

Practice

In her keynote, Finnish researcher Ulla Lädesmäki presented archaeological heritage management (AHM) practice from a Finnish perspective, particularly Tampere Region, and she shared her reflections connected to training needs in AHM. Ulla works as an archaeological researcher at the Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum in Museum Centre Vapriikki, Tampere. She is one of the regional heritage authorities responsible for the management, and particularly protection, of archaeological heritage in the Tampere Region (Pirkanmaa). She is currently finishing her doctoral thesis at the University of Turku, researching the impact of modern land use on archaeological heritage.



Summary

The generations that were trained in the 1970s and 80s have mostly learned their management skills on the job and by leaning from more experienced colleagues after finishing their academic degree. That system in many places is still in use. In the 70s and 80s there was little theoretical education available on cultural heritage; In Finland mainly the Antiquities Act was taught and the administrative organization. Although that same Act still exists, the education has developed and there is a variety of courses as well as university study programs nowadays in Finland. However, these courses in management training are very scattered and it is not transparent where the knowledge can be obtained. The question arises whether there is a need of co-ordination and more co-operation between universities and departments instead of competition.

Practice can be defined as something which transforms principals into reality – it can even be characterized as an approach or a method. It is a means to achieve objectives derived from principles. Practice expresses and reflects how heritage is perceived and how we define this by no means a unified and homogenous phenomenon.

It is important to pay attention to heritage management practice as something that has an impact on the state of heritage itself and on peoples' attitude towards heritage. There are different levels of practice in heritage management. Practice is about the extent to which a site is accessible, it's about the process of isolating it as research material or approaching it with an eye towards the future and integrating it and making it relevant for the present society. Practice is an essential part of monitoring heritage sites and assessing the effect of heritage authorities' work, etc.

Heritage authorities should be aware of their power and role that they play in the management of cultural heritage, they need to be sensitive to different stakeholders and the heritage management professionals should be critical towards themselves and their role in the AHM process.

Practices are based on facts and therefore we need scientific results to build on. Theoretical and practical heritage management research is needed in much larger scale than has been done so far in Finland.

Heritage management practice takes place among people, which means that certain skills and abilities are needed when working with different kind of groups, that go beyond the academic, scientific skills related to archaeology, history, ethnology, anthropology etc. These are the so-called soft skills like communication, mediation and project management.

In management work the professionals need the ability to recognize and understand the relation between heritage management practices and preservation motives and we to keep asking the question: Why and for whom is heritage preserved and protected?

The AHM professionals should also recognize that they must proof their relevance to society. Which means that they need to keep innovating, producing and find resources for heritage management. Even though there is never enough time and there are always too many projects it is important to take time for serious thinking and doing research and this should be part of the practice of archaeological heritage management is well.

LOCAL

Collator: Annemarie Willems, Friends of ICAHM

Note-taker: Holly Flemming

Chair: Eeva-Kristiina Harlin, University of Oulu / Giellagas Institute

What does this new heritage professional look like and what is the basic skill set that he/she needs?

The AHM professional should be able to communicate with people from different backgrounds and with different motives, the development of good social skills is therefore very important. Current AHM professionals need to work better to preserve local heritage and they have to show more respect for the community in the area where they work. The next generation of AHM professionals should be encouraged to start grassroots initiatives with particular emphasis on community archaeology. They must have the skills to excavate and at the same time the knowhow to manage it as a heritage site.

Inclusion of the local community is however not always the best practice, especially in places where looting is or can be a problem. The heritage manager must know the community and teach about the site, as there is often an expectation to learn something from the expert for the locals and the other way around. There is always a local way of understanding the site and a local way of interpreting the site and thus emphasis on communication and listening is integral.

AHM professionals must know the rules of the local political framework in which they have to operate. In terms of urban archaeology a legal framework needs to be developed, informed by practice with a bottom up approach where the practice influences the law. Heritage managers need to be very flexible in order to learn new things along with having a working knowledge of the administrative and legal systems of the place where they work.

How is AHM being taught at the moment?

In Finland, AHM is currently taught from an old fashioned perspective that separates society and government. This means that the archaeological heritage remains separate from many others that have a stake in it, like the local communities. In the north of Finland AHM involves direct work with the Sámi through the Sámi Museum (Siida) and the National Board of Antiques (NBA) making it very important to include those individuals and their heritage within an understanding of AHM.

It is important to approach issues like repatriation of tangible, material heritage, with consideration for the local community and with greater emphasis on the question of who has the right to the past. Currently this idea is only lightly touched upon at universities and ethics in archaeology is not taught at universities in Finland and in many other universities across the world. Leading in this approach are the Universities of Umeå (Sweden) and Tromsø (Norway) that both offer these types of courses.

What is Archaeological Heritage Management?

AHM is varied without a singular definition. There is a constant dialogue between the law and the people and AHM professionals work in the conflict zone between these two areas. They need to be aware of politics, even on the smallest local levels, because heritage management is inherently political.

It should be the mission of the community archaeologist or AHM professional to reconnect people with their closest heritage environment. They must be trained in public outreach, to teach about the past and communicate with the locals about their memories and connection to certain places. This role of educator is very important on a local level, as the local community is given the opportunity to reconnect with their past through heritage managers. Heritage managers must ensure that people know the history of their site and the relation of the community and its heritage. Otherwise, they will not engage with or care about their past. Prior to excavation, community engagement on a daily basis will little by little build an understanding between AHM professionals and the local community.

Is there a need for a teaching program / curriculum / course for this relatively new discipline in Finland and elsewhere and what should or could this program look like?

There is a definite need for a new course in AHM. This could be in the form of online distance learning, because it is a good way to combine subjects from different universities. An overview could be made of the current programs in AHM and the best parts of these programs can be included in a completely new AHM curriculum. This program should include heritage management, budget management, communication, negotiation, good knowledge of politics and the (inter)national and local legal framework behind AHM. The graduate must know how to manage a project, be a project leader, to sell ideas, to write a good application, etc. The AHM student must also obtain a lot of fieldwork experience to be able to recognize local sites, know how to avoid damage, map an area, etc. Furthermore, this program must teach about other branches of cultural heritage such as cultural landscapes, built heritage and intangible heritage. To participate in this program the student would need basic knowledge of archaeology and 3-4 years of experience in heritage management. It should be a Master's level program that can then be continued further on a PhD level. Practice and research must be combined where research is used to validate the practice.

National

Collator: Annemarie Willems, Friends of ICAHM

Note-taker: Marjo Juola

Chair: Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto, University of Jyväskylä

The aim of this session was to discuss archaeological heritage management (AHM) practices on a national level; the selection process, the national research agenda, legislation and policy, etc.



The session was divided into two main themes:

1. Institutions and practices: Who are the key agents involved in AHM? How does the process of selection and conservation work in your country? Who are involved?
2. Hot spots: What are the hot topics now regarding collaboration between different agents? How is the collaboration between different authorities, researchers and local activists?

In Finland the key institutions that deal with AHM are the National Board of Antiquities (NBA) and the provincial Museums.

The NBA monitors and supervises land usage planning and the development of areas which have relics and other valuable cultural heritage issuing statements. They give licenses for the research and conservation of excavated material as well as the export of cultural goods, negotiate the terms of conservation and allocate funding the funding that the State provides.

The NBA has delegated the responsibility for regional AHM issues to archaeologists and researchers working at the 22 Provincial Museums in Finland. The provincial museums are responsible for planning and executing the regional programs for cultural heritage management and the management of cultural environments.

Other agents and important institutions that are involved in Finland's AHM are:

- State & private museums, local museums (Salla museum as an example of cross-institutional collaboration and wide-range local heritage activism);
- Local heritage societies and NGO's;
- Finnish Forest Commission Metsähallitus (managing the state owned land);
- Tourism and construction businesses;
- Antique markets, collectors;
- Media (media attention, social media, TV productions);

- Activist groups and sole actors, “lone wolves”

Examples of hot spots of AHM in Finland:

- Collaboration with amateur metal detectorists (News, TV productions, research and training going on!)
- Treatment of WWII heritage especially in the area of Finnish Lapland (Finnish Defense Forces’ policies, Finnish Forest Commission’s survey 2013, Discussions between museums and hobbyists, local efforts)

Examples of hot spots around the world:

- Decolonization as a challenge for heritage management (governmental agendas / indigineous groups);
- Heritage of conflicts such as Civil War (100 anniversary of Finnish Civil War, Spanish Civil War): heritage agents as facilitators of discussions and reflection? No state-led museum project so far in either of these countries;
- Faro convention and its ratification: European dimension – European cultural heritage (should we promote common European heritage?) / heritage communities (people can claim their heritage but who manages it? and what constitutes a community?);
- Building of Vanajanlinna, a site that has “two histories”, tourism and business in connection to heritage management, interpretation of alternative histories/difficult heritage as methodological choices.

Transnational

Collator: Annemarie Willems, Friends of ICAHM

Note-taker: Andrea Martinez

Chair: Margaret Gowen, Board member European Association of Archaeologists

This session was focussed on transnational heritage within the World Heritage frame and other kinds of thinking, with the aim to refine what a good university based Master's program or a variety of programs should contain in terms of content.

When talking about transnational heritage we are acknowledging that transnational heritage in Europe and transnational heritage in other parts of the world will be very different. Each area presents its own different challenges, different frameworks and individual and collective management considerations. Value is what it all ties together.



The values and the restrictions of the applications of the WH convention were discussed in this session. They provide advocacy on one level, but also provide rules and regulation in a way, some of which, however, cannot be easily adapted. Each situation, especially when it is a transitional context (be it a landscape or a serial site) has to develop its own policies for protection and management. While we must look to the conventions and international doctrinal texts and guidance and apply them where relevant, it is clear that all aspects of all conventions will not be applicable to every country or every situation.

When considering the form of a narrative that is used, or will be used to communicate and transmit different values, relevance must transcend the local but remain relevant to it. In a transnational context, while the cultural expression comes from the ground up it transcends national boundaries and modern culture. Students, therefore need the capacity to view perspectives with different 'lenses'.

International conventions

International conventions are like the law, but professionals cannot look to conventions alone. The conventions set a set of principles against which the case for protection of heritage of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) is agreed. What we have to do in terms of advocacy and development of practice is not something that the convention can do for us.

In developing countries, there are biases. In many states government it is more likely to obey the terms of an international convention, once it's ratified, especially if international corporate business or development interests (mining for example) needs to be kept in check. Once it is implemented in a country it is difficult for politicians and state services to disassociate from it. It therefore can have a significant bearing and influence on the local situation.

In Europe, something similar happened with the Valetta Convention. It led to significant development in national legislations across Europe and became a sort of legislative stick to beat commercial development interest with. It significantly influenced new legislative structures for protection and led to new forms of management practice linked to land use planning. It is accepted that it requires review at this point.

AHM as a course

It is for academia, and such an academic course, to identify best-practise examples and case-studies for students, and also to identify and analyse those that have not been successful and why. In any post-graduate course on Heritage Management, the teaching can't be done by a limited core group of university staff. It must include the participation of a wide variety of practitioners who should be invited to present to students. It could form a very significant part of the teaching.

How do we teach the students about the management needs of the heritage resource before we apply the management? That question goes back to: understanding the site/s, understanding cultural value and knowing the particular value of the resource. There is an opinion that suggests to begin this sort of teaching at Master's level is too late. This type of development of cultural sensibility and awareness must start at the undergraduate level. We need to have 'foot-soldiers' already trained at the bachelor level.

What is the "menu" that the university can offer graduate students so that they may choose a course of this nature at the Master level? We are perhaps not being as pro-active as necessary at the beginning (undergraduate level); we are not 'adding to the buffet' what we should. Academics need to take a hard look at their humanities, archaeology and scientific archaeology courses and look at other under-graduate course like environmental sciences and see what they are offering.

Exchange and networking should be an important part of a Masters level course. Widening professional and academic knowledge comes not just from university teaching. It takes practical experience to learn the language of other disciplines and to learn to communicate the message about cultural heritage in community situations.

Are we talking about archaeological heritage management, or is it necessary to move away from the idea that archaeology is a standalone in the context of heritage management?

Archaeologists need to be more nuanced in their use of language and more nuanced in the way they look at archaeology and the way it contributes to cultural heritage as a whole.

Archaeologists do have to be a recognizable profession within the environmental professional process. There is a need for that. But archaeology needs to create that niche persuasively.

Archaeologists have to defend the relevance of archaeology and understand where archaeologists add value to interdisciplinary professional conservation discourse. In many areas archaeologists are the most appropriate professionals to articulate what is required in the framework of overall

management. This can be the case especially with large transnational sites. They do need to develop the skillsets in students to do this.

World Heritage

Collator: Annemarie Willems, Friends of ICAHM

Note-taker: Oona Simolin

Chairs: Tanja Vahtikari, University of Tampere and Cynthia Dunning, ArchaeoConcept and VP Europe for ICAHM

Introduction

The key concept “Outstanding Universal Value” is a fundamental condition for the definition WH. The OUV is not just a listing criterion, but a management concept as well. A WH site should be managed in a way that it maintains its OUV and here the management plans play a key role.



WHS are multilayered with groups of stakeholders on many levels, the WH status brings an additional level to the management of the site. The possible clashing of the different levels of heritage valuation and management: national and local management systems vs requirements of the WH management plan, is what sets WHS sites apart from other level heritage sites.

In practice, the question of legislation comes forth quite often and it is a big hurdle for many countries, it is therefore important that the international conventions, including the WH Convention, are discussed in this session and included into a possible course in AHM. A particular element about WH, is that management planning is not only recommended but now mandatory for a nomination. Many countries have great problems with their management planning and in particular with applying this management plan to the WH site.

ICOMOS plays a central role in linking national, regional or local management systems and the requirements of UNESCO. ICOMOS experts/consultants function as cultural translators between the two entities (country - UNESCO). These translators do not just need the hard skills, but also soft skills linked to the comprehension of the countries one is working with. These soft skills are usually acquired on the job and less at the universities and training courses.

Another element is the change of generations. Most consultants/experts were trained in AHM on the job. The new generation of heritage professionals has a solid baggage from the 10 or so universities offering WH management but with little or no practical experience.

A question to be addressed in this session is ‘How is World Heritage currently being managed, and how can we train professionals to meet the challenges, and manage WH better? A statement to start the discussion:

The best way to teach AHM for WH passes through a university Masters program in advanced studies allowing the integration of students with a practical background, coming from different areas of knowledge and expertise and in which discussions can form a greater part of the curriculum.

What is WH, UNESCO and OUV? What is management in WH sites?

UNESCO has edited the Operational Guidelines for WH nominations and a series of publications on how to develop management planning for these sites. The publications about the management give examples on how to do this best. But each site has to find its own way to achieve the management goals as best as it can, and these can be manifold. What usually is missing is the know-how amongst the heritage specialists. Therefore, capacity building in this sector is recommended.

In addition to OUV, integrity and authenticity are important WH concepts. Management must contribute to preserving the attributes on the sites leading to its OUV, integrity and authenticity.

Good practices at WH sites

Behind the Finnish WH site of Suomenlinna there is a big, state-led organization that works autonomously. It has a good reputation which makes it easier to attract highly qualified people. Having good connections to other WH sites is important and a Site that is governed by one organization is much easier to manage than other sites.

Compared to Suomenlinna, in Old Rauma, another Finnish WH Site, there is a lot of building activity. One of the main challenges is how the City of Rauma can deliver information to homeowners living at the WH Site and how to get them to respect the necessities of preservation of the attributes of the site while offering modern comfort.

Society affects how WH management is done: in a highly hierarchical society the management structure is completely different than in less-hierarchical environments. It is difficult to develop uniform management structures that work in different societal structures. The problem is even bigger now that WH sites bring different stakeholder groups into management processes.

Tourism in WH sites

The WH site itself should always be the primary concern, not tourism. Inviting the public to WH Sites can be problematic. The increase of visitors may be positive in a financial or publicitaor sense. However, local communities do not necessarily welcome tourism and its impacts or the WH nomination. A significant problem is also that when ritual sites become official heritage sites, it can destroy the original meaning of the site for the local community. Listening to WH site residents is essential.

When tourism increases, sites should be able to deal with openness. Do you want to encourage visitors to explore or keep them on a strict path, these require different management methods and a good balance must be struck.

Last year the number of visitors in Suomenlinna exceeded 1 million people. Year-round tourism has been supported by the Governing Body of Suomenlinna. However, when the growing mass of visitors walk on the bare, snowless land during the winter, it affects vegetation, which is part of the landscape that has been nominated.

Limiting visitor numbers is more complicated than it may seem, limiting the number of visitors means diminishing income for stakeholders. The carrying capacity needs to be determined and a balance needs to be struck weighing the arguments of all stakeholders.

Issues when dealing with WH sites

Managing accumulated data like archives is a key issue. There is no funding for this kind of management work even at WH sites. During the preparation of archaeological research on a site, the responsibilities concerning the archiving of all documentation (including finds) and publication of the results must be decided upon.

Theoretical problem: How much should you excavate your site? When authenticity is prioritized, it is better if you do not touch the site and therefore you shall have less knowledge of it. New techniques may help in the future. It is a matter of measure. The OUV is based on what we know now; when we get to know more, OUV should be reviewed when the knowledge accumulates and technological tools become better and archaeology as a field develops.

UNESCO's requirement for advisory boards is problematic, as well as the fact that it does not always take in account the opinions of the NGOs. For example, in the context of African WH sites, it can be criticized that it is more important to have as many sites as possible to keep up the WH site number in Europe and elsewhere, while the quality and application of the rules for UNESCO WH are not seriously considered.

There are big differences between the archaeological laws and practices of different countries and reasons for nominations vary. However, the fundamental reason should always be protection, not increased visitation.

Involvement of local communities

National stakeholder groups and their interests are important. Local communities are often not taken seriously by national heritage managers and they may only be heard to fulfill a formal political requirement.

In countries where nation states are strong, e.g. Mexico or Turkey, nominations tend to have national meanings versus the countries that are limiting the amount of nominations. Local communities are not actually stakeholders; the attitude of heritage professionals can be

patronizing. In some sites, there is no engagement or even communication with them. In many cases, even though a management structure exists, it is impossible to implement it because of these attitudes. Often local communities are not even aware of the WH nominations.

Training and skills

Heritage managers should be trained to attain political and diplomatic skills. They should know how to reach the different audiences and stakeholders by putting the accent on the different kinds of stories/narratives needed to interest them. There are many stakeholder groups with whom one should be able to operate: scholars, the public, politicians, etc. Vocational training is important in this process. Professionals should be able to enhance their skills during their career.

There are many more organizations involved in AHM than heritage managers, therefore training heritage professionals is not enough. In Finland heritage management is mostly done as co-operation with other partners. Heritage values should be clear to all personnel and employees should be committed to work for them. To achieve that, the WH nomination should be written in cooperation with the whole staff or the OUV should be clearly communicated.

Heritage managers should be very aware of the power they have as storytellers and interpreters. They should have cultural sensitivity. Professionals should be able to propose ways for locals to build their identity, without imposing their own views.

Heritage professionals do not operate in vacuum. There are conventions, regulations and legislations that professionals must respect. The language that these bureaucratic texts speak is completely different to the reality that people are living. Managers prioritize the textual reality, not communities. The problems start where these two realities are being combined: for example, legislations concerning ethnic minorities. Because of this controversy, local heritage should be managed separately from national legislation.

Regulations and local reality are not contradictory. Regulations are written in a loose matter that gives space. It depends strongly on the country how well the bureaucratic reality and local reality can be fitted together. It is important that we have different kinds of communities rather than just 'modern' Western communities.

There is a danger of Eurocentric training. How can we change the perception of heritage management? E.g. at ICCROM -ATHAR the training was building, conservation etc. and all the contents of education are highly influenced by European methodology. There are also non-Western examples in the official heritage system, like the Japanese system in the 80's when they promoted intangible heritage.

The NGOs offering consultation and expertise have specialists who operate worldwide. It would be better if local knowledge and expertise was used. However global networks, exchange of good practices and giving feedback are also highly important.

The world changes and integrity of site changes. It is a problem to require that the site remains unchanged as the world around it is moving.