One World Archaeology

John H. Jameson
James Eogan *Editors*

Training and Practice for Modern Day Archaeologists

Springer

One World Archaeology

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/8606

John H. Jameson • James Eogan
Editors

Training and Practice for Modern Day Archaeologists

Springer

Editors
John H. Jameson
National Park Service
Southeast Archaeological Center
Tallahassee, FL, USA

James Eogan
National Roads Authority
Tramore House RDO
Tramore, Co. Waterford, Ireland

ISBN 978-1-4614-5528-8 ISBN 978-1-4614-5529-5 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-5529-5
Springer New York Heidelberg Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2012951306

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Acknowledgments

The editors would like to thank the following individuals for their valuable input and assistance in helping make this publication possible: Prof. Gabriel Cooney, University College Dublin, for his advice and encouragement; the late Dr. Blaze O'Connor and Dr. Kenneth Aitchison, for programing and organization of sessions at WAC-6; Rónán Swan, Head (Acting) of Archaeology, National Roads Authority, and Ian Doyle, Head of Conservation, The Heritage Council, Ireland, for providing facilities and support to the editors; and finally to Teresa Krauss and Morgan Ryan of Springer, for their patience, understanding, and assistance during production of the book.

Introduction

Entering the second decade of the new millennium, archaeologists and other cultural heritage specialists are adjusting to new and changing dynamics in practice and training. In an era of rapidly expanding globalization, archaeologists worldwide are increasingly engaged in international debates on evolving professional standards for formal education and teaching, employee training, public interpretation, and civic engagement. These activities are concurrent with increasing challenges in the management of archaeology in the context of development and the assimilation and interpretation of large volumes of new data. The most successful models for carrying out programs, projects, and publications place emphasis on interdisciplinary collaborative partnerships.

Trends in Training and Interdisciplinary Collaboration

In recent years, an important and encouraging development has been the markedly increased number of collaborations among archaeologists, educators, preservation planners, and government managers to explore new approaches to archaeological and heritage education and training to accommodate globalization and the realities of the twenty-first century. From site tours to television programs, archaeologists work cooperatively with historic preservationists, museum curators, educators, and personal services interpreters.

At a number of universities, archaeologists have gone a step further with faculty and students partnering with community members in designing and implementing programs. In government, initiatives such as the US National Park Service's Interpretive Development Program (IDP), through employee training and certificate programs, provide opportunities for employee training on effective approaches and techniques to achieve enhanced resource protection and promote public stewardship.

Public archaeologists are increasingly employing collaborative approaches in devising effective strategies for communicating archaeological information and

significance in both academic and public arenas. In the developed world, program success is measured by its capacity to empower and motivate members of nonspecialist audiences to more active involvement. These people may be stimulated by a general interest in archaeology, or they may be engaged by existing sites or museums in their locality. Sometimes their interest may be kindled by exciting new discoveries.

Many archaeologists and cultural heritage specialists are moving beyond the concept of the public as recipients or "customers" of interpretation to focus on active public participation in archaeological and interpretation processes. In these more inter- and transdisciplinary approaches, this conceptual shift facilitates analyses of public participation in the production of knowledge. Increasing examples of this new focus: how nonacademics or lay persons create, use, and react to this new knowledge, with public operating alongside either professionals or students, or on their own, in variable relationships, are emerging (Jameson and Mytum 2011, 2012).

In the developing world (also termed the "emerging economies"), particularly in situations where archaeologists are working to mitigate the impact of development projects, engagement with local and indigenous people who have little or no formal archaeological knowledge can be fraught with ethical dilemmas. Much of this work takes place within the context of international development aid, yet there has been limited research into, or discussion of, the practical and ethical considerations of such work within the profession (Breen and Rhodes 2010).

At the 2003 Fifth World Archaeological Congress (WAC 5) in Washington, DC, a symposium entitled "Archaeology and Globalization: Challenges in Education and Training for the 21st Century" highlighted improved international interdisciplinary collaborations. At WAC 6, held in Dublin, Ireland, in 2008, we expanded this theme in three interconnected sessions that included case study examples come from Western and Eastern Europe, the USA, Canada, former Soviet Republics, Africa, Asia, the Mediterranean, and Australia. Many of the chapters in this volume were derived from presentations at WAC 5 and WAC 6.

An Increasingly Globalized Archaeology

We use the term "globalized archaeology" to convey the sense of archaeology being practiced in an increasingly networked and interconnected world. The twenty-first century is marked by the ease with which information flows around the world. This is resulting in the rapid transmission of ideas, concepts, and knowledge within the archaeological profession. While on the face of it this is a positive development which should allow for the transfer of successful methodological and epistemological strategies from one country to another, it is also possible that governments and corporations who fund many archaeological projects will use the same tools to economize and streamline in ways that will effectively lower archaeological recording standards.

In many developing countries, social and economic factors are affecting the nature and ethical practice of archaeology. Professional training of archaeologists in these areas is undergoing fundamental revision driven by a recognized need for integration into standardized global education systems.

Employment Opportunities and Access to Training

One of the principal objectives of the European Union (EU) is to allow the free movement of labor. With increasing numbers of archaeologists and other cultural heritage specialists seeking to take advantage of opportunities in countries other than their own, how has this mobility of individual workers affected archaeological practice?

What are the opportunities and access to training, and how have they affected archaeological practice in Europe and throughout the world?

In response to these questions, and to follow up on similar issues raised at WAC 5 and at many meetings of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA), the Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe research project was formed. Partly funded by the European Commission, the project examined archaeological employment in 12 European states. With archaeological practice organized in very different ways in the participating states, the project identified differing structures that have led to obstacles that limit opportunities for individual archaeologists. It examined what globalization really means to archaeologists in terms of both competition and cooperation. It paid particular attention to identifying obstacles to transnational mobility and to offering recommendations to minimize those obstacles.

Archaeology and Development

Historically, archaeology has been perceived either as an amateur discipline that anyone can contribute to or as an "ivory tower" academic pursuit with the attendant connotations of dilettantism and exclusivity. In developed countries for much of the twentieth century, archaeologists found employment in academia, in museums, and in government conservation and land management agencies.

Since the earliest days of antiquarianism, archaeological remains have been discovered during development projects such as agricultural activities, extractive industries (e.g., quarrying and peat extraction), infrastructural developments (e.g., canals, railways, and roads), and urban development. Over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, museums around the world filled up with such chance finds, which contributed to the development of archaeology as an academic discipline. In the first six decades of the twentieth century, the increasing mechanization of construction led to large-scale development projects, particularly the construction of industrial plants, dams, highways, and airfields. Following the Second World

War, significant urban reconstruction projects were undertaken in many European countries. Such developments sometimes led to the discovery of significant archaeological remains, and, depending on the local circumstances, archaeologists took the opportunity to investigate these discoveries. The emerging awareness among those interested in archaeology (whether or not they were employed as archaeologists) that development projects could be agencies of archaeological discovery, allied to a wider movement toward the regulation of development by state authorities, led to greater consideration of the archaeological impact of development projects. These conditions form the background to the employment of an increasing number of archaeologists outside the traditional employment areas, which in some countries stimulated the emergence of archaeology as a professional service.

The most significant stimulus for professional services archaeology have been the development and consolidation of governmental and transnational policies and legislative provisions, particularly those involving the control and mitigation of development projects. In particular, the inclusion of archaeological heritage under the broad rubric of cultural heritage in the United States' National Environmental Policy Act (1969), The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (1995), Australia's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999), and the transnational European Union's Directive 85/337/EEC (1985) on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment has established the concept of environmental impact assessment (EIA). These legislative innovations brought many Western archaeologists into a process of structured assessment of the immediate-, medium-, and long-term archaeological and environmental impacts of development proposals within a framework of interdisciplinary collaboration (Carver 2009).

In these countries, the inclusive public processes that are part of the EIA have also exposed archaeology to public scrutiny while at the same time allowing advocates for archaeology to raise their voices in circumstances where they believe that EIAs are flawed. These developments have taken place in parallel with the development of a body of international, transnational, national, and regional policies relating to archaeology. At a global level, UNESCO has adopted the World Heritage Convention (1972). The Council of Europe has been active in promoting a number of different conventions directly relevant to archaeology including the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada, 1985), Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage of Europe (revised) (Valetta, 1992), and the European Landscape Convention (Florance, 2000).

In countries with robust, enforced regulation of development activities, a secondary stimulus for the emergence of archaeology as a professional service has been the drive in construction management to minimize and transfer risk. From the perspective of a construction applicant or permittee promoting a development, the principal archaeological risk is the unanticipated discovery of archaeological remains requiring mitigation during construction. The professionals best placed to manage this risk on behalf of a developer are archaeologists, and in many countries a range of methodologies have been developed to do this (Carver 2009).

Compliance as a Driver of Archaeological Knowledge

In the USA, heritage protection mandates at the federal level in the 1960s and 1970s produced an avalanche of information and collected materials, resulting in great challenges for information and collections management in the late twentieth century that are still with us today (Jameson 2004). As similar approaches were adopted in other countries, analogous issues have arisen.

The predominant instrument of archaeological knowledge creation at the beginning of the twenty-first century continues to be the archaeological inventory, evaluation, and mitigation undertaken in response to development proposals. These developments are public and private, urban and rural, and can vary greatly in scale from single-dwelling houses, to extensive linear projects such as roads, railways, and pipelines, to large area developments such as mines, dams, retail parks, and airports.

Regardless of the scale of the individual projects, they pose many of the same archaeological problems and present many archaeological opportunities. These developments can provide an opportunity to carry out high-quality archaeological excavation and research in areas and regions that often have not been comprehensively researched previously. However, it should be noted that such successful outcomes are predicated on the existence of a body of appropriately trained heritage professionals, the existence of a structured approach to development consent, and the apportionment of responsibility for funding. The presence of public support for the mitigation of the impact of such projects is also important in ensuring a successful outcome, particularly where administrative or legislative structures are poorly developed or under-resourced.

Collective International Experiences

One of the principal aims of the sessions at WAC 6 was to provide an overview of current practice around the globe in both developed and developing countries. Particular issues it hoped to address were:

1. The impact of national and international public policy on the scale and scope of archaeological work carried out on development projects.
2. A review of archaeological responses to the evaluation of large-scale developments.
3. Source criticism—the effect of evaluation and excavation and post-excavation strategies on the creation of the record.
4. Assimilating the so-called “gray literature” into existing archaeological narratives and the creation and maintenance of effective and accessible archives.
5. The changing roles of excavator, specialist, and synthesist in the creation of archaeological knowledge.

Unsurprisingly, many of the papers at WAC 6 focussed on Ireland. At the time of WAC 6 (2008), Irish archaeology was experiencing an historically unprecedented economic boom colloquially known as the Celtic Tiger. Archaeology was not immune from the effects of this economic growth. On the one hand the economic growth stimulated widespread and in many cases large-scale development projects by the private and public sector which directly threatened nonrenewable archaeological heritage. On the other hand these projects provided opportunities for the employment of professional archaeologists and led directly to the discovery and excavation of many previously undocumented archaeological sites which added enormously to our knowledge of the past. While the experiences of archaeologists who worked in Ireland in this period are particular to the specific conditions and structures that were present, they do have a wider relevance.

In Ireland, the following factors helped ensure that the archaeological response to the unprecedented development pressure was reasonably coherent and comprehensive:

1. The existence of relatively well-developed legislative protection for archaeological remains
2. Oversight by professional archaeological staff employed by statutory bodies
3. Knowledge and awareness within the archaeological profession of regulatory and administrative structures in comparable countries
4. An independent representative body for professional archaeologists
5. A young and well-educated archaeological workforce

Based on the experience in Ireland and other countries, in examining the place of archaeology vis-á-vis development, the following questions arise:

1. Are legislative, regulatory, and administrative structures in place at a national or regional level to adequately implement the principles of existing international agreements?
2. Can archaeologists engage effectively with development agencies/corporations and statutory bodies responsible for development control to ensure that the archaeological impacts of construction projects are properly assessed and mitigated?
3. Do effective organizational structures exist to ensure that archaeologists are able to respond to the archaeological impact of development projects?
4. Are there adequate resources (labor, funding, and time) available to meet the needs of such projects?
5. How is the archaeological data curated and how is knowledge gained through such projects effectively communicated within the profession and to the general public?

The responses to these questions are conditioned by the particular circumstances and structures obtaining in particular jurisdictions. In those countries where adequate structures exist, and where there is an explicit commitment to curate the data and communicate it widely, archaeology and society benefit, stimulating public support for archaeology.

Contributions of This Volume

The last three decades of the twentieth century saw the formulation and adoption of a number of significant policy and legislative initiatives as well as the creation of international conservation and professionally oriented structures and organizations, including the World Archaeological Congress (WAC), that are now beginning to have a global impact. In our modern, interconnected world, it is becoming increasingly possible for archaeologists working in a particular country to be cognizant of collaborative approaches and supranational contexts and in which they are practicing their profession. Equally, those communities and stakeholders who are not archaeologists, but whose material and intangible heritage comes into the orbit of archaeological interest, are also becoming increasingly aware of archaeology's global contexts. Moreover, forces of globalization have created a need for contextualizing knowledge in order to address complex issues. This has led to enhanced collaboration across and beyond academic disciplines, using more integrated methodologies that include nonacademics and increased stakeholder participation. In these contexts, a conceptual shift is taking place that facilitates integrative and transdisciplinary approaches that foster public participation in the production of knowledge (Jameson and Mytum 2012).

We pose two central questions: What is the collective experience of archaeologists and cultural heritage specialists in these arenas? Should we be encouraged, or discouraged, by national and international trends? In an attempt to answer these questions, we have assembled selected articles that examine and give representative examples of the respective approaches and roles of government, universities, and the private sector in meeting the educational and training needs and challenges of practicing archaeologists today.

This volume brings together the collective experiences of archaeologists, educators, preservation planners, and government managers to explore new approaches to archaeological heritage management, professional training, and heritage education and interpretation. It offers critique and new insights into these areas of endeavor at the beginning of the twenty-first century, particularly in the context of globalization. In these contexts, globalization should be seen not just in its economic guise (the increasingly integrated global economy marked especially by market liberalization and free trade, free flow of capital, and the tapping of cheaper foreign labor markets), but in the socio-cultural context of providing opportunities for both archaeologists and those interested in archaeology, to increase their knowledge of the practice and contributions of archaeology. This contextual discussion of globalization enables both archaeologists as well as the interested public to compare differing aspects of local as well as international archaeological practice and approaches.

Although this volume does not pretend to be a comprehensive overview of the issues surrounding the training and interdisciplinary collaboration of archaeologists, it does get to the heart of a number of relevant issues: the international mobility of archaeologists and heritage managers; the problems of sustaining employment in a volatile market; employment of archaeologists in managing the archaeological

impact of development projects; and the generation and interpretation of archaeological data and knowledge that results from such projects.

In the twenty-first century, it seems likely that an increasing proportion of archaeological survey, excavation, and conservation work will be undertaken to mitigate the impact of developments. To derive the maximum benefits (academic, societal, and professional) from this work, our archaeological practices need to evolve. The papers in this volume contribute to the development of a greater understanding of the need for these new forms of practice. These problems are of paramount concern to European archaeologists as well as archaeologists in Australasia, Asia, the Americas, the Pacific, and Africa. We hope that this book contributes not only to raising of the awareness of these issues but also to ongoing subject matter debates. In our interconnected world, communication and interdisciplinary approaches hold the key to the advancement of archaeological training and practice.

Tallahassee, FL, USA — John H. Jameson
Tramore, Co. Waterford, Ireland — James Eogan

References

Breen, C., & Rhodes, D. (2010). *Archaeology and international development in Africa*. London: Duckworth.

Carver, M. (2009). *Archaeological investigation*. London: Routledge.

Council of Europe. (1985). Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe. http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/121.htm.

Council of Europe. (1992). Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage of Europe (revised). http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/143.htm.

Council of Europe. (2000). The European Landscape Convention. http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm.

Jameson, J. H. (2004). Public archaeology in the United States. In N. Merriman (Ed.), *Public archaeology* (pp. 21–58). London: Routledge.

Jameson, J. H., & Mytum, H. (2011, January). Abstract to session entitled "Archaeological Agora: the Public as participants and creators of archaeological knowledge and understanding". In Society for Historical Archeology Annual Meetings.

Jameson, J. H., & Mytum, H. (2012, January). Abstract to session entitled "Archaeological Agora Revisited: the Public as participants and creators of archaeological knowledge and understanding." In Society for Historical Archeology Annual Meetings.

UNESCO. (1972). Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext.

Author Biographies

Kenneth Aitchison is Executive Director of Landward Research Ltd, a training and research consultancy based in the UK and operating across Europe. He studied at the Universities of Edinburgh and Sheffield, and he was awarded his PhD in 2011 for an econometric study and contemporary history of employment in UK archaeology, since published as "Breaking New Ground: how archaeology works". He formerly worked for the Institute for Archaeologists as Head of Projects and Professional Development and for the European Commission as an Expert Assessor on the Culture Programme.

Sherene Baugher is an Associate Professor in both Cornell University's Department of Landscape Architecture and Cornell's Archaeology Program. From 1980 to 1990, she was the first official archaeologist for New York City. For over 30 years, she has been involved in heritage projects to bring archaeology to the public. These outreach efforts involved partnerships with Native American leaders, community groups, and staff in government agencies and museums. She has published numerous articles including coediting two archaeology books for Springer.

Niall Brady, a graduate of UCD and Cornell University, is a specialist in agrarian technology with research interests in landscape and underwater archaeology. He directed the Discovery Programme's Medieval Rural Settlement Project, 2002–2010, and is founding director of the Archaeological Diving Company Ltd, Ireland's premier marine and underwater archaeological consultancy.

Aaron Brummitt is originally from eastern Tennessee and earned his baccalaureate degree at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. Since completing his graduate studies at the University of South Carolina in 2007, he has worked in both public and private sectors assisting agencies and applicants comply with cultural resource and environmental protection requirements. In his current position at S&ME, Inc. in Charleston, South Carolina, he serves as the Senior Archaeologist and Principal

Investigator for cultural resource studies and as project manager for environmental compliance-motivated research.

Malcolm A. Cooper was Chief Inspector at Historic Scotland from 2005 to 2010, having held a number of senior positions at English Heritage previously. He has written and lectured widely on heritage and management and is currently undertaking research on Gerard Baldwin Brown at Edinburgh University where he is an honorary research fellow. He is a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and an Honorary Fellow of the Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland. He is also a Member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation, the Institute for Archaeologists, and the Chartered Management Institute.

Cameo Dalley is an Australian-based anthropologist whose work is predominately focused in Aboriginal communities. She has previously published on intercultural engagements in the early twentieth century, on the concept of indigeneity in both Australia and internationally, and on traditional hunting by Aboriginal people. Her PhD research on identity construction was set in the remote Aboriginal community of Mornington Island in northern Australia, where she undertook over 18 months of ethnographic fieldwork. She is the current Secretary of the Australian Anthropological Society.

James Eogan is Senior Archaeologist with the National Roads Authority (Ireland). He studied archaeology at University College Dublin and the Freie Universität Berlin. He has contributed papers on the results of excavations he has directed, methodological issues, and the impact of the recent economic boom and recession on archaeology in Ireland to various publications; he has also coedited a number of books. He is former Vice-Chairperson of the Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland and is presently a member of the Institute's board.

Kate Geary worked in curatorial archaeology in North Wales for 10 years after graduation. Following a brief spell on the historic environment team at Devon County Council, she moved to the Institute for Archaeologists in 2005 as Training & Standards Coordinator, taking up her current role in 2010. She is responsible for the development of standards and best practice guidance and has a particular interest in training and skills initiatives.

Margaret Gowen is an archaeologist who has worked in the commercial sector and development-led archaeology for over 20 years. The early years of her career involved a particular focus on the development of her company as a leading consultancy and project management practice and the general professional development of archaeology and archaeologists working in the commercial sector. She is a former Chairperson of the Institute of Archaeologist of Ireland and President of ICOMOS Ireland and served two terms as Vice-President of the European Association of Archaeologists.

John H. Jameson is Senior Archaeologist and Public Interpretation/Outreach Lead, Southeast Archaeological Center, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. He has long worked to improve the quality of programs in the public interpretation of archaeological and cultural heritage. He has organized interdisciplinary training classes within the U.S. and internationally. In 2005, he was awarded the Sequoia Award for long-term contributions to education and interpretation by the U.S. National Park Service. He serves as Vice President of the International Committee on Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (ICIP), International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS).

Prof. dr hab. **Zbigniew Kobyliński** is an archaeologist and theoretician of cultural heritage management, director of the Institute of Archaeology of the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warszawa, and professor of the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences. He has been President of the Scientific Society of Polish Archaeologists since 2007, an Expert of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage of Poland in archaeological heritage management since 2009, and a Council-member of the Europa Nostra organization since 2010. Formerly he was Deputy Conservator-General of Cultural Heritage in Poland 1995–1999, UNESCO expert in the underwater cultural heritage protection 1997–2001, representative of Poland in the Europae Archaeologiae Consilium 1997–1999, member of the Board of the European Association of Archaeologists 2006–2009, and editor of the *Archaeologia Polona* journal 1991–2011. He has directed archaeological excavations in Poland and Germany, and he has published over 200 papers, edited 12 books of collected papers, and authored five books, including *Theoretical foundations of conservation of the archaeological heritage* (2001) and *Ownership of cultural heritage: ideas – problems – conflicts* (2009).

Patrizia La Piscopia is undertaking her PhD in archaeology and cultural heritage management in conflict zones. She completed a Master's degree in Science and Conservation of Materials in Bologna with the CNR. She then moved to University College Dublin, to pursue an MA in Landscape Archaeology, where she is now conducting her research. Patrizia has many years of experience as an archaeologist and worked in both commercial and research excavations in Europe and further afield.

John P. McCarthy, RPA, has been a practicing archaeologist and architectural historian working in cultural resources management and historic preservation for over 30 years. He is interested in the problems of ethical professional praxis and self-reflexive approaches to research. He also has a strong belief in the importance of the physical record of the past as a source of insight into events and social processes not only of the past but in the present as well.

Conor McDermott is a graduate of University College Dublin. He joined the Irish Archaeological Wetland Unit in 1990 and was subsequently appointed Acting Director from 1996 and Director from 1998 to 2005. Since 2005 he has been Laboratory and Field Officer at the School of Archaeology, University College

Dublin. He was one of the authors of the "Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe: Ireland" report published in 2008 on behalf of the Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland.

Stephen Nichols is Site Registrar in the Cultural Heritage Coordination Unit within the Queensland Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs (DATSIMA) and is responsible for developing and managing the department's significant Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage information collection. He has previously held a variety of positions in both the academic and cultural heritage management sectors. His research interests incorporate a wide range of public archaeological topics, including the representation of archaeology in popular culture, alternative archaeology, and archaeological education.

Michael R. Polk is Principal Archaeologist and co-owner of Sagebrush Consultants, L.L.C., Ogden, Utah, a cultural resources firm founded in 1983 with his wife, Ann, also an archaeologist. Beginning his career in the early 1970s, he has worked on a wide range of archaeological, historical, and ethnographic projects in 16 states, though his primary interest is historical archaeology. Mike's professional service includes serving on the boards of the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) and the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA). He has also served, twice, as President of ACRA.

Edward Pollard is a graduate of University of Bristol and University of Ulster. He has research interests in maritime archaeology and geoarchaeology. He has worked for the Archaeological Diving Company Ltd and Underwater Archaeology Unit in Ireland, and the British Institute of Eastern Africa in Kenya and Tanzania. He is presently a lecturer in marine archaeology at Orkney College, part of the University of the Highlands and Islands, in Scotland.

Linzi Simpson is a consultant archaeologist, who has been working in the private sector in Dublin for the past 20 years. With a specialised interest in medieval Dublin, she has directed many excavations within the historic city, including the large Viking site at Temple Bar West. She has published extensively on the subject and is currently preparing her Temple Bar excavation report for publication.

E. Eoin Sullivan was the Development Officer in the Institute of Archaeologists from 2008 to 2010. He is the owner of Gort Archaeology (est. 2005), an archaeological and heritage consultancy, based in Co. Laois, Ireland. His research interests are landscape archaeology, landowners' perception of the value of cultural features, the continuum of education for qualified professionals, and the effective evaluation of training courses. He is an occasional lecturer in Dorset College (Dublin) where he teaches accredited Professional Development training courses.

Sean Ulm is Director of the Tropical Archaeology Research Laboratory in the School of Arts and Social Sciences at James Cook University Cairns, an Honorary

Senior Fellow at The University of Queensland, an Honorary Associate of the Queensland Museum, and a Fellow of the Cairns Institute. His publications include more than 50 articles on the archaeology of Australia and 5 books, including *Coastal Themes: An Archaeology of the Southern Curtis Coast, Queensland* (2006). He is the former Editor of *Australian Archaeology* and a former President of the Australian Archaeological Association Inc.

Brendon Wilkins is Operations Director for Rubicon Heritage Services, based in the UK. He has over 10 years experience directing, and managing large, complex sites in the UK and Ireland—usually in advance of major construction projects, such as motorways, pipelines, and railways. With a consistent research and publication record, he has lectured internationally on wetland archaeology, Irish archaeology, and new advances in excavation methodology.

František Žák Matyasowszky is professional archaeologist and lecturer with more than 12 years postgraduate experience. He studied in Slovakia at the University of Constantine the Philosopher and at the Archaeological Institute, Nitra; he is holder of two doctorates. Between 2004 and 2011 he worked in Ireland as an archaeologist in various private consultancies but mostly for the National Roads Authority. Within that time he became a licensed archaeologist in Slovakia and Ireland. In 2012, with colleagues from Ireland, he established an archaeological consultancy *Archaeological Agency* in his native Slovakia and became its managing director.

Contents

Contributors

Kenneth Aitchison Landward Research Ltd, London, UK

Sherene Baugher Archaeology Program & Department of Landscape Architecture, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

Niall Brady The Archaeological Diving Company, Castlecomer, Co. Kilkenny, Ireland

Aaron Brummitt S&ME, Inc, Mt. Pleasant, SC, USA

Malcolm A. Cooper 56 Dublin Street, Edinburgh, EH3 6NP, UK

Cameo Dalley Aboriginal Environments Research Centre, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

James Eogan National Roads Authority, Tramore House RDO, Tramore, Co. Waterford, Ireland

Kate Geary Institute for Archaeologists, SHES, University of Reading, Reading, UK

Margaret Gowen Rath House, Castlegate, Rathmichael, Co. Dublin, Ireland

John H. Jameson Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Tallahassee, FL, USA

ICOMOS International Committee for Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritge Sites (ICIP), Merced, CA, USA

Zbigniew Kobyliński Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, Warsaw, Poland

Patrizia La Piscopia School of Archaeology, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin, Ireland

John P. McCarthy Roswell, GA, USA

Conor McDermott School of Archaeology, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin, Ireland

Stephen Nichols Cultural Heritage Unit, Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait, Islands and Multicultural Affairs, QLD, Australia

Michael R. Polk Sagebrush Consultants L.L.C.,, Ogden, UT, USA

Edward Pollard ORCA Marine, Archaeology Department, Orkney College UHI, Kirkwall, Orkney, UK

Linzi Simpson Cabinteely, Dublin, Ireland

E. Eoin Sullivan Gort Archaeology, School Lodge, Drummond, Rosenallis, Laois, Ireland

Sean Ulm Department of Anthropology, Archaeology and Sociology, School of Arts and Social Sciences, James Cook University, Cairns, QLD, Australia

Brendon Wilkins Rubicon Heritage Services Ltd, Canary Wharf, London, UK

František Žák Matyasowszky Archaeological Agency/Archeologická Agentúra s.r.o., Bratislava, Slovak Republic

Part I
Twenty-First Century Archaeological Practice and Training: The New Realities

Chapter 1
Archaeologists at the Table: From Community to Global

John H. Jameson

Introduction

Well into the second decade of the millennium, archaeologists worldwide are prime movers in national and international movements in recognizing the importance of public access, inclusiveness, and sustainability as fundamental elements in promoting public understanding and appreciation of cultural heritage sites. Archaeologists provide some of the most outspoken and articulate voices on matters of heritage identification and forces of change, as well as its preservation and protection. In the age of twenty-first-century globalization, archaeologists worldwide are increasingly engaged in global, albeit less traditional, topics ranging from formal education and teaching standards to employee training, public interpretation, outreach, heritage tourism, and interpretive art.

A simplified definition of the concept of "heritage" is something that has been, or is, inherited from one's predecessors. Evolving notions of "heritage" are defined within historical contexts that have been created by various influences that reached their zenith in Western societies with the increasing professionalization of cultural heritage practice in the late twentieth century. Heritage conservation professionals are increasingly engaged with new forms of diasporic and transnational communities, with mass mobility and modern relationships of cyber cohesion that transcend place. Archaeologists are essential players in maintaining and negotiating these new forms of community. Perhaps, paradoxically, but increasingly widely accepted as a

J.H. Jameson (✉)
Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service,
U.S. Department of the Interior, 2035 E. Paul Dirac Drive,
Johnson Building, Suite 120, Tallahassee, FL 32310, USA

ICOMOS International Committee for Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritge Sites (ICIP), Merced, CA, USA
e-mail: john_jameson@nps.gov; jhjameson@yahoo.com

J.H. Jameson and J. Eogan (eds.), *Training and Practice for Modern Day Archaeologists*, One World Archaeology 1, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-5529-5_1,

truism, heritage is no longer about the past but is more about the power of the past to produce the present and shape the future (Fairclough et al. 2008).

Moreover, archaeologists are playing key roles in shaping the cultural heritage field by contributing to changing definitions of heritage through the mediums of collective memory and landscape, and contributing to international initiatives and intercultural dialogues, helping to form new approaches to heritage management and public interpretation. Archaeologists have made notable success in developing creative ways to integrate archaeology and the archaeological with the nonarchaeological world. What we refer to as "public archaeology" is often seen by professional archaeologists as separate from traditional research-oriented archaeology practiced by archaeologists with a particular knack for public communication and interface. But the notion that public archaeology can be separated from research is, in my opinion, a fallacy. How can any archaeological project today not be seen as a public endeavor with divergent and multiple stakeholders who care about what and how it is recorded, preserved, and ultimately interpreted?

Certainly, in today's heritage management arena, we are witnessing a trend toward more direct involvement in formal education and historic site interpretation, with vastly expanded collaboration between archaeologists and their education and communication partners. In addition, greater emphasis is being placed on the importance of local community connection, interaction, and immersion in the planning and implementation phases of projects. To be successful, models for implementing successful programs, projects, and publications place emphasis on interdisciplinary collaborative partnerships. This chapter explores and gives examples of successful collaborations, initiatives, and strategies. It will describe effective models of collaboration that have enabled archaeologists to engage effectively in wide-ranging educational and interpretive spheres.

Collaborations and Partnerships

Since the 1990s, we have witnessed numerous international applications and an increased interest in establishing partnerships between professional practitioners in public interpretation and educational institutions such as museums and schools. These developments have occurred in the context of a realization that community-based partnerships are the most effective mechanism for long-term success.

Australasian archaeologists were among the first to reflect seriously on the public context of archaeology (Marshall 2002). In 1979, the Australia National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) adopted the "Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance" (Burra Charter), a supplement to the Venice Charter more in line with heritage conservation issues and practice in Australia. The Burra Charter has proved to be a globally significant document affecting evolving philosophies for heritage conservation in other parts of the world. In Europe, institutions such as the Ename [Belgium] Center

for Public Archaeology and Heritage Presentation are working to show how heritage, and the knowledge and stories connected with it, links people and communities with the past and how this influences modern daily life. In North America, a number of long-standing programs are achieving notoriety, having managed to be recognized beyond gray literature through publications with far reaching academic and international audiences and applications. In both the USA and Canada, public archaeologists are setting high standards for interdisciplinary collaboration and community engagement within government-sponsored training programs, museums, and universities (Jameson and Baugher 2007). Canadian archaeologists are experimenting with a more community-oriented archaeology, in the Arctic and other regions, where indigenous stakeholders have forced researchers to reappraise conventional approaches (Lea and Smardz 2000; Rowley 2002).

New Models of Engagement

In many regions of the world, programs are attempting to transcend the didactic and somewhat detached postcolonial model of engagement to one that incorporates communication with local organizations aimed at (1) collaboration in the interpretation of regional history, with an emphasis on open interaction and plain language reports; (2) the interviewing of elders to recover local oral history; (3) the employment and training of local people with the aim of developing full-time positions; (4) public presentation of research findings locally, including creation of an accessible photographic and video archive and development of educational resources, especially for young audiences; and (5) community control of heritage merchandising.

For example, as Pope and Mills (2007) point out in a case study from Newfoundland, Canada, archaeologists are giving increased attention to the social context of their research, often in a self-conscious effort to involve nonspecialists in their work. The situation can be very complex, with some key issues revolving around "ownership" of archaeological heritage. Archaeological researchers and community groups have distinguishable interests: the former oriented to the pursuit of knowledge within the framework of the historical sciences, the latter oriented to economic diversification and social development. These interests overlap in the domain we have come to call "heritage" (Lowenthal 1998). To the extent that researchers remain interested in history, and not simply in heritage, archaeologists should, they say, remain interested in the plausibility of claims about the past, whether or not they will be directly useful for heritage interpretation and whether or not they indirectly promote economic and social development. Archaeologists should recognize the cultural and spiritual links between Aboriginal peoples and the archaeological record, including in particular human remains, special places, and landscape features. They also point out, however, that archaeologists and community organizations have different agendas and only the naive will suppose that pious support for the principles of community archaeology will somehow reconcile these in every case.