

Stuart Campbell · Liz White  
Suzie Thomas *Editors*

# Competing Values in Archaeological Heritage

 Springer

# Competing Values in Archaeological Heritage

Stuart Campbell • Liz White • Suzie Thomas  
Editors

# Competing Values in Archaeological Heritage

 Springer

*Editors*

Stuart Campbell  
Treasure Trove Unit  
National Museum Scotland  
Edinburgh, UK

Liz White  
Institute of Petrochemical Technology  
Beijing, China

Suzie Thomas  
Department of Philosophy, History,  
Culture and Art Studies  
University of Helsinki  
Helsinki, Finland

ISBN 978-3-319-94101-1                      ISBN 978-3-319-94102-8 (eBook)  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94102-8>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018951784

© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG  
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

# Foreword

Throughout the world, cultural heritage resources are under threat from the impact of accelerated development, environmental forces, climate change, social and political changes, and collection practices that are not regulated effectively. Many of these issues came to my attention during my tenure as President of the World Archaeological Congress from 2003 to 2014. As this book demonstrates, all countries have unique cultural heritage and unique challenges to the management of their heritage resources. Each country has to determine its own specific mix of strategies for managing this heritage.

This book provides a wonderful new resource for archaeologists and cultural heritage practitioners around the world. While other publications have considered this topic from an archaeological and legislative basis, this volume provides a wide variety of views with an emphasis in addressing ‘real-world’ or practical issues rather than a simple consideration of legislation. It draws together a range of valuable new material relating to cultural heritage management practices that span eastern, western, northern and southern Europe as well as Britain. A series of chapters review and critically evaluate and compare facets of national legislation, policy and practice, accompanied by recommendations for improved outcomes. The materials analysed range from coins and shipwrecks to plough furrows and human remains. I was particularly interested in new insights on the changes and challenges of cultural heritage management in the former Eastern bloc countries of Slovakia, Romania and the Republic of Moldova.

For the first time, there is broad and nuanced consideration of the value that people who pursue metal detecting can bring to archaeological understandings of the past. Taken together, the chapters in this book call for greater cooperation between archaeologists and non-professional groups, including the metal detectorists that have routinely been demonised by archaeologists. Even as an advocate for a democratisation of cultural heritage management, I must admit I was a little shocked, initially at least, by the views of one group of authors who ‘hope to see professional archaeologists and metal detectorists working side by side on research projects’. (I will leave you to identify the chapter yourself.) However, a persistent theme that runs through many of these chapters is that greater cooperation with

non-professional groups can produce socially nuanced and effective management of cultural heritage resources. The benefits range from the identification of finds and recording of site locales to richer understandings of the social relevance of the past and enhanced site protection. Despite difficulties and historical differences, the approach is optimistic.

In addressing the complexities of everyday cultural heritage management in an ever-changing and diverse world, the authors in this book uniformly offer practical suggestions likely to engender better legislation, policy and practice. Whenever challenges are identified, solutions are suggested, either in the form of new models or through reference to successful practices elsewhere. The results can be startling. Something as 'simple' as the outreach programme run as part of the Treasure Trove programme in Scotland can engender a threefold increase in the reporting of finds by metal detectors. This success seems to rely on the mutual regard and respect that is generated by direct personal contact between metal detector users and archaeological professionals, such as regional heritage managers and museum officers. Other chapters identify commonalities and differences in legislation, archaeological practice and social attitudes, even in adjacent countries. They highlight how some countries are learning from each other, as in the case of Romania and the Republic of Moldova, and how other countries *should* be learning from each other, as in the case of England and Scotland.

My hope is that this book will be read not only by archaeologists, cultural heritage managers and those who develop heritage legislation but also by members of local historical societies and those who are engaged in collecting or metal detecting. This is a book for all who are interested in our rich pasts, whether they be professional archaeologists or lay people. As several authors in this book observe, our shared future depends on working together to identify and preserve the cultural heritage that we wish to pass on to future generations.

Professor Claire Smith  
College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences  
Flinders University  
Adelaide, SA, Australia  
Barunga, NT, Australia

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
	Liz White, Stuart Campbell, and Suzie Thomas	
<b>2</b>	<b>Wreck of the Dutch Merchant Ship Vrouw Maria: Example of Protection and Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage in Baltic Waters</b> . . . . .	<b>7</b>
	Riikka Alvik	
<b>3</b>	<b>Norwegian Archaeological Heritage: Legislation Vs. Reality</b> . . . . .	<b>25</b>
	Ghatts Jeries Sayej	
<b>4</b>	<b>Archaeological Heritage Resource Management in Romania and the Republic of Moldova: A Comparative View</b> . . . . .	<b>45</b>
	Sergiu Musteață	
<b>5</b>	<b>Archaeological Heritage, Treasure Hunters, Metal Detectors and Forgeries in the Centre of Europe (Archaeology and Law in Slovakia)</b> . . . . .	<b>63</b>
	Tomáš Michalík	
<b>6</b>	<b>Legislation and Persuasion; Portable Antiquities and the Limits of the Law: Some Scottish and British Perspectives</b> . . . . .	<b>77</b>
	Stuart Campbell	
<b>7</b>	<b>Conflicts Over the Excavation, Retention and Display of Human Remains: An Issue Resolved?</b> . . . . .	<b>91</b>
	Liz White	
<b>8</b>	<b>Archaeological Metal Detecting by Amateurs in Flanders: Legislation, Policy and Practice of a Hobby</b> . . . . .	<b>103</b>
	Pieterjan Deckers	
<b>9</b>	<b>No Room for Good Intentions? Private Metal Detecting and Archaeological Sites in the Plow Layer in Norway</b> . . . . .	<b>125</b>
	Jostein Gundersen	

**10 Archaeological Heritage and Metal Detectors:  
Should We Be Managing Supply or Demand? . . . . . 139**  
Ignacio Rodríguez Temiño, Ana Yáñez, and Mónica Ortiz Sánchez

**11 Conflicting Values or Common Ground? Some  
Concluding Thoughts . . . . . 155**  
Suzie Thomas

**Index . . . . . 165**



# Contributors

**Riikka Alvik** The Finnish Heritage Agency, Cultural Environment Services, Helsinki, Finland

**Stuart Campbell** Treasure Trove Unit, National Museums Scotland, Edinburgh, UK

**Pieterjan Deckers** Department of History, Archaeology, Art, Philosophy & Ethics (HARP), Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium

**Jostein Gundersen** Directorate for Cultural Heritage (Riksantikvaren), Oslo, Norway

**Tomáš Michalík** Cultural Heritage Consulting Ltd., Trenčín, Slovakia  
Trenčín Museum, Trenčín, Slovakia

**Sergiu Musteață** History and Geography Faculty, “Ion Creanga” Pedagogical State University, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova

**Mónica Ortiz Sánchez** Legal Office of the Department of the Presidency, Regional Government of Andalusia, Seville, Spain

**Ignacio Rodríguez Temiño** Carmona Archaeological Ensemble, Regional Government of Andalusia, Seville, Spain

**Ghatts Jeries Sayej** Vest-Agder County Council, Department of Regional Development, Kristiansand, Norway

**Suzie Thomas** University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

**Ana Yáñez** Department of Administrative Law, Complutense University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain

**Liz White** CIE Education Group (China and UK), Yantai, China

## About the Editors

**Stuart Campbell** is Head of Treasure Trove, managing the Treasure Trove Unit based at the National Museum of Scotland in Edinburgh.

**Liz White** was awarded a PhD based on her investigation of the impact and effectiveness of human remains – related legislation and guidance in England and is currently working as an English expert in Yantai, China.

**Suzie Thomas** is Professor of Cultural Heritage Studies at the University of Helsinki, Finland.

# Chapter 1

## Introduction



Liz White, Stuart Campbell, and Suzie Thomas

Research, practice and even leisure interests in archaeological heritage point to the fact that there are many different values at play. These conflicts of interest might be as recognisable as a developer's wish to exploit a site, thwarted by heritage legislation protecting that particular category, through to the often complex ranges of different meanings that local communities and individuals may associate with a place, which may have little or no resemblance to the 'expert' opinion (see, e.g. Laurajane Smith's premise of the Authorised Heritage Discourse – Smith 2006). Even efforts to make archaeological knowledge more open and accessible to the public can be strictly underpinned by the ideology of the national policy behind it (e.g. Börjesson, Petersson and Huvila 2015). The difficult issue of heritage protection is also complex – with options of preserving in situ, reusing, conserving and a whole range of preventative or restorative measures affecting what 'protection' might actually mean in practice.

The inspiration for this volume came from a series of discussions and meetings surrounding sessions held mainly at the annual meetings of the European Association of Archaeologists. From a range of sessions and debates, one apparent theme became obvious; what are the challenges and conflicts in heritage stewardship that may be obvious to the heritage practitioner but which are poorly defined or invisible to the legal frameworks that actually protect cultural heritage? Whilst the daily frustrations and limitations of the job may appear obvious to those who face the challenge of heritage protection, they are rarely considered in a structured or thoughtful way; rather, the standard measurement of the effectiveness of legislation is often

---

L. White (✉)  
CIE Education Group (China and UK), Yantai, China

S. Campbell  
Treasure Trove Unit, National Museums Scotland, Edinburgh, UK  
e-mail: [s.campbell@nms.ac.uk](mailto:s.campbell@nms.ac.uk)

S. Thomas  
University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

measured against international (or European, in our examples) benchmarks of ‘good practice’ such as the recommendations of the Valletta Convention. The impact of the Faro Convention broadens the issue further, considering as it does the impact of cultural heritage on communities and society as a whole. Whether such laws and agreements work in practice, or whether there are problems that cannot be solved by a legal framework, are often at best moot points. Yet they are also crucial as to whether a cultural heritage framework can actually protect and preserve on a daily and practical basis.

Consequently the contributors to this volume were given what might appear to be a simple task; to discuss issues or challenges in heritage management that could not be resolved or protected by the law or where legal frameworks had proved less than satisfactory in resolving issues. As a complementary topic, they were asked to consider cases where laws might turn out to have unintended consequences or prove challenging to implement. It might be no surprise that our contributors chose to answer this brief in a number of divergent ways, but what came back also was what might appear to be a high level of consistency and agreement.

In considering the challenges in protecting shipwrecks in the Baltic, Riikka Alvik touches upon a range of issues from actively protecting archaeological heritage to tackling looting (and crucially, working with law enforcement to make sure that effective structures are in place), through to those issues that are outside the control of legislation, chiefly the threats posed by global warming (Chap. 2). This range of challenges, from known and quantifiable to those that are not, provides a useful introduction to the scope of this volume. In a similar vein, Ghattas Sayej considers not just the aim of the law in a liberal society but looks beyond the ostensibly commendable intentions of the law in Norway to produce a public benefit to the unintended (and counterproductive) consequences of legislation that would otherwise seem to present a comprehensive solution to many of the problems faced by commercial development and archaeology (Chap. 3). This balance between the law as practical, and the law as presenting a cultural ideal, can be best seen in the two papers by Sergiu Musteață (Chap. 4) and Tomáš Michalík (Chap. 5). Both deal, through case studies of Romania and Moldova and Slovakia, respectively, with the difficult issues of realising an effective and democratic cultural heritage system in countries that have made the difficult transition from totalitarian Cold War era regimes. What is telling, especially from a western European perspective, are the difficulties not so much in creating the framework and legislation but in the challenges in embedding these in a society whose very notion of the citizen and the value of heritage has also had to make transitions. To those who take the ideals of the Valletta Convention for granted (and this is certainly not across the board, as evidenced by the different stances towards non-professional archaeological interventions with the heritage), these chapters are a useful, and perhaps humbling, corrective.

Many of those working in the heritage sector will agree that the translation of heritage legislation into real life is not always an easy task. One such example is the paper by Stuart Campbell, which discusses how heritage legislation can be applied practically in light of the various challenges encountered when dealing with portable antiquities, whether they are found by people using metal detectors or not.

In the context of Scotland, he mentions a ‘crisis of cultural authority’ – an idea associated to a much greater extent with conflicts over the retention of human remains in museums (Jenkins 2010). He believes that: ‘...archaeologists who deal with metal detector finds face just such a challenge to their cultural and intellectual discipline’ (Chap. 6).

The idea of a ‘crisis of cultural authority’ can be seen to a much greater extent in the chapter by Liz White, providing a global overview rather than national or regional case study, which examines ongoing issues relating to the treatment and retention of human remains (Chap. 7). Both the excavation and storage of human remains have been disputed in some countries for a number of decades, and this has led to either the passing of legislation or guidance, both of which continue to bring difficulties. This by itself can bring into sharp focus an issue of wider concern, where the broad public (or at least espousing to be ‘public’) ideals of archaeology as articulated through legislation can often marginalise the values of specific cultural groups. In particular this can be seen in South Africa, where the protection of archaeological sites has excluded cultural groups for whom these sites continue to have contemporary cultural relevance (Ndlovu 2013). This problem is surprisingly widespread, ranging from the countries discussed in White’s chapter to those countries like China, where the state might be said to exert a greater control over civil life (Zhang and Wu 2016). The universality of this challenge, regardless of cultural and legal factors, is by itself a demonstration that solutions should be searched for outside of the strict letter of the law. It is most easily defined as a question of how do we, as a profession or collection of related professions, deal with groups who may feel the interests of archaeology (often viewed within the profession as equating to a wider ‘public good’) is inimical to their own aims?

This question is posed in a number of ways in the different chapters of this volume, not least in those dealing with metal-detector users. The number of contributors who chose to address this issue was initially unexpected but clearly reflects the nature of concerns within current discourse and practice. For example, Pieterjan Deckers provides a critical review of the development of policy and practice for non-professional archaeological metal detecting in Flanders (Chap. 8), whilst Jostein Gundersen provides a perspective of the challenges faced in Norway (Chap. 9). Ignacio Rodríguez Temiño, Ana Yáñez Vega and Mónica Ortiz Sánchez focus on legislation in Andalusia, Spain, and on how the enforcement of this legislation has affected metal detecting (Chap. 10). Like many of the other chapters in this volume, this provides a useful barometer of how prevalent this issue is in cultural heritage terms, when it forms the chief area of interest for many practitioners. In particular it should be noted also the interconnection between topics. For example, whilst Michalik starts his contribution with a review and assessment of legal frameworks in Slovakia, his conclusion focuses again on metal detecting and its problematic (and in this case, illegal) impact on the archaeological record. Whilst Michalik’s chapter, with its assessment of looting, may seem to encapsulate many of the issues around metal detecting and archaeology, the sheer variety of chapters within our volume demonstrate how variegated this area is, running the gamut from those which deal explicitly with looting and illegal behaviour to those chapters that

describe what is a law abiding and frequently constructive area of non-professional engagement with the past. It is often the case (at least in the experience of the editors) that the worst case scenario is often presumed with regard to metal-detector users, that they form a group who will break the law in pursuit of profit. The range of papers here certainly demonstrates a more complex picture and most of all shows that the nature of metal detecting varies on a country by country basis, reflecting a range of factors from the law and the potential of illicit profit to the extent of legally acceptable public access to archaeological materials. Whilst not denying the challenges inherent in promoting a culture of responsible metal detecting, we would submit that the bleakest outcome should never be assumed. Opportunities for cooperation and information sharing exist, as well as mandates for prosecution and prevention.

It is, in fact, the divergence in this area that most usefully demonstrates the tension at the heart of heritage legislation. Whilst on one hand, the aspirations and ideals of the Valletta Convention point to a recognised and accepted need that there are universal tenets that should be found in heritage laws across Europe, the other theme pulls in an opposite and contrasting direction. When reviewing the range of chapters within this volume, it becomes evident that, no matter what ideals of universal good practice may be ascribed to, it is impossible to ignore how widely variant the law is in different jurisdictions. This, by itself, varies the degree to which cultural heritage can be protected. When reviewing the picture here, it is clear that the ability to protect an archaeological monument, claim state ownership over an artefact or enforce and protect in other ways is defined and constrained by that state's legal framework rather than reflecting a wider and universal ideal of cultural heritage protection (notwithstanding the elements of universality, in Europe at least, that the Council of Europe's conventions do achieve). At the same time, chapters such as Musteață's demonstrate how essential these national frameworks are; not all countries start from the same place (particularly those undergoing the difficult transition from former totalitarian regimes), and Musteață demonstrates even how different (though complementary) the approaches of two countries such as Romania and Moldova can be, even though they are on similar trajectories. On a more pragmatic level, how can we square a universal acceptance that chance finds of archaeological material are part of the national patrimony when the laws in different countries ascribe completely different ownership to these finds, whether state, finder or landowner? This question is admittedly as much rhetorical as it is literal, yet it usefully illustrates the divergence between an international ideal and what may be possible by the law of any one country. The gap between this ideal and legal definition is best summed up as the space in which other competing values can fill, whether they are those of the illicit market or the more innocent values of the law abiding metal detector user. It is, by its very definition, an area that is not demarcated by law.

It is precisely in this non-demarcated area, one in particular that is not mapped in any legislation, that a variety of motivations and actors come into play. Whilst more subtle than the problem of legislation impacting on the way of life of a cultural or social group, the question of how other parts of society view heritage legislation

remains pertinent. Reading these chapters, it is striking how often other interest groups, whether divers or metal-detector users, form coherent groups, with coherent responses to government agencies; the reluctance of metal-detector users to lend their help to archaeological research projects that Michalik highlights is one such instance. This itself is a useful juncture at which to question what a citizen might expect in their interaction with the state, especially if the ‘official’ treatment of archaeology may be seen as personally disadvantaging them. Arguably, many of the issues that Musteață and Michalik highlight may have their issues in a residual distrust of the state in former totalitarian regimes. Nevertheless, these same issues can be found across Europe, as the chapters on metal detecting testify, and can perhaps be found also in the caution that the Norwegian property developer exhibits in Sayej’s chapter. In response, the idealisation of archaeology as a public good for universal benefit is made clearly and articulately in the chapter from Spain, espousing precisely why activities for personal benefit can and should be restricted. In contrast to this idea of the public good pushing back against a variety of private benefits, one other common factor in these chapters should be noted: principally the commodification of archaeological material. Whilst this can manifest in the issue of organised criminal looting on both land and sea, it can also be seen to affect other areas. For example, the very existence of a legal market in antiquities can cause effects as varied as a counterfeiting workshop in Slovakia and distort the reporting of artefacts in Scotland as their importance is gauged not so much by their archaeological significance, but how much they might fetch on the legal market. Effectively, the licit market can mean that ‘collectible’ is conflated with ‘archaeologically interesting’.

Amongst this intermixture of universal problems and unique national variants, it is the universal and accepted ideal of archaeological heritage that is the common factor in this volume, motivating our contributors to propose and argue for a variety of solutions to these problems. At the same time, that these ‘others’ who interact with the archaeological heritage form coherent and (sometimes) resistant groups can in itself be a solution, from Finnish divers to Scottish metal-detector users, this volume demonstrates also the value of public and community engagement and outreach.

This volume clearly demonstrates through its broad topics that there are diverse challenges being encountered due to inevitable clashes of values, priorities and agendas. Yet despite this, there are also many commonalities. It is hoped that the experiences shared in this volume are not only of help to those with an interest in heritage protection but will also help to foster meaningful discussion and debate about the future of heritage protection.

## References

- Börjesson, L., Petersson, B., & Huvila, I. (2015). Information policy for (digital) information in archaeology: Current state and suggestions for development. *Internet Archaeology*, 40. <https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.40.4>.
- Jenkins, T. (2010). *Contesting human remains in museum collections: The crisis of cultural authority*. New York: Routledge.
- Ndlovu, N. (2013). Ownership of heritage resources in South Africa: Challenges and opportunities. *Internet Archaeology*, 33. <https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.33.5>.
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Zhang, Y., & Wu, Z. (2016). The reproduction of heritage in a Chinese village: Whose heritage, whose pasts? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 22(3), 228–241.



# Chapter 2

## Wreck of the Dutch Merchant Ship *Vrouw Maria*: Example of Protection and Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage in Baltic Waters



Riikka Alvik

### Introduction

In the brackish waters of the Baltic Sea, there are thousands of shipwrecks from different eras. Some of these wrecks are remarkably well preserved because of the special conditions of the northern Baltic Sea: the low salinity of the seawater, low water temperature, lack of daylight and lack of wood-eating molluscs like the shipworm *Teredo navalis*. Also strong currents do not usually occur in the sea areas except on vessel routes. Moving ice can cause mechanical erosion and changes in the sea bottom topography if the ship sank in depths less than 20 m, but beneath that, the conditions are often quite stable. Even so, every site should be evaluated individually, and both environmental factors and human impact should be taken into consideration.

A wreck is an artificial reef for flora and fauna, and there is always microbial activity in the bottom of the sea and on shipwrecks and structures underwater. Monitoring the sites should be a routine rather than something that is possible only during specific projects. Changes like increasing eutrophication, climate change and warming and anoxic bottoms in the Baltic may cause future threats to preservation of underwater cultural heritage, too. Climate change can relate to changes in salinity, temperature of seawater, changes in water level, oxygen level and amount of daylight that can have an effect on underwater cultural heritage too. New species might occur in flora and fauna, and biological activity can raise to a different level. The Baltic Sea is very shallow, so the changes can be quick and dramatic. The Baltic Sea has a two-layered stratification of salinity in the seawater, and there are seasonal changes in temperature. The range of water temperature varies much between the depths below 100 metres up to 3–8 °C and surface water up to 25 °C. For example, in the Gulf of Finland, the temperature of surface water has increased. Clear change

---

R. Alvik (✉)

The Finnish Heritage Agency, Cultural Environment Services, Helsinki, Finland  
e-mail: [riikka.alvik@museovirasto.fi](mailto:riikka.alvik@museovirasto.fi)

in salinity has not yet been detected, but some inflows from North Sea have occurred also during the summer bringing warm water with high-salinity and low-oxygen level to the depths of the Baltic Sea. Usually these inflows occur during spring and winter bringing cold, high-salinity and oxygen-rich water into the Baltic (Elken and Matthäus 2015, Leino et al. 2011: 133–139). What kind of an effect all these changes can have to the underwater cultural heritage is not researched yet, but, for example, biological activity and degradation of wood correlate with each other and shipworm *Teredo navalis* already exists in the southern Baltic Sea coast eating wooden shipwrecks (Palma 2004:8–39; Gregory 2004b:38–48).

There are approximately 1925 different kind of underwater sites known and registered in the Finnish Heritage Agency public database of cultural heritage including also cultural heritage and archaeological findings on land. Findings of new wrecks are reported by maritime authorities and divers every year. Side-scan sonars are more affordable nowadays, so individual divers and diving clubs practice sea bottom survey nowadays. Sea bottom survey requires permission from the military, but it is possible all the buyers and users are not aware of the regulations concerning it. Buying such equipment is not regulated.

Around 90% of the underwater findings are wrecks of different types and sizes from mediaeval times to modern ages. Most of these wrecks are the remains of wooden sailing ships, but there are also steam ship remains of the First World War military and transport vessels and modern wrecks. For example, big building projects like gas pipelines can provide masses of new information also from the exclusive economic zone. If shipwreck findings occur in such sea bottom surveys, there are some legislative problems in protecting them. The Antiquities Act covers only Finnish territorial waters. Finland has not ratified the UNESCO Convention 2001 on the protection of underwater cultural heritage. Ratifying the convention might give one solution to the protection of shipwrecks at the exclusive economic zone and also measures in the management of them.

According to the Antiquities Act of 1963, all ship findings and shipwreck parts sunk more than 100 years ago are protected by law, so around 750 of the registered sites fulfil this condition. Since 2015, some of the First World War wrecks are now protected. They are both transport vessels and warships that were lost during the First World War. Many of these wrecks have some special features like ammunition and human remains on board that have to take into consideration in the research, protection and management of the wrecks.

With wartime wrecks and transport vessels, there are also issues to solve around fuels or materials used that are can cause conflict between protecting a wreck site and protecting the surrounding natural environment. This theme was studied in an international project “Sunken Wreck Environmental Risk Assessment” (SWERA). There are more than 8500 wrecks around the world that are potential for polluting. The project risk assessment was made in partner countries, and wrecks with fuel and explosives were searched in the archives and databases. In Finnish waters we have some like 33 high-risk modern shipwrecks with a possibility of hazardous waste leaking to the environment. Some of them are Second World War military vessels with seriously hazard fuels inside their fuel tanks like some German Second