European Science Foundation
Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences
Foundation "Res Publica Multiethnica"

Quo vadis archaeologia?

Whither European archaeology in the 21st century?

Proceedings of the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop

Mądralin near Warsaw, 12-13 October 2001

Edited by Zbigniew Kobyliński

Warsaw 2001

Introduction

References

Carman, J. 2000. Theorising the practice of archaeological heritage management. *Archaeologia Polona* 38: 5-21.

Carver, M. 1995. Digging for data: principles and procedures for evaluation, excavation and post-excavation in towns. In *Theory and practice of archaeological research. Vol. II. Acquisition of field data at multi-strata sites,* P. Urbańczyk (ed.), 255-302. Warszawa.

Flannery, K.V. 1982. The Golden Marshalltown: a parable for the archaeology of the 1980s. *American Anthropologist* 84: 265-278.

Holtorf, C.J. 1998. Is the past a non-renewable resource? *Paper given at the WAC Inter-Congress on "The Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property" on the Island of Brač, Croatia, 3-7 May 1998.*

Holtorf, C.J. and T. Schadla-Hall 1999. Age as artefact: on archaeological authenticity. *European Journal of Archaeology* 2(2): 229-247.

Kobyliński, Z. 2001. *Teoretyczne podstawy konserwacji dziedzictwa archeologicznego.* Warszawa.

- 2002. Archaeology on ruins of ivory towers: what theory we need? In *Archaeologies of Europe. History, methods and theories,* P.F. Biehl, A. Gramsch and A. Marciniak (eds), Münster. In print.

Kristiansen, K. 1989. Perspectives on the archaeological heritage: history and future. In *Archaeological heritage management in the modern world,* H.F. Cleere (ed.), 23-29. London.

Kunkel, R. 2000. Problemy zarządzania dziedzictwem kulturowym – dokumentacja. In *Problemy zarządzania dziedzictwem kulturowym,* K. Gutowska (ed.), 129-134. Warszawa.

Larsen, K.E. ed. 1995. *Nara Conference on Authenticity.* Trondheim.

Lipe, W.D. 1984. Value and meaning in cultural resources. In *Approaches to the archaeological heritage,* H. Cleere (ed.), 1-11. Cambridge.

Lowenthal, D. 2000. Stewarding the past in a perplexing present. In *Values and heritage conservation,* E. Avrami and R. Mason (eds), 18-25. The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles.

McGimsey, C.R. 1972. *Public archaeology.* New York.

Schaafsma, C.F. 1989. Significant until proven otherwise: problems versus representative samples. In *Archaeological heritage management in the modern world,* H.F. Cleere (ed.), 38-51. London.

Sloggett, R. and R. Fremantle 1995. *Preserving the past. A guide for conserving library collections.* Melbourne.

Tabaczyński, S. 1998. Archaeological sources: problems of identification and inference. In *Theory and practice of archaeological research. Vol. III. Dialogue with the data: the archaeology of complex societies and its context in the '90s,* S. Tabaczyński (ed.), 33-63. Warszawa.

Tomaszewski, A. 2001. Konserwacja zapobiegawcza środowiska. In *Arx Felicitatis,* 669-671. Warszawa

Washburn, W.E. 1984. Collecting information, not objects. *Museum News* 62 (3): 5-15.

Archaeological heritage management and research

Willem J. H. Willems

There is a widespread feeling in our discipline that the practice of heritage management and academic archaeology have grown apart[1] even very far apart and that the gap between the two needs to be closed, or at least bridged. One approach to this challenge is to emphasise the role or task of archaeology as a scientific discipline in the protection and management of archaeological heritage. It is indeed quite clear, that archaeological heritage management needs critical reflection and an adequate theoretical basis and that it needs better scientific tools. These matters will be examined below. There are, however, two additional issues that are relevant. First, we should realise that the problem is not limited to the relation between archaeological heritage management and archaeological research: it is abundantly clear that other disciplines are involved as well and that what we need to improve heritage management should partly come from other disciplines and be part of an integrated approach. Second, it is necessary to look at the history of development of our discipline because the existing separation needs to be explained and better understood. This will be done first.

It is commonly accepted that about two centuries ago, around the beginning of the 19th century, archaeology became a scientific discipline[2]. Antiquarianism turned into archaeology and the new discipline rapidly evolved in other directions than the traditional interest for the Mediterranean area and the classical word. In 1818, C. Reuvens in the Netherlands was appointed the world's first university professor of archaeology with an explicit teaching commitment for "national", prehistoric archaeology and in 1819 C. Thomsen in Denmark designed the national museum around the stone-bronze-iron succession.

These and many other developments around the same time were by no means a coincidence. The scientific interest for non-classical archaeology was promoted as a direct consequence of the political restructuring of post-Napoleonic Europe, the formation of nation states and the need to develop, or to (re)define, a "national identity". The past is an essential component in that process and it is significant that the concept of "national antiquities" was invented in this period. The term *antiquités nationales* was used in the title of a collection of five volumes, published in 1790 by the French antiquarian A-L. Millin, and was soon applied widely all over early 19th century Europe.

[1] See, for example, numerous papers in recent overviews such as Hunter and Ralston 1993, Dušek 1993, Kobyliński 2000.

[2] For a masterful history of archaeology, see Schnapp 1993.

The national heritage rapidly became one of the foundations of the nation as a political and a demographic entity and was – often quite consciously – used to create and foster a national awareness and pride. This new importance of national antiquities was, of course, a strong impetus for measures to conserve monuments in the field and to display relevant objects in national museums. At the same time, the story behind these remains of the past had to be told as well and it needed scientific legitimating. In fact, the favourable political climate thus also created a basis for the development of academic research. In this sense, it may be said that protection and management of archaeological heritage are not new tasks of archaeology as a scientific discipline but indeed very old and fundamental ones.

Initially, research and conservation activities had a common basis in the need to develop documentation and inventarisation of archaeological remains. On the other hand, it is clear that already during the 19th and especially in the 20th century, dealing with protection and conservation of archaeological heritage and scientific archaeological research became different lines of work. It is not very difficult to see why this occurred, despite the common roots and a common interest in inventarisation. After all, archaeology is about studying the past. Although archaeology may be used or abused for political purposes, completely unconsciously for lack of theoretical reflection, to "colour" a story in a politically desirable way, to leave out elements that are considered undesirable, or even to falsify evidence[3], it is about discovering and interpreting material remains from the past. We do have pseudo-science, but most archaeological research is done in a scientific manner and is generally considered by its recognised practitioners as apolitical and as "pure research"[4].

By contrast, the activity of "taking care of the past" (the German concept of *Denkmalpflege*, or the Dutch *monumentenzorg*) – or its modern form of archaeological heritage management – is something that is done in the present. It is always a political activity that is traditionally dominated by legal issues and practical concerns of conservation methods. For a very long time, therefore, there has been this increasing gap between on the one hand academic research into the history of man and necessarily having an international perspective, and on the other the protection and management of heritage, almost entirely from a national viewpoint and primarily coping with political, legal, administrative and technical issues. The link between the two were the rescue excavations, nowadays also referred to by the politically correct terms of "conservation *ex situ*" or "conservation by record". In many western European countries such as the UK and Germany, even this natural link between research and heritage management became quite weak, in my view for social as well as economic reasons such as the growth of the heritage industry and a rigid academic structure. In smaller countries (such as in Scandinavia, the Netherlands) and in most of Eastern Europe where integration was achieved through the Academies of Science, both branches of archaeology never grew that far apart. Nevertheless, while it is understandable why academic research and heritage management became separated to varying degrees, it remains curious that until very recently there was nothing

[3] In recent years, a vast amount of literature has become available about archaeology in relation to ideology and nationalism; see, for example, Kristiansen 1993 or Gramsch 2000 on the need for theoretical development in archaeology as a means to cope with politisation of research and public presentation. This issue of *"Archaeological Dialogues"* also includes extensive references on the relations between archaeology, nationalism and ideology.

[4] This explains why, for example, the nazi-archaeologists from the *SS-Ahnenerbe* were in a different position both during and after the war than those involved with the *Reichsbund* for prehistory with its pseudo-research; see Haßmann 2000.

in archaeology comparable to the role of archival sciences as a subdiscipline of historical sciences. The preservation of its study material was apparently not a great concern to archaeology.

From the 1960s onwards, many changes occurred. The New Archaeology emerging from the USA led to critical reflection and a more central role for archaeological theory that has changed the discipline: a process that was already described in the early 1970s as archaeology's "loss of innocence" by David Clarke. At the same time, the environmental movement started, resulting in the green debate and the recognition that the world's natural and cultural resources are in danger. This became the basis for the birth of archaeological heritage or "resource" management in the modern sense, the program for which was first laid out by Bill Lipe in 1974[5].

Archaeological monuments, in the sense of movable as well as immovable parts of the cultural heritage, are no longer seen primarily as objects of study but as cultural resources to be of use and benefit in the present and future. In some ways, "archaeological resource management"[6] may be a better term that "archaeological heritage management" because it is probably a more value-free concept than "heritage". It refers to the idea of seeing the material remains of the past as a resource: for society as a whole as well as for research by archaeologists. The concept of "care and protection of monuments" has been replaced by the **management** of these archaeological resources, and viewing them in isolation cannot do this. It has to be done in context: in the context of the landscape and therefore at a regional scale, and in the context of the planning process. It was increasingly realized that "rescue" or "salvage" excavations are in fact the result of a failure to plug archaeology into the decision-making in the land-use planning process[7]. This development has led to the Convention of Malta of 1992, in which this principle is embedded[8], and to notions of sustainable development discussed below.

In a practical sense, the implementation of the Convention in national legislations[9] has not only led to major improvements in way in which archaeological remains are being dealt with, it has also created a boom in archaeological work. These two factors are now – finally – beginning to change traditional archaeological research and training.

It has become clear that for a sensible archaeological heritage management, archaeology needs new and different tools and new types of research are needed to provide such tools. Much of this research is in fact being done by national bodies charged with (archaeological) heritage management, which are diverting their core business from traditional research through excavation to the kind of research that is specifically aimed at creating the knowledge needed for effective management[10]. Academic archaeology in Europe is slower in adapting to this need, although there are vast differences between European countries in this respect. These depend to a large extent on the way their university system works and the flexibility of the academic structure. Another reason for such differences is the degree of integration of

[5] Lipe 1974. See on this subject also Willems 1997 and 1998.

[6] The term was invented by Hunter and Ralston (1993, see discussion on p. vii-viii).

[7] Astonishingly, the concept has apparently been reintroduced by IUPPS, which seems to recently have established a "Commission for Salvage Archaeology".

[8] Council of Europe 1992.

[9] At the time of writing (Summer 2001), the Convention had been ratified by 26 countries.

[10] Examples are English Hertage and Historic Scotland in the UK, Rijksdienst Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek in the Netherlands, Riksantivarieämbetet in Sweden.

academic and heritage management agendas: the way in which strategic alliances can be created between heritage management institutions and universities and the degree to which these institutions have funding policies aimed at influencing research[11].

The increase in work has also increased demand for properly trained professionals, so there is not only change in the type of research that is being done, but also in university training. Such change, however, has only barely begun; in most of Europe it is hardly even visible. This is not surprising when compared to the situation in the USA, where contract archaeology started in the early 1970s: even today, the heritage management sector there complains about the lack of adequate training of students[12].

However this may be, there are nowadays a number of research directions which archaeology has taken up that are very different from the traditional subjects of archaeological research. It is useful to examine these in more detail and to see which trends can be discerned and which desiderata remain.

Theory development

Much of the work in archaeological heritage management is being done from a practical point of view under daily constraints of time and money and within an often unquestioned, positivist framework in which it is assumed that, for example, there is some objective way in which to assess value, to make choices on what to preserve, *etc.* There are very strong political and moral dimensions to this, but at the same time it is also a matter of theoretical development and critical reflection. In recent years, there have been several calls to develop the theoretical underpinning of archaeological heritage management in which we can discern at least four important directions. It can be done by developing a reflexive approach to its role in society[13], by examining its basic principles or, rather, assumptions[14], by looking at the approaches to interpretation of vast amounts of accumulating data[15], and by developing relevant concepts in relation to other disciplines[16]. Some of these have led to important results that will be returned to below and, despite differences in emphases, there is of course a considerable degree of overlap between them.

Selection

One of the most basic problems of archaeological heritage management is that of selection. Not all that remains from the past can be preserved, investigated, or even taken into consideration. Selection itself is a process of political decision-making, governed by aims and constraints that are beyond the realm of science, so there are two ways in which archaeology should be involved with selection.

One is by political activity as a pressure group, by questioning and exposing the explicit or implicit political agendas or the possibly fallacious assumptions and distorted pictures of the past that govern decisions about the heritage, and the legal and other processes by which decisions are being taken. This requires the development of a critical reflexive theory and also the building of an infrastructure as a vehicle for

[11] On the latter subject, see *e.g.*, Thomas 1993.

[12] For numerous discussions on this subject see, for example, recent volumes of newsletters such as the *"SAA Bulletin"* and *"The European Archaeologist"*.

[13] See *e.g.*, Gramsch 2000 and several papers in this volume.

[14] See *e.g.*, Carman 2000.

[15] See *e.g.*, Hodder 1993.

[16] See *e.g.*, Groenewoudt and Bloemers 1997.

action, both at the national and at the international level[17]. Theoretical developments have already been mentioned. As for the "action" part, the organisation of archaeology at the national level shows vast differences in Europe and elsewhere. Some countries do have institutions or associations, which are used for political action, in others these seem to be virtually lacking. At the international level, there are associations such as the SAA for the Americas and the EAA in Europe, which can and do serve as tools for the community of archaeologists to become involved politically. In addition there is, at the global level, the role of ICOMOS as a non-governmental organisation affiliated to UNESCO. One of its central aims is "to establish international standards for the preservation, restoration, and management of the cultural environment". It has several international committees dealing with aspects of archaeological heritage management[18], which produce these standards in the form of charters[19]. They have proved to be quite effective political instruments on many occasions.

Of course the organisations and tools mentioned so far, are important and necessary for many other aspects, but they are included here because "selection" is the most basic issue. Another, very different way in which archaeology is involved with selection, is by research that is intended to provide criteria and a methodology for judging the significance of archaeological remains. As Carman (2000) has recently demonstrated, measuring archaeological significance is a very complex and often underestimated issue that, again, needs thorough theoretical analysis. Recently, Darvill has made an important contribution to this by his distinction between value systems and importance systems, which are distinct but interpenetrating. In the first, there is a consensus of social significance that is widely shared by individuals and groups and relates in very broad terms to archaeological heritage. In the second, there are quantitative as well as qualitative scales of importance which are objective-specific and (in social terms) differently situated because they are developed and implemented by professionals on behalf of society as a whole[20]. As is evident from the rapidly increasing amount of literature on this subject[21], this at least is a task that archaeology as a scientific discipline is taking up.

Quality management

An issue that has so far not received comparable attention is that of quality management in archaeological heritage management[22]. Quality can be defined fairly straightforward as the total of properties and characteristics of a product or service that is relevant for compliance with requirements or needs, although in reality the concept is rather complex. Quality management is a systematic approach to obtaining or maintaining quality and improving it and thus has two aspects: on the one hand it refers to quality assurance, on the other to quality improvement.

---

[17] *Cf.* Willems 2000.

[18] Notably International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM), the International Committee on the Underwater Cultural Heritage (ICUCH) and the committees dealing with Rock Art and Cultural Tourism.

[19] Most notable are the Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage, also known as the Lausanne Charter, and the Charter for the protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, produced as part of a draft Convention on the Underwater Cultural Heritage developed for UNESCO by the International Law Association's Cultural Heritage Committee.

[20] Darvill 2001, 183-4.

[21] Useful recent summaries can be found in Carman 2000 (10-15) and Darvill 2001. The issue *"Archäologisches Nachrichtenblatt"* 6:2 around the theme of *Bewertung* (valuation) is also an interesting source for other than Anglosaxon approaches.

[22] See *e.g.*, Darvill 1993 and some of the statements in Willems (ed.) 2000.

Obviously, the concept of quality in archaeological heritage management has two very different, though nevertheless related, aspects because there are two kinds of needs or requirements that have to be complied with: the needs of the client that has commissioned archaeological work and the needs of society and the archaeological community. The first is normally governed by a contract that is often quite specific; the second may be covered by legislation and a permit, which quite often is rather general.

There is not enough space to go into details here[23], but it is evident that improved heritage legislation has created a basis for a vast increase in archaeological work in many countries. The ultimate purpose of this is to retain as much as possible archaeological information *in situ*, or else excavate, record and interpret it so that it contributes to knowledge of the past. It is surprising to see that instruments by which we can ascertain that what is being done – ranging from evaluation boards to project designs, *etc.* – is and remains relevant to those purposes, are still underdeveloped. This is all the more surprising given the loudly voiced objections to a "heritage industry", although it should be added that – again – there are considerable differences between countries in this respect. Sometimes even within countries, such as the federal republic of Germany.

On the other hand, significant advances have been made in some countries in developing standards of performance, specifications for archaeological work, codes of practice and ethics, and very basic tools such as project management. Especially where the "developer pays principle" has been incorporated in legislation, these are essential in quality assurance as regards the product. For the developer this product may simply be the removal of remains on time and at the agreed upon costs, for the profession and society it can be such things as a report that is actually produced and, on top of that, may even contain relevant information...

Technical conservation issues

A field where much development has occurred is that of technical conservation issues. Traditionally, archaeology as a scientific discipline has been much concerned about the conservation of excavated materials. In addition, there is increasing research into "the conservation and management of archaeological sites", which in fact is the title of a journal that appears since 1996. As is evident from the content of this journal, a lot of work is being done to develop methodologies and tools which enable sites to survive, and the nature of such work varies widely. It involves practical, theoretical as well as ethical issues, such as restoration techniques, the use of vegetation cover, the impact of tourism, the reconciliation of conservation goals and questions of historic and aesthetic integrity, *etc.*

Also, considerable methodological and technical advances in archaeological survey should be mentioned here. They are important not only for better conservation, but especially as a cornerstone of modern archaeological heritage management that increasingly depends on timely and adequate information about the presence of archaeological resources.

A fairly recent branch in the field of technical conservation issues is the study of the conservation of unexcavated materials by archaeometry. Although there is a general

[23] For an interesting debate on two very different approaches to legal and practical systems of quality management in France and in the Netherlands which, in turn, are different from the Anglosaxon one, see *"Les Nouvelles de l'Archéologie" 84 (4), 2000.*

presumption in favour of preservation *in situ* on the assumption that archaeological sites and their contents are best left in the soil, this assumption is not necessarily true. It is becoming clear that environmental changes caused by industrialisation and, for example, changes in agricultural practices, have caused major changes in the condition of buried materials and that the environment in the soil is by no means a static and stable one[24]. This process of degradation has so far only been studied in a limited way, it is of course quite expensive and qualified personnel are hard to come by. Nevertheless, it is safe to say that here should be one of the research priorities of archaeology and surely one that deserves a global approach.

Alliances with other fields

As stated above, when we abandoned the concept of "care and protection of monuments" and the national "stamp collections" of sites that go with it, this was replaced by the concept of managing archaeological resources. This has to be done spatially at a regional scale, in the context of the landscape, and organisationally in the context of the planning process. These changes in perception, scale and organisation require changes, or rather, supplementary approaches in archaeology as a discipline and they require alliances with other disciplines and therefore the instruments and concepts that allow fruitful interaction.

Landscape archaeology is one of the current buzzwords, but the term is somewhat confusing and used in different meanings. Traditionally, archaeology has attempted to reconstruct and understand past landscapes. This is now quite useful in heritage management, as such studies are vital building blocks for predictive modelling and for constructing management tools such as indicative maps of archaeological resources. A different angle is taken by the introduction of the concept of the cultural biography of landscapes, which helps to create an understanding of time depth and past meanings[25]. In the new *European Landscape Convention* , landscape is comprehensively defined as "an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors"[26]. Various approaches are being developed to come to grips with sustainable development and change at a regional scale. The approaches mentioned either look at the past and do not study the present, or they are limited to providing archaeological tools that are understandable for others and therefore ensure that the archaeological landscape is taken into account in decision-making.

Fairclough has recently described the method of historic landscape characterisation, which takes a more holistic approach in line with the definition from the landscape convention. It rests upon interpretation and especially on perception; it aims at understanding the present day landscape almost as an archaeological artefact, unravelling its components to establish areas defined by shared attributes based on the historic character and time-depth of the landscape[27]. This at least has the advantage of taking most aspects of the historic as well as the present landscape into account, which allows a more balanced view on sustainability and managing change, although there seems to be a neglect of the invisible, buried landscape which could potentially be rather dangerous.

[24] See Kars 1997 for an overview.
[25] See *e.g.*, Roymans 1995.
[26] Council of Europe 2000.
[27] Fairclough, in press.

In any case there are, at the moment, many developments in archaeological research which are fundamentally changing archaeological thinking about landscape and which aim at providing the necessary instruments for fruitful co-operation with other disciplines and for integrated approaches that will help to better manage change and achieve sustainable development.

In this contribution, some developments in archaeology as a scientific discipline have been highlighted, which are relevant to heritage management. Of course there is more and there clearly is a need for alliances with other disciplines: spatial sciences including town and country planning, data management, social sciences such as demography and recent specialisations such as leisure/tourism studies or comparative law.

In addition, there is a need to develop a better insight in what is termed "public archaeology", which encompasses all aspects related to the interaction between archaeology and the public. This includes a whole variety of issues that have to do with the role of archaeologists, the presentation of archaeology by various media and cultural tourism, heritage claims of indigenous groups, illicit trade, *etc.* As has often been pointed out, there is a direct relation between the perceived benefits of archaeology and the acceptance by society of the cost of archaeological heritage management and the amount of public support it receives. There is an inherent and apparently fairly universal public interest in archaeology, but this may be less deeply rooted than is often assumed. There is a certain complacency about the need for public education and "outreach". In addition, it has become clear that public interest often arises from elements that are not normally appreciable to a professional, rather than a genuine understanding of the past. All such elements need to be researched, as they are vital to the task of heritage management.

Finally, it should be stressed that there is a need to develop international – in some cases perhaps specifically European – perspectives on all issues discussed. Archaeological heritage management needs to go beyond the national level at which it has been practiced far too long.

References

Carman, J. 2000. Theorising the practice of archaeological heritage management. In *Archaeological heritage management,* Z. Kobyliński (ed.). *Archaeologia Polona* 38: 5-21.

Council of Europe 1992. *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (revised),* Strasbourg (European Treaty Series No. 143).

- 2000. *European Landscape Convention,* Strasbourg (European Treaty Series No. 176).

Darvill, T. 1993. Working practices. In *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK,* J. Hunter and I. Ralston (eds), 169-183. Bath.

- 2001. Value systems in archaeology and heritage management. *Archäologisches Nachrichtenblatt* 6 (2), 183-194.

Dušek, S. 1993. *Archäologische Denkmalpflege und Forschung. Kolloquium anlässlich der Jahrestagung* 1992. Weimar.

Fairclough, G.J. (in press): Cultural landscape, computers and characterisation, in the *Proceedings of the 2001 Computer Applications in Archaeology conference, Visby, April 2001.*

Gramsch, A. 2000. 'Reflexiveness' in archaeology, nationalism and Europeanism. *Archaeological Dialogues* 7 (1), 4-19.

Groenewoudt, B.J. and J.H.F. Bloemers 1997. Dealing with significance. Concepts, strategies, and priorities for archaeological heritage management in the *Netherlands.* In *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands,* W.J.H. Willems, H. Kars and D.P. Hallewas (eds.), 119-172. Assen/Amersfoort.

Haßmann, H. 2000. Archaeology in the 'Third Reich'. In *Archaeology, ideology and society. The German experience*, H. Härke (ed.), 65-139. Frankfurt am Main.

Hodder, I. 1993. Changing configurations: the relationships between theory and practice. In *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK*, J. Hunter and I. Ralston (eds.), 11-18. Bath.

Hunter, J. and I. Ralston (eds) 1993. *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK*. Bath.

Kars, H. 1997. Conservation science and the archaeological property. In *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands*, W.J.H. Willems, H. Kars and D.P. Hallewas (eds), 173-191. Assen/Amersfoort.

Kobyliński, Z. (ed.) 2000. *Archaeological heritage management. Archaeologia Polona* 38.

Kristiansen, K. 1993. 'The strength of the past and its great might'; an essay on the use of the past. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1 (3): 3-32.

Lipe, W.D. 1974. A conservation model for American archaeology. *The Kiva* 39 (1-2): 213-243.

Roymans, N. 1995. The cultural biography of urnfields and the long-term history of a mythical landscape. *Archaeological Dialogues* 2 (1): 2-24.

Schnapp, A. 1993. *La Conquete du Passé: aux origines de l'archéologie*. Paris.

Thomas, R. 1993. English Heritage funding policies and their impact on research strategy. In *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK*, J. Hunter and I. Ralston (eds), 136-148. Bath.

Willems, W.J.H. 1997. Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands: Past, Present and Future. In *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands*, W.J.H. Willems, H. Kars and D.P. Hallewas (eds), 3-34. Assen/Amersfoort.

- 1998: Archaeology and heritage management in Europe: trends and developments, *European Journal of Archaeology* 1 (3): 293-311.

- 2000: Archaeology and Europe: 'reflexiveness and action', *Archaeological Dialogues* 7 (1): 36-39.

Willems, W.J.H. (ed.) 2000. *Challenges for European archaeology*, Zoetermeer 2000.