



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

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

Linde, S.J. van der

Citation

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

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

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

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

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



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

Author: Linde, Sjoerd Jaap van der

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

Issue Date: 2012-12-18

Chapter Six: Digging Holes Abroad

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Over the last few decades, western archaeology abroad has adapted increasingly to the interests and needs of others in society, specifically with respect to archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration. The way in which we deal with other peoples views and values in the interpretation and investigation of archaeological pasts and materials, the way in which we integrate our archaeological narratives and practices with other demands in the heritage field and with processes of heritage-making, and the way in which we deal with power differences in both these processes; all remain as challenging issues when ‘digging holes abroad’.

Current perspectives on the social context of archaeology often look either to the future – by trying to devise better policies, better theories and better ethical codes, trusting that these are neutral problem solving mechanisms that will lead to better practice⁴²³ – or critically to the past, by regarding archaeology in the context of a colonial and hegemonic order that automatically favours western values over other values. But most of these policies, methodologies and critiques have overlooked the complex relationship between project policy, discourse and practice. In addition, they have often focused on the issue of ‘indigenous community’ involvement in postcolonial contexts, and less upon the motivations, desires and values of more broadly defined ‘local communities’ and/or of a broader range of stakeholders in global, national and regional contexts. As such, this study paid more attention to analysing the underlying processes by which archaeological research projects abroad are developed, negotiated and implemented, as well as to the impact of the agency and social position of archaeologists and other actors on project outcomes.

This study has brought forward an ethnographic approach as to investigate how archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context, as well as to be able to reflect upon the role and responsibility of archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of others when working abroad. It has done this by regarding the archaeological research practices of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University as a ‘culture’ under investigation, specifically by taking the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project and the Santa Barbara Project as case studies.

Within this ethnography, research projects have been approached as networks of actors, values, policies and discourses, that centred around a conception of sites as multi-vocal, multi-temporal, multi-spatial and contested sites of knowledge, practice and power. By bringing forward a ‘practice perspective’ towards project policy discourses, this study focused upon the ways in which interrelations between actors and discourses were created across time and space in multiple sites. The concept of ‘value’ has thereby been applied as an analytical tool that illustrated the intentions, desires and motivations of actors in relation to archaeological research, heritage, and collaborative projects.

Taken together, this ethnographic approach investigated three specific research questions; 1) What are the values and discourses of actors in archaeological project policies with respect to research, heritage

⁴²³ As discussed in section 1.5, this line of argumentation is inspired by the work of Van Gastel & Nuijten (2005, 86).

management and collaboration?, 2) How do archaeological actors negotiate these values and discourses in relation to those of others in society abroad?, and 3) What is the influence of this process of policy negotiation upon project outcomes?

This final chapter will address these questions in chronological order as to be able to understand how Dutch archaeological research projects abroad work in their social context (section 6.2 will thereby deal with the first research question, section 6.3 with the second, and section 6.4 with the third). The study will end with a brief reflection upon the role and responsibility of archaeologists in relation to the needs and wishes of others, which will include a discussion on the value of ethnographic research for archaeological research projects abroad (section 6.5).

6.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL VALUES AND DISCOURSES

Both the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project and the Santa Barbara Project were developed out of the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University (LU). Although both these projects were set up as to be sensitive to the input of collaborative partners, and although both projects responded to opportunities and desires by local partners, it was the Dutch archaeological researchers that played the most significant role in the initial development and scope of the project proposals and research programs. These project proposals and programs thereby reflected the specific values and discourses of the Dutch researchers, in response to those of a myriad of funding programs in the field of culture, research and foreign affairs, institutional policies, cultural and archaeological policies, and archaeological theory. Taken together, these values and discourses became embedded in institutionally, academically and personally defined project policies.

The main discourse that could be identified in the project policies and practices is the ‘Authorised Archaeology Discourse’ (AAD).⁴²⁴ This discourse exists of a set of ‘story-lines’ (see section 2.5 and 2.6) that effectively prioritises the archaeological and scientific values of practices of research, heritage management and collaboration. An important story-line in this discourse consists of approaching sites with material remains of the past as a fragile, non-renewable resource under threat that has the potential to yield scientific, objective interpretations and knowledge of the past. It is in line with this view, that the concept of ‘heritage’ is discursively constructed in the AAD; material remains of the past are regarded as ‘archaeological heritage’, and in turn, ‘heritage’ is thought of to be constituted of material manifestations of the past. As the archaeological and scientific values of material remains and sites can only be ‘unlocked’ by objective, scientifically sound archaeological research, the AAD inherently emphasises archaeological researchers as professional experts that can identify, investigate and manage this ‘heritage’ resource on behalf of the public. A related discursive identification of archaeological researchers with the sites that they investigate and the data that they produce, completes this story-line.

In addition, the AAD advocates the primacy of excavation and research over conservation, presentation, tourism and socio-economic development, by regarding scientific field-research as producing objective knowledge that should be considered as universally valuable for future generations, and by regarding this knowledge as the basis for all other future social benefits. By doing so, it postpones the values of other actors in society, as these values and actors are regarded as coming into play only after the archaeological and scientific values of a heritage site have been ‘unearthed’ and sufficiently investigated.

⁴²⁴ As discussed in sections 2.4 and 4.4.1, the AAD has been heavily influenced and inspired by the formulation of the ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (AHD) of Laurajane Smith (2004; 2006). Later in this chapter, I will come back to the relationship between the AAD and the AHD in more detail.

As such, the AAD stresses that once the archaeological value of a resource has been established, and knowledge has been produced, it then becomes important to protect, consolidate and manage the site, after which this ‘heritage site’ – as a source of knowledge of the past – can be presented, interpreted and attract visitors, thereby providing even more public benefit. If done correctly, such interaction of the public with the archaeological value of the site will then ideally lead to enlarge their support, awareness and care for ‘their archaeological heritage’, thereby ensuring the survival of the archaeological data set from ignorance, destruction and development. Taken together, the AAD prioritises expert values, knowledge of a universally significant past, and objective scientific research over alternative values when investigating and/or managing an archaeological site in a collaborative project.

It is hereby important to stress that the AAD, as reflected in the project policies of both the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project as well as the Santa Barbara Project, encapsulated explicit intentions by the Dutch archaeological actors with respect to enhancing the social value of research, heritage management and collaboration. First of all, both project policies intended to promote collaborative partnerships in the field of scientific, professional and objective archaeological research as to enhance capacity building. Secondly, they aimed to integrate their archaeological practices with wider heritage management concerns, by advocating for conservation, presentation and tourism development after their scientific research would have produced knowledge about the past. Thirdly, both project policies were concerned with the value of archaeological research for the general public. They advocated for the development of public benefits in the sense of facilitating local communities to identify with objective and universal archaeological interpretations of heritage, as well as in the sense of socio-economic development as it could arise from tourism. In addition, they promoted community involvement as a means to improve the protection and awareness of archaeological heritage.

However, these policy intentions were not always in line with the values and discourses of other actors in social contexts abroad with respect to research, heritage management and collaboration. As discussed, the AAD sat in contrast with the view that the value of sites with material remains of the past lies primarily in contemporary identifications and uses. For some, material remains were not ‘scientific data’, but rather someone’s ‘heritage’, that is, a manifestation of people’s history, identity, memory or commemoration. For others, sites with material remains were a development burden, a source of income, a tourism asset, an educational tool, an opportunity for capacity building, or simply a place to have family picnics. Interestingly, many of these ‘alternative’ views also used the concept of ‘heritage’ to refer to material remains of the past, but the perception, approach and attributed values were different. Whilst the AAD prioritises the archaeological and scientific values of heritage sites, other discourses prioritised the identity, local, educational, tourism an/or socio-economic values of such places. Taking these alternative values and discourses into account, the question arises how the Dutch archaeological actors negotiated the archaeological and scientific values, and the AAD more generally, in relation to those of others in society abroad.

6.3 PROJECT NEGOTIATIONS

Embedded within the project policies, programs and representations were the story-lines of the AAD as discussed above. These story-lines facilitated other actors to adhere more easily to the project networks and programs. This is because the story-lines allowed actors to translate the policy goals and intentions in the field of research, heritage management and collaboration into the values and interests of their supporting bodies, policies and institutions. As a result, different actors, without necessarily sharing the same values

and discourses, could share a set of story-lines over a limited period of time and space, thereby forming strong temporary discourse-coalitions, or alliances, as to benefit mutually from the archaeological process.

First of all, the AAD fitted seamlessly with the values of partners and policies in the field of science and academia. The emphasis within the story-lines of the AAD on knowledge production, the primacy of excavation, and that of objective scientific research, allowed the archaeological actors to attain institutional support from Leiden University, as it foresaw in their scientific and educational values by providing academic publications, field-schools and student training. For similar reasons, it also meant that the projects could attain financial support from for example the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO)⁴²⁵ or the Leiden University Fund (LUF).

Secondly, the AAD facilitated a translation into the values of partners and policies in the field of heritage management. The AAD thereby fitted seamlessly with the ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (AHD) as brought forward by Laurajane Smith⁴²⁶, as it shared many of its story-lines. Especially the story-line whereby professional expertise was advocated in order to protect material remains of the past as a fragile, scientific ‘heritage resource’ from development pressures and public ignorance, played a fundamental role in this. This story-line, and the AHD more generally, was for instance embedded in the archaeological heritage policies of the Department of Antiquities in Jordan (DoA), of the Department of Urban and Regional Development Planning and Housing in Curaçao (DROV), and in the European ‘Malta Convention’ that was being transferred to the former Netherlands Antilles. Although the AAD prioritised excavation over preventive conservation, and although the AAD focused less upon the monumental, visually attractive material manifestations of the past than the story-lines of the AHD, discourse coalitions could easily be created through stressing that conservation of the past through knowledge production was seen as a necessary step in a management process towards sustaining universal public value. A shared emphasis on the need for professional expertise of archaeologists to act on behalf of the public, and on creating public awareness as to protect a fragile resource for future generations, completed this.

In terms of other aspects of heritage management, the story-line of the AAD that advocated for the conservation, interpretation and presentation of material remains of the past after knowledge production, also facilitated translation into the tourism values of Santa Barbara Plantation and of the DoA. This was because the first could see how knowledge production and excavation allowed for the unobstructed development of golf-courses and tourism trails for (international) visitors, whilst the latter could, in principle, translate such a story-line into the need for tourism development as it was brought forward by the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities.

Finally, the AAD fitted the values, story-lines and intentions of partners with regards to the issue of collaboration. The story-line in the AAD that emphasised objective research as the basis for collaboration, for example matched the values of Yarmouk University (YU), as it could facilitate scientific and educational values that fitted the wish for the creation of a ‘value-free’, independent archaeology in Jordan. Initially, such a story-line also succeeded in facilitating support from both the National Archaeological Anthropological Memory Management in Curaçao (NAAM) as well as the DoA, as the concept of ‘scientific collaboration’ could be translated into their wishes for capacity building and knowledge transfer.

The emphasis on ‘capacity building’ and ‘collaboration’ also meant that the project policies could be brought in line with contemporary postcolonial and postmodern critiques in the field of archaeological theory, as it fitted a discourse on indigenous and local community participation. Stressing the development

⁴²⁵ As discussed in relation to the early phases of the Deir Alla Joint Archaeological Project (see chapter 4), NWO was originally founded as the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO).

⁴²⁶ See section 2.4 for a detailed description of the work of Smith (2004; 2006), Smith & Waterton (2009), and Waterton *et al.* (2006).

of public benefits in the sense of facilitating a local identification with universal and objective archaeological interpretations of heritage, as well as in the sense of socio-economic development as it could arise from tourism, also meant that political support from the Dutch government could be ensured for the Joint Project. A similar emphasis on capacity building and collaboration also strengthened the support by the Leiden University Fund and the Faculty of Archaeology for the Santa Barbara Project, as it fitted their need for demonstrating the social value of research – especially when project actors succeeded in securing private funding from Santa Barbara Plantation. A shared story-line on how a professional collaboration between archaeologists and developers could safeguard heritage by creating universally significant knowledge about the past, also matched the preferred representation of collaboration by Santa Barbara Plantation.

In effect, the story-lines of the AAD as reflected in the policy goals and intentions of the two projects, allowed for the formation of strong, temporary alliances with other partners in society – even without necessary sharing the same values and discourses with respect to research, heritage management and collaboration. The use of very condensed conceptualisations of story-lines, such as ‘capacity building’, ‘community involvement’, ‘heritage’, ‘collaboration’ and/or ‘public benefit’, facilitated this as such ‘mobilising concepts’ (cf Shore & Wright 1997; Hajer 2005; Vos 2011) allowed for different actors to adhere to policy programs and project networks more easily.

The successful translation of values was hereby heavily influenced by the discourse, personal background and agency of individual actors – an issue well illustrated by the way in which the late Henk Franken had set up the original scope and formation of the Deir Alla Project. But also the continuation of project programs needed a constant process of brokering and translation, whereby the institutional affiliation of actors could have strong implications on the perception of a project’s success. The transfer of the Head of Research and Excavation of the DoA to YU is a good example of this, as it left the DoA without an archaeologist that could successfully translate the scientific and archaeological values of the Joint Project into the training and public values of the department; effectively, it led to the transfer of project benefits to the YU.

Secondly, the translation of values by actors was often intrinsically linked to their need for maintaining institutional, political and financial support, most notably by trying to ensure continuous access to the benefits deriving from archaeological projects (cf Mosse 2005). This process has been distilled for instance in the way in which different actors in the former Netherlands Antilles have tried to influence the implementation of the Malta Convention, and of the Santa Barbara Project in particular, as to be able to also benefit from the potential research and financial opportunities deriving from this.

Thirdly, this study illustrated that the discourses and personal background of actors could play an important role in the successful translation of values into political and financial support. The way in which Dutch embassy personnel in Palestine discursively emphasised the social value of archaeological projects in contrast to those in Jordan, is an example of this, as it allowed archaeology to be translated more effectively into policy programs in the sphere of ‘culture and development’. Finally, the processes of policy negotiation, value translation and project network formation have been further ‘contextualized’ through the creation of a network of supporting actors. It is in this sphere that influential actors outside the immediate project networks played an important role, as they could provide significant political support for projects through their extensive global reach (cf Latour 1996). The Council of State Advisor for the Netherlands Antilles, the Dutch Consul General for Jordan, and the Chief Administrator of the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO), are all examples of how ‘external brokers’, with similar story-lines as the AAD, could help in stabilising the continuation of project network formations.

6.4 POLICY AND PRACTICE

Now that I have summarised how the AAD facilitated the formation of temporary partnerships, I will explore in more detail how processes of policy negotiation impacted upon project outcomes. In this respect, it is worth noting that the projects did not (yet) fully succeed in implementing several policy goals and intentions in relation to the social value of archaeology, such as site conservation, site interpretation, the establishment of local museums, capacity building of local institutions, and/or the creation of educational and socio-economic benefits for local communities. In addition, this study has identified an (often unintended) exclusion of local partners from project networks and benefits, such as the DoA in Jordan, the NAAM and the Archaeological Working Group (AWG) in Curaçao, and, arguably, local community members in both these contexts. This in turn led not only to the situation that most of the benefits from archaeological research projects abroad were geared towards (Dutch) archaeological researchers and academic institutions, but also to frictions between partners – most notably in terms of rather drastic different perceptions of success and failure of ‘collaborative projects’.

In effect, this study has illustrated how the scientific and archaeological values of practices of research, heritage management and collaboration came to be prioritised over other values through processes of project negotiation and policy implementation. One of the reasons behind this can be found in the AAD itself. This is because the AAD, as embedded in the project policies, postponed the values of other actors towards the future, by advocating that practices of field-research and knowledge production precedes those of conservation, interpretation, education, tourism and socio-economic development. Another reason for this lies in the inherent top-down approach in the AAD, which argues that universally significant, academic research precedes local use and identification, and which regards heritage as scientific material data that needs to be handled professionally and objectively. In combination with socio-political and historical frameworks that favoured external actors as knowledgeable experts, this in turn led to a situation in which ownership was granted to archaeological project actors as to make decisions over which, and whose, values and activities were to be taken into account in the first phases of the project. Because the formation of project networks was a complicated and time-consuming process, because the attraction of continuous financial support for the implementation of other values could not always be secured, and because the facilitation of some of these values was regarded as lying outside the sphere of influence and responsibility of the archaeological researchers themselves, this meant that conservation, presentation and tourism development activities were postponed to an insecure future. As such, several actors with other values and a lack of ‘archaeological’ expertise came to be – often unintentionally – excluded.

Another contributing factor lies in the fact that the story-lines, and especially the mobilising concepts such as ‘capacity building’, ‘community involvement’, ‘heritage’, ‘collaboration’ and/or ‘public benefit’, concealed the complete array of underlying values and discourses towards practices of research, heritage management and collaboration. This meant that project networks could much easier be maintained if these policy concepts did not overshadow fundamental conflicting values and discourses, especially in terms of ownership, power and access to archaeological resources. In other words, it meant that other actors could much easier continue to commit themselves to project networks and policy practices if they could align the attribution of expertise to archaeologists and the prioritisation of archaeological and scientific values with their own values and discourses.

Both YU and Santa Barbara Plantation for instance, could easily benefit from collaboration with Leiden University (and vice versa), as it fitted their respective aims for academic field research and unobstructed, responsible tourism development. As such, it gave them a strong partner with global access to financial, academic and political resources in relation to local political negotiations with the DoA and NAAM/DROV respectively. These resulting ‘core’ partnerships benefited from the story-line in the AAD

that advocated for professional, expert access to archaeological resources, since a collaboration with a strong external partner that prioritised archaeological excavation meant that ownership and access could be secured in relation to the demands of local partners that advocated for other uses and values.

The prioritisation of scientific and archaeological values was also a result of the significant impact of the institutional and financial research policies that facilitate academic research elements of archaeological projects. The combination of the institutional policies of the Faculty of Archaeology with the research funding policies of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research and/or the Leiden University Fund, meant that a strong demand was placed upon the archaeological actors to undertake field research, organise field schools for students, as well as to write academic publications. The prioritisation of scientific and archaeological values of collaboration in the project policies was thereby strengthened, as these institutional and financial research policies did not easily allow for, or give credit to the undertaking of activities in the field of conservation, outreach, capacity building or tourism development. For the Joint Project, the research funding policies behind Leiden University and YU provided for example substantially greater financial resources to facilitate academic research, then those resources that the DoA could bring to the table for activities in the field of conservation and presentation.

This also meant that global access to potential financial resources for archaeological research played a significant role in the formation of project networks and inherent power relationships between actors. For example, the financial opportunity deriving out of the Dutch cultural policies in the field of foreign affairs, contributed to a shift in research focus from Jordan to Palestine by archaeologists of the Faculty of Archaeology, as these funding policies could easier yield a translation into the research policies' and institutional demand for fieldwork, student training and publications. Likewise, the private matching funds flowing out of a collaboration with the Santa Barbara Plantation in the sphere of developer-led, or 'Malta' archaeology also lead to an increased emphasis on knowledge production, as it fitted the values and wishes of both Santa Barbara Plantation as well those of the institutional and funding priorities of Leiden University to excavate, rather than to conserve the site through the development of an 'archaeological park'. In addition, the choice to excavate specific site locations was thereby also influenced by the specific research questions and objectives of the archaeological actors.

Indeed, the process whereby the archaeological and scientific values of research, heritage management and collaboration were prioritised, was further facilitated because activities in the area of archaeological field investigations and knowledge production could yield substantive research and economic benefits for individuals and institutions. As such, the translation of values by actors was often intrinsically linked to their personal need for maintaining institutional, political and financial support, most notably by trying to ensure continued access and ownership to archaeological resources and the potential benefits deriving from this. This, in turn, was done by reproducing and constructing discourses, story-lines and project representations that fitted the aims and values of their (potential) supporting institutions and policies.

For example, a diversity of actors in both project policies discursively produced the practices of the archaeological projects as a result of 'joint projects', 'shared responsibilities', 'successful collaborations', 'Malta archaeology', 'preventive archaeology', 'community archaeology', and, in some instances, 'indigenous' or 'postcolonial' archaeology. Notably, this was sometimes despite their discrepancy with actual project activities and project partner perceptions. The representation of project activities as a result of project policies was facilitated by the fact that actors could produce the intentions and future values of the AAD – as embedded in the project policies – as actual successes. As pointed out by Bruno Latour (1996) and David Mosse (2005), the success of policy does therefore not necessarily depend so much on its ability to orientate practice, but also on its ability to connect actors, inspire allegiance, and maintain institutional support, by providing coherent interpretations of practice. As such, policy discourses

and representations such as ‘Malta archaeology’ or ‘collaborative archaeology’ could become the end, rather than solely the means of project practices, as these created a more attractive framework for maintaining relationships than the contradictory project realities (Cf Büscher 2008).

The potential research, financial and institutional benefits of archaeological projects were so well facilitated by the AAD story-lines, mobilising concepts and representations of the project policies that other actors, such as the DoA and NAAM, started to produce and utilise these as to gain access and ownership to archaeological resources and projects themselves. However, story-lines that promoted expert ownership over archaeological heritage, or concepts and representations such as ‘collaboration’ and ‘Malta archaeology’, did not fit easily with the alternative values and discourses of these actors as they inherently conflicted with their views on the ‘public’ ownership and beneficiaries of archaeological projects. Basically, by using these story-lines, concepts and representations, they ultimately contributed to a process whereby they could be placed outside of project network formations, primarily because the AAD as embedded in the project policies regarded their lack of resources, of institutional capacity, of effective legal power and of expertise as a reason for exclusion, rather than inclusion.

The DoA for instance, regarded project collaboration primarily as a means for capacity building and regaining ownership within the field of archaeological heritage management, primarily in the face of stronger, international and national academic and political forces. Their emphasis on ‘collaboration’ and ‘national ownership’ as a means to provide benefits for governmental representatives thereby conflicted with the AAD of the project policies, which rather saw capacity building with Jordanian academic counterparts as the most appropriate means to develop an independent Jordanian archaeology. In Curaçao, NAAM also regarded collaboration as a means to enhance institutional capacity and expertise in the struggle for regaining ‘national’ ownership over archaeological heritage management. Expertise was hereby primarily seen in the sense of having knowledge and understanding of local, legal, political and cultural circumstances, whilst archaeological heritage was primarily approached as a material manifestation of memories and commemoration that could function as a means for national identity formation. Such values and discourses, however, conflicted with the project network formations of the Santa Barbara Project, as these stressed that DROV, as the legal state representative, had asked for an implementation of Malta principles whereby the developer, as a major funder, had a right to choose the ‘professional’ archaeological partner. Santa Barbara Plantation hereby preferred to work with an external, academic and professional organisation with ‘archaeological’ expertise, rather than with a local ‘heritage’ organisation without an archaeologist.

Because actors such as the DoA, NAAM and the AWG ultimately did not succeed in gaining their desired access and ownership over archaeological sites and resources, and because they felt that they did not benefit financially, educationally or scientifically from the archaeological projects, they subsequently constructed and contextualized representations of the archaeological projects as being ‘failures’, ‘academically selfish’, or even ‘colonial’.

It is interesting to note that both project policies mentioned that public benefits and involvement were to be the result of archaeological projects. This was primarily seen in the sense of facilitating communities to identify with objective and universal archaeological interpretations of heritage, as well as by means of creating socio-economic development as it could arise from tourism. But despite such intentions for creating public benefits and involvement, the subsequent negotiations over project benefits and ownership between all project partners ultimately contributed to an (often unintended) exclusion of local community members as well.

In Jordan for example, local community perceptions of exclusion were not solely the result of the way in which the AAD was embedded within the Dutch project policies and practices, but also because of

power struggles between notably the DoA, the Ministry of Tourism and YU over the ownership and access to archaeological sites, as none of these partners pro-actively sought to accommodate a bottom-up collaboration with the local municipality. Likewise, the exclusion of local communities and partners in Curaçao was not just the result of the way in which the AAD had been embedded in the specific project policies in a framework of Malta archaeology, but also because of previous conflicts and failed negotiations between NAAM and Santa Barbara Plantation over the ownership, access and management of archaeological ‘heritage’ resources. In addition, internal political decisions within DROV had led to the accommodation of the values and desires of Santa Barbara Plantation. This was not only because several key political and governmental actors did not want to thwart the larger socio-economic benefits for the island, but also because they felt that a foundation such as NAAM had no effective claim in the face of a strong financial partnership by Leiden University and Santa Barbara Plantation, as these would preserve and enhance the public value of archaeological sites within contemporary cultural legal frameworks.

Arguably, local community members in Deir Alla and Santa Barbara did not benefit as much as the archaeological project actors would have liked. Apart from the project policies and negotiations mentioned above, this is also because community members did not primarily attribute archaeological and scientific values to sites and projects, but rather values in the field of access to property, recreation, education, and job-employment through tourism development. In Deir Alla for instance, the fence could be seen as a physical example of an expert boundary between archaeological research on the one hand, and educational, recreational and development values on the other. Despite a general positive view on the archaeological presence, and despite some opportunities for employment in archaeological excavations, community members mainly desired educational opportunities and socio-economic benefits through tourism development. Unfortunately, the intricate workings of the project policy negotiations thereby contributed to the fact that the implementation and development of such activities, most notably through the idea of a regional museum, came to be postponed, and have as of yet not been realised. At Santa Barbara, this study identified a similar local perception of exclusion from the project network. Interestingly, this was not so much related to the undertaking of archaeological research at the pre-columbian site of Spanish Water, but rather to a broader desire for access to the property of the former plantation at large, most notably in the sense of recreational values at the beach, as well as in access to economic benefits through job creation at the international tourism scheme by Santa Barbara Plantation and Hyatt Regency. The way in which some community members came to identify Leiden University as part of a ‘hidden’, ‘forbidden’ and ‘capitalist’ development scheme by Santa Barbara Plantation, is thereby particularly noteworthy. Arguably, the project policies also led to a postponement and exclusion of educational and presentation values for local community members, as, for instance, the envisaged local exhibition at the entrance office of Santa Barbara Plantation and the archaeological tourism amenities by Hyatt Regency (such as the walking trails and the interpretation at the golf courses) will probably not easily fit the desires and opportunities for access by the local community – although this remains to be seen.

In relation to the projects’ intentions to facilitate local communities to identify with archaeological interpretations of heritage, it can be noted that substantially different approaches to ‘indigenous’ identification with heritage existed. In Deir Alla, the identification of the local community was to be found not so much in the sense of shared ties with people of the past to an extreme and hard landscape, but rather in much more recent values of memory and commemoration – most notably in their status as Palestinian refugees, as well as in their experiences and feelings of friendship with members of the archaeological excavation teams during the last 50 years. At Santa Barbara, the local social value that was attributed to the ‘archaeological heritage’ site was not so much to be found in a desire to identify with the history of indigenous Indian populations, nor, interestingly, so much with the history of the wider plantation during colonial times. Rather, the site of Spanish Water was often regarded as part of a wider set of heritage values

that were attributed to Santa Barbara at large, which were to be found in memories relating to its mining history, as well as to the recreation spaces of the former beach at Santa Barbara – both elements that were heavily mixed with broader, socio-political and economic feelings of exclusion to property.

In summary, it can be said that the unequal provision of project benefits to archaeological academic institutions, as well as an exclusion of several local partners, has been the result of a process whereby project policies, discourses and actor agencies together contributed to the prioritisation of archaeological and scientific values, as well as to the attribution of expertise and ownership to archaeological actors. As such, critiques and representations that regard the social impact of archaeological practices abroad as solely the result of either (Dutch) project policies, (western) discourses or (archaeological) actors' motivations, seem to fall short in their explanation.

Still, the question remains if the attribution of ownership and expertise to academic archaeologists through discursive processes is an intended process or rather the result of a self-referential approach (cf Waterton *et al.* 2006, 351).⁴²⁷ Perhaps, as these authors suggest, intentionality becomes at best secondary, as only the outcomes of policy discourses matter. However, this does not mean that intentions do not matter at all. First of all, this study illustrated how actors' intentions to enhance the social value of archaeology have played an important role in how project network formations were developed, and in how subsequent project policies came to postpone other values to the future. Secondly, this study showed how project partners sometimes represented these intentions as successes as to maintain support. Interestingly, this meant that in some instances the intentions of archaeologists, through policy discourses and actor negotiations, could potentially lead to the postponement and exclusion of precisely the values of those actors that they sought to accommodate. In line with La Salle (2012), archaeological academics should as such be careful that their intentions 'to do good' do not lead to the fact that they, nor their partners, are actually selling an archaeological desire for 'digging holes'.

6.5 CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

With such remarks in relation to the intentionality of actors in place, I will end this study by further reflecting upon the role and responsibility of archaeological academics in relation to the values and demands of others in society when working abroad.⁴²⁸

Despite the fact that we, as archaeological academics, might not be solely responsible for the social impact of our archaeological conduct, and despite the fact that our best intentions and policies may be extremely difficult to implement in practice, this does not mean that we can abdicate responsibility. This is because we are, whether we like it or not, often placed in positions of 'gatekeepers' of the past, whereby we are attributed the expertise and power to make decisions over management aspects of archaeological remains that might be broader than our academic and institutional remit. The emphasis of the AAD on archaeological professionalism and expertise, the constant need for brokering, value translation and representation, the access to resources and networks on a global scale, combined with the idea that international experts bring status and strength to local partners in local power structures, all contribute to this.

⁴²⁷ See also the end of section 2.4.

⁴²⁸ Some of these final concluding paragraphs draw upon work by the author during the course of this study as published elsewhere (Perring & Van der Linde 2009).

As such, archaeological academics play an important role in not only the investigation and exploration of the past, but also in the way in which archaeological collaborative projects are integrated with wider heritage issues and socio-political and economic concerns. So, even though we may be employed to investigate the material remains of the past, or train our students how to do so, and even though we may do this according to the legal, cultural and institutional policies and ethical guidelines that frame our archaeological projects abroad, we should always be actively aware that our practices have an impact upon the values and demands of others in society.

Accordingly, if we wish to take up our role and responsibility in relation to archaeological research projects abroad, we need to mitigate the potential negative and exclusionary effects of top-down project policies that postpone the values of other actors in society, by locating our work within broader long-term strategies for cultural and socio-economic development, and by advocating for bottom-up and value-based approaches that take the empowerment of local institutions and communities, according to their own values, seriously. Ultimately, this means that our conduct needs to be based upon a vision of archaeological heritage that cares not only for the creation of knowledge and the preservation of scientific data, but also for those connected to it. In addition, it means that we need to bring to the fore project policies and practices that see the lack of expertise by local partners as a reason for inclusion, rather than exclusion. Basically, we need to accept that material remains of the past are not solely an opportunity for research, but also – simultaneously – a source of identity, economic development, education or recreation.

Instead of seeing the facilitation of other people's values as lying outside our responsibility, I propose that archaeologists should actually take up their privileged position and decision-making power more strongly. If we wish to increase our chances for socially relevant and sensitive archaeological projects that successfully integrate research, heritage management and collaboration, we need to first of all challenge the Authorised Archaeological Discourse, by putting more emphasis, resources and priority on capacity building, empowerment, and competing heritage discourses that include notions of care, memory and self-development. This means that we actively need to try and broaden the values and discourses of our current funding and institutional frameworks, so that they better allow for the implementation, resourcing and evaluation of long-term, institutional collaborations in which conservation, presentation, education, tourism development and/or capacity building elements are seen as a fundamental part of archaeological conduct abroad, and not as a well-intended afterthought. Especially now that societal relevance and impact assessments of research are becoming increasingly important and demanded in the Netherlands (Polman 2012; Zijlstra 2012), we should make sure that these are not only assessed in a Dutch, national context, but also in relation to those societies abroad where we conduct our research.

Ultimately, we can no longer hide behind a notion of archaeological research as a neutral activity free from political and social responsibility. This means that we should not only be honest about the political nature of our work, but also of the way in which our own intentions and desires for maintaining institutional and financial support shape our conduct. This is important, as we often like to represent our practices in a guardianship and interpretive research role rather than a commercial or exploitative one, even when we are engaged in business enterprises as part of commercial development processes (cf Breen & Rhodes 2010, 115). Likewise, we need to make sure that we do not too easily hide behind a sense of not wanting to be seen as 'neo-colonial', as such issues can potentially turn a blind eye to local power discrepancies and the exclusion of local communities in archaeological research processes.

Taking up such an active stance in relation to our privileged position, inherently means recognising the ethical issues that our practices raise. Whilst professional codes of conduct might help us in staying away from the blatantly unethical, ultimately, the specificity of our local practices means that no universal guidelines can save us from having to make difficult decisions as to whose values to involve where, when

and why. The minimum that we can do is to acknowledge the differences in power, listen to other values and views, and facilitate the negotiations of values with those actors that are affected by archaeological conduct. This means that we need to be constantly aware of how our work is located and perceived in local cultural and socio-political power structures, and in the context of wider economic development schemes.⁴²⁹

Because an advocacy for local empowerment by archaeological academics leads potentially to their fears over a loss of control over scientific research questions and approaches, and because a self-aware and proactive stance of academics in the negotiation with local actors is in danger of being perceived as being neo-colonial, top-down and capitalist, it means that everybody involved has to bring to the fore a sensitive and constructive approach to institutional collaboration, one that allows for the harnessing of the personal intentions and institutional constraints of everyone involved. In the words of MacEachern, the problems of negotiations in archaeological research projects are therefore ultimately to be found in the “difficulties of translation, of groups of people who in many cases wished to work productively together, but who found themselves frequently at odds or misdirected because of a failure to appreciate the presumptions and the constraints on other actors in what was supposed to be a shared endeavour” (2010, 350).

In this sense, ethnographies of archaeological practices could play a fundamental role in the future. If we apply a self-reflexive ethnographic approach, right from the start, to the way in which archaeological research projects are developed, negotiated and implemented, we can not only shed light on the actual processes that underlie the outcome of archaeological practices abroad, but we can also contribute to actively engaging stakeholder participation in archaeological research, heritage management and collaboration, by giving voice to their values and wishes in the process. By doing so, the ethnographic approach can contribute to an alignment of the call for multivocality and stakeholder consultation in the instrumental perspectives, with the highlighting of alternative, subaltern and indigenous values in the critical perspectives. Such a call for the integration of ethnography, archaeological research and value-based heritage management approaches, can ultimately contribute to practices in which the values of other actors in society are better cared for and facilitated, and in which collaboration and empowerment is not only sought after with academic peers, but also with staff and people from government bodies, non-governmental organisations and local communities.

However, this does not mean that we should think of ourselves as the actors that have the necessary expertise and right to become site managers. Instead, it means that we can help facilitate the translation of our archaeological research practices with processes of heritage management and heritage-making. Similarly, this does not mean that there is no place anymore for sound, scientific archaeological field method, as this continues to be important for not only raising historic awareness, enjoyment, and tolerance, but also because these methods and field techniques are often sought after in efforts of capacity building. Instead, we need to integrate our archaeological research practices with value-based heritage management assessments and with a self-reflexive ethnographic approach, so as to contribute to more equitable, ethical and locally sustainable collaborative practices that are not only scientifically, but also socially relevant.

⁴²⁹ cf Perring & Van der Linde (2009, 210-211).