



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

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 ICOM (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 led 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.

