



Managing Europe's Archaeological heritage

20th HERITAGE MANAGEMENT SYMPOSIUM

Archaeological sites and monuments in the care of the state – sharing our experiences

Dublin, Ireland, 28 February - 1 March 2019

Abstracts

DAY 1 (Thursday 28 February 2018) (11.30 – 17.30)

Session 1

Sandra ZIRNE

Head of the Department of Archaeology and History, National Heritage Board of Latvia

The practice of preserving and presenting archaeological sites in Latvia

In the Republic of Latvia the public administration of cultural monument protection and use is implemented by the National Heritage Board. Alongside many other responsibilities, the Board also gather information, study cultural heritage, carry out national record keeping of cultural monuments and issue instructions to cultural monument owners on utilization and preservation of the respective monument. Over 2500 archaeological sites of different types (ancient settlements, medieval castles, fortifications, burial places, cult sites, etc.) are included in the List of the State protected cultural monuments. Archaeological sites are mainly of scientific, cultural and educational value. The specific values of the archaeological to be preserved site must be specified in the documentation prepared by including the objects in the list of the state protected cultural monuments. These values can vary depending on the type of archaeological monuments. Most archaeological sites are not visible above the surface and their main value to be preserved is the stratigraphy of the subsurface layers of ancient structures, constructions and other historical elements. Archaeological monuments such as hillforts, medieval castles, fortifications, cult sites, burial mounds, etc., with visible surface structures, are of particular value as part of the surrounding cultural and historical landscape.

Archaeological sites are territorial monuments located on a state, municipality or private land. The owner or land user is responsible for the maintenance and utilization of the archaeological monument. Maintaining archaeological sites means not only taking care of its archaeological features, but also respecting the surrounding landscape. Each site demands individual maintenance plan and regulations that guide the practical activities. Presentation and reconstruction of the site can serve not only for its interpretation or experimental research, but also for tourism. In order to do this, it is necessary to define the possibilities and main activities that help to include archaeological sites as tourism objects in the development of local communities.

Marianne R. LINDEGAARD

Agency for Culture and Palaces, Monuments and Archaeological Heritage (Denmark)

Balancing interpretation and preservation - examples from the working-field of the state

The short paper will address a few dilemmas and conflicting interests that may arise, when the state is involved in developing projects at and around scheduled monuments.

One example concerns the dilemma between the protection of the historical monument and the protection of a specific area of vulnerable nature, such as protected woods or habitats of certain species, etc.). The Danish legislation offers no support whatsoever, regarding whether the protection of vulnerable nature or cultural heritage in such shared contexts should be given priority.

Another example concerns the balance between interpretation and preservation. We have an obligation to inform and educate the public on the history of the specific monuments. Only by doing this will their value be recognized and maintained. The public demand for modernizing and renewing interpretation by adding features or even building-constructions to the monument is challenging in terms of maintaining the balance between interpretation and preservation. Restrictive preservation frames may, however, function as a sort of positive obstruction leading to new and innovative solutions and ideas.

Thomas ROLAND

Agency for Culture and Palaces, Monuments and Archaeological Heritage (Denmark)

14 kilometers of Heritage – Listed Monument, Green Corridor or both?

In the 1880s a 14km long enceinte was constructed to defend the city of Copenhagen. Some 35 years later the enormous defensive work lost its military importance and gradually the area was converted into a public space.

The Western Enceinte stands as a very well-preserved military construction and a unique historic monument, but is also a popular free zone in a part of a dense suburban cityscape with only a few green and open areas.

This short paper will focus on the conflicting interests between preservation, maintenance and use of the listed monument, and also addresses more general questions concerning how to administrate listed monuments within the restrictive frames of the regulating Museum Act.

Prof. Dr. Sergiu MUSTEATA

Institute of Archaeology, Romanian Academy, Iasi branch

Access and Promotion of the archaeological World Heritage Sites. Case of Romania

Romania owns eight properties forming part of the UNESCO World Heritage List (two natural and six cultural sites): the Danube Delta (1991; natural site), Churches of Moldavia (1993), Monastery of Horezu (1993), Villages with Fortified Churches in Transylvania (1993), Dacian Fortresses of the Orăştie Mountains (1999), Historic Centre of Sighişoara (1999), Wooden Churches of Maramureş (1999) and Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe (2017). The Dacian Fortresses of the Orăştie Mountains are among the most iconic ancient archaeological sites of Romania, which includes a series of fortresses, but just six of them were inscribed in the World Heritage List – Sarmisegetusa Regia, Costeşti-Cetăţuie, Costeşti-Blidaru, Lunca-Piatra Roşie, Băniţa, and Căpâlna. All sites are placed in the mountain area and the access to them is a big issue for Romanian authorities and for visitors too. The first question of my presentation is on the access to the Dacian Fortresses, how well the sites are known, how visitors could find the easy way to visit them, etc. The second question is how the sites are promoted at the national, regional and local levels, and the types of media involved in this process, etc. Another aspect, which will be discussed, is the quality of the management plans. Because access and promotion should be part of such plans and sustainable development strategies.

My presentation is part of our new project, launched in August 2017, that has the goal to identify and set up innovative models of good practices, adapted to the local cultural and social-economic specifics, for safeguarding and managing the Romanian World Heritage Sites. The project deals with multi-disciplinary and multi-perspective approaches, developing partnership networks between various institutions from Romania and abroad interested in the project and the transfer of good practices on maintenance, preservation and cultural heritage management, community participation and cooperation

with local public administration in order to develop a National Strategy and management plans that are supported by realistic action plans. Only a common and integrated approach will make it possible to enrich UNESCO standards of preservation and maintain the WHS status.

Franco NICOLIS and Monica DORIGATTI

Ufficio beni archeologici, Provincia autonoma di Trento

Take care of me! Experiencing protection, conservation and presentation of archaeological sites to the public in the autonomous Province of Trento, northern Italy

The Archaeological Heritage Office of the autonomous Province of Trento, northern Italy, carries out institutional activities for the research, protection and conservation of the Trentino archaeological heritage.

The Archaeological Restoration Laboratory directly promotes the restoration of sites, monuments and structures of archaeological interest that are owned by the Province, other institutions or private bodies.

The Archaeological Heritage Office carries out activities aimed at promoting and increasing the knowledge of the provincial archaeological heritage, museums and archaeological areas open to the public and ensuring the best conditions for their use and enjoyment by the public, through studies and scientific research, the dissemination of the related results and the promotion and organization of cultural events, such as exhibitions and conferences also in cooperation with other institutions or private bodies, as well as scientific and popular publications.

The Trentino Archaeological Sites network is made by many different sites; the most relevant are the Sas Underground archaeological area, the archaeological area of Palazzo Lodron, the archaeological area of Porta Veronensis in Trento, the Acqua Fredda archaeometallurgical site of Passo del Redebus, the pile-dwelling site of Fiavè (UNESCO World Heritage site), the Bronze Age site of Fai della Paganella, among others.

Furthermore, following fieldwork carried out by the Archaeological Heritage Office in the context of the archaeology of the First World War, an archaeological site dating back to 1914-1918 and located in the Ortles Cevedale massif at an altitude of 3629m a.s.l., was opened to the public in 2014, in cooperation with the local Great War Museum of Pejo. In each of the last visiting seasons (around 55 days each summer) more than 2500 persons visited the site.

Dóra HEGYI & Zsófia NÁDAI

Castle Headquarters Integrated Regional Development Centre Nonprofit Ltd., Hungary

Archaeological Researches and Reconstructions on Medieval Castles and Historical Gardens of Hungary

In Hungary, a central topic in the field of the cultural heritage is the restoration and reconstruction of monuments and their surroundings. The development of many castles and mansions for touristic purposes have happening in recent years in connection with the touristic investments of the National Castle and Mansion Programme (Nemzeti Vár- és Kastélyprogram).

Medieval Castles:

In this paper we will present a variety of examples, where different ways of the reconstructions can be carried out. The castles to be presented are similar in one main aspect: all of them are ruins, though in various levels of decay. Related to the reconstructions, significant archaeological excavations should be necessary. The degree of preservation basically determines the degree of the reconstruction. What can be shown by the excavated ruins, the historical researches and the architectural concept? How can we make a balance between the buildings created during the reconstruction, the ruins of the castles and the scientific presentation of a medieval building complex, so the result can be a fascinating and interesting experience for visitors? We will discuss these questions through the examples.

Historical Gardens:

We had the opportunity to carry-out archaeological excavations in historical gardens. In Hungary, the current cultural heritage law sets the limit of archaeological heritage's definition to 1711, and most of the discussed parks date from the 18th to the 20th century, and some questions require archaeological methods to answer. Because of the nature of the topic, we could take a scientific approach only with the cooperation of specialists from different disciplines: landscape architects, researchers of historical buildings and archaeologists. It made the process even harder that the former state organisation, which employed the various specialists, had been divided into three parts. Yet we should have discussed our experiences from the initial steps, from the collection of sources, the deployment of remote sensing and fieldwork, the processing of the research data, to the design and construction phases.

In this paper, we will present the results of the archaeological researches which could affect the reconstruction of the parks, highlighting the importance of archaeological methods in other aspects. Through these examples I will discuss the problem of a development-led approach and the paradox of 'heritage preserving investments'.

Dr Nicki SCOTT

Senior Cultural Resources Advisor, Historic Environment Scotland

The impact of filming activities on monuments in the care of the State

Properties in the Care of Historic Environment Scotland have provided the backdrop and the detailed locations for a wide range of filming activities from educational videos through to some of the most iconic films and television shows such as Monty Python and the Holy Grail, T2 Trainspotting, Outlander, Game of Thrones and the recently released Outlaw King.

In Scotland overall, the impact of filming has seen around £100m spent by production companies, up from £23m in 2007. This has also manifested itself in the creation of a dedicated screen unit, Screen Scotland by Creative Scotland, which expects further productions to utilise the landscape and heritage of Scotland.

The success of many of these productions has had a wide-ranging impact on the conservation of the monuments and the visitor experience provided at them. Many of the Properties in Care are also designated as Scheduled Monuments and this has further implications for production companies.

This paper will examine the impacts and the benefits that the use of monuments in media productions has, through the examination of specific case studies. From the actual impact of filming such as site closures and set building, through to the accidental damage and impact after the release of a production. Many Historic Environment Scotland monuments have also seen large increases in visitor numbers, often at sites that are not designed or set-up for this. This can manifest itself in both a poorer visitor experience and in physical impact of wear-and-tear on a monument. However, the flipside of this is that an increase in visitors can bring about a much-needed boost to revenue and a better appreciation and understanding of a monument and its significance.

In addition, other impacts can also include the miss-association of a site with a specific event or individual when a historic drama is filmed as a site, and this can have implications for both the understanding of a site and managing visitor expectations.

The use of a monument for filming can have a long time-depth, even if the site was not in state care at the time. For example, Monty Python and the Holy Grail was filmed at Doune Castle before it was taken in to guardianship. However, the cult impact of the film in which the castle featured has meant that fans of the film specifically seek it out for its cultural rather than historical value. This popularity has been capitalised on by the organisation through themed Monty Python event days and even an audio-guide recorded by Python Terry Jones that takes visitors through the history of the castle and also how it features in the film.

Other, unexpected and unintended impacts of a production can include the rise in popularity of a site through a miss-association or through mention in a production. The Clava Cairns, a group of Bronze Age burial cairns near Inverness, have seen their visitor numbers explode following the release of the Outlander TV series. Despite not being featured in the film, the cairns are associated with the show by

fans, who believe they are the inspiration for the portal which allows a character to time-travel back to 1745 and the battle of Culloden (the battlefield is one mile to the north of the stones).

Rachel PICKERING

Senior Cultural Resources Advisor, Historic Environment Scotland

Visitor Erosion in Fragile Landscapes: Managing Access and Archaeology

Historic Environment Scotland have a responsibility to promote and facilitate access to sites in our care, but what do we do when visitor access poses conservation risks? Many sites in care in Scotland are facing threats from rapidly increasing visitor numbers. Prehistoric monuments and landscapes with fragile, often subtle, archaeological remains are particularly at risk. This paper explores the challenges faced on the HES Estate, with particular focus upon Holyrood Park, Edinburgh as a case study with recommendations for future work to improve the site's long-term management.

Set within the heart of Edinburgh, Holyrood Park is a rugged open landscape within the city. It is in state care, a scheduled monument and has two SSSI designations for its geological interest and rare flora and fauna. With evidence of human occupation and activity spanning from the Mesolithic to the present day, it is a site with incredibly rich archaeological potential, but the remains are subtle and at risk from visitor erosion. It is a complex site with the very real challenge of how to protect the archaeology and scientific interest while continuing to promote and support access and visitor engagement.

Marina VDOVICHENKO

Academic Secretary, Institute of Archaeology of the Russian Academy of Sciences

Medieval churches in Novgorod: aspects of archaeological investigations and museum presentation

Veliky Novgorod is an ancient Russian medieval metropolis included in the system of European trade and cultural relations. Many architectural monuments suffered both in the 1920–1930s, and the Second World War. The process of renovation and conservation of many monuments started in the second half of the 20th century and is still on-going. The Institute of Archeology of the Russian Academy of Sciences is leading excavations at several destroyed architectural objects of Novgorod. The latest works of our Institute resulted with the museum presentation of the Church of the Annunciation on Gorodische (Settlement), which was constructed at the beginning of the 12th century and remains in the archeological state, and is also included in the UNESCO heritage list. The ruins of the church of St. Panteleimon in a medieval monastery near Novgorod are getting ready for a public presentation. The ruins were investigated by our Institute. The cultural layer of Novgorod is under state protection. Therefore, regular rescue archaeological research is being conducted in the center of the city by the Institute of Archeology, with the Moscow State University and Institute of History of Material Culture. The excavations are revealing exceptional scientific results and it has already become one of the tourist brands of Novgorod.

Edward BOURKE and Grellan ROURKE

National Monuments Service

Logistical and technical issues in relation to conservation on the World Heritage Site at Sceilg Mhichíl

Living and working on the World Heritage Site of Sceilg Mhichíl presents each of us with interesting challenges both in terms of physically working there and carrying-out either excavations or conservation works. The monastery and hermitage are perched on terraces high on an island 12km out in the Atlantic Ocean. There is no water and little will grow there except on the terraces that are protected by outer walls. Monks, Lighthouse Keepers and now staff from the Office of Public Works and the National

Monuments Service required major assistance from land-based institutions in order to survive here. Each iteration of activity on the island faces the same logistical issues, although each responded in different ways. This short presentation will focus on these issues.

DAY 2 (Friday, 1 March 2019) (9.15 – 17.15)

Session 2

Jan MAŘÍK & Jiří UNGER

Institute of Archaeology of the CAS, Prague, Czech Republic

VirtualArch – making archaeological heritage visible

Although the rich and diverse archaeological heritage of central Europe often well-known and excellently researched, a broad share of this heritage, even of international importance, is very often hardly visible and tangible for the public, and faces increasing threats. The VirtualArch project unveils regional archaeological heritage – located underground or submerged – to local and regional stakeholders that are responsible for economic development. Activities focus on the sustainable use and protection of non-visible and little known archaeological heritage by increasing the capacities of public actors, and by introducing innovative visualisation approaches and methods. The project will develop innovative and trendsetting visualisation tools in the field of virtual and augmented reality supporting both development and protection of archaeological heritage.

Hefin MEARA (England)

Maritime Archaeologist, Historic England, United Kingdom

Challenges facing the State management of historic shipwrecks in English territorial waters

Funding challenges for maritime archaeology in the UK is forcing Historic England to seek creative solutions to historic wreck management. This paper will detail how historic shipwrecks in English territorial waters are protected, managed and conserved by Historic England on behalf of the nation.

Shipwrecks can be protected on account of their historical, archaeological or artistic importance and to prevent uncontrolled salvage. At present there are 53 protected historic wreck sites in English territorial waters, ranging in date from the Bronze Age to the First World War era. Access to such is controlled via a licencing system, which is administered by Historic England on behalf of the UK Government's Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport. Once protected, the sites need to be managed.

Public access to protected wreck sites by volunteers is a vital part of site management; the volunteers act as custodians of the wrecks and their teams carry out many hours of diving on site, survey work, condition assessments and, on occasion, detailed excavation.

Historic England is committed to make interpretation of protected wrecks sites accessible to all, including both divers and non-divers. We have therefore created dive trails on the seabed at several sites in order to encourage divers to explore. Dive trails assist with monitoring the wreck sites, as visitors to the sites are encouraged to share photographs and information via social media, or by adding information to the online list entry on the National Heritage List for England.

As well as creating trails on the seabed, Historic England has commissioned a series of virtual dive trails, in order to allow non-divers to enjoy the sites via their own desk-top. The trails use photogrammetry and virtual reality technology, in combination with photographs, videos and text, to bring the wreck site to life for the general public.

The strength of the licensing system is that it harnesses the energy, enthusiasm and skills of volunteers, who have dedicated countless hours and large amounts of resources to the study of the wrecks – something which the State could not afford to do in isolation. The volunteers are experts on their particular wrecks, some of whom have been diving on the wrecks for decades. The system allows public access to and enjoyment of historic wreck site, without jeopardising the physical safety and integrity of the wrecks, thereby protecting them in a sustainable way for future generations to enjoy.

A range of current projects will be used to highlight the challenges and opportunities faced by State management of England's protected historic wreck sites, including:

The *London*, sunk in 1665 in the Thames Estuary – site monitoring and surface recovery of artefacts.

HMT Arfon, – A requisitioned trawler on Admiralty Service as a minesweeper. Sunk in 1917 after detonating a mine.

Rooswijk, 1739 wreck of a Dutch East India Company vessel lost on the Goodwin Sands, subject to a programme of excavation by the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands and Historic England.

Saskia VAN DOCKUM & Leonard DE WIT

Executive Director, Regional Trust province of Utrecht / President, EAC

The width and possibilities of ownership; How to support Dutch trusts successfully

The title of this year's symposium 'Archaeological sites and monuments in the care of the state' isn't very inviting for the Dutch. We will not claim that the government of the Netherlands doesn't care about the sites and monuments. It does. But it has little tradition in the acquisition of real estate for the benefit of the cultural heritage.

Our contribution will thus focus on the current system of non-governmental trust organizations who have an ideological objective to preserve the heritage. What are the strengths and weaknesses of these organizations that have evolved over more than a century? And what kind of improvements can be made in the cooperation between trusts and government for public benefit?

In our contribution to the symposium we use the daily practice of such an idealistic organization, namely the oldest provincial trust of the Netherlands: Utrechts Landschap.

Utrechts Landschap focuses on the protection and development of the complex of nature, historic landscape and (archaeological) heritage primarily by ownership. Utrechts Landschap has thousands of hectares in possession and owns dozens of monuments. The organization is led by Saskia van Dockum who is an archaeologist and former director of the archaeological heritage service of the Netherlands.

Prof. Dr. Zeynep ERES ÖZDOĞAN (Turkey)

Istanbul Technical University, Faculty of Architecture, Historic Preservation Graduate Program, Turkey

An overview of the changing policies on the protection and management of archaeological sites in Turkey

The earliest legislation in Turkey on the protection of antiquities was devised by the Ottomans, the forerunner of modern Turkey, issued in 1869 specifically for the protection of archaeological sites and to regulate archaeological excavations that were taking pace in distinct parts of the Empire. The Ottoman antiquities law continued in use after the foundation of the Turkish republic, to be revised as late as 1973 to concord with approaches that took place in Europe. The main objective of the legislation was to establish a rigid control over archaeological excavations, discouraging new projects, thus hindering the availability of new data on cultural history. It was only by late 1990's that the government decided on a new policy to ameliorate tourism by stimulating new touristic itineraries to compliment the conventional ones based on coastal areas, which included a few selected ancient ruins such as Ephesos and Pergamon; this new approach opened up new trajectories, a concern on cultural assets, among them

archaeological sites that had been overlooked. Meanwhile, priority was given to enrich Turkey's place in UNESCO World Heritage List by proposing archaeological sites that can easily fulfill the UNESCO requirements. Thus, currently 13 out of 18 World Heritage Sites of Turkey are archaeological.

Even though tourism is at present considered as the prime indicator of economical development, and cultural heritage as a matter of national pride, viability of government policies on archaeological heritage is rather questionable, mainly due to inconsistencies and bureaucratic obstacles, the red tape; moreover the system being short of experts in museology and conservation, unpleasant consequences of architectural restorations and inadequacy of the tenders are among the weak points of the system. There are strong concerns among academics that the high costs of restoration projects that are either inappropriate or of question concepts. This paper will present an overview assessing governments implementations in conserving and managing archeological sites in relation to the Valletta and Faro conventions.

Kristín HULD SIGURÐARDÓTTIR (Iceland)

Director General, The Cultural Heritage Agency of Iceland

Challenges facing the heritage management in Iceland: Preservation of sites in state-care

As well as describing the way in which the protection of the archaeological sites in Iceland is managed, the talk deals with the problems facing the state directorate responsible for the management. The first Cultural Heritage Act in Iceland was passed in 1907. One of its main aims was to safeguard the protection of the archaeological sites. At that stage the only protection provided was the scheduling of some 800 chosen sites. With legislation passed in 1989 the stages of preservation became two-fold. In addition to scheduling, it was established that all sites over 100 years old were automatically protected. In spite of this double protection there are various factors that cause the management of the sites to be problematic. Those which have the greatest influence are political and financial decisions decided by the parliament. They have great influences on the management, some positive and other negative ones as will be discussed. The same can be said about planning-decisions which are mainly at a municipality level and development, which is decided both at state and municipality levels. The state heritage directory attempts to influence those decisions, but it is harder to steer the various natural forces of Iceland. These include erosion by wind and sea, earthquakes and volcanoes and enormous eruptions and flooding which some of these cause. The same can be said about the global warming, which is beginning to have some impact in Iceland. All this will be discussed, the positive aspects as well as the negative ones, and how we see the future of heritage management in Iceland.

Ulla KADAKAS & Anu LILLAK

National Heritage Board, Estonia

Managing the managers: state control over the monuments in Estonia

About half of the archaeological sites or monuments in Estonia are situated on state or municipal land, but their management is divided between several state or local institutions. Often it is the land (forest, field) or a building on top of it, rather than the monument itself, that is the target of maintenance or management.

There is no unified state policy concerning how to present the archaeological heritage: everything done so far has been project-based, encompassing smaller areas or single sites. Such a situation reflects the state regulations: The Estonian Heritage Conservation Act does not oblige anyone to expose, but only to preserve. Therefore, an institution or a local community responsible for the site can decide the extent of what they want to present a particular site. Of course, the National Heritage Board (NHB) coordinates activities concerning the monuments. All the restoration, renovation as well as presentation projects

have to be approved by the board. The board can also help with expertise or finances, but does not carry out any plans or projects itself.

Many of the archaeological sites do not have any essence to present. Even the majority of monuments with recognizable visual shape will probably remain only a niche attraction that is rarely promoted by local guides. On the other hand, every county has 5 to 10 larger sites which are seen or can be seen as potential tourist attractions. In order to promote them, these sites will need proper infrastructure as well as a story that will attract people.

In order to enhance tourist experience at larger monuments or sites, extensive development works have been undertaken. The development comprises partial restoration or conservation of the monument, equipping the site with better access and information boards, sometimes adding guided tours, extra activities, souvenir shops, cafés etc. Occasionally, the concept is such that the NHB cannot approve (for example, too far from the historical truth or potentially damaging the sites). It is always very hard to find the balance between the ideas or wishes of the developer and heritage protection. Mostly the question is about how much new can be added without damaging the authenticity of the monument. This situation may result with a conflict between the NHB, the developer, and the local community as larger projects provide local identity, workplaces and income.

In the presentation, a few different examples from Estonia will be explored, and some successful and poor stately actions will also be discussed.

Session 3

Mirela HUTINEC & Dora ŠIMIĆ

Vučedol Culture Museum

Vučedol Culture Museum - a new concept of the museum as a centre of future Archaeological Park Vučedol on the Danube

Vučedol Culture Museum is a unique museum dedicated to a single prehistoric cultural phenomenon (3000-2500 BC). Vučedol culture (3000-2500 BC) has its origins in the area between the Danub, Sava and Drava rivers. It existed in the same time period as Sumerians in Mesopotamia, the old empire in Egypt (The Age of pyramids) and Early Troy (I and II), and slowly started to spread covering the area of 13 countries of today's modern Europe. Based on the interdisciplinary archaeological excavations since 1984., numerous scientific data show the high level of development of a society in everyday living, such as in the technological and spiritual spheres.

The idea of the Vučedol Project was initiated in the 1980s, when systematic archaeological excavations began, and as a result of which Vučedol soon became recognized as a valuable archaeological site. In September 1990, Vukovar was surrounded and occupied in the Homeland War, leaving the site abandoned and neglected until the post-war demining in 2001, when the archaeological team returned.

In order to revive cultural and archaeological heritage, Vučedol was constantly promoted by the museum enthusiasts as an important archaeological site and a cultural inheritance of great significance. With the continuation of archaeological research at the site, some extremely valuable scientific findings came to light, encouraging further work on the project of the Vučedol Culture Museum. This project was part of a mega-project "Research, Restoration and Revival of the Cultural Heritage Ilok – Vukovar – Vučedol" financed by the Government of the Republic of Croatia and the Council of Europe Development Bank.

Vučedol Culture Museum was established by Croatian Government Decree on February 21st, 2013 as a museum of interest for the Republic of Croatia. Museum is officially opened to the public on June 30th, 2015 representing the youngest national museum in Croatia.

The museum building is located and integrated into the cultural landscape at the foot of the archaeological site Vučedol, located 5 km from Vukovar (Croatia). Vučedol Culture Museum has numerous innovative concepts, from its overall theme to the incorporation of the building into the natural environment. In its short time of existence it has already achieved significant results through the

involvement and education of the general population by organizing creative and educational workshops and events. It aims to become one of the most important archaeological, museological and scientific centres in Europe, and the centre for the study of Vučedol culture and of Indo-Europeans. The museum also aspires to become a driving force in promoting development of the tourism and education in Vukovar and whole Danube region.

Vučedol Culture Museum, as an integral part of the future archaeological park, will become one of the most important tourist focal points of Europe and will contribute to archaeological research, education, tourism, culture and other aspects of Vukovar and its wider region.

In its short time of existence the Museum has already become a recognizable cultural and tourism product which has, so far, visited more than two hundred thousand visitors from Croatia and the world. The Museum, through its activities and education of the general population, and by organizing creative and educational content, has achieved significant results which is demonstrated by numerous national and international awards in the field of museology and architecture.

Vučedol Culture Museum, as an integral part of the future archaeological park, will become one of the most important tourist hot spots of Europe, and will contribute to the development of archaeological research, education, tourism, culture and other aspects of life in the city of Vukovar and its wider region.

Cynthia DUNNING THIERSTEIN

Director, ArchaeoConcept

Whose archaeological site is it? - A case study of the public's implication in the caretaking and opening of archaeological sites in Switzerland

In Switzerland, all archaeological sites and monuments are under the care of the different cantons in which they are found. The cantonal archaeological services are responsible not only for their conservation, but also for their presentation to the public. Knowing that this takes an enormous amount of time, money and personnel to achieve, a great variety of solutions have been found. While some, such as site museums depend, on institutions at all levels of the administration (from federal to municipal), others involve non-governmental organizations in the form of mostly community-led local associations. Such associations are an important factor of participation in cultural life in Switzerland – every citizen is at least member of one or two associations during his or her lifetime. In the case of those who help maintain archaeological sites (there are more than 500 dedicated to archaeological sites), this form of participation dismantles the barriers between the public and the cantonal archaeological services, and strengthens the trust between professionals and non-professional enthusiastic archaeology lovers.

Through a few well-chosen examples, this paper would like to particularly stress upon the ways these associations work, the pros and cons of associative initiatives in the conservation and opening of sites for the public, their links to the state institutions and their public perception.

Milena KAMENOVA & Lyudmil VAGALINSKI

Manager, Archika / Assoc. Prof. Dr, National Archaeological Institute with Museum, Sofia

Authenticity and Attraction by Presentation of Archaeological Sites in Bulgaria

The paper will present the challenges facing Bulgarian experts in finding the balance between preserving the authenticity of an archaeological structure and its context, and turning them into an understandable and attractive site.

Thanks largely to European funding, over the past 10 years a number of projects have been implemented in Bulgaria for conservation, restoration, exhibition and socialization of archaeological heritage, where the main aim is to achieve a complete tourist product. The economic and social effect, which on the one hand has a positive effect as an inspirer for archaeological researches and the popularization of this type of cultural heritage, has in some instances led to a compromise of their

scientific value. Different examples illustrate the roles of the experts, participants and stakeholders, and their joint work on 'reading' and 'translating' the archaeological structure in their search for opportunities to captivate, clarify and impart the experience of 'genius loci'. The role of the state in the management of archaeological heritage is examined through its different governmental levels and their interaction. The requirements imposed by legislation and practice are also presented.

Статията ще представи предизвикателствата пред българските експерти при намирането на баланса между запазването на автентичността на археологическата структура и нейния контекст и превръщането им в разбираем и привлекателен за посещение обект.

Благодарение основно на европейското финансиране през последните 10 години в България бяха реализирани множество проекти за консервация, реставрация, експониране и социализация на археологическото културно наследство, при които се търси постигането на завършен туристически продукт, икономическият и социалният ефект, което от една страна имаше положителен ефект като стимулатор на археологически проувания и популяризиране на този вид културно наследство, но в определени обекти доведе до компроментиране на научната им стойност. В различни примери са показани ролята на отделните специалисти, участници и заинтересовани страни и тяхната съвместна работа при „разчитането” и „превеждането” на археологическата структура - търсенето на възможността да заинтригуваш, разясниш и предадеш усещането на „духът на мястото”. Разгледана е ролята на държавата в управлението на културното наследство чрез различните ѝ институционални нива и тяхното взаимодействие, изискванията, наложени от законодателството и от практиката.

Ann DEGRAEVE

Head of the Department of Archaeological Heritage, Heritage Direction, Brussels Urbanism and Heritage

Sustainability of archaeological sites and monuments in Brussels, Belgium, or how to conjugate past and future actions. A mitigated but promising report

In Brussels, Belgium, several archaeological sites or part of them have been preserved and are open to the public. These sites span a variety of monument types, from sections of the 13th century city wall through to the remains of the church of a Franciscan cloister (*Bruxella 1238*), all the way to the basement rooms of Charles V's *Aula Magna*. This presentation aims to highlight some of the challenges encountered in managing these sites.

The remains of the 16th century *Aula Magna*, the former Royal Palace, and the Hôtel of Hoogstraten are all incorporated within the Coudenberg Museum in an ambitious concept. They integrate in a very successful way various state and private levels into the daily management of a complex site, augmenting every year their visitor numbers, but not without having gone through years of difficult discussions. The museum *Bruxella 1238*, on the contrary, has long suffered from low accessibility, despite being located on the daily trajectory of thousands of tourists towards the Grand-Place, a UNESCO world heritage site. This struggle is partly linked to its formation history: the museum is largely the result of the public's pressure to safeguard the archaeological remains in the 1980s, when the citizens were for the first time confronted with an extensive archaeological excavation in the middle of the city. Recently, and after an intense battle for the preservation of *Bruxella 1238* within the actual ongoing refurbishment of the central 19th century boulevards where the site is situated, new and interesting developments are finally being implemented to incorporate this site museum into a larger concept around the reuse of the adjoining Brussels stock exchange building.

Sections of the 13th century city wall, some privately owned and some state-owned, are preserved in different parts of the city. Recent years have seen some major restoration projects on these iconic but less well-known remains. While each project has had its own share of cooperation challenges and despite finding various solutions, there is, however, a very clear but still poor link between these projects: a strong on-site communication around the history and the building of the first city wall is badly needed. This communication should be organised by the regional authorities who are responsible for the management of the archaeological heritage and across all levels of ownership in order to fully embrace the Valletta Convention and, by extension, the Faro convention. The engagement of the general public with their heritage can only exist under these conditions.

A remarkable central thread is common to these examples and projects: the balance between the archaeologist, weary of losing the scientific value of the site he/she discovered and documented, and the new needs for accessibility and modern presentation techniques to capture the very demanding public's eye.

Dirk KRAUSSE

State Archaeologist, Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Baden-Württemberg

Taking care of major archaeological sites and monuments in Baden-Württemberg – an example from South-West Germany

In Germany each federal state has responsibility for its cultural affairs, including archaeological monuments. Laws differ between the 16 federal states, but there are also some similarities. In most cases a large number of archaeological sites and monuments belong to the respective federal state. However, only very few of those archaeological monuments are managed in the sense that they are made accessible and visible to the public.

Since the early 19th century only a few Roman ruins in Baden-Württemberg (10m inhabitants) have been selected, restored and conserved as “valuable” monuments. These Roman ruins are still run professionally by the state's Castle and Garden Services. Prehistoric sites – such as the Heuneburg, the first town north of the Alps – have also been owned by the state since the early 19th century. However, they have not been conserved. Rather, they have been used as agricultural land and for forestry, and thereby damaged. Only in the 21st century has a rethinking taken place with regard to these important prehistoric monuments.

This paper illustrates the possibilities and limitations of monument management and protection in a federal state system.

Franz SCHOPPER

Director, Brandenburgisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologisches Landesmuseum

Wittstock, Freyenstein, Seddin. Research, presentation and sustainable site management in Northern Brandenburg