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Editorial

It is summer now, and on fieldwork or not, we are all looking forward to our annual meeting in Maastricht. EAA 2017 is coming up soon, so please remember to book your travel and your hotel or other accommodations. Also, please remember to vote in the EAA election, before 1 September. You should have received an email, or you can vote through the link in your personal profile.

You will notice that this issue of TEA is rather slim in comparison to the ones we previously edited – we have decided to combine the Spring Issue 52 and the Summer Issue 53 as one pdf to archive. Our TEA website is up-to-date, however, as we aim to disseminate all news, announcements and reports as soon as we receive them. Please keep the information coming – we are happy to include all items relevant to the EAA community.

Note that a few contributions to this newsletter by our Vice-president Sophie Hueglin are concerned with archaeology and processes of its professionalization. A united front of professionals makes heritage concerns visible and advocates their relevance to society in competing European interests.

We are still looking for short articles about Open Access in archaeology. This issue of TEA includes a brief discussion of Image Rights for publication and dissemination. The topic of image rights is a good example of the variety of national laws surrounding copyright and permission to reuse data and images. With multi-national archaeological projects becoming ever more common, and multi-national publishers attempting to control copyright, we need to know the applicable laws, and perhaps push for European – or even global – laws governing the dissemination of publicly funded research. Open Access and Creative Commons licensing will not resolve all the differences in national legal systems. EAA, through its cooperative efforts and Europe-wide scope, is positioned to offer guidance and contribute to policies as they develop. We need our membership to offer thoughts and experiences that the EAA can use to address OA in European heritage policies. You can send comments to TEA, or comment directly on the Debate page on the EAA website.

In addition to matters concerning EAA governance and the upcoming 23rd Annual Meetings, this issue also contains several announcements, research, and a tribute to Bernhard Hänsel.

Please send us your debates, research updates and conference announcements for the next issue, Autumn/Fall 2017, by 15 October 2017 at tea@e-a-a.org.

Katharina Rebay-Salisbury and Roderick B. Salisbury
EAA Matters

From our President

by Felipe Criado-Boado, EAA president, on the behalf of EAA Executive Board and Committees
(felipe.criado-boado@incipit.csic.es)

This is turning out to be a very busy but productive year for the EAA and its Officers and Secretariat.

External affairs. As your president, I have represented the EAA at the annual conferences of the SAA (Vancouver), ClfA (Newcastle) and the Prehistoric Society (Southampton), and in the final meeting of the ARIADNE project (Florence), as well as a number of other official meetings and commitments that I attended myself or delegated to other EAA officers, such as the EAC general assembly (Athens), attended by our Vice-president, and the European Heritage Alliance meeting (Brussels), attended by our Treasurer. The EAA has become a member of the European Heritage Alliance, and has participated in the meetings to prepare the European Year of Cultural Heritage.

The SAA in Vancouver was marked by the presentation of its new president, Susan Chandler. We are looking forward to maintaining the same strong connections the EAA has enjoyed in the past with the former SAA presidents Diane Giffor-González and Jeffrey Altschul. In the coming months we will be exploring ways of promoting interaction between our members and organizations. We are also discussing inroads for common complementary cooperation with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ClfA), and we are working on a Memorandum of Understanding between both organizations with Chief Executive Peter Hinton. One year after Brexit we are still keeping a close eye on its potential effects on our British members and those who work in and with UK Archaeology.

Amidst the new wave of nationalisms that are currently appearing in Europe, the EAA will continue to defend and support the advantages of a pan-European perspective on archaeological practice, heritage and research. This is an interest that we share with many other different organizations, with whom we will foster cooperation in the near future; this is the case of The Prehistoric Society, with whose president, Alex Gibson, we are considering the most practical venues to enhance symmetrical cooperation. Moreover, I have been elected, as EAA president, to the Council of Europa Nostra, which will help to nurture mutual relationships.

Forthcoming Annual Meetings. The plans for the Barcelona 2018 annual meeting have intensified over the past few months, and have now received full support from the Directorate of Cultural Heritage of the regional government of Catalonia (the Generalitat) and the Department of Culture of Barcelona City Council. The Scientific Committee has already been created, headed by Margarita Díaz-Andreu. Apart from this, plans for Bern 2019 will soon be announced, and progress has been made in organising Budapest 2020. In addition, the EAA is exploring a series of promising options for arranging meetings after Budapest.

Maastricht and the new media strategy. 2017 will be the first Annual Meeting where we will experience a number of new developments for our conferences. Beyond many others that have been already announced, Maastricht will be the first meeting where we expect to host a full delegation of journalists from different European countries, including a number of prominent journals. In addition to this, the EAA will shortly be rolling out its own media strategy. You will have realised by now that we are using mass e-mails to provide you with practical information, albeit with a firm commitment to avoid frequent and repetitive use of this system: the last thing EAA wants is to spam its members. There are alternative ways of disseminating different kinds of information, and you will have seen that the EAA is increasingly present in social media. We encourage you to follow us on Twitter, Linkedin and Facebook.

Forthcoming organisation of EAA Communities. The announcement of the new system to engage members in the social life of the EAA and promote your basic interests through the creation of the
new “EAA Communities” has opened the way to new initiatives. There are detailed plans for the creation of a new “Community of Research on Wild Plant Resources”. But we also expect that those of us engaged in Contemporary Archaeology, Archaeology of Mountains and certain other issues will start up their own movements and consolidate them as an organized interest group within the EAA. In general, we envisage the quick and effective transformation of the current Working Parties into more active and empowered Communities, for whom a special meeting with representatives of the EAA Working Parties and Committees will be held in Maastricht (see the meeting programme for details).

Publications. This has been a successful year for EAA publications. The release of the first volume of the EJA published with CUP has been a success. We recently found out that the EJA is listed in the SCIMAGO journal, in 23rd position amongst 262 international archaeological journals. Work is underway to develop a strategy to update and promote our Themes series. Also, a new series of CUP will be soon launched, under the editorial direction of the EAA. The series, entitled “Elements on the Archaeology of the Europeans”, will cover the period from the Palaeolithic through the present day, and will boost the visibility of the EAA and the type of archaeology that the EAA considers necessary at this current moment in time. After a public call to select the editor(s) of the series, this will be announced after the summer once the formal decision has been taken. EAA members should note that they will benefit from a 40% discount when buying individual copies.

Europe and beyond. A number of important decisions will be submitted for approval by members at the next Annual Members Businesses Meeting (AMBM, see the meeting schedule for details; if you have still not registered to make up the quorum of the AMBM, please do not forget to do so), including a minor change in our fees system which, without causing any increase in current membership fees, will facilitate the engagement of archaeologists outside of Europe. This is important because the EAA, as part of the strategy to promote an ideal of continental perspectivism for archaeological practice and heritage, also intends to become global in scope, in order to incorporate different inputs and diverse archaeological traditions. By looking beyond regional and nationalist approaches, and then going even further by way of a global critique of Europeanism, we will be able to develop the perspective we need to promote the interests of our members, of those working in Archaeology, and of those societies we serve.

Strategic Planning at the next AMBM. In order to facilitate this, at the AMBM we will also present the EAA Action Plan, Government Plan and Secretariat Plan that develops our Strategic Planning, as announced in Vilnius.

Please use your personal profile on the EAA website. I will finish with two remarks, the first of which is eminently practical, and the second quite general. As members, you should take advantage of the new capabilities of our new web-based system that not only includes personal services but also enhanced personal profiles that support your visibility and further interaction. Please take the time to explore them and make use of them.

Archaeology matters. Finally, I would like to make a closing comment. When I became president two years ago, I said that the future of archaeology lies in the process of connecting it with the big issues currently facing mankind. I proposed that whatever we do, whichever session or paper we review for being presented at our Annual Meetings, should clearly address these big issues. This means accepting that we should become politically engaged on many occasions, not in partisan politics, but in the social and cultural policies that go hand-in-hand with the societal dimensions of archaeological heritage and practices. This also means that all of us, and the EAA, should start thinking about why archaeology matters, what it means, and to whom, in terms of other fields of knowledge, research and social action. I share with all of you the sensation that our future as a discipline and professional activity –a future that is under threat, despite archaeological research continuing to be highly dynamic and archaeological heritage becoming significant for many sectors of the general public–
will depend on our ability to convince others of the social relevance of what we do, what we know, and what we learn every day.

**Calendar for EAA members July to September 2017**

- **28 July**  
  Deadline for session organisers to express interest in filming of sessions before 1 August
- **13 August**  
  Deadline for submission of papers for Student Award
- **15 August**  
  Deadline for last Annual Meeting cancellation
- **25 August**  
  Deadline for postal ballot papers
- **30 August – 3 September**: EAA Annual Meeting in Maastricht
  - **30 August**  
    Opening ceremony
  - **31 August**  
    EAA Annual Party
  - **1 September**  
    Deadline for ballot papers to be returned to the ballot box at the conference and for electronic voting at 12 pm.
    - AMBM and announcement of the election results
  - **2 September**  
    Annual Dinner
  - **15 October**  
    Deadline for sending in articles and announcements for TEA autumn/fall issue
  - **end October**  
    TEA autumn/fall issue

**Upcoming Events**

**2017**

- **18 - 19 August 2017**: 6th European Meeting on Forensic Archaeology (EMFA 2017), Roma
- **30 August - 3 September 2017**: EAA 23rd Annual Meeting, Maastricht, Netherlands
- **13 - 15 September 2017**: Aerial Archaeology Research Group (AARG) 2017 Annual Conference, Pula, Croatia
- **16 - 17 October 2017**: 4th meeting of the Central European Theoretical Archaeology Group (CE-TAG), Vienna, Austria
- **17 - 20 October 2017**: Meeting of the Italian Institute of Pre- and Protohistory “Preistoria e Protostoria della Lombardia” (Pre-and Protohistory of Lombardy), Milano

**2018**

- **22 - 26 May 2018**: 19th International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Cologne/Bonn, Germany
- **10 - 16 June 2018**: XVIII° UISPP mondial congress, Paris, France
- **5 - 9 September 2018**: EAA 24th Annual Meeting, Barcelona, Spain

SAfA (Society of Africanist Archaeologists) meeting, in 2018, will take place at Stony Brook University, New York (dates TBA) - generally in early summer

November 2018: 5th Congress of the PanAfrican Archaeological Association of Prehistory and Related Studies, Rabat, Morocco
Filming of EAA sessions

As in previous years, Landward Research Ltd. has volunteered to video or audio record sessions and roundtables at the 23rd EAA Annual Meeting in Maastricht to enhance the reach and impact of the EAA Annual Meeting. Please see the filmed sessions of past EAA Annual Meetings.

We are contacting you to see if you would be interested in having your session or roundtable filmed or if requested just audio recorded. This is 100% voluntary and your speakers can opt out too. If you are interested, the process is as follows:

► Speakers are contacted ahead of the conference to get their permission to film.
► Speakers can opt out and any speaker who opts out will not be filmed.
► The session is filmed and audio recorded by trained volunteers. Unless specifically requested, questions and the audience will not be recorded.
► The videos are then edited, if there are slides, they are inserted into the video. Speakers are then sent a link to their video or audio and they can request changes i.e. edit out certain sections, etc. or ask that the video not be aired. Speakers will have final editorial control over their own video.
► If the speakers approve their video it will go up on the EAA’s YouTube channel. Audio would go up on ITunes and APN. The videos and audio are released under a Creative Commons license and speakers can have a copy of their videos if they want them.

If you would like your session or roundtable to be filmed or audio recorded or if you have any questions please email Doug Rocks-Macqueen.

The number of sessions and roundtables that can be filmed is limited so please let us know as soon as possible if you are interested. Depending on demand it may not be possible to film your session/roundtable. The deadline for responding is 28 July.

Voices of Culture and Heritage: EAA ‘wins a seat’ within a critical planning forum in the European Commission for the European Year of Cultural Heritage

by Margaret Gowen, EAA Treasurer (mmgowen@live.com)

As one of 35 organisations chosen out of 310 applications to participate in the European Commission’s Stakeholder Committee, EAA is now participating with a significant group of cultural heritage organisations in the planning process for the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH). In addition, EAA has joined with over forty heritage organizations to promote and develop the work of the European Heritage Alliance 3.3. The Alliance, together with Europa Nostra can claim responsibility for the tireless promotion that has led to the success of this important conceptual development within the European Commission.

The first of three meetings planned for 2017 took place in Brussels during April a day after a meeting of the Heritage Alliance. Another meeting will be held in late September and a third in December.
EAA’s participation in the European Commission’s planning forum during 2017 and during 2018 presents a very significant opportunity for the Association. It will build the profile of EAA and help to establish significant contacts with sister organizations and civil society groups across Europe and further afield. In this new context EAA will align with and collaborate with other key ‘players’ in cultural heritage promotion and management around Europe. The Commission has also undertaken to send its information directly to all those 310 organizations that applied for participation in the Stakeholder Committee.

As with other European Years, 2018 will be implemented through initiatives and events at European, national, regional and local levels. National coordinators have been appointed in all EU member states and some countries have already allocated significant funds to support the year at a national level.

Quoting the Commission’s text:

“At European level, implementation of the Year will be a joint effort of the European Commission, the European Parliament, the Council and also the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee.

Activities will encompass awareness-raising and knowledge-sharing events. Up to 10 highly visible European initiatives will build a legacy for the Year following 2018. A large amount of transnational projects will be funded, with the support of the Creative Europe programme, Horizon 2020, Erasmus +, Citizens for Europe, and a number of other EU funding programmes.

The Commission is preparing a visual identity for the Year, which will be available for both national and European initiatives. The name and the logo of the Year may be used in the branding of events and projects taking place between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018, which contribute significantly to achieving one or more of the objectives of the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage.”
Under four headings (Engagement, Value, Protection and Innovation) there are ten areas in which activities will be promoted.

**Engagement:** Shared heritage; Bringing Europe’s cultural heritage, history and shared values closer to people; Heritage at school - discovering Europe’s treasures at an early age; Youth for heritage - engaging the younger generation

**Value:** New uses for heritage - re-imagining industrial, religious or military sites; Tourism and heritage - promoting sustainable cultural tourism

**Protection:** Cherishing heritage - developing standards for quality interventions in the historic environment and at heritage sites; Heritage at risk: fighting the illicit trade in cultural goods and managing risks at heritage sites

**Innovation:** Heritage-related skills - enhancing education and training for the traditional and the new professions; Heritage for all - fostering participation and social innovation; Science for heritage - using research, innovation, science and technology for the better conservation and presentation of heritage

EAA is now in a position where it can (and must) take on a visible and active role in the planning of the EYCH in its own activities. In addition, other opportunities will undoubtedly be identified within the context of planning for the year and active participation within the EYCH Stakeholder Committee and membership within the European Heritage Alliance 3.3. EAA will gain insight and information on the types of projects the Commission is seeking to support during the year and will also gain information on other European-sponsored projects that are aligning with and contributing to the year’s activities.

The EAA Annual Meeting in Barcelona presents a very significant opportunity in the context of the year. In equal measure the EYCH provides an opportunity for significant additional identity to the Barcelona meeting and add its own dynamic to the event.

EAA’s challenge at a general level will be to articulate ourselves clearly, forcefully and coherently within this multi-vocal environment, not least as advocates for the cultural and social value of archaeology. In addition EAA now must consider the need for an improved articulation of what archaeology adds to European cultural life and find its ‘place’ confidently within all those the existing voices that support European cultural heritage.


**Congratulations to Gerhard Ermischer**

*by Sophie Hueglin, Vice-President, European Association of Archaeologists (s.hueglin@web.de)*

We congratulate Gerhard Ermischer and CIVILSCAPE to having been elected Vice-Chair in the Democracy, Social Cohesion and Global Challenges Committee at the Conference of the International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs) of the Council of Europe (CoE)!

EAA member [Gerhard Ermischer](#) is Vice-President of CIVILSCAPE, an international association of civil society non-governmental organisations, which dedicate their work to landscape protection, management and planning, according to the “European Landscape Convention”. Gerhard Ermischer has already spent many years representing CIVILSCAPE in the Conference of the International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs) at the Council of Europe (CoE) in Strasbourg. During the Summer Session 2017, he was elected Vice-Chair of the Democracy, Social Cohesion and Global Challenges Committee together with Luminata Petrescu. In the coming three years, they will work under the President of the Conference of the INGOs Anna Rurka, Committee Chair Thierry Mathieu,
and the Committee members on statements and will participate in the formulation and implementation of conventions of the Council of Europe. With his profound background in archaeology, heritage protection, and civil engagement, Gerhard Ermischer aims to give guidance with the further implementation of the European Landscape Convention. EAA, which has INGO participatory status with the CoE, is looking forward to close cooperation with CIVILSCAPE and Gerhard Ermischer in Strasbourg.

Photo: Gerhard Ermischer (© Sophie Hüglin)
The Conference of INGOs at the Council of Europe

by Gerhard Ermischer, Vice-President of CIVILSCAPE (gerhard.ermischer@civilscape.eu) and Sophie Hueglin, Vice-President of EAA (s.hueglin@web.de)

EAA and CIVILSCAPE are both among the about 300 organisations, which have been granted participatory status with the Conference of the International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs). Therefore, it is important to know how these organisations function and in which way archaeologists can get involved through their institutions and organisations in Strasbourg.

How does the Council of Europe (CoE) work?

The Council of Europe (CoE) is an intergovernmental organization (IGO), a union of states, just as the United Nations (UN) or the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). The CoE includes all 46 sovereign states and dependent territories of Europe with the exception of Belarus. Belarus is the only state in Europe that still has the death penalty and therefore cannot become a member state of the CoE. Any potential member state must firstly adhere to the European Convention on Human Rights, which explicitly forbids the death penalty. The Vatican has been granted a special status with the CoE. Since its foundation in 1949, the CoE has undergone many reforms. Today it is made up by the Quadrilogue or the four columns of the CoE:

1) The Committee of Ministers (CM) is formed by the foreign ministers of the member states. As these meet only in a longer sequence, they are deputized by the ambassadors of the member states of CoE. They have a status as deputy ministers and can make binding decisions. In this configuration, the Council meets very regularly and makes all the important decisions for the Council of Europe.

2) The Parliamentary Assembly (PACE) is the law-making body of the CoE. It is not a parliament of elected members such as the European Parliament of the European Union (EU), which holds regular meetings just across river Ill, but the parliaments of the member states delegate members to PACE.

3) The Congress of the Regions is the assembly of the local and regional governments or parliaments. Its members are also delegated by the appropriate bodies of the member states. Their meetings are called Congress of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR). The CoR has a consultative and participatory role.

4) The Conference of the INGOs at the Council of Europe is the assembly of the delegates of all international NGOs with participatory status. It has a consultative and participatory role.

The administration of the CoE is situated in Strasbourg, mainly in two buildings: the older “Palais” and the younger “Agora” close by. It is organized in General Directories and Directories. At present, it is chaired by the Secretary General, Thorbjørn Jagland and Deputy Secretary General, Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni. The political presidency is held by one of the member states in a half-year rota system, just as it is practised in the EU. In the first half of 2017, the presidency is with Cyprus and in the second half of 2017 it is with the Czech Republic. Of course every presidency tries to set its own accents. The Secretary General and/or his deputy are present at all INGO conferences and answer questions by the NGOs.

The Council of Europe has a number of different institutions and initiatives:

- The European Court for Human Rights (ECHR) is the oldest institution of the Council of Europe and it is unique. The seat of the court is in Strasbourg; it is situated next to the buildings of both the CoE and the European Parliament of the EU. Each potential member state of the CoE must join the convention and make a binding obligation to follow the rules of the ECHR. In recent years, this obligation has come under massive pressure in a number of member states and the
court has no real means of enforcement at hand. This differs from the Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU) situated in Luxembourg, which is responsible to sanction breaking of EU law.

- The **Commissioner for Human Rights** was introduced in 1999 and monitors the state of human rights in the member states, advocating for human rights and strengthening their impact in the member states.

- The **European Pharmacopoeia** (EDQM) is also situated in Strasbourg, next to the Agora building. It is a legally binding institute that ensures quality of medicines and health care. After the Lisbon Treaty entered into force in 2009, the EU has acceded to the institution and so EDQM decisions have now also standard setting force in the EU. According to the Lisbon Treaty the EU can now join international treaties such as conventions etc. of the CoE, and is doing this more and more.

- The **European Youth Centre** (EYC) and **European Youth Foundation** (EYF) are the two institutions at the Youth Department of the CoE. The EYC has two locations, one in in Strasbourg and one in Budapest; apart from conference rooms these buildings offer also accommodation. The EYF, on the other hand, finances youth programmes.

- The **European Bank for Reconstruction and Development** (EBRD) is an international bank of the CoE; it was established in 1991 with the task to finance social projects. It is situated in Paris, where there are also seminar rooms for the use of the CoE. The Development Bank works on the basis of a so-called Partial Agreement. This term is used within the CoE to describe a major activity of European cooperation organised by the CoE that does not include all member states.

- The **European Institute of Cultural Routes** is also the result of a partial agreement. Situated in Luxembourg, it is responsible for awarding the title “European Cultural Route” according to strict criteria. The title can be recalled, if the partners fail to live up to the standards.

At present, more **Partial Agreements** are being prepared. They allow for progress in projects and the creation of institutions, if not all member states want to participate. It also helps the budget of the CoE, as the implementation of such partial agreements is mainly self-financed.

The CoE drafts conventions, chartas and other agreements, the texts of which are all international treaties in the sense of the Convention of Vienna of 1969. The **CoE Treaty Series** (CETS) groups together all the conventions concluded since 1949. With the exception of the human rights convention, the accession to these conventions is not mandatory. Some conventions are meant only for members of the Council of Europe, others are open also to non-member states. The access to the conventions normally requires two steps: the signing of the convention by the government and the ratification by the national parliament, which is the law-making body in a parliamentarian democracy. After a pre-agreed number of states have ratified the convention it comes into force, which means it from then on has binding character for the signatory states. As conventions are mostly formulated very generally and are setting a framework for goals and obligations, they normally have to be implemented into national legislation and – where competences of federal states are affected – often also in the individual laws of these sub-states. Conventions have different institutional bodies to evaluate and further develop the conventions, which can vary in size and binding character from convention to convention. One of the most important conventions is the **European Social Charter** from 1961. In the field of cultural heritage, we find the **Convention for the Archaeological Heritage** (Valetta 1992), the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage (Granada 1985), the **European Landscape Convention** (Florence 2000), the **Framework Convention on the Value of the Cultural Heritage for Society** (Faro 2005) or the brand-new **Convention on Offences relating to Cultural Property**. Most conventions strengthen the position of the civil society and citizen engagement.
**What are INGOs and how does the Conference of INGOs work?**

The Council of Europe is unique, as it gives NGOs not just an observatory or consultative status but a participatory status. Therefore, they can contribute to all processes of drafting conventions, regulations, guidelines etc. and fully participate in the policy making at the Council of Europe.

**How to obtain participatory status as an INGO?**

The status must be applied for and INGOs have to fulfill a number of criteria, e.g. to be independent, active in at least five European countries, and work on themes covered by the agenda of the CoE. They have to give proof of their activities. The application is evaluated by CoE and commented by the governing body of the Conference of the INGOs. The recommendation to accept or deny participatory status is forwarded en bloc once a year to the Committee of Ministers. The CM decides by “quiet approval”; that means, if there is no objection during a certain period, the recommendations will be accepted. If a member state wants to challenge a decision, it has to comment, only then, the CM will decide by vote.

**How are the INGOs evaluated?**

There is a major evaluation process every four years. The INGOs have to fill in a detailed form and give reports on their activities, especially with the CoE and other European and international organizations. The formal criteria are re-checked as well. Failure to proof the formal criteria, to comply with the report obligations or to show sufficient activities will lead to loss of participatory status. The INGOs effected are given a set time to comment, hand in additional information and show their commitment. Again the ruling body of the INGO Conference will comment. Finally the list of INGOs to be removed will be forwarded to the Council of Ministers, who will decide as in the case of new applicants.

**How is the INGO Conference structured?**

The INGO Conference has undergone changes through the 40 years of its existence. Currently, it is structured in three thematic committees:

1. **The Committee for Democracy, Social Cohesion and Global Challenges**
2. **The Committee for Education and Culture** and
3. **The Committee for Human Rights**

There is also an **Expert Council on NGO Law**, the **Gender Equality Expert** and **INGO-Service**, which is the self-administering body of the Conference, financed through voluntary financial contributions from INGOs. Additionally, there is a secretariat, which is part of the administration of the Council of Europe.

Each **Thematic Committee** has a Chair and two Vice-Chairs. The conference has an overall board consisting of the President and three Vice-Presidents. All positions are elected for a three-year period of office and can be re-elected once into the same position. The election of the overall board of the Conference is held half a year after the chairs of the committees: the election of the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Thematic Committees is always in the summer session and for the President and Vice-President in the following winter session. The Conference meets twice a year parallel to the sittings of the CoE Parliamentary Assembly (PACE). President and Vice-Presidents of the Conference of INGOs and the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Thematic Committees form the **Standing Committee**. It includes also the head of the Expert Commission on NGO Law, the Gender Equality Expert and the Head of INGO-Service in a consultative function.

The three Thematic Committees decide on their own working program, which they develop in line with the overall strategy of the Conference of INGOs. The overall strategy is decided on every three years with the start of a new working period. Most of the practical work is done in working groups, active inside the committees but sometimes also transversal, meaning across committees. In cases
of special urgency, ad hoc working groups can be formed. Working groups have to be approved by the chairs of the committees or by the Standing Committee. They normally are created bottom-up by members, but they also can be installed top-down by the chairs.

**How does the administration of the Conference of the INGOs function?**

The administration of the INGO Conference has two columns:

1. **The Secretariat** is part of the administration of the Council of Europe. It is part of the **Forum of the Future of Democracy** (FFT) and here responsible for the interaction with civil society. It does all in-house administration, like the allocation of rooms, simultaneous translation, translation of official documents, etc. FFT’s budget for this is allocated within the greater budget of the CoE.

2. **INGO-Service** is the self-administration of the Conference of INGOs. It is organized as an association, which the INGOs with participatory status should become a member of. As there is still no legal form of a “European Association” it is registered in Strasbourg under French law. As there can be no legally binding mandatory membership the Conference depends on the good will of its members – as the membership fees are essential to allow independent work of the Conference and running its own projects. Actually, the association collects about half of the annual budget of the Conference of INGO’s.

**How does the Conference of INGOs cooperate with the Council of Europe and its other columns?**

It is intended that the four columns of the CoE work closely together. So their representatives are invited to participate in meetings and actions of the other columns. The CoE administers a great number of conventions. These conventions have their own instruments – e.g. the Landscape Convention has the Conference of the Landscape Convention, the Work Shops and the Landscape Award – and are followed up by the appropriate steering committee within the CoE – e.g. the Steering Committee for Culture, Heritage and Landscape is responsible for all conventions in this field. Individual INGOs can apply to be granted observatory status with all these institutions, while the INGO Conference, as one of the four pillars, can attend in a participatory function. Invitations are issued by the administration of the CoE or by the appropriate institution. The invitations are either addressed to the president of the Conference or the Chair of the appropriate thematic committee. Questions of representation are decided within the board. The Conference of INGOs can comment on strategies, participate in the drafting of conventions and create own suggestions, declarations, guidelines etc., which are forwarded to the other columns of the Council of Europe and finally are adopted by the CM.

**What other programs and projects are pursued by the Council of Europe?**

The CoE runs many different programs, like the **European Heritage Days**, the **European Local Democracy Week** (ELDW) etc. Now, they are often pursued in cooperation with the European Commission. Individual INGOs as well as the Conference of INGOs as an institution participate in most of these activities. The Conference of INGO also cooperates closely with the various institutions and Partial Agreements of the Council of Europe.
Lithic raw materials in prehistory: sourcing, network distribution and use

Report on Session TH1-16 at the 22nd Annual Meeting of the EAA in Vilnius, Lithuania

by Clive Bonsall (C.Bonsall@ed.ac.uk), Maria Gurova (gurovam@yahoo.fr) and Pierre Allard (pierre.allard@mae.u-paris10.fr)

In prehistory, lithic raw materials had an important role in economic, social and ideological aspects of society. This session elicited contributions from scholars from Europe and North America addressing three key themes: i) raw material sourcing and supply in prehistory; ii) distribution systems and organization; and iii) factors governing the choice of raw materials for specific tasks.

After a brief introduction by the organisers, the session began with a paper by Robert Tykot (University of South Florida) on the acquisition and use of obsidian in the Central Mediterranean, and changes through time. Clive Bonsall (University of Edinburgh) presented the first results of research (undertaken in collaboration with local scholars) on the provenance of archaeological obsidian from Bulgaria. Šatavičius Egidijus (Vilnius University) reviewed the occurrence of flint resources in Lithuania and the development flint mining sites in the southern part of the country starting in the Late Palaeolithic. The presentation by Rita Gaspar (University of Porto) focused on the multiple uses of greywacke in NW Iberia from the Palaeolithic to the Bronze Age, while that by Norbert Faragó (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest) examined the differences in raw material procurement and use between tell and ‘flat’ sites in Neolithic northeast Hungary.

The second half of the session centred on Northern Europe. Astrid Nyland (Oslo) described her ‘social approach’ to the study of lithic extraction sites from the Stone and Bronze Ages in Norway. Svein Nielsen (Museum of Cultural History, Oslo) presented an analysis of two long blade ‘caches’ dating to the third millennium BC; though found 85km apart, remarkably technological and refitting analysis showed that the blades in both caches had been stuck from the same core! The presentation by Katarzyna Pyzewicz (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań) focused on the manufacture, distribution and function of flint axes from the Final Neolithic in Poland, considering the question of the locus of their manufacture. The prehistoric ‘banded flint’ mines on the northeast margin of the Świętokrzyskie Mountains in Poland were the subject of the presentation by Michal Szubski (University of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński in Warsaw) and demonstrated the value of airborne laser scanning for large area surveys of prehistoric mining sites. The session was brought to a close by Sylwia Buławka (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw) who moved the geographical focus to Egypt and the chronological focus to the Bronze Age, with a review of her ongoing research on the production and use of flint implements during the Dynastic Period.

In addition to the oral contributions, the session included nine posters on the following topics:

- Obsidian blades debitage at Kašov-Cepegov I (Bükk Culture), Slovakia, Pierre Allard (CNRS, Paris)
- In search of a non-destructive way of identifying lidite in archaeological lithic assemblages, Mikael Manninen (University of Oslo)
• A Danubian raw material exchange network: a case study from Chelmno Land (Poland), Dagmara Werra (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology Polish Academy of Science, Warsaw)

• Local flint pebbles reduction strategies in the settlement of Sarnate. Marcis Kalnins (University of Latvia, Riga)

• Localisation of sources of obsidian registered in Bohemian prehistory (Czech Republic), Pavel Burgert (Institute of Archaeology, Prague)

• Chocolate flint extraction points and workshops in Oronsko, Poland. Spatial and functional analysis, Katarzyna Kerneder-Gubała (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poznań)

• Analysis of household units from chipped stone tools at Alsónyék–Bátaszék (Hungary), Kata Szilagyi (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest)

• Flint inventory of the Neolithic and Bronze Age from the sites at Żylicy (Western Belarus), Sviatlan Velent-Shcherbach (Belarus Institute of History, Minsk)

• Application of morphometric methods for the lithic analysis based on 2D and 3D visualizations, Liga Zarina (University of Latvia, Riga)
Conference and Workshop Reports

Dare to Choose – Making Choices in Archaeological Heritage Management

18th Heritage Management Symposium of the European Archaeological Council / Europae Archaeologiae Consilium, 9 - 10 March 2017, Athens, Acropolis Museum

by Sophie Hueglin, Vice-President, European Association of Archaeologists (s.hueglin@web.de)

The European Archaeological Council or Europae Archaeologiae Consilium (EAC) aims to support the management of archaeological heritage throughout Europe. All national bodies charged with the management of archaeological heritage in Europe can become members of the Council. The EAC aims – especially through the Symposia at the Annual Meetings and their publication in the EAC Occasional Papers series – to provide a forum for organisations to establish closer and more structured co-operation and exchange of information.[1][2] The current president of the EAC is Leonard de Wit from the Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency, a lawyer by training. This year’s Symposium in Athens was organised by Ann Degraeve from Ghent University in Belgium.

The topic of the Symposium derives directly from EACs Amersfoort Agenda, a strategic document that intends nothing less than setting the future of archaeological heritage in Europe.[3][4] Theme two of the Amersfoort Agenda _Dare to choose_ lists three agenda items: firstly, to be conscious, explicit and transparent about choices being made; secondly, to develop an infrastructure to be able to make informed choices, and thirdly, to adopt a broader perspective. The Symposium gave EAC members and guests an opportunity to explore the variety of approaches and consider how this may become embedded in general archaeological policy and practice in the coming years. The conference contributions were subdivided into three sessions: _Decision-making mechanisms_, _Research questions for excavations_, and _Involvement of society_.

Barney Sloane from Historic England opened the first session by presenting the preliminary results of a survey that an EAC Working Group had conducted upfront with EAC heritage managers in order to assess differences and similarities of approaches. With 21 answers from 18 countries he deducted three kinds: the structured approach – which would take research questions as guidelines, the broad approach – which by making use of the polluter-pays-principle would try to excavate almost everything – and a least structured approach, that would not have a formal research framework and might try to keep everything. Therefore, Sloane sees a high potential for the EAC to develop supporting structures and guidelines such as National Research Agendas.

Angeliki Simosi turned the attention away from the land to the Mediterranean, to the rich underwater heritage of Greece of which the Antikythera shipwreck is just one of the most famous examples.[5] Although she stressed that Greece has not signed the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, the obligations listed there are being fulfilled in the daily practice of the Ephorate (Greek heritage authority).[6]

David Bibby from the State Office for Cultural Heritage Baden-Württemberg, Germany, and Duncan Brown from the Archaeological Data Service, York, United Kingdom showed that Archaeological Archives in Europe are one step ahead and have a printed policy already: their ARCHES project has produced and published quite pragmatic best practice guidelines that have been widely translated and adopted, but certainly will need further dissemination and implementation.[7] Because it is the archivists, they pointed out, which select the common (conscious) cultural memory of tomorrow.

Lyudmil Vagalinski from the National Archaeological Institute of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences argued strictly in favour of state-led excavations and his institution has won a court case already against the State Road Agency on the question about the admission of private companies. He took
up Sloane’s idea of a National Research Agenda, but wishes to widen the perspective and think about trans- and international research questions namely for sites that reach across borders or are (on) borders.

In Denmark, and similarly in other Scandinavian countries, excavations and archaeological research is in the hand of museums. On the legal background of the Convention of Valetta, Thomas Roland sees two stages, where one can prioritise with excavation triggered by building activities: in the planning phase and in the field. For his constituency he calculated that less than one percent of the plans studied lead to an excavation. The purpose is to prevent “repetitive” archaeology and to investigate a wide variety of features from all periods. Therefore, it is necessary to constantly update the knowledge with the new findings and revise research strategies every three years. Because “no man is an island”, Roland called for inter-Nordic strategies in archaeology.

Representing a possibly outdated, but still widely prevailing attitude, Franco Nicolis from the Autonomous Region of Trento in Italy described how he finds it difficult to negotiate his decisions with all the non-archaeologist experts that are involved in heritage management, be it art historian or architect. He cannot possibly imagine to have to explain his decisions to everybody. To his view the general public sees archaeology and culture as entertainment and his “strategy” is to show that “Archaeology is fun you can have with your pants on”. Here I would like to remark that while it is certainly a good strategy to address emotions and to be passionate oneself, when speaking about archaeology in public or to the media, fun is just one of the “sunny” emotional shades that can and should be evoked.

Agnes Stefánsdóttir and Kristín Sigurðardóttir from the Cultural Heritage Agency of Iceland describe economic explosion with grow rates of 25-30 % per annum that Iceland is experiencing after the currency crash in 2008. In 2008, three airlines brought about 5000 tourists. In 2016, 26 airlines transport 1.7 million travellers per summer season to an island with just over 330,000 inhabitants. This leads to a multitude of building projects, one of them being Reykjavik’s old harbour. This is the most publicly discussed of cases where developers not only criticise, but have gone to court claiming compensations as high as 5.5 million Euros for – in their eyes unrightfully – conditions imposed by the Cultural Heritage Agency. The pending lawsuit in this case will have to clarify whether remains of buildings that are older than 100 years – and therefore protected by Icelandic law since 2012 – still enjoy this status, if they have been moved since as it is the case with some of the harbour buildings. Stefánsdóttir and Sigurðardóttir see in these court cases the acid test for Iceland’s heritage legislation and invest considerable time and energy to convince public and politicians of their point of view.

Against these two women, Bernhard Hebert, the head of the Archaeology Department of the Austrian National Heritage Agency, seemed worldly; detached from aspirations and emotions. In his eyes, it is hubris to believe humans could make monuments survive. A Classical archaeologist by training, he used the Parthenon on the Acropolis hill – just outside the conference venue – as an example. When formulating factors of survival he chose to treat monuments as subjects with strategies rather than object of heritage managers and society. The main strategies used also by the Parthenon was staying in use and changing use. Hebert illustrated this with a painting from the 1830s where the half-ruined Parthenon houses a mosque. Maybe we should not be surprised if the Parthenon chose this strategy again considering the midterm shift of populations and beliefs?

The current political situation in Hungary seems responsible for the overall disenchanted tone of the presentation by Gábor Virágos entitled ‘Dare to lose’, but his arguments pinpoint precisely some of the weak spots of todays’ heritage management. Artefacts, sites and monuments, he criticised, are registered in artificial categories and treated – with little success – like “dying species”. Archives also appear artificial to him, because in his eyes many of them are of dubious origin and have only a very subjective value. Today, he feels, we drown in digital data, which we lose as we gather, because we cannot digest them. He sees documents not being post-processed and finds deteriorating in storage,
while decisions are made by politicians and not by heritage managers. Virágos sees some hope in a new concept of ownership that puts UNESCO’s World Heritage above national, regional and personal regimes. A concept that – inverting a well-known motto – could be called: ‘Think global – act local!’

Ulla Kadakas from the National Heritage Board of Estonia concluded the first session by presenting the number of 6655 archaeological sites she has to look after, what makes something like 1 monument per 6.58 km$^2$. While in her eyes the system set up for heritage management in principle is good, she sees two weaknesses: the one is the lack of resources and the other the lack of public interest and acceptance. Among her colleagues, she observes three kinds of response to the current challenges in heritage management: one group is complaining about losing control, others pretend to be in control and a third part has become somehow sarcastic about not being able to control. She pleads that we not ‘run against the (proverbial) tide, but swim with it and look for allies’. She sees the solution in an integrated approach that embeds a monument in a protection zone with archaeology one of the diverse layers of the cultural landscape.

The discussion of the first session brought forward that a strategy where – in the view of the public – archaeological monuments ‘occupy’ more and more territory and do not allow development is not appropriate and no longer enforceable. Moreover, it does not help in the case of archaeological finds and features which are ‘by nature’ hidden underground. Heritage managers who sit in a trench and fight for their monuments against stupid society, populist politicians and economic pressure are not choosing, but are bound to lose. Similarly, in environmental protection such battle spirit has also lead to vicious circles and has been replaced by what Kadakas called an ‘integrated approach’.

Day 2, and session two, focussed on research frameworks behind choices made with regard to fieldwork. The specific situation of Albania was pointed out by Berbis Islami. Archaeology there began only in the early 20th century, there is no national overview of sites, and research questions derive mainly from written sources and chance finds. Research in the Bronze and Iron Ages dominated in the 1950s to 1990s, and centred on the ethnogenesis of the Illyrians and continuity — according to Islami now proven — to the Albanians of today. This certainly helped modern state formation. Recently, Albania has opened for cooperation with other archaeologists and to research expeditions from other European countries. Today, Islami sees an antagonism at work in which the wish to show one’s heritage stands against the fear of inviting misuse and destruction of sites if they become known publically or become popular tourist destinations like the World Heritage site Butrint.

Commenting on the situation in Albania, session chair Katalin Wollák from Hungary mentioned that she had been asked seriously: ‘Why don’t you just excavate the important sites like Schliemann?’ The underlying message here being: obviously, a site without a name and known location cannot be important.

John O’Keeffe from the Northern Ireland Environment Agency pointed out that most excavations are not the result of research questions, but of development proposals, land use change or the interest of a sponsor. As the number of excavations has increased enormously, there has been a concurrent accumulation of massive data banks. But as nobody finds the time to draw conclusions from these, decisions made today are still based on the knowledge of yesterday. There is also an influence of today’s settlement density on the way sites are treated when discovered: in urban areas they tend to get excavated and thus destroyed completely, in peri-urban areas they are likely to get monumentalised after partial excavation and in rural areas known sites will be avoided.

Bert Groenewoudt from the Cultural Heritage Agency presented Netherlands _New National Archaeological Research Agenda_ (NOaA 2.0).[9] The use of this online tool is not compulsory, but it is meant to help the responsible local authorities with archaeological decision making and may result in giving an excavation mandate to a private agency. Stating that ‘most of Dutch archaeology is not like the Acropolis, but hidden underground’, he deems it is necessary to find it before it is destroyed. For this, it is important not only to work with research questions, but also to develop predictive
models, to scrutinize disturbances, to employ non-invasive prospection methods, to make the results and especially to close the Archaeological Heritage Management (AHM) cycle by creating synthesis and new meaningful information. In the Netherlands there is still a high pressure of development and the crux is that sites that are known already tend to be almost destroyed while the hidden ones are the best preserved.

In Slovenia, Matija Črešnar from the University of Ljubljana explained, the classical site oriented approach has been replaced and widened to have now the whole landscape in view. New methods like LiDAR have prompted this, because they show ‘the landscape is full of sites’. Confronted with such a ‘messy landscape’ it becomes obvious that it is not enough to study development plans others have made, but that it is necessary to get involved in the planning process itself. This should be done with two aims: firstly to steer the development to cause excavations that answer research questions and secondly to make the development fit or even enhance the historic character of the landscape.

Peter Schut works in the Dutch ‘Bible Belt’. In his municipality he is not allowed to mention that the world could be older than 6000 years. At the same time – or because of this – since 2007, the Netherlands have one of the strictest and best obeyed heritage laws worldwide. Every development over 100 m² is subject to some kind of research. So a multitude of reports is being produced, which in Schut’s opinion are mostly irrelevant. He therefore set up guidelines for his region, which strongly discourage engaging in research on or excavation of non-promising or mostly destroyed sites. He wants such sites be made available to public or volunteer research, because this will raise public interest in archaeology and allow professionals to concentrate on the relevant objects. It would be interesting to apply Groenewoudt’s NOaA 2.0 agenda and Schut’s guidelines to the same areas and compare the outcome.

Agnieszka Oniszczuk from the National Heritage Board in Poland made a case for the scientific value of development-led archaeology. With regard to statistics, she argued, it is certainly better to have large random samples. Research-led archaeology done by Universities probably is not as ‘scientific’ as it is commonly labelled. Archaeology in Poland is a market divided between academic scholars, commercial companies and heritage managers. Distinguished academics have literally been pushed out of the field. Commercial archaeologists on the other hand, have the time to neither think nor write, while their findings could rewrite the entirety of prehistory. Worldwide, the importance of development-led archaeology can estimated by looking at the 60 top ten discoveries between 2010 and 2016 published in the Archaeology Magazine: most of them were discovered by commercial archaeology. [10]

With Jef Pinceel’s and Ann Degraeve’s paper the perspective shifted from field features to treatment of finds. Since 2002, when the archaeological conservation and restoration laboratory for the Brussels region was founded, the number of artefacts ‘harvested’ has increased drastically, but the number of personnel has stayed almost the same. This results in pressure to minimise the input of resources, to maximise the output of information and to preserve the future potential of artefacts. For the different materials a range of possible levels from passive or preventive conservation to highly complex conservation and restoration strategies has been developed. To treat or not to treat is the question faced here every day.

The third and last session aimed at the involvement of society. Particularly, the practice of ‘embedding archaeology in society’ through public participation is still in its infancy. In this regard, it was interesting to see what practices the heritage managers regarded as being effective for raising public engagement and awareness under session chair Adrian Olivier. He was English Heritage’s former Heritage Protection Director before the archaeological part of it was renamed Historic England, and it remains a so-called QUANGO, a quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisation.

Constantina Benissi from the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports presented a multi-authored paper that centred on the theme of site management plans as a tool for participative decision-
making. According to §11, managing a cultural world heritage site requires a ‘participatory planning and stakeholder consultation process’. [11] The list of the stakeholders is long and while it is meant to create trust, it also increases complexity and excludes certain groups, which might not have qualified to be involved. Here, I am reminded of Akrotiri, Santorini’s town from the Bronze Age. There in 2005, an ambitious roof construction collapsed just before it was finished and killed one visitor. But this was not the only victim: from the beginning, wasps wanted to settle under the roof of the site that reopened in 2012, but are constantly killed off with insecticides. Shouldn’t these wasps be stakeholders too instead of victims at this extraordinary site?

There are countries that already have a national research agenda for archaeology: Mary Teehan from Ireland, Rebecca Jones from Scotland and Mike Heyworth from England undertook a comparative analysis of three differing approaches to develop an archaeology strategy: ‘Archaeology 2025’ in Ireland [12], ‘Scotland’s Archaeology Strategy’ [13] and ‘Heritage 2000’ [14] in England. Even that they are under three different jurisdictions, they share similar challenges like the economic crisis in 2008, the demographic shift, the technological turn and a raising demand for public participation. First results were presented, but a thorough analysis will follow in the publication of the symposium.

João Marques and Filipa Neto presented some examples that included guided tours, travelling exhibitions, annual meetings and creative workshops. These initiatives – to involve and inform the public at all – would by British or central European standards simply be called public relations. They are not the expected new quality of public involvement asked for in the Amersfoort Agenda, but maybe archaeologists in Britain or Germany are taking for granted what is new in attitude and format to other regions. With the Environmental Impact Assessment procedure such practices of involvement of stakeholders are now being harmonized now throughout the European Union states. [15]

The dissemination measures described by Eva Skyllberg from Sweden seemed also not out of the ordinary, but are obviously a challenge in the daily life of heritage managers and contract archaeologists, especially if no time and budget is allocated to that task. The Swedish Historic Environment Act from 2014 states explicitly that results of an archaeological excavation must be communicated. There is a platform called ‘samla’ – to be released in 2018 – where these reports will be available online. In the discussion following the talk, it was mentioned that also the French government has included the dissemination of results into the new heritage legislation that came out in 2016. This new rule does apply to INRAP, the French National Institute for Preventive Archaeological Research, but not to private companies. In Denmark the target of the prescribed dissemination measure is more the developer than the public and often is done in form of a small exhibition in the newly erected building that gave rise to the excavations.

The threat to sites through metal detectorists, is a topic that had been raised by Kadakas with Estonia before and was taken up by Sandra Zirne from Latvia again. In 2013, amendments to the law ‘On Protection of Cultural Monuments’ were made, due to the critical situation in the country and triggered considerable interest public interest in archaeological heritage preservation problems. Not all comments made publicly about the archaeologists were especially flattering, and showed the degree to which archaeological aims and methods were foreign to the public. The times when it was enough to publish scientific reports, but not to communicate with the wider public throughout the process are definitely gone.

The symposium showed an enormous spectrum of attitudes and approaches to archaeological heritage management in general and decision making in particular. The two most extreme positions are on the one side the site centred perspective that defends its territory by drawing lines and erecting fences; this is on retreat to the high towers of UNESCO world heritage. The other side takes a landscape perspective that sees traces of history and culture everywhere. The first group would be happy to be left alone with the crown jewels (and some funding), the other group wants to get
involved in the planning process and to involve the public in all aspects of archaeology. While for the first group the danger is to lose contact with the people, the second group risks losing the status of the untouchable and infallible. But archaeology in a modern democracy probably must be close to the people and at the same time as complex and contradictory as society and each individual. Making choices in archaeology is a process of negotiation and compromise and it would be good if in Europe this could be done in a transparent, well-informed way according to shared principles. This is the way that leads from Valetta to Faro, from the polluter-pays-principle to the landscape convention.

**SESSION 1: The decision-making mechanisms**

Angeliki G. Simosi (Greece): The Protection of Underwater Antiquities in Greece
David Bibby & Duncan H. Brown: Making Choices for Archaeological Archives in Europe
Lyudmil Vagalinski (Bulgaria): Making Choices in Archaeological Heritage Management – The Case of Bulgaria
Thomas Roland (Denmark): Tools for Validation of Archaeological Investigations and in situ Conservation
Franco Nicolis (Italy): Making Choices in Archaeological Heritage Management in Trentino, Northern Italy
Agnes Stefánsdóttir & Kristín Huld Sigurdardóttir (Iceland): Austurbakk – A Case Study from Iceland
Bernhard Hebert (Austria): Are monuments struggling for life or are we making choices?
Gábor Virágos (Hungary), Dare to Lose
Ulla Kadakas (Estonia): Defining Archaeological Heritage in Estonia

**SESSION 2: The choice of research questions for excavations**

Mariglen Meshini (Albania): The New Structure of Archaeological Processes in Albania
John O’Keeffe (Northern Ireland): Why (or Why Not)? Do I really need to dig it?
Bert Groenewoudt (Netherlands): Question-Driven Archaeological Fieldwork in the Netherlands: The New National Archaeological Research Agenda (NOaA 2.0)
Matija Črešnar (Slovenia): “Research as a firm fundament for decision-making” sounds like a sound choice...
Peter Schut (Netherlands): Dare to Choose: History Writing or Posthole Pampering?
Agnieszka Oniszczuk (Poland): Is Question-Driven Fieldwork vital or not? The Archaeological Heritage Manager’s Perspective
Jef Pinceel & Ann Degraeve (Belgium): To Treat or Not to Treat: Insights in the Strategic Decision Making in the Archaeological Conservation and Restoration Laboratory of the Brussels Capital Region

**SESSION 3: The choice concerning the involvement of society**

Elena Kountouri, Constantina BENISSI & Julia PAPAGEORGIOU: Management Plans: A Tool for Participative Decision Making
Mary Teehan, Rebecca Jones & Mike Heyworth (Ireland): Three for One: Analysis of Three Differing Approaches to Developing an Archaeology Strategy

Eva Skyllberg (Sweden): An Urgent but Difficult Task – Dissemination of the Archaeological Results for the General Public

Sandra Zirne (Latvia): The Relevance of Professional Ethics of Archaeologists in Society

Notes


Image rights and permissions across Europe and beyond

by Katharina Rebay-Salisbury (Katharina.Rebay-Salisbury@oeaw.ac.at)

Continuing from the open data / open access debate in previous issues, I would like to draw attention to policies of obtaining image rights and permissions across Europe and beyond, and publishing images in the context of your own work, in journals, books, on blogs and other forms of new media, and last – but not least – in TEA. Most archaeologists work with images in one form or another; few bother to think about the implications. As editors of TEA, we are often asked to include images, and we often get surprised responses when we ask for copyright information.

At the start, it must be made clear that the location of the publisher determines which country’s law applies when it comes to using images. The European Archaeologist (TEA), as the newsletter of the European Association of Archaeologists, has its legal seat in the Czech Republic, and the server from which the website is broadcast is also located there. Czech law applies.

If you are publishing photos you have taken or images you have drawn, there are normally no problems. It becomes trickier when you would like to use images from sources other than your own. Whist in some countries, such as Germany, a reprint in scientific papers and scholarly books usually only requires the citation of the image, publishers in other countries, such as the UK, require a written permission from the copyright holder. The copyright holder is usually the person that made the image, but not always. (In this context: be careful when signing over the copyright to your images to publishers. Check your contracts!)

Publishing images of artefacts held in museums and collections sometimes require both the permission of the photographer and the keeper of the artefact. How exactly a museum can claim copyright to a piece of art made hundreds, if not thousands of years ago by unknown artists is unclear to me, but I want to believe that the publication fees support heritage preservation. My experience with writing a book about human images (K. Rebay-Salisbury, The Human Body in Early Iron Age Central Europe. Burial Practices and Images of the Hallstatt World. London: Routledge 2016) taught me several valuable lessons: 1. getting image permissions is a very time-consuming process. 2. It may cost money. 3. Many European colleagues are extremely helpful, but responses and their timeframes vary a lot. It is always good to have alternative options. Personal relationships help – many of these are fostered through membership in the EAA. 4. If in doubt, redraw. 5. Never work on images again.

Photographs of people, for instance your colleagues participating in workshops and conferences, are another topic to think about. Many of use like to take group pictures and use them in reports or put them online. Here, we need to consider the rights of the subject in addition to the rights of the photographer. Whether or not a permission to take a picture of a person has to be obtained, depends on where it is taken. In private places, it is expected that permission of the subject is obtained. In public places, this varies widely by country (see list in this article). In Germany, for example, there is no permission required to take a picture of a person in a public place, but for publishing the picture, with or without commercial implications, a consent needs to be obtained. In the Netherlands, where the next EAA meeting will be held, no permission is required from a person being photographed in a public place, nor for commercially using the picture.

Be clear that even if you think you are not using an image commercially, because after all, you are only publishing scholarly work, you may still be involved in a commercial process from which others (i.e. your publishers) benefit. TEA is our association’s newsletter and not commercial, but our European Journal of Archaeology is.
Copyrights protect works of authorship, but do consider releasing some of your work into the public domain. This is not only helpful to others, it also promotes your own work. In terms of images, also consider using images that already are in the public domain. Images from before 1923 should now all be in the public domain (with exceptions, see art held in museums above). The copyright normally expires 70 years after the death of the author, but again, there are variations of this rule, different from country to country. A good place to start are open file repositories such as Wikimedia Commons, where users can upload and share files under different Creative Commons licenses. There are different types of these licenses: some allow artwork to be shared, but not altered, some limit the license to non-commercial use. WikiCommons server are located in the United States, hence US law applies.

Working in the context of European, and indeed global, archaeology, it is becoming increasingly important to be aware that the copyright laws you are used to are not necessarily the same ones that apply to your publications, conference participations, and other dissemination outlets.

The ideal situation (the ‘pie in the sky’) is a world in which copyright rules and laws are the same everywhere, and perhaps it is worth working towards this aim. There are, however, so many unresolved issues in academic publishing more generally, from incompatible commercial and non-commercial models, to open access and shared data challenges, that for the moment it is unclear where we are heading. Staying informed might help to avoid problems, as we continue to rely on each other’s support and generosity in sharing archaeological research.
Announcements

European Elections 2019 – Benchmarks for Archaeology and Heritage Protection

EAA Annual Meeting Maastricht, Round Table 164

Wednesday 30.08.2017, 9:00 – 11:30 am, MECC Room 2.7

by Sophie Hueglin (s.hueglin@web.de), Raimund Karl, Marc Lodewijckx and Jean-Olivier Gransard Desmond

Election benchmarks are an instrument to bring archaeology and heritage protection to politicians and voters. They are a formal tool through which interest groups can neutrally communicate with political parties and voters during upcoming elections. The process is as follows: a short specific catalogue of relevant questions is formulated and sent to the parties. The politicians are requested to reveal how they intend to act – e.g. regarding legislation or financing of archaeology and heritage protection – during the next legislative period. The answers of the parties are collected and published in order to provide voters interested in archaeology with criteria for their decision.

EAA intends to develop benchmarks for the European elections in 2019. This year at the Round Table in Maastricht, the most urgent concerns in European archaeology and heritage protection shall be short-listed with the help of EAA Working Parties, Committees and partner organisations. By the Annual Meeting in Barcelona, the short-listed questions will have been translated and distributed to the election candidates and their parties and responses collected. The politicians’ answers will then be summarized at EAA Barcelona, commented on and widely published, so that politics, the media and the public will become aware of issues concerning archaeology and heritage protection and voters will be able to make informed decisions.

We have invited Frank Siegmund from the German Society for Pre- and Protohistory (DGUF) to report DGUFs experiences with election benchmarking (“Wahlprüfsteine”). Since 2009, DGUF has used the instrument five times in federal and national elections. Originally, “Wahlprüfsteine” were developed by nature conservation organisations, but are used much more widely now to raise awareness of themes considered to be important by special interest communities and to turn attention from political personalities to subject-matters. If repeated, election benchmarks can be used to hold governing parties accountable for promises they made during past election campaigns.
This Round Table is especially interesting to:

- EAA Working Parties and Committees who want to inform voters about their concerns and use election benchmarks to influence European politics at elections
- Partner Organisations of EAA who want to join EAA in setting up benchmarks for the European elections or who are interested to use the instrument themselves on federal or national level
- EAA members who would like to get to know the instrument and help to create the list of concerns. Their support would be needed especially in 2018 and 2019 to translate and distribute questionnaires, collect, summarize and comment responses received, and publish the election benchmarks in the individual member states.

Please follow updates under EAA Political Strategies Committee. If you intend to come, please write directly to Sophie Hueglin (vicepresident@e-a-a.org), Raimund Karl (r.karl@bangor.ac.uk) or Marc Lodewijckx (secretary@e-a-a.org) so that we can identify your concern and organisational background(s). If you come back to us until 17.07.2017, we can include you on the list of expected participants.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) offers to found CIfA Deutschland

by Sophie Hueglin (s.hueglin@web.de), quoting the DGUF Newsletter from 6.7.2017

The necessity of a professional association for archaeologists in Germany was the main topic in Mayence at the conference of the German Society for Pre- and Protohistory (DGUF, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ur- und Frühgeschichte e.V.). The topic had already been discussed online with more than 200 participants in a web-based pre-conference. At the conference on July 4th, representatives of all stakeholder groups and organisations with similar functions had been invited to give position papers.

There, CIfA Board member Gerry Wait presented the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA UK) to the participants. During the following evening reception, he renewed CIfA’s offer from June 1st to support a German working group that would establish this large international professional association with currently 3200 members in Germany. The intention is to found a German association according to German law and German needs and not to become a copy of CIfA UK, but CIfA Deutschland, created from an adaption process to German surroundings and specific requirements. By the end of this process the German group would have to decide for itself whether it would want to become a branch of CIfA UK or to form an independent organisation — developed from the model CIfA UK, but separate. The advantage CIfA UK sees in this partnership would be to widen its base for common lobbying with regard to professional issues. Apart from CIfA Deutschland, CIfA Netherlands is in preparation, too. In order to have a point of contact in Germany, CIfA UK is providing initial financing to create a part-time position for German archaeologist Michaela Schauer M.A. Her primary task is to assist first applicants with their accreditation at CIfA UK and also to help adjusting documents and the existing system of CIfA UK to the requirements of German archaeology. That evening, more than 50 persons already signed the list of interest; among them the Head of Archaeology at the State Office for Cultural Heritage Bavaria, Sebastian Sommer. This group will form the core of CIfA Deutschland.

For the coming twelve months, CIfA Deutschland has the following aims:

- translation of application forms for individuals, institutions and companies
- creation of a German CIfA webpage
According to Gerry Wait, this list shows that a lot of hard work is waiting ahead. Achieving the aims, however, is possible with the cooperation of many. The more colleagues are prepared to volunteer, the better and faster the work will be accomplished.

At the conference and during the evening reception, the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) was represented by Vice-President Sophie Hueglin. In the name of EAA President Felipe Criado-Boado and the EAA Executive Board, she welcomed the founding of CIfA Deutschland. The creation of a Europe-wide roof of national professional organisations is – facing transnational worries about the working conditions of archaeologists in Europe – a very necessary step and the organisation an ideal partner for the EAA, which understands itself as the non-governmental organisation of European archaeologists.

DGUF, who has been instrumental in making the debate on the necessity for a professional organisation in Germany possible, supports CIfA’s offer to create a group in Germany. DGUF will help the project, for example by regular reports in the DGUF Newsletter, because CIfA has of yet no strong communication network in Germany. DGUF President Diane Scherzler, Vice-President Frank Siegmund and several members of the DGUF Advisory Board signed the list of interest – as private persons – and are therefore among the first to apply for membership with CIfA Deutschland.

There will be monthly updates on the progress of CIfA Deutschland in the DGUF Newsletter in German and also information on possibilities to join. The DGUF Newsletter can be ordered independently of DGUF membership here: http://www.dguf.de/49.html. Personally, I would encourage Austrian and Swiss archaeologists to get involved in the project CIfA Deutschland now in order to make it an association of not only German, but German-speaking archaeologists. This transnational association could be called CIFA DACH – D for Deutschland, A for Austria, and CH for Switzerland – and a make it an inclusive European rather than a solely national project.

References
“Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) bietet Gründung von CIfA Deutschland an”

“German archaeologists seeking to create a professional association” (CIfA, 1.6.2017): http://www.archaeologists.net/news/german-archaeologists-seeking-create-professional-association-1496321403

4th Central European Theoretical Archaeology Group CE TAG 2017

Conference date: Monday 16th – Tuesday 17th October 2017
Conference venue: OREA, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Hollandstraße 11–13, 1020 Vienna, Austria

Disciplinarity in Archaeology

Recent years have seen an increasing integration of natural science approaches in archaeology, so much that one could argue that the nature of the discipline is shifting from a historical-philosophical subject towards a natural science one. This brings with it a change in the discipline’s epistemology – in which ways knowledge is generated.

This conference aims to explore where archaeology stands as a discipline. Do we waver uneasily between subject groups, or are we integrating different kinds of knowledge? Archaeology is inherently cross-disciplinary, borrowing from art history, computer science, geography, biology and other subjects. Many projects today are multi-disciplinary, bringing in experts from different fields. Working in this way has become standard practice in archaeology, but how is this actually done? In what ways do the paradigms of different disciplines influence the questions explored and the knowledge generated? Is it appropriate to talk about inter-disciplinarity? How are multiple disciplines integrated within actual research? These questions provide the framework for understanding Disciplinarity in Archaeology.

The official language of the conference is English. The following themes outline the general focus of the conference:

1. Reflections on Inter-disciplinarity

Is the discipline of archaeology cross-, multi-, inter-, or trans-disciplinary? Have archaeologists defined our discipline well enough to even ask these questions? Or are we too fragmented between historical, processual and post-modern epistemologies to have even intra-disciplinary conversations? There is also a strong belief that science approaches generate “hard knowledge” – indisputable facts that are beyond questioning. And yet, the value of scientific knowledge is increasingly questioned in politics and society. What kinds of knowledge does archaeology generate, and is the public right in believing it?

2. Practicing Inter-disciplinarity

How is multi- or inter-disciplinarity practiced in ongoing archaeological research? Most of archaeologists recognize the need for incorporating the results of “hard science” analyses in our work. This includes everything from DNA to remote sensing to chemical analyses of artifacts, with scientists supplying reports, and often collaborating on publications. We are perhaps less open to asking whether disciplines like geophysics or chemistry are objective or subjective, or what the limitations of scientific methods are. Do archaeologists over- or underestimate what strontium isotopes or electron microscopy can prove? Alternatively, are our scientific collaborators aware of
the limitations of archaeological data? In this section, presenters will focus on the practice of interdisciplinarity in their own case studies and projects.

**Organizing committee:** Roderick B. Salisbury, Katharina Rebay-Salisbury, Estella Weiss-Krejci

**Contact:** Roderick.Salisbury@univie.ac.at

The Vienna Virgino Orme and Pesa Valley Project (VOPP)

by Dominik Hagmann (dominik.hagmann@univie.ac.at), Veronika Schreck (veronika.schreck@univie.ac.at) and Raffaela Woller (raffaela.woller@univie.ac.at), Department of Classical Archaeology, University of Vienna

Northern inland Etruria is one of the least investigated areas of Italy regarding the Roman period. Therefore, the research project P 27476 “Val di Pesa and Val Orme as a Changing Rural Landscape: an Integrated Approach”, funded by the Austrian Science Fund under the direction of Prof. Günther Schörner of the University of Vienna, deals with the area of the middle Arno Valley and is designed as a holistic and interdisciplinary archaeological landscape project.

Particular attention is paid to the tributaries of the Arno river, including the Pesa, Orme, and Virginio as well as their valleys (Fig. 1). Apart from the level river valleys, the region of interest is characterized by moderately steep hills. It is situated between the antecessor cities of Fiesole and Florence, Arezzo, Volterra and Pisa, which were well integrated in the ancient infrastructure network. The immediate urban centre was Empoli. Today, the territory is largely agrarian: there are vineyards and olive groves in the hillier parts, and legumes, sunflower and other crops are cultivated in the valleys. Human interaction in the study area is traceable from the Stone Age onwards, whereas the phase showing the main anthropogenic influence was from the 4th century BC until the 5th/6th century AD.

Project aims include the reconstruction of ancient landscapes, detecting continuity or change in the behaviour of Roman period inhabitants, and classifying land-use and settlement patterns in Roman times. To achieve these aims, the region is investigated at various scales around selected potential sites within the river valleys. For large-scale investigations, intensive systematic on- and off-site surveys were performed, with a total area of approximately 167 hectares surveyed by the end of the 2016 season. At the local scale, surveys and excavations have been carried out since 2012 as part of the teaching program of the University of Vienna, employing the latest documentation technologies in digital archaeology. Furthermore, various geophysical prospection surveys were conducted on several sites in the Orme and Pesa valleys in cooperation with the Austrian Archaeological Institute of the Austrian Academy of Science. In addition to these techniques, the project includes complementary approaches, including systematic geoarchaeological investigations, zooarchaeological studies, pollen analysis, agricultural modelling, pottery analysis and remote sensing.

The different methods implemented in the project are used to compare and contrast the various kinds of data. Finally, the results should enable to determine site classifications and definitions by surface assemblages for the middle Arno-Valley and should give an impression of ancient rural life in Etruria.
Figure: The surveyed areas and studied sites of interest within the Orme, Virginio, and Pesa valleys (red). (© D. Hagmann, Esri, Natural Earth 2017)

Research team
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Staff members
Mona Baumgarten, Kevin Brandtner, Tanja Bruckmüller, Felix Eder, Katalin Élő, Sebastian Gradauer, Jasmin Hangartner, Martin Junker, Alarich Langendorf, Sabrina Leixnering, Thomas Leutgeb, Florian Oppitz, Marina Palmieri, Nicole Rottensteiner, Hadwiga Schörner, Andreas Steininger, Romina Weitlaner

More information
visit our all-new project website: http://rrl.univie.ac.at
follow us on Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/rrl.univie/
follow us on Twitter: https://twitter.com/rrl_univie
find us on YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCbbOmhq-2GrUysP_hz4Jr5Q
find us on Flickr: https://www.flickr.com/photos/romanruralscapes/
contact us via e-mail: rrl.klass-arch@univie.ac.at

Funding bodies
Austrian Science Fund FWF: http://www.fwf.ac.at/en/
University of Vienna: http://klass-archaeologie.univie.ac.at/forschung/val-di-pesa-und-val-orme/
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Tributes

Bernhard Hänsel (24.5.1937 – 1.4.2017)

We mourn the death of Bernhard Hänsel, one of the most important European archaeologists of the 20th century.

Bernhard Hänsel's academic work will continue to live far beyond his personal departure, due to his vast publication record and the ‘Berlin School’ that he founded. His research focus on the metal ages in the Carpathian Basin and South-Eastern Europe, already established at an early stage, led to fundamental studies that set standards in Balkan archaeology and beyond. His dissertation 'Beiträge zur Chronologie zur mittleren Bronzezeit im Karpatenbecken’ (Contributions to the Chronology of the Middle Bronze Age in the Carpathian Basin, 1964, published in 1968) and his Habilitationsschrift ‘Beiträge zur regionalen und chronologischen Gliederung der älteren Hallstattzeit an der unteren Donau’ (Contributions to the Regional and Chronological Classification of the Early Hallstatt Period in the Lower Danube, 1972, published in 1976) are major contributions to this field.

The series ‘Prähistorischen Archäologie in Südosteuropa’ (Prehistoric Archaeology in South-Eastern Europe, PAS), initiated and edited by Bernhard Hänsel beginning in 1982, has now been published in 30 volumes, which are based on his standards for basic archaeological research. This series includes the results of his own excavations, including his own writings, as well as comprehensive studies of his students on Balkan archaeology.

His great merit was in combining Gero von Merhart’s established Marburg tradition of a material-based formal and chronological analysis with Vladimir Milojčić’s Heidelberg tradition of archaeological research across borders into his own Berlin School. His basic approach included envisioning social and historical images of the past, for which he used all available sources. This approach is also reflected in his interdisciplinary excavations carried out since the 1980s. Geologists, geographers, geophysicists, archaeozoologists and archaeobotanists were integrated in his excavation teams and included in the publications. It was not by accident that his historical interpretations of Bronze Age societies followed lines of disruption, which he used to establish decisive cultural changes. The exact knowledge of the material culture was his starting point, which he saw as a necessary prerequisite for every competent archaeologist and emphatically demanded and expected from his pupils.

After studying at the Humboldt University in Berlin, and subsequently Jena, Heidelberg and Vienna, a short period as university assistant followed in Heidelberg (1964), as well as a travel scholarship of the German Archaeological Institute (1965). His further career led him to Bochum as a university assistant (1966-1972) and to Erlangen as a lecturer (1973-1976), from where he received the call to the Chair for Prehistoric and Early Medieval Archaeology in Kiel (1976-1981). From his appointment to the Chair of Prehistoric and Early Medieval Archaeology of the Freie Universität in Berlin in 1981 until his retirement in 2006, he gradually expanded the Seminar for Prehistoric Archaeology into a
dynamic centre in our field. His institute became a focal point for prehistorians and many international students, especially from South-East Europe. The successive generations of archaeologists trained by Bernhard Hänsel are active today, within Germany and many other European countries.


In his academic work, Bernhard Hänsel followed his curiosity for historical developments in the Balkans, where he carried out large settlement excavations. After Kastanas in Northern Greece (1975-1976), excavations in Feudvar (Serbia) followed from 1986, which ended because of the Balkan wars. His investigations of the Toumba of Agios Mamas (Prehistoric Olynth, 1994-1996) in northern Greece were followed by excavations in Monkodonia, Istria (1997-2007). One of his earliest and – according to his own assessment – most significant excavations took place in Policoro (Basilicata), one of the oldest Greek colonies in Italy, in the late 1960s (1965-1967). His importance as a role model can probably be attributed to the high standards of his excavations and, above all, their extensive multi-volume publications. Bernhard Hänsel’s most impressive achievement is the publication of his excavations in addition to his diverse scientific commitments. After all, Bernhard Hänsel was primarily a university professor, who not only supervised a large number of MA and PhD students, but also regularly lectured to large classes. His keen interest in discussions and his engagement for his students characterised him as a great teacher.

Bernhard Hänsel was a great European archaeologist. He lives on in his writings and the academic work of his Berlin school and will not be forgotten.

Prof. Dr. Barbara Horejs
OREA Director, Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology, Austrian Academy of Sciences
ArchaeoCakes

This fabulous Must Farm cake was made by Dotty McLeod from Radio Cambridgeshire, who kindly sent us some pictures. Must Farm is a Bronze Age site in Cambridgeshire, UK, which includes a settlement built on a platform on piles over a river channel (c. 1000 – 800 BC). It was destroyed by fire, which caused wooden structures to collapse into the river. The preservation of organic finds makes this site an amazing source of knowledge about living conditions in Bronze Age England.

We are always looking for submissions of ArchaeoCakes! Please e-mail us at tea@e-a-a.org.