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

Linde, S.J. van der

Chapter Five: The Santa Barbara Project

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 INTRODUCTION

> Leiden University behaved like an ordinary project developer. <...> What did all these promises of collaboration mean?[264]
>
> What we know about the Indians has been written by the Spanish, and now by the Dutch and the Americans. <...> It's all hidden from us. It's private, just like Santa Barbara Plantation.[265]
>
> We wanted that the project should be used for the development of local capacity and knowledge <...> but we did not succeed, we could not succeed in my opinion, in maintaining good relationships.[266]
>
> It was a professional project that preserved the archaeological values, but still they tried to work against us <...> in the end, it was a successful project. There was no delay, good PR, an example of how developers should deal with archaeology.[267]

The above statements,[268] made by the director of the foundation 'National Archaeological Anthropological Memory Management' (NAAM) in Curaçao, a local community member, the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University and a director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV respectively, are illustrative of quite different perceptions of success and failure towards the Santa Barbara Project.[269] Similar to my introduction to the case study of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project in chapter 4, I wish to point out that it is not my intention to claim whether these statements are false or true. Rather, my purpose here will be to illustrate how such differing perceptions of success and failure could have developed – only several years after the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University and NAAM had agreed to increase collaboration and public outreach in archaeological research and heritage management in Curaçao.

---

[264] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

[265] Former local school teacher (Montaña Rey, July 2010).

[266] Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, April 2010)

[267] Co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

[268] All quotes by respondents in this chapter are translated from Dutch to English by the author unless stated otherwise.

[269] The project has also been described by archaeologists from Leiden University as the 'Spanish Water Project', referring to the specific site on which research centred. However, I have chosen to use the broader term 'Santa Barbara Project' as it was this connotation that was used mostly by other actors and respondents. I use the term 'Santa Barbara Plantation Project' when describing the tourism development scheme of Santa Barbara Plantation NV.

When discussing the original intentions behind the Santa Barbara Project with the individual researchers of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, and when placing these in a wider framework of their experiences with previous projects in the Caribbean, a clear understanding and willingness came to the fore about the importance of integrating archaeological projects firmly in the social context. An inclusion of issues such as capacity building, heritage management, education and local (indigenous) community participation, could as such clearly be identified in the original aims of the 'Antillean and Aruban Heritage' Project, the project proposal out of which the Santa Barbara Project originally developed: "The care <of cultural heritage>, the practice of further research as well as the support of local institutions and the capacity building of local frameworks are of utmost importance. In particular, a lot of attention will be given to public presentations aimed at contemporary inhabitants".[270] The issue here at stake, therefore, is why such expressed 'good intentions towards collaborative archaeology' (cf La Salle 2010) did not succeed as planned in Curaçao.

5.1.2 STRUCTURE OF CHAPTER

This chapter will follow the methodology as outlined in chapter 3. As a result, its structure closely resembles the outline of the case study of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project. Although comparisons between the case studies will be made, the study is not comparative in any strict sense (see section 3.2.1).

Section 5.2 will provide a background to the case study, delving deeper into the historical and political context of Curaçao and the Santa Barbara Project. It will also give information on the history of Dutch archaeological research on Curaçao as well as on the archaeological policies and heritage legislation of the (former) Netherlands Antilles.

Section 5.3 will outline the development and practice of the Santa Barbara Project, highlighting the differing perceptions of success and some conflicts and problems that arose over the implementation of the project. The remaining chapters will then delve deeper into understanding the archaeological project processes within its wider social context, the description of which will follow the order of the research questions as outlined in sections 2.6 and 3.2.2.

Section 5.4 will investigate the main values and discourses of the archaeological actors in the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project with respect to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration. In line with the analysis given in chapter 4, an 'Authorised Archaeological Discourse' (AAD) (cf Smith 2006) will be identified within the over-all project policy framework.

Section 5.5 will subsequently explore how the Dutch archaeological actors negotiated and constructed these values and discourses in relation to those of local institutional counterparts, government bodies, and commercial developers. It will illustrate how the AAD and related value-systems were constantly (re-)produced by archaeological policies, institutions and actors through processes such as 'translation', 'naturalisation', 'representation' and 'self-reference' (cf Latour 1996; 2005; Mosse 2004; 2005; Smith 2004; 2006; Waterton *et al.* 2006), and how this contributed to a system of (often) 'unintended exclusionary mechanisms' that saw a prioritisation of scientific and archaeological values and the relative closure of the project network towards local actors (cf Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming).

Section 5.6 will explore the relationship between processes of policy negotiation and actual project outcomes. It will illustrate how policy functions not only to orientate practice but also to legitimise practice (cf Mosse 2005, 14; Latour 1996). Whilst the scientific and archaeological values of the AAD have a major impact on project outcomes in terms of a prioritisation of resources and activities, and whilst especially archaeological and funding policies play a major role in this, this section will also illustrate how actors are

[270] Taken from the project summary description of 'Antilliaans en Arubaans Erfgoed: 4000 jaar bewoningsgeschiedenis in beeld', available at the 'Campaign for Leiden' website of Leiden University at http://www.campagnevoorleiden.leidenuniv.nl [Accessed 15 April 2010]. Translated by author.

constantly (re-)producing story-lines and heritage discourse-coalitions in order to mobilise and maintain relationships, support and access to archaeological sites and practices.

Section 5.7 will reflect on the role, responsibility and power of Dutch archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of other actors in the social context of Curaçao. It will discuss how the Dutch archaeologists were attributed a certain amount of expertise and decision-making power over the research and management of archaeological remains, as a consequence of the institutionalised AAD, the constant need for policy negotiation, the historical power discrepancies and of their access to global resources and networks. I will finish by proposing that archaeologists should take up this privileged position more strongly by actively advocating the inclusion of other people's values in the archaeological process.

5.2 BACKGROUND

5.2.1 CURAÇAO

Curaçao is an autonomous country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands, situated in the Caribbean, 50km off the shore of Venezuela. Before the 10th of October 2010, and during the time of research, it was part of the Netherlands Antilles, an island group consisting of Curaçao, Bonaire, Sint Eustatius, Saba and Sint Maarten. Together with Aruba, which already gained its independent status (*status aparte*) as an autonomous country in 1986, and the Netherlands, they together formed the Kingdom of the Netherlands. After '10-10-10', Curaçao and Sint Maarten followed Aruba as an autonomous island, with Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba (the 'BES-islands') becoming 'special municipalities' (Bijzondere Gemeenten) of the Netherlands.

Curaçao is part of the so-called 'leeward group' of islands together with Aruba and Bonaire, situated parallel to the northwestern coast of Venezuela. In 2009, the Netherlands Antilles had a total population of ca 180,000. Curaçao, with a population of ca 135,000 and a land area of 444 km2, is by far the largest island in terms of population and land area, and is generally perceived as dominating the other islands also financially and politically (Jaffe 2006, 31).

During prehistoric periods, all of the islands of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba were inhabited at certain times by Amerindian peoples who had migrated from the South American mainland (Haviser 2001, 63). The occupational history of the Caribbean goes back to around 8000BP. From that period till 1492AD, the islands in the Caribbean Sea have been continuously frequented through feastings, expeditions, visits and migrations from the surrounding continental mainlands (Hofman 2010, 6). During the earliest history of the Caribbean, dynamic interconnections existed between groups and islands, through extensive migration, trade and mobility networks (Hofman 2010; Hofman & Hoogland 2009).

Curaçao itself is rich with prehistoric sites such as Rooi Rincon, Santa Barbara, Savaan, Knip and San Juan, where remains of Indian daily life can be recovered, including pottery, artefacts of stone and shell, grave-goods and rock-paintings. The oldest occupants of Curaçao were pre-ceramic, and are counted archaeologically as belonging to the Archaic Period (ca 4000BC-450AD) Hofman & Hoogland 2009). Relatively little is known about the transcendence from the Archaic to the Ceramic period (around 450AD). However, along the coastal region of the Spanish Water in Curaçao, several shell-middens have been found that can be dated to this period which points towards the use of the inner waters as a gathering and preparation place of shells (ibid). During the Ceramic period, permanent settlements appeared on the leeward group of islands; these settlements showed similarities with occupational remains as can be found in Venezuela, pointing to continuing close contact and networks between the mainland and the islands. The indigenous peoples who inhabited the leeward group of islands during the European encounters in 1492

were identified in contemporary Spanish references as the Caquetio ethnic group (ibid, 29), which belonged linguistically to the Arawakan family (Haviser 2001, 63; Hofman & Hoogland 2009, 24-30). Archaeological evidence suggests that people lived in extended families, with estimates for the population of Curaçao never reaching more than probably 2000 people (Hofman & Hoogland 2009, 30).

Curaçao was first 'discovered' in 1499 by the Spanish. Spanish written accounts of 1540 suggest that by 1515, the entire indigenous population of Curaçao had already been deported (Dalhuisen *et al.* 2009, 33). In subsequent centuries, during alternating Spanish, English and Dutch occupation, small groups of Indian peoples were re-imported or migrated back to Curaçao and the other islands. Although Aruba saw arguably the largest concentration of Indian population, also Curaçao witnessed an increase again in Indian population. From the 18th century onwards, the Indian population had mixed continuously with the African population and especially the so-called 'free coloureds', that by the end of that century, no 'original' Indians were thought to exist anymore on the islands (Dalhuisen *et al.* 2009, 37-39).

In 1634 Curaçao was ceded to the Dutch West Indische Compagnie (WIC), which soon after established a trade settlement in Curaçao to support their highly profitable combination of warfare and trade (Jaffe 2006, 27).[271] With Curaçao slowly becoming one of the 'hubs' in the region for slave trade, the population of Curaçao subsequently saw an influx of Dutch protestant settlers, African slaves, and later also Sephardic Jews from the Dutch parts of Brazil (ibid, 28). Although the Indian population had left Curaçao especially during and after the period of warfare between the Spanish and the Dutch, they returned in the coming century (Dalhuisen *et al.* 2009, 37-38). Apart from two small periods of English occupation in the 19th century, the Dutch remained firmly in power. Although Curaçao saw the coming of plantations, trade dependent on this was never very profitable due to the arid climate. In 1863, slavery was finally abolished under international pressure. As a result, many of the freed slaves settled in small villages dependent on subsistence agriculture in the rural landscapes, later referred to as the 'Kunuku' culture (Jaffe 2006, 28).

After a period of economic depression in the late 19th century, the economic situation soon improved when the Royal Dutch Shell established an oil refinery near the harbour in the heart of Willemstad in 1915. Apart from a substantial impact on the landscape, the changes in socio-economic, social and even cultural structures were severe, with Curaçao changing from an "agrarian-commercial to a modern capitalist industrialised society" (Jaffe 2006, 29). The mixed island population became even further complex, due to a subsequent influx of immigrants from the region and as far as the Middle-East, India and even China.

After World War II, the process of decolonisation commenced, albeit not without difficulties. In 1954, a Charter by the Kingdom of the Netherlands (the so-called *Statuut*) was agreed upon, which stated that the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam would become 'partners' in the Kingdom. This meant that the islands became autonomous with respect to internal policy, local government and legal currency, with the Netherlands taking care of defence and foreign affairs (Haviser 2001, 60).

However, a considerable part of the population did not feel that the newly gained autonomy improved their lives, with a socio-economic and political gap in power still apparent between white elites and the rest of the population (Jaffe 2006, 30; Römer 1998). These tensions, which can be placed in a wider regional context, came to a climax on 30 May 1969, when a labour protest in Willemstad soon broke out into a revolt. Although the resulting changes saw the opening up of positions in the economic and political spheres for those of non-European descent, this arguably did not lead to an overall social or political transformation (ibid).

[271] A very concise and sharp summary of the post 1492 history of Curaçao with its implications on identity, landscape and culture has been given by Jaffe, on whose work I will draw repeatedly in the following paragraphs (Jaffe 2006, 27-44).

In 2004, with the 50th year celebration of the *Statuut*, reflections on possible legal and political re-structuring of the kingdom gave rise to referenda in the Netherlands Antilles, which led, in April 2005, to Curaçao opting for the option of gaining a *status aparte.* On the 10th of October 2010, the Netherlands Antilles were dismantled. The islands of Curaçao and Sint Maarten became autonomous countries within the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The islands of Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba became 'special municipalities' of the Netherlands, which meant that, during a period of 'soft overlap', Dutch legislation would come into effect on these islands.

The combination of a multi-layered political system, together with the 'multiplex relations' of a small island society and a "cultural disposition to avoid unfriendliness", Curaçao is rive with corruption scandals and news of favouritism, patronage and a lack of transparency dominating the political system (Jaffe 2006, 32; Römer 1998). During my time of research, society in Curaçao was still marked by a huge gap between rich and poor in socio-economic terms, often still along ethnic and class lines, with huge percentages of unemployment still being common under especially the youth of Curaçao.

5.2.2 DUTCH ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN CURAÇAO

Apart from some amateur investigations by local catholic priests (Haviser 2001), Dutch archaeological interest in the Caribbean during the late 19th and early 20th century was generally limited. At least, it was in sharp contrast to the investigations being undertaken in the eastern part of Dutch overseas territories (Toebosch 2003; 2008a, 72). While the Dutch were interested in Indonesia due to its monumental archaeology and the early hominid remains, which even led to the development of an Antiquity Service in 1913, the same did not hold true for the Antilles. The work by de Josselin de Jong, anthropologist and conservator of the National Museum of Ethnography in Leiden, was an exception. In 1923, he undertook archaeological research on the islands of Saba, Sint Eustatius, Curaçao and Aruba (Hofman & Hoogland 2007, 6; Hofman 2008), and published his results in 1947 (Josselin de Jong 1947) – all in the rather typical manner of its time: "On Saba, <...> they still talk about the Leiden researcher who got himself carried in a sedan chair <...> to his excavation" (Toebosch 2008a, 72; quoting Hofman).[272]

During the 1950's and 1960's, vocational archaeological investigations took place on Curaçao, leading to extensive collections of ethnographic materials. Most of this material, which included information on intangible heritage such as art, poetry, traditions and songs, is currently held by several museums and archaeological institutions in Curaçao (Haviser 2001, 72). In the 1960's-1970's, further small-scale archaeological investigations were conducted in Curaçao. Apart from the work by local archaeologists and the Venezuelan archaeologist Cruxent, this period also saw several Dutch expeditions being undertaken in the Antilles (mainly on Curaçao and Aruba), initiated by archaeologists from the Dutch State Antiquities Service and from Leiden University (see for example Glazema 1967). Soon after, the first PhDs about Caribbean archaeology appeared at Leiden University (Hofman 2008, 6). Since 1967, these expeditions were undertaken in consultation with the Archaeological Anthropological Institute of the Netherlands Antilles (AAINA), which was established as a sign of an official recognition of archaeology as a responsibility of the state (Haviser 2001, 72-74). However, these Dutch expeditions did not lead to structural, large-scale research programs (Hofman 2010).[273]

---

[272] Translation by author.

[273] Pers. comm. during a radio interview for the Teleac program 'Hoe?Zo!', 24 February 2010. Available at http://www.teleac.nl/radio/1683209/home/item/2798729/graven-in-het-caribisch-gebied/ [Accessed 11 March 2010].

It was only in the beginning of the 1980‘s that professional archaeology on Curaçao started with work undertaken by AAINA, such as an island-wide survey of prehistoric and historical sites in 1982. Such relatively small-scale mapping, survey and excavation work continued on all the islands of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba up to the end of the 1990’s, when AAINA was dismantled (Haviser 2001). The 1980’s also saw the establishment of more structural collaborations between AAINA with overseas academic institutions, such as those with the College of William and Mary. In the mid 1980‘s, the archaeology of the Caribbean also got a more structural place within Leiden University, with excavations being undertaken in the Netherlands Antilles, amongst which Curaçao, in cooperation with for example AAINA and the Archaeological Museum of Aruba (AMA)[274] (Hofman 2008, 6). The interest by several archaeologists of Leiden University in the archaeology of the Antilles finally led to the establishment of the research group ‘Caribbean Archaeology’ in the mid 1990’s, with a primary focus on the prehistory of the islands. Since then, the scope of Leiden research in the Caribbean expanded beyond the Dutch borders of the Antilles, which led to research projects in for example Cuba and Trinidad.

In 1998, the National Archaeological Anthropological Museum Foundation was established on Curaçao (NAAM), as a continuation of the previous governmental AAINA. In 2008, the name of the foundation was changed to National Archaeological Anthropological Memory Management (NAAM). The beginning of the 21st century saw a further establishment of local archaeological organisations in the Netherlands Antilles, such as the Sint Eustatius Centre for Archaeological Research (SECAR), the Bonaire Archaeological Institute (BONAI) and the Sint Maarten Archaeological Centre (SIMARC).

In 2007, Leiden University developed a position for a professor in the ‘Archaeology of the Caribbean with special attention to the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba’. According to the newly appointed professor of Caribbean archaeology, the formed geopolitical division between the islands had lefts its mark on the interpretation and research frameworks of Caribbean archaeology, with the French, Dutch, English and Americans each working on their ‘own’ islands, leading to an idea that island cultures existed independently of each other (Hofman 2008). The current research by Leiden University tries to challenge such a view by studying the underlying mechanisms and dynamics behind mobility and exchange networks between the islands.

5.2.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT IN CURAÇAO

Mirroring the move towards institutionalisation and increased state control of archaeology in Western Europe during the first half of the 20th century, a 1915 Dutch law regulating the export of objects (which included antiquities) was adapted for the Netherlands Antilles in 1944, at that time still a colony of the Netherlands (Haviser & Gilmore 2011, 134).[275] After the Netherlands Antilles were granted autonomy in 1954, the 1944 law was amended in 1960 with more precise detail concerning the regulation of archaeological and ethnographical objects (ibid, 134-135). The potential of heritage for tourism development and the needed preservation of sites, monuments and artefacts was also becoming more explicit in law, as can be seen in a 1970 revision of the law (ibid, 135). However, legislation at this time was rarely enforced, with looting and destruction being common over the next few decades. In 1971, when academic archaeology was maturing and the increase of tourism in the Caribbean was expanding, the Netherlands included its Caribbean territories in its national preservation laws. In 1977, another ’landsverordening‘ (Federal Ordinance) was enacted that regulated the preservation of historical and archaeological sites and monuments, albeit only on a central government level. Until the early 21st century,

[274] In 1981, Aruba saw the establishment the National Archaeological Museum of Aruba (AMA).

[275] The next few paragraphs draw repeatedly on the article by Haviser & Gilmore (2011), which provides a concise overview of the legislative heritage management frameworks of the Netherlands Antilles.

all islands of the Netherlands Antilles utilised this central government legislation, adapting it to island-specific versions and development of heritage management legislation (ibid, 136-137).

Stated by Haviser and Gilmore (2011), and reflected in my interviews (see below), is the assessment that of the five islands of the former Netherlands Antilles, Curaçao had the most extensive and productive heritage legislation and framework. Curaçao's "first attempt at precise cultural heritage management" (ibid, 137) came in 1990 with the establishment of a 'Monument Plan', a list of over 800 monuments on Curaçao. Together with the 'eilandsverordening' (Island Ordinance) for the implementation of the 1989 Monuments Law (Bestuurscollege Curaçao 1991), which was loosely based upon the Dutch 1988 'Monumentenwet', this made it possible to list and protect scheduled monuments, to prevent illicit excavations, as well as to ensure that permissions had to be obtained with the government if development work or disturbance to scheduled monuments was planned to take place.

The protection of monuments was based upon the principle of designation of an object or a building as a monument. The enforcement of this law rested with the Department of Urban and Regional Development Planning and Housing (DROV) of Curaçao. It was in the wider framework of development and land-use policies, that DROV asked AAINA in 1989 to develop a list of archaeological sites to be included in the 1990 Monument Plan, which led to the designation of 11 archaeological monuments on the island (Janga 2009, 36). Over the last two decades however, the pressure and threat to archaeological sites increased with the rising economic development.

As mentioned by the archaeologist of NAAM during a 2009 seminar (see below), all legislation and workgroups despite, most archaeological heritage management planning was done on an *ad hoc* basis, with DROV having to approach NAAM for information on potential archaeological sites and values in a certain areas, and with rescue archaeological work being done immediately after archaeological finds had been made during construction work, if at all. This led to a modus operandi which "depended greatly on the goodwill of developers, something that could not always be counted upon" (Janga 2009, 36). The need for a better solution became even more explicit when the central government of the Netherlands Antilles ratified the Malta Convention in 2007 – a result of the ratification in the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The (revised) 'European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage', also known as the Malta Convention, was adopted in 1992 by the Council of Europe (Council of Europe 1992). After a long period of discussion, adaptation and ratification, it was finally implemented by the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles in June 2007. In its preamble, the Malta Convention regards archaeological heritage as a resource for the knowledge of human history, under threat from development planning, natural hazards, illegal or unscientific excavations and a low degree of public awareness. It tries to protect this archaeological heritage through setting out 18 articles, which have been adopted and implemented differently by European state parties (Willems & van den Dries 2007).

For a complete overview of the content I refer to the original convention (and see O'Keefe 1993), as I will discuss the emphasis which is placed by different actors on certain articles and principles of the Malta Convention throughout this chapter. However, for now I would argue that the main principles could be seen as follows; implementation of the Malta Convention through state legislation, preservation in-situ of archaeological remains, an early integration of archaeological values within development planning, as well as calling for adopting a polluter-pay principle – which means that those responsible for disturbing or destroying archaeological heritage can be held account for the costs of mitigating these impacts. Other articles, such as those calling for the promotion of public awareness (article 9) and the exchange of technical and scientific expertise (article 12), are often thought to be given less attention in practice, although a recent study in the Netherlands suggests otherwise (Van den Dries & Kwast in press).

The Dutch implementation of the Malta Convention has implemented these articles by developing a system built upon several main components:1) decentralization of decision-making, with increased responsibilities for local authorities, that are now deciding on mitigation projects and leaving their mark on the selection policies and research questions, 2) a polluter-pay principle with a liberalized market framework and a commercial archaeological sector in which archaeological companies work for/on behalf of developers, in parallel with 3) a quality assurance system with a minimized controlling role of central government (Van den Dries 2011; Bazelmans 2011; Van den Dries & Willems 2007).

One of the results of this implementation of the Malta Convention in the Netherlands, has been a huge increase in the availability of financial resources for archaeological work, with a subsequent rise of archaeological employment and activities. A second result has been the changed division of tasks – with municipalities now mainly focusing on developing and implementing policies, selection procedures, monument maps and public outreach, and with excavations and research being more executed by companies (Van den Dries *et al.* 2010, 57). As we will see in this chapter, it is especially these two results of the Malta Convention that play a huge role when actors are discussing the possible implementation of the Malta Convention for the Netherlands Antilles, both of them being regarded as ways in which to secure future access to and control over archaeological 'resources'.

The 'coming of Malta' to the Netherlands Antilles required prior research and integration with planning processes, with an imperative to find "a good balance between the mainly economic pressure for developments on the one hand and the strive for the conservation of our cultural-historic values and artefacts because of their importance for our identity, on the other hand" (Janga 2009, 36). Subsequently, from 2006 onwards, NAAM – in collaboration with the Municipality of Amsterdam – had developed a GIS based map with all known historical and archaeological sites and monuments. This collaboration led as such to the archaeological policy *Maneho di Arkeologia* and the *Mapa di balor di Kultural Historiko di Korsou*, a value-based map of archaeological sites aiming to advice policy makers of DROV and developers in planning for spatial development and the potential impact on "heritage sites of value" (Kraan 2009, 101). Both of these instruments were based upon, and aiming to facilitate, the core principles of the Malta Convention in advance of its more structural imbedding into heritage legislation in Curaçao.

Despite all this, the state of archaeological heritage management and protection was far from ideal on all of the islands during the time of research. Natural threats such as coast erosion continue to damage archaeological sites, with human impacts such as looting, damage and destruction of sites as a result of large-scale development programs in for example the tourism industry still thriving (Hofman 2008). In addition, intangible heritage and traditions are also under threat from increased impacts of tourism, migration and western values on local cultures such as has been identified on for instance Saba and Sint Eustatius (Haviser & Gilmore 2011) and within the perception of the population of Curaçao itself (Jaffe 2006).

An additional problem lies in the fact that Curaçao has not had an archaeologist since the late 1990's. It took until 2008 until the Netherlands Antilles financed a position for an archaeologist to be placed at NAAM – a position that was not filled during the lead-on to the project under discussion. In addition, a lack of political vision and coordination between the organisations and governmental institutions dealing with archaeology and cultural heritage has been identified by several respondents.[276] Even the 'Monuments Bureau', the department within DROV entrusted with the enforcement of the Monument Ordinances, often

[276] According to interviews with the director of the Monument Fund (Curaçao), former chairman of the Board of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010) and the Division Head of the Monuments Bureau (Willemstad, July 2010).

did not have the power to advance or implement actions dealing with research and protection of archaeological heritage, loosing out to wider urban and development planning imperatives on the island and to subsequent decision-making processes within DROV itself. As a result, the archaeological policy *Maneho di Arkeologia* was not enforced and implemented within DROV during the time of research since it was often perceived as potentially obstructing economically beneficial development planning on the island.[277]

During my time of research, the future of NAAM, of its archaeologist, as well as of the Monuments Bureau of DROV itself, was uncertain.[278] The weak enforcement of heritage legislation, coupled with under-staffed and under-financed institutions, an ambiguous position of the Netherlands Antilles in terms of possibilities for structural funding from the Netherlands (see section 3.2.1), and a lack of regional collaboration and integration of heritage management policies, meant that the heritage management framework of Curaçao was ready for positive change.

The coming of 'Malta'

The referenda held in 2005 throughout the Netherlands Antilles, were by many active in the heritage field seen as an "opportunity for positive change that has been available only once in multiple generations" (Haviser & Gilmore 2011, 140). Of particular importance here was the possible implementation of 'Malta' legislation that better integrated archaeology in environmental and development planning, better allowed for financial support of archaeological research in advance of disturbance, and better allowed for public participation and preservation of archaeological and cultural heritage in-situ. With the BES-islands coming under Dutch legislation after 10 October 2010, and especially under the Dutch implementation of the European Malta Convention, and with Curaçao, St Maarten and Aruba slowly opting for similar legislation frameworks, the board was set for change in the heritage framework.

In 2005 and 2009, NAAM organised two seminars to prepare for new legislation based upon the principles of the Malta Convention in advance of the constitutional changes of '10-10-10'.[279] By the end of the second seminar, it was concluded that the Malta Convention would be "a good hall-stand for the Antillean (Is)lands, provided there is space for the island reality" (Witteveen *et al.* 2009, 17). By this, it was meant that a careful balance had to be found between heritage preservation, local identity formation and economic development, as well as between the preservation of both tangible and intangible heritage. As such, the involvement of youngsters, the public at large and education were mentioned as a "condition sine qua non in the eventual protection of our heritage" (ibid).

As can be distilled from internal policy documents of the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW), Directorate for Cultural Heritage (DCE), as well as in those of the Dutch State Inspectorate for Heritage, it was not deemed desirable by the Dutch government that the Dutch law on archaeological monuments would be made applicable immediately on the BES islands after '10-10-10' because of the difference in policy frameworks and the size of the islands. However, considering the expected rise in tourism and development activities by Dutch and international building corporations on the archaeologically rich coastal regions, it was deemed desirable to think over how the principles of Malta

[277] Interview with archaeologist of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

[278] According to interviews with staff members of NAAM (Willemstad, June/July 2010) and Monuments Bureau DROV (Willemstad, July 2010).

[279] Seminar 'Legislation Cultural Heritage Netherlands Antilles and Aruba', 22 April 2005 (see Witteveen *et al*. 2005) and the seminar 'Legislation Cultural heritage in Caribbean perspective', 18 Juni 2009 (see Witteveen *et al*. 2009).

could be implemented on the BES-islands during 2011.[280] Ultimately, this lead to OCW setting out a tender for a 'BES report' with advice on how best to implement and facilitate the Malta Convention on the BES-islands. A major guideline in this was that the new legislation would not have to be based upon the Dutch version, but rather on the original version of the Malta Convention.

Such a report was not yet assigned during the time of fieldwork.[281] Different parties in the Netherlands Antilles were aiming at securing the assignment, and even Dutch NGO's in the heritage sector had started to prepare advisory and consultancy reports. The dismantling of the Netherlands Antilles, the 'coming of Malta', increased Dutch influence, the relationships between heritage preservation, economic development and identity formation, and the relationship between tangible and intangible heritage; all formed the background against which the Santa Barbara Project was undertaken. Coupled with the need for archaeological heritage organisations and individuals to re-think their future roles and responsibilities, and the possible financial opportunities deriving from the 'polluter-pay' principle inherent in the Malta Convention, it made for a potent mix.

Public archaeology

In a 2001 article, Haviser discusses the history of historical archaeological research from the point of view of different types of research and the impact of these on society of the islands of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba (Haviser 2001). Building upon the typology by Trigger (1984; see section 2.2) of nationalist, colonialist and imperialist archaeologies, Haviser argues that especially historical archaeology has had a positive impact on the lives of peoples in the Antilles in terms of identity-formation, self-esteem, awareness and potential economic benefits as a result of the translation of research into tourism. In particular, he argues how this can be accomplished by a form of national, public archaeology undertaken by local institutions with the participation of local peoples. Pointing to the European and North-American bias towards researching and restoring certain historical heritage sites in the Antilles (such as plantations, European-descendant sites and forts), he argues how such forms of 'foreign' archaeology can distantiate local communities: "in the case of a project with directors and workers brought in from another culture, such as a summer field-school, the general result is an insulation and relative isolation from local social contexts" (Haviser 2001, 76). In contrast, he argues that

> local investigators are perceived by the general community as conducting research for the local good, albeit on a small scale; while in the other cases there is a general perception of the foreign researchers as `inquisitive tourists' with little to contribute to the local community. Even though there is some economic contribution to the community via local expenditures by the researchers, and sometimes the foreign investigators have further tried to compensate with other assistance to the community such as support for museums, the sense of personal connection with the population is often lacking. This reaffirms the importance of involving local personnel in an archaeological investigation. (ibid)

The fact that the development and legislation procedures for archaeology of these 'foreign' archaeologies have seen a considerable involvement of island government officials, has added to a perception that such research was mainly for the benefit of the elite, and not for local communities themselves, and that "compensative contributions to the community" did not change this (ibid). Since both foreign archaeologists as well as local

[280] Netherlands Ministry of Education, Culture and Science 2009. 'Archive supervision on the BES-islands'. Internal report, DCE, p. 2.

[281] But see Witteveen & Kraan 2012 for the final report.

elites are often outsiders to the local community, archaeological projects can easily be perceived as top-down, lacking real basis and structural support from the ground up (cf Troncoso Morales 2000).[282]

This concern over the importance of research developed by local institutions, with the participation of local community members is subsequently argued to be crucial for developing self-esteem, identity formation and historical awareness. Small-scale archaeological research work, such as conducted by AAINA in the 1980's and 1990's, has according to Haviser (2001) and the former director of AAINA,[283] led to an increased awareness of the importance of archaeological and historical sites, and contributed to the development of a handful of historical and archaeological museums in Curaçao and the other islands, to improved heritage legislation around the 1990's, and an awareness about the role of archaeology in tourism development. However, these also contributed to occasional negative impacts, such as looting and the potential damaging effects of mass tourism on sensitive local cultural expressions.

Culture, identity and heritage

Despite its geographic location and its historical and present-day parallels, Curaçao does not appear to identify itself strongly with the Caribbean. The combination of a discord over the complex relationship with the Netherlands and the rather artificial constellation of the Netherlands Antilles, has led to a less than self-evident approach to regional identification and collaboration; foremost, people in Curaçao seem to identify with Curaçao itself (Jaffe 2006, 34; Römer 1998).

Curaçao culture can be described as a mix of Dutch Protestants, Sephardic Jews, Catholicized Africans, with, through 20th century immigration, also Middle-Eastern and Asiatic influences. Despite the fact that the local language *Papiamentu* (a Creole Afro-Portuguese mix with some Dutch influences) is spoken for at least three centuries, until quite recently it was dismissed as a 'dialect' to denote class and ethnical lines on the island (Jaffe 2006, 38). However, it has been noticed that more recently, *Papiamentu* has become a central element in Curaçaoan culture and a great source of pride (Römer 1998). Over the last decades, an increasing appreciation has been given to local Curaçaoan culture, with heritage identification especially focusing on intangible aspects such as cuisine, songs, tradition and dance. Heritage identification as such seems to focus especially on Curaçaoan culture as an expression of a complex and multi-ethnical past, with specific attention to recent local traditions and memories.

Arguably, it could be noted that Curaçaoan culture is still structured to some degree in anti-thesis to the Netherlands (cf Sluis 2008). One good example of this is a general "lack of openness and tendency to conceal one's opinions mirrored by widespread suspicion, expressed in, and fuelled by, pervasive gossip" on a small island society (Jaffe 2006, 41), as compared to an open and direct social interaction that is often believed to characterise Protestant Dutch culture. A history of passive resistance to the oppressive nature of colonisation and slavery still characterises Curaçao, and has, interestingly, also been identified in the heritage sector in Curaçao over management issues surrounding former plantations (Sluis 2008). As such, the history of slavery and oppression still plays a fundamental role, both in the attitude towards power indiscrepancies as well as in the attitude towards white Dutch 'foreigners'. However, this does not mean that Curaçaoan culture is essentially based upon African roots and slavery – the focus is primarily local, focused upon being 'Antilliaans'. Having said this, a tendency towards including African roots in national

[282] cf Keehnen 2009.

[283] Seru Mahuma, July 2010.

discourses has been identified over the last years, although mostly in elitist circles and less in local populations (Eikrem 1999, 69).[284]

The cultural heritage field in Curaçao can be described as being quite distinctively divided between for example Jewish heritage initiatives, foreign mass tourism heritage initiatives, Dutch initiatives, and Antillian heritage initiatives.[285] It is especially within local communities of 'black Curaçao' that a focus on intangible heritage in the form of recent personal memories seems to flourish.[286] Such communities on the island seem to identify more with a personal, recent past of a couple of generations rather than with a distant, abstract past of pre-columbian and Amerindian times, which might have contributed to a rather low awareness and support for archaeological heritage preservation of 'Indian' heritage on the island. Nevertheless, a few important examples exist in the Caribbean where education and outreach programs have led to an increased awareness of the value of heritage, which in turn led to increased heritage preservation (see for example Siegel & Righter 2011).

Recent research undertaken by DROB (Dienst Ruimtelijke Ontwikkeling en Beheer / Spatial Development and Management Service) on Bonaire also pointed to the fact that 'conservation of cultural heritage' was deemed very important with the community on Bonaire, but that interest was especially given to the preservation of songs, music, traditions, as well as several monuments and houses of which local people could remember the recent histories.[287] According to Allen, a local anthropologist of Curaçao, most people do not really seem to engage with archaeology since

> there is no employment in it. But there is a strong interest in immaterial heritage. In our stories. Especially about more recent times, such as the period of slavery. <...> With regards to Indian history, well, the interest is there, because it is part of the history of the Antilles, but there is no real identification.[288]

On the basis of my own observations and interviews, I would argue that identification with Indian roots is indeed relatively small on the island, especially when compared to other islands in the region, or even to its neighbour Aruba. On Curaçao, the Indian past and culture is perceived as a minor part in the complex mix of what it means to be 'Antilliaans', although an interest in the indigenous roots of the island, with Indian peoples coming from the Venezuelan mainland as a part of local Curaçaoan history is nevertheless existent. A strong focus on such a narrative, as is given by the Santa Barbara Project, is however not without potential contemporary sensitivities. At present, resentment can be identified in Curaçao against the large group of Latino immigrants (mainly coming from Colombia, Dominican Republic and Venezuela). Popular perceptions of these can be identified as them "not taking over local Curaçaoan culture" (Jaffe 2006, 39), "taking over the island" (cf Allen 2003) and stealing the scarcity of available jobs. Such resentments have, interestingly, also played a large part at Santa Barbara Plantation, where jobs in the Hyatt Regency hotel have been taken up especially by Latino immigrants.[289] Development on a former plantation, that takes away recent memories of Curaçaon culture and access, with the economic benefits going to foreign

---

[284] in Jaffe 2006.

[285] See Sluis 2008.

[286] Pers. comm. Allen (Curaçao, July 2010).

[287] Civil servant and architect of DROB, board member of NAAM (Kralendijk, July 2010); referring to internal research by DROB and a local journalist that includes over 500 oral histories in Bonaire.

[288] Curaçao, July 2010.

[289] This perspective came to the fore during interviews with the former director of the newspaper 'Amigoe', acting as PR consultant for Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Rosa, July 2010); the General manager of Hyatt Regency (Santa Barbara, August 2010); as well as during several interviews with local community members (Santa Rosa / Montaña Abou, July 2010).

developers, tourists and Latino immigrants, accompanied by Dutch archaeological research that emphasises the Indian roots of the island, is therefore not without its complexities.

Figure 12. Map of Curaçao showing the location of Santa Barbara Plantation.

5.2.4 SANTA BARBARA PLANTATION

Santa Barbara

Santa Barbara is used as a toponym for an area of ca 1200ha located in the south-east of Curaçao, on the east of Spanish Water. Characteristic for the landscape before habitation is the huge climax of rising sea-levels, leading to the inner bay Spanish Water (Hoogland 2007, 2). During habitation periods, the western part of the landscape has seen little changes except for the climate gradually becoming dryer, which has led to a changed vegetation; thorny bushes and cactuses on land, and mangrove in the lower parts near to the water (ibid). At present, the site houses several important species of fauna and flora, such as mangrove. The eastern part of Santa Barbara has changed considerably in its landscape. The flat outline of the former Tafelberg has been reduced and damaged considerably as a result of the extensive phosphate mining from the late 19th century onwards. More recently, the western area (ca 600ha) has been developed by Santa Barbara Plantation with resulting golf courses, a modern marina, transport infrastructure, a gated community resort, residential terrains, and a large 5 star hotel, the Hyatt Regency Curaçao.[290]

The whole area of Santa Barbara is archaeologically rich. It shows evidence of habitation in the Archaic and Ceramic periods, with settlement-areas and temporary camps (Haviser 1987). The area incorporates a listed Ceramic Age archaeological monument in the north, a listed archaeological site in the west called Spanish Water, which includes a scheduled conservation area in the form of the small island Xaguis in front of the western shores of Spanish Water. In addition, there is evidence of other archaeological and historical sites such as rock shelters, as well as some remains from the early Spanish conquest and Dutch colonial period, former plantations including the large historical plantation house, and buildings and infrastructure relating to the phosphate exploitation industry.

The research under discussion has focused specifically on the archaeological site ‘Spanish Water’, which illustrated a long habitation period from the Archaic period up till the early Spanish colonial period. Along the coastal region of the Spanish Water, several shell-middens have been investigated which point towards the use of the inner waters as a gathering and preparation place of shells (especially *melongena*

[290] See the website of Santa Barbara Plantation, available at http://www.santabarbaraplantation.com/ [Accessed November 2011].

melongena shells) by Indian peoples (Hofman & Hoogland 2009). In a nearby fireplace, remains of dolphins have been found, arguably dated in relation to the Spanish period. In 2008, an additional nearby site was excavated, Seru Boca - a shell midden under a rock shelter with accompanying fireplace, and with several rock paintings.

The first written resources about Santa Barbara appeared in the first half of the 16th century (Römer 2000a, 8).[291] In 1539 a Spanish *hacienda* was established, the first Spanish agrarian settlement at Curaçao which flourished considerably over the following decades (ibid). Near to this, the spring of Bacuval is located, which is probably the reason why Spanish Water got its name (Hartog 1968). Written resources also mention the building of the first Spanish Church on the island in 1542; however, when the Dutch explored the area in 1634, all that was found of the Spanish settlement were deserted remnants – even today, remains of the Spanish period remain scarce (Römer 2000a, 8). During the subsequent WIC governance of the island, several Dutch families further developed the area in plantations up till the late 19th century – these plantations were however never very profitable, mirroring the island wide phenomenon (ibid, 9-10). The plantation house at Santa Barbara was built around the end of the 18th century and early 19th century, and subsequently rebuild in the mid 20th century. Although the history of the plantations on the western side of the island is better documented, historical research suggests that for example in 1863, Santa Barbara was the largest plantation on the eastern side of the island, with 122 slaves (ibid, 9).

In 1874, the non-profitable future of the area changed considerably, when phosphate was discovered in the Tafelberg. Soon after, the first exploitation and export of phosphate started (Broek 2000, 78-79). However, it took until 1912 when the export really took flight. A period of decline during WWII turned out to be the start of more difficulties. Having seen several labour strikes in the 1930‘s and late 1940‘s, and a huge strike during the revolt of 1969, the relationships between the direction of the Mining Company and the local workers came under stress (Römer 2000b, 59-61). When the profits of phosphate mining dropped as well during this period, the mining exploitation stopped in 1970. At this time however, the government of the Netherlands Antilles stepped in and during the period 1970-1979, it provided financial support to the Mining Company as not to further increase local tensions by sustaining employment (Broek 2000). In 1979 the company again operated on itself, but now focusing on the exploitation of limestone.

Until this time, most of the workers at the Mining Company were lower-class inhabitants from Banda Riba, an area in the north-eastern side of Curaçao. Although these workers counted ca 500 in the high days of the Mining Company, they decreased considerably after 1979 to around 100-200, when more immigrants slowly became part of the workforce (Römer 2000b, 59-61). At that time, the southern and western Santa Barbara beach had also been used for generations of local middle-class inhabitants of especially the eastern part of Curaçao, with free access to this side of the Santa Barbara area.

Santa Barbara Plantation project

In 1989, Santa Barbara was bought by CITCO (Curaçao International Trust Company) (Römer 2000c, 75), with the Smeets family, who set up CITCO in 1939, still acting as its controlling shareholder in the form of ‘Smeets Family Trust (SFT) Investment Limited’ (McIntosh 2010). In 1990, the Mining Company (Mijnmaatschappij Curaçao Ltd.) was sold to the Janssen de Jong Group, who took over exploitation of the Tafelberg (Römer 2000c, 75). At that time, the areas were divided along the lines of their businesses: the western side belonging to CITCO, which wanted to develop the area into a resort, and the eastern side, which was used by de Mijnmaatschappij for further limestone exploitation (ibid). In 1998, the

[291] The following paragraphs are based upon several chapters in the book ‘De Tafelberg aan de Fuikbaai, Curaçao, Nederlandse Antillen. 125 jaar exploitatie van grondstoffen in sociaal-economisch perspectief’ (Mijnmaatschappij Curaçao NV 2000).

collaboration between CITCO and Janssen de Jong Group was also legally unbound, with both parts being strictly geographically separated – a division that starts at the entrance of Santa Barbara Plantation.

Although the planning for the Santa Barbara Plantation project by CITCO/SFT started already from the early 1990's, it was in 2000 when the development took flight when a partnership was established between SFT and the US-based resort developer company VIDA Group NV, in order to develop Santa Barbara area into one of the finest luxury resorts in the Caribbean (McIntosh 2010). These project developers have subsequently overseen the development of this ca 600ha beach and bay-front resort community, whilst the operational side of the above mentioned business structure was set up as 'Santa Barbara Plantation NV', hereafter also referred to as 'Santa Barbara Plantation'. With Curaçao previously being known as a busy port, a business centre and for its large oil refinery, and with Aruba and Bonaire attracting more tourism for mainly beaches and diving, Santa Barbara Plantation aimed at making Curaçao a first class tourism attraction in the Caribbean. The development of the project included a 350-room five-star hotel (subcontracted as the Hyatt Regency Curaçao Golf Resort, Spa and Marina), an 'Old Quarry' 18-hole golf course, a 120-slip 'Seru Boca Marina' as well as tennis courts. In addition, the resort includes residences ranging in size from a one-bedroom 'Dutch-flavoured' cottage, to grander houses with prices ranging from $450,000 to $1.3 Million.[292] As can be read on the official website of Santa Barbara Plantation, visitors and residents will "enjoy spectacular diving and snorkelling, along with sailing, fishing, tennis and nearby historic archaeological ruins".[293] It is in the latter 'amenity' that we are interested here.

Archaeological research at Santa Barbara

Figure 13. Excavations by AAINA at Santa Barbara, 1971 (photograph by AAINA; courtesy of Jay Haviser).

Until 2008, the area of Santa Barbara had seen several archaeological investigations. Apart from some early investigations in the wider area of Curaçao by the Catholic priest Van Koolwijk in the late 19th century (Haviser 2001), by the archaeologist de Josselin de Jong in the early 20th century, and an archaeological inventory of the eastern part of Curaçao in 1968 by AAINA, the first real investigations in the area were conducted by AAINA in collaboration with local vocational archaeologists in 1971 (Beurs en Nieuwsberichten 1992). These consisted of several archaeological test-pits of a pre-columbian village site in the north of Santa Barbara, near to the entrance.

In 1977, such investigations were enriched by surveys by other local vocational archaeologists, and by contextualizing research undertaken by the archaeologist of AAINA, eventually leading to a PhD at Leiden University (Haviser 1987). In the late 1980's and early 1990's, several other coastal and interior test-pits were excavated by AAINA. Amongst these was the pre-columbian site of 'Spanish

[292] See the website of Santa Barbara Plantation, available at http://www.santabarbaraplantation.com/ [Accessed November 2011].

[293] See the website of Santa Barbara Plantation, available at http://www.santabarbaraplantation.com/ [Accessed November 2011].

Water' (C-039), which had previously been suggested, together with the pre-columbian settlement site in the north, to be placed on the Monument list of DROV. Although it was placed on a list of archaeologically important monuments, it never led to a real scheduling of the site as a 'Protected Monument' (see above). The site of Spanish Water consisted of three separate parts, but by 1992, already two of them had been heavily damaged and destroyed, one of which by bulldozing activities. Partly to mitigate this, research in 1992 was conducted at Santa Barbara by AAINA and facilitated and sponsored by CITCO (Amigoe 1992, 3). This research, which led to a joined CITCO-AAINA press conference in September 1992, was an early example of collaboration between archaeologists and developers, with early hints of a 'polluter-pay' principle being implemented. Such an approach was also advanced by AAINA at other development sites, such as at Kadushi Cliffs (Curaçao Info 1990, 13) – resulting in an article by the AAINA archaeologist in 1998 calling for increased collaboration between archaeologists, developers and communities (Haviser 1998).

Figure 14. Excavations by AAINA at the site of Spanish Water, Santa Barbara in 1992 (Photograph courtesy of

The research in 1992, albeit small-scale, saw the participation of local vocational archaeologists and workmen – in line with the vision of national public archaeology as outlined by the AAINA archaeologist (see above) – and guided tours around the site (Amigoe 1992; Beurs en Nieuwsberichten 1992). Importantly, it was agreed that the archaeologically significant areas (in this case including the Spanish Water site) would be protected by means of a restricted area as well as a wider park: "what the developers get out of this solution is a precisely defined area of strict preservation, and a wider area of general park protection which allows tourists to walk over the site along nature trails" (Haviser 1998, 9). Notable as well, is that CITCO announced its plans to develop a small museum on the site with archaeological discoveries and pre-columbian artefacts that was to act as a 'monument for the earliest inhabitants' (Amigoe 1992, 3).

The latest archaeological research undertaken at Santa Barbara was that of Leiden University in advance of the development of golf-courses and residences in 2008 and 2009. This project, funded by the Leiden University 'Campaign for Leiden' and Santa Barbara Plantation, was executed in collaboration with DROV and its advisor NAAM, and informally acted as a pilot project for the coming of the Malta Convention to the Netherlands Antilles. Apart from this, a smaller archaeological inventory has been made by NAAM on the small island Isla Yerba in early 2009, located on the western side of Santa Barbara.

Figure 15. View over part of Santa Barbara Plantation towards the north, with in the middle the site of Spanish Water – after the excavations and golf-course developments (photograph by author, July 2010).

5.3 THE SANTA BARBARA PROJECT

5.3.1 THE SANTA BARBARA PROJECT

In December 2004, the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University wrote a letter to NAAM and AMA with a proposal to 'formalise and optimise' the existing collaborations.[294] Such a collaboration was meant to give the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba a more prominent place within Leiden research, as well as to exchange knowledge, staff and students between Leiden, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. The concrete way in which such a collaboration was meant to be advanced was by requesting AMA and NAAM to formerly support the position of an 'Affiliate Professorship Caribbean Archaeology' at Leiden University. After discussions in early 2005 between Leiden archaeologists and the director of NAAM, and

[294] Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM & AMA (December 2004). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

after a positive 'declaration of intention' by NAAM and AMA for such a collaboration in June 2005, this subsequently led to a formal request by NAAM and AMA to the Leiden University Executive Board to develop such a position.[295] In the accompanying documents needed for the request of this position, the Faculty of Archaeology mentioned that the conduct of archaeological research in the Caribbean was "not possible without taking societal relevance into account". As such, it committed itself to advance knowledge and awareness of Caribbean archaeology in both the Netherlands as well as in the Antilles through public outreach, as well as to increase the participation of young people from the Antilles in research and the development of cultural heritage management.[296] NAAM supported this intention by stating that legislation, awareness and identity-formation were especially important now that initiatives were being developed to create new heritage policies based upon "global developments in the field of legislation (Europe: Malta)."[297]

In the second half of 2005, contacts between NAAM and Santa Barbara Plantation also started, when an 'Archaeological Working Group' (AWG), consisting of amateur archaeologists and representatives of NAAM, Monuments Bureau DROV and several other natural and historic foundations on the island, visited the Spanish Water area on the invitation of Santa Barbara Plantation NV in advance of changed plans for development of the area. Referring to the previous commitment by CITCO in the early 1990's to "saving several critical archaeological sites as a park area <...> and even to build and maintain a small museum",[298] the AWG called for protecting the archaeological and historical values of the site by incorporating them into "an interpretive outdoor park where visitors can experience largely the same environment that existed for thousands of years".[299] Subsequently, NAAM offered its services to conduct archaeological research and consultancy for developing a management plan for the park and museum, positioning itself as the appropriate agency to coordinate and oversee such activities "with the use of hired consultants"[300], as it did not have an archaeologist in employment at that time. According to NAAM, such consultants could be formed by researchers from Leiden University in the framework of the collaboration that was being simultaneously developed.[301] Over the course of 2006, correspondence continued between NAAM and the Faculty of Archaeology, whereby Santa Barbara was mentioned as a possible opportunity for joint archaeological assistance, and whereby the outline of a large research project called 'Antillean and Aruban Heritage' (Antilliaans en Arubaans Erfgoed) by Leiden University was discussed. This project proposal, which aimed at investigating pre-columbian archaeology of the Antilles, as well as to increase public awareness and local institutional capacity in order to manage and protect this heritage in light of the increasing threats to the archaeological resource on the islands, was being prepared by the Leiden researchers as part of a bid to the 'Campaign for Leiden'. This was a funding project of Leiden University and the alumni-supported Leiden University Fund, established to locate private investors for university projects. In November 2006, a newly appointed Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology rehearsed the intentions to formalise and intensify collaboration in terms of research, awareness and heritage management, expressing gratitude towards NAAM for proposing a senior archaeologist of Leiden to

[295] Correspondence NAAM and AMA to Leiden University (February 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[296] This was mentioned in the accompanying 'Desirability Report' for the support of an affiliate professorship in Caribbean archaeology, (February 2006, p. 3-5). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[297] This was mentioned in the accompanying 'Desirability Report' for the support of an affiliate professorship in Caribbean archaeology, (February 2006, p. 1). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[298] Correspondence NAAM/AWG to Santa Barbara Plantation NV (October 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

[299] Correspondence NAAM/AWG to Santa Barbara Plantation NV (October 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

[300] Correspondence NAAM/AWG to Santa Barbara Plantation NV (October 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

[301] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

become Professor of Caribbean Archaeology.[302] In this respect, it was clarified that the Executive Board of Leiden University had decided that the position would go further than an affiliate position, and that it would finance the position itself in the form of a Professorship on personal title.

By the end of 2006, the first signs of institutional disagreement over the content and form of the collaboration proposals started to appear, albeit informally. NAAM, who had been working together with the Municipality of Amsterdam on developing archaeological value-based maps in advance of Malta-based heritage legislation,[303] had come to question a perceived 'top-down approach' in the Campaign for Leiden as a sign of a general increase in Dutch influence on the island – both of which the director regarded as being reflected in the budget as well as the name of 'Campaign for Leiden'.[304] In addition, the proposed collaboration over archaeological assistance at Santa Barbara was suddenly terminated by NAAM, stating that research at Spanish Water was "in consultation with the government (DROV), not a priority and not further threatened"[305]. Such a statement was based on the belief that the archaeological values of the area were sufficiently protected since NAAM and Monuments Bureau DROV were trying to schedule the small island Xaguis in front of the Spanish Water site as a conservation area, and because a belief at NAAM existed that discussions about preserving the site of Spanish Water as an archaeological park were still ongoing.

Still, NAAM stressed that it wanted to continue the collaboration, and that this could be done on the basis of previously discussed issues such as "assistance with urgency research", "exchange of knowledge during summer-schools", as well as "assistance of issues with storage and documentation".[306] In early 2007, Leiden University informed NAAM that one of its senior archaeologists would be appointed as a Professor in the 'Archaeology of the Caribbean with special attention to the areas with which the Netherlands has historical ties'.[307] In addition, the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology expressed the Faculty's dedication to continue its search for future possibilities in terms of a "mix of research funding and heritage management" in light of the upcoming constitutional changes in the Netherlands Antilles.[308]

Such statements of intent and collaboration between Leiden University and NAAM were put to the test in early 2007 when Santa Barbara Plantation requested advice from a senior archaeologist of the Faculty of Archaeology. Not wanting to develop the site as an archaeological park, but rather wanting professional

---

[302] Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (November 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[303] At the end of 2006, NAAM organized an open meeting with the title 'Archeologische Waardenkaart voor Curaçao, instrument van beheer van het cultureel erfgoed' ('archaeological value mapping, instrument for cultural heritage management'). During this meeting, NAAM made publicly known that they were working together with the Monuments and Archaeology Bureau (BMA) of the Municipality of Amsterdam, in order to develop an archaeological value-based map that would allow the integration between spatial planning and the preservation of cultural heritage. According to the director of NAAM, the contemporary lack of documentation of the archaeological and cultural sites of Curaçao had recently lead to "an ad hoc approach at excavations <…> and at development projects, as the one at Santa Barbara <…> The result is destruction of heritage and irritations. This is why NAAM has taken the initiative to develop the archaeological value-maps" (Antillen.nu 2006). (Translation by author).

[304] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

[305] Correspondence NAAM to Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (December 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[306] Correspondence NAAM to Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (January 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[307] Correspondence Executive Board Leiden University to NAAM (January 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[308] Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (February 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

advice and research in advance of development, Santa Barbara Plantation stated that all communication with NAAM had ended. In the view of one of the directors of Santa Barbara Plantation, NAAM had a reputation for making public complaints after development projects had started, and of wanting to do archaeological research themselves, this all despite the fact that it did not have a professional archaeologist in employment.[309] Having heard about the previous investigations by Leiden archaeologists into the archaeology of Santa Barbara, and on the basis of recommendation by the previous archaeologist of AAINA, Santa Barbara Plantation asked the senior archaeologist for advice over the way in which to proceed with the archaeological sites on its resort, expressing its wish to develop the resort 'in harmony' with the protected areas.

Replying that the Faculty had experience in terms of developer-led archaeological research, and offering advise on management, protection, presentation and archaeological research, the Leiden archaeologist agreed that a short visit to Santa Barbara could be useful – something of which NAAM was subsequently informed. The reaction by NAAM, however, was one of suspicion.[310] Stating that it expected the Faculty of Archaeology to act in line with the views of NAAM and Monument Bureau DROV as well as with the principles of the Malta Convention, the director referred to earlier discussions about possible archaeological assistance at Santa Barbara and to the report by the AWG to Santa Barbara Plantation. Accordingly, the Leiden archaeologist asked for insight into the AWG-report and the current heritage policies of Curaçao in order to undertake an archaeological value-assessment at Santa Barbara, and in order to be able to get in line with the views of NAAM.[311]

Having confirmed the archaeological values of Santa Barbara as highly significant, but instead concluding that excavation of the site of Spanish Water would be in order, the visit by the Leiden archaeologist to Santa Barbara in June 2007 put things on edge. In a subsequent letter to the Faculty of Archaeology, NAAM referred back to all previous agreements and subsequently stated that Leiden was behaving as a competitor – that it was disturbing the work of NAAM instead of supporting it;

> It is not known to us what the University of Leiden is planning to do there. Or is the Faculty now acting <...> in the grey area of private consultancy? <...> I propose that <...> the University of Leiden consults how the proposed collaboration with NAAM and other local institutes of the Netherlands Antilles, out of local priorities, will indeed be developed.[312]

In a response, the Faculty of Archaeology stressed out to NAAM that their intentions were foremost to conduct a large archaeological research for the benefit of the historical knowledge of Curaçao, and to strengthen the position and capacity of NAAM by means of involving local amateurs and staff.[313] In addition, the Dean of the Faculty discussed the outline of the project with the Head of DROV, which led to informal support.

---

[309] Co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

[310] Correspondence between NAAM and Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (May - June 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[311] Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (May 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[312] Correspondence NAAM to Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (June 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[313] Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (June 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

In July 2008, an agreement was proposed by Leiden and Santa Barbara Plantation NV to conduct archaeological research at the site of Spanish Water, on the basis of "cooperation with local institutions" and "in agreement with the stakeholders". It was envisaged that the project would leave the site "archaeologically clean", and conducted according to "quality norms of archaeological research in the Netherlands", resulting in excavation reports, an archaeological narrative for the envisaged exhibition and a public-oriented publication.[314] Although the remark about "cooperation with local institutions" had led to some concern by Santa Barbara Plantation, the Dutch archaeologists stressed again that it was the intention by Leiden to collaborate with NAAM during and after the fieldwork. Accordingly, the Dean supported the proposed agreement, expressing his satisfaction to NAAM, DROV and Santa Barbara Plantation over the way in which the archaeological heritage was being handled by the developers, and expressing his wish that such "exemplary behaviour" could "benefit local heritage management also by setting an example for the future".[315]

Simultaneously, NAAM and the Monument Bureau DROV had investigated the possibility of turning the small island Xaguis in front of Spanish Water into a conservation area, seeing an opportunity in the fact that Santa Barbara Plantation had handed in their development plans to DROV after some changes to the original plan that had been approved by DROV in the 1990's. NAAM accompanied this strategy with their own proposal to Santa Barbara Plantation to give advise and consultancy to mitigate the impact of the newly planned golf-courses at the site of Spanish Water, stressing that they could work together with Leiden, but preferably by means of a form in which the project would be given to NAAM who would then subsequently ask the expertise of Leiden University for its archaeological research, in order to "give the archaeology, knowledge- and institutional development of our country a serious chance".[316] Such a request was denied by Santa Barbara Plantation, favouring a professional institute over an institute without an archaeologist, and over an institute with, in their opinion, a reputation for potentially disturbing development plans. In addition, there was a feeling by the President of the VIDA Group that he would "rather spend the money on those who actually do the work"[317] – referring to the intention by Santa Barbara Plantation to pay for the archaeological investigations.

By the end of August 2007, a press release was circulated by Santa Barbara Plantation NV in which the archaeological collaboration with Leiden University was announced, stating that it would undertake excavations in collaboration with DROV and NAAM. The response of NAAM and Monument Bureau DROV to Santa Barbara Plantation NV was that such a proposed excavation was premature, since the Monument Bureau had not seen the required legal documents in advance of archaeological valorisation and conduct, that the role of NAAM was not discussed, and that excavation licenses had not been handed out yet – all the while referring to existing heritage policies and laws: "it is the government who assesses the archaeological significance, who decides if there is a threat to archaeological heritage, and subsequently decides how and according to which standards research takes place to safeguard the archaeological remains."[318] Pointing out the fact that in-situ preservation was still the preferred option according to the

[314] Internal correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) (July 2007), Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University; confirmed through an interview with a co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

[315] Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM, DROV and Santa Barbara Plantation NV (August 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[316] Internal correspondence NAAM (August 2007), Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM; subsequently discussed during an interview with the director of NAAM. (Willemstad, July 2010).

[317] President of the VIDA Group (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

[318] Correspondence NAAM to Santa Barbara Plantation (August 2007), Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

Malta Convention, NAAM stressed to Santa Barbara Plantation that heritage policy implementation rested with the government and not with an external party; "it can not be the case that policy relating to our heritage is allocated by an external organisation, no matter how competent".[319]

Correspondence between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation in September 2007 illustrates how Santa Barbara Plantation was suspicious about the involvement of the Monument Bureau DROV, not understanding what the remit of this organisation was on a site that was not a monument, and feeling that their good intentions with regards to archaeology were frustrated by local institutions. Simultaneously, the board of NAAM decided at this time that the director should not longer frustrate the plans of Santa Barbara Plantation, preferring to work together with Leiden in a constructive, albeit cautious, way.[320] In their view, a positioning of NAAM as a professional archaeological institute was no longer tenable in relation to Leiden University, and it decided to publicly support the intentions of a project developer that was willing to invest in archaeological research. Such a move for continued support for the Santa Barbara Project was also supported within DROV itself, where the Head of DROV had made it clear that the Monument Bureau had to continue with the project, and that Santa Barbara Plantation was free to choose with which archaeological operator it wished to work as long as the procedures would follow legalities.[321] The Faculty of Archaeology and Santa Barbara Plantation subsequently agreed to follow the legal and administrative procedures based upon the Dutch implementation of the Malta Convention, as was requested by DROV and NAAM. Such a procedure, which could function as a basis on which to 'decide if the mutual stakes are in tune with each other'[322] could then also be regarded as an informal case-study for the possible implementation of 'Malta' on the island.

The following months saw the preparation by the Faculty of Archaeology of a 'Project Outline' (PvE: Programma van Eisen), a 'Plan of Approach' (PvA: Plan van Aanpak),[323] and a request for an excavation license by DROV. Having secured Santa Barbara Plantation's approval, the documents were sent to DROV in late 2007 for remarks and contributions. These remarks centred around the following points: the island of Xaguis in front of Spanish Water had to be left in situ, remains of other historical periods than that of pre-columbian period had to be documented as well, local amateurs had to be involved, guided tours had to be facilitated, and a public-oriented publication had to delivered as part of the results. After accommodating these changes the documents were approved and a license for Leiden University was given on the 14th of February 2008.

The financial aspects of the project, which had already been discussed much earlier in the process, were now formalised. It was agreed that Santa Barbara Plantation would donate 100,000 euro for archaeological research as a contribution towards mitigating the development impact on the archaeological resource, which would subsequently be matched with the same amount by Leiden University out of their 'Campaign for Leiden' programme. This project had been successfully applied for by the archaeologists of the Faculty of Archaeology on the basis of having secured 'private match funding' for archaeological research, although the original scope and budget of the Campaign for Leiden project, as was discussed with NAAM

---

[319] Correspondence NAAM to Santa Barbara Plantation (August 2007), Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

[320] According to an interview with the former chairman of the Board of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

[321] Former Head of DROV (Willemstad, July 2010); Division Head of the Monuments Bureau DROV (Willemstad, July 2010).

[322] Correspondence Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to DROV (October 2007). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[323] See Willems & Brandt (2004, 214-215) for an extensive description of these terms in the context of the 'Dutch Archaeology Quality Standard' framework.

the previous year, had to be diminished as a result of internal, broader policy processes in Leiden University that saw a general decrease in funds for the programme.

In the beginning of 2008, the Faculty of Archaeology started to prepare the archaeological fieldwork. Although admitting that "their opinions on how things had to proceed apparently differed",[324] the archaeologists still expressed their dedication towards securing local involvement and capacity building, and requested assistance from NAAM to involve the members of the Archaeological Working Group, as well as any interested local students. In addition, the Leiden archaeologists continued to advance their vision that they wanted to work in the spirit of Malta.

Figure 16. Archaeological fieldwork at Santa Barbara Plantation (photograph copyright Ben Bekooij, courtesy Santa Barbara Archaeological Project, Faculty of Archaeology).

From 15 June to 24 August 2008, the first excavation season finally took place. The archaeological work consisted of surveys and excavations undertaken at the Spanish Water site, in collaboration and discussion with Santa Barbara Plantation in advance of its development plans. The research led to a redesign of several parts of the site, and to an extensive archaeological excavation in which over 30 students of Leiden participated. Although NAAM had been unsuccessful in securing an official status to work and oversee the work on behalf of DROV, it was involved in the work as an advisor of the Monument Bureau DROV, now through the position of the newly appointed archaeologist that had started working at NAAM. Together,

[324] Correspondence by the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology (LU) to NAAM (May 2008). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

they overlooked the quality and procedures of the work as outlined in the PvE and PvA. Although not all members of the Archaeological Working Group were completely enthusiastic about the way in which the project had been developed by Leiden in relation to NAAM,[325] some members of the group participated in the work on an occasional basis. In addition, several guided tours were organised on site, with several classes of school children visiting the excavations. Some lectures and publications in local newspapers by the Leiden researchers were also envisaged, leading to a positive news-cycle in local newspapers.

Correspondence between Leiden and NAAM suggests that the collaboration had slightly improved during the aftermath of the first field-season in the second half of 2008. Communications about archaeological dating, analysis and research strategies were discussed and jointly developed, and the Dutch archaeologists expressed an offer of assistance to NAAM by means of student internships that could help with research and management tasks. Still, the proposed arrival of new international staff and experts by Leiden to work on climate-studies and flora and fauna determination led to suspicions by NAAM, internally stating that "the coming of more Dutch <people> is looked at suspiciously by colleagues on Curaçao, and NAAM is there to make sure that clear agreements are in place and that knowledge which is locally produced will not be taken away anymore."[326] The second field-season in early 2009, which consisted of analysis, interpretation and documentation of results as well as a small excavation near Seru Boca, arguably overcame some of these suspicions. Archaeological artefacts and excavation materials were left behind, and reference collections for vegetation reconstruction analysis were given to NAAM. Back home in the Netherlands, the archaeologists of Leiden University continued their analysis and research, with micro-wear analysis on shells, C-14 dating, pottery research and flora and fauna determination. Whilst they were working towards the full excavation report during 2009, the first academic presentations on the research also started to appear at international conferences.

5.3.2 PERCEPTIONS OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE

The Santa Barbara Project had by now left its marks on the institutional networks of Caribbean archaeology. From a Faculty of Archaeology perspective, the project had been successful in scientific and academic terms, but it accepted and regretted that it had not been able to facilitate the envisaged collaboration and capacity building with local counterparts:

> <the project> was successful, in a scientific sense. <…> it brought added value, but unfortunately not one that was always appreciated locally.[327]

> They made our work quite difficult <...> so you loose the incentive, you become less active in trying to find extra funds for capacity building and education and so on.[328]

In the opinion of NAAM and its counterparts, the Santa Barbara Project had been less successful:

---

[325] Interview with two school teachers and vocational archaeologists, members of the AWG (Curaçao, June/July 2010).

[326] Internal correspondence NAAM (December 2008). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

[327] Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

[328] Associate Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, one of the Santa Barbara Project co-directors, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, October 2010).

> I felt excluded when I heard that Leiden walked away with our project <…> I felt cheated, especially after <…> the agreements that we signed with Leiden to collaborate. I wish Leiden would have taken it seriously, the development of local institutional capacity.[329]

> I was disappointed with the fact that they only work with students and international researchers, not with local researchers. <...> Yes, you can join if you want, but it's not real collaboration.[330]

> They asked us to work at Santa Barbara, but they moved past NAAM and our government. My loyalty to the island <...> was the reason that I decided not to participate.[331]

As a pilot-study on the implementation of 'Malta' in the Netherlands Antilles, the Santa Barbara Project also had differing perceptions of success. Whilst there existed a general feeling amongst respondents that the archaeological, scientific work by Leiden was excellent, and whilst everybody, including NAAM and Monument Bureau DROV, highly appreciated the fact that the project developer had paid for archaeological research, it was the collaboration between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation that was criticised as not being sensitive to the needs and wishes of local institutions:

> Foreign archaeologists are of course welcome, but they should always cooperate with local institutions. <Leiden has> fantastic researchers, but the fact that they could operate together with a project developer, without the involvement of NAAM, we thought was not good. It was a warning for us that Malta should be implemented carefully, that we should be careful that we don't loose the control over our own archaeology. However, I see this as problems in the system, I don't think anyone of the individuals or institutions were wrong.[332]

> The initiative <...> by Santa Barbara Plantation was good, but it was kept in a circle, an elitist circle, it doesn't reach our communities like this. <...> they should have included our institutions, and they should have worked with local community members, to increase their historical awareness. Through a local institution, it would undoubtedly have had more impact.[333]

A perception that the local population had not benefitted sufficiently from the project, and that the archaeological research by Leiden had become identified with the private resort of Santa Barbara Plantation, can further be illustrated by the remarks of several community members:

> It's good that the developer paid for the archaeological work. <...> but it also feels like a salve on the wounds, because this development, this economic development, has destroyed a lot of memories and history. <...> it used to be open to us, I used to come there as a child, to the beach. That's not possible anymore.[334]

---

[329] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

[330] Vocational researcher with interest in the archaeology and geology of the Netherlands Antilles (Oranjestad, June 2010).

[331] Vocational archaeologist, member of the AWG (Curaçao, June 2010).

[332] Director of Archaeological Museum Aruba (AMA), Board member of NAAM (Oranjestad, June 2010).

[333] Board member of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

[334] Local community member (Nieuwpoort/Santa Barbara, July 2010). The expression 'salve on the wounds' refers to the Dutch expression 'pleister op de wonde". Translation by the author.

> It's all hidden from us. It's private, just like Santa Barbara Plantation <…> First they stole our land, now they steal our histories.[335]

Santa Barbara Plantation itself, however, expressed their general feelings of success over the project:

> I think it was successful. We wanted to take care of the archaeological and historical values at our resort, and we did. There was no real delay in our development, and we got some nice PR out of it, and perhaps some heritage trails for our visitors and a small exhibition.[336]

The impact of the Santa Barbara Project on the network and development of heritage initiatives in the Netherlands Antilles further became apparent in the aftermath of the second field-season. When NAAM organised its second meeting on the possible implementation of Malta archaeology in the Antilles in March 2009, archaeologists from Leiden were not invited. Likewise, archaeologists from Leiden University organised a meeting in October 2009 in The Hague where representatives of the Dutch government and heritage organisations discussed the coming of Malta to the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. Although representatives of SIMARC, BONAI and SECAR were present, representatives of NAAM were absent at the meeting.

In advance of the 'coming of Malta', NAAM had started to strengthen its ties with the other islands in the former Netherlands Antilles. Around the beginning of 2010, 'protocols of collaboration' were signed between NAAM and the local governments of Bonaire and Saba. In these protocols, it was explicitly mentioned that the parties wanted to "reduce the dependency and enlarge the tenability with regards to external advice in the field of culture and heritage" and to "increase inter-island forms of collaboration in Caribbean perspective".[337]

Despite feelings of slight suspicion by archaeologists on Bonaire, Sint Maarten and Sint Eustatius (which were shared by those of Leiden) about the way in which a Curaçao based organisation tried to establish links to the archaeology of the other islands, the strategy by NAAM seemed to have paid off. In April 2010, OCW offered the final contract for the BES-report (see section 5.2.3) to the 'Project Workgroup Implementation of the Malta Treaty on the BES island', which was coordinated by NAAM and in which representatives of all the islands were present.[338] During a meeting of this workgroup (attached as an appendix to the draft report),[339] members of the working group stated that "small-scale societies should be careful when inviting outsiders to come in and do research",[340] and that "research performed by outsiders is often motivated by science/own knowledge, whereas proper dissemination and education/awareness about collective memory ought to be more important considerations for the islands".[341] Subsequently, it was

---

[335] Former local school teacher (Montaña Rey, July 2010).

[336] Co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

[337] See 'Collaboration Protocol between Foundation NAAM and the island Bonaire, 11 December 2009', Article 2 (Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM).

[338] For the final report, see Witteveen & Kraan 2012.

[339] Draft report 'Verkenning van de Implementatie van het Verdrag van Malta op de eilanden van Caribisch Nederland, Bonaire, St. Eustatius en Saba' (NAAM 2010). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

[340] Draft report 'Verkenning van de Implementatie van het Verdrag van Malta op de eilanden van Caribisch Nederland, Bonaire, St. Eustatius en Saba' (NAAM 2010, 3). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

[341] Draft report 'Verkenning van de Implementatie van het Verdrag van Malta op de eilanden van Caribisch Nederland, Bonaire, St. Eustatius en Saba' (NAAM 2010, 3-4). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

recommended that every island should have an archaeologist, and that heritage policies and implementation should be accompanied by a strong inter-regional advisory body for local governments.

However, the state of archaeology on the islands remained uncertain during my period of research. As of early 2011, the director of NAAM had for example been made redundant, whilst the position of the archaeologist at NAAM as an island archaeologist of Curaçao had also become uncertain. Simultaneously, the strengthening of Leiden University with local counterparts continued. In January 2011, memorandums of understanding were signed by the Faculty of Archaeology, SECAR and SIMARC on the island of Saba, in order to "guarantee quality research, regional collaboration and youth development", in advance of the changing heritage legislation.[342] Subsequently, this had led to plans being developed on Sint Eustatius for a joint archaeological project in advance of a large development scheme.

5.4 THE AUTHORISED ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

5.4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section will investigate the main values and discourses of the archaeological actors in the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project. In line with the analysis given in chapter 4, a dominating discourse on archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration will be identified which prioritises scientific and archaeological values over others. As in section 4.4, I will generalise the characterisation of this discourse, for practical matters, as the 'Authorised Archaeological Discourse' (AAD).

Before I will delve into the discursive practices and consequences of archaeological research projects abroad, I wish to illustrate once again the expressed intentions of the Leiden researchers behind undertaking such projects in the Caribbean. When looking at the track-record of the research projects by the Faculty in the Caribbean, and when discussing the intentions with the individual researchers, it is clear that a clear understanding and willingness exists about the importance of integrating archaeological projects firmly in the social context. As stressed during the inaugural address by the professor in Caribbean archaeology, it is the intention by the Caribbean Research Group to "increase our international collaboration in the area and to strive together with local institutions and museums after mutual care for the management of cultural heritage, promote its public-oriented presentation and to effect the training of local staff" (Hofman 2008, 13).

According to several students, foreign colleagues and external experts, as well as reflected in research seminars and lectures given in Leiden University, the Caribbean Research Group has always promoted capacity building elements, educational programs, heritage management issues and participatory projects with local and indigenous communities and museums, such as in former research projects in St Lucia, Saba and St Vincent. The issue here at stake, is why the approach and this set of 'good intentions' (cf La Salle 2010) did not succeed as planned in Curaçao, and how archaeological policies and practices could contribute to 'unintended consequences' in the sense of relatively 'closed networks' and 'exclusionary mechanisms' (cf Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming). As such, I believe that some of the problems and 'failures' (as perceived by local counterparts of the project), should not be sought in these intentions – rather, I believe they are to be found in the discursive practices and processes of policy negotiation within

[342] This was mentioned in the newspaper article 'Three institutions continue archaeological cooperation' from the Daily Herald in Saba (January 2011), available at http://www.thedailyherald.com/ [Accessed 17 February 2011].

the institutional, political and funding frameworks of archaeology. I will come back to these issues throughout this chapter.

5.4.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE AS A FRAGILE SCIENTIFIC RESOURCE UNDER THREAT

When looking at the values and discourses of Dutch archaeological actors, institutions and policies, one can distil some clear story-lines on the way in which 'archaeological heritage' is defined and approached. Primarily, sites with material remains of the past are regarded as a 'fragile' and 'non-renewable' resource under threat from destruction (cf Holtorf 2002). It is in line with this view, that the concept of 'heritage' is discursively constructed in the AAD; material remains of the past are regarded as 'archaeological heritage', and in turn, 'heritage' is thereby thought of to be constituted of material manifestations of the past. Specifically, heritage is being conceived of as material manifestations of the past, as artefacts and material that should be preserved for the scientific 'data' that it can yield for 'future generations' by means of developing meaningful publications on 'past societies' that are perceived of as being of 'universal' value (cf Smith 2006).

Such a story-line on the scientific appropriation and use of heritage is for instance clearly illustrated within the Malta Convention (cf Duineveld 2006; Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming). Article 1 'The definition of archaeological heritage' states that archaeological heritage is an "instrument for historical and scientific study", where "archaeological heritage shall include structures, constructions, groups of buildings, developed sites, moveable objects, monuments of other kinds as well as their context, whether situated on land or under water" (Council of Europe 1992, article 1). Although the article also mentions archaeological heritage as "a source of the European collective memory", it mainly approaches heritage in its material form, whilst attention to incorporating immaterial, intangible forms of heritage are topics that it considers to be dealt with in other conventions and charters. In addition, archaeological heritage in the Malta Convention is regarded as a fragile resource under threat (Preamble) that needs to be protected and rescued in order to "preserve the archaeological heritage and guarantee the scientific significance of archaeological research work" (Council of Europe 1992, article 3).

This story-line on heritage as a source of scientific data under threat that needs to be preserved is not only advanced by Leiden archaeologists in the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project when supporting the adoption of 'Malta' for the Antilles, but also in a more explicit sense when discussing the social value of archaeology in the region, and when referring to a 'fragile soil archive': "the source of knowledge about the indigenous populations of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba is threatened by natural factors and human activity" (Hofman & Hoogland 2007, 9).

As such, sites with material remains of the past are mainly considered as a 'source of knowledge' under threat that has the potential to yield research benefits by constructing archaeological interpretations of the past. The value of this constructed past, is then often seen in the global, universal benefit that it yields – something also reflected in the Malta Convention when it talks about the 'history of mankind' (Council of Europe 1992). A supporting story-line that advocates that archaeological pasts should be interpreted in a regional or global perspective is also mirrored in the aims of the Leiden Caribbean Research Group. These try to "demystify popular understandings of the Indian past" [343] and challenge island-centric identity perceptions that are currently symptomatic for the islands, where populations share an island-centric view derived from history books and research frameworks that were written and undertaken by former French,

[343] Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, pers. comm. during a radio interview for the Teleac program Hoe?Zo!, 24 February 2010. Available at http://www.teleac.nl/radio/1683209/home/item/2798729/graven-in-het-caribisch-gebied/ [Accessed 11 March 2010].

English, Spanish and Dutch colonial powers (Hofman 2008). The proposed research is therefore international, interdisciplinary, and tries to bring a Caribbean-wide and global approach to the interpretation of archaeology. Interestingly, a same kind of approach is brought forward and advocated for the field of heritage management, calling for the principles of Malta to be implemented across the Caribbean in order to safeguard the remains of a shared and 'threatened Antillean heritage' (ibid).

5.4.3 THE PRIMACY OF SCIENCE AND EXCAVATION

Another story-line within the AAD places emphasis upon scientific rigour in archaeology, as well as upon the importance of archaeological excavation. A good example to start with, is again the Malta Convention, which states not only that archaeological heritage is an "instrument for historical and scientific study", but also that "excavations or discoveries and other methods of research into mankind and the related environment are the main sources of information" (Council of Europe 1992, article 1). Interestingly, the story-line that excavation is a primary source of knowledge extraction goes hand in hand in the same Malta Convention with the call for 'in-situ' preservation, one of its core principles (see especially articles 2, 3 and 4). In effect, these articles call for a priority in terms of safeguarding archaeological sites in-situ over excavation. However, many archaeologists and members of the public that were interviewed identify excavations as the primary activity of archaeologists (cf Schücker forthcoming), whilst the idea of in-situ preservation was often overlooked or misunderstood when discussing the tasks of archaeologists: "I have pointed them towards these old undisturbed sites, but they don't excavate them. I don't understand, I thought archaeologists wanted to do research".[344]

When discussing the discursive practices of archaeology, Smith (2004) illustrates how within the archaeological discipline, the concept of 'archaeological science' privileges scientific rigour, which in turn privileges practices such as 'excavation'. She goes on to explain how this privileged position of excavation is then subsequently reflected and reconstructed in the discourse of the discipline (ibid., 64). Similarly, I will argue that the emphasis on 'archaeological science' and the privileged position of excavation practice in the AAD and the archaeological discipline often comes down to a situation whereby 'rescue excavation' is preferred in practice over 'in situ' preservation. Such an idea is illustrated by the way in which archaeologists themselves talked about the Malta Convention, and by the way in which archaeologists often prioritised the 'polluter-pay' principle of the Malta Convention over other articles, when summarising the Malta Convention. Subsequently, the emphasis on the 'polluter-pay' principle is often mentioned in the context of the Malta Convention as a means of finding funding for archaeological research, and thereby, archaeological excavations.

During an internal research day at the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, it was for instance mentioned that the 'changing laws' in the Caribbean could lead to 'new funding opportunities', which in turn could lead to 'new research opportunities''.[345] Although definitely not incorrect, it is interesting to see how such a notion has been taken over by the media in the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles. For example, an article in the Dutch magazine 'Elsevier' mentioned that if Dutch Malta legislation would be implemented in the Netherlands Antilles, "that <law> would obligate project developers to take archaeology into account and to pay for research" (Toebosh 2008a, 73). That the prioritisation of the polluter-pay principle as a research funding opportunity over other articles is not uncommon with academic archaeologists in general, is also clearly reflected by remarks of the former Chief Inspector for Archaeology at the Dutch Heritage Inspectorate; "the fact that Malta is about in-situ

[344] Vocational researcher with interest in the archaeology and geology of Aruba (Oranjestad, June 2010).

[345] Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, 11 October 2010).

preservation and public outreach, is not well known with academics. They tend to just see it as a huge pot of money".[346]

5.4.4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE AS A PROFESSIONAL CONCERN OF THE STATE

Another story-line of the AAD comprises the idea that the management and responsibility of archaeological heritage is foremost a concern of the state, and that archaeological researchers are best suited to act 'professionally' on its behalf – as professionals that have the knowledge to decide upon the fate of specific archaeological remains and periods, and the 'expertise' to excavate and interpret the archaeological remains according to high research and 'ethical' standards (cf Meskell & Pels 2005a; Holtorf 2005; Smith 2004; 2006). This is because story-lines of the AAD primarily value 'archaeological heritage' as a source of scientific data, but also because the 'past' is often used as a distant, vague rhetorical concept that needs 'expertise' in order to 'unlock' its true meaning (Smith 2006, 29).

The way in which the Malta Convention for example is set up implies that heritage concerns are a matter of the state – or more specifically, in the case of it being a European treaty, a responsibility of the collection of European states. In addition, it mentions the exchange of 'expertise' and 'experts' and talks about 'professional scientific purposes'. Linked to this is the way in which the Malta Convention has been implemented throughout Europe, whereby specific emphasis is placed in national adaptations that call for expertise and professionalism, reflected for instance in quality standards and registers of 'professional' archaeologists (cf Willems & Van den Dries 2007).

The identification of expert archaeologists working on behalf of the state to safeguard and research the archaeological heritage, was also illustrated by some of the remarks by individual archaeologists working in the Caribbean when discussing the remit of other archaeologists in terms of dealing with archaeology and heritage management issues on the islands. In their view, archaeologists who were not directly working for local governments or who were not experienced with the specific archaeology of certain islands in the Caribbean should not be allowed to decide upon heritage matters. In line with this story-line is the focus on 'professionalism'. Interestingly, such a notion also makes it feasible to work on behalf of landowners and developers when it provides opportunities for funding and research. This is because archaeology, as a result of the Malta Convention, has become confronted with dealing with the development and commercial sector, where client relationships call for professionalism when dealing with the impact of archaeology. As was remarked by an employee of Santa Barbara Plantation NV; "we want professionals, real scientists. Not some local organisation without an archaeologist."[347]

The emphasis on archaeological expertise, professionalism and the 'top-down' approach that favours regional and global perspectives to archaeology, in combination favours the access and perceived ownership of archaeological experts. In addition, notions such as 'universal value', or 'shared responsibility' for instance, however well meant, often problematize the local (cf Lafrenz Samuels 2010), thereby calling for more regional and top-down approaches to problems – and, often unintentionally, calling for increased access to archaeology from an academic, global scale. As will be discussed below, such values, story-lines and discourses can be perceived by local partners as a challenge to local demands for ownership, local identity and empowerment over sites with material remains of the past.

---

[346] Former Chief Inspector for Archaeology at the Dutch Heritage Inspectorate, current Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

[347] Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010.

5.4.5 PARTICIPATION AND EDUCATION AS A MEANS TO ADVANCE RESEARCH AND PROTECTION

Finally, I wish to focus on the story-line within the AAD that calls for the creation of public benefit through advancing conservation, presentation, education and tourism development of a site. Such a story-line is for example reflected in the intentions and aims of the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project, of the Campaign for Leiden, as well in the individual discourses of the archaeologists. As I illustrated in my case study on Jordan (see section 4.4), this story-line of the AAD was thereby characterised by actors explicitly mentioning that such socio-economic, educational and tourism values should be dealt with *after* archaeological research had taken place, and then often with a view that the primary reason for involvement, education and awareness of local communities should be seen in the protection of the archaeological record. Although an explicit mentioning of public awareness and benefit as a *final* element of archaeological research projects is not present in the discursive story-lines of the Santa Barbara Project (rather, on the contrary), the Campaign for Leiden project proposal does illustrate how public participation and outreach is regarded as a way in which to develop support for heritage research: "The public <-oriented> presentations and publications will be done at first as to subsequently come to more and focused further research that takes root in the Antillean and Aruban community."[348] In this respect, it has been mentioned that values that call for social change and public participation are often "obscured by the self-referential tendencies of the discourse" (Smith 2006, 16). As such, I will argue in the coming sections how these discursive story-lines within the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project still favoured an idea of educational and collaboration values as elements that could only be dealt with when integrated in a 'linear' approach (cf Williams & van der Linde 2006), that is, under circumstances that do not obstruct scientific and archaeological values of the process – which, in practice, meant that public values and participation opportunities were nonetheless assessed in terms of their capacity to support the primacy of research, and were (often unintentionally) postponed to the future.

5.5 PROJECT POLICY NEGOTIATIONS AND THE TRANSLATION OF VALUES

5.5.1 ALTERNATIVE VALUES AND DISCOURSES

This section will explore in more detail how the Dutch archaeological actors negotiated the above-mentioned values and discourses of the project policies in relation to those of local institutional counterparts, government bodies, and commercial parties. Before doing so, I will start by looking in more detail at the values and discourses used by NAAM with respect to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration.

NAAM advances a different emphasis of values in relation to sites with material remains of the past, one that places the scientific value as secondary to community, identity and socio-economic values. First of all, NAAM advocates a discursive story-line that regards sites with material remains of the past as having a prime function to play in the fostering of identity formation on both an island as well as a pan-Caribbean level, and in the legitimisation and nation-building of the islands as opposed to former, European and

[348] Taken from the project summary description of 'Antilliaans en Arubaans Erfgoed: 4000 jaar bewoningsgeschiedenis in beeld', available at the 'Campaign for Leiden' website of Leiden University at www.campagnevoorleiden.leidenuniv.nl [Accessed 15 April 2010] (Translation by author). A more extensive description of the project outline can be found in the unpublished project policy proposal 'Antilliaans en Arubaans erfgoed: 4000 jaar bewoningsgeschiedenis in beeld' (2006), available at the Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

Western influences. Secondly, as clearly stated in the vision statement of NAAM, an idea of sites with material remains of the past as reflecting specifically intangible aspects is brought forward, which is thought to include memories, dance, language and spiritual values (NAAM 2009, 25-26). Finally, it is stressed that material remains of the past can play an important socio-economic role, especially in light of the increasing touristic developments on the islands.

In effect, the AAD is in sharp contrast with such a view that the value of sites with material remains of the past lies primarily in more contemporary identifications and uses. For NAAM, material remains are not 'scientific data', but rather someone's 'heritage', that is, a manifestation of people's history, identity, memory or commemoration. Interestingly, such a discourse also uses the concept of 'heritage', but the perception, approach and attributed values are different – whilst the AAD prioritises the archaeological and scientific values of heritage sites, the discourse by NAAM prioritises the identity, local, educational, and socio-economic values of such places.

Although the scientific value of 'heritage' is also mentioned as one of the core tasks of NAAM, it should be noted that this is not seen as an end itself, but rather as a means to an end – that is, of identity and nation formation:

> heritage can be found in the landscape, housing; the development of the city; family relationships <...> It manifests itself in music, knowledge and spiritual traditions of people <…> The tangible (material) and living (intangible) cultural heritage that we share together, is not only a source of knowledge and experience but also a cultural and geographical landmark for who and where we are <...> Cultural heritage is an important source of identity and nation building, but also for sustainable economic development. <...> Cultural heritage institutions are powerful tools for identity and autonomy because they not only preserve and enrich the memory of a people <...>, but also confirm its legitimacy. (NAAM 2009, 25-26)

In contrast with the AAD, the director of NAAM placed less emphasis on the idea of material remains of the past as a 'fragile research record' and of the primacy of academic, professional expertise: "I see artefacts as the materialisation of memories, they see it purely as data."[349] Another good example of this alternative discourse and value-attribution to heritage, is the fact that the 'M' of the abbreviation NAAM was changed, in 1998, from 'Museum' to 'Memory Management': "Because <our task> is wider than <...> traditional museum tasks and because it also contributes to the promotion of historical awareness, identity and enriching the collective memory of people, the M of Memory is chosen, Memory Management" (NAAM 2009, 25).

Illustrating the idea of 'Memory Management' further, the director of NAAM explained that "memory management is about the fact that on the Antilles, we have a fragmented memory. We want to preserve and enrich the memoria of the people <…> it's about spirituality, songs, language, <...> habits."[350] During my research, the website of NAAM showed a similar approach towards heritage as a pathway to a self-developed identity formation;

[349] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

[350] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

> Heritage is one of the ways in which a nation slowly constructs for itself a sort of collective social memory <…> This holds even more for Caribbean countries like Curacao, with a long history of colonisation, enslavement and migration.[351]

As we have seen above, the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project from the Dutch end, also placed emphasis on the need of advancing a pan-Caribbean perspective towards the interpretation of archaeological heritage. The difference however, lies in the fact that the Leiden researchers mainly focused on challenging popular myths and island-centric interpretations and on bringing forward scientifically grounded approaches, and on strengthening the idea of a shared, connected Indian past on the islands. Although the Leiden archaeologists explicitly recognised that the identification with the Indian past differed greatly from island to island,[352] it is precisely the scientific focus on the Indian past that differs with the idea by NAAM of strengthening a pan-Caribbean identity on Curaçao – for NAAM, the 'indigenousness' of identity formation lies in a more recent, 'afro-Curaçaoan' past:

> I think we should focus on the continuity of histories and the lives of people that lived here. <…> The contact period is important, and the afro-Curaçaoan history, such as slave burials, the Kunuku culture, and the continuity of these towards the present. <…> the Indian period is interesting, but it should not be a priority for public archaeology.[353]

Despite these different heritage values and discourses, both Leiden and NAAM stressed the importance of regional collaboration in heritage. However the difference, again, lies in the approach and the actors that are envisaged to come into play into such a collaboration. Whilst the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project as developed by Leiden calls for a global, scientific approach towards networks in both the past and the present that leaves room for the position of archaeological experts, NAAM rather advocated a story-line that calls for a 'bottom-up' approach that is based upon personal, traditional and local ways of interaction;

> I think we shouldn't approach history as something that is to be captured and managed in terms of networks, as Leiden does, it is too western. <…> I believe it should be more about something that they call here in Papiamentu *ban topa*, which means something like to meet each other, let's see each other.[354]

This difference in values and discourses is also reflected in the perception by the director of NAAM on the institutional aims and frameworks of both organisations – whilst Leiden favours an approach that prioritises the scientific and archaeological values in order to come to a universal, shared knowledge of cultural heritage, NAAM rather calls for the building of a cultural capital that is self-owned, and self-developed: "My biggest problem with the Santa Barbara project, and with Leiden in general, is the fact that there is a clash of institutional aims. We want to build up local capacity. They want to do research".[355]

---

[351] Available at http://www.naam.an/index.php?topic=cultural_heritage [Accessed 2 November 2010].

[352] Pers. comm. during a radio interview for the Teleac program 'Hoe?Zo!', 24 February 2010. Available at http://www.teleac.nl/radio/1683209/home/item/2798729/graven-in-het-caribisch-gebied/ [Accessed 11 March 2010].

[353] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

[354] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

[355] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

The discourse used by NAAM, however, is more complex. Just as the AAD includes story-lines that call for the incorporation of social values such as public outreach, capacity building and the involvement of local organisations, so does NAAM use story-lines of the AAD in its alternative discourse on heritage. The increasing integration with a discourse that resembles story-lines of the AAD is, firstly, a result of the fact that 'Malta' was brought to the Caribbean through international spheres of influence, and in particular by the Dutch interest in forwarding such laws on the BES-islands. Secondly, the move was mirrored within the island governmental policies, which were based upon the previous 'Monument-laws' of the Netherlands, where the Dutch ratification of Malta was subsequently also taken over by the government of the Netherlands Antilles. Finally, as I will argue below, I believe that another reason existed behind incorporating a move towards AAD story-lines and 'Malta' more generally, and that this should be sought within the need to (re-)gain access and decision-power over the management and research of archaeological sites on Curaçao and the other islands.

For NAAM, the benefits of a governmental responsibility of heritage that is built upon the elements of Malta archaeology, serves not a primary role towards science, but rather one of identity and self-development. As such, the way in which 'Malta' is used by NAAM is different, in the sense that it tries to place it within a 'bottom-up' approach and within a wider framework of values towards archaeological heritage. The newly appointed archaeologist of the Netherlands Antilles, stationed at NAAM, for example emphasised different articles and aspects of the Malta Convention during the second NAAM seminar in 2009 than those previously mentioned as being part of the AAD. Apart from stressing the polluter-pay principle, the archaeologist also stressed the need for public communication, international collaboration, and the fact that value-assessments needed to be made in advance of development. A clear idea on the type of values that needed to be addressed in such an assessment, can be seen by the emphasis that was placed on the inclusion of social and economic values of heritage during the presentation of the *Mapa Kultural Historiko Korsou* on the 30th of Augustus 2007.[356] Indeed, this can be viewed as a challenge to the scientific values that are normally rehearsed as a result of the self-referential system of the expert discourse in Malta Archaeology in the Netherlands (cf Duineveld 2006; Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming). In addition, NAAM placed much more emphasis on 'in-situ' preservation as opposed to the need for excavation, when discussing the plans for the site of Spanish Water: "in-situ has our preference over excavation, unless it is important for us, for our island, for our history".[357]

However, the marriage between the alternative heritage discourse of NAAM with an emphasis on Malta archaeology was an uneasy one. According to Smith (2006, 82), competing, alternative discourses on heritage (such as those dealing with memory, place and dissonance) in the end come together in the 'act of heritage' – in doing, celebrating heritage (or arguably, in relation to the case study of Curaçao, in the act of the above mentioned *ban topa)*, as well as in negotiating and understanding the dissonance, or competing values, of heritage. Accordingly, such an idea of 'heritage' can not be 'managed' in the western, top-down and technical approach favoured by the AAD, since it reduces dissonance and issues arising over memory, place and identity as site-specific problems (ibid). This 'clash of discourses', or the clash between 'memory' and 'management', is however already made explicit through the name of NAAM itself, which refers specifically to 'Memory Management'.

---

[356] See the online newspaper article 'Presentatie digitale Cultuur Historische Kaart Curaçao bij NAAM' at Caribseek Caribbean News (5 September 2007), available at http://news.caribseek.com/ Curacao/article_55449.shtml [Accessed 10 June 2010].

[357] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

The discourse used by NAAM with regards to memory, place and intangible heritage, often sits side by side with indigenous approaches that challenge the idea of a state-owned, governmentally controlled heritage and the way in such a concept of heritage has been used to exclude minorities. The wish by NAAM to gain governmental status from DROV in its negotiations with Leiden University (see above), and the use of governmental policies as to secure access to the archaeology of the Santa Barbara Plantation, therefore sits potentially uneasy with its own discourse. The call for Malta archaeology and the bid to get NAAM recognised as a governmental organisation, was however necessary in order to gain access and power within a system that was dominated by institutions, organisations and policies in which the AAD had become embedded, and which in the Netherlands itself, has been argued to form a closed policy network that excludes non-professional and non-governmental 'amateurs' (Duineveld 2006). The need for NAAM to get an archaeologist appointed was for example also necessary, as to secure a say over the management and access over the archaeological resources on the island and in the 'professional' negotiations with the developers on the island.

The call by NAAM for Malta archaeology, and the resulting challenge that this brought to its own discourse of local, alternative heritage making, can also be distilled in the way in which the emphasis within the opening statements of the two seminars of NAAM changed over the course of the years. Whilst the opening statements of the 2005 seminar 'Legislation cultural heritage in the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba' mentioned explicitly that heritage preservation and management should move away from a sole focus on 'physical monuments and sites' as to include also 'living heritage' (Gomez 2005, 2), a seminar four years later showed that the legislation in terms of intangible heritage was not given any attention yet (see Witteveen *et al*. 2009). Reflecting this, the emphasis in the opening speech by a government official was now stressing another important relationship – that between heritage protection and economic development schemes.

5.5.2 POLICY NEGOTIATIONS AND THE TRANSLATION OF VALUES

Now that I have looked at the alternative values and discourses of NAAM, and its complex integration with the AAD, I will continue to focus upon the way in which the Santa Barbara Project is developed through policy negotiations and translation of the Dutch archaeologists' discourses and values in relation to those of other stakeholders in the social context. The concept of 'translation' will be rehearsed here as a fundamental notion that refers to a process of interpretation by actors of one set of values into another set of values that fit the policy discourses, story-lines and motivations of other stakeholders, organisations and actors (cf Mosse 2005, 9; 2004; Latour 1996, 86; Lewis & Mosse 2006). We will see how the Santa Barbara Project got 'stronger' when more stakeholders could align themselves to the project through successful translation, and how the scientific and archaeological values of archaeologists worked seamlessly with the values of the project developer through shared story-lines, and how through this, the dominating values behind the AAD were constantly reproduced and reflected in discursive practices.

During the years 2004-2007, the collaboration between Leiden and NAAM had been developing on the basis of discussions, correspondence and upon the documents surrounding the creation of a position of a Professor of Caribbean Archaeology in Leiden (see section 5.3). During this period, both partners agreed to develop a partnership, because both of them saw their values reflected in the discourse and story-lines used. Both of the partners agreed that the archaeological 'heritage' of Curaçao and the Netherlands Antilles was under threat, and both agreed that institutional capacity could be strengthened by a collaboration in research and management, and that a Malta-like system in the Netherlands Antilles would provide a good solution to protect and research archaeological heritage. NAAM could easily translate these story-lines into their institutional aims for fostering the identity, educational and community values which it ascribed to a

definition of 'archaeological heritage'. In addition, NAAM saw the proposed collaboration as an opportunity for creating economic benefits for its own institution, for increasing capacity, and for managing heritage sites in a sense that would foster socio-economic benefits for local communities – all through having a strong scientific partner to work with in advance of developments such as those at Santa Barbara. Likewise, Leiden could translate the proposed collaboration into scientific and archaeological values for research, student and staff exchange programs, and into economic values in the sense of a 'Malta archaeology' that would open up third-stream funding opportunities – all values that were embedded in the institutional and funding frameworks of Leiden University, and in the project policies of the 'Campaign for Leiden'.

However, at the core of these agreements, very different ideas existed on what exactly 'a threat to archaeological heritage' entailed. Firstly, NAAM saw this threat in the form of loosing immaterial memories and opportunities for identity and capacity building on the local and island level, and Leiden in the form of losing a material scientific resource that could provide a global, scientific interpretation of a pan-Caribbean past as to challenge island-centric views on pre-columbian history. Secondly, the ideas of how to approach 'institutional capacity building', and of what such a notion actually entails, also differed greatly – best summarised as a 'bottom-up' versus a 'top-down' approach (see above). However, none of these underlying differences were made explicit in the representation of the proposed collaboration at this phase – the use of general, rather vague concepts such as 'capacity building' and 'collaboration' as well as the overlap of each others discourses through shared story-lines (although with a different prioritisation of values) allowed for the establishment of a partnership – each partner successfully translating their values into those of their organisations, supporters and stakeholders.

The policy negotiations between NAAM and Santa Barbara Plantation during the first encounters in 2005 were less successful. After the short value-assessment by the Archaeological Working Group in 2005, NAAM wrote a letter to Santa Barbara Plantation with the suggestion to preserve the site of Spanish Water through means of an archaeological 'park' that could be visited by (local) tourists (see above). NAAM referred to an article and news-paper coverage in which commitments by Santa Barbara Plantation were mentioned after the archaeological work conducted at Santa Barbara in the early 1990's, as to preserve the site and to establish a local museum (Amigoe 1992; Haviser 1998). As such, NAAM advanced the idea of 'in-situ' preservation – in line with their perceptions of the coming Malta Convention, but also related to the fact that NAAM did not have an archaeologist.[358]

Such an idea, however, could not be translated by Santa Barbara Plantation into its own values and motivations. For example, the 'in-situ idea' by NAAM was for Santa Barbara Plantation not an option, since it perceived this as a means by NAAM to secure future access to the site for their own research purposes, and as a means to hinder development through wanting to develop the site as an official monument down the line.[359] As such, Santa Barbara Plantation had come to see the previous preservation efforts and archaeological interventions at the site of Spanish Water – which it had funded on the agreement that several parts could be destroyed after archaeological work – as a means to guarantee the access of future archaeologists. Indeed, in the article that accompanied the proposal of NAAM it was mentioned that the in-situ approach of the 1990's functioned as a way to "preserve a part of the site for tomorrow's scientists" (Haviser 1998, 9). Related to this, was a strong perception by individual actors of Santa Barbara Plantation that archaeology mainly constitutes 'science' and 'excavation', and that it should be undertaken for the benefit of writing universal valuable histories; "developers can give you guys an

[358] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

[359] Co-Director of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara, June 2010).

opportunity. We have land, money, manpower, so you can research and excavate, and educate the world with historic timelines."[360]

The emphasis by Santa Barbara Plantation on the scientific and archaeological values of material remains of the past as well as the benefit of preserving such resources for future generations (of archaeologists) is a typical story-line of the AAD. A related story-line, fuelled by previous experiences of Santa Barbara Plantation personnel who had worked with universities around the world in archaeological rescue excavations, was the idea that archaeological work had to be undertaken by 'professionals', and by experts:

> from our experiences in the golf industry, we know that archaeology has to be dealt with professionally. But this takes the willingness of archaeologists to be team-players, instead of being conflictive. <…> I don't like comments such as 'we don't know what it is, but it's important and you can't touch it'. What we needed is to know where the archaeology was, so we could work around it and be flexible."[361]

The fact that NAAM did not have an archaeologist at that time – not helped by the fact that the vocational Archaeological Working Group visited the site in company of friends and family members – lead to the perception that NAAM was not a 'professional party' to engage with. Crucially**,** Santa Barbara Plantation had come to distrust the intentions of NAAM, due to its reputation as an activist force that wanted to obstruct development, sometimes by turning sites into monuments, sometimes by 'making troubles' after the work had started.[362] Interestingly, I came across similar statements about NAAM and the Monuments Bureau of DROV during my interviews with others working in the tourism-development industry in the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba:

> They don't tell us anything, they wait until we start, and then they come and try to get us. Why should <they> be allowed to stop a two hundred million project, just so they can look at a few piles of shells for their own research? [363]

The emphasis by NAAM on in-situ preservation, a park for local inhabitants and tourists, and 'institutional collaboration' therefore conflicted with the values of Santa Barbara Plantation, that forwarded the idea of excavation, professionalism, establishing universal pasts for tourists, and that had no willingness to include local counterparts out of distrust over the sabotage of development work. Underlying this, was the fact that Santa Barbara Plantation wanted to continue with the development of golf-courses – although there was willingness to mitigate some parts of the site through re-landscaping, a complete idea of a preserved park with local access was one bridge too far, especially in view of the fact that legally, Santa Barbara Plantation had already gained a license for developing the site.[364]

Although Santa Barbara Plantation employees mentioned that "legally, we could have taken the bad PR and destroy it",[365] and although negative media coverage was not considered an issue since "people in the

---

[360] Santa Barbara Plantation NV employee (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

[361] Santa Barbara Plantation NV employee (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

[362] According to the co-director and several employees of Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

[363] Private consultant for the tourism-development industry in the Netherlands Antilles (Willemstad, July 2010).

[364] The fact that the director of NAAM in later correspondence stressed that the idea of a park should be regarded as an interpretive archaeological site and "not as a recreational park area" did not change this the slightest. Correspondence NAAM to DROV (October 2006). Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM.

[365] Santa Barbara Plantation NV employee (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

island here don't care about history",[366] Santa Barbara Plantation opted in the end for a solution in which the archaeological values would be mitigated and hindrance to the development would be minimised.

Figure 17. Santa Barbara golf course near the site of Spanish Water, with the old plantation house located at the back (photograph by author, 2010).

Interestingly, the President of the VIDA Group, in charge of the overall planning decisions at Santa Barbara Plantation, declared that such a decision came primarily out of an automatism from working in the USA where similar policies to Malta were in force.[367] Here, he had come to realise that dealing professionally and early on with archaeological values often provided added benefit to a development project; "incorporating constraints could lead to happier residents and more valuable properties".[368] In this respect, Hyatt Regency (which had recently started to operate its services on the south-western part of the Santa Barbara area), had already come to regard archaeology as an added tourism amenity. As such, Santa Barbara Plantation supported ascribing scientific and archaeological values to the site because, when taken

[366] President of the VIDA Group (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

[367] The fact that US project developers had automatically reserved funds for heritage mitigation because of previous experiences with governmental policies in the USA, has also been described in a research on the possible implementation of the Malta Convention on the BES islands by the Centre for International Heritage Activities (De Groot 2009, 16).

[368] President of the VIDA Group (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

care of 'professionally', these could lead to additional touristic and economic values for the project as a whole, and to avoiding delays in its development. A collaboration with an international university that would deal with local heritage institutions on their behalf, and that would mitigate the archaeological values professionally through excavation and knowledge production, would in their view easier lead to economic benefits and to political support at the highest levels of DROV, than having to work with a local institution that was not a governmental representative and that wanted to gain access to the site by obstructing development through means of establishing an archaeological park.

When, in early 2007, Santa Barbara Plantation requested advise from the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, a process was started that rapidly saw the successful translation of the values and motivations by both partners, and whereby a partnership was established on the basis of a strong discourse-coalition – despite the fact that both partners ascribed different values to the project. The story-line that was (re-) produced mostly within the Santa Barbara Project project policies, and that allowed for the most fruitful translation of values of Leiden University and Santa Barbara, was one of close cooperation between developer and professional archaeologists that allowed for the successful rescuing of threatened archaeological remains by means of excavations and knowledge production about the past, and, by doing so, for fostering educational and tourism benefits for the general public.

The request by Santa Barbara Plantation for mitigating archaeological values through professional experts, was a close resemblance to the story-lines of the AAD used by archaeologists of Leiden University. Replying that the Faculty of Archaeology had experience in professional development archaeology in a Malta context, the prospect of an archaeological project at Santa Barbara lead to as easy translation in terms of the policy goals and institutional motivations of Leiden University. The 'rescue' project at Santa Barbara fitted not only the intentions for mitigating impacts on the archaeological resource in the Antilles, but also the research agendas of the researchers, the need for a large-scale field-season, and for finding external funds from the private sector needed for matching the Campaign for Leiden funds. As such, a project based upon the idea of a large scale excavation that yielded both preservation as well as scientific benefits as a result of Malta policy, kicked of – which, as we have seen, was contrary to the values and motivations of NAAM. In the words of the director of NAAM, and an employee of Santa Barbara Plantation respectively;

> I didn't see the need to excavate at first. We wanted to keep it in-situ. Leiden agreed that it was of high value, but they wanted to excavate it. I didn't see the need for this, the benefit of this scientific knowledge.[369]

> <NAAM> had told us we couldn't touch these two areas, but that was not an option. The golf courses would have to come there, we already had re-located one hole. But they did not have the expertise, no archaeologists, no money, and no willingness to cooperate. They said we couldn't touch it, but I thought you archaeologists wanted to excavate and study <…> you could learn, study, bring students.[370]

The use of common discursive story-lines in relation to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration facilitated an easy translation of values between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation. The preference by Santa Barbara Plantation for Leiden University was however based upon

[369] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

[370] Santa Barbara Plantation NV employee (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

several other factors. The fact that Leiden University would bring in matching funds to the project played a part in this, since it would allow for a much larger project with increased benefits. The fact that Santa Barbara Plantation and the 'Malta' policies towards archaeology prioritised an emphasis on professionalism in excavation, also led to the perception by Santa Barbara that it "rather paid for those who do the work".[371] In addition, the 'top-down' perspective by the Faculty of Archaeology towards archaeological interpretation and management fitted easily with that of Santa Barbara Plantation, which favoured a collaboration with external partners as to not be hindered by institutional collaborations on a local level. As such, it was requested (and later much appreciated) by Santa Barbara Plantation that the archaeologists of the Faculty of Archaeology would have to deal with local counterparts, such as NAAM and the Monument Bureau DROV.

According to the previous director of AAINA, who had worked for many years in the archaeological field in Curaçao (amongst which at the archaeological project at Santa Barbara in the early 1990's), this reflected a more general tendency amongst local politicians and developers to prefer working with powerful external partners in heritage projects because external experts were seen as more knowledgeable than local institutions, and because external partners were outside existing and future social networks on the island, which made them preferable to local partners;

> our politicians, be they black or white, do not believe anything we say. Only when someone from outside, from Leiden for instance, says something about our history, or what we should do with it, they believe it. They don't believe in us.[372]

Such a perception was also brought forward by the new Head of DROV;

> With these developers, but also with politicians, there continues to be this idea that everything from the Netherlands is better. At the core of this, is 500 years of history. We have always been taught that Dutch experts or consultants needed to be brought in.[373]

The story-line that archaeology had to be approached professionally from a scientific, objective perspective that favoured excavation, also fitted well with the wishes of Santa Barbara Plantation to develop an archaeological display on the distant past of pre-columbian societies in its visitor centre: "we want to do something with the archaeological results, <…> for the visitors to the project, and potential buyers. <…> what we need from Leiden, therefore, is some artefacts, and a simple narrative."[374] The idea of presenting a regional history of pre-columbian archaeology also fitted with the views and wishes of Hyatt Regency which had chosen the Indian past as a core theme in its search for 'authenticity';

> here at Hyatt we embrace history and identity. <...> you need uniqueness, its critical, you search for <...> a unique selling point. For us, that was the story of the Arawaks, <...> the first inhabitants of the island. We thought about an African theme first, because of the roots of the island, but it was decided that this was perhaps a little sensitive.[375]

---

[371] President of the VIDA Group (Santa Barbara Plantation, July 2010).

[372] According to the former director of AAINA (Seru Mahuma, July 2010). This perception was consequently supported during interviews with two local anthropologists with experience in the heritage field in the Netherlands Antilles (Willemstad, July 2010 / Oranjestad, June 2010).

[373] Willemstad, August 2010.

[374] PR consultant for Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Rosa, July 2010).

[375] General manager of Hyatt Regency (Santa Barbara, August 2010).

In this view by the General manager of Hyatt Regency, who was himself of Latin-American descent, an emphasis on the pre-columbian archaeology, reflected in terminologies such as the 'Caquetios Board Room' or the 'Arawak Ballroom' would be less problematic than the historical time of the plantation and than more recent interpretations of the past that favoured memories of local inhabitants, which are politically integrated with a discomfort over a loss of access to the beaches and property of Santa Barbara Plantation – a focus that was advocated much stronger by NAAM in its search for an in-situ protection of the site as a park for local inhabitants.

The scientific, regional view on archaeological interpretation also fitted with the heritage discourses of several other key persons in the development of the Santa Barbara Project. A top-level senior politician working for the Netherlands Antilles, who had been asked by Leiden University to act as a broker and 'champion' for the Campaign for Leiden Project, mentioned for example that the research by Leiden University was

> an eye-opener because it approached history from above, it looked over the boundaries of the island, it was trying to get to some universal history, instead of a local history <...> Our local institutions have the tendency to popularise history, with the danger that the larger framework of history disappears. <...> to make people aware about history is good, in itself, but we should not tell everything to everybody <because then they> loot the artefacts and destroy the sites <...> we should keep it secret in the beginning, study it, keep it for the experts and institutions, and then tell the public.[376]

The chairman of the Board of NAAM during the years of the project, who had come to decide with the Board that the director had to give up its struggle against its perceived exclusion by Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation, expressed a similar view on the scientific and archaeological value of material remains of the past; "Santa Barbara Plantation was willing to pay for archaeology, for the first time on the island <...> you should not try to obstruct that, because in the end, you want to achieve that archaeological research will be done."[377] Although both of these respondents favoured a collaboration between Leiden University and NAAM as to advance institutional capacity building, the emphasis on a prioritisation of an expert, scientific, universal history as the core product of the collaboration fitted more easily with the discourses of Leiden and Santa Barbara Plantation then that of NAAM and the AWG.

The idea that archaeological heritage matters are primarily a concern of the state, an important story-line of the AAD as discussed in section 5.4.4, also played a crucial part in the negotiations and development of the Santa Barbara Project. NAAM had received financial support from the government, and a memorandum of understanding between Monument Bureau DROV and NAAM was established in September 2007. Still, the fact remained that NAAM, which had developed out of AAINA, had become a foundation instead of a government institution and thereby had lost its legal and governmental control over heritage policy and enforcement. This fuelled the idea amongst several respondents that NAAM should not have automatic access and ownership over the research and management of archaeological sites. According to the former Head of DROV;

[376] Willemstad, July 2010.

[377] Former chairman of the Board of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

> officially, DROV should control NAAM, through the Monument Laws. But now <...> there is much more conflict of interest, because <the new head of DROV> is also the new chairman of the board of NAAM. <...> NAAM is no government, they are not the ones who give licenses.[378]

In line with the spirit of a Dutch implementation of Malta archaeology, the former Head of DROV believed that Santa Barbara Plantation was free to choose the archaeological operator, and that scientific expertise and experience with the local archaeology was a prerequisite for conducting heritage practice. In this respect, he emphasised that the decision about giving a license to Leiden did indeed play a role within DROV, but that in the end it was the Head of DROV himself who could make the decision;

> NAAM did give me advice against it, and that is their full right, but I put that beside me. There were other stakes that had to be taken into account, the archaeological value was only one, we had given Santa Barbara Plantation already green light for development 10 years ago <...> I agreed with <the Faculty of Archaeology> that NAAM should be a partner in the work, but in the end, I thought that Santa Barbara Plantation could decide on who to work with <...> who are we to question Leiden as an centre of expertise?[379]

The Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University, who had previously been a State Inspector for Archaeology in the Netherlands, made similar remarks;

> NAAM positioned itself within Curaçao as a governmental body, but they were a foundation – if not, I would have reacted differently, especially then, when I just left my position as State Inspector for Dutch archaeology. So I thought in some sense that we could go ahead, because they were not a governmental service, but just a organisation like any other.[380]

As such, the statuary position of NAAM undermined its position in the negotiations over the Santa Barbara Project. Such a view was also expressed by the previous director of AAINA, who oversaw the archaeological work at Santa Barbara in the early 1990's:

> I think <Santa Barbara Plantation> invited us because they knew we could become difficult. <they> told us they wanted to keep the archaeological values and sponsor it. We discussed this with them, and they had to listen to a certain degree, because we were civil servants with legal power. <...> NAAM acts as if they are this as well, but they are not civil servants. They do not have any power. They are a foundation, with support from the government – that's not the same.[381]

The emphasis by NAAM on the need for Malta archaeology, and its resulting uneasy integration of AAD story-lines in its competing discourse on the need for a locally empowered heritage management – which was necessary to be able to be seen as a player in development-led archaeological projects – therefore worked against itself since it could not comply with the implicit demands for expertise, professionalism and governmental ownership.

---

[378] Willemstad, July 2010.

[379] Former Head of DROV (Willemstad, July 2010).

[380] Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

[381] Former director of AAINA (Seru Mahuma, July 2010).

In addition, there were financial, personal and political motivations and perceptions at play. When the former Head of DROV and the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology met during a UNESCO meeting in New Zealand, they shared similar views on the development of the Santa Barbara Project – one in which Santa Barbara Plantation and Leiden University would finance a rescue project, in which DROV would act as the governmental party, and in which NAAM should be involved as a local partner. Such a meeting was however met by a remark by the director of NAAM who had come to perceive such a solution as an elitist, distant, perhaps 'neo-colonial' approach to local heritage matters; "let's hope the Curaçaoan treasure will not be divided on the other side of the world."[382] When in a later phase the Head of DROV was replaced by his deputy, who soon after also became the new director of the Board of NAAM, Leiden's critical perception was that such moves had become entangled with personal favouritism as a result of local political discourses that challenged Dutch and external approaches.

Financial motivations played an important role, since it was clear to both NAAM and Leiden that Santa Barbara Plantation had come to agree to pay for archaeological mitigation, which opened up opportunities for both parties in terms of securing institutional benefits. For NAAM, whose financial future was far from secure and whose budgets had been cut dramatically, the idea of the polluter-pay principle in Malta had been identified explicitly as a means for financial survival within their internal strategy policies (NAAM 2009). According to a Board member of NAAM: "NAAM always needs to attract external funding, it constantly needs to create its right for existence, through media, political support, and funding. <...> NAAM has now missed out on hundred thousand euros of Santa Barbara, which is disastrous."[383] For the Faculty of Archaeology, the financial opportunities were equally attractive in terms of securing match-funding in the framework of the Campaign for Leiden programme and in terms of illustrating to the University that it could secure private, commercial 'third-stream' funds; "The difference in insight was that NAAM wanted to be a central organisation for the Antilles, and they needed the resources for that. We needed funds for matching from out of the Campaign for Leiden."[384]

5.5.3 MECHANISMS OF EXCLUSION

Whilst the Dutch archaeologists saw the successful securement of funds as a contribution towards heritage protection in the Netherlands Antilles and as an opportunity for advancing a project in which there would be place for capacity building, collaboration and public outreach, the Santa Barbara Project as a whole was perceived as 'top-down' by the Monument Bureau DROV, NAAM and the AWG, since both the social network as well as the framework of a project under the political ramifications of a Malta project led to (often unintended) mechanisms of exclusion. The fact that local counterparts did not have the same access to resources on a global scale as the archaeologists of Leiden University is a good example of this. Secondly, the knowledge and experience by the Faculty of Archaeology with Malta archaeological protocols, policies and standards, along with the embedded AAD in the Malta Convention, strengthened the emphasis on expertise, professionalism, and heritage as a material source of scientific data, and thereby the position of Leiden University, because neither Monument Bureau DROV nor NAAM had the necessary experience to implement the policy instruments. An example of how this 'selective accessibility' to some of the policy instruments can subsequently lead to selective reproduction of knowledge and values in project policies (cf Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming), can be seen in the way in which the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project were given form through the drafting of the PvE and PvA by the archaeologists

[382] Correspondence NAAM to Faculty of Archaeology (LU). Santa Barbara Project Archive, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University.

[383] Board Member of NAAM (Willemstad, August 2010).

[384] Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

of Leiden University. The first drafts of these policy documents were starting from the outset with a previously established designation of the Spanish Water site as 'significant heritage' of which the archaeological and scientific values were under threat. Such an assessment was made on the basis of previous excavations and publications of the site in the early 1990's, but also by an additional visit to Santa Barbara that was framed as a 'desk-based assessment and exploratory research'.[385] As a result, the definition of heritage, the designation of the impact area and the significance assessment were favouring an idea of the site with material remains of the past as a specific heritage site of archaeological value, with an emphasis on the pre-columbian archaeology. Interestingly, such a designation was not primarily the work of the Dutch archaeologists, but also the result of earlier work by archaeologists of AAINA and the AWG, although the latter had called for assessing the historical and archaeological values in a broader framework of social, natural and intangible heritage values. The assessment by the Faculty of Archaeology rehearsed the archaeological significance of the site, but in contrast, preferred a solution of excavation over in-situ preservation – in line with the fact that Santa Barbara Plantation had already been granted permission by DROV to conduct development work on the site. Although the site only made up a small percentage of the total area that was developed by Santa Barbara Plantation, and although a broader assessment of heritage could have included the tangible and intangible aspects of the complete history and memories associated with Santa Barbara, the Malta approach requested by DROV and conducted by Leiden University was not thought to allow for such broader definitions of heritage and impact areas. The selective reproduction of archaeological knowledge and values in the policy instruments PvE and PvA were in this sense self-referential, since the assessment and the priority of archaeological values were embedded and strengthened by processes of 'naturalisation', by which I refer to the idea that "the values constructed within the archaeological discourses are presented as natural, normal and objective, as an intrinsic quality, in short, as non-constructed" (Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming).

Accordingly, the original drafts of the PvE and PvA had to be changed on the request of Monument Bureau DROV and the Archaeological Working Group to include the fact that also other periods, beside the pre-columbian layers, would have to be included in the archaeological research. Secondly, it was requested that specific mention needed to be made of the fact that Leiden University would commit itself to develop a publication oriented to the general public in the local language. In addition, it was requested that guided tours would be allowed (in contrast to an original remark in the draft that such tours might not be allowed), and that NAAM and the AWG would be consulted over the participation of local staff and researchers. Although all these requests were incorporated in the final versions of the PvE and PvA, it does illustrate how the request by Santa Barbara Plantation to minimise access and collaboration by local counterparts had found its way in the draft report by the Dutch archaeologists, strengthened by processes of selective accessibility, naturalisation and self-reference. Within the PvE for example, it can be noted that publication and outreach were mentioned under the header 'external communication', and that the designation of capacity building and training of 'local experts and people' found its way under the header 'Deployment of amateurs'.[386] Such discursive elements of the AAD – identified also in the Dutch archaeological quality system (Duineveld 2006) – prioritises expert values over alternative, vocational values in a hierarchical system; again, arguably implicitly, distancing the professional archaeological 'experts' from local counterparts. As such, the project policies of the Santa Barbara Project, with its embedded story-lines of the AAD, contributed to (often unintended) exclusionary mechanisms.

[385] This refers to 'bureau and verkennend onderzoek' (see Willems & Brandt 2004, 210).

[386] Translation by the author ('Inzet amateurs).

Interestingly, it is precisely the 'pro-active' approach by Dutch archaeologists to develop archaeological projects on the islands through means of the polluter-pay principle and the subsequent mitigating and safeguarding of archaeological heritage in the context of a Malta archaeology, that was perceived by some respondents as a 'foreign', 'top-down' and/or 'private' practice.[387] A similar perception was also brought forward by a member of staff of AMA in Aruba in reference to a previous attempt by Dutch archaeologists to establish an archaeological project in collaboration with a project developer and AMA itself: "Their intention is good, but it should be us, the local legal institution concerned with archaeology, that decides who will undertake the archaeological research, where, how and if it happens."[388]

One result of this, is that Leiden University could subsequently become intrinsically identified, through becoming a 'consultant' for the Santa Barbara Plantation in this case, with the motivations and socio-political impacts of such large-scale projects on the island. Such identifications were not only encountered in my interviews with heritage practitioners of local institutions, but also in the remarks by several local inhabitants in the areas surrounding Santa Barbara, such as Nieuwpoort, Montaña Abou, Montaña Rey and Santa Rosa. Negative feelings over the loss of access by local inhabitants to the plantation area and over the increased influx of Venezuelan workers at the Hyatt Regency hotel, are just some examples of why a focus by the Faculty of Archaeology on a pre-columbian site at a former plantation and beach area was perceived by some as problematic. The fact that Leiden University had come into the heritage field in Curaçao through a network in which Dutch and expatriate elites were perceived to hold sway, combined with the fact the Faculty of Archaeology and Santa Barbara Plantation worked together on an archaeological research through a heritage policy that was based upon a liberalised free-market system, are other examples of how the Dutch project became identified with historical, 'elitist' and even 'capitalist' approaches. In this sense, Leiden University was even identified by some local respondents in line with the former Dutch colonial owners of the Plantation, the owners of the Mining Industry, the Santa Barbara Plantation, as well as the current director of CITCO, who lived in the plantation house overlooking the site of Spanish Water;

> At the plantation house, in the past, there used to live the owners of the slaves. Later on, the governor used to live there. Now the owner of Hyatt lives there, I believe.[389]

> I don't know much about the history of the Santa Barbara plantation. I know more about Banda Bau. At least, there you can go and swim for free. <…> At Santa Barbara, we were not allowed to go, and you have to pay. Santa Barbara has always been for the elite.[390]

> I would have liked to see the excavations <...> I didn't go. I assumed it was not allowed.[391]

Such views give an insight into the identification of Leiden University with the historical and contemporary social impact of the Santa Barbara Plantation. Such views are however not exhaustive of the respondents' comments on the project – positive perceptions of the fact that Leiden University had conducted archaeological research were also encountered, with additional positive comments by those

---

[387] See also sections 5.2.3 and 5.3.2.

[388] Oranjestad, June 2010. It should hereby be noted that AMA is a governmental organisation, in contrast to NAAM.

[389] Former local school teacher (Montaña Rey, July 2010).

[390] Local community member, wife of a former local employee at the Santa Barbara Mining Company (Santa Barbara/ Nieuwpoort, July 2010).

[391] Former local employee at the Santa Barbara Mining Company (Montaña Abou, July 2010).

teachers who accompanied the visiting school groups to the site.[392] Still, a general perception came to the fore that the archaeological benefits could not make up for the loss of access (see also 5.3.2), and that the publications in newspapers, lectures, educational visits and the idea of a museum, however valuable, would have a greater and more sustainable impact by incorporating local researchers, people and media:

> I liked the fact that <the Dutch archaeologists> came here, and brought our students to the site. they also did two small talks here for the children. <…> unfortunately, it is not sustainable. You should involve people in the excavation.[393]

> This archaeology you speak of, well, I suppose it's outside my experience, it has nothing to do with my daily life. <...> It is tucked away in scientific reports and exhibitions, that's not enough.[394]

> Communication needs to happen through radio, through children programs, and through an Antillean archaeologist, we will listen to this much better. <…> They know our culture, how we think, how we laugh.[395]

Although some respondents identified the research into an Indian archaeological site as minimally interesting, more positive feelings towards an increased understanding of pre-columbian archaeology were also encountered; "well, it is more interesting in any case than Dutch history, that I had to learn when I was young <...> it is Antillean history, and I am Antillean. <...> we have mixed heritages, so Indian history is part of that".[396] The interest in this archaeology, however, was mostly focused upon the daily lives of people, and less upon general historic timelines and complex interpretations; "the grandmother of my father was of Indian descent. I'd like to know how she lived, what she ate <...> how it was to be an Indian".[397]

According to a local anthropologist who did oral history research in the communities surrounding Santa Barbara (see Allen 2001), heritage connotations about Santa Barbara also do not primarily centre around its time as a plantation (with local importance given much more to the better documented sites on the west of the island) but rather to the more recent memories of the early Mining industries and the use of the beaches:

> As a plantation, or as a heritage of slavery, it doesn't play a big role on the island. What is more important, are the memories and oral histories of the people who used to live in the mining village, and the memories of those who went to the beach there. <...> I did come across some mentions on slavery there, but it was not much. Most of the memories are about the mining industry. <...> The strike in the 1930's also plays a huge role. I have documented the memories and the work-songs of the mining workforce. These songs are still alive.[398]

---

[392] June/July 2010.

[393] Director of a local youth centre *(*Vormingscentrum voor Jeugdwelzijnswerk*)* at Santa Rosa, where the Dutch team of Leiden University had their accommodation (July 2010).

[394] Local community member (Santa Rosa, July 2010)

[395] Local community member (Montaña Abou, July 2010).

[396] Local community member (Santa Rosa / Montaña Abou) and former cook for the Santa Barbara Project (July 2010).

[397] Local community member (Santa Rosa, July 2010).

[398] Curaçao, July 2010.

The focus on 'indigenous' archaeology in the Caribbean, as it is brought forward for example in internal seminars at the Faculty of Archaeology in Leiden University, seems to be less attractive in relation to the current society and social identity of Curaçao, where identifications with Indian history are less strong then on the other islands in the region. The focus by NAAM, on the 'indigenousness' of the current population, with a specific focus on the afro-black history during the post-contact period and the period of slavery, is however equally complex. For example, it was felt by some respondents that NAAM did not speak for the community of Curaçao at large; foreign researchers and archaeologists in the wider Antilles for instance questioned the fact that the senior staff members of NAAM and DROV were of Dutch descent, and that as such, they would still not speak effectively on behalf of the community, nor be entirely successful in translating research benefits to local communities. More critically, some Dutch archaeological vocationalists on the island expressed that they felt excluded from NAAM since they were 'not local', and that the 'Archaeological Working Group' itself formed a closed network of 'amateurs', and focusing too single-mindedly on one part of history: "the history of the Antilles is mixed, you can't exclude a single identity of history out of it, it is made of greys, not black and white".[399]

The emphasis of the local institutions on Malta archaeology also illustrates that incorporating intangible heritage and local communities in archaeological fieldwork might be problematic, since it inherently favours professional expertise over local values. In this respect, it was mentioned by other island archaeologists that the type of Malta archaeology as practiced by NAAM sat uneasily with the idea of community archaeology, due to a perceived lack of incorporation of local workmen and communities. The fact that a member of staff of NAAM criticised the community approach by the former archaeologist of AAINA as 'non-scientific', is a case in point here.

5.5.4 PROJECT BENEFITS

It was discussed above how the constant (re-)production of the AAD and related value-systems and story-lines by Dutch archaeological policies, institutions and operators through successful translation and representation of practices, has (often unintentionally) limited the opportunities for including competing values and discourses in the social context. Mainly, this is because the involvement of other actors and their values were postponed and excluded due to a top-down process that prioritises scientific and archaeological values. The knowledge needed to work with Dutch Malta policies and instruments, the contacts needed to tap into a network of corporate, global and Dutch funding subsidies, the emphasis in the Dutch Malta system on expert assessments of scientific values and the subjugation of local 'amateur' knowledge, and the institutional motivations to yield scientific benefits and education opportunities through finding external financial resources; all of these elements contributed to a system of 'exclusionary mechanisms' (Duineveld *et al.* forthcoming) that saw the relative closure of the project network towards local actors. As a result, most benefits of the archaeological process were perceived by local institutions as continuously being skewed towards foreign researchers, students and institutions.

Because such academic, scientific and educational benefits were in line with the institutional motivations of the Faculty of Archaeology, and that of the specific ramifications of the Campaign for Leiden, the perception of the Santa Barbara Project by the Dean of the Faculty could be labelled as 'successful', despite a regret over the fact that the intentions of collaboration and local participation were not accomplished as envisaged;

[399] According to a Dutch respondent with a personal interest in local archaeology (Willemstad, July 2010).

> The faculty is there to conduct research projects, and this was a successful project. It was a beautiful excavation, innovative in terms of scientific content. It brought a good return in terms of student involvement and experience, and it brought the necessary benefits for our archaeologists. Also, very important, we demonstrated that we could not only in the Netherlands, but also abroad, succeed in securing <private> funds.[400]

In addition to the idea that the role of a university is foremost to conduct academic archaeological research, the Dutch co-directors of the Santa Barbara Project mentioned that the Faculty of Archaeology was not a 'rescue' company, and that it would only conduct projects in the framework of Malta archaeology that would fit the research questions of archaeologists. According to one of the co-directors, some of the wider heritage and community values could only have been addressed after securing external funds, because the diminished funds of the Campaign for Leiden were to be used primarily for archaeological research:

> The Campaign for Leiden <...> wanted us to deliver publications and student internship projects <...> We wanted to accommodate more public and capacity elements, but that could only have been done by finding additional funds.[401]

In this respect, it is interesting to note that the Dutch archaeologists of the Santa Barbara Project mentioned that scientific subsidies in the Netherlands did not easily allow for the funding of activities in the field of 'societal relevance'. When looking at the final expenditure of the Santa Barbara Project, one can indeed see that the largest part of the budget was spent on the archaeological excavation and research and that funds for public outreach and capacity building (such as for example inviting scholars from the Caribbean to the academic conferences in the Netherlands) were paid from out of other, internal research budgets at Leiden University.[402] In addition, faculty staff and students linked to the project felt that they had contributed to the societal relevance of archaeology in the Netherlands Antilles by having found and implemented research funds for a 'rescue' project in Curaçao.

Still, the financial framework of the Santa Barbara Project seemed to favour scientific and archaeological values, as well as a relationship with developers and the commercial sector. Even though the proposal for the Campaign for Leiden explicitly called for the social value of archaeology, the need for heritage preservation, public presentation, and local capacity building, the fact remains that the Campaign for Leiden was "established to locate private investors for university projects", and to enrich "the education, research or facilities of the university".[403] According to respondents from NAAM and DROV, the prioritisation of scientific values was not only reflected in the name 'Campaign for Leiden', but also in the budget of the original proposals for the Campaign for Leiden programme, which according to them, showed an inequality between academic staff salary costs and budgets for education and outreach activities, despite statements in the proposal that allowed for student exchange and a prioritisation of candidates from the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba for the staff posts.[404] The perceived difference in the distribution of scientific and economic benefits thereby contributed to an identification of Leiden

---

[400] Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, November 2010).

[401] Associate Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, one of the Santa Barbara Project co-directors, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, April 2011).

[402] These statements are based upon interviews with the Dutch co-directors of the Santa Barbara Project as well upon insight into the internal finances of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, April 2011).

[403] Available at http://www.luf.nl/default.asp?paginaID=192 [Accessed 15 April 2011].

[404] Such remarks were made by the Director of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010) and a staff member of DROV (Willemstad, July 2010) when specifically discussing the original budget headings of the Campaign for Leiden project.

University with the socio-economic impact and colonial history of the Santa Barbara Plantation development, with subsequent labelling of the project as being 'capitalist', 'foreign' and 'private'. Such perceptions and representations of the project however, were also motivated by concerns over personal and institutional survival in a political and economic sense, as I will explore further in the following section.

This, in turn, led to an increased emphasis by local organisations on a heritage discourse which prioritised local values and bottom-up capacity development, which made it challenging for the Faculty of Archaeology to facilitate their intentions of participation, education and involvement. This contributed to a rather extreme perceived opposition of institutional motivations as being either focused upon 'science', or upon 'local development'. Similar as in the case study on the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project, such a perception of purely scientific motivations by Leiden University was placed within a larger framework of historical and political injustices by the Dutch 'system' on the local level in Curaçao;

> I have tried in the Netherlands to get money to support our institutional capacity, our archaeology, our management. But I have not succeeded. On the other hand, I see that Dutch money is becoming available for Leiden to do research on these matters, on our islands. As such, they are taking all the money which should be meant for building institutional capacity here. <...> I see this as the result of a larger system in the Netherlands.[405]

Interestingly, the discursive story-lines of the Santa Barbara Project in 2007-2011 seemed to copy that of 15 years previously. As was discussed above, it was already agreed in the early 1990's that the archaeologically significant areas (in this case including the Spanish Water site) at Santa Barbara Plantation would be protected by means of a restricted area to "preserve a part of the site for tomorrow's scientists" (Haviser 1998, 9). In exchange for this, the developer could destroy several other, less significant parts of the site, whilst funding parts of the necessary rescue archaeology. Although it was mentioned that this restricted area should also be accommodated by a wider park for tourists, and even though plans were already made for a future museum back then, history has shown us that whilst future archaeologists did indeed benefit from the preservation of the site, the envisaged park did not come to fruition, and the promised visitor centre also being undeveloped at the time of my research. Even if we would see the golf course as a creative 'trail' in a 'park', the people benefiting from access to the archaeological remains, either on the golf course or in the 'visitor centre' might turn out to be international tourists with an interest in buying property, and not local community members; "Get real. Everything we do is about selling 800 properties in the end. The visitor centre, and the archaeological exhibition, is part of that. No, actually, it's all about that, because the visitor centre is where we will sell the properties."[406] Similarly, it was mentioned by several local respondents that the location of the proposed exhibition felt as if they were again refrained from access to the real sites and to Santa Barbara at large: "the idea of a visitor centre I like. But why does it need to be at the gate? Why can't I go in? I want to see the landscape where I went to with my parents when I was a young girl."[407] The way in which the ownership over external communication by Santa Barbara Plantation can also be illustrated, is by the fact that the envisaged guided tours by Hyatt Regency would primarily benefit international tourists. For instance, the Hyatt 'meditation trail', a guided tour around the Indian caves and Indian rock-carvings could at the time of research only be undertaken by paying a fee for a daily access pass to Hyatt of 50$. At least, this illustrates that the envisaged public outreach of the archaeological work had not come to its full potential, and that it could, in its current envisaged form, contribute to feelings of exclusion by the local population.

---

[405] Director of NAAM (Willemstad, June 2010).

[406] Designer working for Santa Barbara Plantation NV (Santa Barbara Plantation, June 2010).

[407] Local community member (Santa Rosa / Montaña Abou) and former cook for the Santa Barbara Project (July 2010).

Figure 18. School visit to the Santa Barbara Project excavations (photograph Santa Barbara Project archive, Leiden University).

Despite several public lectures and guided tours for local school classes, the participation of several vocational archaeologists, and an envisaged local article by the Dutch archaeologists, we have seen how some members of the local community still regard the whole process as being private and exclusive, with critiques towards Leiden University, Santa Barbara Plantation and even NAAM and the AWG appearing. As we have seen, however, this was often against the personal wishes of all the archaeological operators involved – the discontinuous distribution of perceived benefits in this sense could be regarded in light of the discursive conditions and value-networks of archaeological heritage and research policies, and within light of the historical developments of the archaeological discipline and the institutional relationships that governed this interaction. Still, in section 5.7, I will argue that individual archaeologists could take up the opportunity and responsibility to advocate the inclusion and recognition of other values and discourses more explicitly within the archaeological process. If not, the (re-)production of the AAD and the call for Malta archaeology might be in danger of focusing too much on scientifically and archaeologically significant heritage sites, and of offering "greater benefits for tourists and visitors rather than directly improving the residents' sense of pride and place" (Breen & Rhodes 2010, 133).

5.6 PROJECT POLICY AND PRACTICAL OUTCOMES

5.6.1 THE (RE-)PRODUCTION OF HERITAGE VALUES AND DISCOURSES

In this section, I will focus in more detail on the relationship between policy and practice. A fundamental observation in this, is how the AAD should not simply be regarded as a fixed discourse or a set of values and story-lines that influence the development, implementation and practice of the project directly from the outset. Rather, it is a far more complex process. Whilst the scientific and archaeological values behind the AAD are reproduced and developed through policy emphasis, institutionalisation and prioritisation of resources, we also have seen how archaeologists are constantly (re-)producing discursive story-lines in order to secure the survival of institutional relationships and access to the archaeological sites and data. In this section, I will argue that policy discourses and project representations in this sense can become the end, rather than solely the means of project practices, as they create a more attractive framework for maintaining relationships than the contradictory project realities (Cf Büscher 2008). Notions and discourses such as 'Malta archaeology' and 'rescue archaeology' for instance are constantly (re-)produced by archaeological actors to legitimise practice, because they give coherent interpretations of practice, and as such create far more attractive frameworks for maintaining relationships, securing financial support and setting the right opportunities for institutional survival of their individual research motivations than the 'contradictory realities' of fieldwork practice.

This reproduction of discursive story-lines is achieved not only through successful translation of other stakeholders' values into their own, but also through processes of representation whereby certain project activities and outcomes are interpreted so that they appear the result of deliberate policy and archaeological theory (see also section 4.6.2). Apart from the above-discussed representation of pre-columbian archaeology as indigenous archaeology, the representation of the Santa Barbara Project as being undertaken in the framework of 'Malta archaeology' is a good example of this. Although the Dutch archaeologists were explicit about the fact that the framework of Malta archaeology had given them the financial opportunity to conduct research on a site that fitted their research questions and the need for student internships, the project was often externally represented as 'Malta archaeology' or 'preventive archaeology'. This does not mean however, that the project was not undertaken as part of such a process – Santa Barbara Plantation as a developer did indeed pay for archaeological work, and the research plans were translated into Dutch protocols for preventive archaeology, as requested by Monument Bureau DROV. However, my point here is that the selection and assessment of the site, the decision for excavation and the research questions relating to pre-columbian archaeology were not developed out of the principles of Malta, but rather out of a self-referential value system in the AAD that was heavily influenced by academic research interests. The representation of previous academic publications on Santa Barbara as 'desk-based research', and the short field visit to the site as 'exploratory research'[408] are good examples of this, since a broader (and admittedly much more expensive) investigation and exploration of the total land-area of Santa Barbara could have come to broader assessments of sites, archaeological periods and forms of heritage that would need to be addressed. Although the Santa Barbara Project did take into account some archaeological sites out of the direct impact area of the Spanish Water site, one can argue if the excavations and small-scale in-situ preservation of roughly 30x30m2 out of a totally developed 600ha at Santa Barbara could be effectively called 'preventive archaeology' and the site labelled as 'archaeology-free'. The discursive representation of the project as being an example of Malta archaeology whereby professional archaeologists and developers had worked successfully to mitigate threats to the archaeological record, was

[408] This refers to 'verkennend onderzoek', see Willems & Brandt 2004.

however rehearsed and reproduced not only by staff and students of the Faculty of Archaeology but also by the media releases of Santa Barbara Plantation, which subsequently found its way into press coverage in both Curaçao as well as in the Netherlands.

The fact that a senior archaeologist of Leiden University confirmed the assessment by the AWG of the site of Spanish Water as archaeologically significant, but subsequently distilled a decision that excavation would have precedence over in-situ preservation, is another example of the self-referential value-system; even though the local authorities agreed with such an assessment, and even though this was the reality of the powerful wishes of Santa Barbara Plantation, and of the financial resources available. The fact that the conduct of the archaeological work at Spanish Water did not separate the 'explorative research' from archaeological excavation, and as such did not take broader definitions of sites and heritage into account, was one of the major points of critique by a member of staff from NAAM who subsequently interpreted the conduct of Leiden University as 'pretending to do Malta':

> they have included some of the archaeological remains outside the excavation area, which is good, but you can't say the whole site is archaeology-free. <…> they could have included historical archaeology as well, and covered larger parts of the site – but that didn't fit their research questions. <...> in the framework of Malta, they have taken money from the project developer for their own research purposes.[409]

The continuous reproduction of the notion of 'Malta archaeology' in order to establish coherent representations of practice as to adhere to institutional motivations, can also be seen by the discursive practice of NAAM. Although its heritage discourse on intangible heritage, local communities and capacity building was often produced successfully to secure local political support (a fact well illustrated by the use of such discourses by the key-note lectures at the two NAAM seminars in 2005 and 2009), we also have seen their use of competing AAD story-lines in order to secure access in the negotiation over the Santa Barbara Project. The interpretation of Malta archaeology as a means to secure future financial resources and access to the other islands with the coming of Dutch policies to the BES-islands, is another example – but this will be discussed below.

5.6.2 POLICY, PRACTICE AND ACCESS

The Santa Barbara Project illustrates how 'policy' functioned not only to orientate practice, but also to legitimise practice, in the sense of mobilising and maintaining political, financial and institutional support and access (cf Latour 1996, 42-43). The impact of policies upon the orientation and outcomes of practice of archaeology at Santa Barbara is quite discernible, whereby especially the funding frameworks behind the project policies left their mark upon the development of archaeological activities. Through the funding policy of the Campaign for Leiden, and in line with the long tradition of the Caribbean research section being funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO),[410] specific demands were laid upon developing scientific publications and student education. As such, funding policies made a huge impact upon the archaeological practice, since policy negotiations and value translations were underlined by these, as was discussed above. In addition, the policy of the Campaign for Leiden stated that funds

[409] Interview with staff member of NAAM (Willemstad, July 2010).

[410] Most of the funding of the Caribbean Research Group of the Faculty since the 1980's has been funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and Leiden University itself, with many resulting publications, academic promotions and student internships. A rough estimate is for example that in the last 20 years, between 200 and 300 students have undertaken fieldwork on Caribbean islands (Hofman 2008, 12).

would only be given when a matching fund from a private external donor would be found. Related to the request for Malta policy by Curaçao, this made it necessary and desirable for the Faculty of Archaeology to secure financial support from Santa Barbara Plantation. The impact of such policies upon practice also made its way in further prioritisation of the activities by the Santa Barbara Project. According to the Leiden archaeologists, the combination of the Campaign for Leiden and the framework of Malta archaeology – strengthened by the fact that individual careers at the Faculty of Archaeology were mainly being assessed in terms of publications and student supervision – led to the fact that archaeological research was prioritised over outreach activities and capacity building, and over research into areas and histories of the site that lay outside the research questions of the research group. As a result of these policies (in which story-lines of the AAD were embedded), such alternative values and activities were thought to be only made possible if external funds would be attracted (see section 5.5.4).

The practice of the Santa Barbara Project was however not only driven by project policies, but also by the values, discourses and histories of individuals and organisations. What this means, is that policy not only determined practice, but also that practice determined policy. The values, discourses and (desired) activities of actors for example determined the development, negotiation and use of project policies that would most effectively adhere to their need to maintain institutional relationships, power and access to the archaeological record and its benefits. The construction of a certain selective part of the material remains of the past at Santa Barbara as archaeological heritage that fitted the research interests of archaeologists, and the focus on funding sources out of commercial development in order to harness continuing opportunities for academic research, are good examples of this. The development of the scope of the project policies such as the PvE and PvA, and of assessing the significance of the site, was for example not a matter of simply assessing a set of intrinsic values of heritage and the past, but rather a process whereby a certain selective set of values were attributed to material remains in order to *create* heritage and related project practices. Such a constructive notion of heritage (see also section 2.5), was however not explicitly acknowledged in project policies, but rather disguised by a process of naturalisation, in the sense of institutionalised and bureaucratic embedded AAD story-lines that place their emphasis on a supposedly neutral and objective form of heritage assessment and subsequent management.

A need to secure access and resources for research by the Faculty of Archaeology, can for instance be distilled from the institutional and funding policies that demand the development of academic publications and student teaching opportunities, as well as in the call by the Campaign for Leiden to attract match funding. In addition, the ‘personal academic histories’ of the researchers in question had made it desirable to continue looking at archaeological sites in the Caribbean that could yield additional data for their regionalised approach towards understanding the archaeology of the Caribbean within the context of a ‘mobility and exchange’ research framework (see sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.3).

The advancement of Malta archaeology in the Caribbean therefore provided an opportunity that could accommodate these values, needs and interests. The subsequent emphasis within the Malta Convention on a prioritisation of expertise, professionalism and archaeological science and excavation, issues in which the Faculty of Archaeology excelled (with both expertise in academic Caribbean archaeology as well as with Dutch Malta archaeology), could as such be applied effectively as to secure access to archaeological sites and resources. Related to this, is the fact that individual archaeologists were supporting the coming of Malta to the Caribbean for its potential to mitigate the threats to Antillean heritage, whilst emphasising exactly the elements of the Malta Convention that would yield the greatest institutional benefits, such as professionalism, the polluter-pay principle and the prime place of science and excavation. Santa Barbara Plantation, subsequently, played the idea of calling for a Malta archaeology in hand, since such a policy, although called for initially by NAAM and the local Monuments Bureau DROV,

gave them the opportunity to work with an external professional institute outside its own local power network on the island, thereby bypassing the involvement of NAAM and the AWG that it had come to distrust through previous perceptions of them frustrating development.

The call for Malta policy was also supported by the institutional demands and practices of NAAM. Apart from their view that such policies should contribute to the protection of cultural heritage and identity formation in the Netherlands Antilles, the emphasis on Malta archaeology could also contribute to securing financial survival and access to other islands. With the upcoming statuary changes of the BES islands, future Dutch administrative power and resources were thought to shift from Curaçao to Bonaire – an issue clearly illustrated by the fact that the Dutch Ministries, including that of OCW, had already set up offices in Bonaire to prepare the legislative and constitutional changes that would arise out of the BES islands becoming 'special municipalities' of the Netherlands. This, together with the fact that Curaçao would gain the *status aparte*, meant that NAAM would not only loose access to funding opportunities out of the framework of the Netherlands Antilles, but also, potentially, its close links with the other islands of the Netherlands Antilles. Accordingly, NAAM developed a vision for its activities after the constitutional changes, which was summarised in the internal document 'Towards a Caribbean Cultural Heritage Expertise Centre' (see also NAAM 2009). Within this document, NAAM envisaged becoming a regional expertise centre with strong ties to the other islands by playing up an intra-island Caribbean identity. By becoming a 'regional expertise centre', the coming of Malta was explicitly identified as an opportunity for securing financial resources for both archaeological work as well as institutional survival, since the islands in the region were thought to potentially providing annual financial means to NAAM in exchange for advise and expertise (NAAM 2009, 18-29).

Apart from advancing story-lines as to facilitate an effective alignment with Malta policies, NAAM also rehearsed its discursive story-line on the importance of preserving local, intangible heritage, and of securing a regional Caribbean identity through bottom-up and self-development approaches – which was strengthened by the personal history and beliefs of the director of NAAM, who had a background in applied anthropology in the region. Such a story-line, together with the fact that NAAM had established collaboration protocols with local governments on the other islands,[411] fitted the values and discourses of several key civil servants of OCW (the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science), who were looking for a decentralised, bottom-up approach to the implementation of Malta archaeology after '10-10-10';

> We wanted a network with stability and support. We also tried to build this up from the level of the islands, not to impose this from above <...> We therefore wanted to build this up through the <local governmental> executive councils <...> But creating this project-group was difficult <...> I didn't know the archaeology and the network <...> it is important that archaeologists have a say, but in my experience, we had to explain everything that related to laws, regulations and policies several times over <...> that's why we went with NAAM. They had their protocols, they had an existing network that was integrated in the executive councils of the islands, and their board members have political functions.[412]

[411] See for example the 'Collaboration Protocol between Foundation NAAM and the island Bonaire, 11 December 2009', Article 2 (Santa Barbara Project Archive, NAAM).

[412] Dutch civil servant of OCW in Bonaire (Kralendijk, June 2010).

> As a result of the seminar, the Directorate Cultural Heritage (DCE/OCW) has decided on the 26th of June 2009 to take over the recommendation, that the legislation for the protection of cultural heritage will be developed from out of the islands, and that this will not be imposed from out of the Netherlands. (Witteveen *et al*. 2009, 19)

In the end, this resulted in NAAM receiving the tender for the OCW-project that would provide advise on how Malta should be implemented on the BES-islands (see also sections 5.2.3 and 5.3.2). This, in turn, contributed to a perception by some archaeologists and heritage professionals on the other islands that NAAM would use this opportunity to formulate a plan in which NAAM itself would gain a matter of access to the archaeology and the financial benefits arising out of Malta archaeology. One archaeologist expressed thus the hope that NAAM would not "become biased to themselves. They want to survive, to keep their jobs, as we all do. <...> yes, we as archaeologists know that it works this way, but the public does not".[413] In addition, these respondents felt that NAAM was a Curaçao-based foundation that should not behave 'top-down'. Even though NAAM and the AWG themselves had used such discursive critiques to describe the approach of Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation in the context of Curaçaoan heritage politics, a similar critique could now be distilled about the strategy of NAAM, which was in turn related to a wider tendency on the islands that used to see Curaçao as the dominating administrative and financial power.

The Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology and the Professor of Caribbean Archaeology of Leiden University also pleaded for a solution in which local institutions such as BONAI, SECAR and SIMARC would get a primary place within any Malta solution to the BES-islands, pointing out to the example of Aruba, where local archaeologists were in service and where the archaeological heritage policies were thought to work sufficiently (cf De Groot 2009, 21). As such, the view of several local archaeologists on the other islands (some of whom had external positions at Leiden University) was supported that NAAM was a foundation with a remit on Curaçao, and that it should not be too strongly involved with the archaeology of the BES islands since they had not sufficient local archaeological expertise and track-record to be able to decide upon heritage matters. In addition, the exclusion of Leiden University from contributing to the OCW-report, was seen by some Dutch archaeologists as rather strange:

> We have helped <the archaeologist of Sint Eustatius> <...> for several years with the preparations of Malta, but it looks as if OCW tells us that we don't have expertise in this matter. However, they offer the contract to NAAM, even though they don't have experience with the archaeology of the windward islands.[414]

In this sense, two types of networks had been established, which both used a mix between the AAD and the alternative bottom-up heritage discourses to critique each other's motivations. The first was a network between NAAM and local government officials on the BES-islands (some of which also sat in the board of NAAM) that pleaded for an inter-Caribbean approach towards heritage management in order to establish a strong regional identity, and that thought that local political support and knowledge of local cultural socio-political context was the foremost prerequisite for access to the archaeology. The other network consisted of locally resident archaeologists of foreign origin but with decades of archaeological expertise on the islands, with strong academic links to, and supported by, Leiden University, who believed that knowledge and expertise of the local archaeology was a prerequisite for access. As we have discussed before, the

[413] July 2010.

[414] Associate Professor of Caribbean Archaeology, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University (Leiden, October 2010).

establishment of protocols between NAAM and the islands, and the establishment of Leiden University with local archaeological institutions in the form of memorandums of understanding, can both be seen in light of this process whereby future practices and access to the archaeology heavily influenced the establishment of policies.[415]

5.6.3 PROJECT CONTEXTUALISATION

This section will further discuss the way in which the Santa Barbara Project has been (re-)presented, perceived and received by different actors. It will explore how, after a successful process of value translation and policy negotiation by the Dutch archaeological actors, the project was subsequently socially produced as successful through stabilisation of story-lines and discourses by creating a network of 'supporting actors' with an extensive global reach. In line with the work by Latour (1996, 137; 2005; and see Mosse 2004; 2005, 168), I refer to this process as 'contextualisation'.

Contextualisation of the project happened through the repeated use of a set of story-lines that, as was illustrated in section 5.5.2, allowed for the most effective translation of values and a subsequent establishment of a discourse-coalition between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation. The story-line that was (re-)produced primarily was one of close cooperation between developer and professional archaeologists that allowed for the successful rescuing of a threatened archaeological 'record' by means of excavations and fostering expert knowledge about the past, all the while referring back to the idea of Malta archaeology. The contextualisation of the project, and of the discourse-coalition between Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation, was for example facilitated through the repeated use of this story-line by the Dutch archaeologists in academic publications and presentations, a good example of this being the fact that the Santa Barbara Project was mentioned explicitly by the Professor of Caribbean archaeology during the inaugural address. As a result, the story-line was subsequently rehearsed by Dutch media as well as by local Antillean newspapers (see for example Toebosch 2008a in the Dutch magazine Elsevier). A similar contextualisation was facilitated through a press release of 21 July 2008 which was coordinated by the former director of the Curaçao newspaper *Amigoe*, who now worked for Santa Barbara Plantation as a PR consultant.[416]

Contextualisation can further be distilled in the fact that several other actors used their global and international reach in order to support the project formation. The above-mentioned meeting between the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology and the head of DROV during a UNESCO meeting in New Zealand, could be seen as an example of this. The Council of State Advisor for the Netherlands Antilles, a former minister plenipotentiary of the Netherlands Antilles who had been asked to act as a 'champion' for the initial envisaged Campaign for Leiden Project, also brought its connections to bear in order to secure the support and success of the Santa Barbara Project. As a vocational archaeologist that brought forward a discourse on archaeological heritage as a fragile scientific resource under threat, the Council of State Advisor for example supported the former chairman of the Board of NAAM in its decision that the director should stop frustrating the development of the project, as to make sure that archaeological knowledge would be produced (see section 5.5.2).

In the Dutch newspaper *NRC*,[417] which was taken over by several Antillean media, a similar story-line on threatened archaeological archives under pressure from development appeared. Within this article,

---

[415] For a discussion on some of the outcomes and recommendations of the OCW-report, please refer back to section 5.3.2, and see Witteveen & Kraan 2012.

[416] This press release, which mentioned that Santa Barbara Plantation helped facilitate and fund archaeological research in collaboration with Leiden University, was taken over by a range of local newspapers such as *Amigoe*, *Antilliaans Dagblad*, *Laprinsa*, *Vigilante* and *Nobo*.

[417] See Toebosch 2008b.

the need for Malta archaeology was endorsed by the Council of State Advisor for the Netherlands Antilles, whilst the collaboration between Santa Barbara Plantation and Leiden University was mentioned as a successful example of how threatened archaeological resources could be mitigated.

What this suggests, is that when actors saw their values and story-lines reflected and represented in project policies, they did lend their status to stabilise the project, and they worked to uphold representations of the project in order to maintain support. The same can be noted for the initial phases of the proposed collaboration between Leiden University and NAAM. During these phases, the use of story-lines and 'mobilising concepts' (see section 2.5.2) that emphasised capacity building, institutional collaboration and local education, contributed to the fact that NAAM supported the proposed collaboration, and the development of a chair for Professor of Caribbean archaeology in Leiden University. When the project developed in such a way that NAAM, Monuments Bureau DROV and the AWG could not translate their values successfully anymore into their institutional aims and policies, we have seen how they started representing the project as 'institutional undermining', 'foreign' and 'top-down'. In this respect, these local organisations tried to set in motion a process of 'de-contextualisation', trying to produce a 'failure' of the project. For example, NAAM used its strong ties with its Board members who represented important political and archaeological positions at the other islands, in order to paint a negative view of the Santa Barbara Project. When the Head of DROV was replaced by its successor, who emphasised a similar discourse on local development and identity formation as the director of NAAM, the project was even further criticised[418] – especially when the new Head of DROV also took place as the new chairman of the board of NAAM. By then, however, the Santa Barbara Project had already started and was in its final stages of implementation.

Success or failure was as such socially produced and evaluated in line with the values that an actor ascribes to archaeological heritage and the project as a whole (cf Smith *et al*. 2010a, 17). Interestingly, the representations of failure were not at all relating to the actual archaeological field research itself, in the sense that not a single respondent questioned the idea that the excavations were archaeologically, scientifically sound. Project success could as such easily be produced by the Faculty of Archaeology, as it could draw upon the archaeological and scientific values that had been prioritised by the embedded AAD in the project policies, and that were at the basis of the evaluation procedures of their funders and of the quality criteria and standards as set out in Dutch policy and professional quality guidelines such as the KNA (Dutch Archaeology Quality Standard; see Willems & Brandt 2004). However, local actors such as NAAM and the AWG perceived and evaluated the project according to other discourses and values – notably socio-economic, collaboration and educational values, which were at the basis of their perceptions of failure.

Some academic archaeologists that I interviewed questioned if the archaeologist of NAAM, who gave advice on the inspection of the archaeological quality to Monuments Bureau DROV, was sufficiently qualified to do so because the archaeologist did not have a long field experience in Caribbean archaeology. In their views, the ability to evaluate success should be done by those who demonstrated archaeological expertise and who could judge academic merit. In contrast, the NAAM archaeologist, backed up by several local cultural policy government representatives (see above), stated that inspectors should demonstrate knowledge of the local socio-political and cultural context, and that an ability to judge the degree to which contract agreements had been made was more important for an inspector.[419] This view, that cultural

[418] Current Head of DROV (Willemstad, August 2010).

[419] Willemstad, June 2010.

heritage management was more to do with a working knowledge of political and social context instead of by academic expertise, was mirrored also in the reply by the director of NAAM on my question why they had not invited the archaeologists of Leiden University to the cultural heritage seminars of 2005 and 2009; "why should I have invited them? They are archaeologists, not heritage specialists".[420] Accordingly, success of the project was judged by the local partners not on the basis of academic results and quality, but rather on the degree to which local participation and capacity building had been achieved. The emphasis by the newly appointed archaeologist of NAAM on securing that the public outreach activities were done in line with the agreed PvE, illustrates this further.

5.7 THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF ARCHAEOLOGISTS

This final section will tie together some reflections on the role, responsibility and power of Dutch archaeologists in relation to the values and demands of others in the social context of Curaçao.

As a consequence of the institutionalised AAD in the project policies and the constant need for policy negotiation and value translation, the Dutch archaeologists were attributed a certain amount of ownership and decision-making power over the interpretation and management of the material remains of the past at Santa Barbara. The access to resources and networks on a global scale, the emphasis within the dominant value-system on archaeological research, professionalism and expertise, the inherent historical power discrepancies, combined with the idea that foreign experts bring status and strength to local partners in local power structures (Nash 1981; cf Haviser 2001, 77) all contributed to this.

What this means, is that the archaeologists were put in relatively powerful positions in which they could advocate and decide upon management aspects of the archaeological remains that were broader than their professional and institutional remit, and perhaps than their counterparts operating in the Dutch archaeological system (cf KNAW 2007); they were responsible for the project from start to finish, not just for the implementation phase (in terms of excavation), but also in terms of project development, accountability, selection, assessment, advise and public outreach. Ultimately, such a position brings with it responsibilities – a view mirrored by two local archaeologists of the BES-islands, who advocated that the responsibilities of archaeologists should go "far beyond the fieldwork and research of higher academic goals and touch on areas of the political and economic domain" *(*Haviser & Gilmore 2011, 143).

The archaeologists operated successfully within the remit of scientific and archaeological scrutiny, from the perspective of Dutch quality standards and professional ethics, and within the legal parameters of the archaeological and cultural policy framework of the Netherlands Antilles that they themselves had given form on a project level – although certain activities in the field of public outreach and archaeological storage as agreed upon in the PvE still needed to be finalised during my time of research. In line with the perspective of the local NAAM archaeologist who acted as an inspectorate advisor for Monument Bureau DROV, some questions might be raised though over the fact that the PvA and PvE interpreted former academic research and a short field visit as a 'desk-based and explorative research' within the Dutch Malta system, with a resulting short-cut towards an assessment of an obvious need for a full 'surface-covering' archaeological excavation.[421] From a Dutch Malta perspective, an 'archaeological field evaluation'[422]

[420] Willemstad, June 2010.

[421] This refers to 'vlakdekkende opgraving', cf Willems & Brandt 2004.

[422] This refers to 'inventariserend veld onderzoek' (IVO), cf Willems & Brandt 2004, 207.

would have been undertaken in advance of excavation, not simultaneously, as to better inform assessments and analysis by the local government of which sites, periods and areas would be left in-situ, excavated through trenches, or excavated fully. The realities of the project financial resources, development pressure by Santa Barbara Plantation, the linkage between the site with the research questions of Leiden University, as well as the fact that inexperienced government representatives had already chosen to agree with a specific focus on the site of Spanish Water in line with the discussed self-referential system of the Malta policy, made for the fact that the practice of the Dutch project was perceived as a logical result.

In general, I propose that archaeologists should take up their privileged position and decision-making power more strongly by actively advocating the inclusion of local people's and institutional values in a bottom-up process – in this specific case especially collaboration, intangible and community values. The realities of the Dutch research interests, institutional and funding frameworks, as well as the dominant value-system inherent in the Malta system, would however have made it difficult for the Dutch archaeologists to implement such an approach since it inherently regards archaeological heritage as a scientific resource whilst emphasising the need for professionalism, expertise and scientific output.

Nevertheless, Dutch archaeological research projects abroad could increase their chances and intentions for integrated heritage management and collaboration through challenging the AAD, by facilitating the values of other actors much earlier in the process, and by facilitating competing heritage discourses that include notions of care, memory and self-development. This also means that the current funding and institutional frameworks and policies of Dutch archaeology abroad need to better accommodate the practice, implementation, resourcing and assessment of activities such as capacity building, outreach and empowerment.

What is also needed then is to broaden the definition and scope of 'archaeological heritage sites', in terms of giving attention to including intangible values next to tangible values, as well as to sites and places outside of the direct impact areas of development and the time-scope of projects. This, in turn, means challenging the underlying values and story-lines of the Dutch interpretation of the Malta Convention, advocating for a more locally suitable and self-developed adaptation of this treaty in the Netherlands Antilles, as well as to advocate on behalf of local communities and institutions in negotiations with project developers where necessary, as to make sure that archaeological heritage is not solely seen as an obstacle or even as "just another profit-making product like the sun and the sea" (Haviser 2002, 20). On the other hand, such a pro-active approach by archaeological academics in relation to project developers, should perhaps not too easily be discarded by local partners as a large system of 'capitalist exclusion', since such an approach hinders the effective communication and translation of values as well as the inclusion of competing values in the archaeological process.

In any case, academic archaeology abroad needs to explicitly acknowledge that it is not a neutral activity free from political and social responsibility. The archaeological discipline has ethical responsibilities not only towards science and the past, but also towards others in society – be they developers or local organisations and communities. It is therefore in the negotiation, translation and communication of each other's values in which ethical behaviour truly lies (cf Meskell & Pels 2005a, 17; Moshenska 2008, 162 and MacEachern 2010). Starting by mapping out local power structures and stakeholder's values should therefore be at the start of any such process.

However, this does not mean that we should shy away from international development frameworks. Indeed, the private commercial sector is often regarded as

> less supportive of capacity building beyond that required to deal with the issues arising in individual projects, or beyond the physical footprint and active lifespan of each project <...> because building archaeological knowledge and national heritage management capacities can be seen as extraneous to the core business of the developer. (Lilley 2011, 2)

Still, this is not universally the case – a good example being for instance the Oyu Tolgoi mining project in Mongolia which aims to build "national heritage management capacity for the long-term rather than simply mitigate the impact of development on the heritage resources in the project area during the active life of the <project>" (ibid). Likewise, the case study of Santa Barbara shows us that a willingness by international developers is there; it just needs to be harnessed and translated effectively into a kind of archaeology and heritage discourse that is both scientifically and socially relevant. Ultimately, this means replacing a heritage discourse that sees the lack of local expertise as a reason for exclusion, with one that approaches it as a reason for inclusion.