research interest and a dedication to an independent archaeology in the West Bank; a dedication that had its roots in the work and commitment of Henk Franken, the first initiator of the Joint Project in the 1960’s. The archaeological projects in the West Bank that focused on research and institutional capacity building, undertaken from 1996 till 2000, were strengthened by these factors, but were primarily the result from a call for help by the Dutch representative for Palestine, who, in his turn, was approached by the Director of Antiquities in Palestine. This director had sought financial and scientific support from the Dutch representation, in order to undertake a ‘100 endangered sites’ project, that was designed to document and rescue these most significant archaeological sites in Palestine. The subsequent Dutch political governmental support for this project therefore provided a funding opportunity that fitted the research aims and commitment for an independent Palestinian archaeology by the Dutch co-director.

The specific funding for this project came from the Dutch budget schemes for ‘Culture’ and ‘Environment’, all within the broader funding policy for development aid from the Dutch Directorate-General for International Cooperation (DGIS) (Van der Kooij 2003; Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1999). The archaeological projects by Leiden University in the West Bank were as such facilitated by Dutch foreign affairs policy – however, they were not the result of deliberate archaeological aims within these policies. Rather, these funds could be made available mainly because of the personal interests by the Dutch Ambassador and his wife at that time, both of whom saw a great value for Palestinian society in the development of the study of history and archaeology of Palestine. Moreover, both of them recognised the potential of archaeology not solely for its academic and scientific purposes, but rather as part of an holistic and integrated approach towards the environment and towards institutional capacity building.

²¹⁶ Leiden, December 2009.

²¹⁷ According to the Dutch co-director of the Joint Project, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, April 2009).

With the arrival of a new Dutch Minister responsible for development aid in 1998, the Dutch policy shifted towards ‘priority countries’ (Van Gastel & Nuijten 2005; Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2006), which meant that Palestine could depend on an enlarged budget for development aid, whilst Jordan’s budget was stopped completely (Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1999). However, within these policies, ‘culture’ was not seen as an inherent part nor priority of financial aid anymore, which meant that continuing financial support for archaeological and heritage management projects was complicated.

This however changed again with new Dutch foreign policies for the Palestinian Authority from 2006 onwards, in which ‘culture and development’ was seen as a fundamental part (Netherlands Representative Office 2007). This provided new opportunities, especially in combination with the arrival of a new First Secretary of the Representative Office of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Palestinian Authority. This is because the impact of personal interests and values on the financing of certain projects was, as in the mid 1990’s as discussed above, still very great; “The smaller the projects, the bigger the impact and power of individuals. Both myself and the Ambassador still have a great freedom of choice when deciding how to spend our budgets for culture and development.”²¹⁸ What this means, is that this budget could be spend according to their insights, which made it very much dependent on the historical background and personal interest of individuals. During my stay in Palestine, where I travelled together with the First Secretary through the West Bank, it became clear that the archaeological projects by Leiden, as well as the newly formed memorandum of understanding between Leiden University and MOTA-DACH (2009), could count on his continuing support, not in the least because he was trained as an archaeologist in Leiden himself, and because he was aware of the potential social value of archaeological projects. As such, these projects could only be financed within the budget for culture and development, if archaeological research was interpreted as potentially providing sustainable benefits for the socio-economic development of Palestine. The translation of research values into socio-economic values was however easily made due to the specific values and discourses on archaeology by the First Secretary; “I think of culture, history, and therefore also archaeology, as fundamental elements in development aid”.²¹⁹

Because of the personal interest of the First Secretary, and his particular discourse on archaeology as inherently linked to ‘culture’ and wider heritage management issues such as preservation, site development and capacity building, the research elements of the Leiden archaeological projects were made possible. This discursive story-line, of an archaeology that functions foremost as a path to provide socio-economical and educational benefits to the public instead of prioritising scientific benefits per se, was shared by the Minister of Tourism and Antiquities of the Palestinian Authority as well by the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University – something that was very clear during the official ceremony in Ramallah on the 8th of June 2009 when the memorandum of understanding was signed. By using the same concepts, values and story-lines, all actors could easily translate their values to the memorandum and contextualized the project by aligning their values and fates to a future collaboration by means of a strong discourse-coalition.

The Dutch Embassy in Jordan, however, does not have a budget for culture and development, which means that the possible financial support for archaeological and heritage projects is more restrictive than those for Palestine. The budget for Palestine that can be used for ‘culture and development’ is around 150,000 euro per year (Netherlands Representative Office 2007), whilst in Jordan, the budget available for ‘culture’ at large is around 50,000 euro per year (cf Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2009; see below). The difference in budgets available is mainly the result of the fact that Palestine is a priority country for Dutch development

²¹⁸ First Secretary of the Representative Office of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Palestinian Authority (Jerusalem, July 2009).

²¹⁹ First Secretary of the Representative Office of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Palestinian Authority (Jerusalem, July 2009).

aid and international cooperation, whilst Jordan is not. What this also means, is that the budget available for culture in Jordan is not framed within a development aid perspective, which means that it is not linked to the budget available for socio-economic development, which is around 90,000 euro per year.²²⁰ This budgetary shift from the Netherlands in relation to Jordan happened in 1998, when Jordan was no longer perceived as a priority country. It is this policy shift, that is also often referred to by some Jordanian actors of the Joint Project as the major reason why the Joint Project could not find financial support for the Regional Research Centre and Museum;

<The Dutch co-director> tried to develop the museum on a larger scale. But it started to become lost between the new entity that succeeded the ZWO and the Ministry of Development Aid, and I don't know what and what. <...> the Dutch became more interested in financing, and they started to have their second thoughts about expenditures here and expenditures there. Mind you, Holland was one of the least daring in expending on technical assistance for foreign countries. They had their special countries, <...> these priority countries.²²¹

However, the potential for financial support for archaeological projects from the Dutch Embassy in Jordan is not solely dependent on the aims and scope of specific policies, but again, also on the individual's personal values and interests, and his or her discourse on what archaeology entails – or in other words, in which budget category archaeology should be placed;

Jordan is not a country that receives specific attention from the Netherlands for international cultural policy, so we have to cope with the lowest category in terms of policy and financing. That means that we receive a small budget, 50,000 euros per year to be exact, with which we can do whatever we want in the field of culture, in a broad sense. Cultural heritage is part of this <...> but also the promotion of Dutch culture in Jordan. Primarily to promote the intrinsic value of art itself, to facilitate the development of Dutch art and culture, but also to improve the image of the Netherlands. Financing for archaeological projects therefore should come out of this budget heading. We also have another budget, concerning development, socio-economic development, but archaeology does not fall under this category.²²²

The utility of a story-line of archaeology and cultural heritage as contributing to socio-economic development, is therefore partly dependent on the specific values, discourses and interests of the person in charge of the budgets at the Embassy;

The influence of personal interest on funding has always been quite substantial. These projects are very much delegated, we don't have to provide much accountability for small projects to The Hague. It also has to interest you personally <...> If you have, for instance, an ambassador who completely loves archaeology, then you will see that the focus shifts to that.²²³

In Jordan, this becomes clear if one looks at the personal interests of the former ambassador of the Netherlands (2003-2007), who was very interested in the history and archaeology of Jordan, and who actually published on this topic (Scheltens 2009). As a result of this personal interest, the former

²²⁰ Deputy Head of Mission, Royal Dutch Embassy (Amman, July 2009).

²²¹ Honorary General Consul of the Netherlands for Jordan (Amman, November 2009)

²²² Deputy Head of Mission, Royal Dutch Embassy (Amman, July 2009).

²²³ Deputy Head of Mission, Royal Dutch Embassy (Amman, July 2009).

ambassador has been a fundamental influence in re-developing the archaeological museum in Salt, using his personal network – despite the small budgets available for culture in relation to those in the West Bank;

What the former ambassador did, was to use his personal network. He asked some influential and wealthy families of Salt for financial contributions, and he matched to this some contributions from the Embassy. So, here you see how, through him, the embassy has played an important role; otherwise, the <renewed> museum would never have been there.²²⁴

Similar views on finding financial support for archaeological projects were expressed by the former Honorary General Consul of the Netherlands for Jordan (a Jordanian), also a passionate scholar in the history and archaeology of Jordan, and a close friend to Henk Franken, the Dutch initiator of the Joint Project;

Whenever he needed references, I helped Henk Franken. That went on for 20 or 30 years, until he retired. <...> I helped, because I had relations at the highest level. <...> With our royal family, and my relationships with your minister of finance, and Dutch companies and banks. <...> In that time, I developed a keen interest in archaeology, and became the president of the Friends of Archaeology and Heritage in Jordan for five years.²²⁵

To summarise, I believe that the impact of Dutch funding and institutional policies on the Joint Project has been substantial, but that this has been influenced to a large degree by the personal background, values and discourses of the actors involved. The development and scope of the project policies of the Joint Project has thereby also become dependent to a large degree on the Dutch archaeologists, and upon their subsequent role in processes of value translation and policy negotiation. This also meant that the continuation of the Joint Project became dependent on the fate, interest and values of the individual archaeologist – something that was seen as a limitation to the development of long-term international collaboration projects by stakeholders in Jordan, which increasingly call for firm institutional agreements and accountability.

The case of the Joint Project has also illustrated that the way in which the relationship between project policies and wider institutional and political frameworks are perceived by project partners in the Netherlands, is sometimes different from their counterparts in Jordan. Whilst the latter tended to perceive the project policies and practices as a coherent package, driven by a single vision on archaeological research abroad, these were actually more the result of the individual archaeologists values and discourses as a reflection of a myriad of cultural, institutional and funding policies. The different perspectives on the way in which the combination of Dutch policies related to the archaeological project outcomes, as such contributed to frictions over the perceived role and responsibility of Dutch archaeology in Jordan, and on the success of the Joint Project.

Nevertheless, the impact of the financial policies of the Faculty of Archaeology in Leiden and the scientific funding bodies in the Netherlands played a significant role in challenging opportunities for long-term collaborations and the undertaking of wider public and heritage activities because of their discursive emphasis on academic values. The focus on short-term accountability and archaeology as an academic endeavour, whose success depends on its capacity to produce research and teaching benefits, was one of

²²⁴ Deputy Head of Mission, Royal Dutch Embassy (Amman, July 2009).

²²⁵ Honorary General Consul of the Netherlands for Jordan (Amman, November 2009)

the major factors in this. The fact that research and institutional funding did as such not easily provide for activities in the sphere of heritage management and collaboration, meant that the development of such activities became partly dependent, again, on the commitment of the individual researcher.

Before I continue to reflect upon the role and responsibility of Dutch archaeological researchers in relation to the needs and values of others in society (section 4.7), I will focus in a little more detail on the role of Jordanian individual actors within the relationship between project negotiations and project outcomes. I will do this by arguing how the personal background and values of these actors played an important role in the implementation of archaeological policies, such as for example the Jordanian Law on Antiquities.

4.6.4 JORDANIAN POLICY NEGOTIATIONS: MAINTAINING OWNERSHIP AND ACCESS

“The Law of Antiquities in Jordan is a strong law, but weakly implemented”, according to a senior British archaeologist who has worked for several decades in Jordan.²²⁶ During the short field-trip around Jordan in the second week of my fieldwork, I could see the practical results of what was referred to by this statement. Many of the archaeological sites that we visited had an abandoned feel to them; fenced-off sites, with little to no interpretation, damaged architecture, and deserted excavations. What struck me however was not so much the lack of management and interpretation, but rather the critiques expressed by the students and archaeologists in this trip. Surely, it was concluded, the Department of Antiquities did not have an effective control over the management of archaeological sites; something that was more often attributed to a general lack of concern and even corruption, than to anything else; “Jordanians used to have more respect for foreign archaeology, we used to be able to do more. Nowadays, they are not concerned about archaeology anymore, only about money. And we let this happen, because of the postcolonial critiques in archaeology”.²²⁷ Such criticisms however seemed to be connected quite often to the way in which the DoA’s concerns and activities impacted upon the fate of the research interests of the individual archaeological students and academics themselves, and to the way in which the individual archaeologists influenced the archaeological policies, and vice versa.

The impact of individual interests on the negotiation and enforcement of archaeological policies in Jordan became clear to me after looking in more detail to the history of the Joint Project, as well as after talking to several archaeologists and heritage professionals that were outside the direct sphere of influence of the project.

In the first phase of the Joint Project, in the 1960’s and early 1970’s, the DoA was responsible for the enforcement of an Antiquities Law that was formulated during the British Mandate (see for example Simpson 2007; Groot 2008; Maffi 2009; AlGhazawi 2011). According to several Jordanian and foreign archaeologists and government officials that worked during that time,²²⁸ this law was not strongly enforced by a DoA that was generally understaffed and under-skilled, but also because the directors of that time were mostly concerned with facilitating the needs and wishes of foreign archaeologists; “one of the

²²⁶ Amman, November 2009.

²²⁷ Dutch MA student of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (May 2009).

²²⁸ This was according to the Director of the Department of Antiquities himself (Amman, June 2009); the Jordanian Head of Excavations and Research at the Department of Antiquities from 1976 – 1979 (Amman, November 2009); the Dutch co-director of the Joint Project (Deir Alla, June 2009); the Director of Archaeological Conservation for Africa, Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia of the World Monument Fund (Amman, July 2009); as well as during conversations with several French, American and British archaeologists (Amman, July 2009).

Department directors told me that our role is to facilitate the work of others, not do initiate the work of others.”²²⁹

In an analysis of the marginalisation of the Islamic past in the archaeology of Jordan, this context has also been named as one of the reasons why foreign archaeologists could work on the basis of individual agreements, instead of by law (Simpson 2007). According to the present Director of the DoA, this system attributed to the fact that foreign archaeologists were allowed to export archaeological artefacts and materials out of the country (cf Maffi 2009), and to a situation in which interpretations of archaeological data remained unchallenged by Jordanian counterparts – an historic condition that, in his opinion, still lingered in the present situation; “the new permits should be with institutions, not individuals. And they should work not by habit, but abide by the law <...> But you know, people try to get away with it, it’s what they are used to.”²³⁰

In 1976 the DoA developed a new vision and a new temporary Antiquities Law to try and change this situation.²³¹ This vision, which was geared towards “bringing back the ownership to Jordan” and towards providing more benefits for the public of Jordan,²³² was heavily influenced and supported by the co-director of the Joint Project, the Head of Research and Excavation of the DoA at that time. This new provisional Antiquities Law stated, amongst other things, that from now on artefacts were no longer the ownership of those who found them through excavation, but rather from the Jordanian Government as represented by the DoA (see AlGhazawi 2011 for a translation of the revised Antiquities Law). Henk Franken, the Dutch counterpart of the Jordanian co-director of that time, supported this strongly, several years later also in his capacity as official advisory to Jordanian archaeological matters (Van der Kooij 2006, 13) – which was strongly grounded in his dedication to establish a strong and independent Jordanian archaeology. For a while, this new Jordanian law provided a legal framework for the archaeological activities that were already undertaken at the Joint Project. However, also this law soon became less influential, and less strongly enforced, with the transfer from the Jordanian Head of Research and Excavation of the DoA to Yarmouk University in 1979 (something that was already discussed above), and with a subsequent series of directors that resembled the more administrative line of their predecessors in the 1960’s.²³³ It is noticeable that the enforcement of the Antiquities Law was also challenged now by the former Jordanian Head of Research and Excavation, but now in his capacity as the first Director of the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology at YU and co-director of the Joint Project. Advocating the story-line that archaeology should benefit the Jordanian public and unhappy with the fact that the law was not enforced strongly anymore, he started demanding the archaeological finds from the excavations of the Joint Project, so that they could be displayed at the newly formed Yarmouk University Museum.²³⁴ What is striking about this, is that he implicitly challenged the idea of a state ownership of archaeological artefacts, and by doing so, worked against the Antiquities Law that he had been fundamental in setting up himself. The development and enforcement of the Jordanian Law of Antiquities was as such influenced by the

²²⁹ Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project and Head of Excavations and Research at the Department of Antiquities from 1976 – 1979 (Amman, November 2009).

²³⁰ Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009)

²³¹ For a concise overview of the history of the DoA, see the website of the DoA: <http://www.doa.jo/doa1.htm> [Accessed 5 May 2012].

²³² Former Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1976 till 1996 (Amman, November 2009).

²³³ According to several interviews and conversations with the former Head of Excavations and Research at the Department of Antiquities from 1976 – 1979 (Amman, May and November 2009); the Director of the Department of Antiquities (Amman, June 2009) as well as with the Dutch co-director of the Joint Project (Deir Alla, May-July 2009).

²³⁴ Former Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1976 till 1996 (Amman, November 2009).

historical backgrounds, values and interests of individual actors, and by the perceived benefits that could be derived from its implementation – a process that was also illustrated when discussing the process of value translation in section 4.5.

Another result of the move by the Jordanian co-director to YU, is that the Joint Project was strengthened by a collaboration with the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology as a third partner – which soon became a stronger partner in the collaboration than the DoA (see section 4.5). The relatively strong position of the YU in the Joint Project, and the rather weak position of the DoA and its enforcement of the Antiquities Law, became challenged again when another, subsequent Dean of the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology of YU in the late 1990's became the new Director of the DoA in 2000. It was this director, who started to enforce the Law of Antiquities more strictly again, and who challenged the practical ownership over archaeological sites by academic projects, resulting in a more strict policy on handing out excavation permits²³⁵ – thereby increasing his power over the archaeological field in Jordan.

The enforcement of legal power over the ownership and responsibility of the archaeological process and resources, is however not solely the result of a power struggle between the DoA and the Jordanian universities. The fact that it becomes increasingly more difficult to acquire excavation permits is not restricted solely to Jordanian, but also to foreign academic institutions, reminding us of the difference in attributed values to the archaeological process between the archaeological academic institutions and that of the DoA that I discussed in section 4.5; “Not enough people benefit from these archaeological projects. If we don't get benefit for the general public of these projects, why should we allow the archaeologists to excavate?”²³⁶

When I was visiting the DoA during the summer of 2009, I heard from several foreign archaeologists that they had difficulty with acquiring the necessary permits for excavation. In response to this, it was suggested that the DoA was ineffective, and/or that they had started the process of acquiring the necessary personal clearance from the ‘secret police’ too late. Another critique that was heard often was that the current director of the DoA was an epigraphist, and not a ‘real’ archaeologist. Presumably, this might be reasons as for why foreign teams could not get permits to excavate; not only the Dutch, but also several other American, English and French excavation teams were waiting for a permit; “even famous archaeologists!”²³⁷. The perspectives of the DoA in this regard were different;

<They are> always late with their applications and proposals, and send it apart, separate, different times. We have many projects, little staff and time, we are busy. It is a waste of our time and energy. They have an ethical responsibility in that respect as well <...> European and American attitudes and cultures are different <from ours>. The mentality is still very much one of ‘we are standing above you, we know what's best’. They play tricks, they try to cheat you.”²³⁸

²³⁵ This was according to the Director of the Department of Antiquities himself (Amman, June 2009), but such a view could also be distilled through interviews with for example the Dutch co-director of the Joint Project (Deir Alla, June 2009); the Director of Archaeological Conservation for Africa, Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia of the World Monument Fund (Amman, July 2009); as well as during conversations with several French, American and British archaeologists (Amman, July 2009).

²³⁶ Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009)

²³⁷ French archaeologist, whilst discussing matters of excavation licensing in front of the DoA office (Amman, July 2009).

²³⁸ Head of Excavation and Research of the Department of Antiquities (Amman, June 2009).

This situation led to a heated discussion during an archaeological conference in Amman on the Prehistory of Jordan,²³⁹ after the Director of the DoA had heard that Jordanian universities had teamed up with foreign counterparts outside of his knowledge – something about which he expressed reservations to me during an interview, since it would, in his opinion, lead to diminished financial income and capacity building for the DoA, less attention to conservation, and a weaker position of the DoA in relation to Jordanian university demands.²⁴⁰ One reason behind this, is that foreign archaeological team do not have to pay the 10% preservation fee if they have a partnership with a Jordanian university. From the perspective of the Dutch co-director, this situation was actually regarded as strengthening the partnership with the DoA, since he interpreted this as a sign that the DoA was contributing financially to the Joint Project as well. However, the perspective by the Director of the DoA was different;

Look, the Dutch have everything. They have an archaeological station, for free, they don't pay the preservation fee. They never have to pay these things, because we have what they call a historical collaboration. Well, that means that they have ethical obligations to do something more with the site, right?²⁴¹

In addition, it is worthwhile repeating here some perspectives on the inherent power structures of foreign archaeological projects by both Jordanian as well as foreign archaeologists themselves;

I don't think the <DoA> has the means to influence what an archaeologist coming from a foreign country wants to do. I don't think that there is a policy from the DoA that can guide the foreign archaeologists to a certain kind of approach to the archaeology of Jordan.²⁴²

The law is enforced by our Department, but it doesn't work. Sometimes it is internal pressure, sometimes external pressure. It has happened that sometimes ambassadors make sure that preservation fees don't have to be paid by putting pressure on the Department.²⁴³

As a result, <foreigners> influence the implementation, not so much the policy making. People of the DoA do not have the level of confidence to say 'no' to foreigners.²⁴⁴

Such statements and discussions bring us back to the perception that the DoA does not have full control over the ownership and responsibility of the archaeological resources and projects in Jordan in relation to academic demands, especially not when faced with foreign archaeological and political pressures. With this in mind, I will conclude this chapter by further reflecting upon the role and responsibility of foreign archaeological researchers in relation to the values and demands of others in society.

²³⁹ This conference was called 'Jordan's Prehistory: Past and Future Research', organized by the DoA in collaboration with several foreign research institutes in Jordan from 25 - 28 May 2009.

²⁴⁰ Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009).

²⁴¹ Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009).

²⁴² Archaeologist of the American Centre for Oriental Research (Amman, July 2009).

²⁴³ Assistant Professor Conservation and Heritage Management at the Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, June 2009).

²⁴⁴ Italian archaeologist with a long fieldwork experience in Jordan (Amman, July 2009).

4.7 THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF FOREIGN ARCHAEOLOGISTS

I have already discussed some of the processes whereby actors produced the Joint Project as being a successful and equal partnership by tying their fate to that of the project, and by representing the project policies and outcomes in such a way that they appeared to be the result of a deliberate integrated collaborative archaeological management approach, processes which I referred to as ‘representation’ and ‘contextualisation’. Similar processes could be discerned, I believe, in the way in which the Joint Project is labelled as being ‘(un-)ethical’ and/or ‘(post-)colonial’ and in the way in which the responsibility of the Dutch actors is represented and played out in the negotiations of the Joint Project.

Jordanian archaeological academics that were currently involved in the Joint Project stated that the project was of ‘postcolonial value’, and that it was ‘sensitive’ to the needs of Jordan.²⁴⁵ When asked what the future of the Joint Project should look like, especially in light of the imminent retirement of the Dutch co-director, the rhetoric suddenly changed into stressing the ‘historical obligation’, ‘ethical responsibility’ and ‘moral duty’ of the Dutch partners to continue the archaeological field-work at Deir Alla; “Can you imagine that other nationalities come and dig at Deir Alla? Continue what work you already started. It’s a historical obligation, an ethical responsibility.”²⁴⁶ A story-line on the need to continue archaeological excavations and research for the public benefit, as a reflection of the AAD, could also be discerned by the local DoA representatives that were employed by the Joint Project; “We need to continue excavating with the foreigners, to learn and to discover new things, to increase our knowledge of the history. The Dutch team should stay and help us with this.”²⁴⁷

It can be noted however that many of these interviewees also had a clear personal benefit by the continuation of the archaeological work, since it would automatically lead to research benefits in terms of publications and training, as well as in job and career opportunities. Such views were for example expressed by the students who were working on the project and who needed the data for their dissertations and essays, and by the archaeologists who were using the data for their publications. This could also be seen for example by the local DoA representatives; “Yes, I need this project to go on. There is a lot of work for me to do <...> People here need two jobs, you know”.²⁴⁸

In comparison, several people who were not part of the Joint Project (anymore) perceived the future role and responsibility of the Dutch archaeologists as entirely different. These stakeholders, by and large, stressed the fact that it was primarily the Jordanian partners that were accountable for the lack of clear results in the sphere of community involvement, tourism development and site management, and that it was these partners, and not the Dutch, that should address this in the future;

If the people in Deir Alla don’t benefit from the archaeology, then the office of the Department <of Antiquities> is not doing its job well enough <...> I assure you they have more money, and more logistics, not than the Dutch government, but than the archaeological team from Leiden. I think people make it too easy for them.²⁴⁹

²⁴⁵ Interview with two senior academic archaeologists of the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology of Yarmouk University who were part of the Joint Project team in the 2000’s, as well as with the co-director of the Joint Project from 1996 - 2009 (Deir Alla, June 2009).

²⁴⁶ Jordanian co-director of the Joint Project from 1996 - 2009, Professor of Archaeology at the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Deir Alla, June 2009).

²⁴⁷ Representative of the Department of Antiquities for the Joint Project (Deir Alla, June 2009).

²⁴⁸ Director of the Middle Jordan Valley Office of the Department of Antiquities (Deir Alla, July 2009).

²⁴⁹ Jordanian anthropologist specialized in the socio-political and economic context of the Jordan Valley (Amman, November 2009).

The Dutch co-director has not succeeded in finding Dutch money. But we can't say that because it is an historical obligation, now nothing can't happen. He pushed this, yes, but who said, ok, where is plan B? <...> We have a 50 million dollar university here. <...> Don't we have the responsibility over the people in the Jordan valley? We should not think of Leiden as Santa-Claus.²⁵⁰

This is our country, our people, our history, our problem. Don't think we can not build a museum if we would want to.²⁵¹

Well, after 50 years we should say thank you. It is the responsibility of the directors here in Jordan. If the Dutch team can help, this is something up to them, but it is our responsibility.²⁵²

The attributing of responsibility therefore seems not only subjective, but also closely linked to the perceived benefits that could be derived from this – the ethical, historical and moral obligation to continue therefore became often something like a 'card' that was played by certain actors as to pressure the Dutch to continue. Nevertheless, I believe that this does not imply that foreign archaeologists do not have to take responsibility at all – not in the least because they clearly benefit from the undertaking of archaeological projects themselves.

First of all, through the workings of the AAD and related processes of value-translation and policy negotiation, foreign archaeologists are often attributed expertise and ownership to deal with wider management issues in Jordanian archaeology, and to include other values and stakeholders in the process. This process is strengthened by the fact that foreign archaeological teams not only had an historical impact on the development of Jordanian archaeology, but also that they still have a position of power over the degree to which the Antiquities Law in Jordan is implemented – for example also through the fact that those DoA representatives that have to supervise the quality of archaeological fieldwork, are the same who have to be trained in what exactly archaeological methodological and interpretive quality entails; "I'm here to learn, especially the new techniques in archaeology. This year, I learned about ground radar. <...> I also am responsible for quality supervision and the subsequent handling of objects."²⁵³

In addition, it is the story-lines of the AAD, coupled with a field-work involvement at certain sites, as well as with a global access to academic networks and funding resources that leads to the perception that foreign archaeologists have an ownership and expertise to deal with archaeological sites resources. Moreover, foreign archaeologists are often instrumental in the instigation, development and subsequent value-translation and negotiation of project proposals, such as could be seen with the Dutch archaeologists in the Joint Project. Finally, the inclusion of local actors as equal project partners in archaeological research projects depends for a large degree on the successful brokering of the foreign archaeologist – the local mayor of Deir Alla, for example, needed the contacts and networks of the Dutch co-director in order to be involved in the project process.

In short, through the workings of the AAD and the related value-system in Jordanian archaeology, foreign archaeologists are often attributed a position in which they have to make decisions about if, and when other actors and values are to be included in the archaeological project, apart from the actual archaeological

²⁵⁰ Deputy Dean of Research and Science, Yarmouk University (Irbid, July 2009).

²⁵¹ Assistant Manager of the National Centre for Agricultural Research and Extension (Deir Alla, June 2009).

²⁵² Mayor of the Municipality ('Department') of Deir Alla (Swalha, July 2009).

²⁵³ Representative of the Department of Antiquities for the Joint Project (Deir Alla, June 2009).

value that he or she might actually feel comfortable to deal with; “it is a rather absurd reality, but the power that is attributed to western specialists is still very great. It should not be like this – but it is, and that brings responsibilities.”²⁵⁴

Taking up such a kind of responsibility does not necessarily have to be considered as ‘neo-colonial’, according to several Jordanian academics that I interviewed. On the contrary, it was felt that this was actually desirable, as long as such taking up the attributed responsibility and expertise would not be used for gaining personal and academic access and ownership over archaeological processes;

You can make <archaeology> a concern for everybody, for all stakeholders. It can be done, even with this fragmentation. Think about your former ambassador. He had an integrated view. And he had power as a foreigner. Archaeologists can do this as well. This is the duty of the foreign mission. Everyone will tell you that there is problem between the DoA, the Ministry of Tourism <and with local community concerns>. But you can work with this fact.²⁵⁵

You have a system that listens to all agents. And you come here, and see a system that doesn’t work. I think it is your duty to work with this. It is not a kind of new ideas you are bringing, enforcing them upon us. No, I’m saying it is the other way around. Some archaeologists are taking advantage of this. They come and dig <...> and they don’t care about the fact that the system is not working, which is wrong. And you know that it is wrong.²⁵⁶

In addition, it was mentioned by several Jordanian interviewees as well as by a range of senior European archaeologists, that foreign archaeologists should not try and be ‘overly sensitive to former colonial relationships’, as, in their opinion, this continued to have a negative role on the development of a mature Jordanian archaeological heritage management field. One example of this, is the perception that foreign archaeologists often played along with allowing Jordanian archaeologists to put their names on publications since they were partners, and since they needed these for institutional promotion;

There is a tendency in Jordan to adopt a colonised attitude. They want you to write papers, so that they can put their names on <it> and increase their personal status and career <...> We as overseas archaeologists have played along with this for far too long; actually, we have contributed to this system by agreeing to it. <...> Overseas archaeologists often do this, I think, for two reasons. They need local partners on paper, because it suits their funding and needs for public relations. But they also are too friendly and go ahead with this game, whilst thinking they play a postcolonial game. They are afraid of criticising their Jordanian colleagues, they are afraid of being colonisers. But by doing so, they actually contribute to this mutual colonial relationship. I think there is a tendency that researchers from overseas are sometimes too delicate in these things.²⁵⁷

What this implies, I believe, is that foreign archaeologists should take up their responsibility by facilitating and advocating a value-based approach towards archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration that engages with the values and wishes of actors on all levels of Jordanian public society –

²⁵⁴ First Secretary of the Representative Office of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Palestinian Authority (Jerusalem, July 2009).

²⁵⁵ Assistant Professor Conservation and Heritage Management at the Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, June 2009).

²⁵⁶ Associate Professor of Anthropology, Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University (Irbid, November 2009).

²⁵⁷ British archaeologist (Amman, July 2009).

an idea, that has been existent in the Joint Deir Alla Project to a certain degree, albeit often implicitly formulated.

This also means advocating for changes in the national academic and governmental archaeological heritage management structure of society by ways of transferring skills, knowledge and power (cf Rizvi 2008, 122) – not only to archaeological academia, but also to the DoA and to local community members. Such an integrated approach towards archaeological projects would also include an involvement with education, site management, tourism and local community development. However, this does not automatically imply that foreign archaeologists should become heritage managers themselves;

The idea of foreigners taking on the role of heritage managers is not sustainable. As a heritage manager, you have to be on the site all the time. Also, you need an understanding of everybody's role <...> The more people with stakes and ideas, the more problematic it is to find a solution. Foreign archaeologists have to deal with all of them. And they can try to change things. But the ultimate change comes from policies and capacities in Jordan. Still, if they are concerned, they should speak and advocate for the site, its protection, its management, and its excluded stakeholders.²⁵⁸

There should be more reliance on local expertise. Do things with them and for them. We have good expertise in Jordan. ²⁵⁹

Such an approach would eventually entail challenging and de-constructing the AAD in project policies, through story-lines that do not solely focus on global, future generations and knowledge production, but also on present, local generations by advocating for the inclusion of their values at the start of the archaeological process.

From a Dutch perspective, this would also entail challenging the attribution of expertise, ownership and decision-making power of foreign archaeologists by de-constructing the AAD in archaeological curricula, and by contributing to a change in the institutional and financial frameworks of Dutch archaeological research abroad. This chapter has already discussed the impact of the AAD in Dutch financial frameworks, but I believe it is important here to bring forward some final perspectives on this issue by directors of several European archaeological institutions in Jordan, as well as by Jordanian actors themselves;

Most of the grants which are coming from Europe to dig in Jordan, generally they give just money for excavation. <The granting agent> should make it compulsory for the excavator to reserve a part of their budget for preservation <...> It's a shared fault, a shared problem. The granting agent and the receiving agents. If this will happen, preservation will finally become a real part of the process.²⁶⁰

In many ways, you know, you shouldn't apply for a grant that simply allows you to excavate, but rather your funding should cover all those aspects as well. Otherwise, it's better not to get the site in trouble, by just excavating and going.²⁶¹

²⁵⁸ Former Head of the Queen Rania Institute of Tourism and Heritage, Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, November 2009).

²⁵⁹ Member of the royal Jordanian family, former member of the Jordan Tourism Board (Amman, June 2009).

²⁶⁰ Assistant Professor Conservation and Heritage Management at the Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, June 2009).

²⁶¹ Former Head of the Queen Rania Institute of Tourism and Heritage, Hashemite University in Zarqa (Amman, November 2009).

There is a major problem with the university and academic funding of these projects. They all come with one or two year budgets, and so make one or two year plans for the site. As a result, they focus on archaeology and on training their students, because that's what can be achieved and that's what they know and are expected to do from their funders.²⁶²

Because of the increasing demands for accountability through the British funders, and the limited time budgets for projects, people find it difficult to include the time <in their projects> to establish meaningful collaborations and to talk to stakeholders; but such things need time, especially in Jordan. These are practical issues that undermine people's best intentions.²⁶³

The idea that a focus on archaeological and scientific values with an increasing short-term demand for accountability within funding policies contributes to diminished opportunities for heritage management, collaboration and long-term involvement, becomes all the more important when realising that the long-term involvement has been mentioned as one of the main reasons as for why the Joint Project was regarded as a successful project from a Jordanian perspective. Such long-term commitment should however be based upon firm institutional agreements as to make sure that the fate of projects is not overly dependent on the fate of individuals, upon value-based approaches that identify and facilitate the values and wishes of all involved, as well as upon a critical reflection of the AAD in project policies. Taken together, this might even help prevent perceptions that question the sincere commitment of foreign archaeologists – such as those with which I started this chapter.

²⁶² Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (Amman, June 2009).

²⁶³ Director of the Council for British Research in the Levant (Amman, November 2009).

Chapter Five: The Santa Barbara Project

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Leiden University behaved like an ordinary project developer. <...> What did all these promises of collaboration mean?²⁶⁴

What we know about the Indians has been written by the Spanish, and now by the Dutch and the Americans. <...> It's all hidden from us. It's private, just like Santa Barbara Plantation.²⁶⁵

We wanted that the project should be used for the development of local capacity and knowledge <...> but we did not succeed, we could not succeed in my opinion, in maintaining good relationships.²⁶⁶

It was a professional project that preserved the archaeological values, but still they tried to work against us <...> in the end, it was a successful project. There was no delay, good PR, an example of how developers should deal with archaeology.²⁶⁷

The above statements,²⁶⁸ made by the director of the foundation 'National Archaeological Anthropological Memory Management' (NAAM) in Curaçao, a local community member, the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University and a director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV respectively, are illustrative of quite different perceptions of success and failure towards the Santa Barbara Project.²⁶⁹ Similar to my introduction to the case study of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project in chapter 4, I wish to point out that it is not my intention to claim whether these statements are false or true. Rather, my purpose here will be to illustrate how such differing perceptions of success and failure could have developed – only several years after the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University and NAAM had agreed to increase collaboration and public outreach in archaeological research and heritage management in Curaçao.

²⁶⁴ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

²⁶⁵ Former local school teacher (Montaña Rey, July 2010).

²⁶⁶ Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, April 2010).

²⁶⁷ Co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

²⁶⁸ All quotes by respondents in this chapter are translated from Dutch to English by the author unless stated otherwise.

²⁶⁹ The project has also been described by archaeologists from Leiden University as the 'Spanish Water Project', referring to the specific site on which research centred. However, I have chosen to use the broader term 'Santa Barbara Project' as it was this connotation that was used mostly by other actors and respondents. I use the term 'Santa Barbara Plantation Project' when describing the tourism development scheme of Santa Barbara Plantation NV.

When discussing the original intentions behind the Santa Barbara Project with the individual researchers of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, and when placing these in a wider framework of their experiences with previous projects in the Caribbean, a clear understanding and willingness came to the fore about the importance of integrating archaeological projects firmly in the social context. An inclusion of issues such as capacity building, heritage management, education and local (indigenous) community participation, could as such clearly be identified in the original aims of the ‘Antillean and Aruban Heritage’ Project, the project proposal out of which the Santa Barbara Project originally developed: “The care <of cultural heritage>, the practice of further research as well as the support of local institutions and the capacity building of local frameworks are of utmost importance. In particular, a lot of attention will be given to public presentations aimed at contemporary inhabitants”.²⁷⁰ The issue here at stake, therefore, is why such expressed ‘good intentions towards collaborative archaeology’ (cf La Salle 2010) did not succeed as planned in Curaçao.

5.1.2 STRUCTURE OF CHAPTER

This chapter will follow the methodology as outlined in chapter 3. As a result, its structure closely resembles the outline of the case study of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project. Although comparisons between the case studies will be made, the study is not comparative in any strict sense (see section 3.2.1).

Section 5.2 will provide a background to the case study, delving deeper into the historical and political context of Curaçao and the Santa Barbara Project. It will also give information on the history of Dutch archaeological research on Curaçao as well as on the archaeological policies and heritage legislation of the (former) Netherlands Antilles.

Section 5.3 will outline the development and practice of the Santa Barbara Project, highlighting the differing perceptions of success and some conflicts and problems that arose over the implementation of the project. The remaining chapters will then delve deeper into understanding the archaeological project processes within its wider social context, the description of which will follow the order of the research questions as outlined in sections 2.6 and 3.2.2.

Section 5.4 will investigate the main values and discourses of the archaeological actors in the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project with respect to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration. In line with the analysis given in chapter 4, an ‘Authorised Archaeological Discourse’ (AAD) (cf Smith 2006) will be identified within the over-all project policy framework.

Section 5.5 will subsequently explore how the Dutch archaeological actors negotiated and constructed these values and discourses in relation to those of local institutional counterparts, government bodies, and commercial developers. It will illustrate how the AAD and related value-systems were constantly (re-)produced by archaeological policies, institutions and actors through processes such as ‘translation’, ‘naturalisation’, ‘representation’ and ‘self-reference’ (cf Latour 1996; 2005; Mosse 2004; 2005; Smith 2004; 2006; Waterton *et al.* 2006), and how this contributed to a system of (often) ‘unintended exclusionary mechanisms’ that saw a prioritisation of scientific and archaeological values and the relative closure of the project network towards local actors (cf Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming).

Section 5.6 will explore the relationship between processes of policy negotiation and actual project outcomes. It will illustrate how policy functions not only to orientate practice but also to legitimise practice (cf Mosse 2005, 14; Latour 1996). Whilst the scientific and archaeological values of the AAD have a major impact on project outcomes in terms of a prioritisation of resources and activities, and whilst especially archaeological and funding policies play a major role in this, this section will also illustrate how actors are

²⁷⁰ Taken from the project summary description of ‘Antilliaans en Arubaans Erfgoed: 4000 jaar bewoningsgeschiedenis in beeld’, available at the ‘Campaign for Leiden’ website of Leiden University at <http://www.campagnevoorleiden.leidenuniv.nl> [Accessed 15 April 2010]. Translated by author.

constantly (re-)producing story-lines and heritage discourse-coalitions in order to mobilise and maintain relationships, support and access to archaeological sites and practices.

Section 5.7 will reflect on the role, responsibility and power of Dutch archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of other actors in the social context of Curaçao. It will discuss how the Dutch archaeologists were attributed a certain amount of expertise and decision-making power over the research and management of archaeological remains, as a consequence of the institutionalised AAD, the constant need for policy negotiation, the historical power discrepancies and of their access to global resources and networks. I will finish by proposing that archaeologists should take up this privileged position more strongly by actively advocating the inclusion of other people's values in the archaeological process.

5.2 BACKGROUND

5.2.1 CURAÇAO

Curaçao is an autonomous country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands, situated in the Caribbean, 50km off the shore of Venezuela. Before the 10th of October 2010, and during the time of research, it was part of the Netherlands Antilles, an island group consisting of Curaçao, Bonaire, Sint Eustatius, Saba and Sint Maarten. Together with Aruba, which already gained its independent status (*status aparte*) as an autonomous country in 1986, and the Netherlands, they together formed the Kingdom of the Netherlands. After '10-10-10', Curaçao and Sint Maarten followed Aruba as an autonomous island, with Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba (the 'BES-islands') becoming 'special municipalities' (Bijzondere Gemeenten) of the Netherlands.

Curaçao is part of the so-called 'leeward group' of islands together with Aruba and Bonaire, situated parallel to the northwestern coast of Venezuela. In 2009, the Netherlands Antilles had a total population of ca 180,000. Curaçao, with a population of ca 135,000 and a land area of 444 km², is by far the largest island in terms of population and land area, and is generally perceived as dominating the other islands also financially and politically (Jaffe 2006, 31).

During prehistoric periods, all of the islands of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba were inhabited at certain times by Amerindian peoples who had migrated from the South American mainland (Haviser 2001, 63). The occupational history of the Caribbean goes back to around 8000BP. From that period till 1492AD, the islands in the Caribbean Sea have been continuously frequented through feastings, expeditions, visits and migrations from the surrounding continental mainlands (Hofman 2010, 6). During the earliest history of the Caribbean, dynamic interconnections existed between groups and islands, through extensive migration, trade and mobility networks (Hofman 2010; Hofman & Hoogland 2009).

Curaçao itself is rich with prehistoric sites such as Rooi Rincon, Santa Barbara, Savaan, Knip and San Juan, where remains of Indian daily life can be recovered, including pottery, artefacts of stone and shell, grave-goods and rock-paintings. The oldest occupants of Curaçao were pre-ceramic, and are counted archaeologically as belonging to the Archaic Period (ca 4000BC-450AD) Hofman & Hoogland 2009). Relatively little is known about the transcendence from the Archaic to the Ceramic period (around 450AD). However, along the coastal region of the Spanish Water in Curaçao, several shell-middens have been found that can be dated to this period which points towards the use of the inner waters as a gathering and preparation place of shells (ibid). During the Ceramic period, permanent settlements appeared on the leeward group of islands; these settlements showed similarities with occupational remains as can be found in Venezuela, pointing to continuing close contact and networks between the mainland and the islands. The indigenous peoples who inhabited the leeward group of islands during the European encounters in 1492

were identified in contemporary Spanish references as the Caquetio ethnic group (ibid, 29), which belonged linguistically to the Arawakan family (Haviser 2001, 63; Hofman & Hoogland 2009, 24-30). Archaeological evidence suggests that people lived in extended families, with estimates for the population of Curaçao never reaching more than probably 2000 people (Hofman & Hoogland 2009, 30).

Curaçao was first ‘discovered’ in 1499 by the Spanish. Spanish written accounts of 1540 suggest that by 1515, the entire indigenous population of Curaçao had already been deported (Dalhuisen *et al.* 2009, 33). In subsequent centuries, during alternating Spanish, English and Dutch occupation, small groups of Indian peoples were re-imported or migrated back to Curaçao and the other islands. Although Aruba saw arguably the largest concentration of Indian population, also Curaçao witnessed an increase again in Indian population. From the 18th century onwards, the Indian population had mixed continuously with the African population and especially the so-called ‘free coloureds’, that by the end of that century, no ‘original’ Indians were thought to exist anymore on the islands (Dalhuisen *et al.* 2009, 37-39).

In 1634 Curaçao was ceded to the Dutch West Indische Compagnie (WIC), which soon after established a trade settlement in Curaçao to support their highly profitable combination of warfare and trade (Jaffe 2006, 27).²⁷¹ With Curaçao slowly becoming one of the ‘hubs’ in the region for slave trade, the population of Curaçao subsequently saw an influx of Dutch protestant settlers, African slaves, and later also Sephardic Jews from the Dutch parts of Brazil (ibid, 28). Although the Indian population had left Curaçao especially during and after the period of warfare between the Spanish and the Dutch, they returned in the coming century (Dalhuisen *et al.* 2009, 37-38). Apart from two small periods of English occupation in the 19th century, the Dutch remained firmly in power. Although Curaçao saw the coming of plantations, trade dependent on this was never very profitable due to the arid climate. In 1863, slavery was finally abolished under international pressure. As a result, many of the freed slaves settled in small villages dependent on subsistence agriculture in the rural landscapes, later referred to as the ‘Kunuku’ culture (Jaffe 2006, 28).

After a period of economic depression in the late 19th century, the economic situation soon improved when the Royal Dutch Shell established an oil refinery near the harbour in the heart of Willemstad in 1915. Apart from a substantial impact on the landscape, the changes in socio-economic, social and even cultural structures were severe, with Curaçao changing from an “agrarian-commercial to a modern capitalist industrialised society” (Jaffe 2006, 29). The mixed island population became even further complex, due to a subsequent influx of immigrants from the region and as far as the Middle-East, India and even China.

After World War II, the process of decolonisation commenced, albeit not without difficulties. In 1954, a Charter by the Kingdom of the Netherlands (the so-called *Statuut*) was agreed upon, which stated that the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam would become ‘partners’ in the Kingdom. This meant that the islands became autonomous with respect to internal policy, local government and legal currency, with the Netherlands taking care of defence and foreign affairs (Haviser 2001, 60).

However, a considerable part of the population did not feel that the newly gained autonomy improved their lives, with a socio-economic and political gap in power still apparent between white elites and the rest of the population (Jaffe 2006, 30; Römer 1998). These tensions, which can be placed in a wider regional context, came to a climax on 30 May 1969, when a labour protest in Willemstad soon broke out into a revolt. Although the resulting changes saw the opening up of positions in the economic and political spheres for those of non-European descent, this arguably did not lead to an overall social or political transformation (ibid).

²⁷¹ A very concise and sharp summary of the post 1492 history of Curaçao with its implications on identity, landscape and culture has been given by Jaffe, on whose work I will draw repeatedly in the following paragraphs (Jaffe 2006, 27-44).

In 2004, with the 50th year celebration of the *Statuut*, reflections on possible legal and political restructuring of the kingdom gave rise to referenda in the Netherlands Antilles, which led, in April 2005, to Curaçao opting for the option of gaining a *status aparte*. On the 10th of October 2010, the Netherlands Antilles were dismantled. The islands of Curaçao and Sint Maarten became autonomous countries within the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The islands of Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba became ‘special municipalities’ of the Netherlands, which meant that, during a period of ‘soft overlap’, Dutch legislation would come into effect on these islands.

The combination of a multi-layered political system, together with the ‘multiplex relations’ of a small island society and a “cultural disposition to avoid unfriendliness”, Curaçao is rife with corruption scandals and news of favouritism, patronage and a lack of transparency dominating the political system (Jaffe 2006, 32; Römer 1998). During my time of research, society in Curaçao was still marked by a huge gap between rich and poor in socio-economic terms, often still along ethnic and class lines, with huge percentages of unemployment still being common under especially the youth of Curaçao.

5.2.2 DUTCH ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN CURAÇAO

Apart from some amateur investigations by local catholic priests (Haviser 2001), Dutch archaeological interest in the Caribbean during the late 19th and early 20th century was generally limited. At least, it was in sharp contrast to the investigations being undertaken in the eastern part of Dutch overseas territories (Toebosch 2003; 2008a, 72). While the Dutch were interested in Indonesia due to its monumental archaeology and the early hominid remains, which even led to the development of an Antiquity Service in 1913, the same did not hold true for the Antilles. The work by de Josselin de Jong, anthropologist and conservator of the National Museum of Ethnography in Leiden, was an exception. In 1923, he undertook archaeological research on the islands of Saba, Sint Eustatius, Curaçao and Aruba (Hofman & Hoogland 2007, 6; Hofman 2008), and published his results in 1947 (Josselin de Jong 1947) – all in the rather typical manner of its time: “On Saba, <...> they still talk about the Leiden researcher who got himself carried in a sedan chair <...> to his excavation” (Toebosch 2008a, 72; quoting Hofman).²⁷²

During the 1950’s and 1960’s, vocational archaeological investigations took place on Curaçao, leading to extensive collections of ethnographic materials. Most of this material, which included information on intangible heritage such as art, poetry, traditions and songs, is currently held by several museums and archaeological institutions in Curaçao (Haviser 2001, 72). In the 1960’s-1970’s, further small-scale archaeological investigations were conducted in Curaçao. Apart from the work by local archaeologists and the Venezuelan archaeologist Cruxent, this period also saw several Dutch expeditions being undertaken in the Antilles (mainly on Curaçao and Aruba), initiated by archaeologists from the Dutch State Antiquities Service and from Leiden University (see for example Glazema 1967). Soon after, the first PhDs about Caribbean archaeology appeared at Leiden University (Hofman 2008, 6). Since 1967, these expeditions were undertaken in consultation with the Archaeological Anthropological Institute of the Netherlands Antilles (AAINA), which was established as a sign of an official recognition of archaeology as a responsibility of the state (Haviser 2001, 72-74). However, these Dutch expeditions did not lead to structural, large-scale research programs (Hofman 2010).²⁷³

²⁷² Translation by author.

²⁷³ Pers. comm. during a radio interview for the Teleac program ‘Hoe?Zo!’, 24 February 2010. Available at <http://www.teleac.nl/radio/1683209/home/item/2798729/graven-in-het-caribisch-gebied/> [Accessed 11 March 2010].

It was only in the beginning of the 1980's that professional archaeology on Curaçao started with work undertaken by AAINA, such as an island-wide survey of prehistoric and historical sites in 1982. Such relatively small-scale mapping, survey and excavation work continued on all the islands of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba up to the end of the 1990's, when AAINA was dismantled (Haviser 2001). The 1980's also saw the establishment of more structural collaborations between AAINA with overseas academic institutions, such as those with the College of William and Mary. In the mid 1980's, the archaeology of the Caribbean also got a more structural place within Leiden University, with excavations being undertaken in the Netherlands Antilles, amongst which Curaçao, in cooperation with for example AAINA and the Archaeological Museum of Aruba (AMA)²⁷⁴ (Hofman 2008, 6). The interest by several archaeologists of Leiden University in the archaeology of the Antilles finally led to the establishment of the research group 'Caribbean Archaeology' in the mid 1990's, with a primary focus on the prehistory of the islands. Since then, the scope of Leiden research in the Caribbean expanded beyond the Dutch borders of the Antilles, which led to research projects in for example Cuba and Trinidad.

In 1998, the National Archaeological Anthropological Museum Foundation was established on Curaçao (NAAM), as a continuation of the previous governmental AAINA. In 2008, the name of the foundation was changed to National Archaeological Anthropological Memory Management (NAAM). The beginning of the 21st century saw a further establishment of local archaeological organisations in the Netherlands Antilles, such as the Sint Eustatius Centre for Archaeological Research (SECAR), the Bonaire Archaeological Institute (BONAI) and the Sint Maarten Archaeological Centre (SIMARC).

In 2007, Leiden University developed a position for a professor in the 'Archaeology of the Caribbean with special attention to the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba'. According to the newly appointed professor of Caribbean archaeology, the formed geopolitical division between the islands had left its mark on the interpretation and research frameworks of Caribbean archaeology, with the French, Dutch, English and Americans each working on their 'own' islands, leading to an idea that island cultures existed independently of each other (Hofman 2008). The current research by Leiden University tries to challenge such a view by studying the underlying mechanisms and dynamics behind mobility and exchange networks between the islands.

5.2.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT IN CURAÇAO

Mirroring the move towards institutionalisation and increased state control of archaeology in Western Europe during the first half of the 20th century, a 1915 Dutch law regulating the export of objects (which included antiquities) was adapted for the Netherlands Antilles in 1944, at that time still a colony of the Netherlands (Haviser & Gilmore 2011, 134).²⁷⁵ After the Netherlands Antilles were granted autonomy in 1954, the 1944 law was amended in 1960 with more precise detail concerning the regulation of archaeological and ethnographical objects (ibid, 134-135). The potential of heritage for tourism development and the needed preservation of sites, monuments and artefacts was also becoming more explicit in law, as can be seen in a 1970 revision of the law (ibid, 135). However, legislation at this time was rarely enforced, with looting and destruction being common over the next few decades. In 1971, when academic archaeology was maturing and the increase of tourism in the Caribbean was expanding, the Netherlands included its Caribbean territories in its national preservation laws. In 1977, another 'landsverordening' (Federal Ordinance) was enacted that regulated the preservation of historical and archaeological sites and monuments, albeit only on a central government level. Until the early 21st century,

²⁷⁴ In 1981, Aruba saw the establishment the National Archaeological Museum of Aruba (AMA).

²⁷⁵ The next few paragraphs draw repeatedly on the article by Haviser & Gilmore (2011), which provides a concise overview of the legislative heritage management frameworks of the Netherlands Antilles.

all islands of the Netherlands Antilles utilised this central government legislation, adapting it to island-specific versions and development of heritage management legislation (ibid, 136-137).

Stated by Haviser and Gilmore (2011), and reflected in my interviews (see below), is the assessment that of the five islands of the former Netherlands Antilles, Curaçao had the most extensive and productive heritage legislation and framework. Curaçao's "first attempt at precise cultural heritage management" (ibid, 137) came in 1990 with the establishment of a 'Monument Plan', a list of over 800 monuments on Curaçao. Together with the 'eilandsverordening' (Island Ordinance) for the implementation of the 1989 Monuments Law (Bestuurscollege Curaçao 1991), which was loosely based upon the Dutch 1988 'Monumentenwet', this made it possible to list and protect scheduled monuments, to prevent illicit excavations, as well as to ensure that permissions had to be obtained with the government if development work or disturbance to scheduled monuments was planned to take place.

The protection of monuments was based upon the principle of designation of an object or a building as a monument. The enforcement of this law rested with the Department of Urban and Regional Development Planning and Housing (DROV) of Curaçao. It was in the wider framework of development and land-use policies, that DROV asked AAINA in 1989 to develop a list of archaeological sites to be included in the 1990 Monument Plan, which led to the designation of 11 archaeological monuments on the island (Janga 2009, 36). Over the last two decades however, the pressure and threat to archaeological sites increased with the rising economic development.

As mentioned by the archaeologist of NAAM during a 2009 seminar (see below), all legislation and workgroups despite, most archaeological heritage management planning was done on an *ad hoc* basis, with DROV having to approach NAAM for information on potential archaeological sites and values in a certain areas, and with rescue archaeological work being done immediately after archaeological finds had been made during construction work, if at all. This led to a *modus operandi* which "depended greatly on the goodwill of developers, something that could not always be counted upon" (Janga 2009, 36). The need for a better solution became even more explicit when the central government of the Netherlands Antilles ratified the Malta Convention in 2007 – a result of the ratification in the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The (revised) 'European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage', also known as the Malta Convention, was adopted in 1992 by the Council of Europe (Council of Europe 1992). After a long period of discussion, adaptation and ratification, it was finally implemented by the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles in June 2007. In its preamble, the Malta Convention regards archaeological heritage as a resource for the knowledge of human history, under threat from development planning, natural hazards, illegal or unscientific excavations and a low degree of public awareness. It tries to protect this archaeological heritage through setting out 18 articles, which have been adopted and implemented differently by European state parties (Willems & van den Dries 2007).

For a complete overview of the content I refer to the original convention (and see O'Keefe 1993), as I will discuss the emphasis which is placed by different actors on certain articles and principles of the Malta Convention throughout this chapter. However, for now I would argue that the main principles could be seen as follows; implementation of the Malta Convention through state legislation, preservation in-situ of archaeological remains, an early integration of archaeological values within development planning, as well as calling for adopting a polluter-pay principle – which means that those responsible for disturbing or destroying archaeological heritage can be held account for the costs of mitigating these impacts. Other articles, such as those calling for the promotion of public awareness (article 9) and the exchange of technical and scientific expertise (article 12), are often thought to be given less attention in practice, although a recent study in the Netherlands suggests otherwise (Van den Dries & Kwast in press).

The Dutch implementation of the Malta Convention has implemented these articles by developing a system built upon several main components: 1) decentralization of decision-making, with increased responsibilities for local authorities, that are now deciding on mitigation projects and leaving their mark on the selection policies and research questions, 2) a polluter-pay principle with a liberalized market framework and a commercial archaeological sector in which archaeological companies work for/on behalf of developers, in parallel with 3) a quality assurance system with a minimized controlling role of central government (Van den Dries 2011; Bazelmans 2011; Van den Dries & Willems 2007).

One of the results of this implementation of the Malta Convention in the Netherlands, has been a huge increase in the availability of financial resources for archaeological work, with a subsequent rise of archaeological employment and activities. A second result has been the changed division of tasks – with municipalities now mainly focusing on developing and implementing policies, selection procedures, monument maps and public outreach, and with excavations and research being more executed by companies (Van den Dries *et al.* 2010, 57). As we will see in this chapter, it is especially these two results of the Malta Convention that play a huge role when actors are discussing the possible implementation of the Malta Convention for the Netherlands Antilles, both of them being regarded as ways in which to secure future access to and control over archaeological ‘resources’.

The ‘coming of Malta’ to the Netherlands Antilles required prior research and integration with planning processes, with an imperative to find “a good balance between the mainly economic pressure for developments on the one hand and the strive for the conservation of our cultural-historic values and artefacts because of their importance for our identity, on the other hand” (Janga 2009, 36). Subsequently, from 2006 onwards, NAAM – in collaboration with the Municipality of Amsterdam – had developed a GIS based map with all known historical and archaeological sites and monuments. This collaboration led as such to the archaeological policy *Maneho di Arkeologia* and the *Mapa di balor di Kultural Historiko di Korsou*, a value-based map of archaeological sites aiming to advice policy makers of DROV and developers in planning for spatial development and the potential impact on “heritage sites of value” (Kraan 2009, 101). Both of these instruments were based upon, and aiming to facilitate, the core principles of the Malta Convention in advance of its more structural imbedding into heritage legislation in Curaçao.

Despite all this, the state of archaeological heritage management and protection was far from ideal on all of the islands during the time of research. Natural threats such as coast erosion continue to damage archaeological sites, with human impacts such as looting, damage and destruction of sites as a result of large-scale development programs in for example the tourism industry still thriving (Hofman 2008). In addition, intangible heritage and traditions are also under threat from increased impacts of tourism, migration and western values on local cultures such as has been identified on for instance Saba and Sint Eustatius (Haviser & Gilmore 2011) and within the perception of the population of Curaçao itself (Jaffe 2006).

An additional problem lies in the fact that Curaçao has not had an archaeologist since the late 1990’s. It took until 2008 until the Netherlands Antilles financed a position for an archaeologist to be placed at NAAM – a position that was not filled during the lead-on to the project under discussion. In addition, a lack of political vision and coordination between the organisations and governmental institutions dealing with archaeology and cultural heritage has been identified by several respondents.²⁷⁶ Even the ‘Monuments Bureau’, the department within DROV entrusted with the enforcement of the Monument Ordinances, often

²⁷⁶ According to interviews with the director of the Monument Fund (Curaçao), former chairman of the Board of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010) and the Division Head of the Monuments Bureau (Willemstad, July 2010).

did not have the power to advance or implement actions dealing with research and protection of archaeological heritage, loosing out to wider urban and development planning imperatives on the island and to subsequent decision-making processes within DROV itself. As a result, the archaeological policy *Maneho di Arkeologia* was not enforced and implemented within DROV during the time of research since it was often perceived as potentially obstructing economically beneficial development planning on the island.²⁷⁷

During my time of research, the future of NAAM, of its archaeologist, as well as of the Monuments Bureau of DROV itself, was uncertain.²⁷⁸ The weak enforcement of heritage legislation, coupled with under-staffed and under-financed institutions, an ambiguous position of the Netherlands Antilles in terms of possibilities for structural funding from the Netherlands (see section 3.2.1), and a lack of regional collaboration and integration of heritage management policies, meant that the heritage management framework of Curaçao was ready for positive change.

The coming of 'Malta'

The referenda held in 2005 throughout the Netherlands Antilles, were by many active in the heritage field seen as an “opportunity for positive change that has been available only once in multiple generations” (Haviser & Gilmore 2011, 140). Of particular importance here was the possible implementation of ‘Malta’ legislation that better integrated archaeology in environmental and development planning, better allowed for financial support of archaeological research in advance of disturbance, and better allowed for public participation and preservation of archaeological and cultural heritage in-situ. With the BES-islands coming under Dutch legislation after 10 October 2010, and especially under the Dutch implementation of the European Malta Convention, and with Curaçao, St Maarten and Aruba slowly opting for similar legislation frameworks, the board was set for change in the heritage framework.

In 2005 and 2009, NAAM organised two seminars to prepare for new legislation based upon the principles of the Malta Convention in advance of the constitutional changes of ‘10-10-10’.²⁷⁹ By the end of the second seminar, it was concluded that the Malta Convention would be “a good hall-stand for the Antillean (Is)lands, provided there is space for the island reality” (Witteveen *et al.* 2009, 17). By this, it was meant that a careful balance had to be found between heritage preservation, local identity formation and economic development, as well as between the preservation of both tangible and intangible heritage. As such, the involvement of youngsters, the public at large and education were mentioned as a “condition sine qua non in the eventual protection of our heritage” (ibid).

As can be distilled from internal policy documents of the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW), Directorate for Cultural Heritage (DCE), as well as in those of the Dutch State Inspectorate for Heritage, it was not deemed desirable by the Dutch government that the Dutch law on archaeological monuments would be made applicable immediately on the BES islands after ‘10-10-10’ because of the difference in policy frameworks and the size of the islands. However, considering the expected rise in tourism and development activities by Dutch and international building corporations on the archaeologically rich coastal regions, it was deemed desirable to think over how the principles of Malta

²⁷⁷ Interview with archaeologist of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

²⁷⁸ According to interviews with staff members of NAAM (Willemstad, June/July 2010) and Monuments Bureau DROV (Willemstad, July 2010).

²⁷⁹ Seminar ‘Legislation Cultural Heritage Netherlands Antilles and Aruba’, 22 April 2005 (see Witteveen *et al.* 2005) and the seminar ‘Legislation Cultural heritage in Caribbean perspective’, 18 Juni 2009 (see Witteveen *et al.* 2009).

could be implemented on the BES-islands during 2011.²⁸⁰ Ultimately, this led to OCW setting out a tender for a 'BES report' with advice on how best to implement and facilitate the Malta Convention on the BES-islands. A major guideline in this was that the new legislation would not have to be based upon the Dutch version, but rather on the original version of the Malta Convention.

Such a report was not yet assigned during the time of fieldwork.²⁸¹ Different parties in the Netherlands Antilles were aiming at securing the assignment, and even Dutch NGO's in the heritage sector had started to prepare advisory and consultancy reports. The dismantling of the Netherlands Antilles, the 'coming of Malta', increased Dutch influence, the relationships between heritage preservation, economic development and identity formation, and the relationship between tangible and intangible heritage; all formed the background against which the Santa Barbara Project was undertaken. Coupled with the need for archaeological heritage organisations and individuals to re-think their future roles and responsibilities, and the possible financial opportunities deriving from the 'polluter-pay' principle inherent in the Malta Convention, it made for a potent mix.

Public archaeology

In a 2001 article, Haviser discusses the history of historical archaeological research from the point of view of different types of research and the impact of these on society of the islands of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba (Haviser 2001). Building upon the typology by Trigger (1984; see section 2.2) of nationalist, colonialist and imperialist archaeologies, Haviser argues that especially historical archaeology has had a positive impact on the lives of peoples in the Antilles in terms of identity-formation, self-esteem, awareness and potential economic benefits as a result of the translation of research into tourism. In particular, he argues how this can be accomplished by a form of national, public archaeology undertaken by local institutions with the participation of local peoples. Pointing to the European and North-American bias towards researching and restoring certain historical heritage sites in the Antilles (such as plantations, European-descendant sites and forts), he argues how such forms of 'foreign' archaeology can distantiate local communities: "in the case of a project with directors and workers brought in from another culture, such as a summer field-school, the general result is an insulation and relative isolation from local social contexts" (Haviser 2001, 76). In contrast, he argues that

local investigators are perceived by the general community as conducting research for the local good, albeit on a small scale; while in the other cases there is a general perception of the foreign researchers as 'inquisitive tourists' with little to contribute to the local community. Even though there is some economic contribution to the community via local expenditures by the researchers, and sometimes the foreign investigators have further tried to compensate with other assistance to the community such as support for museums, the sense of personal connection with the population is often lacking. This reaffirms the importance of involving local personnel in an archaeological investigation. (ibid)

The fact that the development and legislation procedures for archaeology of these 'foreign' archaeologies have seen a considerable involvement of island government officials, has added to a perception that such research was mainly for the benefit of the elite, and not for local communities themselves, and that "compensative contributions to the community" did not change this (ibid). Since both foreign archaeologists as well as local

²⁸⁰ Netherlands Ministry of Education, Culture and Science 2009. 'Archive supervision on the BES-islands'. Internal report, DCE, p. 2.

²⁸¹ But see Witteveen & Kraan 2012 for the final report.

elites are often outsiders to the local community, archaeological projects can easily be perceived as top-down, lacking real basis and structural support from the ground up (cf Troncoso Morales 2000).²⁸²

This concern over the importance of research developed by local institutions, with the participation of local community members is subsequently argued to be crucial for developing self-esteem, identity formation and historical awareness. Small-scale archaeological research work, such as conducted by AAINA in the 1980's and 1990's, has according to Haviser (2001) and the former director of AAINA,²⁸³ led to an increased awareness of the importance of archaeological and historical sites, and contributed to the development of a handful of historical and archaeological museums in Curaçao and the other islands, to improved heritage legislation around the 1990's, and an awareness about the role of archaeology in tourism development. However, these also contributed to occasional negative impacts, such as looting and the potential damaging effects of mass tourism on sensitive local cultural expressions.

Culture, identity and heritage

Despite its geographic location and its historical and present-day parallels, Curaçao does not appear to identify itself strongly with the Caribbean. The combination of a discord over the complex relationship with the Netherlands and the rather artificial constellation of the Netherlands Antilles, has led to a less than self-evident approach to regional identification and collaboration; foremost, people in Curaçao seem to identify with Curaçao itself (Jaffe 2006, 34; Römer 1998).

Curaçao culture can be described as a mix of Dutch Protestants, Sephardic Jews, Catholicized Africans, with, through 20th century immigration, also Middle-Eastern and Asiatic influences. Despite the fact that the local language *Papiamentu* (a Creole Afro-Portuguese mix with some Dutch influences) is spoken for at least three centuries, until quite recently it was dismissed as a 'dialect' to denote class and ethnical lines on the island (Jaffe 2006, 38). However, it has been noticed that more recently, *Papiamentu* has become a central element in Curaçaoan culture and a great source of pride (Römer 1998). Over the last decades, an increasing appreciation has been given to local Curaçaoan culture, with heritage identification especially focusing on intangible aspects such as cuisine, songs, tradition and dance. Heritage identification as such seems to focus especially on Curaçaoan culture as an expression of a complex and multi-ethnic past, with specific attention to recent local traditions and memories.

Arguably, it could be noted that Curaçaoan culture is still structured to some degree in anti-thesis to the Netherlands (cf Sluis 2008). One good example of this is a general "lack of openness and tendency to conceal one's opinions mirrored by widespread suspicion, expressed in, and fuelled by, pervasive gossip" on a small island society (Jaffe 2006, 41), as compared to an open and direct social interaction that is often believed to characterise Protestant Dutch culture. A history of passive resistance to the oppressive nature of colonisation and slavery still characterises Curaçao, and has, interestingly, also been identified in the heritage sector in Curaçao over management issues surrounding former plantations (Sluis 2008). As such, the history of slavery and oppression still plays a fundamental role, both in the attitude towards power indiscrepancies as well as in the attitude towards white Dutch 'foreigners'. However, this does not mean that Curaçaoan culture is essentially based upon African roots and slavery – the focus is primarily local, focused upon being 'Antilliaans'. Having said this, a tendency towards including African roots in national

²⁸² cf Keehnen 2009.

²⁸³ Seru Mahuma, July 2010.

discourses has been identified over the last years, although mostly in elitist circles and less in local populations (Eikrem 1999, 69).²⁸⁴

The cultural heritage field in Curaçao can be described as being quite distinctively divided between for example Jewish heritage initiatives, foreign mass tourism heritage initiatives, Dutch initiatives, and Antillian heritage initiatives.²⁸⁵ It is especially within local communities of ‘black Curaçao’ that a focus on intangible heritage in the form of recent personal memories seems to flourish.²⁸⁶ Such communities on the island seem to identify more with a personal, recent past of a couple of generations rather than with a distant, abstract past of pre-columbian and Amerindian times, which might have contributed to a rather low awareness and support for archaeological heritage preservation of ‘Indian’ heritage on the island. Nevertheless, a few important examples exist in the Caribbean where education and outreach programs have led to an increased awareness of the value of heritage, which in turn led to increased heritage preservation (see for example Siegel & Righter 2011).

Recent research undertaken by DROB (Dienst Ruimtelijke Ontwikkeling en Beheer / Spatial Development and Management Service) on Bonaire also pointed to the fact that ‘conservation of cultural heritage’ was deemed very important with the community on Bonaire, but that interest was especially given to the preservation of songs, music, traditions, as well as several monuments and houses of which local people could remember the recent histories.²⁸⁷ According to Allen, a local anthropologist of Curaçao, most people do not really seem to engage with archaeology since

there is no employment in it. But there is a strong interest in immaterial heritage. In our stories. Especially about more recent times, such as the period of slavery. <...> With regards to Indian history, well, the interest is there, because it is part of the history of the Antilles, but there is no real identification.²⁸⁸

On the basis of my own observations and interviews, I would argue that identification with Indian roots is indeed relatively small on the island, especially when compared to other islands in the region, or even to its neighbour Aruba. On Curaçao, the Indian past and culture is perceived as a minor part in the complex mix of what it means to be ‘Antilliaans’, although an interest in the indigenous roots of the island, with Indian peoples coming from the Venezuelan mainland as a part of local Curaçaoan history is nevertheless existent. A strong focus on such a narrative, as is given by the Santa Barbara Project, is however not without potential contemporary sensitivities. At present, resentment can be identified in Curaçao against the large group of Latino immigrants (mainly coming from Colombia, Dominican Republic and Venezuela). Popular perceptions of these can be identified as them “not taking over local Curaçaoan culture” (Jaffe 2006, 39), “taking over the island” (cf Allen 2003) and stealing the scarcity of available jobs. Such resentments have, interestingly, also played a large part at Santa Barbara Plantation, where jobs in the Hyatt Regency hotel have been taken up especially by Latino immigrants.²⁸⁹ Development on a former plantation, that takes away recent memories of Curaçaoan culture and access, with the economic benefits going to foreign

²⁸⁴ in Jaffe 2006.

²⁸⁵ See Sluis 2008.

²⁸⁶ Pers. comm. Allen (Curaçao, July 2010).

²⁸⁷ Civil servant and architect of DROB, board member of NAAM (Kralendijk, July 2010); referring to internal research by DROB and a local journalist that includes over 500 oral histories in Bonaire.

²⁸⁸ Curaçao, July 2010.

²⁸⁹ This perspective came to the fore during interviews with the former director of the newspaper ‘Amigoe’, acting as PR consultant for Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Rosa, July 2010); the General manager of Hyatt Regency (Santa Barbara, August 2010); as well as during several interviews with local community members (Santa Rosa / Montaña Abou, July 2010).

developers, tourists and Latino immigrants, accompanied by Dutch archaeological research that emphasises the Indian roots of the island, is therefore not without its complexities.



Figure 12. Map of Curaçao showing the location of Santa Barbara Plantation.

5.2.4 SANTA BARBARA PLANTATION

Santa Barbara

Santa Barbara is used as a toponym for an area of ca 1200ha located in the south-east of Curaçao, on the east of Spanish Water. Characteristic for the landscape before habitation is the huge climax of rising sea-levels, leading to the inner bay Spanish Water (Hoogland 2007, 2). During habitation periods, the western part of the landscape has seen little changes except for the climate gradually becoming dryer, which has led to a changed vegetation; thorny bushes and cactuses on land, and mangrove in the lower parts near to the water (ibid). At present, the site houses

several important species of fauna and flora, such as mangrove. The eastern part of Santa Barbara has changed considerably in its landscape. The flat outline of the former Tafelberg has been reduced and damaged considerably as a result of the extensive phosphate mining from the late 19th century onwards. More recently, the western area (ca 600ha) has been developed by Santa Barbara Plantation with resulting golf courses, a modern marina, transport infrastructure, a gated community resort, residential terrains, and a large 5 star hotel, the Hyatt Regency Curaçao.²⁹⁰

The whole area of Santa Barbara is archaeologically rich. It shows evidence of habitation in the Archaic and Ceramic periods, with settlement-areas and temporary camps (Haviser 1987). The area incorporates a listed Ceramic Age archaeological monument in the north, a listed archaeological site in the west called Spanish Water, which includes a scheduled conservation area in the form of the small island Xaguis in front of the western shores of Spanish Water. In addition, there is evidence of other archaeological and historical sites such as rock shelters, as well as some remains from the early Spanish conquest and Dutch colonial period, former plantations including the large historical plantation house, and buildings and infrastructure relating to the phosphate exploitation industry.

The research under discussion has focused specifically on the archaeological site ‘Spanish Water’, which illustrated a long habitation period from the Archaic period up till the early Spanish colonial period. Along the coastal region of the Spanish Water, several shell-middens have been investigated which point towards the use of the inner waters as a gathering and preparation place of shells (especially *melongena*

²⁹⁰ See the website of Santa Barbara Plantation, available at <http://www.santabarbaraplantation.com/> [Accessed November 2011].

melongena shells) by Indian peoples (Hofman & Hoogland 2009). In a nearby fireplace, remains of dolphins have been found, arguably dated in relation to the Spanish period. In 2008, an additional nearby site was excavated, Seru Boca - a shell midden under a rock shelter with accompanying fireplace, and with several rock paintings.

The first written resources about Santa Barbara appeared in the first half of the 16th century (Römer 2000a, 8).²⁹¹ In 1539 a Spanish *hacienda* was established, the first Spanish agrarian settlement at Curaçao which flourished considerably over the following decades (ibid). Near to this, the spring of Bacuval is located, which is probably the reason why Spanish Water got its name (Hartog 1968). Written resources also mention the building of the first Spanish Church on the island in 1542; however, when the Dutch explored the area in 1634, all that was found of the Spanish settlement were deserted remnants – even today, remains of the Spanish period remain scarce (Römer 2000a, 8). During the subsequent WIC governance of the island, several Dutch families further developed the area in plantations up till the late 19th century – these plantations were however never very profitable, mirroring the island wide phenomenon (ibid, 9-10). The plantation house at Santa Barbara was built around the end of the 18th century and early 19th century, and subsequently rebuild in the mid 20th century. Although the history of the plantations on the western side of the island is better documented, historical research suggests that for example in 1863, Santa Barbara was the largest plantation on the eastern side of the island, with 122 slaves (ibid, 9).

In 1874, the non-profitable future of the area changed considerably, when phosphate was discovered in the Tafelberg. Soon after, the first exploitation and export of phosphate started (Broek 2000, 78-79). However, it took until 1912 when the export really took flight. A period of decline during WWII turned out to be the start of more difficulties. Having seen several labour strikes in the 1930's and late 1940's, and a huge strike during the revolt of 1969, the relationships between the direction of the Mining Company and the local workers came under stress (Römer 2000b, 59-61). When the profits of phosphate mining dropped as well during this period, the mining exploitation stopped in 1970. At this time however, the government of the Netherlands Antilles stepped in and during the period 1970-1979, it provided financial support to the Mining Company as not to further increase local tensions by sustaining employment (Broek 2000). In 1979 the company again operated on itself, but now focusing on the exploitation of limestone.

Until this time, most of the workers at the Mining Company were lower-class inhabitants from Banda Riba, an area in the north-eastern side of Curaçao. Although these workers counted ca 500 in the high days of the Mining Company, they decreased considerably after 1979 to around 100-200, when more immigrants slowly became part of the workforce (Römer 2000b, 59-61). At that time, the southern and western Santa Barbara beach had also been used for generations of local middle-class inhabitants of especially the eastern part of Curaçao, with free access to this side of the Santa Barbara area.

Santa Barbara Plantation project

In 1989, Santa Barbara was bought by CITCO (Curaçao International Trust Company) (Römer 2000c, 75), with the Smeets family, who set up CITCO in 1939, still acting as its controlling shareholder in the form of 'Smeets Family Trust (SFT) Investment Limited' (McIntosh 2010). In 1990, the Mining Company (Mijnmaatschappij Curaçao Ltd.) was sold to the Janssen de Jong Group, who took over exploitation of the Tafelberg (Römer 2000c, 75). At that time, the areas were divided along the lines of their businesses: the western side belonging to CITCO, which wanted to develop the area into a resort, and the eastern side, which was used by de Mijnmaatschappij for further limestone exploitation (ibid). In 1998, the

²⁹¹ The following paragraphs are based upon several chapters in the book 'De Tafelberg aan de Fuikbaai, Curaçao, Nederlandse Antillen. 125 jaar exploitatie van grondstoffen in sociaal-economisch perspectief' (Mijnmaatschappij Curaçao NV 2000).

collaboration between CITCO and Janssen de Jong Group was also legally unbound, with both parts being strictly geographically separated – a division that starts at the entrance of Santa Barbara Plantation.

Although the planning for the Santa Barbara Plantation project by CITCO/SFT started already from the early 1990's, it was in 2000 when the development took flight when a partnership was established between SFT and the US-based resort developer company VIDA Group NV, in order to develop Santa Barbara area into one of the finest luxury resorts in the Caribbean (McIntosh 2010). These project developers have subsequently overseen the development of this ca 600ha beach and bay-front resort community, whilst the operational side of the above mentioned business structure was set up as 'Santa Barbara Plantation NV', hereafter also referred to as 'Santa Barbara Plantation'. With Curaçao previously being known as a busy port, a business centre and for its large oil refinery, and with Aruba and Bonaire attracting more tourism for mainly beaches and diving, Santa Barbara Plantation aimed at making Curaçao a first class tourism attraction in the Caribbean. The development of the project included a 350-room five-star hotel (subcontracted as the Hyatt Regency Curaçao Golf Resort, Spa and Marina), an 'Old Quarry' 18-hole golf course, a 120-slip 'Seru Boca Marina' as well as tennis courts. In addition, the resort includes residences ranging in size from a one-bedroom 'Dutch-flavoured' cottage, to grander houses with prices ranging from \$450,000 to \$1.3 Million.²⁹² As can be read on the official website of Santa Barbara Plantation, visitors and residents will "enjoy spectacular diving and snorkelling, along with sailing, fishing, tennis and nearby historic archaeological ruins".²⁹³ It is in the latter 'amenity' that we are interested here.

Archaeological research at Santa Barbara



Figure 13. Excavations by AAINA at Santa Barbara, 1971 (photograph by AAINA; courtesy of Jay Havisier).

Until 2008, the area of Santa Barbara had seen several archaeological investigations. Apart from some early investigations in the wider area of Curaçao by the Catholic priest Van Koolwijk in the late 19th century (Havisier 2001), by the archaeologist de Josselin de Jong in the early 20th century, and an archaeological inventory of the eastern part of Curaçao in 1968 by AAINA, the first real investigations in the area were conducted by AAINA in collaboration with local vocational archaeologists in 1971 (Beurs en Nieuwsberichten 1992). These consisted of several archaeological test-pits of a pre-columbian village site in the north of Santa Barbara, near to the entrance.

In 1977, such investigations were enriched by surveys by other local vocational archaeologists, and by contextualizing research undertaken by the archaeologist of AAINA, eventually leading to a PhD at Leiden University (Havisier 1987). In the late 1980's and early 1990's, several other coastal and interior test-pits were excavated by AAINA. Amongst these was the pre-columbian site of 'Spanish

²⁹² See the website of Santa Barbara Plantation, available at <http://www.santabarbaraplantation.com/> [Accessed November 2011].

²⁹³ See the website of Santa Barbara Plantation, available at <http://www.santabarbaraplantation.com/> [Accessed November 2011].

Water' (C-039), which had previously been suggested, together with the pre-columbian settlement site in the north, to be placed on the Monument list of DROV. Although it was placed on a list of archaeologically important monuments, it never led to a real scheduling of the site as a 'Protected Monument' (see above). The site of Spanish Water consisted of three separate parts, but by 1992, already two of them had been heavily damaged and destroyed, one of which by bulldozing activities. Partly to mitigate this, research in 1992 was conducted at Santa Barbara by AAINA and facilitated and sponsored by CITCO (Amigoe 1992, 3). This research, which led to a joined CITCO-AAINA press conference in September 1992, was an early example of collaboration between archaeologists and developers, with early hints of a 'polluter-pay' principle being implemented. Such an approach was also advanced by AAINA at other development sites, such as at Kadushi Cliffs (Curaçao Info 1990, 13) – resulting in an article by the AAINA archaeologist in 1998 calling for increased collaboration between archaeologists, developers and communities (Haviser 1998).



Figure 14. Excavations by AAINA at the site of Spanish Water, Santa Barbara in 1992 (Photograph courtesy of

The research in 1992, albeit small-scale, saw the participation of local vocational archaeologists and workmen – in line with the vision of national public archaeology as outlined by the AAINA archaeologist (see above) – and guided tours around the site (Amigoe 1992; Beurs en Nieuwsberichten 1992). Importantly, it was agreed that the archaeologically significant areas (in this case including the Spanish Water site) would be protected by means of a restricted area as well as a wider park: “what the developers get out of this solution is a precisely defined area of strict preservation, and a wider area of general park protection which allows tourists to walk over the site along nature trails” (Haviser 1998, 9). Notable as well, is that CITCO announced its plans to develop a small museum on the site with archaeological discoveries and pre-columbian artefacts that was to act as a ‘monument for the earliest inhabitants’ (Amigoe 1992, 3).

The latest archaeological research undertaken at Santa Barbara was that of Leiden University in advance of the development of golf-courses and residences in 2008 and 2009. This project, funded by the Leiden University ‘Campaign for Leiden’ and Santa Barbara Plantation, was executed in collaboration with DROV and

its advisor NAAM, and informally acted as a pilot project for the coming of the Malta Convention to the Netherlands Antilles. Apart from this, a smaller archaeological inventory has been made by NAAM on the small island Isla Yerba in early 2009, located on the western side of Santa Barbara.



Figure 15. View over part of Santa Barbara Plantation towards the north, with in the middle the site of Spanish Water – after the excavations and golf-course developments (photograph by author, July 2010).

5.3 THE SANTA BARBARA PROJECT

5.3.1 THE SANTA BARBARA PROJECT

In December 2004, the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University wrote a letter to NAAM and AMA with a proposal to ‘formalise and optimise’ the existing collaborations.²⁹⁴ Such a collaboration was meant to give the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba a more prominent place within Leiden research, as well as to exchange knowledge, staff and students between Leiden, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. The concrete way in which such a collaboration was meant to be advanced was by requesting AMA and NAAM to formerly support the position of an ‘Affiliate Professorship Caribbean Archaeology’ at Leiden University. After discussions in early 2005 between Leiden archaeologists and the director of NAAM, and

²⁹⁴ Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM & AMA (December 2004). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

after a positive ‘declaration of intention’ by NAAM and AMA for such a collaboration in June 2005, this subsequently led to a formal request by NAAM and AMA to the Leiden University Executive Board to develop such a position.²⁹⁵ In the accompanying documents needed for the request of this position, the Faculty of Archaeology mentioned that the conduct of archaeological research in the Caribbean was “not possible without taking societal relevance into account”. As such, it committed itself to advance knowledge and awareness of Caribbean archaeology in both the Netherlands as well as in the Antilles through public outreach, as well as to increase the participation of young people from the Antilles in research and the development of cultural heritage management.²⁹⁶ NAAM supported this intention by stating that legislation, awareness and identity-formation were especially important now that initiatives were being developed to create new heritage policies based upon “global developments in the field of legislation (Europe: Malta).”²⁹⁷

In the second half of 2005, contacts between NAAM and Santa Barbara Plantation also started, when an ‘Archaeological Working Group’ (AWG), consisting of amateur archaeologists and representatives of NAAM, Monuments Bureau DROV and several other natural and historic foundations on the island, visited the Spanish Water area on the invitation of Santa Barbara Plantation NV in advance of changed plans for development of the area. Referring to the previous commitment by CITCO in the early 1990’s to “saving several critical archaeological sites as a park area <...> and even to build and maintain a small museum”,²⁹⁸ the AWG called for protecting the archaeological and historical values of the site by incorporating them into “an interpretive outdoor park where visitors can experience largely the same environment that existed for thousands of years”.²⁹⁹ Subsequently, NAAM offered its services to conduct archaeological research and consultancy for developing a management plan for the park and museum, positioning itself as the appropriate agency to coordinate and oversee such activities “with the use of hired consultants”³⁰⁰, as it did not have an archaeologist in employment at that time. According to NAAM, such consultants could be formed by researchers from Leiden University in the framework of the collaboration that was being simultaneously developed.³⁰¹ Over the course of 2006, correspondence continued between NAAM and the Faculty of Archaeology, whereby Santa Barbara was mentioned as a possible opportunity for joint archaeological assistance, and whereby the outline of a large research project called ‘Antillean and Aruban Heritage’ (Antilliaans en Arubaans Erfgoed) by Leiden University was discussed. This project proposal, which aimed at investigating pre-columbian archaeology of the Antilles, as well as to increase public awareness and local institutional capacity in order to manage and protect this heritage in light of the increasing threats to the archaeological resource on the islands, was being prepared by the Leiden researchers as part of a bid to the ‘Campaign for Leiden’. This was a funding project of Leiden University and the alumni-supported Leiden University Fund, established to locate private investors for university projects. In November 2006, a newly appointed Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology rehearsed the intentions to formalise and intensify collaboration in terms of research, awareness and heritage management, expressing gratitude towards NAAM for proposing a senior archaeologist of Leiden to

²⁹⁵ Correspondence NAAM and AMA to Leiden University (February 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

²⁹⁶ This was mentioned in the accompanying ‘Desirability Report’ for the support of an affiliate professorship in Caribbean archaeology, (February 2006, p. 3-5). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

²⁹⁷ This was mentioned in the accompanying ‘Desirability Report’ for the support of an affiliate professorship in Caribbean archaeology, (February 2006, p. 1). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

²⁹⁸ Correspondence NAAM/AWG to Santa Barbara Plantation NV (October 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

²⁹⁹ Correspondence NAAM/AWG to Santa Barbara Plantation NV (October 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

³⁰⁰ Correspondence NAAM/AWG to Santa Barbara Plantation NV (October 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

³⁰¹ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

become Professor of Caribbean Archaeology.³⁰² In this respect, it was clarified that the Executive Board of Leiden University had decided that the position would go further than an affiliate position, and that it would finance the position itself in the form of a Professorship on personal title.

By the end of 2006, the first signs of institutional disagreement over the content and form of the collaboration proposals started to appear, albeit informally. NAAM, who had been working together with the Municipality of Amsterdam on developing archaeological value-based maps in advance of Malta-based heritage legislation,³⁰³ had come to question a perceived 'top-down approach' in the Campaign for Leiden as a sign of a general increase in Dutch influence on the island – both of which the director regarded as being reflected in the budget as well as the name of 'Campaign for Leiden'.³⁰⁴ In addition, the proposed collaboration over archaeological assistance at Santa Barbara was suddenly terminated by NAAM, stating that research at Spanish Water was "in consultation with the government (DROV), not a priority and not further threatened"³⁰⁵. Such a statement was based on the belief that the archaeological values of the area were sufficiently protected since NAAM and Monuments Bureau DROV were trying to schedule the small island Xaguis in front of the Spanish Water site as a conservation area, and because a belief at NAAM existed that discussions about preserving the site of Spanish Water as an archaeological park were still ongoing.

Still, NAAM stressed that it wanted to continue the collaboration, and that this could be done on the basis of previously discussed issues such as "assistance with urgency research", "exchange of knowledge during summer-schools", as well as "assistance of issues with storage and documentation".³⁰⁶ In early 2007, Leiden University informed NAAM that one of its senior archaeologists would be appointed as a Professor in the 'Archaeology of the Caribbean with special attention to the areas with which the Netherlands has historical ties'.³⁰⁷ In addition, the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology expressed the Faculty's dedication to continue its search for future possibilities in terms of a "mix of research funding and heritage management" in light of the upcoming constitutional changes in the Netherlands Antilles.³⁰⁸

Such statements of intent and collaboration between Leiden University and NAAM were put to the test in early 2007 when Santa Barbara Plantation requested advice from a senior archaeologist of the Faculty of Archaeology. Not wanting to develop the site as an archaeological park, but rather wanting professional

³⁰² Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (November 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³⁰³ At the end of 2006, NAAM organized an open meeting with the title 'Archeologische Waardenkaart voor Curaçao, instrument van beheer van het cultureel erfgoed' ('archaeological value mapping, instrument for cultural heritage management'). During this meeting, NAAM made publicly known that they were working together with the Monuments and Archaeology Bureau (BMA) of the Municipality of Amsterdam, in order to develop an archaeological value-based map that would allow the integration between spatial planning and the preservation of cultural heritage. According to the director of NAAM, the contemporary lack of documentation of the archaeological and cultural sites of Curaçao had recently lead to "an ad hoc approach at excavations <...> and at development projects, as the one at Santa Barbara <...> The result is destruction of heritage and irritations. This is why NAAM has taken the initiative to develop the archaeological value-maps" (Antillen.nu 2006). (Translation by author).

³⁰⁴ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

³⁰⁵ Correspondence NAAM to Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (December 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³⁰⁶ Correspondence NAAM to Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (January 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³⁰⁷ Correspondence Executive Board Leiden University to NAAM (January 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³⁰⁸ Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (February 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

advice and research in advance of development, Santa Barbara Plantation stated that all communication with NAAM had ended. In the view of one of the directors of Santa Barbara Plantation, NAAM had a reputation for making public complaints after development projects had started, and of wanting to do archaeological research themselves, this all despite the fact that it did not have a professional archaeologist in employment.³⁰⁹ Having heard about the previous investigations by Leiden archaeologists into the archaeology of Santa Barbara, and on the basis of recommendation by the previous archaeologist of AAINA, Santa Barbara Plantation asked the senior archaeologist for advice over the way in which to proceed with the archaeological sites on its resort, expressing its wish to develop the resort ‘in harmony’ with the protected areas.

Replying that the Faculty had experience in terms of developer-led archaeological research, and offering advise on management, protection, presentation and archaeological research, the Leiden archaeologist agreed that a short visit to Santa Barbara could be useful – something of which NAAM was subsequently informed. The reaction by NAAM, however, was one of suspicion.³¹⁰ Stating that it expected the Faculty of Archaeology to act in line with the views of NAAM and Monument Bureau DROV as well as with the principles of the Malta Convention, the director referred to earlier discussions about possible archaeological assistance at Santa Barbara and to the report by the AWG to Santa Barbara Plantation. Accordingly, the Leiden archaeologist asked for insight into the AWG-report and the current heritage policies of Curaçao in order to undertake an archaeological value-assessment at Santa Barbara, and in order to be able to get in line with the views of NAAM.³¹¹

Having confirmed the archaeological values of Santa Barbara as highly significant, but instead concluding that excavation of the site of Spanish Water would be in order, the visit by the Leiden archaeologist to Santa Barbara in June 2007 put things on edge. In a subsequent letter to the Faculty of Archaeology, NAAM referred back to all previous agreements and subsequently stated that Leiden was behaving as a competitor – that it was disturbing the work of NAAM instead of supporting it;

It is not known to us what the University of Leiden is planning to do there. Or is the Faculty now acting <...> in the grey area of private consultancy? <...> I propose that <...> the University of Leiden consults how the proposed collaboration with NAAM and other local institutes of the Netherlands Antilles, out of local priorities, will indeed be developed.³¹²

In a response, the Faculty of Archaeology stressed out to NAAM that their intentions were foremost to conduct a large archaeological research for the benefit of the historical knowledge of Curaçao, and to strengthen the position and capacity of NAAM by means of involving local amateurs and staff.³¹³ In addition, the Dean of the Faculty discussed the outline of the project with the Head of DROV, which led to informal support.

³⁰⁹ Co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

³¹⁰ Correspondence between NAAM and Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (May - June 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³¹¹ Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (May 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³¹² Correspondence NAAM to Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (June 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³¹³ Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (June 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

In July 2008, an agreement was proposed by Leiden and Santa Barbara Plantation NV to conduct archaeological research at the site of Spanish Water, on the basis of “cooperation with local institutions” and “in agreement with the stakeholders”. It was envisaged that the project would leave the site “archaeologically clean”, and conducted according to “quality norms of archaeological research in the Netherlands”, resulting in excavation reports, an archaeological narrative for the envisaged exhibition and a public-oriented publication.³¹⁴ Although the remark about “cooperation with local institutions” had led to some concern by Santa Barbara Plantation, the Dutch archaeologists stressed again that it was the intention by Leiden to collaborate with NAAM during and after the fieldwork. Accordingly, the Dean supported the proposed agreement, expressing his satisfaction to NAAM, DROV and Santa Barbara Plantation over the way in which the archaeological heritage was being handled by the developers, and expressing his wish that such “exemplary behaviour” could “benefit local heritage management also by setting an example for the future”.³¹⁵

Simultaneously, NAAM and the Monument Bureau DROV had investigated the possibility of turning the small island Xaguis in front of Spanish Water into a conservation area, seeing an opportunity in the fact that Santa Barbara Plantation had handed in their development plans to DROV after some changes to the original plan that had been approved by DROV in the 1990’s. NAAM accompanied this strategy with their own proposal to Santa Barbara Plantation to give advise and consultancy to mitigate the impact of the newly planned golf-courses at the site of Spanish Water, stressing that they could work together with Leiden, but preferably by means of a form in which the project would be given to NAAM who would then subsequently ask the expertise of Leiden University for its archaeological research, in order to “give the archaeology, knowledge- and institutional development of our country a serious chance”.³¹⁶ Such a request was denied by Santa Barbara Plantation, favouring a professional institute over an institute without an archaeologist, and over an institute with, in their opinion, a reputation for potentially disturbing development plans. In addition, there was a feeling by the President of the VIDA Group that he would “rather spend the money on those who actually do the work”³¹⁷ – referring to the intention by Santa Barbara Plantation to pay for the archaeological investigations.

By the end of August 2007, a press release was circulated by Santa Barbara Plantation NV in which the archaeological collaboration with Leiden University was announced, stating that it would undertake excavations in collaboration with DROV and NAAM. The response of NAAM and Monument Bureau DROV to Santa Barbara Plantation NV was that such a proposed excavation was premature, since the Monument Bureau had not seen the required legal documents in advance of archaeological valorisation and conduct, that the role of NAAM was not discussed, and that excavation licenses had not been handed out yet – all the while referring to existing heritage policies and laws: “it is the government who assesses the archaeological significance, who decides if there is a threat to archaeological heritage, and subsequently decides how and according to which standards research takes place to safeguard the archaeological remains.”³¹⁸ Pointing out the fact that in-situ preservation was still the preferred option according to the

³¹⁴ Internal correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (July 2007), Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University; confirmed through an interview with a co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

³¹⁵ Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM, DROV and Santa Barbara Plantation NV (August 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³¹⁶ Internal correspondence NAAM (August 2007), Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM; subsequently discussed during an interview with the director of NAAM. (Willemstad, July 2010).

³¹⁷ President of the VIDA Group (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

³¹⁸ Correspondence NAAM to Santa Barbara Plantation (August 2007), Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

Malta Convention, NAAM stressed to Santa Barbara Plantation that heritage policy implementation rested with the government and not with an external party; “it can not be the case that policy relating to our heritage is allocated by an external organisation, no matter how competent”.³¹⁹

Correspondence between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation in September 2007 illustrates how Santa Barbara Plantation was suspicious about the involvement of the Monument Bureau DROV, not understanding what the remit of this organisation was on a site that was not a monument, and feeling that their good intentions with regards to archaeology were frustrated by local institutions. Simultaneously, the board of NAAM decided at this time that the director should not longer frustrate the plans of Santa Barbara Plantation, preferring to work together with Leiden in a constructive, albeit cautious, way.³²⁰ In their view, a positioning of NAAM as a professional archaeological institute was no longer tenable in relation to Leiden University, and it decided to publicly support the intentions of a project developer that was willing to invest in archaeological research. Such a move for continued support for the Santa Barbara Project was also supported within DROV itself, where the Head of DROV had made it clear that the Monument Bureau had to continue with the project, and that Santa Barbara Plantation was free to choose with which archaeological operator it wished to work as long as the procedures would follow legalities.³²¹ The Faculty of Archaeology and Santa Barbara Plantation subsequently agreed to follow the legal and administrative procedures based upon the Dutch implementation of the Malta Convention, as was requested by DROV and NAAM. Such a procedure, which could function as a basis on which to ‘decide if the mutual stakes are in tune with each other’³²² could then also be regarded as an informal case-study for the possible implementation of ‘Malta’ on the island.

The following months saw the preparation by the Faculty of Archaeology of a ‘Project Outline’ (PvE: Programma van Eisen), a ‘Plan of Approach’ (PvA: Plan van Aanpak),³²³ and a request for an excavation license by DROV. Having secured Santa Barbara Plantation’s approval, the documents were sent to DROV in late 2007 for remarks and contributions. These remarks centred around the following points: the island of Xaguis in front of Spanish Water had to be left in situ, remains of other historical periods than that of pre-columbian period had to be documented as well, local amateurs had to be involved, guided tours had to be facilitated, and a public-oriented publication had to be delivered as part of the results. After accommodating these changes the documents were approved and a license for Leiden University was given on the 14th of February 2008.

The financial aspects of the project, which had already been discussed much earlier in the process, were now formalised. It was agreed that Santa Barbara Plantation would donate 100,000 euro for archaeological research as a contribution towards mitigating the development impact on the archaeological resource, which would subsequently be matched with the same amount by Leiden University out of their ‘Campaign for Leiden’ programme. This project had been successfully applied for by the archaeologists of the Faculty of Archaeology on the basis of having secured ‘private match funding’ for archaeological research, although the original scope and budget of the Campaign for Leiden project, as was discussed with NAAM

³¹⁹ Correspondence NAAM to Santa Barbara Plantation (August 2007), Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

³²⁰ According to an interview with the former chairman of the Board of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

³²¹ Former Head of DROV (Willemstad, July 2010); Division Head of the Monuments Bureau DROV (Willemstad, July 2010).

³²² Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to DROV (October 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³²³ See Willems & Brandt (2004, 214-215) for an extensive description of these terms in the context of the ‘Dutch Archaeology Quality Standard’ framework.

the previous year, had to be diminished as a result of internal, broader policy processes in Leiden University that saw a general decrease in funds for the programme.

In the beginning of 2008, the Faculty of Archaeology started to prepare the archaeological fieldwork. Although admitting that “their opinions on how things had to proceed apparently differed”,³²⁴ the archaeologists still expressed their dedication towards securing local involvement and capacity building, and requested assistance from NAAM to involve the members of the Archaeological Working Group, as well as any interested local students. In addition, the Leiden archaeologists continued to advance their vision that they wanted to work in the spirit of Malta.



Figure 16. Archaeological fieldwork at Santa Barbara Plantation (photograph copyright Ben Bekooij, courtesy Santa Barbara Archaeological Project, Faculty of Archaeology).

From 15 June to 24 August 2008, the first excavation season finally took place. The archaeological work consisted of surveys and excavations undertaken at the Spanish Water site, in collaboration and discussion with Santa Barbara Plantation in advance of its development plans. The research led to a redesign of several parts of the site, and to an extensive archaeological excavation in which over 30 students of Leiden participated. Although NAAM had been unsuccessful in securing an official status to work and oversee the work on behalf of DROV, it was involved in the work as an advisor of the Monument Bureau DROV, now through the position of the newly appointed archaeologist that had started working at NAAM. Together,

³²⁴ Correspondence by the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (May 2008). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

they overlooked the quality and procedures of the work as outlined in the PvE and PvA. Although not all members of the Archaeological Working Group were completely enthusiastic about the way in which the project had been developed by Leiden in relation to NAAM,³²⁵ some members of the group participated in the work on an occasional basis. In addition, several guided tours were organised on site, with several classes of school children visiting the excavations. Some lectures and publications in local newspapers by the Leiden researchers were also envisaged, leading to a positive news-cycle in local newspapers.

Correspondence between Leiden and NAAM suggests that the collaboration had slightly improved during the aftermath of the first field-season in the second half of 2008. Communications about archaeological dating, analysis and research strategies were discussed and jointly developed, and the Dutch archaeologists expressed an offer of assistance to NAAM by means of student internships that could help with research and management tasks. Still, the proposed arrival of new international staff and experts by Leiden to work on climate-studies and flora and fauna determination led to suspicions by NAAM, internally stating that “the coming of more Dutch <people> is looked at suspiciously by colleagues on Curaçao, and NAAM is there to make sure that clear agreements are in place and that knowledge which is locally produced will not be taken away anymore.”³²⁶ The second field-season in early 2009, which consisted of analysis, interpretation and documentation of results as well as a small excavation near Seru Boca, arguably overcame some of these suspicions. Archaeological artefacts and excavation materials were left behind, and reference collections for vegetation reconstruction analysis were given to NAAM. Back home in the Netherlands, the archaeologists of Leiden University continued their analysis and research, with micro-wear analysis on shells, C-14 dating, pottery research and flora and fauna determination. Whilst they were working towards the full excavation report during 2009, the first academic presentations on the research also started to appear at international conferences.

5.3.2 PERCEPTIONS OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE

The Santa Barbara Project had by now left its marks on the institutional networks of Caribbean archaeology. From a Faculty of Archaeology perspective, the project had been successful in scientific and academic terms, but it accepted and regretted that it had not been able to facilitate the envisaged collaboration and capacity building with local counterparts:

<the project> was successful, in a scientific sense. <...> it brought added value, but unfortunately not one that was always appreciated locally.³²⁷

They made our work quite difficult <...> so you lose the incentive, you become less active in trying to find extra funds for capacity building and education and so on.³²⁸

In the opinion of NAAM and its counterparts, the Santa Barbara Project had been less successful:

³²⁵ Interview with two school teachers and vocational archaeologists, members of the AWG (Curaçao, June/July 2010).

³²⁶ Internal correspondence NAAM (December 2008). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

³²⁷ Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

³²⁸ Associate Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, one of the Santa Barbara Project co-directors, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, October 2010).

I felt excluded when I heard that Leiden walked away with our project <...> I felt cheated, especially after <...> the agreements that we signed with Leiden to collaborate. I wish Leiden would have taken it seriously, the development of local institutional capacity.³²⁹

I was disappointed with the fact that they only work with students and international researchers, not with local researchers. <...> Yes, you can join if you want, but it's not real collaboration.³³⁰

They asked us to work at Santa Barbara, but they moved past NAAM and our government. My loyalty to the island <...> was the reason that I decided not to participate.³³¹

As a pilot-study on the implementation of 'Malta' in the Netherlands Antilles, the Santa Barbara Project also had differing perceptions of success. Whilst there existed a general feeling amongst respondents that the archaeological, scientific work by Leiden was excellent, and whilst everybody, including NAAM and Monument Bureau DROV, highly appreciated the fact that the project developer had paid for archaeological research, it was the collaboration between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation that was criticised as not being sensitive to the needs and wishes of local institutions:

Foreign archaeologists are of course welcome, but they should always cooperate with local institutions. <Leiden has> fantastic researchers, but the fact that they could operate together with a project developer, without the involvement of NAAM, we thought was not good. It was a warning for us that Malta should be implemented carefully, that we should be careful that we don't lose the control over our own archaeology. However, I see this as problems in the system, I don't think anyone of the individuals or institutions were wrong.³³²

The initiative <...> by Santa Barbara Plantation was good, but it was kept in a circle, an elitist circle, it doesn't reach our communities like this. <...> they should have included our institutions, and they should have worked with local community members, to increase their historical awareness. Through a local institution, it would undoubtedly have had more impact.³³³

A perception that the local population had not benefitted sufficiently from the project, and that the archaeological research by Leiden had become identified with the private resort of Santa Barbara Plantation, can further be illustrated by the remarks of several community members:

It's good that the developer paid for the archaeological work. <...> but it also feels like a salve on the wounds, because this development, this economic development, has destroyed a lot of memories and history. <...> it used to be open to us, I used to come there as a child, to the beach. That's not possible anymore.³³⁴

³²⁹ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

³³⁰ Vocational researcher with interest in the archaeology and geology of the Netherlands Antilles (Oranjestad, June 2010).

³³¹ Vocational archaeologist, member of the AWG (Curaçao, June 2010).

³³² Director of Archaeological Museum Aruba (AMA), Board member of NAAM (Oranjestad, June 2010).

³³³ Board member of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

³³⁴ Local community member (Nieuwpoort/Santa Barbara, July 2010). The expression 'salve on the wounds' refers to the Dutch expression 'pleister op de wonde'. Translation by the author.

It's all hidden from us. It's private, just like Santa Barbara Plantation <...> First they stole our land, now they steal our histories.³³⁵

Santa Barbara Plantation itself, however, expressed their general feelings of success over the project:

I think it was successful. We wanted to take care of the archaeological and historical values at our resort, and we did. There was no real delay in our development, and we got some nice PR out of it, and perhaps some heritage trails for our visitors and a small exhibition.³³⁶

The impact of the Santa Barbara Project on the network and development of heritage initiatives in the Netherlands Antilles further became apparent in the aftermath of the second field-season. When NAAM organised its second meeting on the possible implementation of Malta archaeology in the Antilles in March 2009, archaeologists from Leiden were not invited. Likewise, archaeologists from Leiden University organised a meeting in October 2009 in The Hague where representatives of the Dutch government and heritage organisations discussed the coming of Malta to the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. Although representatives of SIMARC, BONAI and SECAR were present, representatives of NAAM were absent at the meeting.

In advance of the 'coming of Malta', NAAM had started to strengthen its ties with the other islands in the former Netherlands Antilles. Around the beginning of 2010, 'protocols of collaboration' were signed between NAAM and the local governments of Bonaire and Saba. In these protocols, it was explicitly mentioned that the parties wanted to "reduce the dependency and enlarge the tenability with regards to external advice in the field of culture and heritage" and to "increase inter-island forms of collaboration in Caribbean perspective".³³⁷

Despite feelings of slight suspicion by archaeologists on Bonaire, Sint Maarten and Sint Eustatius (which were shared by those of Leiden) about the way in which a Curaçao based organisation tried to establish links to the archaeology of the other islands, the strategy by NAAM seemed to have paid off. In April 2010, OCW offered the final contract for the BES-report (see section 5.2.3) to the 'Project Workgroup Implementation of the Malta Treaty on the BES island', which was coordinated by NAAM and in which representatives of all the islands were present.³³⁸ During a meeting of this workgroup (attached as an appendix to the draft report),³³⁹ members of the working group stated that "small-scale societies should be careful when inviting outsiders to come in and do research",³⁴⁰ and that "research performed by outsiders is often motivated by science/own knowledge, whereas proper dissemination and education/awareness about collective memory ought to be more important considerations for the islands".³⁴¹ Subsequently, it was

³³⁵ Former local school teacher (Montaña Rey, July 2010).

³³⁶ Co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

³³⁷ See 'Collaboration Protocol between Foundation NAAM and the island Bonaire, 11 December 2009', Article 2 (Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM).

³³⁸ For the final report, see Witteveen & Kraan 2012.

³³⁹ Draft report 'Verkenning van de Implementatie van het Verdrag van Malta op de eilanden van Caribisch Nederland, Bonaire, St. Eustatius en Saba' (NAAM 2010). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

³⁴⁰ Draft report 'Verkenning van de Implementatie van het Verdrag van Malta op de eilanden van Caribisch Nederland, Bonaire, St. Eustatius en Saba' (NAAM 2010, 3). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

³⁴¹ Draft report 'Verkenning van de Implementatie van het Verdrag van Malta op de eilanden van Caribisch Nederland, Bonaire, St. Eustatius en Saba' (NAAM 2010, 3-4). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

recommended that every island should have an archaeologist, and that heritage policies and implementation should be accompanied by a strong inter-regional advisory body for local governments.

However, the state of archaeology on the islands remained uncertain during my period of research. As of early 2011, the director of NAAM had for example been made redundant, whilst the position of the archaeologist at NAAM as an island archaeologist of Curaçao had also become uncertain. Simultaneously, the strengthening of Leiden University with local counterparts continued. In January 2011, memorandums of understanding were signed by the Faculty of Archaeology, SECAR and SIMARC on the island of Saba, in order to “guarantee quality research, regional collaboration and youth development”, in advance of the changing heritage legislation.³⁴² Subsequently, this had led to plans being developed on Sint Eustatius for a joint archaeological project in advance of a large development scheme.

5.4 THE AUTHORISED ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

5.4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section will investigate the main values and discourses of the archaeological actors in the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project. In line with the analysis given in chapter 4, a dominating discourse on archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration will be identified which prioritises scientific and archaeological values over others. As in section 4.4, I will generalise the characterisation of this discourse, for practical matters, as the ‘Authorised Archaeological Discourse’ (AAD).

Before I will delve into the discursive practices and consequences of archaeological research projects abroad, I wish to illustrate once again the expressed intentions of the Leiden researchers behind undertaking such projects in the Caribbean. When looking at the track-record of the research projects by the Faculty in the Caribbean, and when discussing the intentions with the individual researchers, it is clear that a clear understanding and willingness exists about the importance of integrating archaeological projects firmly in the social context. As stressed during the inaugural address by the professor in Caribbean archaeology, it is the intention by the Caribbean Research Group to “increase our international collaboration in the area and to strive together with local institutions and museums after mutual care for the management of cultural heritage, promote its public-oriented presentation and to effect the training of local staff” (Hofman 2008, 13).

According to several students, foreign colleagues and external experts, as well as reflected in research seminars and lectures given in Leiden University, the Caribbean Research Group has always promoted capacity building elements, educational programs, heritage management issues and participatory projects with local and indigenous communities and museums, such as in former research projects in St Lucia, Saba and St Vincent. The issue here at stake, is why the approach and this set of ‘good intentions’ (cf La Salle 2010) did not succeed as planned in Curaçao, and how archaeological policies and practices could contribute to ‘unintended consequences’ in the sense of relatively ‘closed networks’ and ‘exclusionary mechanisms’ (cf Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming). As such, I believe that some of the problems and ‘failures’ (as perceived by local counterparts of the project), should not be sought in these intentions – rather, I believe they are to be found in the discursive practices and processes of policy negotiation within

³⁴² This was mentioned in the newspaper article ‘Three institutions continue archaeological cooperation’ from the Daily Herald in Saba (January 2011), available at <http://www.thedailyherald.com/> [Accessed 17 February 2011].

the institutional, political and funding frameworks of archaeology. I will come back to these issues throughout this chapter.

5.4.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE AS A FRAGILE SCIENTIFIC RESOURCE UNDER THREAT

When looking at the values and discourses of Dutch archaeological actors, institutions and policies, one can distil some clear story-lines on the way in which ‘archaeological heritage’ is defined and approached. Primarily, sites with material remains of the past are regarded as a ‘fragile’ and ‘non-renewable’ resource under threat from destruction (cf Holtorf 2002). It is in line with this view, that the concept of ‘heritage’ is discursively constructed in the AAD; material remains of the past are regarded as ‘archaeological heritage’, and in turn, ‘heritage’ is thereby thought of to be constituted of material manifestations of the past. Specifically, heritage is being conceived of as material manifestations of the past, as artefacts and material that should be preserved for the scientific ‘data’ that it can yield for ‘future generations’ by means of developing meaningful publications on ‘past societies’ that are perceived of as being of ‘universal’ value (cf Smith 2006).

Such a story-line on the scientific appropriation and use of heritage is for instance clearly illustrated within the Malta Convention (cf Duineveld 2006; Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming). Article 1 ‘The definition of archaeological heritage’ states that archaeological heritage is an “instrument for historical and scientific study”, where “archaeological heritage shall include structures, constructions, groups of buildings, developed sites, moveable objects, monuments of other kinds as well as their context, whether situated on land or under water” (Council of Europe 1992, article 1). Although the article also mentions archaeological heritage as “a source of the European collective memory”, it mainly approaches heritage in its material form, whilst attention to incorporating immaterial, intangible forms of heritage are topics that it considers to be dealt with in other conventions and charters. In addition, archaeological heritage in the Malta Convention is regarded as a fragile resource under threat (Preamble) that needs to be protected and rescued in order to “preserve the archaeological heritage and guarantee the scientific significance of archaeological research work” (Council of Europe 1992, article 3).

This story-line on heritage as a source of scientific data under threat that needs to be preserved is not only advanced by Leiden archaeologists in the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project when supporting the adoption of ‘Malta’ for the Antilles, but also in a more explicit sense when discussing the social value of archaeology in the region, and when referring to a ‘fragile soil archive’: “the source of knowledge about the indigenous populations of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba is threatened by natural factors and human activity” (Hofman & Hoogland 2007, 9).

As such, sites with material remains of the past are mainly considered as a ‘source of knowledge’ under threat that has the potential to yield research benefits by constructing archaeological interpretations of the past. The value of this constructed past, is then often seen in the global, universal benefit that it yields – something also reflected in the Malta Convention when it talks about the ‘history of mankind’ (Council of Europe 1992). A supporting story-line that advocates that archaeological pasts should be interpreted in a regional or global perspective is also mirrored in the aims of the Leiden Caribbean Research Group. These try to “demystify popular understandings of the Indian past”³⁴³ and challenge island-centric identity perceptions that are currently symptomatic for the islands, where populations share an island-centric view derived from history books and research frameworks that were written and undertaken by former French,

³⁴³ Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, pers. comm. during a radio interview for the Teleac program Hoe?Zo!, 24 February 2010. Available at <http://www.teleac.nl/radio/1683209/home/item/2798729/graven-in-het-caribisch-gebied/> [Accessed 11 March 2010].

English, Spanish and Dutch colonial powers (Hofman 2008). The proposed research is therefore international, interdisciplinary, and tries to bring a Caribbean-wide and global approach to the interpretation of archaeology. Interestingly, a same kind of approach is brought forward and advocated for the field of heritage management, calling for the principles of Malta to be implemented across the Caribbean in order to safeguard the remains of a shared and ‘threatened Antillean heritage’ (ibid).

5.4.3 THE PRIMACY OF SCIENCE AND EXCAVATION

Another story-line within the AAD places emphasis upon scientific rigour in archaeology, as well as upon the importance of archaeological excavation. A good example to start with, is again the Malta Convention, which states not only that archaeological heritage is an “instrument for historical and scientific study”, but also that “excavations or discoveries and other methods of research into mankind and the related environment are the main sources of information” (Council of Europe 1992, article 1). Interestingly, the story-line that excavation is a primary source of knowledge extraction goes hand in hand in the same Malta Convention with the call for ‘in-situ’ preservation, one of its core principles (see especially articles 2, 3 and 4). In effect, these articles call for a priority in terms of safeguarding archaeological sites in-situ over excavation. However, many archaeologists and members of the public that were interviewed identify excavations as the primary activity of archaeologists (cf Schücker forthcoming), whilst the idea of in-situ preservation was often overlooked or misunderstood when discussing the tasks of archaeologists: “I have pointed them towards these old undisturbed sites, but they don’t excavate them. I don’t understand, I thought archaeologists wanted to do research”.³⁴⁴

When discussing the discursive practices of archaeology, Smith (2004) illustrates how within the archaeological discipline, the concept of ‘archaeological science’ privileges scientific rigour, which in turn privileges practices such as ‘excavation’. She goes on to explain how this privileged position of excavation is then subsequently reflected and reconstructed in the discourse of the discipline (ibid., 64). Similarly, I will argue that the emphasis on ‘archaeological science’ and the privileged position of excavation practice in the AAD and the archaeological discipline often comes down to a situation whereby ‘rescue excavation’ is preferred in practice over ‘in situ’ preservation. Such an idea is illustrated by the way in which archaeologists themselves talked about the Malta Convention, and by the way in which archaeologists often prioritised the ‘polluter-pay’ principle of the Malta Convention over other articles, when summarising the Malta Convention. Subsequently, the emphasis on the ‘polluter-pay’ principle is often mentioned in the context of the Malta Convention as a means of finding funding for archaeological research, and thereby, archaeological excavations.

During an internal research day at the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, it was for instance mentioned that the ‘changing laws’ in the Caribbean could lead to ‘new funding opportunities’, which in turn could lead to ‘new research opportunities’.³⁴⁵ Although definitely not incorrect, it is interesting to see how such a notion has been taken over by the media in the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles. For example, an article in the Dutch magazine ‘Elsevier’ mentioned that if Dutch Malta legislation would be implemented in the Netherlands Antilles, “that <law> would oblige project developers to take archaeology into account and to pay for research” (Toebosh 2008a, 73). That the prioritisation of the polluter-pay principle as a research funding opportunity over other articles is not uncommon with academic archaeologists in general, is also clearly reflected by remarks of the former Chief Inspector for Archaeology at the Dutch Heritage Inspectorate; “the fact that Malta is about in-situ

³⁴⁴ Vocational researcher with interest in the archaeology and geology of Aruba (Oranjestad, June 2010).

³⁴⁵ Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, 11 October 2010).

preservation and public outreach, is not well known with academics. They tend to just see it as a huge pot of money”.³⁴⁶

5.4.4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE AS A PROFESSIONAL CONCERN OF THE STATE

Another story-line of the AAD comprises the idea that the management and responsibility of archaeological heritage is foremost a concern of the state, and that archaeological researchers are best suited to act ‘professionally’ on its behalf – as professionals that have the knowledge to decide upon the fate of specific archaeological remains and periods, and the ‘expertise’ to excavate and interpret the archaeological remains according to high research and ‘ethical’ standards (cf Meskell & Pels 2005a; Holtorf 2005; Smith 2004; 2006). This is because story-lines of the AAD primarily value ‘archaeological heritage’ as a source of scientific data, but also because the ‘past’ is often used as a distant, vague rhetorical concept that needs ‘expertise’ in order to ‘unlock’ its true meaning (Smith 2006, 29).

The way in which the Malta Convention for example is set up implies that heritage concerns are a matter of the state – or more specifically, in the case of it being a European treaty, a responsibility of the collection of European states. In addition, it mentions the exchange of ‘expertise’ and ‘experts’ and talks about ‘professional scientific purposes’. Linked to this is the way in which the Malta Convention has been implemented throughout Europe, whereby specific emphasis is placed in national adaptations that call for expertise and professionalism, reflected for instance in quality standards and registers of ‘professional’ archaeologists (cf Willems & Van den Dries 2007).

The identification of expert archaeologists working on behalf of the state to safeguard and research the archaeological heritage, was also illustrated by some of the remarks by individual archaeologists working in the Caribbean when discussing the remit of other archaeologists in terms of dealing with archaeology and heritage management issues on the islands. In their view, archaeologists who were not directly working for local governments or who were not experienced with the specific archaeology of certain islands in the Caribbean should not be allowed to decide upon heritage matters. In line with this story-line is the focus on ‘professionalism’. Interestingly, such a notion also makes it feasible to work on behalf of landowners and developers when it provides opportunities for funding and research. This is because archaeology, as a result of the Malta Convention, has become confronted with dealing with the development and commercial sector, where client relationships call for professionalism when dealing with the impact of archaeology. As was remarked by an employee of Santa Barbara Plantation NV; “we want professionals, real scientists. Not some local organisation without an archaeologist.”³⁴⁷

The emphasis on archaeological expertise, professionalism and the ‘top-down’ approach that favours regional and global perspectives to archaeology, in combination favours the access and perceived ownership of archaeological experts. In addition, notions such as ‘universal value’, or ‘shared responsibility’ for instance, however well meant, often problematize the local (cf Lafrenz Samuels 2010), thereby calling for more regional and top-down approaches to problems – and, often unintentionally, calling for increased access to archaeology from an academic, global scale. As will be discussed below, such values, story-lines and discourses can be perceived by local partners as a challenge to local demands for ownership, local identity and empowerment over sites with material remains of the past.

³⁴⁶ Former Chief Inspector for Archaeology at the Dutch Heritage Inspectorate, current Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

³⁴⁷ Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010.

5.4.5 PARTICIPATION AND EDUCATION AS A MEANS TO ADVANCE RESEARCH AND PROTECTION

Finally, I wish to focus on the story-line within the AAD that calls for the creation of public benefit through advancing conservation, presentation, education and tourism development of a site. Such a story-line is for example reflected in the intentions and aims of the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project, of the Campaign for Leiden, as well in the individual discourses of the archaeologists. As I illustrated in my case study on Jordan (see section 4.4), this story-line of the AAD was thereby characterised by actors explicitly mentioning that such socio-economic, educational and tourism values should be dealt with *after* archaeological research had taken place, and then often with a view that the primary reason for involvement, education and awareness of local communities should be seen in the protection of the archaeological record. Although an explicit mentioning of public awareness and benefit as a *final* element of archaeological research projects is not present in the discursive story-lines of the Santa Barbara Project (rather, on the contrary), the Campaign for Leiden project proposal does illustrate how public participation and outreach is regarded as a way in which to develop support for heritage research: “The public <-oriented> presentations and publications will be done at first as to subsequently come to more and focused further research that takes root in the Antillean and Aruban community.”³⁴⁸ In this respect, it has been mentioned that values that call for social change and public participation are often “obscured by the self-referential tendencies of the discourse” (Smith 2006, 16). As such, I will argue in the coming sections how these discursive story-lines within the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project still favoured an idea of educational and collaboration values as elements that could only be dealt with when integrated in a ‘linear’ approach (cf Williams & van der Linde 2006), that is, under circumstances that do not obstruct scientific and archaeological values of the process – which, in practice, meant that public values and participation opportunities were nonetheless assessed in terms of their capacity to support the primacy of research, and were (often unintentionally) postponed to the future.

5.5 PROJECT POLICY NEGOTIATIONS AND THE TRANSLATION OF VALUES

5.5.1 ALTERNATIVE VALUES AND DISCOURSES

This section will explore in more detail how the Dutch archaeological actors negotiated the above-mentioned values and discourses of the project policies in relation to those of local institutional counterparts, government bodies, and commercial parties. Before doing so, I will start by looking in more detail at the values and discourses used by NAAM with respect to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration.

NAAM advances a different emphasis of values in relation to sites with material remains of the past, one that places the scientific value as secondary to community, identity and socio-economic values. First of all, NAAM advocates a discursive story-line that regards sites with material remains of the past as having a prime function to play in the fostering of identity formation on both an island as well as a pan-Caribbean level, and in the legitimisation and nation-building of the islands as opposed to former, European and

³⁴⁸ Taken from the project summary description of ‘Antilliaans en Arubaans Erfgoed: 4000 jaar bewoningsgeschiedenis in beeld’, available at the ‘Campaign for Leiden’ website of Leiden University at www.campagnevoorleiden.leidenuniv.nl [Accessed 15 April 2010] (Translation by author). A more extensive description of the project outline can be found in the unpublished project policy proposal ‘Antilliaans en Arubaans erfgoed: 4000 jaar bewoningsgeschiedenis in beeld’ (2006), available at the Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

Western influences. Secondly, as clearly stated in the vision statement of NAAM, an idea of sites with material remains of the past as reflecting specifically intangible aspects is brought forward, which is thought to include memories, dance, language and spiritual values (NAAM 2009, 25-26). Finally, it is stressed that material remains of the past can play an important socio-economic role, especially in light of the increasing touristic developments on the islands.

In effect, the AAD is in sharp contrast with such a view that the value of sites with material remains of the past lies primarily in more contemporary identifications and uses. For NAAM, material remains are not ‘scientific data’, but rather someone’s ‘heritage’, that is, a manifestation of people’s history, identity, memory or commemoration. Interestingly, such a discourse also uses the concept of ‘heritage’, but the perception, approach and attributed values are different – whilst the AAD prioritises the archaeological and scientific values of heritage sites, the discourse by NAAM prioritises the identity, local, educational, and socio-economic values of such places.

Although the scientific value of ‘heritage’ is also mentioned as one of the core tasks of NAAM, it should be noted that this is not seen as an end itself, but rather as a means to an end – that is, of identity and nation formation:

heritage can be found in the landscape, housing; the development of the city; family relationships <...> It manifests itself in music, knowledge and spiritual traditions of people <...> The tangible (material) and living (intangible) cultural heritage that we share together, is not only a source of knowledge and experience but also a cultural and geographical landmark for who and where we are <...> Cultural heritage is an important source of identity and nation building, but also for sustainable economic development. <...> Cultural heritage institutions are powerful tools for identity and autonomy because they not only preserve and enrich the memory of a people <...>, but also confirm its legitimacy. (NAAM 2009, 25-26)

In contrast with the AAD, the director of NAAM placed less emphasis on the idea of material remains of the past as a ‘fragile research record’ and of the primacy of academic, professional expertise: “I see artefacts as the materialisation of memories, they see it purely as data.”³⁴⁹ Another good example of this alternative discourse and value-attribution to heritage, is the fact that the ‘M’ of the abbreviation NAAM was changed, in 1998, from ‘Museum’ to ‘Memory Management’: “Because <our task> is wider than <...> traditional museum tasks and because it also contributes to the promotion of historical awareness, identity and enriching the collective memory of people, the M of Memory is chosen, Memory Management” (NAAM 2009, 25).

Illustrating the idea of ‘Memory Management’ further, the director of NAAM explained that “memory management is about the fact that on the Antilles, we have a fragmented memory. We want to preserve and enrich the memoria of the people <...> it’s about spirituality, songs, language, <...> habits.”³⁵⁰ During my research, the website of NAAM showed a similar approach towards heritage as a pathway to a self-developed identity formation;

³⁴⁹ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

³⁵⁰ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

Heritage is one of the ways in which a nation slowly constructs for itself a sort of collective social memory <...> This holds even more for Caribbean countries like Curacao, with a long history of colonisation, enslavement and migration.³⁵¹

As we have seen above, the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project from the Dutch end, also placed emphasis on the need of advancing a pan-Caribbean perspective towards the interpretation of archaeological heritage. The difference however, lies in the fact that the Leiden researchers mainly focused on challenging popular myths and island-centric interpretations and on bringing forward scientifically grounded approaches, and on strengthening the idea of a shared, connected Indian past on the islands. Although the Leiden archaeologists explicitly recognised that the identification with the Indian past differed greatly from island to island,³⁵² it is precisely the scientific focus on the Indian past that differs with the idea by NAAM of strengthening a pan-Caribbean identity on Curaçao – for NAAM, the ‘indigenusness’ of identity formation lies in a more recent, ‘afro-Curaçaoan’ past:

I think we should focus on the continuity of histories and the lives of people that lived here. <...> The contact period is important, and the afro-Curaçaoan history, such as slave burials, the Kunuku culture, and the continuity of these towards the present. <...> the Indian period is interesting, but it should not be a priority for public archaeology.³⁵³

Despite these different heritage values and discourses, both Leiden and NAAM stressed the importance of regional collaboration in heritage. However the difference, again, lies in the approach and the actors that are envisaged to come into play into such a collaboration. Whilst the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project as developed by Leiden calls for a global, scientific approach towards networks in both the past and the present that leaves room for the position of archaeological experts, NAAM rather advocated a story-line that calls for a ‘bottom-up’ approach that is based upon personal, traditional and local ways of interaction;

I think we shouldn’t approach history as something that is to be captured and managed in terms of networks, as Leiden does, it is too western. <...> I believe it should be more about something that they call here in Papiamentu *ban topa*, which means something like to meet each other, let’s see each other.³⁵⁴

This difference in values and discourses is also reflected in the perception by the director of NAAM on the institutional aims and frameworks of both organisations – whilst Leiden favours an approach that prioritises the scientific and archaeological values in order to come to a universal, shared knowledge of cultural heritage, NAAM rather calls for the building of a cultural capital that is self-owned, and self-developed: “My biggest problem with the Santa Barbara project, and with Leiden in general, is the fact that there is a clash of institutional aims. We want to build up local capacity. They want to do research”.³⁵⁵

³⁵¹ Available at http://www.naam.an/index.php?topic=cultural_heritage [Accessed 2 November 2010].

³⁵² Pers. comm. during a radio interview for the Teleac program ‘Hoe?Zo!’, 24 February 2010. Available at <http://www.teleac.nl/radio/1683209/home/item/2798729/graven-in-het-caribisch-gebied/> [Accessed 11 March 2010].

³⁵³ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

³⁵⁴ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

³⁵⁵ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

The discourse used by NAAM, however, is more complex. Just as the AAD includes story-lines that call for the incorporation of social values such as public outreach, capacity building and the involvement of local organisations, so does NAAM use story-lines of the AAD in its alternative discourse on heritage. The increasing integration with a discourse that resembles story-lines of the AAD is, firstly, a result of the fact that ‘Malta’ was brought to the Caribbean through international spheres of influence, and in particular by the Dutch interest in forwarding such laws on the BES-islands. Secondly, the move was mirrored within the island governmental policies, which were based upon the previous ‘Monument-laws’ of the Netherlands, where the Dutch ratification of Malta was subsequently also taken over by the government of the Netherlands Antilles. Finally, as I will argue below, I believe that another reason existed behind incorporating a move towards AAD story-lines and ‘Malta’ more generally, and that this should be sought within the need to (re-)gain access and decision-power over the management and research of archaeological sites on Curaçao and the other islands.

For NAAM, the benefits of a governmental responsibility of heritage that is built upon the elements of Malta archaeology, serves not a primary role towards science, but rather one of identity and self-development. As such, the way in which ‘Malta’ is used by NAAM is different, in the sense that it tries to place it within a ‘bottom-up’ approach and within a wider framework of values towards archaeological heritage. The newly appointed archaeologist of the Netherlands Antilles, stationed at NAAM, for example emphasised different articles and aspects of the Malta Convention during the second NAAM seminar in 2009 than those previously mentioned as being part of the AAD. Apart from stressing the polluter-pay principle, the archaeologist also stressed the need for public communication, international collaboration, and the fact that value-assessments needed to be made in advance of development. A clear idea on the type of values that needed to be addressed in such an assessment, can be seen by the emphasis that was placed on the inclusion of social and economic values of heritage during the presentation of the *Mapa Kultural Historiko Korsou* on the 30th of Augustus 2007.³⁵⁶ Indeed, this can be viewed as a challenge to the scientific values that are normally rehearsed as a result of the self-referential system of the expert discourse in Malta Archaeology in the Netherlands (cf Duineveld 2006; Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming). In addition, NAAM placed much more emphasis on ‘in-situ’ preservation as opposed to the need for excavation, when discussing the plans for the site of Spanish Water: “in-situ has our preference over excavation, unless it is important for us, for our island, for our history”.³⁵⁷

However, the marriage between the alternative heritage discourse of NAAM with an emphasis on Malta archaeology was an uneasy one. According to Smith (2006, 82), competing, alternative discourses on heritage (such as those dealing with memory, place and dissonance) in the end come together in the ‘act of heritage’ – in doing, celebrating heritage (or arguably, in relation to the case study of Curaçao, in the act of the above mentioned *ban topa*), as well as in negotiating and understanding the dissonance, or competing values, of heritage. Accordingly, such an idea of ‘heritage’ can not be ‘managed’ in the western, top-down and technical approach favoured by the AAD, since it reduces dissonance and issues arising over memory, place and identity as site-specific problems (ibid). This ‘clash of discourses’, or the clash between ‘memory’ and ‘management’, is however already made explicit through the name of NAAM itself, which refers specifically to ‘Memory Management’.

³⁵⁶ See the online newspaper article ‘Presentatie digitale Cultuur Historische Kaart Curaçao bij NAAM’ at Caribseek Caribbean News (5 September 2007), available at http://news.caribseek.com/Curacao/article_55449.shtml [Accessed 10 June 2010].

³⁵⁷ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

The discourse used by NAAM with regards to memory, place and intangible heritage, often sits side by side with indigenous approaches that challenge the idea of a state-owned, governmentally controlled heritage and the way in which a concept of heritage has been used to exclude minorities. The wish by NAAM to gain governmental status from DROV in its negotiations with Leiden University (see above), and the use of governmental policies as to secure access to the archaeology of the Santa Barbara Plantation, therefore sits potentially uneasy with its own discourse. The call for Malta archaeology and the bid to get NAAM recognised as a governmental organisation, was however necessary in order to gain access and power within a system that was dominated by institutions, organisations and policies in which the AAD had become embedded, and which in the Netherlands itself, has been argued to form a closed policy network that excludes non-professional and non-governmental ‘amateurs’ (Duineveld 2006). The need for NAAM to get an archaeologist appointed was for example also necessary, as to secure a say over the management and access over the archaeological resources on the island and in the ‘professional’ negotiations with the developers on the island.

The call by NAAM for Malta archaeology, and the resulting challenge that this brought to its own discourse of local, alternative heritage making, can also be distilled in the way in which the emphasis within the opening statements of the two seminars of NAAM changed over the course of the years. Whilst the opening statements of the 2005 seminar ‘Legislation cultural heritage in the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba’ mentioned explicitly that heritage preservation and management should move away from a sole focus on ‘physical monuments and sites’ as to include also ‘living heritage’ (Gomez 2005, 2), a seminar four years later showed that the legislation in terms of intangible heritage was not given any attention yet (see Witteveen *et al.* 2009). Reflecting this, the emphasis in the opening speech by a government official was now stressing another important relationship – that between heritage protection and economic development schemes.

5.5.2 POLICY NEGOTIATIONS AND THE TRANSLATION OF VALUES

Now that I have looked at the alternative values and discourses of NAAM, and its complex integration with the AAD, I will continue to focus upon the way in which the Santa Barbara Project is developed through policy negotiations and translation of the Dutch archaeologists’ discourses and values in relation to those of other stakeholders in the social context. The concept of ‘translation’ will be rehearsed here as a fundamental notion that refers to a process of interpretation by actors of one set of values into another set of values that fit the policy discourses, story-lines and motivations of other stakeholders, organisations and actors (cf Mosse 2005, 9; 2004; Latour 1996, 86; Lewis & Mosse 2006). We will see how the Santa Barbara Project got ‘stronger’ when more stakeholders could align themselves to the project through successful translation, and how the scientific and archaeological values of archaeologists worked seamlessly with the values of the project developer through shared story-lines, and how through this, the dominating values behind the AAD were constantly reproduced and reflected in discursive practices.

During the years 2004-2007, the collaboration between Leiden and NAAM had been developing on the basis of discussions, correspondence and upon the documents surrounding the creation of a position of a Professor of Caribbean Archaeology in Leiden (see section 5.3). During this period, both partners agreed to develop a partnership, because both of them saw their values reflected in the discourse and story-lines used. Both of the partners agreed that the archaeological ‘heritage’ of Curaçao and the Netherlands Antilles was under threat, and both agreed that institutional capacity could be strengthened by a collaboration in research and management, and that a Malta-like system in the Netherlands Antilles would provide a good solution to protect and research archaeological heritage. NAAM could easily translate these story-lines into their institutional aims for fostering the identity, educational and community values which it ascribed to a

definition of ‘archaeological heritage’. In addition, NAAM saw the proposed collaboration as an opportunity for creating economic benefits for its own institution, for increasing capacity, and for managing heritage sites in a sense that would foster socio-economic benefits for local communities – all through having a strong scientific partner to work with in advance of developments such as those at Santa Barbara. Likewise, Leiden could translate the proposed collaboration into scientific and archaeological values for research, student and staff exchange programs, and into economic values in the sense of a ‘Malta archaeology’ that would open up third-stream funding opportunities – all values that were embedded in the institutional and funding frameworks of Leiden University, and in the project policies of the ‘Campaign for Leiden’.

However, at the core of these agreements, very different ideas existed on what exactly ‘a threat to archaeological heritage’ entailed. Firstly, NAAM saw this threat in the form of loosing immaterial memories and opportunities for identity and capacity building on the local and island level, and Leiden in the form of losing a material scientific resource that could provide a global, scientific interpretation of a pan-Caribbean past as to challenge island-centric views on pre-columbian history. Secondly, the ideas of how to approach ‘institutional capacity building’, and of what such a notion actually entails, also differed greatly – best summarised as a ‘bottom-up’ versus a ‘top-down’ approach (see above). However, none of these underlying differences were made explicit in the representation of the proposed collaboration at this phase – the use of general, rather vague concepts such as ‘capacity building’ and ‘collaboration’ as well as the overlap of each others discourses through shared story-lines (although with a different prioritisation of values) allowed for the establishment of a partnership – each partner successfully translating their values into those of their organisations, supporters and stakeholders.

The policy negotiations between NAAM and Santa Barbara Plantation during the first encounters in 2005 were less successful. After the short value-assessment by the Archaeological Working Group in 2005, NAAM wrote a letter to Santa Barbara Plantation with the suggestion to preserve the site of Spanish Water through means of an archaeological ‘park’ that could be visited by (local) tourists (see above). NAAM referred to an article and news-paper coverage in which commitments by Santa Barbara Plantation were mentioned after the archaeological work conducted at Santa Barbara in the early 1990’s, as to preserve the site and to establish a local museum (Amigoe 1992; Haviser 1998). As such, NAAM advanced the idea of ‘in-situ’ preservation – in line with their perceptions of the coming Malta Convention, but also related to the fact that NAAM did not have an archaeologist.³⁵⁸

Such an idea, however, could not be translated by Santa Barbara Plantation into its own values and motivations. For example, the ‘in-situ idea’ by NAAM was for Santa Barbara Plantation not an option, since it perceived this as a means by NAAM to secure future access to the site for their own research purposes, and as a means to hinder development through wanting to develop the site as an official monument down the line.³⁵⁹ As such, Santa Barbara Plantation had come to see the previous preservation efforts and archaeological interventions at the site of Spanish Water – which it had funded on the agreement that several parts could be destroyed after archaeological work – as a means to guarantee the access of future archaeologists. Indeed, in the article that accompanied the proposal of NAAM it was mentioned that the in-situ approach of the 1990’s functioned as a way to “preserve a part of the site for tomorrow’s scientists” (Haviser 1998, 9). Related to this, was a strong perception by individual actors of Santa Barbara Plantation that archaeology mainly constitutes ‘science’ and ‘excavation’, and that it should be undertaken for the benefit of writing universal valuable histories; “developers can give you guys an

³⁵⁸ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

³⁵⁹ Co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

opportunity. We have land, money, manpower, so you can research and excavate, and educate the world with historic timelines.”³⁶⁰

The emphasis by Santa Barbara Plantation on the scientific and archaeological values of material remains of the past as well as the benefit of preserving such resources for future generations (of archaeologists) is a typical story-line of the AAD. A related story-line, fuelled by previous experiences of Santa Barbara Plantation personnel who had worked with universities around the world in archaeological rescue excavations, was the idea that archaeological work had to be undertaken by ‘professionals’, and by experts:

from our experiences in the golf industry, we know that archaeology has to be dealt with professionally. But this takes the willingness of archaeologists to be team-players, instead of being conflictive. <...> I don't like comments such as ‘we don't know what it is, but it's important and you can't touch it’. What we needed is to know where the archaeology was, so we could work around it and be flexible.”³⁶¹

The fact that NAAM did not have an archaeologist at that time – not helped by the fact that the vocational Archaeological Working Group visited the site in company of friends and family members – lead to the perception that NAAM was not a ‘professional party’ to engage with. Crucially, Santa Barbara Plantation had come to distrust the intentions of NAAM, due to its reputation as an activist force that wanted to obstruct development, sometimes by turning sites into monuments, sometimes by ‘making troubles’ after the work had started.³⁶² Interestingly, I came across similar statements about NAAM and the Monuments Bureau of DROV during my interviews with others working in the tourism-development industry in the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba:

They don't tell us anything, they wait until we start, and then they come and try to get us. Why should <they> be allowed to stop a two hundred million project, just so they can look at a few piles of shells for their own research? ³⁶³

The emphasis by NAAM on in-situ preservation, a park for local inhabitants and tourists, and ‘institutional collaboration’ therefore conflicted with the values of Santa Barbara Plantation, that forwarded the idea of excavation, professionalism, establishing universal pasts for tourists, and that had no willingness to include local counterparts out of distrust over the sabotage of development work. Underlying this, was the fact that Santa Barbara Plantation wanted to continue with the development of golf-courses – although there was willingness to mitigate some parts of the site through re-landscaping, a complete idea of a preserved park with local access was one bridge too far, especially in view of the fact that legally, Santa Barbara Plantation had already gained a license for developing the site.³⁶⁴

Although Santa Barbara Plantation employees mentioned that “legally, we could have taken the bad PR and destroy it”,³⁶⁵ and although negative media coverage was not considered an issue since “people in the

³⁶⁰ Santa Barbara Plantation NV employee (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

³⁶¹ Santa Barbara Plantation NV employee (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

³⁶² According to the co-director and several employees of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

³⁶³ Private consultant for the tourism-development industry in the Netherlands Antilles (Willemstad, July 2010).

³⁶⁴ The fact that the director of NAAM in later correspondence stressed that the idea of a park should be regarded as an interpretive archaeological site and “not as a recreational park area” did not change this the slightest. Correspondence NAAM to DROV (October 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

³⁶⁵ Santa Barbara Plantation NV employee (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

island here don't care about history",³⁶⁶ Santa Barbara Plantation opted in the end for a solution in which the archaeological values would be mitigated and hindrance to the development would be minimised.



Figure 17. Santa Barbara golf course near the site of Spanish Water, with the old plantation house located at the back (photograph by author, 2010).

Interestingly, the President of the VIDA Group, in charge of the overall planning decisions at Santa Barbara Plantation, declared that such a decision came primarily out of an automatism from working in the USA where similar policies to Malta were in force.³⁶⁷ Here, he had come to realise that dealing professionally and early on with archaeological values often provided added benefit to a development project; “incorporating constraints could lead to happier residents and more valuable properties”.³⁶⁸ In this respect, Hyatt Regency (which had recently started to operate its services on the south-western part of the Santa Barbara area), had already come to regard archaeology as an added tourism amenity. As such, Santa Barbara Plantation supported ascribing scientific and archaeological values to the site because, when taken

³⁶⁶ President of the VIDA Group (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

³⁶⁷ The fact that US project developers had automatically reserved funds for heritage mitigation because of previous experiences with governmental policies in the USA, has also been described in a research on the possible implementation of the Malta Convention on the BES islands by the Centre for International Heritage Activities (De Groot 2009, 16).

³⁶⁸ President of the VIDA Group (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

care of ‘professionally’, these could lead to additional touristic and economic values for the project as a whole, and to avoiding delays in its development. A collaboration with an international university that would deal with local heritage institutions on their behalf, and that would mitigate the archaeological values professionally through excavation and knowledge production, would in their view easier lead to economic benefits and to political support at the highest levels of DROV, than having to work with a local institution that was not a governmental representative and that wanted to gain access to the site by obstructing development through means of establishing an archaeological park.

When, in early 2007, Santa Barbara Plantation requested advice from the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, a process was started that rapidly saw the successful translation of the values and motivations by both partners, and whereby a partnership was established on the basis of a strong discourse-coalition – despite the fact that both partners ascribed different values to the project. The story-line that was (re-) produced mostly within the Santa Barbara Project project policies, and that allowed for the most fruitful translation of values of Leiden University and Santa Barbara, was one of close cooperation between developer and professional archaeologists that allowed for the successful rescuing of threatened archaeological remains by means of excavations and knowledge production about the past, and, by doing so, for fostering educational and tourism benefits for the general public.

The request by Santa Barbara Plantation for mitigating archaeological values through professional experts, was a close resemblance to the story-lines of the AAD used by archaeologists of Leiden University. Replying that the Faculty of Archaeology had experience in professional development archaeology in a Malta context, the prospect of an archaeological project at Santa Barbara led to as easy translation in terms of the policy goals and institutional motivations of Leiden University. The ‘rescue’ project at Santa Barbara fitted not only the intentions for mitigating impacts on the archaeological resource in the Antilles, but also the research agendas of the researchers, the need for a large-scale field-season, and for finding external funds from the private sector needed for matching the Campaign for Leiden funds. As such, a project based upon the idea of a large scale excavation that yielded both preservation as well as scientific benefits as a result of Malta policy, kicked off – which, as we have seen, was contrary to the values and motivations of NAAM. In the words of the director of NAAM, and an employee of Santa Barbara Plantation respectively;

I didn’t see the need to excavate at first. We wanted to keep it in-situ. Leiden agreed that it was of high value, but they wanted to excavate it. I didn’t see the need for this, the benefit of this scientific knowledge.³⁶⁹

<NAAM> had told us we couldn’t touch these two areas, but that was not an option. The golf courses would have to come there, we already had re-located one hole. But they did not have the expertise, no archaeologists, no money, and no willingness to cooperate. They said we couldn’t touch it, but I thought you archaeologists wanted to excavate and study <...> you could learn, study, bring students.³⁷⁰

The use of common discursive story-lines in relation to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration facilitated an easy translation of values between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation. The preference by Santa Barbara Plantation for Leiden University was however based upon

³⁶⁹ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

³⁷⁰ Santa Barbara Plantation NV employee (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

several other factors. The fact that Leiden University would bring in matching funds to the project played a part in this, since it would allow for a much larger project with increased benefits. The fact that Santa Barbara Plantation and the ‘Malta’ policies towards archaeology prioritised an emphasis on professionalism in excavation, also led to the perception by Santa Barbara that it “rather paid for those who do the work”.³⁷¹ In addition, the ‘top-down’ perspective by the Faculty of Archaeology towards archaeological interpretation and management fitted easily with that of Santa Barbara Plantation, which favoured a collaboration with external partners as to not be hindered by institutional collaborations on a local level. As such, it was requested (and later much appreciated) by Santa Barbara Plantation that the archaeologists of the Faculty of Archaeology would have to deal with local counterparts, such as NAAM and the Monument Bureau DROV.

According to the previous director of AAINA, who had worked for many years in the archaeological field in Curaçao (amongst which at the archaeological project at Santa Barbara in the early 1990’s), this reflected a more general tendency amongst local politicians and developers to prefer working with powerful external partners in heritage projects because external experts were seen as more knowledgeable than local institutions, and because external partners were outside existing and future social networks on the island, which made them preferable to local partners;

our politicians, be they black or white, do not believe anything we say. Only when someone from outside, from Leiden for instance, says something about our history, or what we should do with it, they believe it. They don’t believe in us.³⁷²

Such a perception was also brought forward by the new Head of DROV;

With these developers, but also with politicians, there continues to be this idea that everything from the Netherlands is better. At the core of this, is 500 years of history. We have always been taught that Dutch experts or consultants needed to be brought in.³⁷³

The story-line that archaeology had to be approached professionally from a scientific, objective perspective that favoured excavation, also fitted well with the wishes of Santa Barbara Plantation to develop an archaeological display on the distant past of pre-columbian societies in its visitor centre: “we want to do something with the archaeological results, <...> for the visitors to the project, and potential buyers. <...> what we need from Leiden, therefore, is some artefacts, and a simple narrative.”³⁷⁴ The idea of presenting a regional history of pre-columbian archaeology also fitted with the views and wishes of Hyatt Regency which had chosen the Indian past as a core theme in its search for ‘authenticity’;

here at Hyatt we embrace history and identity. <...> you need uniqueness, its critical, you search for <...> a unique selling point. For us, that was the story of the Arawaks, <...> the first inhabitants of the island. We thought about an African theme first, because of the roots of the island, but it was decided that this was perhaps a little sensitive.³⁷⁵

³⁷¹ President of the VIDA Group (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

³⁷² According to the former director of AAINA (Seru Mahuma, July 2010). This perception was consequently supported during interviews with two local anthropologists with experience in the heritage field in the Netherlands Antilles (Willemstad, July 2010 / Oranjestad, June 2010).

³⁷³ Willemstad, August 2010.

³⁷⁴ PR consultant for Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Rosa, July 2010).

³⁷⁵ General manager of Hyatt Regency (Santa Barbara, August 2010).

In this view by the General manager of Hyatt Regency, who was himself of Latin-American descent, an emphasis on the pre-columbian archaeology, reflected in terminologies such as the ‘Caquetios Board Room’ or the ‘Arawak Ballroom’ would be less problematic than the historical time of the plantation and than more recent interpretations of the past that favoured memories of local inhabitants, which are politically integrated with a discomfort over a loss of access to the beaches and property of Santa Barbara Plantation – a focus that was advocated much stronger by NAAM in its search for an in-situ protection of the site as a park for local inhabitants.

The scientific, regional view on archaeological interpretation also fitted with the heritage discourses of several other key persons in the development of the Santa Barbara Project. A top-level senior politician working for the Netherlands Antilles, who had been asked by Leiden University to act as a broker and ‘champion’ for the Campaign for Leiden Project, mentioned for example that the research by Leiden University was

an eye-opener because it approached history from above, it looked over the boundaries of the island, it was trying to get to some universal history, instead of a local history <...> Our local institutions have the tendency to popularise history, with the danger that the larger framework of history disappears. <...> to make people aware about history is good, in itself, but we should not tell everything to everybody <because then they> loot the artefacts and destroy the sites <...> we should keep it secret in the beginning, study it, keep it for the experts and institutions, and then tell the public.³⁷⁶

The chairman of the Board of NAAM during the years of the project, who had come to decide with the Board that the director had to give up its struggle against its perceived exclusion by Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation, expressed a similar view on the scientific and archaeological value of material remains of the past; “Santa Barbara Plantation was willing to pay for archaeology, for the first time on the island <...> you should not try to obstruct that, because in the end, you want to achieve that archaeological research will be done.”³⁷⁷ Although both of these respondents favoured a collaboration between Leiden University and NAAM as to advance institutional capacity building, the emphasis on a prioritisation of an expert, scientific, universal history as the core product of the collaboration fitted more easily with the discourses of Leiden and Santa Barbara Plantation than that of NAAM and the AWG.

The idea that archaeological heritage matters are primarily a concern of the state, an important story-line of the AAD as discussed in section 5.4.4, also played a crucial part in the negotiations and development of the Santa Barbara Project. NAAM had received financial support from the government, and a memorandum of understanding between Monument Bureau DROV and NAAM was established in September 2007. Still, the fact remained that NAAM, which had developed out of AAINA, had become a foundation instead of a government institution and thereby had lost its legal and governmental control over heritage policy and enforcement. This fuelled the idea amongst several respondents that NAAM should not have automatic access and ownership over the research and management of archaeological sites. According to the former Head of DROV;

³⁷⁶ Willemstad, July 2010.

³⁷⁷ Former chairman of the Board of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

officially, DROV should control NAAM, through the Monument Laws. But now <...> there is much more conflict of interest, because <the new head of DROV> is also the new chairman of the board of NAAM. <...> NAAM is no government, they are not the ones who give licenses.³⁷⁸

In line with the spirit of a Dutch implementation of Malta archaeology, the former Head of DROV believed that Santa Barbara Plantation was free to choose the archaeological operator, and that scientific expertise and experience with the local archaeology was a prerequisite for conducting heritage practice. In this respect, he emphasised that the decision about giving a license to Leiden did indeed play a role within DROV, but that in the end it was the Head of DROV himself who could make the decision;

NAAM did give me advice against it, and that is their full right, but I put that beside me. There were other stakes that had to be taken into account, the archaeological value was only one, we had given Santa Barbara Plantation already green light for development 10 years ago <...> I agreed with <the Faculty of Archaeology> that NAAM should be a partner in the work, but in the end, I thought that Santa Barbara Plantation could decide on who to work with <...> who are we to question Leiden as an centre of expertise?³⁷⁹

The Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, who had previously been a State Inspector for Archaeology in the Netherlands, made similar remarks;

NAAM positioned itself within Curaçao as a governmental body, but they were a foundation – if not, I would have reacted differently, especially then, when I just left my position as State Inspector for Dutch archaeology. So I thought in some sense that we could go ahead, because they were not a governmental service, but just a organisation like any other.³⁸⁰

As such, the statutory position of NAAM undermined its position in the negotiations over the Santa Barbara Project. Such a view was also expressed by the previous director of AAINA, who oversaw the archaeological work at Santa Barbara in the early 1990's:

I think <Santa Barbara Plantation> invited us because they knew we could become difficult. <they> told us they wanted to keep the archaeological values and sponsor it. We discussed this with them, and they had to listen to a certain degree, because we were civil servants with legal power. <...> NAAM acts as if they are this as well, but they are not civil servants. They do not have any power. They are a foundation, with support from the government – that's not the same.³⁸¹

The emphasis by NAAM on the need for Malta archaeology, and its resulting uneasy integration of AAD story-lines in its competing discourse on the need for a locally empowered heritage management – which was necessary to be able to be seen as a player in development-led archaeological projects – therefore worked against itself since it could not comply with the implicit demands for expertise, professionalism and governmental ownership.

³⁷⁸ Willemstad, July 2010.

³⁷⁹ Former Head of DROV (Willemstad, July 2010).

³⁸⁰ Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

³⁸¹ Former director of AAINA (Seru Mahuma, July 2010).

In addition, there were financial, personal and political motivations and perceptions at play. When the former Head of DROV and the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology met during a UNESCO meeting in New Zealand, they shared similar views on the development of the Santa Barbara Project – one in which Santa Barbara Plantation and Leiden University would finance a rescue project, in which DROV would act as the governmental party, and in which NAAM should be involved as a local partner. Such a meeting was however met by a remark by the director of NAAM who had come to perceive such a solution as an elitist, distant, perhaps ‘neo-colonial’ approach to local heritage matters; “let’s hope the Curaçaoan treasure will not be divided on the other side of the world.”³⁸² When in a later phase the Head of DROV was replaced by his deputy, who soon after also became the new director of the Board of NAAM, Leiden’s critical perception was that such moves had become entangled with personal favouritism as a result of local political discourses that challenged Dutch and external approaches.

Financial motivations played an important role, since it was clear to both NAAM and Leiden that Santa Barbara Plantation had come to agree to pay for archaeological mitigation, which opened up opportunities for both parties in terms of securing institutional benefits. For NAAM, whose financial future was far from secure and whose budgets had been cut dramatically, the idea of the polluter-pay principle in Malta had been identified explicitly as a means for financial survival within their internal strategy policies (NAAM 2009). According to a Board member of NAAM: “NAAM always needs to attract external funding, it constantly needs to create its right for existence, through media, political support, and funding. <...> NAAM has now missed out on hundred thousand euros of Santa Barbara, which is disastrous.”³⁸³ For the Faculty of Archaeology, the financial opportunities were equally attractive in terms of securing match-funding in the framework of the Campaign for Leiden programme and in terms of illustrating to the University that it could secure private, commercial ‘third-stream’ funds; “The difference in insight was that NAAM wanted to be a central organisation for the Antilles, and they needed the resources for that. We needed funds for matching from out of the Campaign for Leiden.”³⁸⁴

5.5.3 MECHANISMS OF EXCLUSION

Whilst the Dutch archaeologists saw the successful securement of funds as a contribution towards heritage protection in the Netherlands Antilles and as an opportunity for advancing a project in which there would be place for capacity building, collaboration and public outreach, the Santa Barbara Project as a whole was perceived as ‘top-down’ by the Monument Bureau DROV, NAAM and the AWG, since both the social network as well as the framework of a project under the political ramifications of a Malta project led to (often unintended) mechanisms of exclusion. The fact that local counterparts did not have the same access to resources on a global scale as the archaeologists of Leiden University is a good example of this. Secondly, the knowledge and experience by the Faculty of Archaeology with Malta archaeological protocols, policies and standards, along with the embedded AAD in the Malta Convention, strengthened the emphasis on expertise, professionalism, and heritage as a material source of scientific data, and thereby the position of Leiden University, because neither Monument Bureau DROV nor NAAM had the necessary experience to implement the policy instruments. An example of how this ‘selective accessibility’ to some of the policy instruments can subsequently lead to selective reproduction of knowledge and values in project policies (cf Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming), can be seen in the way in which the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project were given form through the drafting of the PvE and PvA by the archaeologists

³⁸² Correspondence NAAM to Faculty of Archaeology (LU). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

³⁸³ Board Member of NAAM (Willemstad, August 2010).

³⁸⁴ Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

of Leiden University. The first drafts of these policy documents were starting from the outset with a previously established designation of the Spanish Water site as ‘significant heritage’ of which the archaeological and scientific values were under threat. Such an assessment was made on the basis of previous excavations and publications of the site in the early 1990’s, but also by an additional visit to Santa Barbara that was framed as a ‘desk-based assessment and exploratory research’.³⁸⁵ As a result, the definition of heritage, the designation of the impact area and the significance assessment were favouring an idea of the site with material remains of the past as a specific heritage site of archaeological value, with an emphasis on the pre-columbian archaeology. Interestingly, such a designation was not primarily the work of the Dutch archaeologists, but also the result of earlier work by archaeologists of AAINA and the AWG, although the latter had called for assessing the historical and archaeological values in a broader framework of social, natural and intangible heritage values. The assessment by the Faculty of Archaeology rehearsed the archaeological significance of the site, but in contrast, preferred a solution of excavation over in-situ preservation – in line with the fact that Santa Barbara Plantation had already been granted permission by DROV to conduct development work on the site. Although the site only made up a small percentage of the total area that was developed by Santa Barbara Plantation, and although a broader assessment of heritage could have included the tangible and intangible aspects of the complete history and memories associated with Santa Barbara, the Malta approach requested by DROV and conducted by Leiden University was not thought to allow for such broader definitions of heritage and impact areas. The selective reproduction of archaeological knowledge and values in the policy instruments PvE and PvA were in this sense self-referential, since the assessment and the priority of archaeological values were embedded and strengthened by processes of ‘naturalisation’, by which I refer to the idea that “the values constructed within the archaeological discourses are presented as natural, normal and objective, as an intrinsic quality, in short, as non-constructed” (Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming).

Accordingly, the original drafts of the PvE and PvA had to be changed on the request of Monument Bureau DROV and the Archaeological Working Group to include the fact that also other periods, beside the pre-columbian layers, would have to be included in the archaeological research. Secondly, it was requested that specific mention needed to be made of the fact that Leiden University would commit itself to develop a publication oriented to the general public in the local language. In addition, it was requested that guided tours would be allowed (in contrast to an original remark in the draft that such tours might not be allowed), and that NAAM and the AWG would be consulted over the participation of local staff and researchers. Although all these requests were incorporated in the final versions of the PvE and PvA, it does illustrate how the request by Santa Barbara Plantation to minimise access and collaboration by local counterparts had found its way in the draft report by the Dutch archaeologists, strengthened by processes of selective accessibility, naturalisation and self-reference. Within the PvE for example, it can be noted that publication and outreach were mentioned under the header ‘external communication’, and that the designation of capacity building and training of ‘local experts and people’ found its way under the header ‘Deployment of amateurs’.³⁸⁶ Such discursive elements of the AAD – identified also in the Dutch archaeological quality system (Duineveld 2006) – prioritises expert values over alternative, vocational values in a hierarchical system; again, arguably implicitly, distancing the professional archaeological ‘experts’ from local counterparts. As such, the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project, with its embedded story-lines of the AAD, contributed to (often unintended) exclusionary mechanisms.

³⁸⁵ This refers to ‘bureau and verkennend onderzoek’ (see Willems & Brandt 2004, 210).

³⁸⁶ Translation by the author (‘Inzet amateurs’).

Interestingly, it is precisely the ‘pro-active’ approach by Dutch archaeologists to develop archaeological projects on the islands through means of the polluter-pay principle and the subsequent mitigating and safeguarding of archaeological heritage in the context of a Malta archaeology, that was perceived by some respondents as a ‘foreign’, ‘top-down’ and/or ‘private’ practice.³⁸⁷ A similar perception was also brought forward by a member of staff of AMA in Aruba in reference to a previous attempt by Dutch archaeologists to establish an archaeological project in collaboration with a project developer and AMA itself: “Their intention is good, but it should be us, the local legal institution concerned with archaeology, that decides who will undertake the archaeological research, where, how and if it happens.”³⁸⁸

One result of this, is that Leiden University could subsequently become intrinsically identified, through becoming a ‘consultant’ for the Santa Barbara Plantation in this case, with the motivations and socio-political impacts of such large-scale projects on the island. Such identifications were not only encountered in my interviews with heritage practitioners of local institutions, but also in the remarks by several local inhabitants in the areas surrounding Santa Barbara, such as Nieuwpoort, Montaña Abou, Montaña Rey and Santa Rosa. Negative feelings over the loss of access by local inhabitants to the plantation area and over the increased influx of Venezuelan workers at the Hyatt Regency hotel, are just some examples of why a focus by the Faculty of Archaeology on a pre-columbian site at a former plantation and beach area was perceived by some as problematic. The fact that Leiden University had come into the heritage field in Curaçao through a network in which Dutch and expatriate elites were perceived to hold sway, combined with the fact the Faculty of Archaeology and Santa Barbara Plantation worked together on an archaeological research through a heritage policy that was based upon a liberalised free-market system, are other examples of how the Dutch project became identified with historical, ‘elitist’ and even ‘capitalist’ approaches. In this sense, Leiden University was even identified by some local respondents in line with the former Dutch colonial owners of the Plantation, the owners of the Mining Industry, the Santa Barbara Plantation, as well as the current director of CITCO, who lived in the plantation house overlooking the site of Spanish Water;

At the plantation house, in the past, there used to live the owners of the slaves. Later on, the governor used to live there. Now the owner of Hyatt lives there, I believe.³⁸⁹

I don’t know much about the history of the Santa Barbara plantation. I know more about Banda Bau. At least, there you can go and swim for free. <...> At Santa Barbara, we were not allowed to go, and you have to pay. Santa Barbara has always been for the elite.³⁹⁰

I would have liked to see the excavations <...> I didn’t go. I assumed it was not allowed.³⁹¹

Such views give an insight into the identification of Leiden University with the historical and contemporary social impact of the Santa Barbara Plantation. Such views are however not exhaustive of the respondents’ comments on the project – positive perceptions of the fact that Leiden University had conducted archaeological research were also encountered, with additional positive comments by those

³⁸⁷ See also sections 5.2.3 and 5.3.2.

³⁸⁸ Oranjestad, June 2010. It should hereby be noted that AMA is a governmental organisation, in contrast to NAAM.

³⁸⁹ Former local school teacher (Montaña Rey, July 2010).

³⁹⁰ Local community member, wife of a former local employee at the Santa Barbara Mining Company (Santa Barbara/Nieuwpoort, July 2010).

³⁹¹ Former local employee at the Santa Barbara Mining Company (Montaña Abou, July 2010).

teachers who accompanied the visiting school groups to the site.³⁹² Still, a general perception came to the fore that the archaeological benefits could not make up for the loss of access (see also 5.3.2), and that the publications in newspapers, lectures, educational visits and the idea of a museum, however valuable, would have a greater and more sustainable impact by incorporating local researchers, people and media:

I liked the fact that <the Dutch archaeologists> came here, and brought our students to the site. they also did two small talks here for the children. <...> unfortunately, it is not sustainable. You should involve people in the excavation.³⁹³

This archaeology you speak of, well, I suppose it's outside my experience, it has nothing to do with my daily life. <...> It is tucked away in scientific reports and exhibitions, that's not enough.³⁹⁴

Communication needs to happen through radio, through children programs, and through an Antillean archaeologist, we will listen to this much better. <...> They know our culture, how we think, how we laugh.³⁹⁵

Although some respondents identified the research into an Indian archaeological site as minimally interesting, more positive feelings towards an increased understanding of pre-columbian archaeology were also encountered; “well, it is more interesting in any case than Dutch history, that I had to learn when I was young <...> it is Antillean history, and I am Antillean. <...> we have mixed heritages, so Indian history is part of that”.³⁹⁶ The interest in this archaeology, however, was mostly focused upon the daily lives of people, and less upon general historic timelines and complex interpretations; “the grandmother of my father was of Indian descent. I'd like to know how she lived, what she ate <...> how it was to be an Indian”.³⁹⁷

According to a local anthropologist who did oral history research in the communities surrounding Santa Barbara (see Allen 2001), heritage connotations about Santa Barbara also do not primarily centre around its time as a plantation (with local importance given much more to the better documented sites on the west of the island) but rather to the more recent memories of the early Mining industries and the use of the beaches:

As a plantation, or as a heritage of slavery, it doesn't play a big role on the island. What is more important, are the memories and oral histories of the people who used to live in the mining village, and the memories of those who went to the beach there. <...> I did come across some mentions on slavery there, but it was not much. Most of the memories are about the mining industry. <...> The strike in the 1930's also plays a huge role. I have documented the memories and the work-songs of the mining workforce. These songs are still alive.³⁹⁸

³⁹² June/July 2010.

³⁹³ Director of a local youth centre (Vormingscentrum voor Jeugdwereldzinnigwerk) at Santa Rosa, where the Dutch team of Leiden University had their accommodation (July 2010).

³⁹⁴ Local community member (Santa Rosa, July 2010)

³⁹⁵ Local community member (Montaña Abou, July 2010).

³⁹⁶ Local community member (Santa Rosa / Montaña Abou) and former cook for the Santa Barbara Project (July 2010).

³⁹⁷ Local community member (Santa Rosa, July 2010).

³⁹⁸ Curaçao, July 2010.

The focus on ‘indigenous’ archaeology in the Caribbean, as it is brought forward for example in internal seminars at the Faculty of Archaeology in Leiden University, seems to be less attractive in relation to the current society and social identity of Curaçao, where identifications with Indian history are less strong than on the other islands in the region. The focus by NAAM, on the ‘indigenusness’ of the current population, with a specific focus on the afro-black history during the post-contact period and the period of slavery, is however equally complex. For example, it was felt by some respondents that NAAM did not speak for the community of Curaçao at large; foreign researchers and archaeologists in the wider Antilles for instance questioned the fact that the senior staff members of NAAM and DROV were of Dutch descent, and that as such, they would still not speak effectively on behalf of the community, nor be entirely successful in translating research benefits to local communities. More critically, some Dutch archaeological vocationalists on the island expressed that they felt excluded from NAAM since they were ‘not local’, and that the ‘Archaeological Working Group’ itself formed a closed network of ‘amateurs’, and focusing too single-mindedly on one part of history: “the history of the Antilles is mixed, you can’t exclude a single identity of history out of it, it is made of greys, not black and white”.³⁹⁹

The emphasis of the local institutions on Malta archaeology also illustrates that incorporating intangible heritage and local communities in archaeological fieldwork might be problematic, since it inherently favours professional expertise over local values. In this respect, it was mentioned by other island archaeologists that the type of Malta archaeology as practiced by NAAM sat uneasily with the idea of community archaeology, due to a perceived lack of incorporation of local workmen and communities. The fact that a member of staff of NAAM criticised the community approach by the former archaeologist of AAINA as ‘non-scientific’, is a case in point here.

5.5.4 PROJECT BENEFITS

It was discussed above how the constant (re-)production of the AAD and related value-systems and story-lines by Dutch archaeological policies, institutions and operators through successful translation and representation of practices, has (often unintentionally) limited the opportunities for including competing values and discourses in the social context. Mainly, this is because the involvement of other actors and their values were postponed and excluded due to a top-down process that prioritises scientific and archaeological values. The knowledge needed to work with Dutch Malta policies and instruments, the contacts needed to tap into a network of corporate, global and Dutch funding subsidies, the emphasis in the Dutch Malta system on expert assessments of scientific values and the subjugation of local ‘amateur’ knowledge, and the institutional motivations to yield scientific benefits and education opportunities through finding external financial resources; all of these elements contributed to a system of ‘exclusionary mechanisms’ (Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming) that saw the relative closure of the project network towards local actors. As a result, most benefits of the archaeological process were perceived by local institutions as continuously being skewed towards foreign researchers, students and institutions.

Because such academic, scientific and educational benefits were in line with the institutional motivations of the Faculty of Archaeology, and that of the specific ramifications of the Campaign for Leiden, the perception of the Santa Barbara Project by the Dean of the Faculty could be labelled as ‘successful’, despite a regret over the fact that the intentions of collaboration and local participation were not accomplished as envisaged;

³⁹⁹ According to a Dutch respondent with a personal interest in local archaeology (Willemstad, July 2010).

The faculty is there to conduct research projects, and this was a successful project. It was a beautiful excavation, innovative in terms of scientific content. It brought a good return in terms of student involvement and experience, and it brought the necessary benefits for our archaeologists. Also, very important, we demonstrated that we could not only in the Netherlands, but also abroad, succeed in securing <private> funds.⁴⁰⁰

In addition to the idea that the role of a university is foremost to conduct academic archaeological research, the Dutch co-directors of the Santa Barbara Project mentioned that the Faculty of Archaeology was not a 'rescue' company, and that it would only conduct projects in the framework of Malta archaeology that would fit the research questions of archaeologists. According to one of the co-directors, some of the wider heritage and community values could only have been addressed after securing external funds, because the diminished funds of the Campaign for Leiden were to be used primarily for archaeological research:

The Campaign for Leiden <...> wanted us to deliver publications and student internship projects <...> We wanted to accommodate more public and capacity elements, but that could only have been done by finding additional funds.⁴⁰¹

In this respect, it is interesting to note that the Dutch archaeologists of the Santa Barbara Project mentioned that scientific subsidies in the Netherlands did not easily allow for the funding of activities in the field of 'societal relevance'. When looking at the final expenditure of the Santa Barbara Project, one can indeed see that the largest part of the budget was spent on the archaeological excavation and research and that funds for public outreach and capacity building (such as for example inviting scholars from the Caribbean to the academic conferences in the Netherlands) were paid from out of other, internal research budgets at Leiden University.⁴⁰² In addition, faculty staff and students linked to the project felt that they had contributed to the societal relevance of archaeology in the Netherlands Antilles by having found and implemented research funds for a 'rescue' project in Curaçao.

Still, the financial framework of the Santa Barbara Project seemed to favour scientific and archaeological values, as well as a relationship with developers and the commercial sector. Even though the proposal for the Campaign for Leiden explicitly called for the social value of archaeology, the need for heritage preservation, public presentation, and local capacity building, the fact remains that the Campaign for Leiden was "established to locate private investors for university projects", and to enrich "the education, research or facilities of the university".⁴⁰³ According to respondents from NAAM and DROV, the prioritisation of scientific values was not only reflected in the name 'Campaign for Leiden', but also in the budget of the original proposals for the Campaign for Leiden programme, which according to them, showed an inequality between academic staff salary costs and budgets for education and outreach activities, despite statements in the proposal that allowed for student exchange and a prioritisation of candidates from the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba for the staff posts.⁴⁰⁴ The perceived difference in the distribution of scientific and economic benefits thereby contributed to an identification of Leiden

⁴⁰⁰ Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

⁴⁰¹ Associate Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, one of the Santa Barbara Project co-directors, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, April 2011).

⁴⁰² These statements are based upon interviews with the Dutch co-directors of the Santa Barbara Project as well upon insight into the internal finances of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, April 2011).

⁴⁰³ Available at <http://www.luf.nl/default.asp?paginaID=192> [Accessed 15 April 2011].

⁴⁰⁴ Such remarks were made by the Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010) and a staff member of DROV (Willemstad, July 2010) when specifically discussing the original budget headings of the Campaign for Leiden project.

University with the socio-economic impact and colonial history of the Santa Barbara Plantation development, with subsequent labelling of the project as being ‘capitalist’, ‘foreign’ and ‘private’. Such perceptions and representations of the project however, were also motivated by concerns over personal and institutional survival in a political and economic sense, as I will explore further in the following section.

This, in turn, led to an increased emphasis by local organisations on a heritage discourse which prioritised local values and bottom-up capacity development, which made it challenging for the Faculty of Archaeology to facilitate their intentions of participation, education and involvement. This contributed to a rather extreme perceived opposition of institutional motivations as being either focused upon ‘science’, or upon ‘local development’. Similar as in the case study on the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project, such a perception of purely scientific motivations by Leiden University was placed within a larger framework of historical and political injustices by the Dutch ‘system’ on the local level in Curaçao;

I have tried in the Netherlands to get money to support our institutional capacity, our archaeology, our management. But I have not succeeded. On the other hand, I see that Dutch money is becoming available for Leiden to do research on these matters, on our islands. As such, they are taking all the money which should be meant for building institutional capacity here. <...> I see this as the result of a larger system in the Netherlands.⁴⁰⁵

Interestingly, the discursive story-lines of the Santa Barbara Project in 2007-2011 seemed to copy that of 15 years previously. As was discussed above, it was already agreed in the early 1990’s that the archaeologically significant areas (in this case including the Spanish Water site) at Santa Barbara Plantation would be protected by means of a restricted area to “preserve a part of the site for tomorrow’s scientists” (Haviser 1998, 9). In exchange for this, the developer could destroy several other, less significant parts of the site, whilst funding parts of the necessary rescue archaeology. Although it was mentioned that this restricted area should also be accommodated by a wider park for tourists, and even though plans were already made for a future museum back then, history has shown us that whilst future archaeologists did indeed benefit from the preservation of the site, the envisaged park did not come to fruition, and the promised visitor centre also being undeveloped at the time of my research. Even if we would see the golf course as a creative ‘trail’ in a ‘park’, the people benefiting from access to the archaeological remains, either on the golf course or in the ‘visitor centre’ might turn out to be international tourists with an interest in buying property, and not local community members; “Get real. Everything we do is about selling 800 properties in the end. The visitor centre, and the archaeological exhibition, is part of that. No, actually, it’s all about that, because the visitor centre is where we will sell the properties.”⁴⁰⁶ Similarly, it was mentioned by several local respondents that the location of the proposed exhibition felt as if they were again refrained from access to the real sites and to Santa Barbara at large: “the idea of a visitor centre I like. But why does it need to be at the gate? Why can’t I go in? I want to see the landscape where I went to with my parents when I was a young girl.”⁴⁰⁷ The way in which the ownership over external communication by Santa Barbara Plantation can also be illustrated, is by the fact that the envisaged guided tours by Hyatt Regency would primarily benefit international tourists. For instance, the Hyatt ‘meditation trail’, a guided tour around the Indian caves and Indian rock-carvings could at the time of research only be undertaken by paying a fee for a daily access pass to Hyatt of 50\$. At least, this illustrates that the envisaged public outreach of the archaeological work had not come to its full potential, and that it could, in its current envisaged form, contribute to feelings of exclusion by the local population.

⁴⁰⁵ Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

⁴⁰⁶ Designer working for Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara Plantation, June 2010).

⁴⁰⁷ Local community member (Santa Rosa / Montaña Abou) and former cook for the Santa Barbara Project (July 2010).



Figure 18. School visit to the Santa Barbara Project excavations (photograph Santa Barbara Project archive, Leiden University).

Despite several public lectures and guided tours for local school classes, the participation of several vocational archaeologists, and an envisaged local article by the Dutch archaeologists, we have seen how some members of the local community still regard the whole process as being private and exclusive, with critiques towards Leiden University, Santa Barbara Plantation and even NAAM and the AWG appearing. As we have seen, however, this was often against the personal wishes of all the archaeological operators involved – the discontinuous distribution of perceived benefits in this sense could be regarded in light of the discursive conditions and value-networks of archaeological heritage and research policies, and within light of the historical developments of the archaeological discipline and the institutional relationships that governed this interaction. Still, in section 5.7, I will argue that individual archaeologists could take up the opportunity and responsibility to advocate the inclusion and recognition of other values and discourses more explicitly within the archaeological process. If not, the (re-)production of the AAD and the call for Malta archaeology might be in danger of focusing too much on scientifically and archaeologically significant heritage sites, and of offering “greater benefits for tourists and visitors rather than directly improving the residents’ sense of pride and place” (Breen & Rhodes 2010, 133).

5.6 PROJECT POLICY AND PRACTICAL OUTCOMES

5.6.1 THE (RE-)PRODUCTION OF HERITAGE VALUES AND DISCOURSES

In this section, I will focus in more detail on the relationship between policy and practice. A fundamental observation in this, is how the AAD should not simply be regarded as a fixed discourse or a set of values and story-lines that influence the development, implementation and practice of the project directly from the outset. Rather, it is a far more complex process. Whilst the scientific and archaeological values behind the AAD are reproduced and developed through policy emphasis, institutionalisation and prioritisation of resources, we also have seen how archaeologists are constantly (re-)producing discursive story-lines in order to secure the survival of institutional relationships and access to the archaeological sites and data. In this section, I will argue that policy discourses and project representations in this sense can become the end, rather than solely the means of project practices, as they create a more attractive framework for maintaining relationships than the contradictory project realities (Cf Büscher 2008). Notions and discourses such as ‘Malta archaeology’ and ‘rescue archaeology’ for instance are constantly (re-)produced by archaeological actors to legitimise practice, because they give coherent interpretations of practice, and as such create far more attractive frameworks for maintaining relationships, securing financial support and setting the right opportunities for institutional survival of their individual research motivations than the ‘contradictory realities’ of fieldwork practice.

This reproduction of discursive story-lines is achieved not only through successful translation of other stakeholders’ values into their own, but also through processes of representation whereby certain project activities and outcomes are interpreted so that they appear the result of deliberate policy and archaeological theory (see also section 4.6.2). Apart from the above-discussed representation of pre-columbian archaeology as indigenous archaeology, the representation of the Santa Barbara Project as being undertaken in the framework of ‘Malta archaeology’ is a good example of this. Although the Dutch archaeologists were explicit about the fact that the framework of Malta archaeology had given them the financial opportunity to conduct research on a site that fitted their research questions and the need for student internships, the project was often externally represented as ‘Malta archaeology’ or ‘preventive archaeology’. This does not mean however, that the project was not undertaken as part of such a process – Santa Barbara Plantation as a developer did indeed pay for archaeological work, and the research plans were translated into Dutch protocols for preventive archaeology, as requested by Monument Bureau DROV. However, my point here is that the selection and assessment of the site, the decision for excavation and the research questions relating to pre-columbian archaeology were not developed out of the principles of Malta, but rather out of a self-referential value system in the AAD that was heavily influenced by academic research interests. The representation of previous academic publications on Santa Barbara as ‘desk-based research’, and the short field visit to the site as ‘exploratory research’⁴⁰⁸ are good examples of this, since a broader (and admittedly much more expensive) investigation and exploration of the total land-area of Santa Barbara could have come to broader assessments of sites, archaeological periods and forms of heritage that would need to be addressed. Although the Santa Barbara Project did take into account some archaeological sites out of the direct impact area of the Spanish Water site, one can argue if the excavations and small-scale in-situ preservation of roughly 30x30m² out of a totally developed 600ha at Santa Barbara could be effectively called ‘preventive archaeology’ and the site labelled as ‘archaeology-free’. The discursive representation of the project as being an example of Malta archaeology whereby professional archaeologists and developers had worked successfully to mitigate threats to the archaeological record, was

⁴⁰⁸ This refers to ‘verkenkend onderzoek’, see Willems & Brandt 2004.

however rehearsed and reproduced not only by staff and students of the Faculty of Archaeology but also by the media releases of Santa Barbara Plantation, which subsequently found its way into press coverage in both Curaçao as well as in the Netherlands.

The fact that a senior archaeologist of Leiden University confirmed the assessment by the AWG of the site of Spanish Water as archaeologically significant, but subsequently distilled a decision that excavation would have precedence over in-situ preservation, is another example of the self-referential value-system; even though the local authorities agreed with such an assessment, and even though this was the reality of the powerful wishes of Santa Barbara Plantation, and of the financial resources available. The fact that the conduct of the archaeological work at Spanish Water did not separate the ‘explorative research’ from archaeological excavation, and as such did not take broader definitions of sites and heritage into account, was one of the major points of critique by a member of staff from NAAM who subsequently interpreted the conduct of Leiden University as ‘pretending to do Malta’:

they have included some of the archaeological remains outside the excavation area, which is good, but you can't say the whole site is archaeology-free. <...> they could have included historical archaeology as well, and covered larger parts of the site – but that didn't fit their research questions. <...> in the framework of Malta, they have taken money from the project developer for their own research purposes.⁴⁰⁹

The continuous reproduction of the notion of ‘Malta archaeology’ in order to establish coherent representations of practice as to adhere to institutional motivations, can also be seen by the discursive practice of NAAM. Although its heritage discourse on intangible heritage, local communities and capacity building was often produced successfully to secure local political support (a fact well illustrated by the use of such discourses by the key-note lectures at the two NAAM seminars in 2005 and 2009), we also have seen their use of competing AAD story-lines in order to secure access in the negotiation over the Santa Barbara Project. The interpretation of Malta archaeology as a means to secure future financial resources and access to the other islands with the coming of Dutch policies to the BES-islands, is another example – but this will be discussed below.

5.6.2 POLICY, PRACTICE AND ACCESS

The Santa Barbara Project illustrates how ‘policy’ functioned not only to orientate practice, but also to legitimise practice, in the sense of mobilising and maintaining political, financial and institutional support and access (cf Latour 1996, 42-43). The impact of policies upon the orientation and outcomes of practice of archaeology at Santa Barbara is quite discernible, whereby especially the funding frameworks behind the project policies left their mark upon the development of archaeological activities. Through the funding policy of the Campaign for Leiden, and in line with the long tradition of the Caribbean research section being funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO),⁴¹⁰ specific demands were laid upon developing scientific publications and student education. As such, funding policies made a huge impact upon the archaeological practice, since policy negotiations and value translations were underlined by these, as was discussed above. In addition, the policy of the Campaign for Leiden stated that funds

⁴⁰⁹ Interview with staff member of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

⁴¹⁰ Most of the funding of the Caribbean Research Group of the Faculty since the 1980's has been funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and Leiden University itself, with many resulting publications, academic promotions and student internships. A rough estimate is for example that in the last 20 years, between 200 and 300 students have undertaken fieldwork on Caribbean islands (Hofman 2008, 12).

would only be given when a matching fund from a private external donor would be found. Related to the request for Malta policy by Curaçao, this made it necessary and desirable for the Faculty of Archaeology to secure financial support from Santa Barbara Plantation. The impact of such policies upon practice also made its way in further prioritisation of the activities by the Santa Barbara Project. According to the Leiden archaeologists, the combination of the Campaign for Leiden and the framework of Malta archaeology – strengthened by the fact that individual careers at the Faculty of Archaeology were mainly being assessed in terms of publications and student supervision – led to the fact that archaeological research was prioritised over outreach activities and capacity building, and over research into areas and histories of the site that lay outside the research questions of the research group. As a result of these policies (in which story-lines of the AAD were embedded), such alternative values and activities were thought to be only made possible if external funds would be attracted (see section 5.5.4).

The practice of the Santa Barbara Project was however not only driven by project policies, but also by the values, discourses and histories of individuals and organisations. What this means, is that policy not only determined practice, but also that practice determined policy. The values, discourses and (desired) activities of actors for example determined the development, negotiation and use of project policies that would most effectively adhere to their need to maintain institutional relationships, power and access to the archaeological record and its benefits. The construction of a certain selective part of the material remains of the past at Santa Barbara as archaeological heritage that fitted the research interests of archaeologists, and the focus on funding sources out of commercial development in order to harness continuing opportunities for academic research, are good examples of this. The development of the scope of the project policies such as the PvE and PvA, and of assessing the significance of the site, was for example not a matter of simply assessing a set of intrinsic values of heritage and the past, but rather a process whereby a certain selective set of values were attributed to material remains in order to *create* heritage and related project practices. Such a constructive notion of heritage (see also section 2.5), was however not explicitly acknowledged in project policies, but rather disguised by a process of naturalisation, in the sense of institutionalised and bureaucratic embedded AAD story-lines that place their emphasis on a supposedly neutral and objective form of heritage assessment and subsequent management.

A need to secure access and resources for research by the Faculty of Archaeology, can for instance be distilled from the institutional and funding policies that demand the development of academic publications and student teaching opportunities, as well as in the call by the Campaign for Leiden to attract match funding. In addition, the ‘personal academic histories’ of the researchers in question had made it desirable to continue looking at archaeological sites in the Caribbean that could yield additional data for their regionalised approach towards understanding the archaeology of the Caribbean within the context of a ‘mobility and exchange’ research framework (see sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.3).

The advancement of Malta archaeology in the Caribbean therefore provided an opportunity that could accommodate these values, needs and interests. The subsequent emphasis within the Malta Convention on a prioritisation of expertise, professionalism and archaeological science and excavation, issues in which the Faculty of Archaeology excelled (with both expertise in academic Caribbean archaeology as well as with Dutch Malta archaeology), could as such be applied effectively as to secure access to archaeological sites and resources. Related to this, is the fact that individual archaeologists were supporting the coming of Malta to the Caribbean for its potential to mitigate the threats to Antillean heritage, whilst emphasising exactly the elements of the Malta Convention that would yield the greatest institutional benefits, such as professionalism, the polluter-pay principle and the prime place of science and excavation. Santa Barbara Plantation, subsequently, played the idea of calling for a Malta archaeology in hand, since such a policy, although called for initially by NAAM and the local Monuments Bureau DROV,

gave them the opportunity to work with an external professional institute outside its own local power network on the island, thereby bypassing the involvement of NAAM and the AWG that it had come to distrust through previous perceptions of them frustrating development.

The call for Malta policy was also supported by the institutional demands and practices of NAAM. Apart from their view that such policies should contribute to the protection of cultural heritage and identity formation in the Netherlands Antilles, the emphasis on Malta archaeology could also contribute to securing financial survival and access to other islands. With the upcoming statutory changes of the BES islands, future Dutch administrative power and resources were thought to shift from Curaçao to Bonaire – an issue clearly illustrated by the fact that the Dutch Ministries, including that of OCW, had already set up offices in Bonaire to prepare the legislative and constitutional changes that would arise out of the BES islands becoming ‘special municipalities’ of the Netherlands. This, together with the fact that Curaçao would gain the *status aparte*, meant that NAAM would not only lose access to funding opportunities out of the framework of the Netherlands Antilles, but also, potentially, its close links with the other islands of the Netherlands Antilles. Accordingly, NAAM developed a vision for its activities after the constitutional changes, which was summarised in the internal document ‘Towards a Caribbean Cultural Heritage Expertise Centre’ (see also NAAM 2009). Within this document, NAAM envisaged becoming a regional expertise centre with strong ties to the other islands by playing up an intra-island Caribbean identity. By becoming a ‘regional expertise centre’, the coming of Malta was explicitly identified as an opportunity for securing financial resources for both archaeological work as well as institutional survival, since the islands in the region were thought to potentially providing annual financial means to NAAM in exchange for advice and expertise (NAAM 2009, 18-29).

Apart from advancing story-lines as to facilitate an effective alignment with Malta policies, NAAM also rehearsed its discursive story-line on the importance of preserving local, intangible heritage, and of securing a regional Caribbean identity through bottom-up and self-development approaches – which was strengthened by the personal history and beliefs of the director of NAAM, who had a background in applied anthropology in the region. Such a story-line, together with the fact that NAAM had established collaboration protocols with local governments on the other islands,⁴¹¹ fitted the values and discourses of several key civil servants of OCW (the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science), who were looking for a decentralised, bottom-up approach to the implementation of Malta archaeology after ‘10-10-10’;

We wanted a network with stability and support. We also tried to build this up from the level of the islands, not to impose this from above <...> We therefore wanted to build this up through the <local governmental> executive councils <...> But creating this project-group was difficult <...> I didn't know the archaeology and the network <...> it is important that archaeologists have a say, but in my experience, we had to explain everything that related to laws, regulations and policies several times over <...> that's why we went with NAAM. They had their protocols, they had an existing network that was integrated in the executive councils of the islands, and their board members have political functions.⁴¹²

⁴¹¹ See for example the ‘Collaboration Protocol between Foundation NAAM and the island Bonaire, 11 December 2009’, Article 2 (Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM).

⁴¹² Dutch civil servant of OCW in Bonaire (Kralendijk, June 2010).

As a result of the seminar, the Directorate Cultural Heritage (DCE/OCW) has decided on the 26th of June 2009 to take over the recommendation, that the legislation for the protection of cultural heritage will be developed from out of the islands, and that this will not be imposed from out of the Netherlands. (Witteveen *et al.* 2009, 19)

In the end, this resulted in NAAM receiving the tender for the OCW-project that would provide advise on how Malta should be implemented on the BES-islands (see also sections 5.2.3 and 5.3.2). This, in turn, contributed to a perception by some archaeologists and heritage professionals on the other islands that NAAM would use this opportunity to formulate a plan in which NAAM itself would gain a matter of access to the archaeology and the financial benefits arising out of Malta archaeology. One archaeologist expressed thus the hope that NAAM would not “become biased to themselves. They want to survive, to keep their jobs, as we all do. <...> yes, we as archaeologists know that it works this way, but the public does not”.⁴¹³ In addition, these respondents felt that NAAM was a Curaçao-based foundation that should not behave ‘top-down’. Even though NAAM and the AWG themselves had used such discursive critiques to describe the approach of Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation in the context of Curaçaoan heritage politics, a similar critique could now be distilled about the strategy of NAAM, which was in turn related to a wider tendency on the islands that used to see Curaçao as the dominating administrative and financial power.

The Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology and the Professor of Caribbean Archaeology of Leiden University also pleaded for a solution in which local institutions such as BONAI, SECAR and SIMARC would get a primary place within any Malta solution to the BES-islands, pointing out to the example of Aruba, where local archaeologists were in service and where the archaeological heritage policies were thought to work sufficiently (cf De Groot 2009, 21). As such, the view of several local archaeologists on the other islands (some of whom had external positions at Leiden University) was supported that NAAM was a foundation with a remit on Curaçao, and that it should not be too strongly involved with the archaeology of the BES islands since they had not sufficient local archaeological expertise and track-record to be able to decide upon heritage matters. In addition, the exclusion of Leiden University from contributing to the OCW-report, was seen by some Dutch archaeologists as rather strange:

We have helped <the archaeologist of Sint Eustatius> <...> for several years with the preparations of Malta, but it looks as if OCW tells us that we don’t have expertise in this matter. However, they offer the contract to NAAM, even though they don’t have experience with the archaeology of the windward islands.⁴¹⁴

In this sense, two types of networks had been established, which both used a mix between the AAD and the alternative bottom-up heritage discourses to critique each other’s motivations. The first was a network between NAAM and local government officials on the BES-islands (some of which also sat in the board of NAAM) that pleaded for an inter-Caribbean approach towards heritage management in order to establish a strong regional identity, and that thought that local political support and knowledge of local cultural socio-political context was the foremost prerequisite for access to the archaeology. The other network consisted of locally resident archaeologists of foreign origin but with decades of archaeological expertise on the islands, with strong academic links to, and supported by, Leiden University, who believed that knowledge and expertise of the local archaeology was a prerequisite for access. As we have discussed before, the

⁴¹³ July 2010.

⁴¹⁴ Associate Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, October 2010).

establishment of protocols between NAAM and the islands, and the establishment of Leiden University with local archaeological institutions in the form of memorandums of understanding, can both be seen in light of this process whereby future practices and access to the archaeology heavily influenced the establishment of policies.⁴¹⁵

5.6.3 PROJECT CONTEXTUALISATION

This section will further discuss the way in which the Santa Barbara Project has been (re-)presented, perceived and received by different actors. It will explore how, after a successful process of value translation and policy negotiation by the Dutch archaeological actors, the project was subsequently socially produced as successful through stabilisation of story-lines and discourses by creating a network of ‘supporting actors’ with an extensive global reach. In line with the work by Latour (1996, 137; 2005; and see Mosse 2004; 2005, 168), I refer to this process as ‘contextualisation’.

Contextualisation of the project happened through the repeated use of a set of story-lines that, as was illustrated in section 5.5.2, allowed for the most effective translation of values and a subsequent establishment of a discourse-coalition between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation. The story-line that was (re-)produced primarily was one of close cooperation between developer and professional archaeologists that allowed for the successful rescuing of a threatened archaeological ‘record’ by means of excavations and fostering expert knowledge about the past, all the while referring back to the idea of Malta archaeology. The contextualisation of the project, and of the discourse-coalition between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation, was for example facilitated through the repeated use of this story-line by the Dutch archaeologists in academic publications and presentations, a good example of this being the fact that the Santa Barbara Project was mentioned explicitly by the Professor of Caribbean archaeology during the inaugural address. As a result, the story-line was subsequently rehearsed by Dutch media as well as by local Antillean newspapers (see for example Toebosch 2008a in the Dutch magazine *Elsevier*). A similar contextualisation was facilitated through a press release of 21 July 2008 which was coordinated by the former director of the Curaçao newspaper *Amigoe*, who now worked for Santa Barbara Plantation as a PR consultant.⁴¹⁶

Contextualisation can further be distilled in the fact that several other actors used their global and international reach in order to support the project formation. The above-mentioned meeting between the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology and the head of DROV during a UNESCO meeting in New Zealand, could be seen as an example of this. The Council of State Advisor for the Netherlands Antilles, a former minister plenipotentiary of the Netherlands Antilles who had been asked to act as a ‘champion’ for the initial envisaged Campaign for Leiden Project, also brought its connections to bear in order to secure the support and success of the Santa Barbara Project. As a vocational archaeologist that brought forward a discourse on archaeological heritage as a fragile scientific resource under threat, the Council of State Advisor for example supported the former chairman of the Board of NAAM in its decision that the director should stop frustrating the development of the project, as to make sure that archaeological knowledge would be produced (see section 5.5.2).

In the Dutch newspaper *NRC*,⁴¹⁷ which was taken over by several Antillean media, a similar story-line on threatened archaeological archives under pressure from development appeared. Within this article,

⁴¹⁵ For a discussion on some of the outcomes and recommendations of the OCW-report, please refer back to section 5.3.2, and see Witteveen & Kraan 2012.

⁴¹⁶ This press release, which mentioned that Santa Barbara Plantation helped facilitate and fund archaeological research in collaboration with Leiden University, was taken over by a range of local newspapers such as *Amigoe*, *Antilliaans Dagblad*, *Laprinza*, *Vigilante* and *Nobo*.

⁴¹⁷ See Toebosch 2008b.

the need for Malta archaeology was endorsed by the Council of State Advisor for the Netherlands Antilles, whilst the collaboration between Santa Barbara Plantation and Leiden University was mentioned as a successful example of how threatened archaeological resources could be mitigated.

What this suggests, is that when actors saw their values and story-lines reflected and represented in project policies, they did lend their status to stabilise the project, and they worked to uphold representations of the project in order to maintain support. The same can be noted for the initial phases of the proposed collaboration between Leiden University and NAAM. During these phases, the use of story-lines and ‘mobilising concepts’ (see section 2.5.2) that emphasised capacity building, institutional collaboration and local education, contributed to the fact that NAAM supported the proposed collaboration, and the development of a chair for Professor of Caribbean archaeology in Leiden University. When the project developed in such a way that NAAM, Monuments Bureau DROV and the AWG could not translate their values successfully anymore into their institutional aims and policies, we have seen how they started representing the project as ‘institutional undermining’, ‘foreign’ and ‘top-down’. In this respect, these local organisations tried to set in motion a process of ‘de-contextualisation’, trying to produce a ‘failure’ of the project. For example, NAAM used its strong ties with its Board members who represented important political and archaeological positions at the other islands, in order to paint a negative view of the Santa Barbara Project. When the Head of DROV was replaced by its successor, who emphasised a similar discourse on local development and identity formation as the director of NAAM, the project was even further criticised⁴¹⁸ – especially when the new Head of DROV also took place as the new chairman of the board of NAAM. By then, however, the Santa Barbara Project had already started and was in its final stages of implementation.

Success or failure was as such socially produced and evaluated in line with the values that an actor ascribes to archaeological heritage and the project as a whole (cf Smith *et al.* 2010a, 17). Interestingly, the representations of failure were not at all relating to the actual archaeological field research itself, in the sense that not a single respondent questioned the idea that the excavations were archaeologically, scientifically sound. Project success could as such easily be produced by the Faculty of Archaeology, as it could draw upon the archaeological and scientific values that had been prioritised by the embedded AAD in the project policies, and that were at the basis of the evaluation procedures of their funders and of the quality criteria and standards as set out in Dutch policy and professional quality guidelines such as the KNA (Dutch Archaeology Quality Standard; see Willems & Brandt 2004). However, local actors such as NAAM and the AWG perceived and evaluated the project according to other discourses and values – notably socio-economic, collaboration and educational values, which were at the basis of their perceptions of failure.

Some academic archaeologists that I interviewed questioned if the archaeologist of NAAM, who gave advice on the inspection of the archaeological quality to Monuments Bureau DROV, was sufficiently qualified to do so because the archaeologist did not have a long field experience in Caribbean archaeology. In their views, the ability to evaluate success should be done by those who demonstrated archaeological expertise and who could judge academic merit. In contrast, the NAAM archaeologist, backed up by several local cultural policy government representatives (see above), stated that inspectors should demonstrate knowledge of the local socio-political and cultural context, and that an ability to judge the degree to which contract agreements had been made was more important for an inspector.⁴¹⁹ This view, that cultural

⁴¹⁸ Current Head of DROV (Willemstad, August 2010).

⁴¹⁹ Willemstad, June 2010.

heritage management was more to do with a working knowledge of political and social context instead of by academic expertise, was mirrored also in the reply by the director of NAAM on my question why they had not invited the archaeologists of Leiden University to the cultural heritage seminars of 2005 and 2009; “why should I have invited them? They are archaeologists, not heritage specialists”.⁴²⁰ Accordingly, success of the project was judged by the local partners not on the basis of academic results and quality, but rather on the degree to which local participation and capacity building had been achieved. The emphasis by the newly appointed archaeologist of NAAM on securing that the public outreach activities were done in line with the agreed PvE, illustrates this further.

5.7 THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF ARCHAEOLOGISTS

This final section will tie together some reflections on the role, responsibility and power of Dutch archaeologists in relation to the values and demands of others in the social context of Curaçao.

As a consequence of the institutionalised AAD in the project policies and the constant need for policy negotiation and value translation, the Dutch archaeologists were attributed a certain amount of ownership and decision-making power over the interpretation and management of the material remains of the past at Santa Barbara. The access to resources and networks on a global scale, the emphasis within the dominant value-system on archaeological research, professionalism and expertise, the inherent historical power discrepancies, combined with the idea that foreign experts bring status and strength to local partners in local power structures (Nash 1981; cf Haviser 2001, 77) all contributed to this.

What this means, is that the archaeologists were put in relatively powerful positions in which they could advocate and decide upon management aspects of the archaeological remains that were broader than their professional and institutional remit, and perhaps than their counterparts operating in the Dutch archaeological system (cf KNAW 2007); they were responsible for the project from start to finish, not just for the implementation phase (in terms of excavation), but also in terms of project development, accountability, selection, assessment, advise and public outreach. Ultimately, such a position brings with it responsibilities – a view mirrored by two local archaeologists of the BES-islands, who advocated that the responsibilities of archaeologists should go “far beyond the fieldwork and research of higher academic goals and touch on areas of the political and economic domain” (Haviser & Gilmore 2011, 143).

The archaeologists operated successfully within the remit of scientific and archaeological scrutiny, from the perspective of Dutch quality standards and professional ethics, and within the legal parameters of the archaeological and cultural policy framework of the Netherlands Antilles that they themselves had given form on a project level – although certain activities in the field of public outreach and archaeological storage as agreed upon in the PvE still needed to be finalised during my time of research. In line with the perspective of the local NAAM archaeologist who acted as an inspectorate advisor for Monument Bureau DROV, some questions might be raised though over the fact that the PvA and PvE interpreted former academic research and a short field visit as a ‘desk-based and explorative research’ within the Dutch Malta system, with a resulting short-cut towards an assessment of an obvious need for a full ‘surface-covering’ archaeological excavation.⁴²¹ From a Dutch Malta perspective, an ‘archaeological field evaluation’⁴²²

⁴²⁰ Willemstad, June 2010.

⁴²¹ This refers to ‘vlakdekkende opgraving’, cf Willems & Brandt 2004.

⁴²² This refers to ‘inventariserend veld onderzoek’ (IVO), cf Willems & Brandt 2004, 207.

would have been undertaken in advance of excavation, not simultaneously, as to better inform assessments and analysis by the local government of which sites, periods and areas would be left in-situ, excavated through trenches, or excavated fully. The realities of the project financial resources, development pressure by Santa Barbara Plantation, the linkage between the site with the research questions of Leiden University, as well as the fact that inexperienced government representatives had already chosen to agree with a specific focus on the site of Spanish Water in line with the discussed self-referential system of the Malta policy, made for the fact that the practice of the Dutch project was perceived as a logical result.

In general, I propose that archaeologists should take up their privileged position and decision-making power more strongly by actively advocating the inclusion of local people's and institutional values in a bottom-up process – in this specific case especially collaboration, intangible and community values. The realities of the Dutch research interests, institutional and funding frameworks, as well as the dominant value-system inherent in the Malta system, would however have made it difficult for the Dutch archaeologists to implement such an approach since it inherently regards archaeological heritage as a scientific resource whilst emphasising the need for professionalism, expertise and scientific output.

Nevertheless, Dutch archaeological research projects abroad could increase their chances and intentions for integrated heritage management and collaboration through challenging the AAD, by facilitating the values of other actors much earlier in the process, and by facilitating competing heritage discourses that include notions of care, memory and self-development. This also means that the current funding and institutional frameworks and policies of Dutch archaeology abroad need to better accommodate the practice, implementation, resourcing and assessment of activities such as capacity building, outreach and empowerment.

What is also needed then is to broaden the definition and scope of 'archaeological heritage sites', in terms of giving attention to including intangible values next to tangible values, as well as to sites and places outside of the direct impact areas of development and the time-scope of projects. This, in turn, means challenging the underlying values and story-lines of the Dutch interpretation of the Malta Convention, advocating for a more locally suitable and self-developed adaptation of this treaty in the Netherlands Antilles, as well as to advocate on behalf of local communities and institutions in negotiations with project developers where necessary, as to make sure that archaeological heritage is not solely seen as an obstacle or even as "just another profit-making product like the sun and the sea" (Haviser 2002, 20). On the other hand, such a pro-active approach by archaeological academics in relation to project developers, should perhaps not too easily be discarded by local partners as a large system of 'capitalist exclusion', since such an approach hinders the effective communication and translation of values as well as the inclusion of competing values in the archaeological process.

In any case, academic archaeology abroad needs to explicitly acknowledge that it is not a neutral activity free from political and social responsibility. The archaeological discipline has ethical responsibilities not only towards science and the past, but also towards others in society – be they developers or local organisations and communities. It is therefore in the negotiation, translation and communication of each other's values in which ethical behaviour truly lies (cf Meskell & Pels 2005a, 17; Moshenska 2008, 162 and MacEachern 2010). Starting by mapping out local power structures and stakeholder's values should therefore be at the start of any such process.

However, this does not mean that we should shy away from international development frameworks. Indeed, the private commercial sector is often regarded as

less supportive of capacity building beyond that required to deal with the issues arising in individual projects, or beyond the physical footprint and active lifespan of each project <...> because building archaeological knowledge and national heritage management capacities can be seen as extraneous to the core business of the developer. (Lilley 2011, 2)

Still, this is not universally the case – a good example being for instance the Oyu Tolgoi mining project in Mongolia which aims to build “national heritage management capacity for the long-term rather than simply mitigate the impact of development on the heritage resources in the project area during the active life of the <project>” (ibid). Likewise, the case study of Santa Barbara shows us that a willingness by international developers is there; it just needs to be harnessed and translated effectively into a kind of archaeology and heritage discourse that is both scientifically and socially relevant. Ultimately, this means replacing a heritage discourse that sees the lack of local expertise as a reason for exclusion, with one that approaches it as a reason for inclusion.

Chapter Six: Digging Holes Abroad

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Over the last few decades, western archaeology abroad has adapted increasingly to the interests and needs of others in society, specifically with respect to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration. The way in which we deal with other peoples views and values in the interpretation and investigation of archaeological pasts and materials, the way in which we integrate our archaeological narratives and practices with other demands in the heritage field and with processes of heritage-making, and the way in which we deal with power differences in both these processes; all remain as challenging issues when ‘digging holes abroad’.

Current perspectives on the social context of archaeology often look either to the future – by trying to devise better policies, better theories and better ethical codes, trusting that these are neutral problem solving mechanisms that will lead to better practice⁴²³ – or critically to the past, by regarding archaeology in the context of a colonial and hegemonic order that automatically favours western values over other values. But most of these policies, methodologies and critiques have overlooked the complex relationship between project policy, discourse and practice. In addition, they have often focused on the issue of ‘indigenous community’ involvement in postcolonial contexts, and less upon the motivations, desires and values of more broadly defined ‘local communities’ and/or of a broader range of stakeholders in global, national and regional contexts. As such, this study paid more attention to analysing the underlying processes by which archaeological research projects abroad are developed, negotiated and implemented, as well as to the impact of the agency and social position of archaeologists and other actors on project outcomes.

This study has brought forward an ethnographic approach as to investigate how archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context, as well as to be able to reflect upon the role and responsibility of archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of others when working abroad. It has done this by regarding the archaeological research practices of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University as a ‘culture’ under investigation, specifically by taking the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project and the Santa Barbara Project as case studies.

Within this ethnography, research projects have been approached as networks of actors, values, policies and discourses, that centred around a conception of sites as multi-vocal, multi-temporal, multi-spatial and contested sites of knowledge, practice and power. By bringing forward a ‘practice perspective’ towards project policy discourses, this study focused upon the ways in which interrelations between actors and discourses were created across time and space in multiple sites. The concept of ‘value’ has thereby been applied as an analytical tool that illustrated the intentions, desires and motivations of actors in relation to archaeological research, heritage, and collaborative projects.

Taken together, this ethnographic approach investigated three specific research questions; 1) What are the values and discourses of actors in archaeological project policies with respect to research, heritage

⁴²³ As discussed in section 1.5, this line of argumentation is inspired by the work of Van Gastel & Nuijten (2005, 86).

management and collaboration?, 2) How do archaeological actors negotiate these values and discourses in relation to those of others in society abroad?, and 3) What is the influence of this process of policy negotiation upon project outcomes?

This final chapter will address these questions in chronological order as to be able to understand how Dutch archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context (section 6.2 will thereby deal with the first research question, section 6.3 with the second, and section 6.4 with the third). The study will end with a brief reflection upon the role and responsibility of archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of others, which will include a discussion on the value of ethnographic research for archaeological research projects abroad (section 6.5).

6.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL VALUES AND DISCOURSES

Both the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project and the Santa Barbara Project were developed out of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University (LU). Although both these projects were set up as to be sensitive to the input of collaborative partners, and although both projects responded to opportunities and desires by local partners, it was the Dutch archaeological researchers that played the most significant role in the initial development and scope of the project proposals and research programs. These project proposals and programs thereby reflected the specific values and discourses of the Dutch researchers, in response to those of a myriad of funding programs in the field of culture, research and foreign affairs, institutional policies, cultural and archaeological policies, and archaeological theory. Taken together, these values and discourses became embedded in institutionally, academically and personally defined project policies.

The main discourse that could be identified in the project policies and practices is the ‘Authorised Archaeology Discourse’ (AAD).⁴²⁴ This discourse exists of a set of ‘story-lines’ (see section 2.5 and 2.6) that effectively prioritises the archaeological and scientific values of practices of research, heritage management and collaboration. An important story-line in this discourse consists of approaching sites with material remains of the past as a fragile, non-renewable resource under threat that has the potential to yield scientific, objective interpretations and knowledge of the past. It is in line with this view, that the concept of ‘heritage’ is discursively constructed in the AAD; material remains of the past are regarded as ‘archaeological heritage’, and in turn, ‘heritage’ is thought of to be constituted of material manifestations of the past. As the archaeological and scientific values of material remains and sites can only be ‘unlocked’ by objective, scientifically sound archaeological research, the AAD inherently emphasises archaeological researchers as professional experts that can identify, investigate and manage this ‘heritage’ resource on behalf of the public. A related discursive identification of archaeological researchers with the sites that they investigate and the data that they produce, completes this story-line.

In addition, the AAD advocates the primacy of excavation and research over conservation, presentation, tourism and socio-economic development, by regarding scientific field-research as producing objective knowledge that should be considered as universally valuable for future generations, and by regarding this knowledge as the basis for all other future social benefits. By doing so, it postpones the values of other actors in society, as these values and actors are regarded as coming into play only after the archaeological and scientific values of a heritage site have been ‘unearthed’ and sufficiently investigated.

⁴²⁴ As discussed in sections 2.4 and 4.4.1, the AAD has been heavily influenced and inspired by the formulation of the ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (AHD) of Laurajane Smith (2004; 2006). Later in this chapter, I will come back to the relationship between the AAD and the AHD in more detail.

As such, the AAD stresses that once the archaeological value of a resource has been established, and knowledge has been produced, it then becomes important to protect, consolidate and manage the site, after which this ‘heritage site’ – as a source of knowledge of the past – can be presented, interpreted and attract visitors, thereby providing even more public benefit. If done correctly, such interaction of the public with the archaeological value of the site will then ideally lead to enlarge their support, awareness and care for ‘their archaeological heritage’, thereby ensuring the survival of the archaeological data set from ignorance, destruction and development. Taken together, the AAD prioritises expert values, knowledge of a universally significant past, and objective scientific research over alternative values when investigating and/or managing an archaeological site in a collaborative project.

It is hereby important to stress that the AAD, as reflected in the project policies of both the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project as well as the Santa Barbara Project, encapsulated explicit intentions by the Dutch archaeological actors with respect to enhancing the social value of research, heritage management and collaboration. First of all, both project policies intended to promote collaborative partnerships in the field of scientific, professional and objective archaeological research as to enhance capacity building. Secondly, they aimed to integrate their archaeological practices with wider heritage management concerns, by advocating for conservation, presentation and tourism development after their scientific research would have produced knowledge about the past. Thirdly, both project policies were concerned with the value of archaeological research for the general public. They advocated for the development of public benefits in the sense of facilitating local communities to identify with objective and universal archaeological interpretations of heritage, as well as in the sense of socio-economic development as it could arise from tourism. In addition, they promoted community involvement as a means to improve the protection and awareness of archaeological heritage.

However, these policy intentions were not always in line with the values and discourses of other actors in social contexts abroad with respect to research, heritage management and collaboration. As discussed, the AAD sat in contrast with the view that the value of sites with material remains of the past lies primarily in contemporary identifications and uses. For some, material remains were not ‘scientific data’, but rather someone’s ‘heritage’, that is, a manifestation of people’s history, identity, memory or commemoration. For others, sites with material remains were a development burden, a source of income, a tourism asset, an educational tool, an opportunity for capacity building, or simply a place to have family picnics. Interestingly, many of these ‘alternative’ views also used the concept of ‘heritage’ to refer to material remains of the past, but the perception, approach and attributed values were different. Whilst the AAD prioritises the archaeological and scientific values of heritage sites, other discourses prioritised the identity, local, educational, tourism an/or socio-economic values of such places. Taking these alternative values and discourses into account, the question arises how the Dutch archaeological actors negotiated the archaeological and scientific values, and the AAD more generally, in relation to those of others in society abroad.

6.3 PROJECT NEGOTIATIONS

Embedded within the project policies, programs and representations were the story-lines of the AAD as discussed above. These story-lines facilitated other actors to adhere more easily to the project networks and programs. This is because the story-lines allowed actors to translate the policy goals and intentions in the field of research, heritage management and collaboration into the values and interests of their supporting bodies, policies and institutions. As a result, different actors, without necessarily sharing the same values

and discourses, could share a set of story-lines over a limited period of time and space, thereby forming strong temporary discourse-coalitions, or alliances, as to benefit mutually from the archaeological process.

First of all, the AAD fitted seamlessly with the values of partners and policies in the field of science and academia. The emphasis within the story-lines of the AAD on knowledge production, the primacy of excavation, and that of objective scientific research, allowed the archaeological actors to attain institutional support from Leiden University, as it foresaw in their scientific and educational values by providing academic publications, field-schools and student training. For similar reasons, it also meant that the projects could attain financial support from for example the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO)⁴²⁵ or the Leiden University Fund (LUF).

Secondly, the AAD facilitated a translation into the values of partners and policies in the field of heritage management. The AAD thereby fitted seamlessly with the ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (AHD) as brought forward by Laurajane Smith⁴²⁶, as it shared many of its story-lines. Especially the story-line whereby professional expertise was advocated in order to protect material remains of the past as a fragile, scientific ‘heritage resource’ from development pressures and public ignorance, played a fundamental role in this. This story-line, and the AHD more generally, was for instance embedded in the archaeological heritage policies of the Department of Antiquities in Jordan (DoA), of the Department of Urban and Regional Development Planning and Housing in Curaçao (DROV), and in the European ‘Malta Convention’ that was being transferred to the former Netherlands Antilles. Although the AAD prioritised excavation over preventive conservation, and although the AAD focused less upon the monumental, visually attractive material manifestations of the past than the story-lines of the AHD, discourse coalitions could easily be created through stressing that conservation of the past through knowledge production was seen as a necessary step in a management process towards sustaining universal public value. A shared emphasis on the need for professional expertise of archaeologists to act on behalf of the public, and on creating public awareness as to protect a fragile resource for future generations, completed this.

In terms of other aspects of heritage management, the story-line of the AAD that advocated for the conservation, interpretation and presentation of material remains of the past after knowledge production, also facilitated translation into the tourism values of Santa Barbara Plantation and of the DoA. This was because the first could see how knowledge production and excavation allowed for the unobstructed development of golf-courses and tourism trails for (international) visitors, whilst the latter could, in principle, translate such a story-line into the need for tourism development as it was brought forward by the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities.

Finally, the AAD fitted the values, story-lines and intentions of partners with regards to the issue of collaboration. The story-line in the AAD that emphasised objective research as the basis for collaboration, for example matched the values of Yarmouk University (YU), as it could facilitate scientific and educational values that fitted the wish for the creation of a ‘value-free’, independent archaeology in Jordan. Initially, such a story-line also succeeded in facilitating support from both the National Archaeological Anthropological Memory Management in Curaçao (NAAM) as well as the DoA, as the concept of ‘scientific collaboration’ could be translated into their wishes for capacity building and knowledge transfer.

The emphasis on ‘capacity building’ and ‘collaboration’ also meant that the project policies could be brought in line with contemporary postcolonial and postmodern critiques in the field of archaeological theory, as it fitted a discourse on indigenous and local community participation. Stressing the development

⁴²⁵ As discussed in relation to the early phases of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project (see chapter 4), NWO was originally founded as the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO).

⁴²⁶ See section 2.4 for a detailed description of the work of Smith (2004; 2006), Smith & Waterton (2009), and Waterton *et al.* (2006).

of public benefits in the sense of facilitating a local identification with universal and objective archaeological interpretations of heritage, as well as in the sense of socio-economic development as it could arise from tourism, also meant that political support from the Dutch government could be ensured for the Joint Project. A similar emphasis on capacity building and collaboration also strengthened the support by the Leiden University Fund and the Faculty of Archaeology for the Santa Barbara Project, as it fitted their need for demonstrating the social value of research – especially when project actors succeeded in securing private funding from Santa Barbara Plantation. A shared story-line on how a professional collaboration between archaeologists and developers could safeguard heritage by creating universally significant knowledge about the past, also matched the preferred representation of collaboration by Santa Barbara Plantation.

In effect, the story-lines of the AAD as reflected in the policy goals and intentions of the two projects, allowed for the formation of strong, temporary alliances with other partners in society – even without necessary sharing the same values and discourses with respect to research, heritage management and collaboration. The use of very condensed conceptualisations of story-lines, such as ‘capacity building’, ‘community involvement’, ‘heritage’, ‘collaboration’ and/or ‘public benefit’, facilitated this as such ‘mobilising concepts’ (cf Shore & Wright 1997; Hajer 2005; Vos 2011) allowed for different actors to adhere to policy programs and project networks more easily.

The successful translation of values was hereby heavily influenced by the discourse, personal background and agency of individual actors – an issue well illustrated by the way in which the late Henk Franken had set up the original scope and formation of the Deir Alla Project. But also the continuation of project programs needed a constant process of brokering and translation, whereby the institutional affiliation of actors could have strong implications on the perception of a project’s success. The transfer of the Head of Research and Excavation of the DoA to YU is a good example of this, as it left the DoA without an archaeologist that could successfully translate the scientific and archaeological values of the Joint Project into the training and public values of the department; effectively, it led to the transfer of project benefits to the YU.

Secondly, the translation of values by actors was often intrinsically linked to their need for maintaining institutional, political and financial support, most notably by trying to ensure continuous access to the benefits deriving from archaeological projects (cf Mosse 2005). This process has been distilled for instance in the way in which different actors in the former Netherlands Antilles have tried to influence the implementation of the Malta Convention, and of the Santa Barbara Project in particular, as to be able to also benefit from the potential research and financial opportunities deriving from this.

Thirdly, this study illustrated that the discourses and personal background of actors could play an important role in the successful translation of values into political and financial support. The way in which Dutch embassy personnel in Palestine discursively emphasised the social value of archaeological projects in contrast to those in Jordan, is an example of this, as it allowed archaeology to be translated more effectively into policy programs in the sphere of ‘culture and development’. Finally, the processes of policy negotiation, value translation and project network formation have been further ‘contextualized’ through the creation of a network of supporting actors. It is in this sphere that influential actors outside the immediate project networks played an important role, as they could provide significant political support for projects through their extensive global reach (cf Latour 1996). The Council of State Advisor for the Netherlands Antilles, the Dutch Consul General for Jordan, and the Chief Administrator of the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO), are all examples of how ‘external brokers’, with similar story-lines as the AAD, could help in stabilising the continuation of project network formations.

6.4 POLICY AND PRACTICE

Now that I have summarised how the AAD facilitated the formation of temporary partnerships, I will explore in more detail how processes of policy negotiation impacted upon project outcomes. In this respect, it is worth noting that the projects did not (yet) fully succeed in implementing several policy goals and intentions in relation to the social value of archaeology, such as site conservation, site interpretation, the establishment of local museums, capacity building of local institutions, and/or the creation of educational and socio-economic benefits for local communities. In addition, this study has identified an (often unintended) exclusion of local partners from project networks and benefits, such as the DoA in Jordan, the NAAM and the Archaeological Working Group (AWG) in Curaçao, and, arguably, local community members in both these contexts. This in turn led not only to the situation that most of the benefits from archaeological research projects abroad were geared towards (Dutch) archaeological researchers and academic institutions, but also to frictions between partners – most notably in terms of rather drastic different perceptions of success and failure of ‘collaborative projects’.

In effect, this study has illustrated how the scientific and archaeological values of practices of research, heritage management and collaboration came to be prioritised over other values through processes of project negotiation and policy implementation. One of the reasons behind this can be found in the AAD itself. This is because the AAD, as embedded in the project policies, postponed the values of other actors towards the future, by advocating that practices of field-research and knowledge production precedes those of conservation, interpretation, education, tourism and socio-economic development. Another reason for this lies in the inherent top-down approach in the AAD, which argues that universally significant, academic research precedes local use and identification, and which regards heritage as scientific material data that needs to be handled professionally and objectively. In combination with socio-political and historical frameworks that favoured external actors as knowledgeable experts, this in turn led to a situation in which ownership was granted to archaeological project actors as to make decisions over which, and whose, values and activities were to be taken into account in the first phases of the project. Because the formation of project networks was a complicated and time-consuming process, because the attraction of continuous financial support for the implementation of other values could not always be secured, and because the facilitation of some of these values was regarded as lying outside the sphere of influence and responsibility of the archaeological researchers themselves, this meant that conservation, presentation and tourism development activities were postponed to an insecure future. As such, several actors with other values and a lack of ‘archaeological’ expertise came to be – often unintentionally – excluded.

Another contributing factor lies in the fact that the story-lines, and especially the mobilising concepts such as ‘capacity building’, ‘community involvement’, ‘heritage’, ‘collaboration’ and/or ‘public benefit’, concealed the complete array of underlying values and discourses towards practices of research, heritage management and collaboration. This meant that project networks could much easier be maintained if these policy concepts did not overshadow fundamental conflicting values and discourses, especially in terms of ownership, power and access to archaeological resources. In other words, it meant that other actors could much easier continue to commit themselves to project networks and policy practices if they could align the attribution of expertise to archaeologists and the prioritisation of archaeological and scientific values with their own values and discourses.

Both YU and Santa Barbara Plantation for instance, could easily benefit from collaboration with Leiden University (and vice versa), as it fitted their respective aims for academic field research and unobstructed, responsible tourism development. As such, it gave them a strong partner with global access to financial, academic and political resources in relation to local political negotiations with the DoA and NAAM/DROV respectively. These resulting ‘core’ partnerships benefited from the story-line in the AAD

that advocated for professional, expert access to archaeological resources, since a collaboration with a strong external partner that prioritised archaeological excavation meant that ownership and access could be secured in relation to the demands of local partners that advocated for other uses and values.

The prioritisation of scientific and archaeological values was also a result of the significant impact of the institutional and financial research policies that facilitate academic research elements of archaeological projects. The combination of the institutional policies of the Faculty of Archaeology with the research funding policies of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research and/or the Leiden University Fund, meant that a strong demand was placed upon the archaeological actors to undertake field research, organise field schools for students, as well as to write academic publications. The prioritisation of scientific and archaeological values of collaboration in the project policies was thereby strengthened, as these institutional and financial research policies did not easily allow for, or give credit to the undertaking of activities in the field of conservation, outreach, capacity building or tourism development. For the Joint Project, the research funding policies behind Leiden University and YU provided for example substantially greater financial resources to facilitate academic research, then those resources that the DoA could bring to the table for activities in the field of conservation and presentation.

This also meant that global access to potential financial resources for archaeological research played a significant role in the formation of project networks and inherent power relationships between actors. For example, the financial opportunity deriving out of the Dutch cultural policies in the field of foreign affairs, contributed to a shift in research focus from Jordan to Palestine by archaeologists of the Faculty of Archaeology, as these funding policies could easier yield a translation into the research policies' and institutional demand for fieldwork, student training and publications. Likewise, the private matching funds flowing out of a collaboration with the Santa Barbara Plantation in the sphere of developer-led, or 'Malta' archaeology also lead to an increased emphasis on knowledge production, as it fitted the values and wishes of both Santa Barbara Plantation as well those of the institutional and funding priorities of Leiden University to excavate, rather than to conserve the site through the development of an 'archaeological park'. In addition, the choice to excavate specific site locations was thereby also influenced by the specific research questions and objectives of the archaeological actors.

Indeed, the process whereby the archaeological and scientific values of research, heritage management and collaboration were prioritised, was further facilitated because activities in the area of archaeological field investigations and knowledge production could yield substantive research and economic benefits for individuals and institutions. As such, the translation of values by actors was often intrinsically linked to their personal need for maintaining institutional, political and financial support, most notably by trying to ensure continued access and ownership to archaeological resources and the potential benefits deriving from this. This, in turn, was done by reproducing and constructing discourses, story-lines and project representations that fitted the aims and values of their (potential) supporting institutions and policies.

For example, a diversity of actors in both project policies discursively produced the practices of the archaeological projects as a result of 'joint projects', 'shared responsibilities', 'successful collaborations', 'Malta archaeology', 'preventive archaeology', 'community archaeology', and, in some instances, 'indigenous' or 'postcolonial' archaeology. Notably, this was sometimes despite their discrepancy with actual project activities and project partner perceptions. The representation of project activities as a result of project policies was facilitated by the fact that actors could produce the intentions and future values of the AAD – as embedded in the project policies – as actual successes. As pointed out by Bruno Latour (1996) and David Mosse (2005), the success of policy does therefore not necessarily depend so much on its ability to orientate practice, but also on its ability to connect actors, inspire allegiance, and maintain institutional support, by providing coherent interpretations of practice. As such, policy discourses

and representations such as ‘Malta archaeology’ or ‘collaborative archaeology’ could become the end, rather than solely the means of project practices, as these created a more attractive framework for maintaining relationships than the contradictory project realities (Cf Büscher 2008).

The potential research, financial and institutional benefits of archaeological projects were so well facilitated by the AAD story-lines, mobilising concepts and representations of the project policies that other actors, such as the DoA and NAAM, started to produce and utilise these as to gain access and ownership to archaeological resources and projects themselves. However, story-lines that promoted expert ownership over archaeological heritage, or concepts and representations such as ‘collaboration’ and ‘Malta archaeology’, did not fit easily with the alternative values and discourses of these actors as they inherently conflicted with their views on the ‘public’ ownership and beneficiaries of archaeological projects. Basically, by using these story-lines, concepts and representations, they ultimately contributed to a process whereby they could be placed outside of project network formations, primarily because the AAD as embedded in the project policies regarded their lack of resources, of institutional capacity, of effective legal power and of expertise as a reason for exclusion, rather than inclusion.

The DoA for instance, regarded project collaboration primarily as a means for capacity building and regaining ownership within the field of archaeological heritage management, primarily in the face of stronger, international and national academic and political forces. Their emphasis on ‘collaboration’ and ‘national ownership’ as a means to provide benefits for governmental representatives thereby conflicted with the AAD of the project policies, which rather saw capacity building with Jordanian academic counterparts as the most appropriate means to develop an independent Jordanian archaeology. In Curaçao, NAAM also regarded collaboration as a means to enhance institutional capacity and expertise in the struggle for regaining ‘national’ ownership over archaeological heritage management. Expertise was hereby primarily seen in the sense of having knowledge and understanding of local, legal, political and cultural circumstances, whilst archaeological heritage was primarily approached as a material manifestation of memories and commemoration that could function as a means for national identity formation. Such values and discourses, however, conflicted with the project network formations of the Santa Barbara Project, as these stressed that DROV, as the legal state representative, had asked for an implementation of Malta principles whereby the developer, as a major funder, had a right to choose the ‘professional’ archaeological partner. Santa Barbara Plantation hereby preferred to work with an external, academic and professional organisation with ‘archaeological’ expertise, rather than with a local ‘heritage’ organisation without an archaeologist.

Because actors such as the DoA, NAAM and the AWG ultimately did not succeed in gaining their desired access and ownership over archaeological sites and resources, and because they felt that they did not benefit financially, educationally or scientifically from the archaeological projects, they subsequently constructed and contextualized representations of the archaeological projects as being ‘failures’, ‘academically selfish’, or even ‘colonial’.

It is interesting to note that both project policies mentioned that public benefits and involvement were to be the result of archaeological projects. This was primarily seen in the sense of facilitating communities to identify with objective and universal archaeological interpretations of heritage, as well as by means of creating socio-economic development as it could arise from tourism. But despite such intentions for creating public benefits and involvement, the subsequent negotiations over project benefits and ownership between all project partners ultimately contributed to an (often unintended) exclusion of local community members as well.

In Jordan for example, local community perceptions of exclusion were not solely the result of the way in which the AAD was embedded within the Dutch project policies and practices, but also because of

power struggles between notably the DoA, the Ministry of Tourism and YU over the ownership and access to archaeological sites, as none of these partners pro-actively sought to accommodate a bottom-up collaboration with the local municipality. Likewise, the exclusion of local communities and partners in Curaçao was not just the result of the way in which the AAD had been embedded in the specific project policies in a framework of Malta archaeology, but also because of previous conflicts and failed negotiations between NAAM and Santa Barbara Plantation over the ownership, access and management of archaeological ‘heritage’ resources. In addition, internal political decisions within DROV had led to the accommodation of the values and desires of Santa Barbara Plantation. This was not only because several key political and governmental actors did not want to thwart the larger socio-economic benefits for the island, but also because they felt that a foundation such as NAAM had no effective claim in the face of a strong financial partnership by Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation, as these would preserve and enhance the public value of archaeological sites within contemporary cultural legal frameworks.

Arguably, local community members in Deir Alla and Santa Barbara did not benefit as much as the archaeological project actors would have liked. Apart from the project policies and negotiations mentioned above, this is also because community members did not primarily attribute archaeological and scientific values to sites and projects, but rather values in the field of access to property, recreation, education, and job-employment through tourism development. In Deir Alla for instance, the fence could be seen as a physical example of an expert boundary between archaeological research on the one hand, and educational, recreational and development values on the other. Despite a general positive view on the archaeological presence, and despite some opportunities for employment in archaeological excavations, community members mainly desired educational opportunities and socio-economic benefits through tourism development. Unfortunately, the intricate workings of the project policy negotiations thereby contributed to the fact that the implementation and development of such activities, most notably through the idea of a regional museum, came to be postponed, and have as of yet not been realised. At Santa Barbara, this study identified a similar local perception of exclusion from the project network. Interestingly, this was not so much related to the undertaking of archaeological research at the pre-columbian site of Spanish Water, but rather to a broader desire for access to the property of the former plantation at large, most notably in the sense of recreational values at the beach, as well as in access to economic benefits through job creation at the international tourism scheme by Santa Barbara Plantation and Hyatt Regency. The way in which some community members came to identify Leiden University as part of a ‘hidden’, ‘forbidden’ and ‘capitalist’ development scheme by Santa Barbara Plantation, is thereby particularly noteworthy. Arguably, the project policies also led to a postponement and exclusion of educational and presentation values for local community members, as, for instance, the envisaged local exhibition at the entrance office of Santa Barbara Plantation and the archaeological tourism amenities by Hyatt Regency (such as the walking trails and the interpretation at the golf courses) will probably not easily fit the desires and opportunities for access by the local community – although this remains to be seen.

In relation to the projects’ intentions to facilitate local communities to identify with archaeological interpretations of heritage, it can be noted that substantially different approaches to ‘indigenous’ identification with heritage existed. In Deir Alla, the identification of the local community was to be found not so much in the sense of shared ties with people of the past to an extreme and hard landscape, but rather in much more recent values of memory and commemoration – most notably in their status as Palestinian refugees, as well as in their experiences and feelings of friendship with members of the archaeological excavation teams during the last 50 years. At Santa Barbara, the local social value that was attributed to the ‘archaeological heritage’ site was not so much to be found in a desire to identify with the history of indigenous Indian populations, nor, interestingly, so much with the history of the wider plantation during colonial times. Rather, the site of Spanish Water was often regarded as part of a wider set of heritage values

that were attributed to Santa Barbara at large, which were to be found in memories relating to its mining history, as well as to the recreation spaces of the former beach at Santa Barbara – both elements that were heavily mixed with broader, socio-political and economic feelings of exclusion to property.

In summary, it can be said that the unequal provision of project benefits to archaeological academic institutions, as well as an exclusion of several local partners, has been the result of a process whereby project policies, discourses and actor agencies together contributed to the prioritisation of archaeological and scientific values, as well as to the attribution of expertise and ownership to archaeological actors. As such, critiques and representations that regard the social impact of archaeological practices abroad as solely the result of either (Dutch) project policies, (western) discourses or (archaeological) actors' motivations, seem to fall short in their explanation.

Still, the question remains if the attribution of ownership and expertise to academic archaeologists through discursive processes is an intended process or rather the result of a self-referential approach (cf Waterton *et al.* 2006, 351).⁴²⁷ Perhaps, as these authors suggest, intentionality becomes at best secondary, as only the outcomes of policy discourses matter. However, this does not mean that intentions do not matter at all. First of all, this study illustrated how actors' intentions to enhance the social value of archaeology have played an important role in how project network formations were developed, and in how subsequent project policies came to postpone other values to the future. Secondly, this study showed how project partners sometimes represented these intentions as successes as to maintain support. Interestingly, this meant that in some instances the intentions of archaeologists, through policy discourses and actor negotiations, could potentially lead to the postponement and exclusion of precisely the values of those actors that they sought to accommodate. In line with La Salle (2012), archaeological academics should as such be careful that their intentions 'to do good' do not lead to the fact that they, nor their partners, are actually selling an archaeological desire for 'digging holes'.

6.5 CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

With such remarks in relation to the intentionality of actors in place, I will end this study by further reflecting upon the role and responsibility of archaeological academics in relation to the values and demands of others in society when working abroad.⁴²⁸

Despite the fact that we, as archaeological academics, might not be solely responsible for the social impact of our archaeological conduct, and despite the fact that our best intentions and policies may be extremely difficult to implement in practice, this does not mean that we can abdicate responsibility. This is because we are, whether we like it or not, often placed in positions of 'gatekeepers' of the past, whereby we are attributed the expertise and power to make decisions over management aspects of archaeological remains that might be broader than our academic and institutional remit. The emphasis of the AAD on archaeological professionalism and expertise, the constant need for brokering, value translation and representation, the access to resources and networks on a global scale, combined with the idea that international experts bring status and strength to local partners in local power structures, all contribute to this.

⁴²⁷ See also the end of section 2.4.

⁴²⁸ Some of these final concluding paragraphs draw upon work by the author during the course of this study as published elsewhere (Perring & Van der Linde 2009).

As such, archaeological academics play an important role in not only the investigation and exploration of the past, but also in the way in which archaeological collaborative projects are integrated with wider heritage issues and socio-political and economic concerns. So, even though we may be employed to investigate the material remains of the past, or train our students how to do so, and even though we may do this according to the legal, cultural and institutional policies and ethical guidelines that frame our archaeological projects abroad, we should always be actively aware that our practices have an impact upon the values and demands of others in society.

Accordingly, if we wish to take up our role and responsibility in relation to archaeological research projects abroad, we need to mitigate the potential negative and exclusionary effects of top-down project policies that postpone the values of other actors in society, by locating our work within broader long-term strategies for cultural and socio-economic development, and by advocating for bottom-up and value-based approaches that take the empowerment of local institutions and communities, according to their own values, seriously. Ultimately, this means that our conduct needs to be based upon a vision of archaeological heritage that cares not only for the creation of knowledge and the preservation of scientific data, but also for those connected to it. In addition, it means that we need to bring to the fore project policies and practices that see the lack of expertise by local partners as a reason for inclusion, rather than exclusion. Basically, we need to accept that material remains of the past are not solely an opportunity for research, but also – simultaneously – a source of identity, economic development, education or recreation.

Instead of seeing the facilitation of other people's values as lying outside our responsibility, I propose that archaeologists should actually take up their privileged position and decision-making power more strongly. If we wish to increase our chances for socially relevant and sensitive archaeological projects that successfully integrate research, heritage management and collaboration, we need to first of all challenge the Authorised Archaeological Discourse, by putting more emphasis, resources and priority on capacity building, empowerment, and competing heritage discourses that include notions of care, memory and self-development. This means that we actively need to try and broaden the values and discourses of our current funding and institutional frameworks, so that they better allow for the implementation, resourcing and evaluation of long-term, institutional collaborations in which conservation, presentation, education, tourism development and/or capacity building elements are seen as a fundamental part of archaeological conduct abroad, and not as a well-intended afterthought. Especially now that societal relevance and impact assessments of research are becoming increasingly important and demanded in the Netherlands (Polman 2012; Zijlstra 2012), we should make sure that these are not only assessed in a Dutch, national context, but also in relation to those societies abroad where we conduct our research.

Ultimately, we can no longer hide behind a notion of archaeological research as a neutral activity free from political and social responsibility. This means that we should not only be honest about the political nature of our work, but also of the way in which our own intentions and desires for maintaining institutional and financial support shape our conduct. This is important, as we often like to represent our practices in a guardianship and interpretive research role rather than a commercial or exploitative one, even when we are engaged in business enterprises as part of commercial development processes (cf Breen & Rhodes 2010, 115). Likewise, we need to make sure that we do not too easily hide behind a sense of not wanting to be seen as 'neo-colonial', as such issues can potentially turn a blind eye to local power discrepancies and the exclusion of local communities in archaeological research processes.

Taking up such an active stance in relation to our privileged position, inherently means recognising the ethical issues that our practices raise. Whilst professional codes of conduct might help us in staying away from the blatantly unethical, ultimately, the specificity of our local practices means that no universal guidelines can save us from having to make difficult decisions as to whose values to involve where, when

and why. The minimum that we can do is to acknowledge the differences in power, listen to other values and views, and facilitate the negotiations of values with those actors that are affected by archaeological conduct. This means that we need to be constantly aware of how our work is located and perceived in local cultural and socio-political power structures, and in the context of wider economic development schemes.⁴²⁹

Because an advocacy for local empowerment by archaeological academics leads potentially to their fears over a loss of control over scientific research questions and approaches, and because a self-aware and proactive stance of academics in the negotiation with local actors is in danger of being perceived as being neo-colonial, top-down and capitalist, it means that everybody involved has to bring to the fore a sensitive and constructive approach to institutional collaboration, one that allows for the harnessing of the personal intentions and institutional constraints of everyone involved. In the words of MacEachern, the problems of negotiations in archaeological research projects are therefore ultimately to be found in the “difficulties of translation, of groups of people who in many cases wished to work productively together, but who found themselves frequently at odds or misdirected because of a failure to appreciate the presumptions and the constraints on other actors in what was supposed to be a shared endeavour” (2010, 350).

In this sense, ethnographies of archaeological practices could play a fundamental role in the future. If we apply a self-reflexive ethnographic approach, right from the start, to the way in which archaeological research projects are developed, negotiated and implemented, we can not only shed light on the actual processes that underlie the outcome of archaeological practices abroad, but we can also contribute to actively engaging stakeholder participation in archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration, by giving voice to their values and wishes in the process. By doing so, the ethnographic approach can contribute to an alignment of the call for multivocality and stakeholder consultation in the instrumental perspectives, with the highlighting of alternative, subaltern and indigenous values in the critical perspectives. Such a call for the integration of ethnography, archaeological research and value-based heritage management approaches, can ultimately contribute to practices in which the values of other actors in society are better cared for and facilitated, and in which collaboration and empowerment is not only sought after with academic peers, but also with staff and people from government bodies, non-governmental organisations and local communities.

However, this does not mean that we should think of ourselves as the actors that have the necessary expertise and right to become site managers. Instead, it means that we can help facilitate the translation of our archaeological research practices with processes of heritage management and heritage-making. Similarly, this does not mean that there is no place anymore for sound, scientific archaeological field method, as this continues to be important for not only raising historic awareness, enjoyment, and tolerance, but also because these methods and field techniques are often sought after in efforts of capacity building. Instead, we need to integrate our archaeological research practices with value-based heritage management assessments and with a self-reflexive ethnographic approach, so as to contribute to more equitable, ethical and locally sustainable collaborative practices that are not only scientifically, but also socially relevant.

⁴²⁹ cf Perring & Van der Linde (2009, 210-211).

Appendix

Original outline of semi-structured interviews

This original list of themes and questions formed the basis of an iterative interview process,⁴³⁰ whereby they were adapted in the field in relation to specific respondents and research issues. The questions are by no means exhaustive, and merely functioned as an inspiration for discussion (see section 3.2.2).

1. Introduction

- Introduction of the author and outline of research
- Research ethics

2. Factual/Personal

- Personal and institutional background
- Personal involvement with project
- Institutional involvement with project

3. Experiential

- Motivations and project policies
 - o *How did you become involved in the project?*
 - o *What did you – and/or your institution – wish to accomplish with the project?*
 - o *Did these motivations/objectives change during the course of the project?*
 - o *What would you like to accomplish with the project in the future?*
- Causal chains and key events
 - o *Can you describe to me how the project has evolved during your involvement?*
 - o *What were, in your opinion, determining factors and events during the project?*
- Collaboration
 - o *Who were involved in this project?*
 - o *How would you describe the collaboration on this project?*
 - o *Who else would you like to see involved?*
- Project outcomes
 - o *How far do you see your objectives/motivations represented and implemented by the project?*
 - o *Do you consider the project a success?*
 - o *What have you learned during this project?*

4. Conceptual

- Research
 - o *Do you think archaeology is important?*
 - o *How should archaeology be conducted, and with what purpose?*
 - o *What periods/places should be investigated?*
- Heritage management
 - o *Is the site important to you? Why?*
 - o *What should happen to the site?*
 - o *What does the word 'heritage' mean to you?*
- Collaboration
 - o *Who should be involved in the archaeological process?*
 - o *Who should make decisions on archaeological sites?*
 - o *What advice would you give to foreign archaeologists?*

5. Conclusions

- o *Is there anything else you'd like to tell me?*
- o *Who else should I talk to?*

Central sensitising concepts: 'research', 'multivocality', 'community collaboration', 'heritage', 'significance', 'expertise', 'ownership', 'empowerment' and 'decolonization'.

⁴³⁰ Inspired by Kvale & Brinkman (2009, 103) and Rubin & Rubin (2005).

References

- AbuJaber, R. 2009. Dutch Cultural and Archaeological Activities in Jordan during the last fifty years. In E Kaptijn & L. P. A. Petit, eds. *A Timeless Vale. Archaeological and related essays on the Jordan Valley in honour of Gerrit van der Kooij on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 9–17.
- Aitchison, K., 2007. Ethical issues in European professional archaeology. *Public Archaeology*, 6(2), 116–123.
- Al-Husban, A.H., 2006. *School Curriculum and Cultural Heritage: A case study from Jordan*, Unpublished paper presented at the 3rd Tempus Workshop in Irbid, Jordan, 23-27 May 2006. Available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/activities/documents/activity-125-4.pdf> [Accessed July 20, 2011].
- AlGhazawi, R., 2011. *Challenges of the Jordanian Museum. The role of environment in preventive conservation*, Leiden University: Unpublished PhD Dissertation.
- Alkhaysheh, F. ed., 2007. *Munjazat 2007*, Amman: Department of Antiquities.
- Allen, R.M.,
 2001. *Ta Cuba mi ke bai (naar Cuba wil ik gaan)*, Willemstad: ICS Nederland.
2003. Acceptatie of uitsluiting? Enkele belangrijke invalshoeken voor de discussie over beeldvorming over immigranten uit de regio en over Curaçaoenaars. In R. M. Allen, C. Heijes, & V. Marcha, eds. *Emancipatie en acceptatie. Curaçao en Curaçaoenaars: beeldvorming en identiteit honderdveertig jaar na de slavernij*. Amsterdam: SWP, 72–90.
2010. The Complexity of National Identity Construction in Curaçao, Dutch Caribbean. *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 89, 117–125.
- Amigoe, 1992. Havisier doet archeologische opgravingen. Oud en nieuw op Santa Barbara. *Amigoe*. 19 September 1992, 3.
- Antillen.nu, 2006. Informatieavond Archeologisch Beheer trekt veel bezoekers. *Antillen.nu*. 3 August 2006.
- Appadurai, A., 1986. Introduction. Commodities and the politics of value. In A. Appadurai, ed. *The social life of things. Commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–63.
- Archaeological Dialogues, 2007. Special Issue: Archaeology of Europe: the 2007 EAA Archaeological Dialogues Forum. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 15(1).
- Ashworth, G.J., Graham, B. & Tunbridge, J.E., 2007. *Pluralising pasts: heritage, identity and place in multicultural societies*, London: Pluto Press.

- Atalay, S., 2008. Multivocality and Indigenous Archaeologies. In J. Habu, C. P. Fawcett, & J. M. Matsunaga, eds. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*. New York: Springer, 29–44.
- Australia ICOMOS, 1999. *Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance*. Available at: <http://australia.icomos.org/publications/charters/> [Accessed January 7, 2012].
- Australian Archaeological Association, 1991. *Code of Ethics*. Australian Archaeological Association. Available at: www.australianarchaeology.com/ [Accessed January 7, 2012].
- Avrami, E., Mason, R. & de la Torre, M., 2000. *Values and Heritage Conservation: Research Report*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Badran, A., 2006. *Enhancing the Presentation of Archaeological Landscapes in Jordanian Primary School Teaching: Opportunities for Archaeological Museums*, Unpublished paper presented at the Forum UNESCO University and Heritage 10th International Seminar ‘Cultural Landscapes in the 21st Century’ Newcastle-upon-Tyne, April 2005. Available at: conferences.ncl.ac.uk/unescolandscapes/files/BADRANArwa.pdf [Accessed February 4, 2010].
- Bartu, A., 2000. Where is Çatalhöyük? In I. Hodder, ed. *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 101–109.
- Bazelmans, J., 2011. Serving two masters: Dutch archaeology since the Valletta Convention. In L. Webley, M. Van der Linden, C. Haselgrove & R. Bradley, eds. *Development-led archaeology in Northwest Europe, proceedings of a round table at the University of Leicester 19th-21st November 2009*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 9–21.
- Berriane, M., 1999. *Tourism, Culture and Development in the Arab Region: Supporting culture to develop tourism, developing tourism to support culture*, Paris: UNESCO. Available at: unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001183/118316eo.pdf [Accessed April 5, 2010].
- Bestuurscollege Curaçao, 1991. *Eilandsverordening ter uitvoering van de Monumentenlandsverordening 1989 en tot wijziging van de Bouw en Woningverordening 1935 (Monumenteneilandsverordening Curaçao)*, AB 1990 no 5. Curaçao.
- Beurs en Nieuwsberichten, 1992. Santa Barbara was woon- en werk gebied Caquetio Indianen. *Beurs en Nieuwsberichten*. 19 September 1992.
- Bhabha, H.K., 1994. *The location of culture*, London: Routledge.
- Binford, L.R., 1978. *Nunamiut Ethnoarchaeology*, New York: Academic Press.
- Blake, J., 2001. *Developing a new standard-setting instrument for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage: elements for consideration*, Paris: UNESCO.
- Blumer, H., 1954. What is wrong with social theory? *American Sociological Review*, 18, 3–10.
- Bourdieu, P., 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice* 1st ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bowen, G.A., 2006. Grounded theory and sensitizing concepts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(3), 1–9.
- Brand, L., 2000. Resettling, Reconstructing and Restor(y)ing: Archaeology and Tourism in Umm Qays. *Middle East Report*, 216, 28–31.
- Breen, C. & Rhodes, D., 2010. *Archaeology and International Development in Africa*, Duckworth Debates in Archaeology. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co Ltd.
- Broek, A.G., 2000. Plantation Santa Barbara and its Mesa. A history of Calcium Phosphate Mining. In Mijnmaatschappij Curaçao NV., ed. *De Tafelberg aan de Fuikbaai, Curaçao, Nederlandse Antillen. 125 jaar exploitatie van grondstoffen in sociaal-economisch perspectief*. Willemstad: Van Haaren Printers NV, 87–80.
- Büscher, B., 2008. The nuances of development (Review of the book ‘Cultivating Development’ by Mosse, D. 2005). *The Broker*. Available at: <http://www.thebrokeronline.eu/en/Articles/The-nuances-of-development> [Accessed July 6, 2012].
- Byrne, D., 1991. Western hegemony in archaeological heritage management. *History and Anthropology*, 5 (2), 269–276.
- Castañeda, Q.E., 2008. The ‘ethnographic turn’ in archaeology: research positioning and reflexivity in ethnographic archaeologies. In Q.E. Castañeda & C Matthews, eds. *Ethnographic archaeologies: reflections on stakeholders and archaeological practices*. Lanham MD: AltaMira Press, 25–61.
- Castañeda, Q.E. & Matthews, C. eds., 2008. *Ethnographic Archaeologies: Reflections on Stakeholders and Archaeological Practices*, Lanham MD: AltaMira Press.
- Cernea, M., 2001. Economic benefits and poverty reduction through Cultural Heritage preservation. In M. Cernea, ed. *Cultural Heritage and Development: A Framework for Action in the Middle East and North Africa*. New York: World Bank Publications, 41–55.
- Chakrabarti, D., 2001. South Asia. In T. Murray, ed. *Encyclopedia of Archaeology: History and Discoveries*, Vol.3. Santa Barbara CA: ABC-Clio, 1183–1194.
- Charkasi, D., 2000. High tech may water Jordan Valley, but dry up family farming. *Jordan Times*. 31 August 2000.
- Charmaz, K.,
2000. Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, eds. *Strategies for qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 249–291.
2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*, London: Sage.
- Chiang, M., 2012. *Memory Contested, Locality Transformed. Representing Japanese Colonial ‘Heritage’ in Taiwan*. Archaeological Studies Leiden University 26, Leiden: Leiden University Press.

- Clark, I., 2005. The bigger picture. Archaeology and values in long term cultural resource management. In C. Mathers, T. Darvill, & B. J. Little, eds. *Heritage of value, archaeology of renown. Reshaping archaeological assessment and significance*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 317–30.
- Cleere, H. ed., 1984. *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage: A Comparative Study of World Cultural Resource Management Systems*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cleere, H.,
 1989a. Introduction: The Rationale of archaeological heritage management. In H. Cleere, ed. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1–19.
 1989b. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*, London: Unwin Hyman.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C., 2006. Memory pieces and footprints: multivocality and the meanings of ancient times and ancestral places among the Zuni and Hopi. *American Anthropologist*, 108(1), 148–162.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C. & Ferguson, T.J., 2008. Introduction: The Collaborative Continuum. In C. Colwell-Chanthaphonh & T.J. Ferguson, eds. *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*. Lanham MD: Rowman Altamira, 1–34.
- Corbishley, M., Henson, D. & Stone, S., 2004. Introduction. In M. Corbishley, D. Henson, & S. Stone, eds. *Education and the Historic Environment*. London: Routledge, 1–12.
- Council of Europe,
 1992. *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised) and Explanatory Report*. European Treaty Series 143, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
 2005. *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, European Treaty Series 199. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Curaçao Info, 1990. Kadushi Cliffs, Curaçao's first vacation ownership resort. *Curaçao Info*. June 1990, p. 13.
- Dalhuisen, L., Donk, R., Hoeft, R., & Steegh, F. eds., 2009. *Geschiedenis van de Antillen*, Zutphen: Walburg Pers.
- Darvill, T.,
 1994. Value Systems and the Archaeological Resource. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 1, 52–64.
 1995. Value Systems in Archaeology. In M. Cooper, A. Firth, J. Carmen & D. Wheatley, eds. *Managing Archaeology*. London: Routledge, 40–50.
 2005. 'Sorted for ease and whiz'? Approaching value and importance in archaeological resource assessment. In C. Mathers, T. Darvill, & B. J. Little, eds. *Heritage of value, archaeology of renown. Reshaping archaeological assessment and significance*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 21–42.

- Deeben, J., Groenewoudt, B.J., Hallewas, D.P. & Willems, W.J.H., 1999. Proposals for a Practical System of Significance Evaluation in Archaeological Heritage Management. *European Journal of Archaeology*, 2(2), 177–199.
- Diaz-Andreu, M. & Champion, T. eds., 1996. *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, London: UCL Press.
- Doeser, J., 2008. Evaluating Multiple Narratives. Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies (Review of the book ‘Evaluating Multiple Narratives. Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies’ by Habu, J. et al. 2008). *European Journal of Archaeology*, 11, 131–133.
- Duineveld, M., 2006. *Van oude dingen, de mensen, die voorbij gaan...; Over de voorwaarden meer recht te kunnen doen aan de door burgers gewaardeerde cultuurhistorie*. (PhD Dissertation, Wageningen University), Delft: Eburon.
- Duineveld, M., Van Assche, K. & Beunen, R., forthcoming. The plight of amateur archaeologists in a revamped Dutch policy landscape. *Public Archaeology*.
- Edgeworth, M. ed., 2006. *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*, Lanham MD: AltaMira Press.
- Eickhoff, M., 2007. Archeologisch erfgoed: Een onbeheersbaar concept. In F. Grijzenhout, ed. *Erfgoed: de geschiedenis van een begrip*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 231–265.
- Eikrem, O., 1999. *Contested Identities: A Study of Ethnicity on Curacao, the Netherlands Antilles*, Norwegian University of Natural Science and Technology: Unpublished PhD Dissertation.
- El-Haj, N.A., 2001. *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society* 1st ed., University Of Chicago Press.
- Elmusa, S.S., 1994. *A Harvest of Technology. The Super-Green Revolution in the Jordan Valley*, Washington DC: Center for Contemporary Arab Studies Georgetown University.
- Fairclough, G., Harrison, R., Schofield, J., Jnr, J.H.J. eds., 2007. *The Heritage Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., 2001. The Discourse of New Labour: Critical Discourse Analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates, eds. *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage, 229 – 266.
- Favell, A., 2006. The sociology of EU politics. In K. E. Jørgensen, K. E. Pollack, & B. Rosamond, eds. *Handbook of EU Politics*. London: Sage, 122–138.
- Fawcett, C., Habu, J. & Matsunaga, J.M., 2008. Introduction: Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies. In J. Habu, C. P. Fawcett, & J. M. Matsunaga, eds. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*. New York: Springer, 1–11.

- Fienieg, A., Parthesius, R., Groot, B., Jaffe, R., Van der Linde, S.J., Van Roosmalen, P., 2008. Heritage trails. International cultural heritage policies in a European perspective. In G. Van Oostindie, ed. *Dutch colonialism, migration and cultural heritage*. Leiden: KITLV Press, 23–62.
- Foucault, M.,
1979. *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
1982. *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language*, New York: Pantheon Books.
1994. Interview with Michel Foucault. In J. D. Faubion, ed. *Power: Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984*, Vol. 3. New York: The New Press, 239–268.
- Franken, H.J.,
1969. *Excavations at Tell Deir Alla. A stratigraphical and analytical study of the early Iron Age pottery*, Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui. Leiden: Leiden University.
1970. The other side of the Jordan. *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan*, 15, 5–10.
1976. The problem of identification in Biblical Archaeology. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 108, 3–11.
1991. Deir Alla re-visited. In J. Hoftijzer & G. Van der Kooij, eds. *The Balaam text from Deir 'Alla re-evaluated. Proceedings of the international symposium held at Leiden, 21-24 August 1989*. Leiden, 3–15.
- García Díaz-Andreu, M., 2007. *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology: Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geurds, A.,
2007. *Grounding the Past. The Praxis of Participatory Archeology in the Mixteca Alta, Oaxaca, Mexico*, Leiden: CNWS Publications.
2011. Dual of Dualistic Collaboration? Competing Imagining of Archaeological Heritage in Central Nicaragua. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 26(2), 87–104.
- Glaser, B.G., 2001. *The grounded theory perspective I: Conceptualization contrasted with description*, Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A.L., 1967. *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*, Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co.
- Glazema, P., 1967. *Rapport betreffende de uitzending van dr. P. Glazema naar de Nederlandse Antillen, Suriname en Venezuela, 23 januari tot 17 mei 1967*, Internal report, Amersfoort: ROB.
- Gnecco, C., forthcoming. Europe and the People without Archaeology. In S.J. Van der Linde, M.H. Van den Dries, N. Schlanger & C. Slappendel, eds. *European Archaeology Abroad*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.

- Gomez, N., 2005. NAAM-Seminar over wetgeving en cultureel erfgoed Nederlandse Antillen en Aruba. In I. Witteveen, E. Evenhuis, & L. Pandt, eds. *Wetgeving Cultureel Erfgoed Nederlandse Antillen en Aruba. Seminar 22 April 2005*. Willemstad: NAAM, 1–3.
- Goodwin, C., 2006. A Linguistic Anthropologist's Interest in Archaeological Practice. In M. Edgeworth, ed. *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*. Lanham MD: AltaMira Press, 45–55.
- Gosden, C., 1999. *Anthropology and Archaeology: A Changing Relationship*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Gould, P., 2009. The role of communities in sustainable heritage preservation. *Anthropology*, 511, 1–35.
- Gould, R., 1974. Some Current Problems in Ethnoarchaeology. In C. B. Donnan & C. W. Clewlow, eds. *Ethnoarchaeology*. Monograph 4, Los Angeles: Institute for Archaeology University of California, 29–48.
- Graeber, D., 2001. *Toward an anthropological theory of value. The false coin of our own dreams*, New York: Palgrave.
- Gray, M., 2002. Development Strategies and the Political Economy of Tourism in Contemporary Jordan. In G. Joffé, ed. *Jordan in Transition*. London: Hurst and Company, 308–329.
- Greenberg, R., 2009. Extreme Exposure: Archaeology in Jerusalem 1967-2007. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 11(3-4), 262–281.
- Greer, S., Harrison, R. & McIntyre-Tamwoy, S., 2002. Community Based Archaeology in Australia. *World Archaeology*, 34(2), 265–287.
- Groenewoudt, B.J. & Bloemers, J.H., 1997. Dealing with Significance: Concepts, Strategies and Priorities for Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands. In W. J. H. Willems, H. Kars, & D. P. Hallewas, eds. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands: Fifty Years State Service for Archaeological Investigations*. Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 119–172.
- Groot, B.,
2008. *Archaeology and the archaeological heritage in the construction of national identity. A case study of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (1921 - present day)*, Leiden University: Unpublished MA Dissertation.
- in prep. *Understanding the corporate stakeholder: changing heritage rights and responsibilities*, Leiden University: PhD Dissertation.
- De Groot, M., 2009. *Archeologische Monumentenzorg op de BES-eilanden. Een onderzoek naar de mogelijkheden archeologische monumentenzorg op Bonaire, Sint Eustatius en Saba op te zetten*, Unpublished report, Leiden: Centre for International Heritage Activities.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S., 1989. *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Gupta, A. & Ferguson, J., 1997. Discipline and Practice: 'The Field' as Site, Method and Location in Anthropology. In A. Gupta & J. Ferguson, eds. *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1–46.
- Habu, J., Fawcett, C. & Matsunaga, J.M. eds., 2008. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*, New York: Springer.
- Hajer, M.A.,
1995. *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
2005. Coalitions, Practices and Meaning in Environmental Politics: From Acid Rain to BSE. In D. Howarth & J. Torfing, eds. *Discourse Theory in European Politics. Identity, Policy and Governance*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 297–315.
- Hajer, M.A. & Wagenaar, H., 2003. Introduction. In M. A. Hajer & H. Wagenaar, eds. *Deliberative policy analysis. Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–30.
- Hamilakis, Y. & Anagnostopoulis, A., 2009a. What is Archaeological Ethnography? In Y. Hamilakis & A. Anagnostopoulis, eds. *Archaeological ethnographies. Public Archaeology*, 8(2-3). Leeds: Maney Publishing, 65–87.
- Hamilakis, Y. & Anagnostopoulis, A. eds., 2009b., *Archaeological ethnographies. Public Archaeology*, 8 (2-3). Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Hamilakis, Y. & Duke, P. eds., 2007. *Archaeology and capitalism: from ethics to politics*, Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press.
- Hartog, J., 1986. *Curaçao, from colonial dependence to autonomy*, Aruba: De Witt.
- Haviser, J.,
1987. *Amerindian Cultural Geography on Curaçao*, Leiden University: Unpublished PhD Dissertation.
1998. Developers and archaeologists can work together for the common good. *Imagen Ambiental*, 15(1), 8–9.
2001. Historical Archaeology in the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. In P. Farnsworth, ed. *Island Lives. Historical Archaeologies of the Caribbean*. Tuscaloosa and London: University of Alabama Press, 60–82.
2002. Welcome to Slavery Land: A call for Ethical Standards in the Long-term Partnership of African Diaspora Heritage and the Tourism Industry. *Kristof*, 12(1), 17–36.
- Haviser, J. & Gilmore III, R.G., 2011. Netherlands Antilles. In P. E. Siegel & E. Righter, eds. *Protecting Heritage in the Caribbean*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 134–142.

- Henson, D., 2004. Archaeology in Schools. In M. Corbishley, D. Henson, & S. Stone, eds. *Education and the Historic Environment*. London: Routledge, 23–33.
- Hodder, I.,
 1985. Postprocessual archaeology. In M. Schiffer, ed. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*. Vol.8 New York: Academic Press, 1–26.
 1999. *Archaeological Process; an Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell.
 2000. *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*, Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
 2005. Post-processual and interpretive archaeology. In C. Renfrew & P. Bahn, eds. *Archaeology. The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge, 207–212.
 2008. Multivocality and Social Archaeology. In J. Habu, C. P. Fawcett, & J. M. Matsunaga, eds. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*. New York: Springer, 196–200.
- Hofman, C.L.,
 2008. *Indianenverhalen, het kwetsbare verleden van de Antillen*. (Oratie uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van hoogleraar in de archeologie van het Caraïbisch gebied, met bijzondere aandacht voor de gebieden waarmee Nederland een historische band heeft), Leiden: Leiden University.
 2010. *The archaeology of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba*, Unpublished paper presented at the European Association of Archaeologists Conference, The Hague, 1–5 September 2010.
- Hofman, C.L. & Hoogland, M.L.P.,
 2007. Kwetsbaar bodemarchief. Het indiaanse verleden van de Antillen. *Monumenten*, 28(11), 6–9.
 2009. De oorspronkelijke bewoners. In L. Dalhuisen, R. Donk, R. Hoeft, & F. Steegh, eds. *Geschiedenis van de Antillen*. Zutphen: Walburg Pers.
- Hoftijzer, J. & Van der Kooij, G. eds., 1991. *The Balaam text from Deir Alla re-evaluated. Proceedings of the international symposium held at Leiden, 21-24 August 1989*, Leiden: Leiden University.
- Hollowell, J. & Nicholas, G.,
 2008. A Critical Assessment of Ethnography in Archaeology. In Q.E. Castañeda & C. Matthews, eds. *Ethnographic archaeologies: reflections on stakeholders and archaeological practices*. Lanham MD: AltaMira Press, 63–94.
 2009. Using Ethnographic Methods to Articulate Community-Based Conceptions of Cultural Heritage Management. In Y. Hamilakis & A. Anagnostopoulis, eds. *Archaeological ethnographies. Public Archaeology*, 8(2-3). Leeds: Maney Publishing, 141–160.

- Holtorf, C.,
2002. Is the past a non-renewable resource? In R. Layton, P. Stone, & J. Thomas, eds. *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*. New York: Routledge, 286–297.
2005. *From Stonehenge To Las Vegas: Archaeology As Popular Culture*, Lanham MD: Rowman Altamira.
2006. Studying Archaeological Fieldwork in the Field: Views from Monte Polizzo. In M. Edgeworth, ed. *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*. Lanham MD: AltaMira Press, 81–94.
- Hoogland, M.L.P., 2007. *Ontwerp van het Plan van Aanpak voor het Archeologisch Onderzoek van de vindplaats Spaanse Water (C-039), St. Barbara, Curaçao*, Unpublished archaeological proposal report for DROV, Curaçao. M.B. 2008.01.
- ICAHM, 1990. *Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage*, ICOMOS Charter approved by the 9th General Assembly in Lausanne. Available at: www.international.icomos.org/charters/arch_e.pdf [Accessed June 6, 2012].
- ICOMOS, 1994. *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, ICOMOS. Available at: <http://www.icomos.org/fr/charters-and-texts> [Accessed April 6, 2012].
- Institute for Archaeologists, 2010. *Code of conduct. By-laws of the Institute for Archaeologists. (Revised)*, Available at: <http://www.archaeologists.net/codes/ifa> [Accessed July 6, 2012].
- Jaffe, R.K., 2006. *Urban Blight in the Caribbean; City, Environment and Culture in Curaçao and Jamaica*, Leiden University: Unpublished PhD Dissertation.
- Janga, L., 2009. The Cultural-Heritage Map of Curaçao and its value for DROV. In I. Witteveen, E. Evenhuis, & C. Kraan, eds. *Wetgeving Cultureel Erfgoed in Caribisch Perspectief. Seminar 18 Juni 2009. Eindrapport*. Willemstad: NAAM, 35–37.
- Joffé, G., 2002. Introduction. In G. Joffé, ed. *Jordan in Transition*. London: Hurst and Company, p. xi–xxii.
- Josselin de Jong, J.P.B., 1947. *Archaeological material from Saba and St. Eustatius, Lesser Antilles*, Mededelingen van het Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, 1. Leiden: Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde.
- Kafafi, Z. & Van der Kooij, G., 2010. A preliminary report on the 1996-2004 excavations at Tell Deir Alla. *Newsletter of the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology Yarmouk University*, 30, 4–7.
- Kaptijn, E., 2009. *Life on the Watershed - Reconstructing Subsistence in a Steppe Region Using Archaeological Survey: A Diachronic Perspective on Habitation in the Jordan Valley*, Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- Keehnen, F., 2009. *Archaeological Heritage Management and Ownership in a Caribbean Setting*, Leiden University: Unpublished MA assessment.

- Khoury, R.G., 1981. *The Jordan Valley. Life and Society below Sea Level*, London and New York: Longman.
- Kim, C., 2008. Multivocality, Multifaceted Voices, and Korean Archaeology. In J. Habu, C. P. Fawcett, & J. M. Matsunaga, eds. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*. New York: Springer, 1–11.
- Klamer, A. & Zuidhof, P., 1999. The Values of Cultural Heritage: Merging Economics and Cultural Appraisals. In R. Mason & M. de la Torre, eds. *Economics and Heritage Conservation. A Meeting Organized by the Getty Conservation Institute, December 1998*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 27–56.
- KNAW, 2007. *De toren van Pisa rechtgezet. Over de toekomst van de Nederlandse archeologie*, Verkenningen 10. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen.
- Kohl, P.L., 1998. Nationalism and Archaeology: On the Constructions of Nations and the Reconstructions of the Remote Past. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 27(1), 223–246.
- Kohl, P.L. & Fawcett, C.P. eds., 1995. *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kolen, J., 2009. The ‘anthropologisation’ of archaeological heritage. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 16(2), 209–225.
- Kraan, C., 2009. Archaeology in Practice on Curaçao. In I. Witteveen, E. Evenhuis, & C. Kraan, eds. *Wetgeving Cultureel Erfgoed in Caribisch Perspectief. Seminar 18 Juni 2009. Eindrapport*. Willemstad: NAAM, 101–102.
- Kvale, S. & Brinkman, S., 2009. *Interviews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Labadi, S. & Long, C. eds., 2010. *Heritage and Globalisation*, Key Issues in Cultural Heritage. London: Routledge.
- Lafrenz Samuels, K.,
2008. Value and significance in archaeology. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 15 (Special Issue 01), 71–97.

2010. Material Heritage and Poverty Reduction. In S. Labadi & C. Long, eds. *Heritage and Globalisation*. Key Issues in Cultural Heritage. London: Routledge, 202–217.
- Latour, B.,
1996. *Aramis, or the Love of Technology*, London: Harvard University Press.

2000. When things strike back: a possible contribution of science studies. *British Journal of Sociology*, 5(1), 105–123.

2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leone, M.P., Potter, P. & Shackel, P., 1987. Toward a critical archaeology. *Current Archaeology*, 28(3), 283–302.
- Lévin, S., forthcoming. French Archaeology Abroad. In S.J. Van der Linde, M.H. Van den Dries, N. Schlanger & C. Slappendel, eds. *European Archaeology Abroad*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Lewis, D. & Mosse, D., 2006. *Development brokers and translators: the ethnography of aid and agencies*, Kumarian Press.
- Liebmann, M.,
 2008a. Introduction: The Intersections of Archaeology and Postcolonial Studies. In M. Liebmann & U. Z. Rizvi, eds. *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 1–20.
 2008b. Postcolonial Cultural Affiliation: Essentialism, Hybridity, and NAGPRA. In M. Liebmann & U. Z. Rizvi, eds. *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 73–90.
- Liebmann, M. & Rizvi, U.Z. eds., 2008. *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*, Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Lilley, I.,
 2008. Archaeology, The World Bank, and Postcolonial Politics. In M. Liebmann & U. Z. Rizvi, eds. *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 141–164.
 2011. *Capacity Building in Cultural Heritage Management, Institute of Archaeology, University of Oxford, 16-18 May 2011. Briefing Notes*, International Heritage Group: Unpublished Document.
- Lilley, I. & Williams, M., 2005. Archaeological and indigenous significance. A view from Australia. In C. Mathers, T. Darvill, & B. J. Little, eds. *Heritage of value, archaeology of renown. Reshaping archaeological assessment and significance*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 227–247.
- Lipe, W.D., 1974. A Conservation Model for American Archaeology. *The Kiva*, 39, 213–243.
- Long, N., 2003. An actor-oriented approach to development intervention. In D. A. Cruz, ed. *Rural life improvement in Asia. Report of an APO Seminar on Rural Life Improvement for Community Development held in Japan, 22-26 April 2002*. Tokyo: Asian Productivity Organization.
- Louwe Kooijmans, L.P., 2000. De onschuld voorbij. De Faculteit der Archeologie. In H. J. De Jonge & W. Otterspeer, eds. *Altijd een vonk of twee, de Universiteit Leiden van 1975 tot 2000*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 17–26.
- Lynott, M. & Wylie, A. eds., 2000. *Ethics in American Archaeology* 2nd ed., Washington DC: Society for American Archaeology.
- MacEachern, S., 2010. Seeing Like an Oil Company's CHM Programme Exxon and Archaeology on the Chad Export Project. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 10(3), 347–366.

- Maffi, I.,
2002. New Museographic Trends in Jordan: The Strengthening of the Nation. In G. Joff , ed. *Jordan in Transition*. London: Hurst and Company, 208–224.
2009. The emergence of cultural heritage in Jordan. The itinerary of a colonial invention. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 9(1), 5–34.
- Marshall, Y., 2002. What is community archaeology? *World Archaeology*, 34(2), 211–219.
- Mason, R., 2002. Assessing values in conservation planning. In M. de la Torre, ed. *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 5–30.
- Mason, R. & Avrami, E., 2002. Heritage Values and Challenges of Conservation Planning. In J. Teutonico & G. Palumbo, eds. *Management planning for archaeological sites: an international workshop organized by the Getty Conservation*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 13–26.
- Mathers, C., Darvill, T. & Little, B.J. eds., 2005. *Heritage of Value, Archaeology of Renown: Reshaping Archaeological Assessment and Significance* 1st ed., Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- McIntosh, B., 2010. Citco Fund Services. Adapting hedge fund administration to changing needs. *The hedgefund journal*. Available at: <http://www.thehedgefundjournal.com/magazine/201011/profiles/citco-fund-services.php> [Accessed November 24, 2011].
- Meskell, L.M. & Pels, P.J., 2005a. Introduction: Embedding ethics. In L. M. Meskell & P. J. Pels, eds. *Embedding Ethics*. London: Berg Publishers, 1–26.
- Meskell, L.M. & Pels, P.J. eds., 2005b. *Embedding Ethics*, London: Berg Publishers.
- Meskell, L.M. ed., 1998. *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, London: Routledge.
- Meskell, L.M.,
2002. The intersection of identity and politics in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 279–301.
- 2005a. Archaeological Ethnography: Conversations around Kruger National Park. *Archaeologies*, 1(1), 81–100.
- 2005b. Social Archaeology. In C. Renfrew & P. Bahn, eds. *Archaeology. The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge, 235–240.
- Mijnmaatschappij Cura ao NV. ed., 2000. *De Tafelberg aan de Fuikbaai, Cura ao, Nederlandse Antillen. 125 jaar exploitatie van grondstoffen in sociaal-economisch perspectief*, Willemstad: Van Haaren Printers NV.
- Mills, J., Bonner, A. & Francis, K., 2006. The development of constructivist grounded theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 1–10.

- Moser, S. Glazier, D., Phillips, J.E., Nemr, E., Nasser, L., Mousa, M.S., Aiesh, R.N., Richardson, S., Conner, A., Seymour, M., 2002. Transforming Archaeology through Practice: Strategies for Collaborative Archaeology and the Community Archaeology Project at Quseir, Egypt. *World Archaeology*, 34(2), 220–248.
- Moshenska, G., 2008. Ethics and ethical critique in the archaeology of modern conflict. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 41(2), 159–175.
- Mosse, D.,
2004. Is good policy unimplementable? Reflections on the ethnography of aid policy and practice. *Development and Change*, 35(4), 639–671.

2005. *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice* 1st ed., London: Pluto Press.
- Mosse, D. & Lewis, D. eds., 2005. *The Aid Effect: Giving and Governing in International Development*, London: Pluto Press.
- NAAM ed., 2009. *NAAM Expert Meeting 2009. Safeguarding the Netherlands Antilles Cultural Heritage after the Constitutional Changes*, Willemstad: NAAM. Available at: http://www.naam.an/index.php?topic=policy_papers [Accessed March 4, 2011].
- Naffé, B.O.M., Lanfranchi, R. & Schlanger, N. eds., 2009. *L'archéologie préventive en Afrique : Enjeux et perspectives: actes du colloque de Nouakchott, 1er-3 février 2007*, Saint-Maur-des-Fossés: Sépia.
- Nash, D., 1981. Tourism as an Anthropological Subject. *Current Anthropology*, 22, 361–468.
- Nasser, N., 2000. *Sustaining Cultural Tourism in Jordan: Petra and Jerash. Socio-Economic and Marketing Issues*, University College London: Unpublished MA Dissertation.
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
1999. *Explanatory memorandum of the assembly year 1998-1999, National Budget Foreign Affairs 1999*, The Hague: Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

2006. *From Project Aid towards Sector Support. An evaluation of the sector-wide approach in Dutch bilateral aid 1998–2005*, IOB Evaluations Policy and Operations Evaluation Department 301. The Hague: Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

2009. *Explanatory memorandum of the assembly year 2008-2009, National Budget Foreign Affairs 2009*, The Hague: Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Netherlands Representative Office, 2007. *Palestinian Territories. Multi-Annual Strategic Plan 2008-2011*, Ramallah: Netherlands Representative Office.
- NVvA, 2001. *Gedragscode voor Beroepsarcheologen van de NVvA. Ethische Principes en Gedragsregels voor Nederlandse archeologen*, Available at: <http://www.nvva.info/ethische-code/> [Accessed May 6, 2012].

- O'Keefe, P.J., 1993. The European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage. *Antiquity*, 67(255), 406–413.
- Okamura, K., 2010. Foreword. In G. Smith, P.M. Messenger & H.A. Soderland, eds. *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 55–62.
- Oliva, F., 1994. Education as a means of protection of the archaeological heritage in the districts of Buenos Aires Province, Argentina. In P. Stone & Molyneaux, eds. *The Presented Past. Heritage, Museums and Education*. London: Routledge, 109–119.
- Oliver, P., 2004. *Writing Your Thesis*, London: Sage.
- Pagán Jiménez, J.R. & Rodríguez Ramos, R., 2008. Toward the Liberation of Archaeological Praxis in a 'Postcolonial Colony': The Case of Puerto Rico. In M. Liebmann & U.Z. Rizvi, eds. *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 53–72.
- Perring, D. & Van der Linde, S.J., 2009. The Politics and Practice of Archaeology in Conflict. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 11(3-4), 197–213.
- Polman, J.M., 2012. *Societal Relevance: a complex necessity. A study to facilitate the demonstration of societal relevance of research*, Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen / Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: Unpublished Document.
- Pyburn, K.,
2008. The Pageantry of Archaeology. In Q.E. Castañeda & C. Matthews, eds. *Ethnographic archaeologies: reflections on stakeholders and archaeological practices*. Lanham MD: AltaMira Press, 139–156.
2009. Practising Archaeology - As if it really matters. In Y. Hamilakis & A. Anagnostopoulis, eds. *Archaeological ethnographies. Public Archaeology*, 8(2-3). Leeds: Maney Publishing, 161–175.
- Rio Tinto, 2011. *Why cultural heritage matters. A resource guide for integrating cultural heritage management into Communities work at Rio Tinto*, Melbourne: Rio Tinto Limited.
- Rizvi, U.Z., 2008. Decolonizing Methodologies as Strategies of Practice: Operationalizing the Postcolonial Critique in the Archaeology of Rajasthan. In M. Liebmann & U.Z. Rizvi, eds. *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 109–128.
- Römer, R.A.,
1998. *De Curaçaose samenleving*, Curaçao: Amigoe NV.
- 2000a. Van plantage tot mijnbedrijf. In Mijnmaatschappij Curaçao NV., ed. *De Tafelberg aan de Fuikbaai, Curaçao, Nederlandse Antillen. 125 jaar exploitatie van grondstoffen in sociaal-economisch perspectief*. Willemstad: Van Haaren Printers NV, 8–14.
- 2000b. De Mijnmaatschappij sinds de revolutie van 30 Mei 1969. In Mijnmaatschappij Curaçao NV., ed. *De Tafelberg aan de Fuikbaai, Curaçao, Nederlandse Antillen. 125 jaar exploitatie van grondstoffen in sociaal-economisch perspectief*. Willemstad: Van Haaren Printers NV, 59–72.

- 2000c. Recente ontwikkelingen. In Mijnsmaatschappij Curaçao NV., ed. *De Tafelberg aan de Fuikbaai, Curaçao, Nederlandse Antillen. 125 jaar exploitatie van grondstoffen in sociaal-economisch perspectief*. Willemstad: Van Haaren Printers NV, 73–77.
- Rowlands, M. & Butler, B., 2007. Conflict and heritage care. *Antropology Today*, 23(1), 1–2.
- Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I.S., 2005. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sahlins, M., 1976. *Culture and Practical Reason*, Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- LaSalle, M.J., 2010. Community Collaborations and Other Good Intentions. *Archaeologies*, 6(3), 401–422.
- Sanjek, R., 1990. On Ethnographic Validity. In R. Sanjek, ed. *Fieldnotes. The makings of Anthropology*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- Scarre, C. & Scarre, G., 2006. *The Ethics of Archaeology. Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheltema, H.G., 2009. *Megalithic Jordan. An introduction and field guide*, Amman: American Centre of Oriental Research publications.
- Schlanger, N, Van der Linde, S.J. & Van den Dries, M.H., forthcoming. Introduction: Archaeology Abroad. In S.J. Van der Linde, M.H. Van den Dries, N. Schlanger & C. Slappendel, eds. *European Archaeology Abroad*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Schücker, N., forthcoming. Warum in die Ferne schweifen? An overview of German archaeology abroad. In S.J. Van der Linde, M.H. Van den Dries, N. Schlanger & C. Slappendel, eds. *European Archaeology Abroad*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Shankland, D., 2005. The socio-ecology of Çatalhöyük. In I. Hodder, ed. *Çatalhöyük perspectives: reports from the 1995-99 seasons*. Cambridge and London: MacDonald Institute and British Institute in Ankara, 15–26.
- Shanks, M., 1997. Archaeological Theory: What's on the Agenda? *American Journal of Archaeology*, 101, 395–399.
- Shanks, M. & Tilley, C.,
1987. *Reconstructing Archaeology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1988. *Social theory and archaeology*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Shepherd, N. & Haber, A., 2011. What's up with WAC? Archaeology and 'Engagement' in a Globalized World. *Public Archaeology*, 10(2), 96–115.
- Shore, C. & Wright, S., 1997. *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power*, London: Routledge.

REFERENCES

- Siegel, P.E. & Richter, E. eds., 2011. *Protecting Heritage in the Caribbean*, Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Silberman, N.A. & Small, D.A., 1997. *The Archaeology of Israel. Constructing the Present, Interpreting the Past*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Silliman, S., 2009. Blurring for Clarity: Archaeology as Hybrid Practice. In P. Bikoulis, D. Lacroix, & M. Peuramaki-Brown, eds. *Postcolonial Perspectives in Archaeology. Proceedings of the 39th (2006) Annual Chacmool Archaeological Conference*. Alberta: Chacmool Archaeological Association, The University of Calgary, 15–25.
- Simpson, I., 2007. *Marginalising the Islamic Past – Bilad Al-Sham in Archaeological and Heritage Practice*, Københavns Universitet: Unpublished MA Dissertation.
- Slappendel, C., Van den Dries, M.H. & Van der Linde, S.J., forthcoming. Dutch Archaeology Abroad. In S.J. Van der Linde, M.H. Van den Dries, N. Schlanger & C. Slappendel, eds. *European Archaeology Abroad*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Sluis, M., 2008. *Zoutrif*, Amsterdam: KIT Publishers.
- Smardz, K., 2000. Digging with Kids. Teaching students to touch the past. In K. Smardz & S. J. Smith, eds. *The archaeology education handbook : sharing the past with kids*. Walnut Creek CA: AltaMira Press, 234–248.
- Smith, C.,
2010. Foreword. In G. Smith, P.M. Messenger & H.A. Soderland, eds. *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 9–12.
2011. Errors of Fact and Errors of Representation: Response to Shepherd and Haber’s Critique of the World Archaeological Congress. *Public Archaeology*, 10(4), 223–234.
- Smith, G.S., Messenger, P. M. & Soderland, H.A., 2010a. Introduction. In G. Smith, P.M. Messenger, & H.A. Soderland, eds. *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 15–26.
- Smith, G.S., Messenger, P. M. & Soderland, H.A. eds., 2010b. *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*, Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Smith, L.,
2001. Archaeology and the Governance of Material Culture: A Case Study from South-Eastern Australia. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 34(2), 97–105.
2004. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage* 1st ed., London and New York: Routledge.
2006. *Uses of Heritage* 1st ed., London and New York: Routledge.

- Smith, L. & Waterton, E. eds., 2009. *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Society for American Archaeology, 1996. *Principles of Archaeological Ethics*, Available at: <http://www.saa.org/> [Accessed January 7, 2012].
- Soejono, R.P., 1984. On the conditions and scope of development of archaeology in Indonesia. In P. Van de Velde, ed. *Prehistoric Indonesia: A Reader*. KITLV Verhandelingen 104. Dordrecht: Foris, 15–28.
- Strauss, A.L. & Corbin, J., 1998. *Basics of qualitative research* 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Tanudirjo, D.A., 1995. Theoretical trends in Indonesian archaeology. In P. Ucko, ed. *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tarawneh, M.F., in press. *Rural Capitalist Development in The Jordan Valley The case of Deir Alla - The Rise and Demise of Social Groups*, Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- Tarlow, S., 2001. Decoding ethics. *Public Archaeology*, 1, 245–259.
- Teutonico, J. & Palumbo, G. eds., 2002. *Management planning for archaeological sites: an international workshop organized by the Getty Conservation*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Thiaw, I., forthcoming. Colonisation and the expansion of French archaeology in Senegal, 1850s-1980s. In S.J. Van der Linde, M.H. Van den Dries, N. Schlanger & C. Slappendel, eds. *European Archaeology Abroad*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Thornberg, R., 2010. *Informed Grounded Theory in Ethnography: Data Sensitizing Principles in Using Literature in Fieldwork and Analysis*, Unpublished paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Helsinki, 25-27 August 2010. Available at: <http://www.eera.de/ecer-programmes/print/conference/ecer-2010/> [Accessed October 2, 2012].
- Toebosch, T.,
2003. *Grondwerk: 200 jaar archeologie in Nederland*, Amsterdam: SUN.
- 2008a. Echte Indianenverhalen. *Elsevier*, 10 May, 72–73.
- 2008b. Slavenbegraafplaats geruimd voor golfbaan. *NRC*, 4 July 2008.
- de la Torre, M. ed., 2002. *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Trigger, B.G.,
1984a. *A History of Archaeological Thought*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 1984b. Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *Man*, 19(3), 355–370.
2006. *A History of Archaeological Thought* 2nd ed., New York: Cambridge University Press.

2008. 'Alternative Archaeologies' in historical perspective. In J. Habu, C. P. Fawcett, & J. M. Matsunaga, eds. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives. Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*. New York: Springer, 187–195.
- Trochim, W.M., 2000. *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*, Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing. Available at: <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/index.php> [Accessed March 3, 2012].
- Troncoso Morales, B., 2000. Initiatives on Cultural Tourism of the State Secretary for Tourism for the Period 1996-2000. In *Dominican Republic*. Paris: ICOM, 141–144.
- Truscott, M. & Young, D., 2000. Revising the Burra Charter. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 4(2), 101–116.
- Tunbridge, J.E. & Ashworth, G.J., 1996. *Dissonant heritage: the management of the past as a resource in conflict*, Chichester and New York: Wiley.
- Ucko, P., 1983. Australian Academic Archaeology: Aboriginal Transformation of its Aims and Practices. *Australian Archaeology*, 16, 11–16.
- Ucko, P. ed., 1995. *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective*, London and New York: Routledge.
- UNESCO, 2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO. Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich> [Accessed March 5, 2012].
- Van Aken, M., 2003. *Facing Home. Palestinian Belonging in a Valley of Doubt*, Utrecht: Shaker Publishing.
- Van Assche, K., 2004. *Signs in time. An interpretive account of urban planning and design, the people and their histories*, (PhD Dissertation) Wageningen: Wageningen University.
- Van Dijk, T., 1993. Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse Society*, 4(2), 249–283.
- Van den Dries, M.H., 2011. The good, the bad and the ugly? Evaluating three models of implementing the Valletta Convention. *World Archaeology*, 43(4), 594–604.
- Van den Dries, M.H. & Kwast, S.M., in press. Post-Malta developments in the Dutch archaeological profession. In INRAP, ed. *The Archaeological Profession*. Cahier 5. Paris: INRAP.
- Van den Dries, M.H. & Van der Linde, S.J., forthcoming. Twenty years after Malta: archaeological heritage as a source of collective memory and scientific study anno 2012. *Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia*.
- Van den Dries, M.H., Waugh, K.E. & Bakker, C., 2010. A crisis with many faces. The impact of the economic recession on Dutch archaeology. In N. Schlanger & K. Aitchison, eds. *Archaeology and the global economic crisis - multiple impacts, possible solutions*. Tervuren: CultureLab, 55–68. Available at: <http://ace-archaeology.eu/fichiers/25Archaeology-and-the-crisis.pdf> [Accessed February 7, 2012].

- Van den Dries, M.H. & Willems, W.J.H., 2007. Quality Management - The Dutch Perspective. In W. J. H. Willems & M. H. Van den Dries, eds. *Quality Management in Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 50–56.
- Van Gastel, J. & Nuijten, N., 2005. The genealogy of the ‘good governance’ and ‘ownership’ agenda at the Dutch Ministry of Development Cooperation. In D. Mosse & D. Lewis, eds. *The Aid Effect: Giving and Governing in International Development*. London: Pluto Press, 85–105.
- Van der Kooij, G.,
 2001a. De maatschappelijke rol van theoretische archeologie als wetenschappelijk geweten. In E. Kaptijn & E. Van Rossenberg, eds. *Een zeemansgraf Feestbundel met opstellen ter gelegenheid van het vervroegd pensioen van Pieter van de Velde*. Leiden: Faculty of Archaeology, 25–33.
- 2001b. The vicissitudes of life at Dayr Alla during the first millennium BC, seen in a wider context. In G. Bisheh, ed. *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan VII*. Amman: Department of Antiquities, 295–303.
2003. *Khirbet Balameh Joint Project of the Palestinian Department of Antiquities and Leiden University/Faculty of Archaeology, 1998-2002*, Netherlands Representative in Ramallah: Unpublished Document.
2006. In Memoriam Henk Franken (1917-2005). *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan*, 49, 11–13.
- 2007a. Irrigation Systems at Deir Alla. In F. Alkhaysheh, ed. *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan IX*. Amman: Department of Antiquities, 133–144.
- 2007b. Tell Deir Alla: wisselvalligheden van bestaan in de Jordaanvallei. *Monumenten*, 28(11), 10–13.
- Van der Kooij, G. & Ibrahim eds., 1989. *Picking up the threads... A continuing review of excavations at Deir Alla, Jordan*, Leiden.
- Van der Linde, S.J., 2011. Archaeology and International Development in Africa (Review of the Book ‘Archaeology and International Development in Africa’ by C. Breen & D. Rhodes). *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 13(2-3), 281–285.
- Van der Linde, S.J. & Van den Dries, M.H., forthcoming. Norwegian Archaeology and African Competence Building - An Interview with Randi Haaland. In S.J. Van der Linde, M.H. Van den Dries, N. Schlanger & C. Slappendel, eds. *European Archaeology Abroad*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Van der Linde, S.J., Van den Dries, M.H., Schlanger, N., & Slappendel, C., eds., forthcoming. *European Archaeology Abroad*, Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Van Oostindie, G. ed., 2008. *Dutch colonialism, migration and cultural heritage*, Leiden: KITLV Press.

- Van Reybrouck, D. & Jacobs, 2006. The Mutual Constitution of Natural and Social Identities During Archaeological Fieldwork. In M. Edgeworth, ed. *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*. Lanham MD: AltaMira Press, 33–44.
- Viner, S., Kojan, D. & Albarella, U., 2008. *Personal Ethics, Social Justice, and the Practice of Archaeology in the World*. Session abstract for World Archaeological Congress 6, Dublin. Available at: <https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/> [Accessed January 17, 2012].
- Vos, C., 2011. *Showing the Way Forward for Serbia's past. A study of the Regional Heritage Programme in Serbia as a vehicle of Europeanisation*, Aarhus University: Unpublished PhD Dissertation.
- Waterton, E., Smith, L. & Campbell, G., 2006. The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12(4), 339–335.
- Weiner, A.,
1985. Inalienable wealth. *American ethnologist*, 12, 210–227.

1992. *Inalienable possessions. The paradox of keeping-while-giving*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Willems, W.J.H.,
2002. The role of archaeological societies in preserving cultural memorials. In *Encyclopedia of life support systems*. Oxford: UNESCO/EOLSS Publishers.

2009. European and world archaeologies. *World Archaeology*, 41(4), 649–658.
- Willems, W.J.H. & Brandt, R.W. eds., 2004. *Dutch Archaeology Quality Standard*, (RIA-report). The Hague.
- Willems, W.J.H., Kars, H. & Hallewas, D.P. eds., 1997. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands: Fifty Years State Service for Archaeological Investigations*, Uitgeverij Van Gorcum.
- Williams, T. & Van der Linde, S.J., 2006. Archaeological site management: theory, strategies and implementation for the archaeological landscapes of Jericho. In L. Nigro & H. Taha, eds. *Tell es-Sultan/Jericho in the Context of the Jordan Valley. Site Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development*. Rome: Roma La Sapienza, 111–144.
- Witmore, C., 2006. Id quod facimus sumus! (We are what we do!) A commentary on *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*. *Archaeolog*. Available at: http://traumwerk.stanford.edu/archaeolog/2006/12/id_quod_facimus_sumus_we_are_w.html#more [Accessed September 15, 2010].
- Witteveen, I., Evenhuis, E. & Kraan, C. eds., 2009. *Wetgeving Cultureel Erfgoed in Caribisch Perspectief. Seminar 18 Juni 2009. Eindrapport*, Willemstad: NAAM.
- Witteveen, I., Evenhuis, E. & Pandt, L. eds., 2005. *Wetgeving Cultureel Erfgoed Nederlandse Antillen en Aruba. Seminar 22 April 2005*, Willemstad: NAAM.

- Witteveen, I. & Kraan, C. eds., 2012. *Verkenning van de Implementatie van het Verdrag van Malta op de eilanden van Caribisch Nederland, Bonaire, St. Eustatius en Saba*, Willemstad: NAAM.
- World Archaeological Congress, 1990. *World Archaeological Congress Codes Of Ethics. First Code of Ethics*, Available at: http://www.worldarchaeologicalcongress.org/site/about_ethi.php [Accessed September 21, 2011].
- Yanow, D., 1996. *How Does a Policy Mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational Actions*, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Yarrow, T., 2006. Sites of Knowledge: Different Ways of Knowing an Archaeological Excavation. In M. Edgeworth, ed. *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*. Lanham MD: AltaMira Press, 20–32.
- Zijlstra, H., 2012. *Kamerbrief over prestatieafspraken met hogescholen en universiteiten*. Kamerstuk: Kamerbrief 07 March 2012. The Hague: Dutch Ministry for Education, Culture and Science. Available at: <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2012/03/07/kamerbrief-over-prestatieafspraken-met-hogescholen-en-universiteiten.html> [Accessed July 15, 2012].
- Zimmerman, L.J., Vitelli, K.D. & Hollowell-Zimmer, J. eds., 2003. *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*, Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAD	Authorised Archaeological Discourse
AAINA	Archeological Anthropological Institute of the Netherlands Antilles
AHD	Authorised Heritage Discourse
AMA	National Archaeological Museum of Aruba
AWG	Archaeological Working Group, Curaçao
BONAI	Bonaire Archaeological Institute
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
DASAS	Deir Alla Station for Archaeological Studies, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan
DCE	Directorate for Cultural Heritage
DoA	Department of Antiquities, Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan
DROB	Dienst Ruimtelijke Ontwikkeling en Beheer (Spatial Development and Management Service), Bonaire
DROV	Dienst Ruimtelijke Ontwikkeling en Volkshuisvesting (Department of Urban and Regional Development Planning and Housing), Curaçao
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
KNA	Dutch Archaeology Quality Standard
LU	Leiden University, The Netherlands
LUF	Leiden University Fund, The Netherlands
NAAM	National Archaeological Anthropological Memory Management, Curaçao
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
NWO	Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research
OCW	Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science
PvE	Programma van Eisen (Project Outline)
PvA	Plan van Aanpak (Plan of Approach)
SAA	Society for American Archaeology
SECAR	Sint Eustatius Center for Archaeological Research
SIMARC	Sint Maarten Archaeological Center
YU	Yarmouk University, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WAC	World Archaeological Congress
ZWO	Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research

List of Figures and Tables

- Figure 01. Visual conceptualisation of the multi-vocal, multi-spatial and multi-temporal character of archaeological projects and sites.
- Figure 02. Visual conceptualisation of a value-based analytical framework.
- Figure 03. Visual summary of a conceptual framework as it applies to an ethnographic practice approach towards archaeological research projects abroad.
- Figure 04. Deir Alla excavation team, 1960 (Deir Alla Archive, Leiden University; courtesy Gerrit van der Kooij).
- Figure 05. Map of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan showing the location of Deir Alla.
- Figure 06. View from Tell Deir Alla towards the south-west (photograph by author, June 2009).
- Figure 07. Deir Alla excavations, 1960's (Deir Alla Archive, Leiden University; courtesy Gerrit van der Kooij).
- Figure 08. Visual conceptualisation of the Authorised Archaeological Discourse.
- Figure 09. Joint Project team members on top of Tell Deir Alla, late 1970's (Deir Alla Archive, Leiden University; courtesy Gerrit van der Kooij).
- Figure 10. Team meeting at the DASAS during the 2009 fieldseason (photograph by author).
- Figure 11. Guided tour on Tell Hammeh during the 2009 ceremony at DASAS (photograph by author, 2009).
- Figure 12. Map of Curaçao showing the location of Santa Barbara Plantation.
- Figure 13. Excavations by AAINA at Santa Barbara, 1971 (photograph by AAINA; courtesy of Jay Haviser).
- Figure 14. Excavations by AAINA at the site of Spanish Water, Santa Barbara in 1992 (photograph courtesy of Jay Haviser).
- Figure 15. View over part of Santa Barbara Plantation towards the north, with in the middle the site of Spanish Water – after the excavations and golf-course developments (photograph by author, July 2010).
- Figure 16. Archaeological fieldwork at Santa Barbara Plantation (photograph copyright Ben Bekooij, courtesy Santa Barbara Archaeological Project, Faculty of Archaeology).
- Figure 17. Santa Barbara golf course near the site of Spanish Water, with the old plantation house located at the back (photograph by author, 2010).
- Figure 18. School visit to the Santa Barbara Project excavations (photograph Santa Barbara Project archive, Leiden University).
- Table 01. Type of foreign archaeological projects undertaken in Jordan in the year 2007.
- Table 02. The historic development of the main values as mentioned in the project policies of the Joint Project.

Gaten Graven in het Buitenland: een Etnografie van Nederlandse Archeologische Onderzoeksprojecten in het Buitenland

SAMENVATTING

In de voorbije decennia heeft de westerse archeologie zich steeds meer aangepast aan de interesses en behoeften van anderen in de maatschappij, in het bijzonder wat betreft archeologisch onderzoek, erfgoedbeheer en samenwerking. De wijze waarop wij omgaan met de ideeën en waarden van anderen bij de interpretatie van en het onderzoek naar archeologische resten, de wijze waarop wij onze archeologische verhalen en praktijken integreren met andere vereisten in het erfgoedveld en met processen in het erfgoedbeheer, en de wijze waarop wij omgaan met verschillen in machtsverhoudingen binnen deze processen, leiden alle tot uitdagingen wanneer we 'gaten graven in het buitenland'. Echter, het huidige beleid, de methodologie en de academische kritiek doen vaak geen recht aan de complexe relatie tussen projectbeleid, discours en praktijk. Daarnaast concentreert men zich vaak op de (overigens uitermate belangrijke) kwestie van het betrekken van de oorspronkelijke bewoning in postkoloniale context, en minder op de motivaties, wensen en waarden van 'lokale gemeenschappen' en/of een bredere verscheidenheid aan *stakeholders* in wereldwijde, nationale of regionale context. Daarom besteedt dit proefschrift enerzijds meer aandacht aan de analyse van de onderliggende processen op basis waarvan archeologische onderzoeksprojecten in het buitenland worden ontwikkeld, onderhandeld en geïmplementeerd, en anderzijds aan de impact van de vertegenwoordiging en sociale positie van archeologen en andere actoren op de resultaten van een project.

Deze studie heeft een etnografische benadering toegepast die het mogelijk maakt te onderzoeken hoe archeologische onderzoeksprojecten in het buitenland in hun sociale context hun werking vinden. Dit is gedaan door de archeologische onderzoekspraktijken van de Faculteit der Archeologie van de Universiteit Leiden te beschouwen als een te onderzoeken 'cultuur', in het bijzonder door middel van het onderzoeken van twee *case studies*: het *Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project* in het Hashemite Koninkrijk in Jordanië (met aanvullend onderzoek op Tell Balata op de Palestijnse Westoever) en het *Santa Barbara Project* op Curaçao. Deze *case studies* combineerden veldwerk, participierend observeren, semi-gestructureerde en open interviews en document analyse.

Binnen deze etnografie zijn onderzoeksprojecten benaderd als netwerken van actoren, waarden, beleid en discours die zijn gecentreerd rond een voorstelling van 'erfgoed'-sites als multi-vocale, multi-temporele, multi-ruimtelijke en omstreden sites van kennis, praktijk en macht. Door het toepassen van een 'praktijk-perspectief' op projectbeleid-discoursen, heeft dit onderzoek zich gericht op de wijze waarop onderlinge relaties tussen actoren en discoursen ten op zichten van verschillende sites werden gecreëerd op meerdere plaatsen en door de tijd heen. Het concept van 'waarde' is hierbij toegepast als een centraal analytisch instrument dat de intenties, verlangens en motivaties van actoren met betrekking tot archeologisch onderzoek, erfgoed, en samenwerkingsprojecten illustreert. Bij elkaar genomen zijn met deze etnografische benadering drie specifieke onderzoeksvragen onderzocht; 1) Wat zijn de waarden en discoursen van de actoren in archeologisch projectbeleid met betrekking tot onderzoek, erfgoedbeheer en samenwerking?, 2) Hoe onderhandelen archeologische actoren over deze waarden en discoursen in relatie tot die van anderen in de buitenlandse samenleving?, en 3) Wat is de invloed van dit proces van beleids-onderhandeling op de projectresultaten?

Deze studie heeft vastgesteld dat er een dominant archeologisch discours bestaat binnen het huidige beleid en de praktijken van de twee *case studies*. Dit 'geautoriseerde' archeologie-discours plaatst expertwaarden, kennis van een universeel belangrijk verleden, en objectief wetenschappelijke veldonderzoek boven alternatieve waarden bij het onderzoek en/of het beheren van een archeologische site in een samenwerkingsproject. Het is hierbij belangrijk te benadrukken dat het discours, zoals bestaand in het projectbeleid van beide *case studies*, ook expliciete voornemens omvatte met betrekking tot het verbeteren van de maatschappelijke waarde van onderzoek, erfgoed en samenwerking. Echter, deze beleidsvoornemens waren niet altijd in overeenstemming met de waarden en discoursen van de andere actoren in de buitenlandse sociale context, aangezien ze contrasteerden met de opvatting dat de waarde van sites met materiële resten van het verleden ligt in de hedendaagse identificaties en toepassingen. Voor sommigen waren materiële resten geen 'wetenschappelijke gegevens', maar eerder iemands 'erfgoed'. Voor anderen waren sites met materiële resten een last bij projectontwikkeling, een bron van inkomsten, een toeristische troef, een educatief hulpmiddel, een kans voor capaciteitsopbouw, of gewoon een plek om familiepicknicks te houden. Toch werden de wetenschappelijke en archeologische waarden van onderzoek, erfgoedbeheer en samenwerking boven andere waarden gesteld door middel van projectonderhandeling en processen rond de uitvoering van beleid. Dit komt mede doordat de beleidsdoelstellingen van de twee projecten de ruimte boden voor de vorming van sterke, tijdelijke allianties met andere partners in de samenleving – ook zonder noodzakelijkerwijs dezelfde waarden en discoursen met betrekking tot onderzoek, erfgoedbeheer en samenwerking te delen. Het gebruik van zeer gecondenseerde conceptualisaties, zoals '*capacity building*', 'maatschappelijke betrokkenheid', 'erfgoed', 'samenwerking' en / of 'algemeen nut', vergemakkelijkte dit. De succesvolle translatie van waarden werd daarbij beïnvloed door het discours, de persoonlijke achtergrond en *agency* van individuele actoren, alsook door hun behoefte voor het behouden van institutionele, politieke en financiële steun. Ook wereldwijde toegang tot potentiële financiële middelen voor archeologisch onderzoek speelden een belangrijke rol in de vorming van projectnetwerken en inherente machtsrelaties tussen actoren.

Uiteindelijk zijn de projecten er (nog) niet volledig in geslaagd een aantal beleidsdoelstellingen en intenties met betrekking tot de maatschappelijke waarde van archeologie te realiseren, zoals site behoud, site interpretatie en presentatie, de oprichting van lokale musea, capaciteitsversterking van lokale instellingen, en/of het creëren van educatieve en sociaal-economische voordelen voor de gastgemeenschappen. Daarnaast heeft deze studie vastgesteld dat lokale partners soms uitgesloten waren van projectnetwerken en -voordelen. Dit leidde niet alleen tot het idee dat de meeste van de voordelen van het archeologisch onderzoek in het buitenland waren gericht op (Nederlandse) archeologische onderzoekers en academische instellingen, maar ook tot frictie tussen de partners – met name geuit in nogal drastisch verschillende percepties van succes en falen van 'samenwerkingsprojecten'.

Samenvattend kan gesteld worden dat de ongelijke verdeling van projectvoordelen voor archeologische academische instellingen, alsmede de uitsluiting van een aantal lokale partners, een (vaak onbedoeld) resultaat is geweest van een proces waarin het projectbeleid, de discoursen en actor-*agencies* samen hebben bijgedragen aan de prioritering van archeologische en wetenschappelijke waarden, alsmede aan de toekenning van expertise en eigendom aan archeologische actoren. Als zodanig lijken kritieken en representaties die de sociale impact van archeologische praktijken in het buitenland beschouwen als uitsluitend het gevolg van of (Nederlands) projectbeleid, of van (westerse) discoursen, of van de motivaties van (archeologische) actoren, te kort te schieten in hun uitleg.

Uiteindelijk spelen archeologische academici niet alleen een belangrijke rol in het onderzoek en de verkenning van het verleden, maar ook in de manier waarop archeologische samenwerkingsprojecten

worden geïntegreerd met bredere erfgoedvraagstukken en sociaal-politieke en economische aspecten. Dit is omdat zij vaak, of ze het nu leuk vinden of niet, worden geplaatst in de positie van 'poortwachter' van het verleden, waarbij zij de expertise en de bevoegdheid toegekend krijgen om beslissingen te nemen rond beheersaspecten van archeologische overblijfselen die een belangrijke invloed hebben op de behoeften en waarden van anderen in de samenleving. Daar uit volgt dat archeologen moeten aanvaarden dat materiële overblijfselen van het verleden niet uitsluitend een onderzoeksmogelijkheid bieden, en dat ze zich niet langer kunnen verschuilen achter een notie van archeologisch onderzoek als een neutrale activiteit die vrij is van politieke en sociale verantwoordelijkheden. De discipline moet daarnaast proberen de waarden en discoursen van de huidige financiering en institutionele kaders te verbreden, zodat ze beter geschikt zijn voor de uitvoering, financiering en evaluatie van institutionele samenwerkingsverbanden op de lange termijn, waarin het behoud, de presentatie en de elementen van capaciteitsopbouw worden gezien als een fundamenteel onderdeel van archeologische handelingen in het buitenland, en niet als een goedbedoelde bijzaak.

In dit licht kunnen etnografieën van de archeologische praktijk in de toekomst een fundamentele rol spelen. Wanneer een zelfreflecterende, etnografische benadering vanaf het begin wordt toegepast op de wijze waarop archeologische onderzoeksprojecten worden ontwikkeld, onderhandeld en geïmplementeerd, kan deze niet alleen licht werpen op de daadwerkelijke processen die ten grondslag liggen aan het resultaat van buitenlandse archeologische praktijken, maar kan deze ook een bijdrage leveren aan het actief bewerkstelligen van *stakeholder* participatie door een stem te geven aan hun waarden en wensen met betrekking tot archeologische en erfgoedbeheerprocessen. Het integreren van archeologisch onderzoek met een op waarden gebaseerde erfgoedbeheer-benadering en met een continue etnografische analyse, kan als zodanig bijdragen aan eerlijkere, meer ethische en lokaal duurzamere samenwerkingspraktijken, die niet alleen wetenschappelijk maar ook sociaal relevant zijn.

Digging Holes Abroad: An Ethnography of Dutch Archaeological Research Projects Abroad

SUMMARY

Over the last few decades, western archaeology abroad has adapted increasingly to the interests and needs of others in society, specifically with respect to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration. The way in which we deal with other peoples views and values in the interpretation and investigation of archaeological pasts and materials, the way in which we integrate our archaeological narratives and practices with other demands in the heritage field and with processes of heritage management, and the way in which we deal with power differences in both these processes; all remain as challenging issues when ‘digging holes abroad’. However, most of current archaeological and cultural heritage policies, methodologies and critiques have overlooked the complex relationship between project policy, discourse and practice. In addition, they have often focused on the issue of ‘indigenous community’ involvement in postcolonial contexts, and less upon the motivations, desires and values of ‘local communities’ and/or of a broader range of stakeholders in global, national and regional contexts. As such, this thesis paid more attention to analyzing the underlying processes by which archaeological research projects abroad are developed, negotiated and implemented, as well as to the impact of the agency and social position of archaeologists and other actors on project outcomes.

This study has brought forward an ethnographic approach as to investigate how archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context. It has done this by regarding the archaeological research practices of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University as a ‘culture’ under investigation, specifically by taking the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (with additional research at Tell Balata in the Palestinian Westbank) and the Santa Barbara Project in Curaçao as case studies. The case studies combined fieldwork, participant observation, semi-structured and open interviews, as well as document analysis.

Within this ethnography, research projects have been approached as networks of actors, values, policies and discourses, that centered around a conception of ‘heritage’ sites as multi-vocal, multi-temporal, multi-spatial and contested sites of knowledge, practice and power. By bringing forward a ‘practice perspective’ towards project policy discourses, this study focused upon the ways in which interrelations between actors and discourses were created across time and space in multiple sites. The concept of ‘value’ has thereby been applied as an analytical tool that illustrated the intentions, desires and motivations of actors in relation to archaeological research, heritage, and collaborative projects. Taken together, this ethnographic approach investigated three specific research questions; 1) What are the values and discourses of actors in archaeological project policies with respect to research, heritage management and collaboration?, 2) How do archaeological actors negotiate these values and discourses in relation to those of others in society abroad?, and 3) What is the influence of this process of policy negotiation upon project outcomes?

The study identified the existence of a dominant archaeological discourse within the current policies and practices of the two case studies. This ‘authorized’ archaeology discourse effectively prioritized expert values, knowledge of a universally significant past, and objective scientific field research over alternative values when investigating and/or managing an archaeological site in a collaborative project. It is hereby important to stress that the discourse, as reflected in the project policies of both case studies, also encapsulated explicit intentions with respect to enhancing the social value of research, heritage management and collaboration. However, these policy intentions were not always in line with the values and discourses of other actors in social contexts abroad, as they sat in contrast with the view that the value of sites with material remains of the past lies in contemporary identifications and uses. For some, material remains were not ‘scientific data’, but rather someone’s ‘heritage’. For others, sites with material remains were a development burden, a source of income, a tourism asset, an educational tool, an opportunity for capacity building, or simply a place to have family picnics. Nevertheless, the scientific and archaeological values of practices of research, heritage management and collaboration came to be prioritized over other values through processes of project negotiation and policy implementation. This is because the policy goals and intentions of the two projects allowed for the formation of strong, temporary alliances with other partners in society – even without necessary sharing the same values and discourses with respect to research, heritage management and collaboration. The use of very condensed conceptualizations, such as ‘capacity building’, ‘community involvement’, ‘heritage’, ‘collaboration’ and/or ‘public benefit’, facilitated this. The successful translation of values was thereby influenced by the discourse, personal background and agency of individual actors, as well as to their need for maintaining institutional, political and financial support. Global access to potential financial resources for archaeological research also played a significant role in the formation of project networks and inherent power relationships between actors.

Ultimately, the projects did not (yet) fully succeed in implementing several policy goals and intentions in relation to the social value of archaeology, such as site conservation, site interpretation, the establishment of local museums, capacity building of local institutions, and/or the creation of educational and socio-economic benefits for host communities. In addition, this study identified an exclusion of local partners from project networks and benefits. This in turn led not only to the idea that most of the benefits from archaeological research projects abroad were geared towards (Dutch) archaeological researchers and academic institutions, but also to frictions between partners – most notably in terms of rather drastic different perceptions of success and failure of ‘collaborative projects’.

In summary, we can say that the unequal provision of project benefits to archaeological academic institutions, as well as an exclusion of several local partners, has been an (often unintended) result of a process whereby project policies, discourses and actor agencies together contributed to the prioritization of archaeological and scientific values, as well as to the attribution of expertise and ownership to archaeological actors. As such, critiques and representations that regard the social impact of archaeological practices abroad as solely the result of either (Dutch) project policies, (western) discourses or (archaeological) actors’ motivations, seem to fall short in their explanation.

Ultimately, archaeological academics play an important role in not only the investigation and exploration of the past, but also in the way in which archaeological collaborative projects are integrated with wider heritage issues and socio-political and economic concerns. This is because they are, whether they like it or not, often placed in positions of ‘gatekeepers’ of the past, whereby they are attributed the expertise and power to make decisions over management aspects of archaeological remains that have an important impact upon the needs and values of others in society. Accordingly, this means that archaeologists need to accept that material remains of the past are not solely an opportunity for research, and that they can no longer hide behind a notion of archaeological research as a neutral activity free from political and social responsibility. The discipline also needs to try and broaden the values and discourses of its current funding

and institutional frameworks, so that they better allow for the implementation, resourcing and evaluation of long-term, institutional collaborations in which conservation, presentation and capacity building elements are seen as a fundamental part of archaeological conduct abroad, and not as a well-intended afterthought.

In this sense, ethnographies of archaeological practices can play a fundamental role in the future. If a self-reflexive ethnographic approach is applied, right from the start, to the way in which archaeological research projects are developed, negotiated and implemented, it can not only shed light on the actual processes that underlie the outcome of archaeological practices abroad, but it can also contribute to actively engaging stakeholder participation by giving voice to their values and wishes in archaeological and heritage management processes. Integrating archaeological research with a value-based heritage management approach and with continuing ethnographic analysis, can as such contribute to more equitable, ethical and locally sustainable collaborative practices that are not only scientifically, but also socially relevant.

Acknowledgements

A short while ago I read in a column in the NRC Handelsblad that undertaking a PhD research is a privilege. That is unmistakably true. Having the opportunity to focus on one specific research topic for several years and to travel the world and discuss your ideas with peers, friends and the general public, can only be described as pure luxury, for which I am truly grateful.

I first of all wish to thank Prof. Willem Willems for supporting me over the last five years, and for presenting me with trust and opportunities to undertake my research and to develop my career. Willem, I am glad that we are still working together on unfolding our vision and passion with a shared sense of humour, and I look forward to continue doing this in the future.

I also wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Jaap Lengkeek, for asking me difficult questions and for opening up his home and providing continuous support. Jaap, I am especially grateful for showing me how long walks in the open air are the best remedy for regaining a sharp view on difficult matters; a helpful tradition that I continued myself at our family home at Terschelling.

I also would like to thank my paranymphs Rutger Colenbrander and Tim Williams. Tim, thank you so much for your warm friendship and your help over the years. I wouldn't be here without you. Colen, bedankt mien jong – especially for coming all the way from the Congo to stand at my side in a penguin suit.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Dr. Monique van den Dries and Dr. Martijn Duineveld for supporting me during these last years as colleagues and friends, and for critically discussing archaeological heritage matters. I also would like to thank Prof. Peter Pels and Prof. Raymond Corbey for opening up my view into the field of anthropology and ethnography, Prof. Ian Lilley for introducing me to a whole new world of cultural resource management and capacity building, and Prof. George Smith for his moral support.

A special thanks goes to Prof. Corinne Hofman and Dr. Menno Hoogland, who provided me with the opportunity to critically investigate their project activities, and with the trust to follow up on their contacts, networks and even internal correspondence. I can't say enough how much I admire this, and I hope we can continue our collaborations in the future.

I also would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Gerrit van der Kooij for allowing me to critically investigate his endeavours, and for the long discussions, the hospitality and the feedback over the past years. Gerrit, thank you so much for the warm friendship you offered, especially during my fieldwork.

In Curacao, I especially like to thank Ieteke Witteveen, Claudia Kraan and Edward Jonkheer for their help, for facilitating my research in such detail, and for placing their trust in me to investigate some of their work – I am ever so grateful for this. I also would like to thank all members and staff of NAAM, DROV, Santa Barbara Plantation, the Archaeological Working Group, AMA and BONAI for their help, and especially Dr. Jay Havisser for his enthusiasm, discussions and help in background research.

In Jordan, I would like to thank Prof. Zeidan Kafafi, Prof. Moawiyeh Ibrahim and Dr. Fawwaz Alkhraysheh for being so honest and open, as well as the staff, students and colleagues from the DoA, DASAS, YU, the CBRL and the Friends of Archaeology in Amman. A special word of gratitude goes to the wonderful people of Deir Alla and surroundings, especially to Amer who helped me with translations in the field, and to all my fellow team members of the Deir Alla Project in 2009. For Palestine, a special word of thanks goes to Dr. Hamdan Tahan and Mr. Harry Putker.

The list of people, organisations and respondents in Curacao, Jordan and Palestine that I would like to thank is simply too great to include them all here, but I would like to use this opportunity to express my gratitude to everybody who took the time to answer my questions, and who were willing to contribute to this research.

I would further like to thank David de Bruijne and Adam Jagich for their awesome support as friends and partners in crime, as well as my other colleagues of CommonSites, Claartje and Krijn, for taking over work when the need was greatest. I also would like to thank Lucienne for offering me a place to work at the Van Ostadestraat and Stijn from Profysio for making the PhD also physically bearable. Steven, a special word of thanks to you – sorry for crashing up your car, but I am glad to say I finally made it, not in the least because you gave me an opportunity all those years ago.

My colleagues in Leiden also deserve a special word of thanks, especially Claske en Corijanne for helping me with references, for providing feedback on parts of the dissertation and for being such wonderful colleagues to work with. Joanne and Hans I would like to thank for their last-minute help with the publication. Ilone, Claudia and Roswitha I like to thank for administrative issues and for making daily practicalities much more fun, and Brittany, Carrie, Raed, Kay, Alexander, Lizzy, Alexandra, Rivke, Robert, Annette, Sebastiaan, Jimmy and Alex for sharpening my mind or for offering their feedback and advice on specific parts of my research.

Finally, a warm word of thanks to my friends and family, especially to Wouter, Jaro, Merijn, Michel, Anna and Cecily. Dear Arjen, Peter, Sascha, Saskia, Feike, het nieuwe mannetje; glad to have you here to celebrate this together. Lieve Janne, I could not have done this without you and your smile.

Finally, I would like to thank my mother for her love. I wish dad could be here.

From him, I learned that Leiden is not the centre of the world and that it is worthwhile to observe things from a little distance.

I dedicate this book to my father.

Curriculum Vitae

Sjoerd Jaap van der Linde was born on the 8th of March 1979 in Heerenveen, the Netherlands. After receiving his VWO diploma at the Praedinius Gymnasium in Groningen in 1997, he successfully completed his propaedeutic degree in Architecture at the TU Delft in 1999. Sjoerd continued to study at the Faculty of Archaeology at Leiden University, where he obtained a BSc summa cum laude in Archaeological Sciences in 2003. Subsequently, Sjoerd studied at the Institute of Archaeology at University College London (UCL), where he graduated cum laude with a MA in Managing Archaeological Sites in 2004. His MA dissertation on management strategies for the UNESCO World Heritage Site of Ancient Merv was awarded the UCL Petrie Prize.

After an internship at the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in Paris, Sjoerd returned to London from 2005 to 2007, where he worked as a Research Assistant Managing Archaeological Sites at UCL, as Interpretation Officer Stonehenge at English Heritage, and as Head of Site Management & Interpretation at the UCL Centre for Applied Archaeology.

In 2007, Sjoerd started as a researcher at the Faculty of Archaeology at Leiden University, the Netherlands. During subsequent years, Sjoerd combined his PhD research on ‘Digging Holes Abroad’ with fieldwork at the Tell Balata Archaeological Park Project in Palestine, as well as with his function as electronic review editor for the journal *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* (CMAS). Moreover, Sjoerd was a researcher in the EU Culture 2007 ‘Archaeology in Contemporary Europe’ (ACE) project, where he co-edited the volume ‘European Archaeology Abroad’, which entails a comparative analysis of European archaeological policies and practices in foreign contexts.

Presently, Sjoerd is an Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Archaeology at Leiden University in the field of archaeological heritage management, as well as General Director of the Foundation CommonSites. His research interests include heritage management, ethnographic research and new media applications in community archaeology.

