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I. Introduction

The relationship between the public and archaeology is a subject which has become one of my main interests in my archaeological studies through the years. This Research Master’s thesis will be a tool for me to get more involved in it, while also gaining a better understanding of the current affairs of this discipline in general. The reasons for my interests in this complex and relatively young aspect of archaeology have probably sprouted from an increased interest in the human psyche. “Different strokes for different folks”, but why is archaeology such an enigmatic, yet increasingly popular topic among a large part of the public? Wherever archaeologists are at work, people will stop and look. “Have you ever found anything valuable?” It is a frequent question archaeologists are asked. It is also one of the most difficult questions to answer, since what an archaeologist might find valuable, could be completely underwhelming to the questioner. While for archaeologists a monetary value of archaeological finds (hopefully) does not exist,1 this might be exactly what a visitor wants to hear about. The situation described above broadly shows the problems that exist between professional archaeology and the public: while the archaeologist loves to share knowledge, often the presentation and the manner in which the facts are shared are not received well (enough) by the audience. The audience has different goals and interests when involved in archaeology.

For archaeology, ‘the public’ (in its broadest sense) is the mammoth in the room: while every archaeologist believes heritage and archaeology have a great value to society as a whole, it is not always easy for them to explain to laymen why. Part of this might be explained by the lack of good training of archaeologists on the subject. At the same time, little effort is being made to find out how the public actually feels about archaeology and what aspects of our discipline it would like to see and in what manner. It is usually the archaeologist as an expert that will share knowledge ‘from above’; knowledge which is often served from the archaeologists’ ideas of what is important to share and what is not. There is little room for the public to make its own interpretations. Fortunately, the role of the public within archaeology is taking big steps in the Netherlands, and I have found that those that are involved with public archaeology are truly passionate to contribute to an innovative, interactive and creative future for the discipline.

I would like to seize this opportunity to go one step further; I would like to study public archaeology through a specific case-study within Drenthe, the province in which I grew up. The Hunze river, while little known among non-locals, is on the verge of being recognised far and wide for its nature, ecology and opportunities for recreation. Archaeology deserves a place in this landscape. Therefore, not only the relationship between the public and archaeology will be investigated, but also the relationship with the landscape. My hopes are that this thesis will inspire others and will aid in other public archaeology projects around the world.

I.1 Terms and definitions

The subject of this Research Master’s thesis is the relationship between archaeology and the public. By now a whole range of definitions and terms have come up in archaeological publications, such as: public archaeology, community archaeology, public outreach, public involvement, public participation, heritage management, archaeology today, etc.2 Confusingly, the definition of these terms tend to overlap, depending on who is discussing them. For example, the term community archaeology is used with relative ease by archaeologists to denote the wider concept of public archaeology, while they actually are talking about something closer to public outreach or archaeology of a consultative nature.2 Community archaeology usually strives for projects to be as democratic as possible, but just like most other terms in the discipline, it is hard to come to a conclusive definition. In some cases, it may not be desirable to have definitions set in stone.3

---

1 Although archaeology as a whole of course has an economic value to archaeologists.
2 Pape 2012, p. 21.
3 Ibid, p. 16.
In chapter III the problematics concerning terminology within the discipline are explained more thoroughly, but for clarity I would like to mention the main definitions that will be used hereafter. ‘Public archaeology’, while in its use highly dependent on national/regional styles and containing several sub-disciplines, will be used in this thesis to denote any procedure or project, concerned with archaeology and heritage, designed to involve or interact with the public in one way or another and the study thereof. In short, ‘the public’ defines the following in this thesis: a group of persons with an interest in ideas/products/services as provided by an organisation or other group of persons who is in turn interested in gaining the interest of first-mentioned group.

While public archaeology is a generally new discipline in archaeology, a lot has already been written about the subject and many projects, in the Netherlands and abroad, have been carried out to try to involve or inform the public about their heritage. The problem seems to be that the success of such projects is not evaluated. The practices are developed, but the development of methods in public archaeology, as well as the development of a wider support base of the Dutch public for archaeology, are inhibited. In the Netherlands there are many options available for public outreach, education or edutainment and interaction. However, many opportunities are left unexploited, especially on a regional level. Because of this, I have decided to research the possibilities for involvement of the public for a specific case-study, assessing different stakeholders and methods in the process.

I.2 Valletta

The importance of public outreach has already been acknowledged by the Dutch government, proved by the signing of the Valletta Treaty in 1992. This treaty, also simply referred to as Malta, was signed by several EU countries with the aim of protecting national and international heritage. The treaty left the implementation of these goals to decide on for each country individually. In the Netherlands this lead to the creation of the Wet Archeologische Monumentenzorg (Archaeological Heritage Management Act; WAMZ) in 2007. This act made Dutch archaeology into what it is today. To prevent taxes having to be raised to pay for all this ‘new’ heritage, a rule known as “the polluter pays” has come into existence. This means that in the case in situ preservation is not possible, a developer, be it a company, home owner or governmental institution, has to follow the (local) regulations regarding archaeological remains, known and expected, and pay for the archaeological research and excavations necessary in the project. Archaeological research is then carried out by one of many commercial parties or companies, each registered and in possession of a permit, while working within the research regulations as defined in the KNA (quality norm Dutch archaeology). Commercial archaeologists work in a cost-driven environment which puts pressure on the quality of research and achieve to deliver maximum quality for a minimum price.

When describing the current situation in the paragraph above you might have noticed that one major stakeholder in archaeological heritage management is missing: the public. Especially in commercial archaeology the role of the public is small, because the developer sees little benefit in involving it. For commercial archaeologists, involving the public means making extra costs which cannot be compensated by the developer or government. So far, public archaeology is not (yet) integrated in commercial archaeology in the Netherlands. It is clear that unless public archaeology becomes a fixed and regulated part of commercial archaeology, the role of the public will remain limited.

At its very least the WAMZ has led to many more excavations taking place (even though one of the main goals is that of in situ preservation), which has also increased visibility of archaeology in public. The government is trying to encourage municipalities to implement archaeology in such a way that it adds value to the environment, which in turn will lead to an increased support base among the public to protect heritage. Usually this is executed in the form of exhibitions of finds in the municipality hall or museum, open days at excavations, or information signs at the location of an interesting archaeological find. While this mostly leads to little interaction (with the most possible exception of open

---

4 Abeling et al. 2007.
5 Pape 2012, p. 68.
6 Alkemade et al. 2009, p. 117.
days), the national government does advice municipalities to plan and budget (also for maintenance) these kinds of projects in advance. The goal is that when archaeologists, landscape architects, city planners and artists work together to visibly integrate archaeology and history in spatial planning, archaeology will return on investment, instead of simply costing a lot of money.

About public outreach, the Valletta Treaty specifically states the following:

*Promotion of public awareness*

*Article 9*

*Each Party undertakes:*

- to conduct educational actions with a view to rousing and developing an awareness in public opinion of the value of the archaeological heritage for understanding the past and of the threats to this heritage;
- to promote public access to important elements of its archaeological heritage, especially sites, and encourage the display to the public of suitable selections of archaeological objects.

While this is stated clearly in the treaty, the Dutch government has not incorporated it in any laws, assuming archaeologists will try to live up to article 9 by their own initiative. Attempts to do this are becoming more common, but there are still many problems concerned with the implementation of this article in the treaty. The public has increasingly become a determining factor within archaeology, society as a whole is important to archaeology. The realisation has hit that without it there would be no archaeology. Therefore, reaching out to the public is not just an act of political-correctness or acting on the goals as described in the Valletta Treaty and WAMZ, but is absolutely crucial for the continued existence of archaeology. The public will play one of the central roles in answering the main questions of this thesis as described below, but there are also other determining factors involved. As a case-study, I have looked for a landscape with a rich archaeological background and appealing aesthetics, in which archaeology has so far received little to no attention for public outreach. In short: a landscape with great potential, but with little public awareness concerning archaeology. I have come into contact with Jan Jaap Hekman at Grontmij after a job market event at the university. We talked about possible thesis subjects and he mentioned the Hunze valley to me. It soon became clear to us that the valley would form a great case-study for public archaeology related research. During the writing of this thesis I have enjoyed Jan Jaap’s good advice and comments.

The research area of this thesis has thus become the landscape of the Hunze river in Drenthe, the Netherlands (fig. 1 + 2). This landscape is rich in archaeology, unique both nationally and internationally. The archaeology that was found here consists mainly of finds from Prehistory, such as temporary camps from the Mesolithic, remains from the Funnel beaker culture and ritual depositions in waterways. In recent years it has been subject to renovation, mostly for ecological and water extraction purposes, in which the canalised Hunze is once again to follow its meandering course, often derived from historic maps and coring data (for example, compare the renovation plan for Bonnerklap in appendix I with the Hunze in figure 2). Because the area already has interested parties within nature conservation, recreation and archaeology/history, there is ample opportunity for collaboration between different natural and cultural institutions as well.

The research area is limited to the municipality of Aa en Hunze, which encompasses large parts of the river and valley (fig. I.1 + I.2). Furthermore, the sentiments in this area are positive towards archaeology. A limitation of the research area to one municipality is not desirable, as large parts of the Hunze’s archaeology will be unable to be incorporated. A limitation is necessary considering the available time and size of this thesis.

---

7 Ibid 2009, p. 118.
8 Alkemade et al. 2009, P. 118.
9 Council of Europe 1992 [online].
10 Pape 2012, p. 19.
11 See chapter II for more information.
Figure I.1: A map of the Netherlands showing the municipality Aa en Hunze in orange (created with ArcGIS and edited by author).
Figure 1.2: Map of several municipalities in Drenthe and Groningen, through which the Hunze is running (marked in blue). Please note this is an older map, which is not showing the recent developments on the course of the river (created with ArcGIS and edited by author).
I.4 Research questions

This thesis will research the problems and opportunities when dealing with landscapes and public archaeology. As a case-study the Hunze river has been selected, in which a public archaeology project will be proposed. As a guide for this research a main research question can be posed:

What strategies and what methods of interpretation should be utilised to engage the public in the archaeological heritage of the Hunze landscape, in the context of the Hunze river?

The following sub-questions have been formulated to answer the specific problems which are relevant to this research and are associated with the above research question:

1. How can be determined which pasts of the Hunze are most suitable to present to the public?

2. What are the target audiences for public engagement and what are the demands for knowledge and presentation for the archeology of the Hunze?

3. What are the possible methods to involve the public in archaeology and how efficient are they?

4. How can the strategies and methods proposed for the Hunze valley be useful to other projects?

On the basis of these questions the thesis will attempt to create a ‘pilot plan’ for a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley. While the river and the surrounding landscape have a rich history, there are many challenges involved in trying to present a mostly ‘void’ landscape\(^\text{12}\) to the public. Choosing which pasts to represent, deciding upon what public to reach and what platforms to utilise will be the main goal of this research.

In chapter II the valley itself will be investigated, along with its past and the relationship between landscape, perception and archaeology is discussed. Highlights of the available archaeological data in the research area will be presented, after which the most suitable theme or ‘stories’ within the Hunze valley will be selected. Chapter III will focus on ‘the public’ and its position within archaeology and public archaeology specifically. Motivations for involving the public will be discussed, as well as the issues regarding the different interests and aims of archaeologists and the public. Eventually, several groups of stakeholders will be described, of which one will be chosen as most suitable to incorporate in a public archaeology project in the Hunze. Archaeology and the public alone are not enough to tell the ‘story’. For that, a variety of methods are employed. Several methods to attract, inform, entertain and involve the public in archaeology are discussed in chapter IV. For each the advantages and disadvantages are described and where possible an estimate of the costs involved. The best methods for a public archaeology project in the Hunze will then be selected.

In chapter V the information from chapters II-IV will be used to create a pilot plan or plan de campagne for a public archaeology project. A framework of all the steps involved in the planning and organisation of such a project are also described and could be beneficial to all those interested in public archaeology and/or setting up a public archaeology project. The pilot plan will keep the goals for this project in mind: to involve the public in the local past in an interactive and dynamic manner and to increase the understanding and appreciation of archaeology and the archaeological process. The plan is described step by step, based on the framework set out in the chapter. An estimate of the costs involved with the pilot plan will also be included.

It is important to note that there is no such thing as the perfect public archaeology project. The context, theme, public and available methods determine what a project will look like. All three depend on each other and influence each other. In this thesis the decision has been made to look first at the landscape and its past, then the public and finally the methods involved.

In essence, the goal of this thesis is two-fold: while a plan de campagne will be made and proposed for the Hunze to involve the public in its archaeology, a framework will be designed for public interaction for similar

---

\(^{12}\) Meaning a landscape in which most archaeological remains are seemingly invisible on the surface by most of the public, but can be recognised by those that have had training to carefully ‘read’ the landscape.
projects concerning landscapes elsewhere. My hopes are that such a framework may be useful to others and aid in the development of public awareness of archaeological remains in the Netherlands. I expect the outcome of this research will be focused on the use of digital platforms in combination with information ‘on-site’, perhaps in the form of *living history* or excursions.
II. The Hunze, Landscape & Stories

As described in chapter I the Hunze valley is the case-study in this research, in particular the Hunze within the municipality of Aa en Hunze. The valley is especially interesting in archaeological context, because little is yet known about archaeology in river valleys, especially in the north of the Netherlands. The renovations of the Hunze offer new possibilities for much needed archaeological research, but also for reaching out to the public to show the Hunze’s past. As the Hunze valley will develop into a more attractive and natural environment, there will also be more opportunities for archaeological stories to be told.

As is the case with many landscapes in the Netherlands, the current appearance of the Hunze valley is entirely the result of centuries of human intervention and exploitation. This means that, although a rich history is present, many of the elements of the past have seemingly disappeared from the landscape. Archaeologists are able to see beyond the appearance of a landscape and see that there is much more to offer. The various stories or ‘pasts’ play a crucial role in the appreciation of and identification with the landscape once revealed. In this chapter the (past) dynamics of the Hunze valley will be described, as well as the recent developments in the Hunze that have led to this thesis. First the theory of archaeology and perception in landscape will be looked into. Next will be explained how the current appearance of the landscape came to be; i.e. how climate, erosion and human influence have shaped it. Afterwards, the different ‘histories/pasts’ of the Hunze landscape will be investigated, looking at what the landscape has to offer in the field of archaeology. Eventually, a decision will be made of what ‘stories’ of the past will be most suitable for incorporating in a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley.

II.1 The Hunze

The name “Hunze” was first mentioned in 1262 and referred to as Hunesa.¹ It means something like “the brown one”, which is probably a reference to the colour of the water flowing through the river. This should come as no surprise, considering the river was fed mainly by iron-rich seepage from the Hondsrug and Drents Plateau on the one hand and boggy brown waters from the peat lands on the other (more on that below).² The Hunze river is being fed by two streams, known as the Voorste Diep and Achterste Diep, which join forces at Drouwenzand. Before canalisation and inundation, the lower parts of the Hunze would have burst the banks almost every year. Total drainage of the river has been estimated at 100 million cubic meters.³ On the higher grounds the water is mainly being transported as groundwater, set in motion by the height differences between the Hondsrug and the Hunze valley. For this reason, seepage is especially profound on the eastern side of the Hondsrug, in the south of the river valley. In the northern part of the Hunze, height differences are less dramatic and clay and loam are a natural obstruction of the water flow.⁴ Larger sand ridges, mainly near the lower parts of the river, have their own groundwater processes and therefore develop micro-ecological systems.⁵ As a result groundwater levels were generally quite high in the Hunze landscape. Nowadays the water is partially drained by underground pipes and canals.⁶

II.2 Hunzevisie

In 1995 the Hunzevisie (“Hunze vision”) was formulated, in which the provinces of Groningen and Drenthe worked together with the associated municipalities to come to a future plan for the Hunze, aimed at nature development, ecology and water management.⁷ The Hunze was to become a ‘living stream’ once again, with all the natural processes that are expected (such as erosion, inundation and sedimentation), in harmony with other processes in the landscape associated with agriculture, living and (drinking) water management. In the twenty years that have passed, nature has developed and

² Van der Bilt & Glastra 1995, p. 34.
³ Ibid, p. 34.
⁴ Ibid, p. 35.
⁵ Ibid, p. 35.
⁶ Ibid, p. 35.
⁷ Van der Bilt & Glastra 1995; Stichting het Drentse Landschap et al. 2014.
expanded, new species have come and water is well-managed. Along most of the Hunze so far natural development has taken place and the majority of the goals set in 1995 have been met.\(^8\)

The plan is that in the next 15 years subsequent developments will take place to increase the potential of the natural environment of the stream valley considerably, including connection to the Wadden Sea, plans to counter climate change and the appreciation and incorporation of cultural-historical values.\(^9\)

Plans for the future, to be concluded in 2030, include the connection between the individual nature development areas in the Hunze, as well as inclusion of other wet natural environments, creating more opportunities for counteracting flooding and climate change, improving water quality for nature development and drinking water, making the areas more accessible to visitors, contributions from agriculture to the development and offering local/regional economically interesting opportunities and, last but not least, accentuating the growing appreciation of cultural-historical heritage.\(^10\) In the renewed Hunzevisie cultural heritage is mentioned as “triple-star quality of the Hunze valley which will provide new economic growth”.\(^11\) All of this suggests there is room for public archaeology in the Hunze and that archaeology is not the only beneficiary of such a project, but that also local companies, inhabitants, agriculture and tourists will reap the benefits.

II.3 The Hunze: reconstructing authenticity

The current situation in the Hunze is twofold, but both created by man: on one side there are the straight canals and potato fields so common, formed due to the industrialised peat reclamation in the valley, on the other side there are the small patches of ‘natural’ landscape of meandering streams and wetlands, full of wildlife and clear waters. Those ‘natural’ landscapes are what make the Hunze so interesting from an archaeological perspective. It is these areas that will attract people, mostly for leisurely activities like hiking, enjoying nature, watching wildlife, etc. These landscapes are much more compelling and speak to the imagination of people, which makes the landscapes ideal to present local archaeological stories, which usually come alive much better in natural, or ‘authentic’ landscapes, than in flat agricultural and obviously man-made environments.

Next to this, the valley in general is important to archaeology. All former stream valleys in the Netherlands contain valuable information about past lives; still little archaeology is known in these areas. It is perhaps little surprising, because no settlement or large constructions are usually found in the wetlands. For that, the higher and dryer sandy soils are hotspots. Yet on those soils no traces exist of the activities that would be expected near water, or all kinds of finds from organic material, preserved by the peaty, wet and silty soils. Furthermore, the stream continuously brings in new sediments, covering precious archaeological data and protecting them from harm by modern activities. It is what makes stream valleys crucial for research to reconstruct the landscape and associated human life from the past, especially in relation to water associated activities.

In recent years the archaeological appreciation of stream valleys has increased. But it is not archaeology that takes the lead, but a renewed interest in stream valleys, or beekdalen, in general. As a result, several projects have risen, mostly by initiative of nature management organisations. In a way the landscape is being ‘ecologically redesigned’.\(^12\) While the province of Groningen already reserved the large area of the Zuidlaardermeer and surroundings for the development of nature and recreation, Drenthe kept spearheading agriculture in its own region.\(^13\) More recently the municipalities (Aa en Hunze, Tynaarlo and Borger-Odoorn) and the province of Drenthe are trying to change this image and make the Hunze valley more desirable in terms of recreation, tourism and nature.\(^14\) While agriculture is still a dominating factor in the province’s policy, recreation, nature management and in a lesser degree archaeology, are deemed more important now than ever before.\(^15\) Already in 1995, Hans Elerie stressed that the cultural-historical values of the stream valleys in Drenthe deserve more attention, especially when it comes to
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nature development. It is like he said later, together with During and Groenedijk: “When it comes to preservation of cultural-historical values, it seems they are most vulnerable in our natural environments, because public opinion is so distanced from it.”

Changes to the landscape are not limited to re-meandering of the Hunze and reserving pastures for ecological development. In many areas in the north of the Netherlands new forest is developed, including the Hunze valley. There is a wish to increase the diversity of species, since it is very small in the Hunze valley (compared to the conditions before extensive human interference). The wish to rekindle the ecological infrastructure goes hand in hand with new demands for water management, caused by the subsidence (inkinglinking) as a consequence of gas extraction. Next to ecological development, also drinking water, recreational activities, improvement of living areas and the cultural-historical character of the “peat villages” are important factors of the changes the landscape would have to achieve. Especially the relation between drinking water abstraction from surface water and nature development was spearheaded in the plans. In fact, drinking water companies have admitted that the Hunze valley is the best location for water abstraction in the north of the Netherlands.

In 1993 the first steps towards concrete plans to renew the Hunze valley were made with the Waterhuishoudingsplan Drenthe. That same year the archaeological bureau RAAP executed an investigation in the valley, producing an evaluation of archaeological values and a plan for protection. Sites from the Late Palaeolithic were considered to be especially important. The municipality of Aa en Hunze has a relatively high number of high category sites (category two), meaning sites that have a high chance of harbouring intact archaeological finds, which at the time of Scholte Lubberink’s research were inadequately protected. The advice towards to the province focused on incorporating ways to protect archaeological sites of importance within nature development and management projects, as well as spatial planning projects.

The changes to the Hunze to a more ‘authentic’ landscape are definitely not bad for archaeology. It resulted in a lot of work for archaeological companies or institutions, like Grontmij, RAAP and MUG ingenieursbureau. Next to this, the reconstructed appearance of the landscape has potential for all kinds of public outreach. Visitors are already attracted by the natural and ecological values the new landscape has to offer and are likely to be interested in stories of the past. The peat reclamation areas east of the Hunze have already been marked as preferred locations for the development of new lodging. Also locations for new day attractions are named, such as on both sides of the N33 road or Gasseltijveensche-kanaal and Gasselte for the Star railway.

II.4 Archaeology and Landscape: authentic potentials

The discussion of landscape studies is a crucial point in this thesis, because of the central role played by the Hunze valley: a complex, yet undervalued landscape. For setting up a public archaeology project here, it is essential to go into the theory behind landscape in relation to archaeology. In this case, the landscape carries identity and atmosphere determinative for the reception of a public archaeology project. When discussing landscape and archaeology, a clear definition of ‘landscape’ is indispensable. Below, several definitions of ‘landscape’ are set out as taken from the Merriam-Webster dictionary:
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1. a picture representing a view of natural inland scenery or the art of depicting such scenery
2a. The landforms of a region in the aggregate
2b. A portion of territory that can be viewed at one time from one place
2c. A particular area of activity, f.e. the political landscape

These are general definitions of landscape and therefore not specified towards archaeology. However, I find they can be useful here as this thesis discusses not only landscape in archaeological context, but also landscape perception. The first definition given above is not suitable here for obvious reasons: it refers to landscape in visual art, such as paintings or photographs. The second group of definitions focuses on landscape in the actual outdoors. Definition 2b specifically directs the image of the actual outdoors by referring to whatever can be seen at one time from one place. The Hunze valley, however, would fit more with definition 2a, since the valley in its entirety is much too large to be seen from one place at any given time. This definition also does not exclude any other features in the landscape that would be considered unnatural, but instead takes everything together to belong to the landscape. Definition 2c could be used for the Hunze valley, for example in the context of a ‘natural’ landscape or political landscape. For this thesis I would like to stick with definition 2a, in which the landscape is described as the landforms of an area (the Hunze valley) in the aggregate.

Studying the landscape is essential to archaeology, since the surroundings played an important part in the way people have organised and constructed their lives. A landscape biography can be helpful to picture the human processes that are now mostly invisible on the surface, the ‘stories’ of a landscape that need to be revealed by research. In such a biography the ‘life history’ of an ever-changing cultural landscape is explained. The making of such a biography is very interdisciplinary in nature, which is no surprise considering the many components a landscape exists of, such as geology, climate, vegetation, human processes, etc. While a landscape biography of the Hunze landscape would add a lot to the process of the preparation of a good public archaeology project, it requires extensive research and mapping of a wide range of landscape elements. Due to time and size restraints, this thesis is not the place for a full landscape biography, although it would be highly desirable. Next to adding a lot to the scientific understanding of a landscape, a landscape biography has a lot of influence on spatial planning and the subsequent design of the landscape. Instead, some parts of the Hunze landscape biography will be highlighted in this thesis.

Many landscapes hold powerful notions of the past, but these could be hidden without the knowledge needed to recognise or interpret them. To complicate things further, the perception we, as a modern society, have of landscape is probably completely different from that of our ancestors. The little hints that we have about the perception of the landscape in the past comes from written sources, such as folklore and assumptions based on extrapolation. It is suggested that the division between internal and external places in the landscape was introduced during the period of strong christianisation in the Middle Ages and established in Renaissance Europe. Before then, this division was not as pronounced. The realisation that our current perception of the landscape, that of the ‘natural’ vs the ‘civilised’, mostly derives from the Medieval outlook on the world, will help in understanding the prejudices we have towards the earlier past. That the number of archaeological finds is much larger on the higher, dryer and sandy soils than in the valley could be the cause and result of this prejudice. If it seems unlikely to us that anyone would want to live in the wet valleys (wet, cold, mosquitos, unable to build long-lasting structures, grow crops or keep cattle), because of our perception of what makes an ideal living environment, why would we look there? As a result we know very little about the activities in the valleys in the early past, although many Oversticht castles are situated there. Yet trying to imagine how our ancestors saw the landscape could have a lot of
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impact on our appreciation of the landscape today.

The Hunze is a landscape with a high level of authenticity. As Cruysheer already pointed out, elements in the landscape contribute to the feeling of authenticity in monuments or tokens from the past.\textsuperscript{37} Compared to museums (with perhaps the exception of outdoor museums), landscapes are much more suitable for creating this feeling of authenticity. The reason for this is that in museums objects, or the story, are taken from their context and put in a modern, un-authentic setting.\textsuperscript{38} Jan Kolen agrees, stating that especially landscapes are capable of carrying a high sense of authenticity, because they are layered (in their identity) and durable.\textsuperscript{39} It must be noted that museums, a book, or any other form of “un-authentic” presentation, have different things to offer than a landscape, such as providing a setting to tell the archaeological story.\textsuperscript{40} The Hunze as a landscape (landforms of a region in the aggregate) will play a major part in the forming of a public archaeology project. The ongoing transformations in the Hunze valley will add to the authentic feel of the landscape, increasing also the potential for telling archaeological stories.

II.5 The Hunze: genesis, transformation and archaeology

To begin the story of the Hunze, its geographic past will be described, explaining the origins of the current physique of the landscape, followed by the stories of human habitation and exploitation. I will outline the general story of the Hunze valley, after which specific (archaeological) sites and findings within the municipality of the Aa en Hunze will be discussed.

II.5.1 Saalian (238.000 – 126.000 years ago) & Eemian (130.000 – 115.000 years ago)

In the Saalian ice age an ice sheet covered about half of the Netherlands (including what would later become the Hunze valley).\textsuperscript{41} Large amounts of melt water from the glaciers were running under the ice and hit the elevated Hondsrug, parallel to the Hunze valley and the highest landscape element in the North, also conceived under the ice and running north-south from Groningen city to about Emmen. The water deflected on the Hondsrug, causing a parallel deep valley of 30 to 50 meters deep and 10 km wide at some points.\textsuperscript{42} An alternative theory is that the ice itself scoured at the sediments below.\textsuperscript{43} Either way, an extensive and wide valley of the river Hunze was created. Ice melted and water levels rose during the interglacial of the river Hunze. In the north of the valley the tides were depositing sea clay, while in the south fluvial sediments were carried in.\textsuperscript{44} During this time, the height differences between the highest point of the Hondsrug and the lowest point of the valley was, to Dutch standards, a dramatic 80 meters, but was quickly decreased as sediments (mainly sand, gravel and loam) filled most of the valley (fig. II.1).\textsuperscript{45}

II.5.2 Weichselian 116.000 – 11.700 years ago: Late Palaeolithic

Hereafter, during the Weichselian glaciation (the last Ice Age), no ice sheet reached the Netherlands, but harshly cold conditions caused an ‘arctic desert’, which blew the sands on the dry North Sea bed in a southwestern direction. A thick layer of sediments was deposited on the west side of the Hondsrug, creating the Drents Plateau.\textsuperscript{46} On the east side deposition of aeolian sands also occurred, creating a hilly landscape. Some of these glacial dunes can still be found at the famous Duunsche Landen, west of Annen.\textsuperscript{47} Nearing the end of the Weichselian the landscape in the Hunze valley was full of sandy hills and lows, with the higher areas covered in grasses, herbs and small birches, while the lows were wetter and grew willows instead of birches.\textsuperscript{48} The local wildlife consisted of several species, among which reindeer, wild horses and arctic foxes. At this time the Hunze was a small, shifting stream, flowing in a wide belt of boggy grounds.\textsuperscript{49} The versatile landscape offered a lot of opportunities for Prehistoric hunters: hunting, fishing
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and gathering of other foods. In the earlier periods there was hardly any peat, making movement through the valley in the summer relatively easy. The oldest remains of human activity in the Hunze valley are from the second half of the Late Palaeolithic. They were especially attracted to the hills close to the Hunze or to former swamps and lakes.

The Tjonger/Federmesser hunter-gatherers have left many traces in the valley. As a warmer period began, they hunted on elk, wild boar and moose in the open birch and pine forests. Fish was also part of the diet. The Tjonger people settled their tents on the dryer hills in the summer, next to the water.

Archaeological finds are concentrated in these areas and consist mostly of flint objects, like: scrapers, arrow heads, borers, etc. Unfortunately, the sites are often disturbed by modern activities, like leveling and ploughing. Organic remains in old, filled brook arms are very well-preserved and offer a wealth of information otherwise unknown (on the sandy Pleistocene soils).

During the succeeding warmer period in the Holocene, many parts of the Hunze landscape developed permanently wet conditions, because of poor drainage, rain water and seepage from groundwater. In these areas peat started to develop rapidly, especially covering the southern part of the Hunze valley. East of the Hunze stagnant rainwater created ideal circumstances for Sphagnum (peat moss) to grow, while in most other areas more calcareous and nutritious waters fed broekveen (carr peat), zeggenveen (sedge peat) and rietzeggenveen (reed-sedge peat).

Of these peat types, zeggenveen was the most dominant in the Hunze valley. Next to peat, forests of birch and alder developed in the wetlands, the so-called broekbossen.

II.5.3 Mesolithic

The development of increasingly wet conditions as described above, took place specifically during the Atlantic. It is in this time period that the valley was a popular spot for Mesolithic humans to live. Meanwhile the landscape had changed into that of deciduous forests with oak, lime, elm, hazel and alder.

Nearly on all flanks of sand ridges near water in the valley, remains of Mesolithic settlements can be found. The meander ridges (the shores of the Hunze streams) are also rich in archaeological finds. After the ice ages, the sea level rose. This in combination with increased seepage from the western Drents Plateau and Hondsrug, created waterlogging.
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conditions in the *Hunze* valley. 60 This had drastic effects on the physique of the landscape between 8000 and 3000 BC, with the upcoming of peat and rich alder forests. 61 It is at this time that east of the *Hunze* the largest peat moss bogs in the Netherlands grew, fed by rainwater. As a result, these areas became inaccessible for a long time. The more accessible, foresty areas were sometimes burned by the Mesolithic population in order to create open fields attractive to game. 62 For the rest, human beings had little influence on the appearance of the landscape at this time.

### II.5.4 Neolithic

During the Neolithic the first farming activities took place in *Drenthe* and large scale clearances began. 63 These farmers belonged to the Funnel beaker culture, named after the shape of their pottery. The purpose of the clearances was to create agricultural fields. Animals were herded in the forests, slowly creating more open land, sometimes filled with heather. Slowly the primeval forest disappeared and made way for an open park-like landscape. At this time the *Hondsruig* became very densely populated, possibly the most densely populated area in the Netherlands. 64 The *Hunze* valley was close by and very useful for the local population, which settled especially on the light sands of the *Hondsruig*, probably because it was dryer than in the valley. Next to the obvious source of drinking water, the main purpose of the river for past people was that of transport, for example to get to the hard-to-reach areas in the swampy wetlands in the southwest of *Groningen*. 65 Travelling took place by canoes in open water, while in the peaty areas bog ways were built. 66 In Prehistory many single archaeological finds have been retrieved from wet contexts, many also in the *Hunze* valley. Many of these seem to have been ritually deposited. The depositions occurred in various types of wet areas. From the Neolithic the best known examples for this are the flint axes. 67 While smaller, polished and used axes have been retrieved from settlements and graves, large axes were found in wet areas, near running water. These axes were imported from regions like Scandinavia and Germany, unpolished, unused and in a likely impractical size. Their importance is further highlighted by evidence of red ochre on the surface and of being wrapped and unwrapped repeatedly over time, before eventually being deposited. In *Drenthe* the axes have been found mostly on the west side of the *Hunze*. 68

### II.5.5 Bronze & Iron Age

A downside of living on the light sandy grounds, was that the nutrients in the soil were quickly depleted, causing sand-drifts. Next to that, the grazing of animals in forests continued in the Bronze and Iron Age. 69 However, in the Bronze Age new innovations lead to more intensive farming, such as the introduction of the horse as a beast of burden and mount and woolen and possibly linen clothing. 70 Bronze tools and jewellery made their appearance at this time, showing the intensifying trading networks over Europe.

In the Iron Age people were slowly abandoning the *Hondsruig*, favouring the fertile boulder clay soils. 71 This was the first time large-scale exploitation of the boulder clay soils was possible, with the introduction of new techniques and materials (iron) and an increasingly open landscape (due to grazing). The Celtic fields were introduced in the Iron Age, with small settlements nearby, and were used well into Roman times. 72

In the Bronze Age the number of depositions in wetlands skyrocketed, with a whole new range of artefacts, each associated with a certain type of terrain (fig. II.2). 73 Again, most objects appear to be unused or specifically made for their ritual or ceremonial purpose. In most cases the objects appear to be bronze weaponry, with the possible exception of axes. In the Iron Age there is an addition of different objects in the wetlands next to ceremonial weaponry, like (Roman) rotary querns, braids of human hair, bog bodies, fish traps, wooden objects such as wheels, wool yarn, garbage dumps, fibulae and bronze containers. 74

While the Romans did not settle this far north in the Netherlands, their presence can be traced through numerous finds.
still be seen in the archaeological record. Roman rotary querns of basaltic lava and other valuable items have been retrieved, such as the bronze fibula found in Torenveen (table II.3). The rotary querns are often found in peat and are possibly part of a ritual deposition.\textsuperscript{75} Many of these items are likely to have been in possession of the non-Roman locals during their deposition.

II.5.6 Middle Ages

After 800 AD more permanent settlements arose on the location of previous esdorpen (a village situated on essen).\textsuperscript{76} The fields were kept fertile by mixing sods and manure. This method raised the fields some; they are now referred to as essen. The essen expanded greatly in the Middle Ages, corresponding with the expanding of villages and the increasing number of villages. These act as a cover of older layers, so archaeological finds are usually abundant in and near these locations. Until around 800 AD the settlements on the essen were shifted regularly, because the houses were not very durable.\textsuperscript{77} The site of an old farm was usually put to use as a field, rich in nutrients thanks to the manure and garbage left there. The characteristic landscape that many people associate with Drenthe as a province, is that of fields of heather, grazed by large herds of sheep. This landscape only came into being after 1450, when large herds of sheep were introduced to the area.\textsuperscript{78} Before then, the landscape was a mosaic of grasses, herbs, heather, thickets, open forest and peat. From the 11th-12th century onwards the areas close to the river and streams were exploited extensively. The water seeping into the valley from the Hondsruig and Drents Plateau was much richer in nutrients, allowing for a wild growth of vegetation on the west side of the Hunze. The willow and alder forests were removed to make way for meadows, or hoolanden, used for the harvesting of hay and the gathering of willow branches.\textsuperscript{79} The wet and green lands surrounding the Hunze were vitally important to the Medieval population. Such good pastures were rare on the higher grounds.\textsuperscript{80} The higher grounds were used predominantly for grazing of cattle, horses and later sheep. Animals had to be transported on foot over the maze of sandy ridges, hills and voorden (fords) to get to the remote valley. Because food for them was scarce, the cattle was often sold at a young age to farmers in the west, where they could grow nice
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and fat.81 Only after the Middle Ages were the higher pastures divided into long, narrow plots, separated by houtwallen (rows of trees and shrubberies) or ditches. While the area was mostly inaccessible, the habitation was far from primitive. Evidence of cobble stone pathways, wooden watermills, weirs and aalstallen (gardens in the river to attract and catch eels) have been found along the Hunze.82

In the Middle Ages people began peat reclamation, also referred to as the “brown gold”, for fuel.83 At first this reclamation consisted of digging small trenches to drain the peat and create fuel as well as dry land. Near the end of the Middle Ages the various landowners started dividing the peat lands.84 New settlements on the edge of the peat fields came into being, stretched out like a ribbon to allow every settler a strip of peat to exploit.85 Most of these villages can be recognised by their name ending with –veen (peat), like Gieterveen, Zuidlaarderveen and Annerveen. With the developing of the peat market, the settlements were also developing and more extensive changes were made to the waterways for better transportation. At this time agriculture was very limited and existed only in the form of self-produce to provide for the daily needs, but not to sell surplus.86

II.5.7 Modern times

As the city of Groningen was developing rapidly, the attention of religious institutions was drawn to the large peat fields in Drenthe.87 Peat was drained before it was dug, after which it would be dried and used as fuel. In a landscape already mostly devoid of the forests once present, this was a welcome new and cheap way to heat living spaces. For a long time the monasteries in Groningen controlled large parts of Drenthe solely for the reclamation of peat. The lands they owned were situated adjacent to the Hunze, because transportation was simplest over water. Before long the city of Groningen took over a lot of these lands, and most of the fuel was shipped to beer breweries and brick works.88 The Hunze quickly became an investor’s hot spot. Without the peat trade, the large economic developments that took place (mostly in Groningen) would probably not have occurred. At first it was only the natural waterways, like the Hunze, that were used for transport, sometimes with small adjustments.89 New villages popped up where peat reclamation was taking place. When Groningen dug the Schuitendiep (canal), creating a direct connection between the Hunze and the city, it acquired monopoly over the bogs.90 This and the placement of a knipje (a type of sluice) near Annen increased the navigability of the river and raised the price of land.

As the peat reclamation developed and an increasing number of parties were involved in transport, digging, trading, charging toll and adjustments to the waterways, more conflicts arose.91 Groningen rigidly kept the monopoly over the waterways, which caused most conflicts to remain unsolved. True peat colonies made their appearance, with the city taking the largest assets. It was not until 1900 that the means and techniques for cultivating the river landscape were available.92 Before then techniques existed mostly of: draining with a series of small ditches, sanding the peaty soils for stability, crop rotation of oats for improvement of grasslands, irrigation and inundation for fertility and burning. Also after 1900 manure, terpaarde (terp soil) and later artificial fertilizers were used, greatly increasing the potential arable.93 The fields were worked on previous peat lands. Growing crops here was not without problems.94 The stagnant waters and high acidity soils proved ideal for weeds and parasites like fluke (Trematoda sp.). In the south of the Hunze valley (near Drouwen and Buinen) buckwheat was produced as a relatively undemanding crop.95

In 1817 a convenant was signed that changed the Hunze for good. It made sure the peat was transported over the Groningen fairways, while an increase in draining water caused more floods in the Hunze valley in winter.96 Nevertheless, the province of Drenthe
developed a booming industry after 1900. Instead of the peat fields adjacent to the Hunze, now the peat fields in the east were the focus of exploitation. The industry in this area is referred to as the veenkoloniiën (peat colonies). After the Winschoterdiep canal was dug, Groningen extended its influence deeper into the peat fields and made sure she got a fair share of the profits. The demand for peat was higher than ever and the city had to look for other sources, deeper into the province. The city did all it could to annihilate the competition from Drenthe. There is little the competition could do against the city, because of her monopoly of the fairways. Furthermore, in the province of Groningen new canals were joined on the existing canals, making a quick and profitable peat trade possible. In turn, the city demanded ownership of these new canals on Drenthe territory. The Hunze began to be canalised, making the peat extractions in the western parts of the valley much more efficient, but only for a short while, as new waterways were being dug to be connected with the canals of Groningen in the east. Much of the original landscape was disappearing. Agriculture was intensifying and utilising more land, with potatoes as a lucrative newcomer.

Because of the continuous territorial squabbles between the several parties in Drenthe with the city of Groningen, it was only after 1956 that efficient plans and changes were made for the ‘improvement’ of the Hunze. The whimsical and wild Hunze was thus transformed in a slow-moving straight ditch, surrounded by potato fields, instead of yellow marigolds (Caltha palustris). Some 100 years ago the ideal image of the Hunze valley was not that of an ecological haven and of nature management (as it is now), but of a prosperous agricultural region. As a result of this goal, most of the Hunze landscape has been designed for agricultural efficiency. The Hunze was canalised and the landscape now resembles that of most post-peat extraction areas in the north of the Netherlands.

II.6 Archis case-studies
Before assessing what elements of the Hunze landscape and past would be most suitable for public archaeology projects, it is important to understand the nature of the landscape’s past in more detail. For this reason I would like to present example case-studies from the region. As case-studies several sources have been used to shape an image of the archaeology present in the research area (the municipality Aa en Hunze). First, as is custom for archaeologists, I have consulted the Dutch online database Archis. Later in II.7, several reports of archaeological investigations and their findings will be discussed, along with some recent findings, not yet reported. Some of the findings from that research and the Archis observations undoubtedly overlap.

Of the Archis observations near the Hunze in the municipality of Aa en Hunze a number of them stand out, because of their rarity or interesting nature; these are listed below in several categories in tables II.1 - II.6.

II.6.1 Palaeolithic and Mesolithic material
A large portion of the finds from the research area seem to be from the (late) Palaeolithic and Mesolithic. As mentioned, the environment and climate at these times were very different from now. In Archis several finds can be traced of the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic activity in the area (table II.1). The Palaeolithic material from the region is mostly limited to production waste, but occasional tools can also be found. In most cases the finds are no longer in situ, because of the dynamic processes of the valley since Palaeolithic times.

In 1969, near the village of Havelte excavations and surveys were carried out in search of Mesolithic remains by the University of Michigan and the University of Groningen. Remains are almost exclusively lithic artefacts and most of them were found on the surface, although also a concentration of hearths was uncovered (observation 238124). During the Mesolithic humans had to adapt their hunter-gatherer way of life to
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the conditions after the Ice Age. It is likely that only a very small part of Mesolithic sites can still be found in situ, because of the drastic changes the landscape has been through over the last centuries. Flint artefacts from the Mesolithic are usually recognised by microlithic retouched tools, small and often geometric in shape. Other than the microlithic tools, tools like scrapers and retouched blades are hard to pin to the Mesolithic, since they can easily occur in such a form in the previous or later periods as well. Much of the evidence we find of Mesolithic activities consist of waste material, not tools. Of these tools the backed blades, like observation 137135 (Elzenmaat) are very common in the northern Netherlands Mesolithic.

When comparing high sandy Mesolithic sites with those near streams and in valleys, it becomes apparent that the finds assemblages from the different localities range significantly, with backed blades and larger retouched pieces occurring more frequently in the higher areas than in the lower areas (stream and valley). The finds all suggest there is a variation in the activities of Mesolithic populations in the province. Other signs point to the increasing of the population after 8000 BP in the province. This is closely related to the rise in sea level during the Postglacial, after which populations were forced to more inland as previously dry environments were changing.

The finds indicate that the creation and use of flint tools took place near the Hunze. Some finds give a clear indication of their use in the valley, such as the fish net weight (239528) at Gieterveen, which would have been used as an aid for fishing. Other tools could have been used for a range of activities: scrapers to clean hides, knifes to cut string (sinew), hides, plants and roots, flesh etc., grinding stones for grinding tools made of several materials (including wood, bone and antler), and so on.

II.6.2 Stone axes, hammeraxes and mace heads

In this category larger stone tools have been gathered, mostly axes and hammeraxes but also mace heads (Geröllkeule). The examples mentioned here are from the Mesolithic up to the Bronze/Iron Age and show many different types (table II.2). As described earlier, these ‘weapon’-type objects are perceived to have ended in the valley as depositions, perhaps of ritual nature.

Core axes, like the one from Bonnerveen (239536) occur late in the Mesolithic and are associated with the De Leien-Wartena...
This group had its settlements mainly around rivers and open waters, but they seem to have been mostly absent from Drenthe. In the Neolithic core axes were continued to be used.

The Adze found at Stokdillen near Gasselte is dated to the Neolithic. Associated shafts have been uncovered in wet conditions before, like the one at Nieuw-Dordrecht made of yew, although to the author no examples from the Hunze valley are known. Geröllkeule or stone mace heads are a rather mysterious object that seem to have occurred during the Mesolithic and Neolithic. The objects occur in several types and consist of a stone with or without a shaft hole of a rather round appearance. They are considered to be rare compared to adzes and axes, but occur quite a lot in the municipality of Aa en Hunze (table II.2) and the province of Drenthe as a whole. While their English name refers to a type of weapon, little is known about their use.

The flint axes, sometimes polished, are typical of the Neolithic and in the northern Netherlands belonging mostly to the Funnel Beaker Culture. Their occurrence in the valley is not surprising, since they are often associated with ritual deposition in wet conditions. As a consequence, these objects have been subject to extensive research. Additionally, the axes occur both in graves as well as in waterlogged conditions; but Wentink et al. consider these axes in both location types respectively belonging to a whole different Funnel Beaker cosmology. To demonstrate, the axes which were found at the edges of bogs, along streams, are often exceedingly large and hardly practical, imported from Scandinavia or Germany, but never ‘finished’ (unpolished). Additionally, many axes were not used for axe-associated...
activities, but instead show traces of having been wrapped and unwrapped repeatedly over their use-life.\textsuperscript{119} Some of the axes also show traces having come in contact with red ochre, which seems to have been applied on the cutting edges. None of the Neolithic flint axes in the municipality of Aa en Hunze have been found in grave contexts, which makes it likely they have been deposited for some kind of ritual associated with the specific landscape-types available in the Hunze valley.

Hammeraxes are basically stone tools with a cutting edge on one side and a hammer-butt on the other. Those from the Neolithic are associated with the Dutch Protruding Foot Beaker Culture.\textsuperscript{120} Nackengebogene Äxte is the German name for hammeraxes from the Bronze/Iron Age, although of this group it is not certain if the tools were ever used as an axe or hammer (or both).\textsuperscript{121} Unlike the hammeraxes from the Neolithic, the later examples are not made of flint, but of stone. This makes it easier to add shaft holes, but makes the cutting edges blunter. Of the types of Nackengebogene hammeraxes, the Scandinavian type is most rare in the Netherlands, with only a few known examples.\textsuperscript{122} The other types that occur in the Netherlands are called Muntendam and Baexem, after their site locations. Achterop & Brongers talk about two Scandinavian type hammeraxes in the Netherlands, of which 66 D51 is one (observation number 55) and can be described as belonging to the East-Sweden and general Scandinavian type.\textsuperscript{123} This is the hammeraxe retrieved from Gasselternijveen with observation number 55 (fig. II.3A). The other hammeraxe types are very common in the province of Drenthe, as well as in Groningen. Observation 67, found near Gasselte, is also mentioned as type Muntendam 2 (fig. II.3B).\textsuperscript{124} Achterop & Brongers continue to state that many hammeraxes in the province of Drenthe are associated with the finding of the Valtherbrug peat trackway: in the peat the hammeraxes are found along the track and on the sand where the track ways end; at these locations seem to be concentrations.\textsuperscript{125} Although many hammeraxes were found in peat, there is also evidence of hammeraxes being retrieved from wet brook land areas, in which at least in one case a piece of the handle was still lodged in the shaft hole, thanks to the preservation provided by these wet conditions.\textsuperscript{126} It is to be expected that more such handles can be found in wet conditions in the future.

\subsection*{II.6.3 Metal objects}

Most of the metal objects worth mentioning here are from the metal ages, although one with a modern date has been added to show the versatility of the metal objects in the Hunze valley (table II.3).

Two fibulae have been uncovered near the Hunze in the municipality of Aa en Hunze. One of them is a so-called bronze spectacle fibula (fig. II.4) from the Late Bronze Age, the other is an Iron Age/Roman pin. These objects would have been used to hold clothing like cloaks in place and also had a decorative purpose. Some fibulae were quite impressive and signaled to everyone the status and wealth of a person. Because these items were relatively small, they were also easily lost. It is likely the objects retrieved in the municipality suffered the same fate, as pins of all sorts seemed to have been reserved as gifts for burials.\textsuperscript{127}

A bronze palstave axe from the Middle Bronze Age, two socketed axes (one with handle) from the Late Bronze Age and a copper/bronze bladed axe from the Early Iron Age nicely show the transition of metal axe-types that took place in the area during these times. Like the proceeding stone axes and hammeraxes, their bronze counterparts seem to have similar functions, as these also ended up in waterlogged conditions. Some metal axes do show signs of having been used, but still their deposition in such conditions are likely to have been ceremonial in nature.\textsuperscript{128} The objects that did not end in burials (rarely) or in wet landscapes (majority) and consisted of the largest group of metalwork, were likely recycled.\textsuperscript{129}

The copper bucket is of a modern date and could have been used for activities that took place in or near the Hunze.
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Figure II.3A+B: hammeraxes from near the Hunze. A. Hammeraxe ‘Scandinavian’ from Gasselternijveen. B. Hammeraxe ‘Muntendam 2’ from Gasselte (after Achterop & Brongers 1979, pp. 303; 311).

Figure II.4: Example of a bronze spectacle-type fibula, found in north Greece and dating around the 7th or 8th century BC (after Spectacle Fibula with pin 1997-2017 [online]).
II.6.4 Objects of organic nature

Organic materials can be preserved very well in waterlogged conditions. This includes the peat bogs that have been part of the Hunze landscape, but also parts of the river's course that no longer exist and have now been buried. Most of the organic finds from the municipality Aa en Hunze date to the Neolithic (table II.4). These give a great insight into the use of tools made of organic materials that are not preserved on the higher and dryer grounds, on which the Funnel Beaker Culture settlements are believed to have been situated. It also shows that, while perhaps not preferred as the location of settlements, the valley did have its purpose and activities were taking place there.

The one-piece disc wheel found in Gasselterboerveen is mentioned in Van der Waal's promotion (fig. II.5A+B).\textsuperscript{130} It was found in summer 1838 during peat reclamation activities just east of the Hunze river.\textsuperscript{131} It was situated just above the sand underlying the peat. A similar, but smaller wheel was supposedly found, but chopped to pieces by peat-cutters to continue their work. The wheel was originally round, but due to drying and traction retains an oval shape now.\textsuperscript{132} The wheel, like other one-piece disc wheels, was made of a single piece of oak. About the use of such wheels rather little is known.\textsuperscript{133} During the Neolithic both two-wheeled as well as four-wheeled wagons could have occurred.\textsuperscript{134} In general it is agreed that wagons with such heavy disc wheels were drawn by pairs of oxen. Horses as a draught animal only appeared in Europe later, in the Bronze Age, with the introduction of war chariots and spoked wheels.\textsuperscript{135}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Observation no. & Location & Details & Date \\
\hline
33448 & Bonnermade/Gieten & Bronze spectacle fibula & Late Bronze Age \\
\hline
46998 & Aardappelmeelfabriek/ Gasselternijveen & Flint “Rechteck” axe and bronze palstave axe & Middle Neolithic-Middle Bronze Age \\
\hline
227 & Boerdijk/ Gasselternijveen & Bronze socketed axe & Late Bronze Age \\
\hline
238952 & Hunze/Nieuw- Annerveen & Copper bucket & Modern era \\
\hline
137209 & Gasselternijveen & Bronze socketed axe with handle & Late Bronze Age \\
\hline
137211 & Torenveen & Bronze fibula/pin & Iron Age-Roman \\
\hline
239174 & Looweg/Kostvlies & Heavily worn copper/bronze bladed axe & Middle Neolithic-Early Iron Age \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Table II.3: Archis observations of metal objects.}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Observation no. & Location & Details & Date \\
\hline
137185 & Oude Landen/ Bonnerven & Pierced moose antler hoe/hack & Neolithic-Roman \\
\hline
239518 & Hunze/Oostmoersche vaart/Gasselterboerveen & Pierced antler hack/hoe & Neolithic \\
\hline
239564 & Bonnerklap/Gieterven & Pierced moose antler hack/hoe & Mesolithic-Iron Age \\
\hline
239565 & Gasselterboerveen & Wooden disc wheel & Late Neolithic \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Table II.4: Archis observations of objects of organic nature.}
\end{table}
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\textsuperscript{135} Ibid, p. 46.
It is possible that such Neolithic disc wheels ended up in the peat as votive or ritual deposits, since almost all of the Dutch wheels found are from peat and are neither brand new (for wetting the wood) or broken (deposited as waste).\textsuperscript{136} The practice of offering wooden wheels as votive depositions in bogs and other wet landscapes fits in with the information we have of Neolithic society in the north of the Netherlands. Furthermore, almost all Prehistoric finds in Europe of wheels and wagons are in some way associated with burial and ritual practices; many were found in peat, such as the sun-disc chariot of Trundholm (Denmark) and wagons of Ystad (Sweden).\textsuperscript{137}

II.6.5 Structures
Both structures mentioned in table II.5 have been retrieved during the archaeological investigations by Grontmij in 2011-2012. The findings at this site are discussed later.

II.6.6 Remaining objects
These finds do not fit in with the other categories, but are worth mentioning (table II.6). Of none of these objects an indication of its purpose in the landscape is known. Flint sickles were used to cut grasses or wheats high in silicates; their use created a typical gloss on the blade.

The flint dagger from the Bronze Age indicates that even though metallurgy had arrived throughout the Netherlands at this time, flint was still being used to create tools.\textsuperscript{138}

The napjessteen from Torenveen is a rather mysterious object. Its true function is not known, but it seems to have been some kind of quern or mortar. Napjesstenen are stones with a clear indentation in the center, caused by continual rubbing through use, but also by pecking during its creation.

II.7 Case studies
II.7.1 Torenveen Grontmij
Grontmij has performed archaeological research (including an excavation) at Torenveen in 2011-2012.\textsuperscript{139} The location is situated
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II. The Hunze, Landscape and Stories

between Gieterveen and Gasselternijveen and was intended for nature development and remeandering of the Hunze. As a result of the investigations, findings from Prehistory to modern times were retrieved.140 The majority belonged to the Late Palaeolithic and Mesolithic. A ford and possibly remains of a bridge were uncovered at Torenveen (Archis observations 445439 & 445445; see table II.5). Historical maps have shown that bridges, fords and lenten (docking stations associated with peat reclamation) all occurred in the surroundings of Torenveen.141 Fords and vonders (simple bridges; fig. II.6) were usually located at narrow places in the river where the banks were shallow. Previous stream valley research has proven that at these locations it is not unusual to recover artifacts from previous periods as well. The presence of verlaten (a type of sluice or lock) and lenten in the Hunze can be associated with the activities of the Schuitenschuiversgilde (guild dedicated to inland shipping), which was in control of the peat transport in the Hunze during the 15th century.142 Both lenten and verlaten were meant to ease and increase the accessibility of the river for peat transport. At several locations large concentrations of boulders were uncovered. Boon et al suggest these may be the remains of fords, although in some cases they may also be remains of a lent.143 Fords seem to have been present at regular intervals along the Hunze.144 In the southern part of Torenveen a set of wooden poles/beams have been uncovered, which were probably part of a bridge.145 Later also clear remains of a lent were excavated (fig. II.7).146 All of the remains of these structures are likely to date from modern times, although possible predecessors may have existed for the fords.147

In Torenveen peat reclamation has taken place from as early as the Middle Ages (while in other areas reclamation began in the 17th century).148 Part of a leather shoe sole uncovered in Torenveen has not been carbon dated, but the type was common in the 17th-19th century.149 The majority of the finds were ceramics and dated to the 17th-19th century as well. The flint material dates from Prehistory and signals the time before extensive wet conditions and peat growth.150 Overall, it is clear that most finds and structures uncovered at Torenveen are related to ship transport.151

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation no. (waarnemening)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>445439</td>
<td>Torenveen/Gieterveen</td>
<td>Boulders, indicating the location of a ford</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445445</td>
<td>Torenveen/Gieterveen</td>
<td>Remains of a wooden bridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II.5: Archis observations of structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation no. (waarnemening)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>239062</td>
<td>Duunsche Landen/Nieuw-Annerveen</td>
<td>Flint sickle with sickle-gloss</td>
<td>Neolithic-Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137201</td>
<td>Oude Landen/Bonnerveen</td>
<td>Flint dagger</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239561</td>
<td>Torenveen</td>
<td>“napjessteen” type of quern</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II.6: Archis observations of the remaining objects.

---
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II.7.2 Bonnerklap

At Bonnerklap, near Gieterveen and De Hilte (both villages built in the Late Middle Ages) a desktop survey has been carried out by Grontmij in 2004 for the same reasons as at Torenveen.\(^{152}\) In this study historical maps especially were used to chart the historical landscape in the specific area.\(^{153}\) Cadastral maps from 1811-1832 served to follow the old course of the Hunze, as well as mark the location of bridges and locks.

Hunze man

In October 2014 an extraordinary discovery was made during fieldwork at Bonnerklap. The skeleton of what appears to be a man of approximately 30 years of age was uncovered, nearly complete and in very good shape (fig. II.8).\(^{154}\) Initially, this lead archaeologists to believe that the skeleton was a couple of hundred years old, but after carbon dating the true age of the skeleton was revealed: 2500-2800 years old (Iron Age). At first glance Gertie Bergsma (MUG ingenieursbureau) could see the teeth were very worn.

---

\(^{152}\) Boon & Osinga 2012.

\(^{153}\) Ibid., pp. 16-17.

\(^{154}\) RTV Drenthe, gevonden skelet Gieterveen blijkt man uit de IJzertijd 2015 [online]; Waterschap Hunze en Aa’s 2015 [online]; MUG ingenieursbureau, persbericht: menselijk skelet aangetroffen tijdens werkzaamheden Bonnerklap 2014 [online].
This could indicate they were being used as a tool, “for example for the clasping of rope or a piece of leather”. Little is yet known about the cause of death or the reason for the man’s find location, complicated by the rarity of human remains from the Iron Age. The man could have been buried, because the skeleton is almost complete and includes small finger bones. If the man drowned or was simply thrown in the river, loss of bones would have been more apparent, caused by the current and animals. Alternatively, the man could have suffered an accidental death and was covered by sediments quickly after death.

Verlaat

Also in October 2014 the archaeologists of the MUG ingenieursbureau uncovered a wooden construction identified as a verlaat. This is a type of sluice or lock used to transport boats of ships from one water level to another higher, or lower one. The several verlaten in the Hunze were meant to keep the water level high in the river’s headwaters. At Bonnerklap in fact two verlaten were found: an older one (probably 16th century) of which only the foundations remained, and a newer one (probably 17th century) which was amazingly well-preserved (fig. II.9A+B).

The construction was built mostly from oak and pine; individual parts carried a telmerk (mark for joining fitting parts). This indicates the construction was made elsewhere and transported to this location in the Hunze to be put together, almost like an Ikea construction set. It could have been fabricated as far as Germany or Scandinavia. After 1817 most of the peat transport would have taken place over the canals to the east, making verlaten such as these obsolete.

The location of the verlaat can still be seen on cadastral maps from 1811-1832 (fig. II.10). An open-day had been organised to allow members of the public to take a closer look and ask questions to the associated archaeologists.

II.7.3 RAAP-rapport 78

Scholte Lubberink carried out research after the Hunze valley in 1993. His research consisted of an extensive investigation after the archaeological values that occur there, to provide the province and municipalities with sound advice on preservation. It was
Figure II.9A+B: Photographs of the excavations of two verlaten at Bonnerkrap; A: the older verlaat can be seen in the front, and further in the distance the wooden construction of the newer verlaat; B: ‘cross-section’ of the newer verlaat, showing the great state the wood was in (photos by MUG ingenieursbureau, 2014).
determined that the area contained 344 sites, of which those of the Late Palaeolithic (Tjonger/Federmesser tradition) were particularly important. These sites usually consist of hunting camps and single finds, like animal bones in the river beds. But the number of sites from this period is very high, not only for the region, but nationally (and possibly internationally). The report mentions ‘finds clusters’ in the area, of which one is located on the sand ridges on both sides of the Hunze near De Hilte, Torenveen and Veenhof.165 Another is located near Gasselternijveen and Buinen, on sandy ridges among which the Achterste Diep is running.166 This corresponds with the data from Archis (table II.1 - II.6), which lists a lot of finds at these toponyms. The majority of the sites are from the Late Palaeolithic and Mesolithic and concern remains of (temporary) hunter-gatherer camps. The amount of Late Palaeolithic sites is relatively large for the Netherlands.167 These sites are to be associated with the Federmesser/Tjonger culture; the Hamburg tradition is rare in the area. Mesolithic sites are hardly ever extensively researched in the Hunze valley.168 Later in Prehistory, and continuing into the Middle Ages, the nature of the finds changed drastically, because of the emergence of agriculture and a more sedentary way of life. Larger settlements, burial fields and celtic fields are abundant. Some finds, located in the wettest areas, are considered to be votive depositions, such as complete stone artefacts like flint axes, and possibly some Iron Age pottery from where the Achterste- and Voorste Diep join into the Hunze.169

While in Drenthe many burials and burial mounds have been found (dating to the Neolithic, Bronze- and Iron Age), they hardly occur near the Hunze. Nearby, such as in Eext and Hoornse Veld near Buinen, urnfields, concentrations of burial mounds and other graves were uncovered.170 In the Middle Ages peat reclamation began in the north of the Hunze valley as instigated by monasteries from Groningen. This could explain a number of Medieval pottery finds from that region.171 In the east of the valley other pottery finds from the Middle Ages, Roman period and Iron Age could be explained by the fertilisation with terp-soils in the late 1800’s and early 1900’s. The pottery probably has its origins from the associated terps.172 Scholte Lubberink further mentions wooden watermills built in the Middle Ages along the Voorste Diep near Borger and Bronneger. So far one of these has been researched.173

---

166 Ibid, p. 21.
170 Ibid, p. 22.
171 Ibid, p. 22.
II.8 Conclusion on the Hunze archaeology

Above the Archis finds and the case-studies give an idea of what kind of archaeology was found near the Hunze in the municipality of Aa en Hunze. For a public archaeology project, this information is needed to select and eventually tell the archaeological stories. The Archis finds show that main themes revolve around stone tools from the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age, in particular flints and hammeraxes/mace heads, as well as metal objects from the Bronze and Iron Age, mainly axes, and organic (wood, bone) objects from all periods. These show the diversity of the local archaeology. The mentioned case-studies concern mostly specific locations in the Hunze, such as Bonnerklap and Torenveen. These harboured many amazing finds, among which the Hunze man, possible fords and a verlaat. Some overlap between the Archis finds and the case-studies exist, namely the structures found at Torenveen. Together the finds show that the river was used extensively over a large period of time, from the earliest human habitation in Prehistory, up into modern times. In Prehistory the use of the river is still shrouded in mystery, but every find offers a glimpse into the meaning of the Hunze valley to Prehistoric people. Early flint and bone tools show the presence of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic peoples. The presence of many ‘high-status’ finds, such as well-fabricated tools and weapons of stone and metal from the Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age, show that the river had a ritual aspect next to undoubtedly being a practical source of food and water. The Hunze man’s final resting place in an old river bend indicates that the valley was also a place of death. The water, as well as the peat fields, must have been respected by the Prehistoric people. As the ages progressed, human interference increased and left more visible marks and larger archaeological remains, such as the verlaat at Bonnerklap.

These finds form the story of the Hunze valley and can be used for a public archaeology project to increase the appreciation of archaeology in the region. The people living in the municipality Aa en Hunze are probably not aware of the archaeological finds from their region, perhaps with the exception of Hunze man and the verlaat at Bonnerklap, which are recent finds and have been mentioned on local television and in newspapers. While all archaeology in a region is relevant, a selection needs to be made to create a successful project. At least the Archis finds in combination with the case-studies show the right potential of the valley.

II.8 Conclusion and the ‘story’ at hand

The Hunze valley and adjoining Hondsrug are unique landscape elements which are inextricably connected. But when it comes to recreation and awareness of the past, the Hondsrug and the Aa river west of it take the lead. Perhaps this has something to do with the long inaccessibility of the Hunze valley or the strong association with ‘boring’ potato fields. In contrast to the Hondsrug, the valley is home to straight and long canals, flat fields and pastures, seemingly with not much more going on. Besides, there are not many hunebedden, the large megalithic structures so famous for Drenthe. These are usually situated on the Hondsrug or on the higher sand ridges, not adjacent to the river. The occasional picturesque village is the remainder of an old settlement in direct contact with the Hondsrug by one of these ridges. The Hunze valley is first and foremost a farmers land, adjusted first for peat reclamation and later for agriculture (mainly potatoes).

All of these things are changing rapidly because of the decisions made by the province and associated municipalities in Drenthe (Tynaarlo, Aa en Hunze and Borger-Odoorn). The valley is no longer just the domain of farmers, as recreation, nature and water are being invested in. The landscape in and around the Hunze has been made much more attractive, especially in those parts where the Hunze has its meanders revived. There, nature once again thrives, with increased species diversity and clear waters. This, in combination with the construction of new hiking and biking trails, has made the area much more appealing for visitors, whether they are from far or near.

The archaeological remains that have been found in the valley are usually without context but reveal a great deal about the nature of the activities that must have taken place there. Tools and weapons seem to have

been ‘destroyed’ in ceremonies; people lost items like fishing net weights and fibulae. The renewing of the Hunze has set in motion a lot of archaeological research, be it desk-assessment or in the field. At Spijkerboor, remains of a lent were discovered, while at Torenveen remains of a bridge and one or more fords were revealed. More recently, at Bonnerklap, a human skeleton and a verlaat were uncovered.

It seems the recent developments are ideal for the incorporation of a public archaeology project, especially now the Hondsrug has been given Geopark status. There is room and willingness to invest time and energy in archaeology in relation to the public. This counts for the province as a whole, but the municipality Aa en Hunze has a past of having a positive attitude towards archaeology and may reap the benefits of their experience now. Next to increasing the appreciation of regional archaeology, jobs are created in a range of fields (next to archaeology and heritage, also the hospitality industry/tourism), hence the economy can benefit.

II.8.1 Choice of the story: theme for a public archaeology project

Depending on the character of a public archaeology project, one or several main themes or ‘stories’ in the history of a landscape can be kept in mind. Because the renewed parts of the Hunze are also in a way ‘historical reconstructions’, they offer some interesting opportunities for imbedding stories of the past for any visitors who might be interested. However, the past is left largely side-lined as nature & ecology, water management & abstraction are the focal points of the projects in the Hunze valley. That being said, there is definitely potential. There appear to be two main themes in history playing a part in the valley: the story of the Prehistoric people and that of the peat reclamation.

As of now, in the cases that history is even discussed, it is mostly concerned with the story of the peat reclamation: a process that began in the Late Middle Ages and continued into the 19th century. While the other ‘great theme’ of the Hunze valley seems to be that of Prehistory, it is often overlooked. This is reflected not only in the website of the Hunze valley, which also focuses largely on the nature of the valley, but also in the guidebooks of local hiking, canoeing and cycling trails. Most of the information about Prehistoric societies is based on the evidence uncovered on the higher, dryer sandy grounds, mostly based on the Hondsrug. In this case the majority of the Prehistoric stories are centered around the Funnel Beaker Culture, a society that built the famous hunebedden. Professionals are now of the opinion that, even though the settlements seem to be located on these sandy dunes, the wet valley was highly important to the survival and culture of the Prehistoric societies, not just that of the Neolithic such as the Funnel Beaker Culture, but also in the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age.

While the peat reclamation in the area plays a large role in the history of the Hunze valley and the resulting appearance of the landscape, it is a topic which has already been discussed to a great degree in all kinds of platforms, including hiking trails and similar, websites, books and musea (or museum exhibitions). The much lesser known and visible Prehistoric story of the landscape, deserves some attention. Perhaps I am slightly biased, since the Prehistory has been the main topic of my studies in archaeology in the past. Perhaps part of me is wishing to grant the ‘underdog’ of the Hunze past some more fame. Fame it truly deserves, for the wet, hostile and almost inaccessible lands had a great attraction to our ancestors and offer many clues about how such ‘magical’ landscapes were perceived. I am hopeful that putting the Prehistory of the Hunze valley in the limelight will also create and increased understanding for the measurements taken to protect this past (especially for local farmers and land owners) and an increased awareness and appreciation of the landscape and the secrets of the past it holds. I therefore propose the main theme in the past of the Hunze valley for this dissertation and public archaeology plan should be ‘Prehistory & water’, in which the relation between Prehistoric societies and the waters of the Hunze will be the central story.
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When discussing archaeology in relation to the public, often referred to as ‘public archaeology’, the first question that should come to mind is “who is the public?”. In other words: what does ‘public’ mean in this context and, consequently, how is determined what the target audience(s) for a project should or will be. Questioning the definition of ‘public’ and ‘public archaeology’ is integral to the development of the discipline and something that is often overlooked in literature on the subject.¹ In this chapter the relationship between archaeology (and/or archaeologists) and ‘the public’ is investigated. Using the stakeholders of the municipality of the Aa en Hunze, mentioned in the previous chapter as a case-study, I will illuminate the process of choosing an audience for a project, as well as discussing the problems that can come along during this task. Eventually, this should lead to the selection of a ‘public’, a target audience most suitable to involve in an archaeological project in the Hunze landscape.

III.1 Public(s)

There is a lot of ambiguity in the use of terms concerning the relations between the public and archaeology. Admittedly, using English semantics for the situation in the Netherlands in this thesis complicates things further. The Society for American Archaeology (SAA)² has a complete website dedicated to public archaeology, on which this ambiguity is discussed.³ According to this society, ‘public archaeology’ used to mean (and in some cases still means) descriptions and “how-tos” of involving and engaging the public. Nowadays, however, the focus world-wide is on theory, in a manner which expands far beyond the practical matters of the public and archaeology.

The implications of this growing discipline are being investigated by academics and colleagues alike. As a result, several authors have attempted to define ‘public’ and ‘public archaeology’. Skeates et al. highlight the need for a critical evaluation of the term ‘public archaeology’.⁴ In fact, the whole Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology is written with the disambiguation of the terms in mind. Carman admits ‘public archaeology’ is a term that is not well-defined and is used broadly.⁵ He mentions some definitions other authors have used, reproduced here. Schadla-Hall for example defines ‘public archaeology’ as any area within archaeology that interacts or has the potential to interact with the public.⁶ Ascherson, on the other hand, states there are two possible definitions: a) it is the problems that arise when archaeology moves into the real world of economics and political conflict, accordingly, it is about ethics and b) the task of asking who are in charge of the definition of heritage and in what way they can profit from this.⁷ Unfortunately, there is little written about a clear definition of ‘public’ (as a noun) within academic archaeology. The Merriam-Webster dictionary gives the following definitions of ‘the public’:⁸

- The people of a country, state, etc.
- A group of people who have a shared interest, quality, etc.
- The group at which a particular activity or enterprise aims.

There is a tendency in archaeology, but also in other disciplines, to connote ‘the public’ with a variety of different meanings.⁹ For this reason I have decided to incorporate the definitions stated by the Merriam-Webster dictionary as a reasonable starting point. The second and third of the above definitions are inevitably part of the first, which could be equated to “the general public”. The last definition of Merriam-Webster is especially interesting, because it is a definition not often used in archaeology, but more so in that of other (non)scientific disciplines, such as PR
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and marketing. A simple synonym for this term could be ‘target audience’.

‘Public’ as an adjective is also commonly (and confusingly) used. On the subject of archaeological heritage management most seem to agree that archaeological remains and the treatment thereof are a matter of ‘public’ concern. In fact, one could wonder if there even is such a thing as ‘private’ archaeology. Well, not according to McGimsey, who stated in his *Public Archaeology* (1972: the earliest publication using the term ‘public archaeology’): “[...] because no individual may act in a manner such that the public right to knowledge of the past is unduly endangered or destroyed”. So while ‘private archaeology’ could exist (perhaps in the form of a private collection of artefacts), it is something that should be – and for the most part is – avoided at all costs. Keeping the above mentioned definitions in mind, I would like to propose the following definition for this thesis:

**Public: a more or less categorised group of individuals which is supposed to have, or is likely to acquire, a latent or active interest in ideas, products or services provided by an organisation (or an [group of] individual[s]) which in its turn is interested in acquiring the attention and/or support of this group, resulting in a certain amount of reciprocity between public and organisation, as well as an increased demand for the organisation’s services.**

Now the public has been defined, it is time to define ‘public archaeology’. The SAA describes Public Archaeology as subject to national and regional styles and containing different areas of expertise within its practice (museums, education, descendant involvement, ethics, cultural tourism, etc.). Furthermore, they mention the large variety of research objectives the discipline has, including, but not limited to: educational archaeology, archaeology activism, community archaeology, civically engaged archaeology and the archaeology of social justice. Because of this diversity in specialism, objectives and practices, the SAA decides not to insist on a fixed definition for public archaeology. While this is useful for a website that focuses on public archaeology in general, for a thesis focusing only on parts of the discipline a more contained definition is useful, even though its fluidity and fickleness should always be kept in mind. Instead of coming up with a new clever term to describe the subject at hand, I have decided to simply state my definition of public archaeology. However, I would like to emphasize the need for every academic working on this subject to do the same; incorporate a clear and unambiguous definition of terms; in this way confusion and mix-ups will hopefully be prevented.

**Public archaeology: any procedure or project, concerned with archaeology and heritage, designed to involve or interact with the public in one way or another and the study thereof.**

Public archaeology is a fluid phenomenon, because it is very dependent on social factors and trends, as well as the opinions and preferences (prejudices and assumptions, but also racism and other ideas) of the archaeologist(s) or the public involved. For this reason it is impossible to describe the perfect public archaeological project or compose a strict model of what such a project should include. Most important is to remember that while it is impossible to form a strict model every project should follow, nor should this ever be the goal, there are several factors that can contribute to a project’s success when incorporated. In the following chapter (chapter IV) such factors will be explained on the basis of examples of successful projects.

The term ‘community archaeology’ is also frequently used in a variety of meanings. Usually, it is referred to as an interactive form of research in which people outside of the archaeological profession have an opportunity to get involved in the archaeological process, mostly in excavations and surveys. Often it is confused with the wider term of public archaeology or public outreach. In fact, community archaeology is a means to public archaeology. It will be discussed in chapter IV as one of the methods to involve the public in a landscape rich with archaeology.

### III.2 Public Relations of the Past

When looking at the definition and importance that ‘publics’ play in other fields of study, it

10 Franklin *et al.* 2009.
13 SAA (Society for American Archaeology) 2014 [online].
15 Pape 2012, p. 21.
16 Ibid, p. 21.
seems public archaeology is in fact a type of PR (public relations), as becomes clear by the following stated by the CIPR (Chartered Institute of Public Relations): “Public relations is about reputation- the result of what you do, what you say and what others say about you.” In other words, PR is the planned and sustained effort to create goodwill between an organisation and public(s).17

The reason why public archaeology can be compared to a form of PR is because of the great importance of the public to archaeology. Without the public, archaeology as a practice would not exist. Archaeology and archaeological knowledge are not necessities in society, as most people are able to live happy lives without ever having any knowledge of the distant past. Using any technique available, public archaeology attempts to involve the public, leading to public participation and even emancipation,18 in a way attempting to increase the reputation of archaeology and thus stabilising the position of archaeology in society. In reality this is quite an opportunistic approach, but perhaps not in a bad way. Idealism (the idealistic approach: people should know about the past) and opportunism in this case could work together to help both archaeology and the public.

III.3 Archaeology in the public domain: value & authority

In the 70’s and 80’s, a time which saw an upturn in building projects in the Netherlands, the interest in archaeology increased. People had more to spend and education was more available and getting better.19 In the period between 1996 and 2004 (and after that20), archaeology has also increased in popularity among the Dutch public.21 These developments have had a positive impact on archaeology in society, but more recently, perhaps accelerated by the economic crisis, archaeology and heritage management are facing more difficult times and are not at all on the top of the list of priorities. While archaeology seems safe at the moment, protected by legislation, this is no guarantee for the future. In order for archaeology to continue to exist (and to be socially relevant), the public
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(and hence, politics) need to see the value of this discipline to society, which is no easy task. Meanwhile, the question remains who decides what is valuable and what is not. In other words: who has the authority over archaeology? After all, all archaeology is ‘public’ and archaeological remains and heritage are being handled in the public domain (by governments, museums, etc.) on behalf of - and for the good of - the public.22 Value and authority are inseparably connected to public archaeology (and heritage for that matter). Their relevance is great to archaeology in general; they are at the heart of the principles of archaeological practice and theory. Because of this, these two terms deserve some explanation.

III.4 Value: archaeology

‘Value’, a term which ranks as one of the top 1000 frequently used words by the Oxford Dictionary,23 is also one with several meanings and connotations. A definition of ‘value’ in archaeology is needed here. There are many possible definitions for value, revolving mainly around the amount of money something is worth or something’s importance or usefulness. The definition that is most suitable here comes from the Oxford Dictionary:24

*The regard that something is held to deserve; the importance, worth or usefulness of something.*

This definition does not exclude value as monetary worth, but also includes what people perceive is important and why. In other words: the appreciation of someone or something is value. Value in this sense is a very personal thing: the way in which it is established and the role it plays in life is different for everyone. Yet different individuals can have similar standards of value, or general trends may be imposed by social and cultural construct.

It is very hard to figure out what the general public attaches value to and what these values are based on. It is probably for this reason that archaeologists try a different approach and attempt to convince the public of the scientific value and contribution of archaeology to society in the form of social validation. Sadly, in the field of commercial archaeology, social validation is usually
directed towards developers and municipalities, even when attempting public related projects, because these are the main employers of archaeologists. These are the parties that archaeologists are in direct contact with and are regarded as authority (although by law all parties are required to allow archaeological research when needed). By focusing on developers and municipalities, the interests of the general public are by-passed and it seems the general public is not seen as an audience worth investing in. That is not to say archaeologists don’t care about this/these public(s) at all. Many would like to see something other than a boring report as the result of their research, especially when it concerns great finds. Public archaeology’s function therefore is not only to fulfill the goals as set in the Valetta Treaty (article 9: promotion of public awareness; see chapter I) and convince the public of the importance of archaeology, but to find ways to attract target audiences and increase the support base for archaeology and heritage and to ensure a future for our past. The public in this case is very important. If the public is convinced of the importance of heritage and archaeology, it will result in an increased interest of politicians on a regional and national level, because they depend on the public for votes. Furthermore, if the current trends develop in the manner Tim de Ridder assumes, government authorities will start to play increasingly smaller roles in archaeology. Therefore, enlarging the support base for archaeology should be one of the main goals of archaeologists.

Archaeologists know that the value of the past should not be expressed in monetary units, but to non-archaeologists this is not as straightforward, especially in the light of the current economic crisis. The Dutch government officials (and most other governments in Europe) are trying to cut funding in a lot of places, and most citizens feel the effects in their wallets. This has many consequences for archaeology and heritage management as a whole, not only because of the decrease of funding available, but also because people are less likely to condone funding for heritage projects or pay for books or other forms of commercialized heritage. People are likely more critical what they spend their money on (for example museum vs. theme park vs. bungee jumping). The advantage in this case is that joining in or visiting archaeological projects doesn’t have to cost (a lot of) money and are very attractive when close to home (partially because of small travel costs).

The practice of valuating archaeology is born out of the need to resolve practical issues, which is why most methods of valuation are technical in nature and not philosophical. Many of the principles of archaeological value have come from other disciplines, like the economic sciences or accounting. In the Netherlands archaeological sites are being evaluated by a “valuation and selection” procedure as set by the Kwaliteitsnorm Nederlandse Archeologie (KNA: quality norm Dutch archaeology). This method focuses on the selection of archaeological services by evaluating the individual site: does it require no protection, full protection, excavation or supervision? The value is determined by several factors: experience (among which beauty and memorial value), physical quality (among which the state and conservation) and contential quality (among which rarity, information value, ensemble value and representativity). Groenewoudt stresses that although a scoring system of the factors mentioned above has been set, the valuation must still be well-executed and carried out with expert judgement. However, this system of evaluation is created to answer individual questions of preservation in situ, not to value archaeological sites for the purpose of public exposure or public appreciation.

Several professionals have tried to place a financial value on archaeology by adopting methods from economic valuation. The valuation methods focus mostly on museums (collections in particular) and heritage monuments, sometimes on archaeological excavations, but rarely on archaeological landscapes. Museums are high-profile, non-profit and usually paid for from public funds, making it important to provide some sort of accountability. In some cases this leads to museums attempting to place monetary values.
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value on their collections.\textsuperscript{35} This accountability is needed to show the government and the public that their funds are being put to good use, or in other words: "your money is contributing to something important, so please keep it coming". Such accountability is already undertaken in archaeological practice in the Netherlands to some degree; archaeologists have to report their project and findings to the client. However, just showing what objects, projects or otherwise are being spent on is not the way to increase public awareness and convince of the importance of archaeology. The problems concerned with economic valuation revolve around the notion that financial quality is an explicit means of value as a whole.\textsuperscript{36} As an example, the economic valuation of museum collections is based on the idea that over time an increase or decrease in value can be seen, for which those in charge (museum directors/managers, collection owners, etc.) can be held responsible. While museums and other heritage-related institutions are usually economic bodies, the increase in value of a collection is hardly ever the goal of a museum.\textsuperscript{37} Instead, the collection's purpose is to function in a museum setting, like an exhibition, and is not to be sold back into the market. Additionally, the economic value of, for example, a collection of pottery sherds or soil samples is negligible, while their research value may be very high, depending on context.\textsuperscript{38} For this reason alternative methods to determine archaeological value have been suggested, in which 'replacement cost' and 'contingent valuation' are important factors.\textsuperscript{39} The replacement cost method looks at what it would cost to replace objects, were they lost in a collection. This can also be used for items from an excavation, when looking at the costs of preparation, excavation and post-excavation analysis. Contingent value relies on statements by visitors and respondents about how much they are willing to pay as taxes or entrance fees in order to provide for - and maintain the existence of - heritage and museums.\textsuperscript{40} Both may lead to measurable monetary value, but can also lead to absurdities. With the replacement cost method items may be priced too high or too low. In the case of contingent valuation it is not taken into account that there are people who are of the opinion heritage should be free.\textsuperscript{41} Again, the problems with putting financial value on heritage and archaeology become clear.

In nature management, which is close to archaeology in ways concerned with policy and law, putting economic value on ecosystems and biodiversity also occurs. TEEB (the economics of ecosystems & biodiversity) is a global initiative that does just that.\textsuperscript{42} It recognizes value in nature, demonstrates value in economic terms, which is useful for policy makers, and then captures value by taking measures to protect the valuable nature. The reason for the economic valuation is solely in order to protect nature more efficiently by showing policy makers and other officials that nature is not a luxury, but necessity. TEEB shows that ecosystems and biodiversity have, next to other types of value concerned with people’s appreciation, economic value and therefore added value to society. Such an initiative is important, because it seems too easy for policy makers and the like to dismiss nature management as luxury, instead of a valuable and appreciated element in society, because the economic value is not self-explanatory. Perhaps such a global initiative could be useful for archaeology.

In the light of archaeological landscapes, the valuation of archaeological sites may be more suitable to discuss here. Because not all archaeological sites can be preserved, some kind of significance must be assigned to each (known) site.\textsuperscript{43} This is to decide what sites should be preserved, excavated, or subjected to another form of archaeological method. In the Netherlands this assessment takes shape in the NoaA.\textsuperscript{44} In this research agenda most areas of Dutch archaeology are discussed together with their knowledge gaps and where most research is needed. Those subjects with highest research value are appointed the most significance. While in a scientific point of view this makes perfect sense, these values may be subjective and may not overlap with what the public considers important.\textsuperscript{45} Nevertheless, value formation
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is highly dependent on experts and (their) knowledge. It is therefore no surprise that archaeologists are the main actors in this decision-making process. Valuation plays a central role in archaeology and most actions within the science are carried out from this principle. The main problem with assigning significance in this way, next to the issue of the public’s limited input in this process, is that it only reflects the concerns of today and not that of the future. Carver puts it like this: archaeological value is something that should be global, composed by professionals and directed towards the largest, but voiceless public of all: that of the future. He makes an interesting point stating that most valuation of heritage monuments and the like are based on what is already known and explored, instead of that which remains unseen and yet undiscovered. As a result, the development of new techniques and knowledge of the undiscovered past is being hampered. While Carver’s point may be valid, at this point there is no real way of getting around this problem.

It is clear that the measurement of value of archaeology will always be dynamic and relative in nature. In public archaeology projects the archaeologists should always keep this in mind and keep a close eye on how the value of the objects, sites, or pasts involved are determined.

III.5 Authority: the archaeologist

Discussing the importance of the public raises complex questions, which come down to the following: who does archaeology belong to? Answering this question is complicated, not only because many determinant factors (area, type of heritage, etc.) are involved, but also because it is hard to decide who has the authority in deciding upon who has the authority, and so on. Authority is a subject within archaeology that is not often discussed, but which is a crucial element that defines public archaeology and archaeology in general.

Authority in archaeology takes several forms. The first that comes to mind is the authorities over archaeologists, the stakeholders like government officials and clientele. While they are by law bound to allow archaeological research, they also decide which archaeologists to hire and where to build; so to avoid archaeological research or choose locations of the lowest costs. Of course these same authorities for a part determine the archaeological policy. On the other hand, as has already been mentioned briefly, individual archaeologists also possess authority. The current archaeological system is based on the knowledge and expertise of archaeologists. Archaeologists are considered to be experts on the subject and for that reason have a lot of authority, but also responsibility. As a result, many other non-archaeologists have been excluded from the system, like amateur archaeologists. The significance that archaeologists attach to certain objects or sites relies mostly on the perceived research value. The problems concerned with this system of valuation have already been addressed; that of known heritage taking priority over the unknown. Another factor is that the public has no say in determining which archaeology is important. State officials determine what heritage is important, advised by a close circle of professional archaeologists. So while more stakeholders have been involved in the archaeological process since the Valetta convention, archaeology has remained the domain of an intellectual elite (however, ‘professional elite’ may be a more suitable description here).

In recent years the tendency lies towards granting the public more authority in deciding the direction of archaeology. Yet also the public takes more initiatives in projects that concern archaeology or heritage. The diminishing of centralised authority is something that can be seen in other societal areas too, like education. Alternative histories, in the form of ‘fringe archaeology’ or ‘pseudo-archaeology’, such as the works of Erich von Däniken, are reaching a larger audience.
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than academic or mainstream archaeological books. People are less and less likely to accept the general established past, and wish to have options and alternatives to choose from. This is worrying to some archaeologists, who fear that letting the public decide what is important in archaeology could result in a warped reality about the past and heritage, so in a way 'whoring' archaeology to the public in favour of a more positive opinion about archaeology. Of course, this only concerns a portion of the general public. If the public even wants something from archaeology, than never unanimously, as one. The real fear is that the public will prefer the 'adventure and mystery archaeology' over the other less exciting, but from the archaeologists' point of view also important subjects and artefacts. Instead of simply leaving the authority with archaeologists, surely there are possibilities to find some middle-ground. This of course depends on local factors, such as the type of heritage, its age (younger sites usually have more factual data available than older sites, which have more room for imagination, but are also harder to visualise) and perhaps the interest of the public (although partially the responsibility of the concerned archaeologists).

In figure III.1 a model is presented that shows the relation between the authority of the archaeologist versus the authority of the public. When the authority of the public rises, the authority of the archaeologist decreases. Additionally, as the authority of the public rises, so does the support base for archaeology increase (by author in collaboration with Daan Raemaekers, graphics by Gary Nobles and author).

Figure III.1: Model showing the relation between the degree of authority of an archaeologist versus the degree of authority of the public, in any given project or specific case. When the authority of the public rises, the authority of the archaeologist decreases. Additionally, as the authority of the public rises, so does the support base for archaeology increase (by author in collaboration with Daan Raemaekers, graphics by Gary Nobles and author).  
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than at point \( A \). In such a case involved members of the public may have a say in the progress of a project, or are able to share their own interpretations. The archaeologist still leads, but listens to input and acts upon this according to his/her own judgement. An example of this degree of authority can be seen in community projects, where not only excavations, but also post-excavation processes are left to (local) volunteers. Interpretation of the remains could be left to the volunteers, but the archaeologist will have the final say about what is recorded or published. At point \( C \) the archaeologist and the public will both have an equal degree of authority. This is the point where most archaeologists will start to become nervous, as control over the outcome of a project is mostly lost. It is also harder to come up with an example, as there are fewer projects that have embodied this point in the model. The problems of diminishing authority of the archaeologist are more complicated than just offering the public more of it: people are inclined to listen to specialists. So when an archaeologist talks about archaeology, he/she is almost automatically granted more authority in any decision-making process on the matter (exceptions aside). Another complication is the difficulty in weighing the degree of authority of both parties. Exactly when are both the archaeologist and the public equally important? I would like to propose the following as an example: the archaeologist offers a set of data, perhaps old excavation data, to a team of non-archaeologist volunteers. The volunteers could make plans for what to do with the data, making decisions and sharing ideas with each other. The archaeologist is present and helps the volunteers when they need his/her specialism, for example when it comes to the interpretation of recorded archaeological data. The archaeologist will have authority, since he/she chooses the data and gives direction to the ideas and decisions made by the volunteers. These in turn have authority, because they are allowed to discuss and make decisions in the project. At point \( D \) the degree of the archaeologist’s authority has decreased even more. The public in this case has more authority than the archaeologist. In such a case the public might create a project independently of archaeologists, and making decisions and interpretations by itself. The archaeologist is only called in when advice is needed. The archaeologist’s specialism is used, but he/she has no say in the direction of the project or about any interpretations. Point \( E \) is the opposite of point \( A \). In this case all the archaeological authority rests with the public, and the archaeologist has no role. He/she might even be completely absent. While possible, it is an unlikely case. In practice, public archaeology projects are mostly initiated by archaeologists. In some projects the presence of archaeologists is even needed, because of the existing code of conduct in the Netherlands when dealing with archaeological remains. Most archaeologists would not like to see a public archaeology project in which no archaeologists are involved, because they fear bad methods and interpretations cannot be avoided, perhaps even that the project will end in some kind of pseudo-archaeology.

During came to a very similar conclusion, although he writes about ‘the ladder of heritage participation’ which heritage specialists can climb.\(^ {61} \) In his version, the ladder has 5 steps, in which the first has the most influence from heritage specialists, and the last step has the least influence from the specialist: governmental initiative, citizens participation, co-creation, governmental participation and private initiative. He rightfully states that even though heritage specialists may not play a role in a project, they could still learn and document cases at the top of the ladder.\(^ {62} \) The higher on the ladder, the more ‘bottom-up’ a project is, while at the beginning of the ladder, it is ‘top-down’ projects initiated by the government or other heritage institutions. During encourages heritage specialists to ‘climb the ladder’, even though this breaks with established working traditions and could even diminish their professional reputation.\(^ {63} \)

However, as the degree of authority of the public increases, so does the support base of the public for archaeology.\(^ {64} \) In other words, the more the public is allowed to be involved in the decision-making progress of archaeological projects, the more it will appreciate and understand archaeology, attaching value to it and hence the support base is increased. The public is a generalised term, but it consists of individuals, each with own thoughts,
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ideals and wishes. Therefore, when attempting a public archaeology project, it is not wholly unimportant to find out what ‘the public’ really wants, instead of making assumptions based on archaeology in popular culture. For this, it is also important to know what kind of public you wish to approach and what kind of questions you can expect. Naturally, different views of the public are in constant state of change, since our view of the past is not static. The larger and more diverse a public becomes, the larger the amount and variation of opinions will be.

According to Cruysheer it is the responsibility of archaeologists to act on the execution of article 9 of the Valetta agreement, because it is the archaeologists that give a story and context to archaeological objects and sites. Archaeologists are also responsible of implementing the wishes of the (local) community in their projects, because it seems the public assumes the authority of archaeologists without questioning. This is not always the case, according to Thomas, who suggests that because of the increased consumer choice available to the public, they are less likely to accept theories without question. In fact, because of the increasing global and uniform attitudes, people are looking for other ways to increase their individuality, and prefer to choose whatever past seems most important to them. Thomas talks about the situation in England, not in the Netherlands. It has yet to be proven that the average Dutch person has a strong opinion on archaeological subjects, although there are groups, in particular those with a strong religious faith, that raise their voice against the views put forward by archaeologists. In the Netherlands such case-studies exist mostly in conservative Christian villages, such as Staphorst. The majority of the voters there is protestant Christian and as a result, so is the local political parties. A few years ago the municipality ordered the making of a mandatory archaeological prospection map. The parties were not so pleased to read in the associated report that many finds from the region were pre-dating the 6,000 years believed to be the age of our planet (based on the Bible). Eventually, this lead to the incorporation of a paragraph stating alternative views about dating and the age of the Earth; the fact that the municipality was paying for the report, was one of the main arguments. The full extent of such opinions in the Netherlands is unknown, but does not diminish Thomas’ just statement, stressing archaeology officials should be facilitators and guides through the past instead of a strict authority. This also counts for non-governmental archaeologists who are involved in public archaeology projects.

It will depend on the kind of project how easy it will be to implement the public values. In some cases non-archaeologists could even be handed an authoritative role, for instance in community archaeology or when dealing with website management. But even then only a small part of the public will have a voice. In most other cases, the power will be in the hands of the archaeologist to decide what matters, and which parts of what is deemed important by the community will be implemented in a project. This is not necessarily an issue, as long as there is interaction and the community knows it is being heard. The archaeologist needs to shift from an authoritative to a facilitating, guiding role, while using the tools and skills he/she has at hand: ready and available information about archaeology, knowing the way around techniques and sources. In other words: there should be a growing realisation that it is not so much the archaeologists’ task to be teachers or leaders, but to serve the public as it wants to be served.

III.6 Willing and able? Public opinions and archaeology

After considering the theory concerned with the relation between the public and archaeology, the next step should be to create a project that responds to the interests of your target audience. The problem is that it is not clear what the public (in its broadest sense) would like when it comes to archaeology. Some studies (mostly theses) have been done to try to determine the interest of the public in archaeology. These kind of
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studies are helpful, because they open up much needed opportunities to understanding different kinds of attitudes towards the past and archaeology held by different kinds of people. It helps archaeologists look at the public not as a general mass, but as groups of individuals, all with their own wishes and interests. Below some of the outcomes of these studies are discussed to show the diversity of opinions and wishes out there to be considered.

That being said, none of these studies can truly represent the opinions of the Dutch public (and the subcategories that have been questioned), but the general outcome seems to be, surprisingly or not, that an interest in archaeology definitely exists. The public considers archaeology to be of educational value, but TV and open days are preferred over reading material. It seems that archaeology in their own living space is most interesting to the public. People seem to want their imagination challenged and want to have room to make interpretations of their own. In Lampe’s research the public would most like to learn about artefacts and way of life in the past, instead of archaeological methods. However, on the same page she shows that the public would also like to participate in excavations. Merriman has executed the largest survey concerning the views to the past in Britain. In his study the public was divided by the usual terms of wealth and social status, but also by their related level of association of heritage: high status (frequent visitors), middle status (regular visitors) and low status (rare/non-visitors). Regardless of status, 68% of respondents considered knowing about the past valuable. Each group valued different kinds of pasts: frequent visitors/high status people valued world history and that of the United Kingdom as a whole, while lower status groups placed more value on family and local history. Merriman concludes the distinction can be made between a “personal past” and an “impersonal heritage”. While the first may not have any tangible manifestation, it relies on personal memories and family histories. It is a very vivid experience of the past, not comparable to any museum visit(s). The latter principle sees the past as something detached, created by professionals and mostly the kind of pasts that are presented in museums and accordingly. It is impossible to draw the attention of a wide audience by offering only static, one-way information (like is often presented in museums). Our society has developed to attach more and more value to experiences and individuality, instead of property and static facts, bridging status and education. Consequently this may lead to financial qualities no longer being equated to value. This could be beneficial for archaeologists, if they focus on the story-telling side of their profession.

Many wishes of the public will originate in their perception of archaeology and archaeologists. In his book “Archaeology is a brand!”, Holtorf investigates archaeology in the light of popular culture. Archaeology is a very appealing subject to newspapers and TV, but also to tourists. In popular culture archaeology plays a large, mostly positive, role, especially when compares to other sciences, which are often portrayed as dangerous, dull or dubious (for example the pharmaceutical sciences). Holtorf divides the public into two groups, stating that archaeology provides engaging experiences for the ‘experience society’ and extremely evocative stories for the ‘dream society’. He concludes that archaeologists should take to heart that archaeology is very popular in the public domain, and that we could use our positive image to our advantage. On the other hand, archaeology is not so popular among the public when it comes to legislation and spatial planning. In that sense archaeologists are often seen as the ‘left’ hobbyists, making vague stories about layers and broken pots, while costing a lot of money, delaying building projects and imposing all kinds of rules on civilians.
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III.7 What’s my name?
Categorisation of the public
For any public archaeology project, a clear picture is needed of which group of people should be engaged: the target audience. The manner in which the public is categorised says a lot about the goals and ambitions of any project. Usually, the distinctions are based on age, sex, education, locality, profession and ethnic group, but there are endless possibilities. Such distinctions are problematic, because of the haziness that sticks to some categories, as well as the possibility of an individual belonging to several categories at once (female, aged 20-25, academic education, etc.). Regardless of this, generalisation (‘cutting up’ the public in generalised groups) is necessary to point out a target audience, a suitable ‘public’. Another way of categorising the public is to look at what the public is interested in. For instance, do they like: national or local archaeology/history, battlefields, rituals, hunebedden, etc.; or how close they are to what extent they are involved in the process of archaeological research (think of a crane operator, policy maker, city archaeologist, ground worker, etc.). In general the categorisation of the public consists of tourists, visitors, sources of revenue and capital funding, audiences and customers. MacManamon used his experience in the USA to distinguish five groups of people: the general public, students and teachers (i.e. those in education), members of congress and the executive branch (legislators), government attorneys, managers and archaeologists (professionals) and Native Americans (indigenous peoples). The categories made up by MacManamon are not meant to be exclusive, since people from one group could easily fall in another too. Four of the groups are also included in “the general public”. In the Netherlands we do not usually have a category ‘indigenous peoples’, but a similar and often overlooked category is that of the minorities (Indonesian, Moroccan, Turkish, Polish, Surinam peoples), all of which should have a voice in Dutch heritage as they are part of society in the Netherlands. They are also some of the hardest publics to reach and their voice is often unheard.

III.8 To conclude
I have attempted to shed some light on the complicated discussion of who the ‘public’ is and what ‘public archaeology’ is and the roles these factors play in archaeology, at least as far as this thesis is concerned. Society is changing to value experiences and dynamics more than property and statics. Value can mean different things, but at least is no longer by definition connected to financial quality. People attach more meaning to what they value than before, also in the experience of the past. A lot of new opportunities for archaeologists are provided, as long as they are willing to be open to change and invest in new methods and approaches. Archaeology is very popular among the public and for good reason: we offer experiences and evocative stories to spark the imagination of any. Archaeologists should be story-tellers of the past and should function as guides through these stories for whoever will hear, instead of being stark and strict teachers.

III.9 Stakeholders: 8 publics
The theoretic background outlined above is necessary to come to a well-informed decision about what ‘public’ or ‘publics’ are most suitable to elect as target audience(s) for a public archaeology project in the Hunze. In order to do this, one more step must be taken. Eight subgroups will be listed further below; the subgroups are based on the stakeholders in the municipality Aa en Hunze. For each I will go into the advantages and disadvantages of involving this public into archaeological projects. This way an adequate choice will be able to be made.

To recapitulate on the area and project at hand: the Hunze river and valley, situated in the province of Drenthe, has a lot of potential for (a) public archaeology project(s). Currently the valley is ‘under construction’, as some parts of the river are being re-made into a meandering, slow-moving brook, leading through wetlands and peat lands. The plans for this were made with ecology and biodiversity in mind, together with options for water retention and water surface extraction. But as an unintentional side-effect, these parts of the river have been subjected to extensive archaeological research and
brought back to a state much closer to that of the far past, feeling more authentic. The area I have confined my research to is the part of the valley situated in the municipality Aa en Hunze, where re-meandered parts of the river are present and policy makers have a positive view on archaeology and heritage. A new addition to the province is Geopark de Hondsrug, centered around the large sand ridge west of the Hunze, but also incorporating other subjects and themes. This geopark opens new windows for local projects, such as a public archaeology project. In chapter II a theme, or story, has been selected as most suitable for incorporation in a public archaeology project. It is the story of 'Prehistory and water': the story of our distant ancestors exploring and exploiting a landscape thought to be uninhabitable, unpleasant and dangerous. While the remains from Prehistory are almost invisible in the landscape and the nature of the finds could be underwhelming for non-archaeologists at first glance, it has great potential in my view.

It is necessary to point out that, while in the time and space available for this thesis it is impossible to discuss all stakeholders or 'publics' in the area, below is an attempt to list at least the largest categories and most important groups of people to be discussed. Some of the categories overlap. For instance: policy makers are usually also local inhabitants, just like farmers and owners of local businesses.

III.9.1 Public #1: local inhabitants

The local inhabitants comprise everyone living in an area - and for that reason this is the largest group mentioned here. Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is also the group which is the most diverse, consisting of people of all ages, education, interests, etc. Among others, it includes school-going children, complete families and senior citizens. It is clear that within this group categories can also be made. Some of them have been listed among the publics mentioned here. In general, local inhabitants are not very involved in archaeology in their area. The exceptions are those that are in some way connected to archaeologists, be it as contractors, amateurs/volunteers, or as a person living next door to an excavation. These are categorised under public #5: amateur archaeologists or volunteers. There are also those that are not amateur archaeologists or volunteers, but have a larger than average interest in archaeology and heritage, voluntarily seeking out local archaeological information and visiting sites and exhibitions. It is these groups, next to amateurs and volunteers, that are easiest to involve, since usually they do not need to be convinced of how interesting and important local archaeology is: it is already valuable to them.

The demographics of the municipality have been researched, as is usual, for example, for tourism purposes.91 The inhabitants of the municipality Aa en Hunze are mostly members of a two-persons household of people aging 55 years or older, followed by one-person households of 55 years and older and families with children over 13 years of age.92 The income of the inhabitants is modaal (average wage in the Netherlands) and all levels of education are well-represented.93 A large majority of the inhabitants are in possession of at least one car. It is interesting to note that a lot of the inhabitants use the internet to seek out information, prefer to read regional newspapers and listen to regional radio.94 For outdoor recreation, around 65% enjoy hiking as an activity, followed by cycling for fun and touring with the car.95 When it comes to cultural activities, about 44% of the locals enjoy visiting a cinema or film house, while 37% like to visit a museum (this comes in second place) and 28% enjoy visiting ancient and archeological sites and objects, like excavations, burial mounds or hunebedden (this last group comes in fourth place).96

The advantages of incorporating local inhabitants in public archaeology are several. First of all, if large parts of this group will be effectively involved in a public archaeology project, the support base for archaeology in the area will increase. As mentioned above, this can only be beneficial to archaeology. Second, local inhabitants will be easier to involve in a project than inhabitants of other regions, because they do not have to travel so far and often feel connected with their environment. This connection can make them curious after the local past and possibly ancestors. In other words: their sense of
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identity makes it more likely they will be interested in a local public archaeology project. In return, a public archaeology project could increase their sense of identity and emotional ties to the environment. This could even lead to an increased sense of solidarity in the local society, because in some projects the interaction is not only between archaeologist and inhabitants, but also between inhabitants.

The disadvantages, unfortunately, are also many. Because of the size of this group the expectations and interests could be very diverse. Although it is the case with most publics, it could be hard to please everyone, leading to discussions or some subgroups feeling ‘left-out’. It is usually those with a more than average interest in archaeology or the past that will be interest in taking part in a project. Involving other groups, for example those of an average interest in archaeology and the past, could be challenging. While one of the benefits of involving local inhabitants could be the increased sense of identity with place and the past, it could also have a darker consequence. If locals were more involved in their past and their ‘ancestors’, those people that do not originate from the locality could feel left out, or even worse, rejected or expelled. While this last scenario is hopefully unlikely, it wouldn’t be the first time the past was used in conflicts later (as was often the case in ethnic conflicts).

III.9.2 Public #2: politicians & policy makers

As mentioned earlier the municipality officials of the Aa en Hunze generally have a positive view on archaeology. The official in charge of archaeology and related heritage is Charles Houx. Together with his advisors and archaeologists working for the government (such as the provincial archaeologist, Wijnand van der Sanden) he usually sees the most of archaeological activities in the region, because he is also a contractor of archaeologists. The reports that have to be written according to the rules set for archaeological research in the Netherlands, are handed to the contractors. Because municipalities also have obligations towards archaeology, they at least have some knowledge of archaeological practices and connections with archaeological advisors, provincial archaeologists and archaeological companies. In the municipality Aa en Hunze this is adequately incorporated in the municipal organisation.

The advantages of incorporating politicians and policy makers seem straightforward: perhaps if they are involved, their appreciation of archaeology will increase. The politicians and policy makers have a direct influence on the state of archaeology in the area. With their interest and appreciation, archaeology could stand stronger against flaws or injustice. There is also an advantage for the politicians and policy makers: they could use an involvement in such a project as good PR-strategy, showing their involvement with local past and identity towards local inhabitants.

Involving politicians and policy makers is important, but not as the only group to be involved, since this group is quite small in comparison to the other stakeholders. Another disadvantage could be that not all politicians & policy makers are equally interested in archaeology in the region. They might be more interested in how to avoid expensive archaeological research locally in order to please farmers and other local stakeholders, than in a project that tries to involve the public. Luckily, in the case of the municipality Aa en Hunze, the concerned officials appreciate heritage and archaeology.

III.9.3 Public #3: tourists

This group is a major stakeholder in the municipality of Aa en Hunze, because, like in most parts of the province of Drenthe, tourism is a big source of income for local businesses. In fact, the tourism and hospitality market in the province is a matter of millions, with many jobs depending on it.97 Tourists come in all shapes and sizes, and for that reason it is fortunate that many studies are done after tourism in the Netherlands (because it is such a profitable business). For that reason a lot of information about tourists coming to Drenthe exists.

Visiting tourists in Drenthe are from the Netherlands or from abroad; in some cases tourists are local. A family living in Gieten could decide to go on a day trip in the locality, so it is possible there is some overlap between tourists and local inhabitants. In a lot of cases tourists in the Aa en Hunze will be from other regions of the Netherlands. A study after tourism in Drenthe shows that most of the tourists come from Noord-

97 Wagenaar 2014, pp. 49-62.
Zuid-Holland, but that Drenthe is also a popular vacation province for people living in Groningen and Overijssel.\textsuperscript{98} As far as foreign tourists in Drenthe go in 2013, about 60% of them are from Germany.\textsuperscript{99} Tourists who spend day trips in Drenthe (but are not travelling from their own address) are mostly local (79%).\textsuperscript{100}

Tourists are put in groups for the same reason our stakeholders are put into publics: to easily determine what kinds of people are dealt with (and what their expectations and wishes are). In tourism studies, one way to categorise tourists is in lifestyle groups, which means age, sex, education, etc. are not being looked at, but rather what motivates the tourists to travel and undertake certain activities.\textsuperscript{101} Tourists are then put into colour-coded groups, like cultureel en inspirerend rood (culturally and inspiring red), ondernemend paars (venturous purple), uitbundig geel (exuberantly yellow) and ingetogen aqua (modest aqua).\textsuperscript{102} The tourists of Drenthe have also been colour-coded after this model.\textsuperscript{103} It seems that the majority of the tourists visiting Drenthe from other regions of the Netherlands belong to the colours yellow and lime, which corresponds to lifestyles associated with relaxation, social activities and spending time with family/friends. Local tourists from the municipality of Aa en Hunze predominantly belong to aqua and in a lesser degree to yellow and lime.\textsuperscript{104} This means they are most keen on experiencing nature and culture.

Similar studies have also revealed some information about the demographics of tourists. Relatively, Drenthe is visited a lot by families with children between the ages of null and five, but most vacation-goers belong to the group of two person (of 35 years and older) households.\textsuperscript{105} Most Dutch tourists in the Netherlands appear to travel by car, so they are very flexible when it comes to visiting areas otherwise hard to reach (for example a location that is not close to a public transportation point). In 2012 also the bicycle and on foot were preferred modes of transportation.\textsuperscript{106} It is clear that the tourists who decide to come to the Aa en Hunze are usually not limited by public transportation, travelling by car, bicycle or on foot.

Tourists like to visit the province of Drenthe: it is one of the most popular touristic regions in the Netherlands, with 10% of native tourists going there in 2012.\textsuperscript{107} The sandy grounds of Groningen, Friesland and Drenthe are popular among Dutch tourists for short vacations in both the summer as winter season.\textsuperscript{108} Dutch tourists come to Drenthe mainly for nature, to relax or to spend time with friends and/or family.\textsuperscript{109} The activities they like to undertake consist of going out for dinner, hiking and swimming. In Drenthe in 2012 and 2013, most money is spend on daytrips, followed by inland touristic vacations.\textsuperscript{110} A study after the economics of tourism in Drenthe established something that has already been mentioned in this chapter before: the need for experiences surpasses that of the need for possessions.\textsuperscript{111}

The advantage of this subgroup is that it is a group of persons willing to invest in experiences and relaxation. They come to enjoy themselves and during the period they are visiting, are not limited to working hours and such. Of course some tourists have more money to spend than others, but in general they are not reluctant to splurge during vacations or day trips. It appears that local tourists are more interested in archaeology and the past, and culture in general, than visitors from other regions in the Netherlands. This last group is more interested in having a good time with friends and/or family, to relax and to experience. Learning about culture or the past is not always part of the equation. Therefore, local tourists are more likely to engage in a project. Knowledge about a project may be carried further if tourists are involved; when they return to their homes, they could share information about the project with others from their locality.

Some of the disadvantages of incorporating tourists is that, in contrast to local inhabitants, (non-local) tourists do not usually feel connected to the local past. If any, the

\begin{thebibliography}{111}
\bibitem{98} Wagenaar 2014, pp. 29-30.
\bibitem{99} Ibid, p. 41.
\bibitem{100} Ibid, p. 24.
\bibitem{101} The BSR-model developed by RECRON and SmartAgent, for more information see: SmartAgent, het BSR model 2015; Drenthe 2012.
\bibitem{102} Wagenaar 2014, pp. 21-24.
\bibitem{103} Ibid, pp. 21-24.
\bibitem{104} The Smartagent Company n.d., p. 71.
\bibitem{105} Wagenaar 2014, p. 27.
\bibitem{106} NBTC Holland marketing 2013.
\bibitem{107} Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek 2013, p. 29.
\bibitem{108} Ibid, p. 20.
\bibitem{109} Wagenaar 2014, p. 42.
\bibitem{110} Ibid, p. 59.
\bibitem{111} Ibid, p. 13.
\end{thebibliography}
III. The Public

existing sense of ancestry and connection is small. This means that tourists are unlikely to get very involved in a project. They might enjoy watching, learning a thing or two and giving their opinion, but most are unlikely to be willing to spend much of their free time on a public archaeological project. Instead, they prefer visiting several different sights and events, following a busy vacation schedule. Long-term or in-depth involvement is unlikely, although slightly more likely in the case of local tourists.

III.9.4 Public #4: (local) corporations and institutions

For the title of this public I decided to put ‘local’ in brackets. The reason for this is that there are corporations and institutions that might be stakeholders in the archaeology of the Aa en Hunze that are not located in the municipality. I realise that by doing so the potential number of members of this group could be enormous. In reality I assume only a number of corporations and institutions will be stakeholders, as the group that is meant here consists of those companies and institutions that have an interest in archaeology born out of the desire for increased profit. Companies like cafes, restaurants, hotels, B&Bs, bakeries and shops of all kinds rely on tourism to different degrees. When archaeology in the region can be utilised to attract customers, companies will surely be interested. For companies such as these, identification with local archaeology can attract both local, as well as non-local customers, for example by offering lunches at a public archaeology project, aiding in the production of goody bags\textsuperscript{112} for projects, exhibiting archaeological finds or hosting sessions and lectures. So far this has not been utilised much in the Netherlands. Other companies or institutions, like libraries, museums, etc. are more involved in these practices. In an area where archaeology and the past are held in high regard, these are all viable options.

A larger institutions, such as Geopark de Hondsrug, will be interested in local archaeology for a similar, but slightly different goal. The data will be used to expand its current network of ‘hotspots’, providing more interesting finds and facts. Eventually, this will be to attract more visitors. The Geopark is already working closely with local corporations and institutions in order to house their network of hiking and cycling trails, interesting sights, etc. This works, because the visitors that come for the Geopark, will undoubtedly visit the other corporations and institutions in the area.

Incorporating this group could have many advantages. One could be to lower costs of the project, by having local corporations sponsor. This could be in the form of money, but more likely as products and services. Another advantage could be that the sense of solidarity and togetherness will increase, as involved individuals see local companies pitch in. The involvement of larger institutions, like Geopark de Hondsrug, could be beneficial for their existing network and available funds. There are some disadvantages as well. For one, companies are unlikely to get involved in a project, unless they will be convinced of its success. How else will they be able to advertise and attract more customers? Companies may also have high demands when it comes to their share of the success or their level of involvement. Behind local corporations and institutions are individual people, and while some of them might be interested in archaeology and the past, some are certainly not.

III.9.5 Public #5: amateur archaeologists & volunteers

This group is small, but very active. They have been an important stakeholder of archaeology for decades, owing their relevance mostly to their strong emotional involvement and incredible interest in the past. In general, amateurs and volunteers are very attracted to material remains first, and sites and monuments second. Members of this group can be segmented as well, for instance as detector amateurs, excavation volunteers and local devotees.

The inclusion of amateurs and volunteers is often stressed in archaeological projects. However, since the compliance of the new regulations (Malta and the revised Monumentenwet 2007), the number of volunteers and amateurs have decreased. The reason for this being the accumulation of new regulations, making volunteering more complicated and allowing less freedom to the volunteers and amateurs.\textsuperscript{113} Before the new regulations, the amateurs played a large and
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helpful role in Dutch archaeology. Local key figures rose and were the ‘eyes and ears’ of the professional archaeologists.114 Without this devoted group, it is possible many protected archaeological sites would not exist today. Furthermore, the amount of knowledge present in amateur circles should not be underestimated, especially when it comes to specialised knowledge (about the region but also about objects) which is often lacking among professionals.115 This is especially true for detector amateurs, who, attracted by the freedom and anonymity of their hobby, build collections of finds. While this hobby was, and sometimes still is, looked at as destructive and undesirable, an increasing number of detector amateurs feel comfortable to share their information and data with professional circles. Still, the knowledge of other anonymous amateurs is left unutilised.

This would be one of the major arguments for incorporating amateurs and volunteers in a public archaeology project: not only are they very interested in archaeology and the past, the knowledge they may have could contribute greatly to any project, for the sake of research. It is usually during fieldwork projects that volunteers are involved, although some projects also include volunteers during other parts of the archaeological process, such as planning and post-excavation activities. Volunteers are widely operable, depending on their skillset and interests. The involvement of metal detector amateurs can be very helpful in fieldwork projects. Because they are usually in possession of their own detector, it will not be necessary to provide one (considering the costs of purchase or rent). Furthermore, metal objects that would otherwise not have been recovered, have a better chance of being retrieved.

A disadvantage of incorporating this group is that it is hard to tell what kind of knowledge or skills the individuals possess. A person may be of the opinion he/she is an expert on a certain topic, but this will be hard to verify at first glance. As with any group, involvement in a project needs planning in advance; volunteers are not simply free working forces, but need guidance and supervision constantly. The archaeologist(s) involved must also make time to answer any questions.

III.9.6 Public #6: farmers, landowners and ‘destroyers’
In contrast to amateurs, this group is not incredibly interested in the past or archaeology.116 They come into contact with archaeology, because they have to. To them, the financial and organisational consequences are much more burdensome than for the average amateur archaeologist. No archaeologist will be surprised when I say that this group usually does not have a very positive view on archaeology. To be fair, this aversion is mostly to do with the myriad of rules and regulations, which make farmers and landowners feel like they are counteracted with every act of ‘destruction’ they commit.117 While this feeling is unjustified, it is perhaps understandable. Groenendijk names an example in Groningen, the province in which he is seated as provincial archaeologist. In the rural areas of the province Mesolithic remains are located close to the surface, on ancient sand ridges.118 As a result, the sand ridges receive a high expectancy value of archaeology on prospection maps. Because remains from this period are rare, archaeologists tend to be careful in these cases, leading to frustrations of farmers who happen to be so unlucky to own land with these localities and who are willing to build. The costly and obligatory archaeological research that takes place in advance mostly delivers no results and is of little significance to academics.119 One-sided communication and confusion lead to aversion and frustration among the ‘destroyers’: those, who according to Dutch law, are required to pay for archaeological research when destroying in situ archaeology.

The advantage of involving this subgroup, that will consist mainly of farmers, in a public archaeology project is clear, but not overly obvious. It could lead to better communication and understanding between archaeologists and ‘destroyers’, which will hopefully lead to an increased support base for archaeology.

The downside is that this group currently is not positive about archaeology, especially when it comes to regulations. It might be tricky to persuade members of this public to get involved in a project. The key seems to be continually seeking contact with the
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farmers and landowners and maintaining an open-minded and understanding attitude. However, a slight opening might be present, since especially farmers have often lived in an area their entire life. It is likely their ancestry runs back many decades in the region. A curiosity for what secrets might be hidden beneath the surface of their land could of their family history or ancestry be sparked. Groenendijk proposes a simple, but effective method to increase communication: the kitchen table chat.\textsuperscript{120} Possible financial benefits could also persuade farmers to become part of the archaeological project, such as profits from selling farm products to visitors.\textsuperscript{121}

**III.9.7 Public #7: the media**

With the media I mean to comprise (regional) newspapers, programmes on (regional) radio, journalists, (regional) news websites, etc. While once again this group may be small, it is a stakeholder that is not to be taken lightly. The media is in direct contact with the rest of the public, delivering news, opinions and interesting facts. This group comes into contact with archaeology looking for a story to present to its readers or listeners. Data from the province and municipality has already pointed out that inhabitants enjoy listening to regional radio or reading regional newspapers, so these members of the subgroup should definitely be considered.

Reaching out to journalists can be very beneficial, especially when a public archaeology project is concerned. The media can share information about a project and thus entice more people to get involved. Furthermore, journalists are trained to present information as clearly as possible, something that is not always easy for a professional archaeologist, used to professional jargon. The character and directness journalists and presenters often possess, will perhaps be more enticing than the shy, dull, or socially awkward archaeologists involved (of course, I exaggerate and generalise).

One major disadvantage is that the media is a stakeholder with an agenda of its own. They will be happy to visit your project or talk to you about a subject, but there is no control over what will be presented to the public later. The journalists work to give the people what they want, so they will keep purchasing newspapers or listening to the radio. While this is mostly the case for non-regional TV & radio, newspapers and websites, it is something to keep in mind. Offering the journalists a written explanation of the project will aid in making sure correct information will be used. While the media is great for recruiting other members of the general public, they are unlikely to get much more involved on their own. Once information has been gathered, perhaps with a follow-up article or programme on established results, the purpose of the media has been fulfilled.

**III.9.8 Public #8: archaeologists**

This group, while small, should not be underestimated. Like amateur archaeologists, this group is often heavily emotionally involved. Next to the archaeologists working for commercial companies, like archaeological companies or engineering companies, there are those that work as advisors for municipalities and provinces, like Marjo Montforts, although employed at Libau in Groningen, advisor to the municipality Aa en Hunze. A last group belongs to the ‘plain-clothes’ archaeologists, who have the required training, but not the associated job. Even though members of this group may not be employed in the archaeological work field, they are likely to stand up for the sake of archaeology in the locality and are involved in activities like volunteering at excavations, events and in organisations.

As has been mentioned, this group has emotional and practical ties to archaeology and for that reason will be willing to put in a lot of time and effort to make a project work. The fact that this group already has the skill-set and knowledge will make things a little easier. Most will be able to make just interpretations, record data, excavate, etc. without much help. Many will also have their own gear, which means not having to supply extra gear for your project.

For a large part this last group will overlap with amateurs & volunteers, yet they are a little different. People who have received archaeological training may demand more authority. It is not hard to imagine a situation where such a person may begin to tell other volunteers what to do. Whether this is desirable or not may depend on the project. Another thing to look out for is that there is a limited supply of local plain-clothes

\textsuperscript{120} Groenendijk 2010, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{121} Personal communication Jan Jaap Hekman, (Grontmij) 20 July 2015, letter.
archaeologists and there is a good chance individuals will come from other regions to participate. It is likely several will know each other, leading to the formation of ‘cliques’ and increasing the ‘us’ and ‘them’ sensation so often felt between archaeologists and non-archaeologists.

III.10 Conclusion

The above publics have shown that it is impossible to cut the public into clear, bite size pieces. It is evident that even within these eight groups, further subgroups can be pointed out. It will depend on the project and the goal of segmentation to what degree the public will be categorised. I have attempted to righteously portray the most important stakeholders in the archaeology of the municipality of Aa en Hunze. There is some overlap between stakeholders, but this cannot be avoided and should not harm the goals as set in this chapter. While all of the publics are relevant, it is needed to make a selection. The selected public will be incorporated in the pilot plan for a public archaeology project.

The more people a public consists of, the more diverse the wishes and interests of that public will be. For that reason, would it be best to simply select one public? In theory this should lead to the smallest diversity of opinions and for an easier incorporation in a project. Although, this will mean only a limited number of people will be able to engage in the project, excluding other members of the public who could be more than willing to get involved. The opposite situation, meaning the incorporation of anyone who might be willing to, is perhaps not the worst scenario. Diversity of opinions, perspectives and wishes in a project could be effective in creating a discussion of the role and significance of archaeology. In practice, many public archaeology projects use this method. However, this does not mean a project should be designed around them, although they should be kept in mind when planning for location, funding, possible dates, etc.

Instead, public #1 (local inhabitants), public #3 (tourists) and public #6 (farmers, landowners & ‘destroyers’) are the largest stakeholders and should be considered in the planning for a project. Of course, public #6 and to a lesser degree #3 are also members of public #1. That is not to say their opinions, interests and wishes are similar, quite the opposite. The techniques necessary to involve them are also different. Tourists are looking for a time to relax, to learn and experience, and to wind down. Farmers and landowners can be reluctant to get involved, because of their negative experiences with archaeology (or better said: archaeological regulations). In general, they do have a stronger bond with the area and its past, with their family history often rooted locally. So while tourists might be looking for fun events, excitement or seeing archaeologists at work, farmers and landowners could be looking for placement in the past, traces of their ancestry and understanding of their land’s past.

The remaining two publics, #5 (amateurs & volunteers) and #8 (archaeologists), are very similar, also when looking at the advantages and disadvantages of incorporating them in a project. Their perspectives will largely overlap, and a wish to be involved can be equally strong. These two groups will not need much persuasion to join in a project, and not a lot of planning is needed to incorporate them. However, there is a group
of amateurs and volunteers that will only be interested in some parts of the archaeological process, such as excavation. It is possible that they will not participate in a non-fieldwork project.

Local inhabitants are the major stakeholders in archaeology and should have a decent degree of authority over the past in their area. While tourists may also be local, usually these are visitors from elsewhere. While they have a lot to contribute to archaeological projects, the emotional involvement and willingness to participate long-term is often absent. Farmers and landowners, for whom archaeology is often a ‘nuisance’, could be incorporated in the project for an increased support base, but are difficult to persuade to participate and belong also to the local inhabitants in general. For that reason, local inhabitants should be the main group involved in a public archaeology project in the municipality of Aa en Hunze. As a result, hopefully the local past will be better protected as the local act as advocates and guardians.

Studies and practice have already pointed out that the attitude towards archaeology and the past is positive in this municipality, so there should be a lot of possibilities. Together with the theme of the project, ‘Prehistory & water’, this should give interesting results.
IV. Methods in Public Archaeology

This chapter is dedicated to methods and techniques involved in presenting archaeology to the public or involving and/or engaging the public in archaeological projects. First, it is important to address some of the theory surrounding methods in public archaeology, to understand the processes and decisions to be made prior to a project, to come to the desired results. In the previous chapters I discussed the difficulties that are concerned with choosing what stories or ‘histories’ should be told and which public you wish to be your audience. The decisions for and development of a public archaeology project are entirely dependent on context, audience and objectives. Next to that, it is important to decide on the desired level of involvement of the public in a project, or to what degree archaeology should be democratic should be in your case. In the most democratic of projects, the public chooses what the project will eventually look like.1

Of the vast amount of methods and techniques used in presenting archaeology to the public, a couple will be highlighted here. For clarity several categories are made and for each technique or method the advantages and disadvantages will be listed, in addition to, when possible, an example. At the end of the chapter a decision will be made about what methods or techniques are most suitable for employment in the Hunze valley in the municipality Aa en Hunze.

IV.1 Discussing methods in public archaeology

IV.1.1 Storyteller

The methods described in this chapter function as tools for the archaeologist to tell a story. The archaeologist as storyteller will present a story of the past and explain its sources. This could be, for example, as a guide in a museum, but also as an archaeologist writing a brochure or book about a site or culture. However, in order for archaeologists to use these methods properly, they should become aware of their image, of what they are (storytellers), also in the eyes of society.2

For archaeologists to take advantage of the positive appeal of archaeology among the public and in popular culture, they need to embrace the various connotations of their own archaeological ‘brand’ and stand behind it.3 It would be very beneficial for archaeologists, especially those concerned with public archaeology, to further develop their skills as storytellers and learn about the ins and outs of society.

According to Holtorf, storytelling exceeds the importance of education in public archaeology.4 In his eyes the archaeologist should be a sophisticated storyteller, a performer on a public stage. A good story will also educate and create goodwill, not just among the public but also among politicians. In any case, telling a story does not necessarily mean that education comes second. While it takes some skill, storytelling and education can go together, in the form of a little edufun (education + fun).

IV.1.2 Engagement, excitement

Holtorf mentioned that nowadays it is experiences that attract audiences instead of the static flow of information provided until recently.5 Perhaps this is why open days and community archaeology are so popular. Pape made a model showing the relation between the level of excitement of the public and the level of contact with an artefact or archaeology (fig. IV.1).6 He distinguishes between “hearing about”, “seeing it” and “touching it”. The closer a person gets to touching archaeology, the more excited this person will be and the closer this person feels to archaeology. This means that when possible, ‘touching’ archaeology should be provided in projects to entice the public to join in. In some cases even the infamous historical sensation may occur, in which a person has a very personal and direct moment, linking with the past, brought about by touching an artefact.7 Essential for these sensations to occur seems to be the authenticity of the artefact and

---

1 Like in the case of the Levi Jordan Project, see Pape 2012, pp. 34-37; Levi Jordan Plantation 1998 [online].
2 Holtorf 2007, p. 138, 141-142, 144.
3 Holtorf 2007, p. 134.
5 Ibid, pp. 4, 6, 144.
6 Pape 2012, p. 74.
7 Pape 2012, pp. 74-75; Cruysheer 2002, p. 29.
context. Such a moment is truly personal and emotional, therefore a great way to draw the public into archaeology. It is hard to tell how such a sensation can be triggered and almost impossible to predict. Still, a project can keep the conditions for a historical sensation in mind when planning a project, to evoke the ideal circumstances.

**IV.1.3 Durability**

Public archaeology is currently often viewed as a nice extra to indulge in, be it at excavations or in a later (or earlier!) stage of a public project. Very important for any project, but especially for those with goals to engage the public, is to start with planning as early as possible, and to have the hopes and aims of the project clear for every stakeholder involved. The goals of a project, for example to increase the support base for archaeology, will be the focal point during the planning process. A project can attempt to achieve a goal, but in order to have a lasting effect, special measures need to be taken. While projects are by definition limited, reoccurring projects or long-term projects, seem to have more effect in a target audience than temporary projects. To make a project ‘durable’, it is indeed necessary to begin planning of the project at an early stage.

Unfortunately, it is not very clear what kind of methods will help create durable effects of a project. The type of methods used will also depend on the goals of a project. Examples of ‘durable’ methods are for instance books, which can be read again and again and can be sold over a long period of time, or websites, which will remain to be online for as long as hosting is paid for and can offer information and updated information. It will not be possible for every project to attempt durable methods. Open days can only be held as long as an excavation is taking place, which is usually from an afternoon to a few weeks. Naturally, they can be part of a larger project that does have possibilities for long-term activity, for instance in the case of excavations taking place annually in which also pre- and post-excavation activities are included. The limit to possibilities is only as big or small as the creativity of the project manager. That is not to say the project manager is not very dependent on other factors, such as financial access, the type of archaeology concerned and last but not least, the local community. Usually, more funding will be needed to make a project durable, but in the case of annual events, funding might be more easily accessible if the project has been proven to be successful. In this way a first-time project is a pilot for subsequent years.

**IV.1.4 Funds and Sponsors**

After it is determined which story or stories need(s) to be told, to what audience and what kind of role this audience should play in the project and how the project will materialize, it is time to plan finances. The creation of
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8 Cruysheer 2002, pp. 30-34.
9 Evert van Ginkel, personal communication (meeting), March 6, 2014.
such a project is in most cases quite expensive: funding will have to be provided, preferably at an early stage of the project. While in some cases a developer or governmental institute will be client and therefore decide on a budget, independent projects will have to rely on some kind of funding and sponsoring from various sources. In either case a realistic and clear estimate of the costs will have to be necessary, which aids in the gathering of funds and sponsors. At the moment there is no extensive sponsoring taking place in archaeology in general, apart from the money that is needed for the fieldwork and subsequent standard report. The absence of other sponsoring could partially be explained by the fact that many archaeologists are not exactly hardcore businessmen or -women. The situation is almost the same vice versa: business(wo)men are not familiar with archaeology (except for, of course, developers etc.) and what it has to offer.

Sponsors (companies that are willing to either invest money or a service into a project) usually decide to help out because they wish to reach a local community. It is crucial the sponsor is convinced that the community will be interested in the story told. In fact, he/she must really believe in your story. It is important that whatever part of the project he/she chooses to sponsor, is clearly visible and separable for the public (like a model or reconstruction drawing vs restoration or lunches). Usually the income from sponsoring is not very high. Some sponsors want to have some kind of reassurance that the project will have a demand in the community.

There are some good examples that local projects could benefit from crowdfunding as well. A society in the small village of Dreumel, near Tiel, has succeeded in gathering enough funding for an emergency excavation. The excavation, taking place in the centre of the village, was initiated by Nils Kerkhoven of Tremele, who thought guiding the building process at the site was not enough to protect and document the plentiful archaeology coming to light. The goal was to gather 1000 euros through local crowdfunding. The project was a great success and lead to funding of over 5500 euros, in which locals, but also sponsors contributed. Next to the crowdfunding, the archaeologists made sure that locals were allowed to volunteer in the excavation and documentation; tours and explanations were given and a small local exhibition of the finds took place. A major advantage of the site was that there were many finds, from a range of periods and contexts, providing many interesting stories to share with the audience. In this case crowdfunding was not only utilised to protect archaeology that would otherwise be destroyed, but also to increase the local support base for archaeology and successfully so.

Warhorse Studios, the small-scale developers of a video game called *Kingdom Come: Deliverance*, while not active locally, needed to convince their sponsor of demand. Their new product is a live action role-playing game, set in 1401 in Central Europe. The developers strive for the game to be as authentic and factual to true events as possible. Their sponsor was not sure there would be a demand for a role-playing game which has a Medieval setting, but lacks magic and dragons, which are proven to be very popular. To solve this, Warhorse Studios made an agreement they would gather a percentage of the planned funding (£300,000) to prove the demand through the website Kickstarter. This website allows for all kinds of projects and products to gather funding by crowdfunding. Usually those that decide to contribute will receive a gift in return, the value of which is dependent on the size of their contribution. So far Warhorse Studios have gathered a staggering £1.100.000 through Kickstarter, further proving that there is indeed a demand for historically/archaeologically themed videogames.

I suspect Kickstarter and other similar websites will be playing a larger role in archaeological projects in the future, but the success of this kind of crowdfunding is very dependent on the quality of a project and its ability to reach out to a large community online. Therefore it might not be the best way to gather funding for smaller, local projects. Still, there are already a few websites dedicated to crowdfunding for heritage or archaeology, like Digventure and Micropasts. The Dutch founded CommonSites also helps with the around £50000. Such websites will likely be playing an increasing role in the future, as they can provide a range of benefits to both the community and the project.

---

13 Dorpshart Dreumel 2014 [online]; De Erfgoedstem, uniek: crowdfunding voor archeologische opgraving 2014 [online].
14 Tremele is a historical society; Tremele 2014 [online].
15 Kickstarter, Kingdom Come: Deliverance by Warhorse Studios 2014 [online].
16 Digventures 2015 [online]; MicroPasts 20?? [online].
funding, but has a more elaborate goal of creating an open and dynamic global heritage network.\textsuperscript{17}

Next to sponsors and crowdfunding, there is the possibility of applying for several funds. There are a range of funds available for culture, heritage and archaeology. For the Netherlands, most available funds have been gathered on a so-called \textit{fondsenboek}, which is accessible in book form, on a CD or online.\textsuperscript{18} As opposed to sponsors, foundations do not have to be convinced of economic benefits, but they do wish to see some sort of guarantee that the project will be successful with their funding. Some of the largest cultural funding in the Netherlands comes from the Prins Bernard Cultuurfonds.\textsuperscript{19} It funds many projects, not just about archaeology or heritage, but also the arts. The downside of these funds is that the project has to comply to some specifics in order to get the funding, but of course this counts for most funding bodies. Unfortunately, foundations do not have as much financial aids available as a decade ago, a trend set in motion because of the current economic crisis. For this reason, there is not a lot of money available from funding either.

As mentioned before, archaeologists are not known to be great business entrepreneurs, which could complicate the gathering of sponsors and funds. As Tim Schadla-Hall \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{20} put it, there is a lack of socio-economic data which is necessary for good lobbying, planning and marketing, such as the degree of popular support for funding and evidence for the positive economic impact of heritage. They state that the reason for this is is that those responsible will not gather this data, arguing that the expenses involved in carrying out such research are too high. While Schadla-Hall \textit{et al.} are referring to the situation in the United Kingdom, I believe this holds for the Netherlands as well. They urge the archaeological and heritage management sector to determine what data is available by gathering polling data and committing to economic analyses.\textsuperscript{21} It is probably wise to recommend the same in the Netherlands. Without data about popular demands, evidence of economic sustainability and the positive economic impact of archaeology on a region, we do not only risk (more) budget cuts by government institutions (provinces and municipalities), but also miss out on opportunities from these government institutions, as well as from companies, sponsors and foundations.

As a final option, there is the possibility of asking the audience for a contribution. This is not suitable for every project and the risk is that a part of your audience will choose not to take part in your project. The key here is that an experience must seem enjoyable and worthwhile to have people willing to pay; as added bonus archaeologists and project leaders will automatically give the experiences that they are offering more thought.\textsuperscript{22} Therefore it is not just aiding public archaeology financially, but can also increase the success of the outcome of a project.

\textbf{IV.2 Methods}

Not all methods available to archaeologists and project leaders to reach out to a public will be discussed here. There is a myriad of methods, some of them variants of another, and it would be superfluous to attempt to mention all of them. Instead, I have decided to select methods which appear to be quite popular at the moment, next to methods who have been tried-and-tested in the past. The goals of the public archaeology project, in combination with the selected stories, target audience and the methods will eventually be the backbone of the project. The methods below are discussed generally for their purpose in archaeology, but at the end of each category of methods their possible suitability in the \textit{Hunze} valley project in the municipality of \textit{Aa en Hunze} will be mentioned. In the conclusion of this chapter a selection of methods will be made on the basis of the decisions made in the previous chapters.

The methods described here are divided into several categories. Sometimes it is difficult to direct a method to one group, because it could be part of several. In that case it has been put in the category thought to be most suitable. For every method I will attempt to name an example. Below are listed the categories I have determined should be incorporated in this thesis, subdivided into

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{17} CommonSites 2012 [online].
  \item \textbf{18} FIN: Vereniging van Fondsen in Nederland 2015 [online]; Van Ginkel & Cruysheer 2003, p. 49.
  \item \textbf{19} Prins Bernard Cultuurfonds 2015 [online].
  \item \textbf{20} Schadla-Hall \textit{et al.} 2010, p. 125.
  \item \textbf{21} \textit{Ibid}, p. 125.
  \item \textbf{22} Holtorf 2007, p. 136.
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IV. Methods in Public Archaeology

IV.2.1 (Multi)media

While this category provides a range of possibilities, it is a problematic one. Usually, very high costs are involved and its success is very dependent on the platform provided and the quality of the project, next to PR. The first type of method to come to mind are movies. Movies can appear on TV or be made for theatres. Both are very pricy, especially the theatre movies.23 The problem with most movies is that their function is not to educate or to inform, but to entertain. While these movies may not educate people about what archaeology is really about, they are a huge part of popular culture and are cause a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Platform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Multi)media</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Heritage</td>
<td>Apps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QR-codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Layar (augmented reality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom projects</td>
<td>Leskisten &amp; lespakketten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tours for classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guided trails for classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeologist in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reenactment</td>
<td>Experimental archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical events replayed &amp; living history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Books &amp; e-books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brochures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art in the public sphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructions</td>
<td>Reconstructions of buildings or settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstructions of items or single finds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital/3D reconstructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological interpretative illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological excavations</td>
<td>Open days/visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community archaeology/participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tours at excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of information</td>
<td>Information boards, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits</td>
<td>Museum exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travelling exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City hall exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital presentation</td>
<td>Websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virtual reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D scans of artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV.1: Categories and associated platforms of public outreach/engagement methods and techniques in archaeology.

Subcategories (platforms) to provide some clarity on the content of the categories (table IV.1).

23 As an example, the History Channel series Vikings season 1 (2013), consisting of 9 episodes, allegedly cost around €36 million: StarTribune, meet the real Ragnar in History Channel's Vikings 2013 [online], while the movie Pompeii (2014) had a budget of €72 million: Faughnder 2014 [online].
relatively positive view on archaeology as a science. Still, movies are not the best method for involving or engaging the public, since they are very costly and offer minimal possibilities for being interactive and educative, while still bringing in a profit.

A more affordable option are documentaries, with a low-budget documentary costing around €80,000 and more expensive productions around €380,000.24 Documentary series with an archaeological theme also exist, but can be quite controversial. American Digger, Diggers and Nazi Diggers are all shows about teams (mostly non-archaeologists) digging up old items on battlefields and other rich sites, which they then continue to sell for a profit.25 A much more desirable portrayal of archaeology is the immensely popular Time Team, a series recorded and broadcasted for about a decade in the United Kingdom and many other countries. In every episode of this show a team of archaeologists and specialists go to a site and have only three days to excavate. Most of the archaeological process is shown and everything is visibly recorded. Eventually the past of the site is being revealed with the help of finds, stories and illustrations, but unmistakably the archaeological process and the ‘revealing of the secret’ is even more exciting to watch than only the end result.26

On Dutch television archaeology is not as popular as in the UK, although in the past a rather successful television series has appeared on public television in the Netherlands, called “Nederland in de Prehistorie” (The Netherlands in Prehistory). It aired in 2000, consisted of 12 episodes and was presented by Leo Verhart.27 A more recent series, directed at children, is called “Pieter in de Prehistorie” (Peter in Prehistory), which quite efficiently uses a mixture of humor, science and visual effects to tell the story of the past.28 While a one-off documentary may be cheaper, a series can potentially reach a larger audience (because of the multiple broadcasting dates)

24 On low-budget documentaries: Evert van Ginkel, personal communication (meeting), December 9, 2014; the National Geographic documentary Nasca Lines: The buried secrets (2010) had an estimated budget of €380,000: IMDB, Nasca lines: the buried secrets 2010 [online].
25 Kloor 2012 [online]; Heritage Daily, National Geographic buries Nazi Diggers 2014 [online].
26 Holtorf 2007, p. 131.
28 VPRO, Pieter in de Prehistorie 2014 [online].
and allows more broadcasting time in total. Series could find a home on regional channels on which they can be quite successful, such as the “Expeditie Limburg”. This TV documentary series about the pasts of Limburg was created by Kris Förster for a local station and proved quite successful (appendix II).29 Broadcasting on TV could be a successful way for archaeologists to reach out to the public; after all, TV is the public’s single most preferred medium to learn about archaeology.30 It is therefore very important to consider, but has many drawbacks in ways of financials, planning, demands of channels, etc.

Short movies and film presentations may be very useful in other settings, such as school classes, at the start of museum exhibitions or guided tours, at an information centre, broadcasted on the internet, etc. For this purpose DVD’s (or downloadable films) could be a good medium. These can cost a lot of money as well, for example around €20.000-50.000, as was the case for the DVD productions created by Henri Vos and Olav Lens (Landscape Studios) for the Province of Friesland in 2000.31 In all fairness, their production contained five series spread out over ten years, which could explain the steep costs.32 These work well at exhibitions or ‘hotspots’, because they can be easily operated and are not very vulnerable to wear and tear. More common now is the appearance of short online films about a certain topic or excavation, offered through popular video websites such as Youtube or Vimeo, sometimes posted on websites, social media or blogs. Broadcasting these online is completely free, but making the public aware of them can be an issue.

IV.2.1.2 Radio
Radio seems to be a dying medium, but in fact has proven itself quite flexible. Next to traditional analog radio, increasingly popular is online radio (or internet radio).33 Dutch radio stations offer only one historically themed programme at the moment, called OVT (Onvoltooid Verleden Tijd) on

29 Expeditie Limburg 2013 [online].
32 Evert van Ginkel, personal communication (meeting) December 9, 2014.
33 Vogels 2014 [online].
Radio 1. There used to be another historical programme on the radio, called Een Leven Lang on Radio 5, but this was cancelled early 2014. There are some numbers available about what radio stations are most popular, delivered by the Stichting Nationaal Luister Onderzoek. These numbers do not go into what programmes are most popular. It seems local and regional radio stations are a better platform for history and archaeology, because there is more time and interest on the subject. Regional and local radio stations are much more likely to allow archaeologists some time to talk about upcoming excavations, open days, historical events, results of excavations and more. Therefore, it is a great way to reach out to people, in a way promoting, an upcoming excavation or event. This works best in combination with other methods of marketing/promotion, like regional TV, handing out flyers, putting up banners, etc.

IV.2.1.3 Videogames
There are countless historically-themed videogames out there, but most of them are not very historically accurate. This is not necessarily needed, since video games are very interactive (more than TV or movies) and therefore offer a much better way to immerse in the past. Video games come in all genres, but most common are the real-time strategy games, puzzle-solving or mystery games and role-playing games. Examples of popular and somewhat historically accurate video games are Age of Empires (1997-2014), the aforementioned Kingdom Come: Deliverance (upcoming: 2015), Cossacks: European Wars (2001), Annals of Rome (1986), Call of Duty I & II (2003-2005), Brothers in Arms (2005-2010), Crusader Kings (2004-2014), Europa Universalis (2000), Assassin’s Creed (2007-2014), Pharaoh (1999), Rome: Total War (2004), LA Noir (2011) and many, many more. I have not included the many games about archaeology, or about being an archaeologist.

In the case of video-games it is hard, if not impossible, to develop a historically-accurate game. Just like with movies and TV series, this is not something that is desirable in the first place. The games are mainly meant to be entertaining and interactive. But in order for the games to be entertaining, a level of credibility and realism is required. For this reason a lot of fantasy games use a historic setting. The past as a framework offers to tell a story (something that did not truly happen or could not happen in real life), without having to explain too much about the game world and its complications. The gamers are expected to have some basic knowledge about the historical worlds (for example the Roman Empire, World War II, Middle Ages, etc.), which also makes it easier for them to immerse in the world.

Another group of games is those that are developed to be educative first, entertaining second. They are usually created for classrooms and school-going children, to entice students to learn about the past by presenting it in a fun way. These are by no means mainstream, but can be popular in a school environment. These type of games can also be used in museum exhibitions. In the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden (Dutch National Museum of Antiquities) in Leiden for example, a computer was set up with a game in the Egyptian exhibition, in which the deceased (the player) has to fulfil a range of tasks to go to the afterlife. On the internet a range of games are available for free, but they vary greatly in quality. Some of the better educative games are those from the BBC. Another similar example is that of a game about the construction of Stonehenge, where the user is given the rule of master builder. These games are usually a lot cheaper to make than the high-end commercial games out there. For that reason they are also easier to offer to schools or museums. Games as a platform appeal to children very much and can be a good addition to lectures in class.

One obvious disadvantage is that video-games are quickly outdated, not only from a visual perspective, but also in terms of archaeological data and interpretations offered in the game. Keeping a game updated is possible, but only to a limit and it will be hard to keep in touch will all consumers to update the game. Online games may be updated automatically. Additional costs will be necessary with running updates as well. For a lot of games errors and flaws will require updates.

34 OVT does not translate well into English, but means “imperfect” or “unfinished past times”; NPO Radio 1, OVT 2015 [online].
35 NPO Geschiedenis, een leven lang 2013 [online].
36 Nationaal luister onderzoek 2017 [online].
IV.2.1.4 Concluding (multi)media
There are many opportunities for involving (multi)media in public archaeology projects, because of their versatile nature and many different applications. In general, this group of methods can be categorised into film (and documentary), TV, radio and video games. Most of them are quite costly, because of the technology and manpower involved in delivering the final product. Low-budget options are becoming more common, with technology becoming more widely available and platforms cheaper or free. However, this will usually mean the quality of the product has to suffer too. Where quality of the visuals may have to diminish, the quality of the content can still be worthwhile. Like with most, if not all, public archaeology projects, PR is necessary to increase awareness of the project’s existence. For the Hunze valley, regional television/radio and short online films may be an option to engage people with the local past, probably in combination with other methods.

IV.2.2 Portable Heritage
This term is a rather unfortunate one, because it does not directly offer a good explanation of what is meant by ‘portable heritage’. It signifies all the information about that which is considered to be cultural heritage and is portable. While folders and books are of course portable, it is new digital technologies that are meant here, such as apps for on smartphones and tablets, and QR-codes. These technologies are relatively new to archaeology and heritage management, but have already been used quite a lot in the Netherlands and abroad.

IV.2.2.1 Apps
Apps (applications for smartphones or tablets) have a great advantage over books and folders, because the information provided can be updated at all times and automatically. Another advantage is that an app can be made more interactive and offer a range of services or possibilities not possible for publications. There are also some downsides to the use of apps, like the need for compatibility with different operating systems (iOS, Android, Microsoft Windows, etc.) and the need for internet access in order for most apps to work. Thankfully, mobile internet is widely available in the Netherlands, so users will usually have access to the app’s data (granted they have mobile internet access on their phone). While some apps can be used without internet access, data is often taken from the internet to limit the amount of space used on the phone itself.

Two examples of apps are the MaastrichtMap and the Via Belgica Digitalis, as developed by Kris Förster of KF InHeritage.39 The MaastrichtMap uses a website in combination with an app to offer a wide range of information about the city of Maastricht, not limited to history and archaeology. The Via Belgica Digitalis, however, is entirely dedicated to the local Roman past, along the Roman route the Via Belgica, cutting straight through the province of Limburg. The app works in combination with a website as well, with way points on a map offering extensive information in the form of videos, photos, text, animations, etc. (fig. IV.2). It is very well executed. The power of apps like the MaastrichtMap and the Via Belgica digitalis, and a lot of apps like them, is that they use the GPS function of the phone to locate the user and nearby ‘hotspots’. These hotspots can be monuments, places where some part of the past can be seen or where an historical event took place. The app then provides the user with additional information, like a story, audio, images, maps, etc. The user determines how much and the type of the information he or she wishes to see. This method for apps is used widely and in the Hunze as well. The app Anno Drenthe offers a database of a lot of hiking, cycling and canoeing routes through Drenthe.40 They can be selected based on several criteria, like location and theme. Every route has a story, sometimes reinforced with a few pictures, a map and instructions. In the route several hotspots are highlighted, with information in the form of pictures (for example historical pictures of the same scene where the user is standing), stories or video footage. A great bonus of this app is that the maps with additional information are only downloaded when selected, so unnecessary downloading is prevented, which slows down the app and phone and crams the phone with unnecessary data. There are also apps that do not make use of GPS but still try to engage the public in

39 KF InHeritage 2017 [online]; Via Belgica Digitalis 2012 [online]; Maastricht: Map 2013 [online].
40 Anno Drenthe.NU 2012 [online].
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the past in an interactive manner. One example of this is *Pompeii Touch*, which uses the smartphone or tablet’s touch screen to allow the user to ‘erase’ the image of today and see a reconstruction of the same location.\(^{41}\) Several images are available and the 3D reconstructions also offer further information about what the user is viewing. The app can be bought through the “App store” for €1.79 or downloaded for free as a demo. *De Rijksmuseum* in Amsterdam has developed a widget\(^{42}\) aptly named the *Rijkswidget*.\(^{43}\) This widget shows a different prized artefact from the collection of the Rijksmuseum every day, such as paintings and sculptures. The widget links to the website of the Rijksmuseum offering further information, like time period, artist, etc. How much all the above apps are being used, is unknown. The problem with these apps, even if they are free, is that people often do not know about them. For a successful app, additional funds are needed to promote the service to the public. Leaving folders in a tourist information centre (VVV) is an option, but locals are not often reached in this way. As many platforms as possible need to be used to reach the desired public and increase awareness of the existence of such an app.

Some app developers choose to also develop a website to improve the services provided. The advantage is that people who do not have a smartphone or internet access, can still visit the website and see the information there. The “*Via Belgica Digitalis*” is a good example, offering the same stories (written, audio and video), images and maps available through the app.\(^{44}\) For those users that wish to have extensive in-depth information about the past, excavation photos, ground plans and further information is available. The *Anno Drenthe* app also has an associated website, but its function is more to assist the routes provided by the app.\(^{45}\) Users can upload pictures of locations on a route, but can also make a new route. In order to do this they need to register and log in on the

---

\(^{41}\) *Pompeii Touch* 2014 [online].

\(^{42}\) A sort of app for smartphones and tablets that remains activated on the ‘home screen’, the desktop of a tablet or smartphone.

\(^{43}\) *I-culture, Rijkswidget: iedere dag een ander schilderij uit het Rijksmuseum* 2009 [online].

\(^{44}\) *Via Belgica Digitalis* 2012 [online].

\(^{45}\) *Anno Drenthe.NU* 2012 [online].
website. Just like the app, the website offers users the ability to look into several historical maps of Drenthe.

The costs of developing an app depends greatly on the app itself. It also depends on who will develop the app. There are companies specialised in this matter and sometimes also specialised in heritage. In a few cases the developer is the same person as the initiator, in which case costs are usually reduced. Companies charge around €50,- to €100,- an hour, while apps are mostly offered to the public for free.46 As a rule, the more complex the services of the app are and the higher the quality of the app, the higher the costs will be. While making profit is not always necessary, in comparison with books or DVD’s, only a small part of the public will be willing to pay for access. Local companies like restaurants, hotels and museums, may be willing to sponsor the app development. Especially for those apps that use GPS and maps, it is easy to incorporate these companies. As an additional service to the weary hiker, this does not necessarily have to take away from the main goal of the app. Many free apps make use of advertisements in their app to reduce costs or make a profit, but this can diminish the professional look of the app.

IV.2.2.2 QR codes
Some apps are only meant to direct to information based on an associated website. The more old-fashioned QR-codes have the same function. Some people seem to be of the opinion that QR-codes are already quite out of date, but they are still being used extensively for appointments and tickets, be it for municipality meetings or for a visit to the cinema. The QR-code can be recognised as an image of a square consisting of several black and white blocks (fig. IV.3). The unique size and sequence of these blocks determines the information hidden behind the code. QR-codes in general require less space on the phone for data, but an application needs to be downloaded to be able to scan and recognise the code, such as Barcode Scanner or Neoreader.47 After the code is scanned, the user is referred to the belonging image, text or website. In most cases a website is involved, which is why fewer data needs to be stored on the phone. A disadvantage is that the user needs to be in possession of a phone with mobile internet access or Wi-Fi and a camera to scan the code. Luckily, most smartphones these days are in the possession of a camera; the quality of the device is of lesser importance.

This method has been used for some archaeology-related purposes, like at the Hunebedcentrum in Borger. The QR-codes there are placed on small signs near points of interest, like the large hunebed D27 or a reconstruction of a prehistoric farm. The QR-codes refer to audio files online, creating a sort of free audio tour, named ontdek het verleden (”discover the past”) that can be taken on a person’s own smartphone.48 Next to the points of interest around the Hunebedcentrum, there is a hiking trail in the surrounding village called the zwerfsteentpad, about local boulders brought in by the ice ages.49 This trail also makes use of small signs with QR-coding, referring to additional information in the form of pictures and stories online. Research by Van de Bunt has determined that while in the start-up phase little people were making use of the QR-codes, there is an increasing number of people using them after the method become more well-known.50 Of course the research done by Van de Bunt has already aged a little, but since QR-codes are still in use for

46 AppGoeroes, wat kost het om een app te laten maken 2012 [online].
47 Microsoft, Neoreader 2015 [online]; Google Play , Barcode Scanner 2015 [online].
48 Ontdek het verleden 201? [online]; Hunebedcentrum , audiotour 201? [online].
49 Hunebedcentrum, wandelen 201? [online].
50 Van der Bunt 2011a, pp. 35-36; Van der Bunt 2011b, pp. 16-17.
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diverse purposes, there is no reason to assume the QR-codes at the hunebedcentrum are no longer being used.

IV.2.2.3 Virtual and augmented reality on mobile devices

Layar is another piece of interesting software which can be used for heritage purposes. The same-named Dutch company specialises in augmented reality on smartphones and tablets. The service uses in-built camera, GPS and camera to determine the location of the user. The user sees whatever the phone’s camera is pointed at, but an additional layer is placed over it with additional or different information. This could be the location of interesting stores, gas stations and the like, but also old photos or an image to show what the location looked like in the past. An example of a project that makes use of this kind of technology is KAD-AR, an app still in development. The app allows the user to view reconstructions as layered over the original ruins of a Cyprus Bronze Age settlement. It uses visual data as well as GPS and location services and can receive additional information about structures, objects and more. A Dutch example of using augmented reality techniques for archaeology-related purposes is Kerkrade in 3D. A project in which several pieces from Roman history (Villa Krichelberg) are being presented in moving 3D models after the associated emblems are scanned with the corresponding app on a smartphone or tablet.

IV.2.2.4 Concluding Portable Heritage

It is to be expected that portable heritage will be incorporated in most public archaeological projects in the future. Not only do the methods offer many advantages and fast development, the public is also expecting to be able to use their smartphone and/or tablet when engaging with the past. It is likely new and better adapted forms of portable heritage will be invented to replace the old, for example QR-codes, which still rely on the downloading of additional software before it can be used. The development of smartphone and tablet technology will likely continue as well and with it the applications and services to do with archaeology change too. While this may be true, for now still a portion of the public does not possess a smartphone or tablet and cannot make use of some of the available apps. For this reason portable heritage should only be incorporated after careful consideration of the target audience and goals. It is relatively simple to create an app, depending on its complexity, and there are numerous ways of keeping costs down. Next to funding and advertisements, charging for apps is an option, but it will also cause many people to refrain from downloading these apps. QR-codes have a benefit there, as their use is completely free for the user and the supplier, as QR-codes can be made for free and only link to an image, audio-file or a page on the internet. Luckily, internet connection for mobile technology is fairly good in the Netherlands (networks provided by KPN, Vodafone or T-mobile) and can be accessed at most locations, especially now Wi-Fi hot spots are becoming more common. Apps do need to be designed for different operating systems (iOS, Windows, Android, etc.) for wider availability. Layar technology is offered in apps and is a form of augmented reality (see also ‘digital presentations’ below). With this method the relation between the past and the present becomes very apparent and is controlled by the user to a large extent. This method is not so common yet but is being used around the world in several places.

All-in-all it seems portable heritage will make up a large part of public archaeology projects in the future, but already they have been used for several purposes. It is hard to determine just how successful these projects have been, without being affiliated to the projects. Special care must be taken to choose a target audience and create a qualitative and interactive product. While QR-codes may be the cheapest, they do depend on extensions to function, like information boards and, of course, online content. For all portable heritage counts that some PR must be done for public awareness. For the Hunze valley, the Anno Drenthe app already exists, which does not focus on archaeology and heritage, but on hiking trails and the like. Portable heritage could certainly play a role in a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley, especially in combination with other methods, such as information signs, exhibitions or tours.

---

51 Layar 2011 [online].
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because of the limited impact on the ‘natural’ landscape.

IV.2.3 Classroom projects

Children as a group are one of the most important stakeholders for heritage and archaeology, because they hold the future in their hands and will end up determining what the future of archaeology will look like. It is no surprise then that there are a lot of methods and techniques out there to engage children with the past. The most convenient time and space for this is the classroom. A lot of children are concentrated there and will come from all kinds of circles. Some of the more popular methods for Dutch classrooms are the leskisten (lesson boxes), but there are other ways too, like guided tours/excursions and one-on-one contact with archaeologists. All of these methods are obviously targeted at school-going children, but do not have to be employed solely in the classroom. In some public archaeology projects special activities are organised for visiting children (for example at open days of excavations). Lesson boxes or a visiting archaeologist in the classroom serve well as preparations for or additions to visits to excavations or museums. Usually a combination of the methods discussed below work best.

There are a lot of possibilities for schoolteachers in the Netherlands to incorporate archaeology in the curriculum. Dutch schools have to live by government-opposed rules what classes are taught and how much time is spent on them, which means there is no room for week-long archaeology sessions. There are several websites that are dedicated to providing schoolteachers with archaeological information and where to get lesson boxes or packages, like "archeoloog in de klas"/archeos and the AWN website (several departments within this society for archaeological volunteers provide services for education).55

IV.2.3.1 Leskisten

Lesson boxes (leskisten) or lesson packages (lespakketten) are just what you might expect: boxes that can be used in class for lessons concerned with archaeology and the past. In a box or chest original artefacts (like flint artefacts or pieces of ceramics) are combined with replicas of more precious/important archaeological finds.56 These finds are usually accompanied by text of some kind, for example in the form of hand-outs or folders. Maps and illustrations are also a possibility. Sometimes the box is provided in digital form, for example on a CD or DVD. The lesson boxes are mostly aimed at older children in primary school (10-12 years old) and the youngest years at high school (13-14 years old). The costs vary per lesson box, depending on factors like the amount of high-quality images used and the amount of research required for the topic. A Dutch example of the lesson box is "een koffer vol scherven" (a suitcase filled with sherds).57 This lesson box is widely available in the Netherlands and can be borrowed for free or a small fee from an archaeological institution in the area, like a commercial archaeological company, a museum or from archaeologists working for a municipality. It is possible using the information provided by een koffer vol scherven to make a new leskist. A suitcase and archaeological material need to be provided individually. Making a new and completely unique leskist can be expensive. A set of five may cost around €27,500,-, but cheaper options are around €21,000,- (two suitcases and a CD). 58

IV.2.3.2 Tours and open days

Guided tours and excursions are often incorporated in the leskist, but can also be used individually. Tours can take place at a range of places, like ongoing excavations (for open days at excavations, please see below), archaeological sites (still visible in the landscape), archaeological depots, museums or an archaeological commercial company. Tours for classrooms do not necessarily need the involvement of an archaeologist, depending on the location. In a museum an employee could very well give a tour of the objects that are being exhibited, at an excavation an experienced amateur archaeologist could give a tour. Still, the involvement of an archaeologist could be very beneficial, even though the knowledge of museum employees can be wonderful, more in-depth questions can often only adequately be answered by archaeologists. There is another advantage of letting archaeologists be the tour guides:


57 Archeoloog in de klas, een koffer vol scherven 201? [online].
a look into what children consider interesting and how they choose to interpret and look at the past. Archaeologists could learn from this. As a downside, there is usually little money available for payment as a tour guide, so most guides will be volunteers. Then there are problems of suitability; not every is suitable for becoming a tour guide, especially when there are children on the listening end. Lacking the training, this could definitely count for archaeologists. That is not to say archaeologists in general would not fit the job. It might take some practice and an open mind, but clear communication and interaction with children is necessary. Such tours by archaeologists are already taking place, like at the *Hunebedcentrum in Borger (Drenthe)* or at the *NAD Nuis* (Northern Archaeological Depot) in *Nuis (Groningen)*. While arguably a type of museum, the *educatieve erven* (educational courtyards/sites) are a great place to visit for classrooms. These are places that are furnished to represent sites from the past, where all kinds of activities from the past can be undertaken. Examples are *Buitencentrum Wilhelminaord, Dzertijdboerderij Dongen, Stichting Prehistorisch Kamp Apeldoorn ‘Haps’* and Themapark Archeon (although the last one could be considered an open-air museum more than just an *educatief erf*). These are available throughout the Netherlands, so there should be an *educatief erf* near every school.

Related, but slightly different, are the guided trails for classrooms and children. On these trails children will hike or cycle, on the way making stops to learn from sites, stories and objects they come across. Needless to say these trails take place exclusively outside. A disadvantage of this method is that it is limited to areas where archaeological heritage is visible in the landscape. It might be possible to give such guided trails in areas where archaeology is not visible- but it will be much more challenging and harder to comprehend for the children involved. Archaeological practices, like ground survey or coring, could be a solution in these cases.

**IV.2.3.3 Archaeologist in the classroom**

Another option often combined with a *lespakket or leskist*, is a visiting archaeologist in the classroom. The archaeologist will come and explain archaeological practices or elaborate on a certain time period. The children can ask questions (prepared in advance) to the archaeologist. Sometimes lectures are given about specific archaeological themes, for instance *hunebedden*, which are specifically targeted at school-going children. These do not necessarily take place inside the classroom, but could be held at museums, municipality or provincial offices, libraries or universities. A related option is inviting a living history group to the classroom. These groups, who try to act out the past as realistically and accurately as possible, usually focus on one theme or time period from history, for example as Vikings or Roman soldiers. More will be explained about living history later, but it should be noted that they are a good opportunity for school-going children to learn about the past.

**VI.2.3.4 Concluding Classrooms**

Leskiten, open days, tours and visiting archaeologists or living history groups are very good ways to introduce children to archaeology and archaeological practices. It is unfortunate that many schools do not have time to incorporate these methods, because of rigid school schedules and subject divisions. Nonetheless, *leskisten* seem to be quite popular, because they can often be borrowed by schools for free, but also because they can be planned without introducing third parties, such as an archaeologist or guide. The best *leskisten* offer real artefacts or reproductions, along information and questions. A requirement is that the information needs to be presented in a way clear to children of varying ages, which is no easy task.

Children are the future and for that reason deserve to be involved in archaeology. If an increased support base for archaeology is desired, children cannot be dismissed. However, the problem with specific methods catering to classrooms, is that they exclude other target audiences. For this reason it seems classroom methods, such as *leskisten* and a visiting archaeologist, are not suitable for the *Hunze* valley, since the target audience is the local public. This public includes children, but does not exclude the others living in the region.

59 Based on a list on Docentensite Archeos, educatieve erven 2007-2017 [online].
IV.2.4 Reenactment

This form of public outreach, and sometimes participation, revolves around acting out the past. These methods really speak to the imagination of an audience, because of the clear visual aspect involved and the possibilities for interaction. Reenactment is used to describe events in which people, dressed up in period-appropriate outfits and adorned with the historically accurate gear, act out historical events as known from history. Mostly this concerns famous battles and besiegement. I have named this section ‘reenactment’, but included techniques described as experimental archaeology and living history, that do not per se involve the acting out of specific historical events. Many open-air museums have popped up over the last century and rely heavily on reenactment. Their visitors come first and foremost to see the past come alive. It is one of the most interactive ways of learning about the past: even when the visitor is not allowed to participate in activities, the actors, playing a character from the past, can be asked questions about the activities or their persona. Hardly any visitor will question the answers given. Of course, like with many other methods, the success of reenactment is dependent on a variety of factors.

IV.2.4.1 Experimental archaeology

The more scientific branch within reenactment is experimental archaeology. It is born out of scientific aspirations, not out of the desire to create an image of the past for public display. While the term is used loosely, in principal it is the act of performing activities to recreate the process of manufacture or other activities from known artefacts from the past. In other words, when a flint axe has been retrieved, experimental archaeology may be used to see what knapping techniques could have been utilised to come to the end result. Careful analysis will compare the original with the copied experimental archaeological object. In another way, modern flint objects may be used for different purposes to find out what use-wear analysis pattern corresponds most closely to that of the original. In that way the purpose of tools can be researched. Period appropriate outfits are not necessary, but all the tools used in the procedures will be attempted to be as close to their historical counterparts as possible. In this way it could also be called reconstruction archaeology. Several academic archaeology departments conduct this kind of research, but also museums and individual groups may participate in experimental archaeology. In museums and independent groups the scientific conduct may not always be up to standards; as there lie other priorities.

IV.2.4.2 Living history & historical reenactment

So not all experimental archaeological practices have as heavy a foot in academics and instead act more as a hobby, for entertainment or to demonstrate to the public. Living history and reenactment of historical events (sometimes referred to as historical reenactment) belong to this last category. In living history and in replayed historical events, the goal is to dress as close to how people would have dressed in a certain time period, have the accurate gear and props and most of the time also create a convincing character to be played, with a history, personality and dialogue of itself. The people who are involved in living history could be archaeologists or historians, but not necessarily. These people perform in living history in the first place because they enjoy doing so. That is not to say other factors, such as education to the public, are not important. By portraying as accurate an image as possible of any given time in the past, the public can be attracted, interested and involved. In this way it will be an adventure to discover and learn. As an educational medium it is often used by museums or at events at historical sites and monuments, in living history groups or at schools, to name a few examples. Depending on the events played out, living history and historical reenactment can focus on very specific items from the past, such as manufacture or items, everyday life, struggles in society, etc. While living history and historical reenactment are very much alike, the latter usually focuses more on events that are believed to have actually occurred, while the first can create scenarios easily. Needless to say that the Prehistoric past from the Netherlands can only really be performed as living history,

60 For example: University of Exeter (UK), University of Sheffield (UK), University of Leiden (NL), University of Colorado (USA), University of Queensland (AUS), Århus University (DK), Universität Heidelberg (DE), etc.; for an extensive list, see: Exarc, Wanted, universities with experimental archaeology 2014 [online].
because no specific events are known from (written) history.

There is some attempt to connect experimental archaeology and living history/historical reenactment, for example by the organisation known as EXARC. This organisation, lead almost exclusively by university staff from all over Europe, enlists institutions and individuals that affiliate to living history or experimental archaeology. It already has about 250 members from more than 30 countries and is growing. The point of this organisation is to increase knowledge and skill transfer between institutions, developing the quality of experimental archaeology and living history around the world. Collaborations between institutions are promoted. Next to this, symposia and lectures are held.

**IV.2.4.3 Open-air/living history parks**

Many museums have appeared over the last century that are focused entirely on reenactment (around 300 open-air museums in Europe). These may revolve around a specific period in time, like the Roman period (such as the Archäologischer Park Xanten/ Römermuseum, Germany), or a series of subsequent time periods, like at Archeon (Prehistory up to and including the Middle Ages). In the Netherlands two archaeological open-air museums are quite famous, one of which is Archeon and the other Eindhoven Museum, formerly Historisch Openluchtmuseum Eindhoven (HOME).

Both are quite large and in comparison with some of the other museums, they focus mainly on reconstructions and reenactment, with exhibitions as an extra. Reenactment seems to be a great way to attract an audience, but the costs of maintaining such an open-air museum are high. A lot of museums use this method to make periods discussed in the (non open-air) exhibition come alive. The possibilities for interactivity is an added bonus. Children and adults a like will appreciate being able to ‘do’ or ‘make’ things from the past, as explained by them by a real hunter-gatherer, Roman soldier, or Medieval nun, to name a few examples. According to Paardekooper, who has researched experimental archaeology and archaeological open-air museums, these museums have significant visitor figures. In total, they attract roughly 6 to 7 million visitors each year. He states the open-air museums are so successful, because they teach about the way of life in the past to an audience that would not be reached with other methods, such as books, an archaeological site, or a traditional museum. They are institutions located in the realm between archaeological science and the public.

**IV.2.4.4 Concluding reenactment**

As mentioned before, there are endless possibilities for engagement and interaction which involve several senses (not just seeing or hearing about, but also touching and – while not a true sense- doing). As described before in figure A, diminishing the distance between archaeology and the public has a beneficial effect on the engagement level, making sure people feel more involved. Archaeological open-air museums do just that. Next to asking questions to characters, people can be put to several tasks from the past, such as grinding wheat, fishing, flint knapping, sword fighting, weaving, spinning, chanting, and the list goes on. They also can be allowed to touch all the objects and structures scattered around the open-air museum, like tools, carpets, pots, walls, dyeing materials, sheets, clothes, and many more. The combination of all these practices makes for a very enjoyable experience.

The success of both living history and historical reenactment rely heavily on a number of factors, of which the most important one is credibility. Similar to movies and games, for the sake of immersion both context, props and characters must be credible. Performing living history of the Prehistory in a classroom, for instance, will be less credible than in a reconstructed prehistoric village, a forest or another natural environment. When credibility is low, the experience is less interesting and attracting, possibly losing the attention of the crowd. For living history counts that detail is key: if the garments and props are worked out accurately and meticulously, they will be more convincing. Small details will aid in the credibility of a character. Living history actors usually make their own props
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and garments, so a lot of individual investment of time and money is to be expected. In the case of living history museums, the costs can be reimbursed, but this is not always the case. Next to a suitable environment and appropriate dress and gear, a living history actor needs a lot of knowledge about the specific time period and competent acting skills. The first requires a lot of preparation (but shows why archaeologists would qualify for such a job), the second depends perhaps on a bit of luck (and shows why not all archaeologists will qualify for the job). Of course acting skills will vary greatly, and successful living history characters do not need to be experts, a good dose of imagination and story-telling skills will come a long way. In the case of acting out specific historical events, the actors must be willing to study the scenario, which is sometimes meticulously planned, almost like choreography. Figures from history may be played out, in which case likeness and a script may be involved. This form is usually less interactive, as there is no time for people to ask questions to the characters or get involved in activities. Instead, the power of these events rely on detail, accuracy, the emotional charge of events played out and the sheer number of actors involved sometimes. Good examples are the historical reenactment of battles, such as at Waterloo. Such large-scale battle reenactments may often take place at the actual grounds where the battle took place in the past.

A benefit of reenactment is that those who are involved will go to great lengths to dress and act as appropriately as possible. For non-archaeologists and non-historians, sometimes training is needed, but most will have some self-taught knowledge of their own. Reenactment can be one of the best ways of conveying images of the past to the public. Because there is room for interactivity, the public can be involved on all kinds of levels. Joining in on activities from the past, talking to characters from the past or touching (reconstructed) objects and materials will be popular among a large audience, including and especially children. It will increase the engagement level. The benefit of archaeological open-air museums versus living history groups, experimental archaeology groups and historical reenactment, is that museums are more permanent, offering long-term value of the reconstructions and investments done.

Disadvantages of using reenactment revolve around how costly and how detailed and well-planned the carried out events must be. Creating a suitable environment, like a reconstructed village, will be costly. In that case, a natural environment may suffice as a substitute. Another option is to let the actors build constructions in the village, as a way of living history, or even experimental archaeology (when carried out correctly). Still, construction material and knowledge need to be provided. The expertise of the actors and the detail and accuracy in their dress and gear are another factor. These are expensive, but cannot always be provided by the actors in question. Next to this, the willingness to create the dress and props has to exist among the actors. The availability of actors in the region could potentially pose a problem. If the reenactors are volunteering, like with any volunteers, their reliability is questionable and their demands may be high. Employing reenactors is a possibility, such as at the Archeon, but this solution is also costly. For anyone who will want to start an archaeological open-air museum, there are more difficulties concerned: great expertise is required on a number of levels, not just archaeology, but also management, tourism, commerce and education.

Experimental archaeology may appeal less to the public, since it is more concerned with data than entertainment and education, although as a bonus it contributes a lot to archaeological research. A compromise can be made by making sure that those who conduct the experiments dress according to the period concerned and by adding an educational program, for example for school children.

IV.2.5 Publications

Publications are, next to museums, probably the oldest and most traditional methods for public outreach. That does not mean that these should be abolished. They are in fact, while little interactive, quite successful. Books, as an example, are personal, tangible and keep their value. This does not usually count for exhibitions or websites, to name a few examples. Folders and other non-book
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publications can be very useful for notifying of an upcoming event, summarizing finds of an excavation, describing hiking and cycling trails, etc. Many still prefer holding and reading text on paper over digital formats.

IV.2.5.1 Books
Books are the largest kind of publication available to archaeologists. Meant here are the books intended for a large non-archaeological public. Archaeological books do not usually sell in such amounts that a reprint is necessary, or more than 2000 books will be printed. Besides, it is hard to find an author, as writing such a book takes months, if not years. Most archaeologists do not have time for this. Furthermore, not every archaeologist is capable of writing a proper text for a book for laymen. A collaboration of experts and writers is not uncommon, but comes with a whole different set of problems. On the upside, funding is usually available for good archaeological books and there are usually some institutions that are guaranteed to take some books, like the government. Other than proper text and images, the design of the publication is crucial. Leaving this to professionals can be very pricy, but trying yourself will be a time-consuming and high-risk process. Of course, this all depends on the size, number of pages and number of images of the book. A professional and well-known designer, hired for example for the cover of a book, will charge a lot, but there are other options, like creative students, family members with experience, using stock photos, etc. Thanks to modern PC programmes and increased skills among people, designing the layout of a publication has become simpler and could be done independently. Knowledge and experience are needed, as the visual aspect of a publication is incredibly important. Especially the book cover can determine if people will be willing to read the publication or not. In some cases the publisher will not allow the author to decide what cover to use, because their profit will rely on the success of a book. In the case of archaeology books, profit is not always the most important factor, so these demands may not be so common. There are certainly advantages to leaving the layout and book cover design to other parties, but this will mostly take away from profit or add to the cost of publishing.

An example of a popular archaeology book is Verleden Land, written by Bloemers, Louwe Kooijmans and Sarfatij. It was published in the 80’s of the last century for the general public, and was well-received. It is probably the most popular archaeological book for laymen in the Netherlands, with 120,000 published prints. In it is explained what archaeology is, what archaeologists do, what can be found in different regions in the Netherlands with data from – at that time – recent excavations and information about museums across the country. It has many high-quality pictures of artefacts and excavations and was very well-written.

E-books are a modern alternative that are cheaper to produce and less costly for the eventual buyer. They are increasing in popularity quickly, as proven by the sales numbers of Amazon.com, that has sold more e-books than printed books in 2011-2012. This goes hand-in-hand with the increasing number of people who own a device to read e-books with, like a tablet or e-reader. It is cheaper to produce an e-book, because no printing, paper or transport is required. Of course, digital transport is required. The e-books must be available online. Websites like Amazon.com or the Dutch Bol.com offer e-books. They are usually cheaper than the printed version of the book. People who own an e-reader device, are also willing to buy more books. Whether this means that there is no future for printed books, remains to be seen.

IV.2.5.2 Folders & flyers
While printing folders or flyers may seem cheaper than publishing a book, relatively they are more expensive. That being said, producing a set of folders is much quicker. It is also much more wasteful: printing a large amount of folders will be cheaper, but many unused and unwanted folders will be leftover. For the design and content of the folder or flyer in question, the same counts as for publishing a book: there are professional for
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hire that will deliver a good product, but a less costly way is to design the folder independently. The talent and know-how are still indispensable.

IV.2.5.3 Magazines
As a last category I wish to mention magazines. There are, of course, already several mainstream magazines that have a lot of archaeology content. National Geographic, Archaeology and Current Archaeology come to mind. In the Netherlands National Geographic is for sale and within the genre it is definitely the most popular and can be found in everyone dentist’s waiting room. It is well-known for its great photography and interesting stories, that tend to take people across the world to experience adventures. It is released every month, a yearly subscription will cost €39.95. Archaeology is not the only subject, with nature, history and architecture also making up a large part of the magazine. Other examples of Dutch magazines concerned with archaeology are Archeologie Magazine and Westerheem. The last one is the magazine for members of the AWN (society of volunteers in archaeology). Both Archeologie Magazine and Westerheem do not reach a public broader than those already very interested in archaeology, but they are not meant for the purely academic archaeological circle. There is also Tijdschrift van de Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed (Journal of the civil service for cultural heritage), which is downloadable for free, but also available in print. Subscription to the journal is also for free. The contents are not limited to archaeology, but also consists of heritage management in general, art and history. Basically all tasks of the civil service are subject. Sadly, the journal is not well-known among the public. Next to these, more ‘available’ journals and magazines, there are the many academic journals. These do not involve the public, because of the common usage of jargon and theories, which may be hard to comprehend for a layman. They also tend to use mostly images only when these aid the data mentioned in an article, so there is no interesting visual aspect. E-journals are becoming more common and also existing printed magazines choose to offer e-journals, for example for tablets and e-readers. The same issues as with e-books are present here and it is of little use to get into this in more detail.

Publishing magazines comes with the same issues as publishing a book or a folder/flyer, but there is also considerable time-pressure involved. Especially with magazines that are published monthly, a lot of content has to be gathered, written and designed in a very short time span. The number of people necessary to accomplish this is large and costly. Less regular magazines may be easier to create. Even more so than with books, the cover is very important and determines if it will be read or not. Next to this, the popularity of the magazine can easily be a letdown, preventing subsequent issues from coming out. A one-time magazine, as an alternative to a book or journal, may be the best solution in the case of a public archaeology project. Especially in combination with other methods, like an open day or a website, it could be beneficial. Magazines, like books, can be kept for a long time and can be read and looked into frequently. While the link to a website may be forgotten or lost, a magazine will still be lying around on the coffee table or be handed to friends and family.

IV.2.5.4 Hiking, cycling & maps
Another form of publication, quite popular among tourists especially, are hiking and cycling booklets and maps about history and archaeology. These, usually combined, describe trails and routes through a city, the countryside or a number of villages. At certain points the booklet will explain something about the local history, show a marker from the past in the landscape, etc. The method of trails and routes will be mentioned further on in this thesis, but the published booklets in itself are publications and therefore deserve a place here. In the Netherlands it is mainly the TRAP-routes that are known and are aimed specifically on cultural heritage. As the name suggests, it is targeted at tourists, but non-tourist hikers and cyclists may also make use of them. The booklets are usually for sale at tourist information points, but can also be ordered from the website. There are many different TRAP-routes available and they are considered a great success.
**IV.2.5.5 Concluding publications**

Some of the benefits of using these methods have already been mentioned. While it is an older, more traditional form of reaching out to the public, it is not necessarily a bad one. In this digital age, many people still like to read, especially well-written texts about world far away (or in the distant past). Just like with many other methods, an element of adventure is needed to engage the public. For a public archaeology project, most publication methods will be best equipped as an additional item to aid whatever the project consists of. Folder/flyers, and more elaborately a magazine, can aid with the understanding of an excavation, presented for example in a local exhibition or open day. Books can contribute to long-term projects set up in a municipality of village/city. Sometimes books, like *Lagen in Stad: Oude vondsten in nieuwe verhalen*, a book about the archaeology of the city of Groningen, are specifically meant to enlarge the popularity of the past among the public, and specifically the local past, to create a sense of identity and relatability with the ‘ancestors’. In it, finds from Groningen are explained by archaeologists, after which a story involving a specific find will be told by a writer. It is a great cooperation of archaeologists and authors, joining forces to present archaeology to the public in an exciting and imaginative manner. It is clear there are many possibilities for using these methods, depending on context and available funds. Hiking and cycling booklets and maps are especially popular among tourists and those that enjoy the outdoors. Such booklets may also become outdated, but in general can be used for a longer period of time. Many still favour these over digital maps and hiking trails via apps, especially those who are not so familiar with modern (smartphone & GPS) technology. On top of all this, folders, flyers, books, magazines and hiking and cycling trails are easy to hand out during events.

There are several disadvantages to be considered when dealing with publications as a method for public engagement. For example, the visual aspect usually does not come forward as well as in other methods. Of course publications can contain pictures, but these are static and usually limited. Moving images, in for example videos or digital 3D reconstructions, speak more to the imagination and have a higher degree of interaction. Books and other publications about archaeology nowadays are expected to be rich in illustrations and images. This can drive up the costs considerably, as large, full-colour books with shiny pages are simply more expensive than paperbacks that are text-only. Furthermore, publications must be well-adapted to their target audience. It is hard to make a publication suitable for both children and adults, but also for subgroups within adults and children, texts must be very targeted. Obviously, not all content is suitable for children of 8 years old, but some of it may be appropriate for older children, like 14 year olds. Another downside is that published text become outdated very quickly. Newer editions are a possibility, but not always practical. The major disadvantage of publications is that they have very limited possibilities for interaction. With the demand for engagement and interaction increasing among the public and public archaeology projects, publications by themselves are rarely a viable option. As mentioned before, they usually work best in combination with other methods. For example the hiking and cycling trails/routes, like the *TRAP-routes*, work so well because they are a combination of written text and images and hiking and cycling. However, even in these cases the interaction is limited. The text will not change nor will there be a way of changing the routes or trails depending on personal preferences or wishes (with some exceptions).

**IV.2.6 Art and Spatial Planning**

All around, also in cities and landscapes in the Netherlands, sculptures and other pieces of art can be found in the public sphere. Some of them are modern, others more traditional. Some of them depict persons, others objects or abstracts. This subchapter will talk about the artistic methods that can be utilised for public archaeology projects. Sculptures and spatial planning will be discussed, as well as other historically themed art. Some of the sculptures or artworks are monuments to commemorate specific persons, events or time periods. These have a direct connection to the past.
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**IV.2.6.1 Art**

In Groningen two examples can/could be found of these kind of artworks can be found. They are similar in nature, because both remind of the previous location of city gates, but their representation is different. The first is located at the south-end of the **Herestraat** (a very busy shopping street in Groningen's city centre). At the location where the city gate was standing, known as the **Herepoort**, now polished boulders mark the position of its fundaments (fig. IV.3). One of the boulders in the sidewalk, right at the entrance of a fashion store, has “**Herepoort, 11e eeuw**” (Herepoort, 11th century) engraved. At the other side of the city centre, at the north-end of the **Oude Boteringestraat**, the previous location of the **Boteringepoort** was for a long time the home of an artwork called “A virtual Medieval city gate” (fig. IV.4 A+B). The virtual gate has been removed since then, but was represented by two yellow light bars built into the sidewalk and two curved light bars of the same colour attached to the gables on each side of the street, to suggest the original shape of the gate. Both artworks were/were supposed to be subtle reminders of the gates’ past existence. The projects must have been intended as a way of making interesting pieces of history available to the public, but since both are/were hardly noticeable, these efforts are likely in vain.85

Just like with any method mentioned in this thesis, art has limitations. While in theory, art has many possibilities for interaction, in practice this is not usually the case. There is little, if any, interaction. In some cases the locals are allowed to vote on what artwork has the privilege of appearing in the public sphere, but these opportunities are rare. Some artworks, like the **Rollebollen** at the **Bermouilleplein** (Groningen), make some interaction possible.86 The large metal ball-like objects can be moved around the field and sounds will come from inside the balls as well (fig. IV.5). It is working: many move the balls, especially in summer time, for example to create football goals. Other artworks may be interactive in different ways; for example, they can be climbed on or used for other, more practical purposes (bike-racks, seats, etc.).

But even if art is able to be interactive, the hardest task might be to incorporate the past. This is left to the artist(s). While there are ‘historical artworks’, like the creative city gates at the north and south of Groningen’s city center, the message about the past is not often conveyed without further knowledge. The artwork has become an object in the public sphere that can have many effects on people, but conveying something about the past is hardly one of them. For this further knowledge is required. A sign with information might be used here, but it will only be read by those who come close to the artwork and are drawn by the initial appearance of it. In my opinion, while art in the public sphere serves many purposes, it is not a very reliable tool for public engagement and/or interaction. In some cases, such as for war monuments, the story that is trying to be told is obvious, but only because of the association with the events surrounding a generally well-known past. On Memorial Day (4th of May in the Netherlands), ceremonies are carried out at these monuments and flowers and wreaths are put down at their feet all over the country.

**IV.2.6.2 Spatial planning**

There are several situations in the Netherlands where spatial planning has incorporated themes from the past, usually as requested by the municipality of city, but sometimes from the inspiration of the architect/spatial planner. One of these locations is situated in **Almere, Flevoland** and is called the **Homeruspark**. This park was created by Martijn Schoots in collaboration with Thijs van Hees in 2009/2010 and is about 13,6 hectares (13,6 acres).87 The park lays on top of prehistoric settlement sites (8000-6500 BC). These sites together are called **Grote Green** and **Kleine Green**.88 The outline of this site, that will remain protected in situ, is demarcated by a small step towards the center of the park. Pollen analysis from the site has produced a diagram which has been used to select the species of trees represented along the outline of the park, next to a hiking trail (fig. IV.6). The visitor can walk the trail around the park and ‘travel through time’. The hiking trail is about 1,3 km long and starts with the species of trees most common in 8000 BC.
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IV. Methods in Public Archaeology

Fig. IV.3: The Herepoort, or the marker of its previous location, at the south-end of the Herestraat, Groningen. Artist unknown, but was placed in 1995. Polished boulders mark the foundations of what was once the gate (photo by author, 2013).

Fig. IV.4 A+B: Artwork “A virtual medieval city gate” by Efraim Milikowski (2002), representing the Boteringepoort, the city gate as it originally stood. Located at the north-end of the Oude Boteringestraat, Groningen. The artwork has been removed since these pictures were taken (photos by author, 2013).
mainly birch, and slowly progresses to those of 6500 BC: from fir and hazel, eventually to oak. A chronological presentation of the past environment is created in this way. The addition of a sculpture, the *erfgoedmarker* by Iris le Rütte, to mark the starting location of the hiking trail, is a nice touch. The park is situated in a modern and open-minded neighbourhood and next to the trees and hiking trail there is also space reserved for events, outdoor activities and gardens.

Also in *Almere* is the *Vindplaats Zenit*, a park overlaying an archaeological site dating to Prehistory as mentioned by Marie-France van Oorsouw (appendix II). The park needs to be preserved because of its underlying archaeology, but is designed to offer the locals a place to enjoy greenery, meet and interact. The past is marked along a special trail, there is an archaeological playground, vegetable gardens and fire place. The park is being maintained by the neighbourhood. In this way the site is a constant reminder of the past, while also serving other purposes.

Another location where the intention was to combine spatial planning with art in the public sphere is in *Leiden*: *Archeologisch Park Matilo*. This park was put at the site of what was once a Roman *castellum (Matilo)* on the Roman *Limes* border and now is a protected monument. It is located in a modern neighbourhood and the locals have been incorporated in the process of the creation of the park throughout. Several methods have been employed in the park, of which spatial planning, art and website use are the most apparent. The park consists for a large part of a reconstructed *castellum*, or at least the outline of a fort, with earthen walling and watch towers (fig. IV.7). Around this ‘fort’ hiking trails, a vegetable, fruit and herb garden, playgrounds, indoor space for workshops and artworks are spread out over the park grounds. Most of the artwork is heavily inspired by the local Roman past and some are intended to increase knowledge about this past. The website offers a lot of information about events, the past, the artworks and more. During the festive opening of the park there were even some Roman soldiers present. The spatial planning of the park, with the aid of the artworks placed within, show the hidden past to the public and tell the story of the castellum and the people living in it and outside of it (the Romans and the Cananefates). On the website a lot of information about the local Roman and Germanic past can be found, but also pictures and details about the excavations are present.

Just like in the case of the *Homeruspark* in *Almere*, the park was commissioned by the municipality. For *Park Matilo*, there were many different parties involved for the design of the park, but more so for the design and execution of the website. For both the *Homeruspark* and *Park Matilo* it is hard to evaluate their success. Both were incorporated in
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modern neighbourhoods (*nieuwbouwwijken*) and a lot of attention was paid to their official openings. The parks are likely visited mostly by the locals, living in the adjacent neighbourhoods. Most events that take place in the parks are also organised by neighbourhood associations. It is therefore a technique that is reserved for a very limited group of people. This is not necessarily a bad thing, but needs to be kept in consideration.

### IV.2.6.3 Concluding art & spatial planning

Art has a great way of reminding people of the past, showing a different perspective of the past, or highlighting a specific event from the past. Especially when placed in the public sphere, for all to see, art becomes a constant reminder of the past. In the case of sculptures and other large 3-dimensional works, their size becomes a power tool: a sizable piece of art can not only remind people of the past, but can also demand a certain degree of respect. Art is emotion. Spatial planning can also be considered a form of art and is a necessity in countries like the Netherlands, where space is valuable. Spatial planning is also used to make the living environment more appealing. The use of art and the past can be a large part of this, as shown by the *Homeruspark*, *Vindplaats Zenit* and *Park Matilo*. The combination of spatial planning and art in the public sphere seems to work well and there are many opportunities and possibilities involved for interaction with the public. While art itself may not be very suitable for incorporation in a public archaeology project, it may be best employed in combination with other methods, like spatial planning as proven at the *Park Matilo*, or in combination with an exhibition or some other method in which background information can easily be provided.

In the *Hunze* valley, spatial planning has a place. While little building will take place near the *Hunze*, its renovation into a natural, more ecologically friendly environment based on historical maps, is also a form of spatial planning. Art could be utilised in a public archaeology project in the valley, but without context and other methods, could have a limited effect in transmitting the underlying message and reaching the goals of the project, especially if no clear (local) historical link is presented.

**Fig. IV.6:** Layout of the *Homeruspark* in Almere, Flevoland. *Homeruspark* is a good example of archaeology incorporated in spatial planning. The location of the archaeological site is marked within the park. The species of trees lining the park are based on pollen analysis. Text translates as follows: *tuinen*: gardens; *vindplaats*: site; *omloop*: hiking trail around the park (Image: Martijn Schoots 2010 [online]).
IV.2.7 Reconstructions

There are many different ways in which to make archaeological reconstructions, and each comes with their own limitations, advantages and disadvantages. Some of the methods have already been discussed slightly in association with (multi)media and reenactment. In media like video games it is common to have reconstructions of archaeological or historical structures or sometimes complete cities. As we have seen, accuracy has not always been the most important part of these reconstructions. In reenactment reconstructions appear in the form of clothing, accessories and weaponry, but also as structures and tools. Depending on the kind of reenactment these might be very accurate. In this subchapter I will go into archaeological reconstructions in the form of structures and settlements, individual items and/or single finds and archaeological interpretative illustrations.

IV.2.7.1 Structures & settlements

Reconstructions of structures, or in some cases parts of a settlement, can be very effective in conveying a message about the past. Walking around in such an environment speaks to the imagination of the public: it becomes easier to imagine what life must have been like for past populations. Accurate reconstructions are made based on evidence from excavations and/or remaining ruins. Especially for constructions made of wood, there are many good appliances for reconstructions. Photos or drawings of postholes simply are not as appealing as a complete house or hut. Material reconstructions can be found in archaeological theme parks, such as Archeon, or at actual archaeological sites, such as Pompeii and Herculaneum. At these last two sites actual ruins are combined with partial reconstructions. This allows the public to see both the then and now, but special attention must be paid to make sure restoration/reconstruction methods are reversible, so the original can never be confused with the modern additions or modifications.

The controversial reconstructions at Knossos by Sir Arthur Evans are a good example of reconstructions gone wrong. While Evans paid careful attention to the excavation and covered all of its expenses, he believed the complex at Knossos to be a palace. It inevitably coloured his reconstructions and delivered some controversy about what is truly Minoan and what is a figment of Evans’ creative mind. In reality, there has never been any proof that the structure was a palace, or even the house of a ruler. Alternative theories are that it might have been a necropolis.
(city of the dead) or a temple structure. The main problems concerned with Evans’ reconstructions focus on his vision of the frescoes and pillars. Evans’ prime piece of evidence for the structure being a palace to King Minos, was the reconstruction of the “priest king” fresco, based on only a few original fragments not proven to be in the right place. Even in his own time, the accuracy of this reconstruction (and many other frescoes) was doubted. The use of materials non-native to the Knossos culture, like concrete, is another point of controversy, just as the plastering and colouring of walls and pillars, based on Evans’ own ideals. Ideals and identity have a large influence on the outcome of any reconstruction, which is why it is important to understand that a truly accurate reconstruction is hardly ever possible. Being aware of personal perspectives coloured by era and identity, can be helpful in creating a successful reconstruction.

The reconstruction of archaeological sites are much more complicated when original ruins and structures are still present. In general, it is highly advised not to restore existing ruins. In principle original materials, as used by the people of the past, need to be used for an accurate reconstruction. As mentioned before, the reconstruction or restoration must be visible: the difference between the original and the modern must be able to be recognised. Next to this, reconstruction or restoration needs to be reversible, no matter if structures or single artefacts are concerned. Near the Hunze in the municipality of Aa en Hunze, no structures of such nature are present that are worth reconstructing in such a way as the ‘palace of Knossos’ or Pompeii and Herculaneum. Reconstructions made from excavation plans and the like are cheaper, but also speak less to the imagination. They can be moved easily, are cheaper, but also speak less to the imagination. The ability to combine with living history or other kinds of reenactment, as well as the incorporation of reconstructed single artefacts is nullified.

Reconstructions and/or restorations of single artefacts is employed for different reasons. Just like in the case of the restoration of structures, restoration of artefacts is usually avoided, but employed when it concerns a highly unique, important, or characteristic objects. Restored artefacts usually find their home in exhibits in museums. Reconstructed artefacts can also end up in exhibitions, but are also used in living history and other kinds of reenactment, or in combination with the reconstruction of structures. Tools and objects from daily life cannot only enrich the

IV.2.7.2 Reconstruction of artefacts

The same counts for the reconstruction of artefacts, although there is usually more information available for reconstructions. The restoration of structures and single artefacts is almost entirely left to professionals, because of the care and precision to carry out such tasks without doing much damage. The necessity of this has been proved on many occasions, like the recent discovery of a haphazard fix on the golden mask of Tutankhamun. The gold-and-blue beard had broken off the mask after cleaning activities, and was hastily glued back on with the wrong kind of glue (epoxy), leaving scratches and a thick rim of glue showing. The mask was to be put on display again as soon as possible. Luckily, it seems the mask can be restored to its former glory by specialists. Reconstructions, made without authentic parts, do not have to be made by professionals necessarily, although it is advisable. In the case of the reconstruction of a Bronze Age farm and an Iron Age farm at the Hunbedcentrum (Borger), volunteers were given the opportunity to aid in the construction, which they much appreciated. If life-size reconstructions are not an option, model reconstructions are a viable alternative. They can be moved easily, are cheaper, but also speak less to the imagination. The ability to combine with living history or other kinds of reenactment, as well as the incorporation of reconstructed single artefacts is nullified.
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reconstruction of structures and settlements, but also allow for the visitor to have more to look at- and to touch. In some cases such reconstructions can be made with the public or volunteers. There are even possibilities for experimental archaeology and involvement of the public. Reconstructions of objects, or replicas, can also be sold by museums, at events or online shops, but are usually only bought by those looking for such items.

**IV.2.7.3 Digital reconstructions**

Nowadays, with modern technology, it is not uncommon to see digital reconstructions or 3D reconstructions. There are a lot of advantages to using these kinds of reconstructions, mostly concerned with costs. A digital reconstruction means less labourers, less time to produce and less material to purchase. License to a good computer programme is needed, but the artist is usually already in possession of such licenses and programmes. Still, the costs should not be underestimated. A digital reconstruction, together with the preparation and research necessary, can cost around €15,000.\(^{103}\) Digital reconstructions have one major advantage over material reconstructions: there are endless possibilities for the incorporation of characters, animals and objects. Also the landscape can be restyled into a time-appropriate fashion, such as in the case of the “Digital Iron Age Uppsala environment” created by game designer Daniel Westergren, who took special care to use appropriate botanical elements.\(^{104}\) While material reconstructions can also have characters, animals and objects, these are harder to control and more costly. While a material reconstruction allows a visitor to really explore the past in real life, digital reconstructions can come close. An additional benefit is the possibility of easily showcasing different stages in construction, as well as settlement and construction sequences, such as in the case of the short digital film created by Kieran Baxter of the settlement Jarlshof on the Shetland Islands.\(^{105}\) Here not only are the original remains and digital reconstruction shown, but also the different settlement phases. For all digital reconstructions counts that when the realism of such reconstructions is high and the interior well-dressed, immersion can be very good. Music as an addition to these digital reconstructions should not be underestimated, as they highly influence the experience of the user/viewer and can increase immersion and focus.

**IV.2.7.4 Archaeological interpretative illustrations**

While arguably more associated with art, I have decided to group archaeological interpretative illustrations under reconstructions, simply because often the same reasons are there for its creation: to show people clearly what life in the past could have looked like. For interpretative illustrations, sometimes referred to as ‘artist impressions’, professional artists are a necessity, those that have an interest or some knowledge of the past are preferred. The illustration can be based on excavation results, ruins, extrapolated from other sources and be enriched by the artist’s personal imagination. Such illustrations can cost around 1000-2000 euros, but they are usually worth it.\(^{106}\) While static, a feeling of dynamics can be brought about, depending on the skills of the artist. Besides, such illustrations usually lead a long life and can be re-used countless times.\(^{107}\) The downside of such impressions is that they cannot be edited and for that reason are at risk of being outdated quickly. Illustrations can be outdated in style, but more importantly the archaeological opinions about a depicted subject can change, after which the illustration will represent an outdated image. But outdated is not the only problem concerned with interpretative illustrations. Sometimes incorrect information can be put into an illustration and, when unnoticed, can end up being published. Interpretative illustrations can be used for multiple purposes, like publication in books, folders and the like, on information signs and boards (see "information boards, etc." further down) in exhibitions and on websites or in other digital applications (for example as ‘loading’ screens). Sometimes interpretative illustrations can be used as inspiration for material or digital reconstructions. In any case, if executed well, interpretative illustrations are well worth their money and has a range of appliances.

\(^{103}\) Van Ginkel & Cruysheer 2003, p. 67.
\(^{104}\) DD 2014 [online].
\(^{105}\) Baxter 2012 [online].
\(^{106}\) Van Ginkel & Cruysheer 2003, p. 68.
\(^{107}\) Ibid, p. 68.
IV.2.7.5 Concluding reconstructions

The benefits of using reconstructions in a public archaeology project are multiple. The first argument for reconstruction usually focuses on the educational value. Reconstructions and restorations make it easier for the general public to understand what the past was like. The techniques, whether they are material, digital, or in the form of an illustration, are suitable for people of most ages, from young children to pensioners, thus reaching a large audience (depending of course on other methods involved). The educational value does not only exist for non-archaeologists. Specialists and professionals may also learn from creating reconstructions, as a way of experimental archaeology. The education provided by reconstructions, can result in an increased appreciation of the local archaeology and past. This could aid in better (local) site preservation and an improved general opinion towards archaeological practices. A reconstruction in or on an archaeological site can benefit its preservation (for example from development pressure), because it shows the site is being used actively. The general opinion of professionals is that restorations on original structures and artefacts should take place as little as possible, so the age and authentic feeling of such subjects can be maintained, all the while avoiding irreversible additions or modifications. While at the Hunze there are little opportunities for restoration, such restorations can allow for re-use of structures. This does not often happen, but there are examples, like Greek and Roman amphitheaters being used once again for shows and concerts. It seems the true power of any reconstruction is to make the invisible visible to the public. Lost buildings or items can be restored digitally or through crafts and can provide truly immersive and interactive experiences with the past.

Disadvantages of these methods revolve mainly around costs, as well as ethics. The material reconstructions or restorations are costly, because of the need of specialists, as well as material. Model reconstructions, digital reconstructions and interpretative illustrations will be cheaper, especially when larger structures or (parts of) a settlement are the subject, but these have lesser options for combining with other methods, such as reenactment. The ability to see, hear and touch all together at one location creates a high efficiency in conveying information about the past, that cannot be reached digitally, on paper or with old-fashioned models. The options for interaction are also larger. The largest downside of material life-size reconstructions compared to smaller reconstructions, is that they are harder to move, costly and usually require constant maintenance.

The more ethical concerns with reconstructions revolve around several matters. The necessity of restoration when original structures are concerned is debatable, since damage can be done by reconstructions (limiting possibilities for future research) and ruins tend to have more charisma than reconstructed buildings, caused by simple nostalgia for the past. Achieving true authenticity is very difficult, if not impossible. As we have seen at Knossos, reconstructions tend to be reflections of their maker’s ideals, time and culture, not truly mirroring its inspiration from the past. Data from excavations can hardly ever deliver the amount of detail required to make an authentic reconstruction. At least some assumptions have to be made, consciously or unconsciously, and these can be influenced by several factors, like contemporary art. So the probability of portraying incorrect information in reproductions is very high. The acceptability of presenting laymen with such reconstructions is worth considering and will differ for each situation. In some cases even professionals can be misled by wrongful reconstructions. With every reconstruction or restoration, it must be clear for all what parts were reconstructed based on what, to prevent the distribution of incorrect information. However, in practice this is hardly ever the case. More close to home, reconstructions in the Hunze landscape could results in a disruption of landscape values. Introducing reconstructed buildings to a landscape otherwise void of most other structures, will have devastating effects to the appearance and focal points of the landscape. The reconstruction will claim all attention and the appreciation of the site as a whole could be diminished. Next to
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this, the Hunze valley is a mostly ‘natural’ landscape in which reconstructions can have enormous effects on the experience of visitors. The environment has been shaped to tend to people looking for outdoor recreation and ‘natural’ environments to hike and cycle around in, not for archaeological reconstructions. Models or digital reconstructions are an alternative, but can also be costly and need a platform. Models need to be displayed somewhere (perhaps a museum or municipality building) and digital reconstructions need a home in a museum exhibition or on the internet (for example on Youtube, a blog or a website). In the last case many different factors determine how many people will be reached by the reconstruction, mostly to do with PR.

Even though there are plenty of disadvantages to using reconstructions, both on practical and ethical merits, the advantages may still outweigh these. This depends entirely on context, with available funds, site complexity, available archaeological data and other factors all contributing to the considerations involved in making reconstructions. Material reconstructions are by far the more costly and complicated, but also have a high level of immersion and experience when executed well, preferably in combination with reconstructions of single artefacts and reenactment. Interaction may be provided in the form of experimental archaeology, workshops, or volunteering in the construction process. Presentation of other forms of reconstruction, like models, digital reconstructions and illustrations, offer an enormous range of applications in all kinds of fields, of which exhibitions, games and publications are only a few. All in all, reconstructions are a worthwhile technique, but careful consideration of the subject to be reconstructed is necessary. While not always necessary to be incorporated in the entire process of reconstruction, hiring specialists is a must, in the light of the interpretative nature of reconstructions.

IV.2.8 Archaeological excavations

There are a lot of possibilities to incorporate excavations into a public archaeology project. The degree of which is entirely dependent on the strategies, context, planning and funding available. Of course, there should be an excavation, or opportunities for excavations, in the first place. Community archaeology is perhaps the most well-known example of a public archaeology project in general, but there are also other ways of incorporating excavations, like crowdfunding and (guided) tours. In some of these ‘public’ excavations, like the aforementioned emergency excavations at Dreumel by Tremele, the public interacted not only when it came to crowdfunding, but also in the process of excavation.

IV.2.8.1 Community archaeology

Community archaeology is a term often used in conjunction with public archaeology, but the terms are sometimes used interchangeable. Slowly, yet surely, community archaeology is finding its way into academics, where it cannot be discussed separate from public archaeology, at least as described in this thesis. Community archaeology is from the public, for the public, and usually reserves a large role for the (local) community in its initiation, organisation and execution, but this may vary per project. It may encompass simply volunteers from the community taking part in excavations or post-exavocation procedures, but the interaction could also be much more extensive, allowing communities a large input in interpretation, monitoring sites, decision-making and more. In most cases where the term ‘community archaeology’ is dropped, excavation plays an essential role in the whole project. And with good reason: excavations are a great way to teach about the archaeological process, about the past and to allow the community hands-on experience with the past. Touching the past as it comes straight out of the earth, as if from a time capsule, creates the highest form of engagement (fig. IV.1; graph from Pape). When funding is available and the community is interested, such projects can be long-term, returning each year to find out more about the local past. One example of such a project is the Kerk Garsthuizen excavations (appendix II). Van Oorsouw has also mentioned this project, in which was organised by Henny Groenendijk and students from the University of Groningen. An old church, positioned on top of a terp and doomed to disintegrate, was excavated with the help of locals. Tours and presentations were also organised for the public. An additional website with blog, pictures and video was set up and
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a short documentary was made by the team as an impression of the participation project. The project was labeled as a big success as many volunteers participated in the excavations and other activities.

The excavations in Dreumel organised by the historical society Tremele also encouraged locals to participate and made their project possible with the help of crowdfunding. The media followed the project closely as around €5500,- was raised in just a week to continue the archaeological investigations. Archaeologists in the Netherlands and abroad followed the project with enthusiasm. According to Marie-France van Oorsouw, it was a very successful project (appendix II).

Another excavation, this time in Çatalhöyük in Turkey, is mentioned by Marie-France (appendix II).119 This famous archaeological site is still being investigated in an interdisciplinary way, but also involves local volunteers (and employees), tourists and all kinds of specialists. Room is made for personal interpretations and perceptions, with the help of small exhibitions, photography and stories. The ongoing project will continue to involve different community groups every year.

An early, yet good example of such a community project, is that of Ozette (Washington State, USA).120 Located at the coast, this Prehistoric/early whaling settlement was under threat of mudslides. After previous excavations showcasing very well-preserved organic materials, the local Makah (native American) community asked archaeologists to return and perform rescue excavations. A huge excavation plan was set up, that lasted for more than 10 years (1970-1981) and welcomed around 60,000 visitors yearly. The local Makah community initiated the project and remained in control of it throughout. Nearing the end of the project even a Makah Cultural Research Center was constructed to house and showcase the uncovered remains, as well as perform research and publish results. In this way the initial set up of the excavations, as well as the management over finds and research, was kept in control of the community over the entire project and has proven to be quite successful. Of course, this could be related to the involvement of a native American community, in which identity and preservation of culture were and still are considered incredibly important. Such native communities do not exist in the same way in the Netherlands and are not present near the Hunze. Still, there is no reason to assume such tactics may not work, but the essential part here is that the community will initiate the project and remain to be interested for continual research over a long period of time. For this reason, it may be difficult to embody such a project in the Hunze area, also because there are no real opportunities for years of excavation projects.

While the project does not directly involve the public in excavations, the "zoektocht naar de oer-Vlaardinger" (search for the ancient Vlaardinger) initiated in 2006, does let the locals interact in post-excavation research.121 Marjolein van den Dries mentions this as a successful interactive public archaeology project (appendix II). DNA from remains of men from a Medieval graveyard in Vlaardingen were compared to that of local volunteers. The aim of the project was to determine if any descendants of the 11th century men from the graveyard were still alive today. More than 80 men participated; remarkably a rare DNA match was found between a Vlaardinger and a skeleton. The project was very successful and well-received and won the Bob Verbiest Cultuurprijs because of it. It inspired subsequent projects elsewhere in the Netherlands, because it succeeded very well in involving the public in the local past and creating a tangible link between the past and present.

IV.2.8.2 Open excavations

Another way in which excavations are used to incorporate members of the public, are fieldwork opportunities for those seeking to earn credits for an academic curriculum or simply volunteer. Usually these excavations will incorporate classes to train the volunteers and there might be excursions involved, but all at a price. The required costs are needed to cover housing expenses as well as meals and travels, but in some cases the income will be used to pay for the excavation: tools, professionals, transport etc. Websites such as Past Horizons list many fieldwork opportunities

The costs may vary a lot, depending on site location (country), as well as what kind of accommodation and meals are provided and whether transport is included in the price. Projects may charge more if there is the possibility of acquiring university credits. In general, such projects draw the attention of students (with funds) or enthusiastic volunteers who are willing and able to spend money on such ventures. The resulting ‘community’ is very versatile, comprising of people of different ages, levels of expertise and/or nationality. While there is room for locals in such projects, these spots are not always reserved, resulting in little to no interaction with the local population. Furthermore, it is usually foreign universities that initiate such projects in countries like Egypt, Jordan, Romania, Bulgaria and the like, complicating contact with locals further. It is clear such fieldwork projects are initiated by academics associated with universities, not usually by the local community. Because there are hardly any fieldwork opportunities in the Hunze, in this case this option is not the best one.

**IV. 2.8.3 Open days**

Excavations may be incorporated in public archaeology projects in other ways. Some of them have already been discussed, such as guided tours and open days, not necessarily limited to those aimed at school-going children. Such open days, often combined with a tour by an archaeologist, can be a great way to show the locals what is being excavated, how and why. The remains can be viewed, sometimes touched, and there is room for questions. There are several ways to organise such open days, but the key is always to make sure people know about it. Like with any project, but especially for temporary projects like open days, PR is important. In Groningen, when excavations were taking place at the Grote Markt in 2008-2010, remains from a variety of time periods were uncovered, from Prehistory, the Middle Ages as well as from the WWII period. Especially the last time period was associated with heavy emotions and drew a lot of attention. Gert Kortekaas, the city archaeologist, arranged for weekly tours, in which he would describe the archaeological process and the findings. In case of his absence, information signs would tell visitors about what was going on. Next to this, a podium was built around the excavation, to allow the archaeologists to work in peace, while offering curious by-passers and visitors to see everything clearly. In addition also updates and videos were posted on the city’s website. The local television and radio were also involved. It was a great success, but it should be kept in mind that archaeology in the city usually draws more visitors than in rural areas, where there are fewer by-passers and further travelling is required. Such tours or open days are essential to city excavations, because of the number of curious people passing by and asking questions (keeping the archaeologists off their work).

**IV. 2.8.4 Concluding excavations**

Excavations are one of the best ways to enrich a public archaeology project, because of the many opportunities for interaction and involvement, in which the public has the chance to learn about and see the archaeological process as well as the (local) past. The high level of engagement (i.e. touching the finds as they come from the earth: the past) is the highest possible in any kind of setting. Planning an excavation is not always possible, especially in the light of Dutch spatial planning and regulations. The Hunze has been subject to several small excavations, but only because of the ongoing renovations in the Hunze valley. The areas with highest archaeological expectation are avoided. It is unlikely that many excavations will take place in the near future; those that will occur are mostly small-scale and under time restraints. It is therefore unlikely that excavations are a viable option for public archaeology projects in the Hunze valley.

Using post-excavation research, however, could be applied, such as in the case of the search for the oer-Vlaardinger. Data from local excavations were used to create a public archaeology project, which not only succeeded in involving a large part of the local public, but also had scientific merit. It is not unlikely that research after archaeological data from the Hunze could be used to involve the public. Using the DNA of the
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Hunze man to look for descendants will be tricky; the skeleton is well-preserved, but if DNA is available remains to be seen. Even if good quality DNA is retrieved, the Iron Age is much more distant than the 11th century, making it very unlikely a match can be found.

IV.2.9 Information boards, etc.
One of the most common ways to present archaeological interpretations to the public is the use of information panels or signs. These can be employed in a large variety of settings, like museums, near monuments or reconstructions, at the location of a site, at excavations, etc. The reason for their frequent use is because of several factors, among which the relatively low price, easy installation and probably because it is one of the oldest public outreach methods for archaeology in existence. Information panels and signs can be found anywhere and, like the ‘etc.’ in the title suggests, they are very versatile in their form and shape.

IV.2.9.1 Old-fashioned information boards
Like with publications, the text on the panel needs to be tailored to a target audience. The text on a panel is usually very comprised and a certain level of expertise and/or talent is needed to present the information in a clear, well-formulated manner. Sometimes the panel can be used to present information in other forms than text, such as (interpretative) illustrations, photos and QR-codes that link to websites with more information, pictures or audio/video. The form in which to present the information can also vary greatly. The durability and solidity of the item need to be kept in mind (the material), as well as the shape (board/sign/panel, pillar, rock, floor, wall, etc.). All of these factors influence the overall feel of the presentation of information, as well as the costs and durability.

That the material which is chosen for information panels needs to be considered carefully, is proven by the famous bronze plaques with information that were placed on boulders near many hunebedden in Drenthe (fig. IV.8). In recent years a lot of these plaques were removed with brute force to be remelted and sold. As a precaution all of the bronze information plaques have been removed. Slowly they are being replaced by presentations of information not interesting for thieves. Even though the plaques stated little more than the number of the hunebed (for example D49), location and ownership (for example the province), their removal has been considered a great loss. The signs were placed in the 1950’s by Van Giffen, a man regarded as one of the founding fathers of Dutch archaeology. With the disappearance of the signs at the site of the monuments, also a piece of history is lost. Luckily the few remaining plaques are kept safely in storage.

Other, more traditional information boards can still spark the imagination to a great extent, especially when there is made use of good quality interpretative illustrations, that make clear not only to adults, but also children, what was going on in the past. What comes to mind are the characteristic information signs from the United Kingdom, where reconstructions/illustrations take up a large 124 NOS, geen brons meer bij hunebedden 2011 [online]; RTV Drenthe, platen van hunebedden per direct verwijderd 2011 [online].
part of the panel, like at Dun Dornaigil broch in Scotland (fig. IV.9). Such signs with well-made illustrations and protected from vandalism, can cost around €2500,- (taxes not included).  

**IV.2.9.2 Other forms of presentation**

Next to the general information boards and signs known from museums and usually placed around archaeological monuments, there are more interesting and innovative ways to present information in an aesthetic manner. One of these ways has been executed at the *grafheuvellijn* (line of burial mounds) near Vaassen in the Netherlands. At this location, where a straight line of around six kilometers of burial mounds lies, several facilities for the public have been employed to enjoy the nature and past.  

Along the line, which is thought to have been part of a Prehistoric ceremonial road of the likes of Stonehenge-Avebury, a hiking trail has been set up. Along this trail and near points of interest, like the parking lot and subsequent burial mounds, small hidden pillars or ‘pollers’ were placed (fig. IV.10 A + B). These are located in the ground and have to be drawn up by a visitor to be viewed. In the pillar a small ‘exhibition’ portrays an element from the past, like an aspect of burial practices, and information in text. Hidden near points of interest, their impact on the experience of the surroundings is minimal, but the pollers will have to be searched for by visitors. This is not necessarily a bad thing, as some visitors, in particular children, will find looking for the pollers exciting and fun.  

Another case in which information boards/pillars are combined with a sort of mini-exhibition, are the pillars at *Leidschendam-Voorburg* (also in the Netherlands). Near and in a park five “beacons” were placed, each with their own theme. The archaeological information provided focuses on the Roman history at the time of the emperor Tajan, who named the settlement *Forum Hadriani*. Two of the beacons contain a showcase with archaeological finds, alongside interpretative illustrations, a reconstruction over a photograph and text. These information pillars are highly informative, since every side (each beacon has three) of the pillar is used to convey the story of an element from the local Roman past.

**IV.2.9.3 Concluding information boards.**

The advantages of information boards (for lack of a better overarching term) depends greatly on the shape, content and execution. The manner in which information is presented...
can vary as much as in different kinds of publications, both in quality and in the way it is tailored for a specific target audience. One major benefit is that there are many different options for information boards, as we have seen, and for every situation this method is one of the cheapest, durable and accepted ways to present information to the public. Of course, like with any method, there are downsides too. Information signs have to be constructed to be able to withstand all kinds of weather, the test of time and vandalism. Next to this, the information on the boards has to be written carefully, preferably by a professional. It is not always easy to squeeze a large amount of information into a few lines of text. Like with any kind of publication, the text can become outdated too. The risks of involving an interpretative illustrator have already been mentioned under reconstructions and also have to do with historical accuracy. Finally, information panels are not usually very interactive. Even in the case of the information pollers at Vaassen, the most interactive aspect is the looking for and ‘pulling up’ of the pollers. Yet, because of the versatile nature of information boards and their accepted status among the public as a means to present information about the past, panels, pillars, signs, etc. are highly effective in the transference of archaeological ‘stories’. Yet, quality is important and where possible professionals should contribute. The lack of interaction is unfortunate, but in combination with other techniques this can be avoided. When more than one information board is needed, it is advisable to limit the amount of signs and go for a streamlined set of boards, clearly connected through their design and content.

**IV.2.10 Exhibits**

This method is best known from museums, but can be used in several ways and places. Some of these we have already seen, like the mini-exhibitions in the information pillars at Vaassen and Leidschendam-Voorburg, or the exhibition of finds at the excavations in Dreumel. I will discuss several exhibitions, which roughly fall into two categories: permanent and temporary. Of course, some overlap exists, as can be read in the descriptions below.

**IV.2.10.1 Permanent exhibitions**

Museum exhibits can be both permanent and temporary. The content and nature of the exhibitions can vary, depending on the type of museum. Regional museums will usually have several permanent exhibitions, ranging from art, themes from history and biographical exhibitions about important persons from the region. Next to this, temporary exhibits may complement the permanent exhibitions, but a wide range of subjects are possible. In the exhibits information is provided by means of showcasing artefacts, information in text (on Fig. IV.10: A Information/heritage “pollers” for the burial mounds at Vaassen and Epe, the Netherlands, revealed at an official opening (De Stentor, prehistorie herleeft rond grafheuvels 2015 [online]); B Information/heritage “poller” at the moment of installment near a burial mound (photo: Vossen 2014 [online]).
information signs, panels, folders, etc.) and any other means to educate and excite the audience (video, videogames, photographs, reconstructions, virtual reality, etc.). Non-text information can have a higher degree of interaction, in ways as simple as allowing the visitor to do anything other than looking, such as doing a quiz on a computer, opening cabinets or drawers to discover new things and more. In general, with the exception of living history parks, most museums offer little interaction through exhibits, especially when it comes to interpretation. For the establishment of an exhibition for a complete museum, like in the case of the Hunebedcentrum in Borger (the Netherlands), a lot of organising and planning is needed. This museum project was picked up by a diverse team, among which Evert van Ginkel, and incorporated reproductions (models, a hunebed, a Funnelbeaker family, a farmhouse, etc.), video material, exhibitions, text and information signs and more. For special productions, such as the production of a collection of figures representing a life-like Funnelbeaker family, the model of a settlement and the hunebed, specialists were hired. The costs of such an elaborate archaeological exhibition, where special attention was paid for exciting and fun ways to learn about the past, were around €300,000 (± €136,134,-). The expenses do not stop there, as repairs and renewal of any permanent exhibition will have to take place. Exhibitions are a continuing process of refinement, renewal and design to offer the audience the best museum experience possible and keep them coming for more.

IV.2.10.2 Temporary exhibitions
Temporary exhibitions may be very regional in nature too, but can also be travelling exhibits of a usually popular and extraordinary subject. Such travelling exhibits (and to a lesser degree temporary exhibits) are meant to draw visitors to a museum, those that would otherwise not visit the museum or perhaps those that have visited the museum before (and now are offered something new to look at). Travelling exhibits may limit to the Netherlands but more commonly they travel worldwide. This has benefits for the museum as well as for the country of origin: exhibits of the country’s most special and extraordinary elements from the past work as a commercial and intensifies international ties. Examples of travelling archaeological exhibits in the past are collections of the Chinese terracotta army, the Dead Sea scrolls: life and faith in ancient times, Medea’s gold (Georgian gold artefacts), The Aztecs, and so on. These kind of exhibitions are usually well-advertised around the country where the exhibit takes place, with posters, flyers and even commercials on TV.

A new development (2014) in museums in the Netherlands is the creation of ArcheoHotspots. Van Oorsouw mentions these as platforms for public interaction (Appendix II). In several places in the Netherlands existing institutions will open a free Hotspot, each with an ArcheoLab, ArcheoScope and ArcheoCommunity. Archaeologists will station these Hotspots and do research while visitors can look, ask questions, have finds identified and more. The aim is to make archaeology available to everyone in an exciting and interesting manner. Existing ArcheoHotspots exist in the Allard Pierson museum in Amsterdam and in the Groot Tuighuis (a governmental building) in Den Bosch and many are sure to follow. While the project has only just begun, it is a very promising initiative.

IV.2.10.3 Small-scale exhibitions
Small-scale exhibitions may take place in small local museums, in which case they can be permanent, but can also find a place in a library, in a city hall or in a trailer on an excavation open day. Naturally, these last few are all temporary. They serve especially well to present recent findings from excavations, or artefacts that are part of an investigation into the region’s past. The city hall and library are places people of all kinds will visit, but not usually in the first place for an archaeological exhibit. This does not have to mean that these locations are the wrong places to showcase archaeology. In particular regional archaeological artefacts and/or data may be presented at these places and persons that would normally never visit a museum, for whatever reason, may now get close with and learn about their past. A small exhibit at an excavation, like at an open day, is suitable to further educate visitors while relieving pressure on the workers in the field. The
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people who show up for these open days will for the most part be interested in archaeology or the past to a decent degree anyway. All of these smaller exhibits do not require the same level of expertise as is employed in larger museums, who have multiple exhibits, both of a permanent and temporary nature. It is not expected from small-scale exhibitions to be very chic or up-to-date, as long as good information is combined with material to look at. These exhibits are not only useful for the presentation of new (or old) archaeological findings, but also for archaeological projects. With the use of photos, maps, illustrations and more, the process of setting up a project may be shown to the public. For example, the construction of a park like Park Matilo or the Homeruspark could be explained step by step, explaining the relation between the past and the present day.

**IV.2.10.4 Concluding exhibitions**

Exhibitions are very versatile and can be employed for different reason. In the light of public archaeology projects, this is usually to educate and share information about the regional past. Depending on the scale of the exhibit, subject, location and whether it is permanent or temporary, costs may vary. It is always important that the exhibitions are well-planned and executed, otherwise visitors will not be very attracted to the information and may learn little. Therefore, it is not uncommon for a large team to be involved, incorporating many specialists. Permanent exhibitions can be updated and renewed all the time, limiting the risk of presenting outdated archaeological information. However, this is not always the case, even in more ‘high-class’ museums. The Moravské zemské muzeum (Moravian museum), with exhibitions spread out over different locations in Brno (Czech Republic) comes to mind. Its permanent exhibitions seem to have had little updating or restoration since the 1980’s, as socialist references are common in every other information sign, and models and exhibitions appear old and dusty. Small-scale museums usually lack the funds and manpower to update their exhibitions regularly. Small-scale exhibitions work well in temporary settings, like libraries and city halls, where they can be used to draw an audience usually not involved in archaeology. These exhibitions are ideal for presenting information from recent excavations or research associated with the regional past. All in all exhibitions are a great place for education, because a lot of information can be presented about the past. The way in which this information is presented, is crucial for the success of an exhibition in terms of enjoyment of the visitors as well as the enhancement of knowledge.

The great disadvantage of exhibitions is that there is little interaction, although there are all kinds of things that can be done to increase the level of interaction. These will subsequently increase the costs, but can be worth it. These things can be as simple as placing reproductions that are allowed to be touched or climbed on, or workshops for past activities (archery, cooking, making an amulet, etc.), but can also be more complicated like video games, quizzes, living history, workshops or scavenger hunts, to name a few. Concerning exhibitions in museums, the overall reputation and status of museums may be a disadvantage. Of some social groups, usually from a high-class, well-educated and sufficient funds, it is expected to visit museums; these groups choose to visit museums to confirm their social status too. People from the other side of the spectrum, classified by Merriman as ‘lower status groups’, associate traditional museum presentations with mausoleums. These groups may choose not to visit museums for this reason, but might be interested in other forms of archaeological presentations, like open days at excavations. Museums simply do not offer the stories these groups are attracted to.

Temporary and permanent exhibitions both have their pros and cons (mostly relating to their setting). For the Hunze valley an exhibition may be useful to present the rather unknown archaeological findings in an informative, but clear and interesting way. Special care is required to choose a good setting (for example: museum vs library) and a carefully selected collection of artefacts to tell the story. Exhibitions can be used as an addition to other methods in a public archaeology project, or other methods can be employed to enrich an exhibition. Because of the difficulties concerned with creating interaction with the public, I personally find the first option more appealing and think this could be
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a useful addition to a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley.

**IV.2.11 Digital presentations**

This form of presentation has already been mentioned in several of the other categories above. It is one of the most versatile, because of the countless applications of this form of presentation. Technology is endlessly moving forward, constantly making new and exciting possibilities. Digital technology is also becoming increasingly more portable. In this subchapter I would like to mention some of the more well-known digital techniques as well as some of the newer. For all of these techniques counts that their quality is highly dependent on the professionals involved, the execution and incorporation with other methods. It is important to remember that while new technology can enrich the telling of an archaeological story, adding new forms of digital presentations simply for the sake of doing so, should be avoided for financial and qualitative reasons.

**IV.2.11.1 Websites**

Since the emergence of the internet, websites have increasingly played an important role in the distribution of knowledge. Like never before, all kinds of knowledge is accessible at the click of a mouse-button. Now, websites seem to decrease in importance as mobile technology is becoming more popular. Apps are taking over the roles of many websites, but still websites are incredibly important. Unlike apps, they are usually easier to use when it comes to switching between information sources. Links to other webpages are easily and quickly accessed and reading of larger texts or images is more pleasant. The wealth of information available can distract from finding qualitative information. Unfortunately, there is a lot of information on the internet that is skewed or plainly incorrect. For laymen it can be difficult to differentiate between good and bad info, which is why the manner in which a website is executed is important. It must be clear to all visitors that the information provided is based on scientific sources. The fact remains that the most popular way of acquiring information for a day trip or short vacation in the Netherlands is by far websites.\(^{134}\) This suggests that the internet is also the go-to place for searching for information about events and projects in the region. Archaeology already makes use of the internet to quite a degree, with museum websites offering more information about particular finds or sites, online databases, maps, literature and more. Archaeological news also spreads faster, with those interested not having to rely on colleagues or expensive journal memberships to hear the latest developments. There are countless examples of the use of websites in public archaeology projects and the like, so I selected a number of sites that cover varying areas of the web and purposes.

Websites can be the focal point of a project, instead of an addition. It then becomes the means to accomplish a higher goal. An example is *De verhalen van Groningen* ("the stories of Groningen"), a website dedicated to telling the many different stories that make Groningen (fig. IV.11).\(^{135}\) While not purely archaeological, archaeology does have a share, joined by stories of more recent pasts. These are more common, as people can add or recommend stories about the past or memories of Groningen by filling in a form on the website. Photos, video and text elaborate on a multitude of stories, categorised by date and theme. Events are also organised, such as "Story Cafes" in which stories can be shared and gathered. Next to this non-affiliated events and projects, like temporary exhibitions, are promoted. The website also has a Facebook and Twitter page to keep people notified of recent events and updates. Despite the website’s sleek look, well-executed layout and incorporation of social media, it is not very well-known, even among archaeology students in Groningen. Another Dutch example of an interactive website is *WatWasWaar*, which basically is an interactive map of the Netherlands with sources from history.\(^{136}\) On the site maps, photos and other information can be viewed, so comparing locations through time is not difficult. The development of the landscape is easily visible in this way. The project has been aided by the government, but also with countless archives all over the country. For every location different maps are available. Visitors can use the website to investigate their city or village’s past, or another area they might be
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\(^{134}\) Previously known as *Het verhaal van Groningen* ("The story of Groningen"): De verhalen van Groningen 2017 [online].

\(^{135}\) NBTC Holland marketing 2013.

\(^{136}\) Wat Was Waar 2011 [online].
interested in. Professionals also make use of the website, because of the amount of data available. Archaeologists for example can investigate if whatever structure they have found appears on any maps, that could help with dating or interpretation.

There are many more examples, of which some combine methods, like the earlier mentioned Via Belgica website and app, or Kerk Garsthuizen as mentioned by Marie-France van Oorsouw, in which excavations, volunteering opportunities and a website with news, blogs and vlogs (video blogs) are combined. Although these projects offer interaction between the public and the past, their websites in particular are not meant to engage the public in a way that goes further than navigating information on the website and reading, looking and listening. Websites can be a medium through which to use the qualities and numbers of the public, like in the case of the Pictish Puzzle. On this website, commissioned by National Museums Scotland, people are allowed to help solve an archaeological puzzle, consisting of thousands of rock puzzle pieces, once part of a Pictish standing stone (±80 AD). Among specialists there is a lack of manpower to put the pieces back together, but the gaming public can now lend a hand. All the individual sandstone pieces are scanned to make 3D digital copies that can be pieced together on the website (fig. IV.12). Initiatives like these are truly interactive in a very broad sense: they allow non-archaeologists from all over the world to be part of the archaeological process. In this case, they are even needed.

Museums make use of websites more and more, by adding further information about artefacts, exhibitions, creating online databases, updating visitors via social media and more. Rijksmuseum van Oudheden Leiden has a very extensive online database of artefacts, like the Hermitage in St. Petersburg (Russia). On the Hermitage website, even personal collections of favourite items can be made. A similar initiative in the Netherlands is the Mix & Match Museum, a website where people can make a private collection with digital collections of items from six museums in the Netherlands. The most popular items will be presented in real-life exhibits in the same six museums. It is expected from museums to have a website, with at least information about location, opening hours, the kinds of exhibitions and ticket prices. Many museums now utilise their websites to a large extent by providing online content that is more interactive and encourages the visitor to

137 National Museums Scotland, Pictish Puzzle 2017 [online].
138 Than 2014.
139 Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, collectiezoek-er 2017 [online]; The State hermitage Museum, the Hermitage collections 2015 [online].
140 Mix Match Museum 2017 [online].
come by the museum in the future. Museums websites that update their website often and offer recent content and a modern look and feel, could persuade potential visitors that there is a lot to offer at the museum as well. The most high-end museums will have a very good website, but these museums also have funding for such developments.

**IV.2.11.2 Social Media**

Websites such as Facebook, Academia.edu, LinkedIn and a range of archaeological news websites offer these services to archaeologists and interested laymen. Facebook and LinkedIn are among social media websites that are great for discussions among peers, for example about legislation or interpretation and new findings. In theory these groups could also be used for sharing stories about the past among people from a community, but in practice these usually do not last long. Facebook is more convenient for these type of groups, because of its informal and free online environment. Instead of Facebook groups, Facebook pages may be more suitable for incorporation in a public archaeology project. Pages require less commitment and keep people up to date without them having to do much—except for checking their Facebook time-line regularly after ‘liking’ the page. This kind of knowledge distribution or promotion of a project is very common, often in combination with a Twitter account and/or Instagram. Facebook pages multiply their fans mostly by a ‘sharing’ system. A person can ‘like’ the page, after which his/her friends may see this action on their timeline. If the subject appeals to them, they may also choose to ‘like’ the page and so on. Others may find the page through a different way, like searching in Google or Facebook, being linked through a website or by a QR-code or mention in a folder or on TV. The main reasons why Facebook pages are incorporated in projects are concerned with the reminding
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Fig. IV.12: A visitor of the Pictish Puzzle website has managed to piece together some 3d scanned fragments (National Museums Scotland, pictish puzzle 2017 [online], screenshot taken at 24 February 2015).

141 Twitter is a website where people can share thoughts, opinions and news in 140 character messages, ideal for use with a smartphone or tablet; Instagram (instagram.com) is a website where a person can share photos, often taken with a smartphone or tablet accompanied by a short description or message. Both make use of a network of friends or ‘followers’; Twitter 2015 [online].
of fans of activities and the existence of the project, next to inviting to events and receiving feedback on the project. A disadvantage is that even though fans have ‘liked’ the page, they may not see all activities on the Facebook pages. This depends on their personal settings, the intervals with which they visit Facebook and the settings of the Facebook page. Facebook offers paid services for companies and pages to become more visible, but in most cases this is avoided. The solution is to post interesting and attractive news, events and information regularly, preferably once a day, to reach as many fans as possible. Every time a fan ‘likes’ an item posted on the page, there is a chance more people will like the page and follow. Because instant links between Facebook, Twitter and Instagram exist, it is easy to share information on all platforms with one simple action.

**IV.2.11.3 Virtual Reality**

Next to websites and social media, there are other kinds of digital presentations. One of those is called virtual reality, and is mostly used in combination with other methods, like museum exhibitions. Virtual reality is quite a descriptive term, but comes down to showing a 3D environment through virtual means, created with the computer, in which the user can interact with the environment. The aid of electronic devices such as special goggles, helmets and/or gloves with sensors are needed in most cases. It should not be confused with *augmented reality*, in which the real world is seemingly changed, usually by adding digital elements on a screen. See for example the Pompeii app as described earlier. It should also not be confused with ‘virtual archaeology’, which describes all computer-aided reconstructions. Virtual reality is not common in use for archaeology or cultural heritage in the Netherlands, but in other regions of the world it is more widely used. Virtual reality can be useful in public archaeology projects, because there is a high level of interaction with the user: the user interacts with the environment. If this environment feels realistic and authentic, immersion may be good. However, most virtual reality applications used in the cultural heritage sector are not up to standards with, for example, the high-detail and realism found in 3D reconstruction and video games. More familiar with these media, the public might expect the same level of quality from virtual reality. A downside of virtual reality is that explanation is needed for the user about how to use the application and interaction is limited to what happens in the environment. This might lead to enhanced educational benefits, but interaction on the level of interpretation and/or the archaeological process is not included. It is likely that the unique experience provided by virtual reality will tempt many to try it, especially when provided for free (or as part of a package, like a museum visit). One example is a virtual reality environment in which the development of technological works in Greek history is presented at the science center and technology museum in Thessaloniki, Greece. Here special care was taken to produce a realistic, well-executed environment that was easy to use and understand for laymen. The ancient technology presented was easier to understand, as proven by the 95% satisfaction of the test subjects. Virtual reality environments can also be utilised to create a game, similar to videogames, as opposed to allowing the user to simply roam the environment and seek out information about the past. This will provide the user with a goal and keep him/her interested while learning. One could argue that the need for full immersion as offered by virtual reality no longer really exists and that so many applications come so close to a kind of virtual reality that the term itself has become obsolete. More important is the experience provided, of which cultural presence in the virtual environment is key. The culture in the environment will strengthen the idea that the user is living in the “there and then” and not the “here and now”, distant from the cultural rules of the real world. This truly triggers immersion. Still, because of the unique status of virtual reality and the use of gadgets like goggles and gloves, could create a new and interesting experience to the user and persuade to take part for that reason alone.

**IV.2.11.4 Scanning, models and printing in 3D**

Three-dimensional scanning has become increasingly more popular within the archaeological science, but also in the heritage sector.
Part of the credit for this rise in 3D scans is likely the increasing popularity of 3D printers, with which three-dimensional replicas of artefacts or scaled models can be printed in plastic or other materials. In order to do this, 3D models are necessary. These can be made in the computer with the use of 3D modelling computer programs, with the use of a set of photographs from all angles of an object and appropriate computer programs, or can be made by scanning a real-life object with a 3D scanner. Scanners and printers have become more available, therefore their applications have also increased. One of the reasons for 3D scanning and printing of archaeological artefacts is easy access of research material for those that do not have direct access to the original.\textsuperscript{147} 3D scanning of structures and artefacts could lead to a more interactive archaeology.\textsuperscript{148} Another benefit is that people can handle an object as close to the original as possible, without the risk of damaging a priceless artefact. The 3D replica can be created cheaply and in large numbers, in theory making archaeology more available while also allowing to ‘touch the past’. In reality, I have my doubts if 3D printing readily available at this moment offers the quality required for reaching the desired level of authenticity of replicas to appeal to the public. Still, 3D scans and models are being used in projects, such as at the \textit{Hunebedcentrum}.\textsuperscript{149} Funnel beaker pottery is being scanned and printed by a 3D printer for use in education and exhibition purposes in and around the museum. The museum also wishes to lend the replicas for research. The success of this project is yet to be determined.

3D scans of objects can also be used in reconstructions, such as in the case of the Pictish Puzzle already discussed, next to the reconstruction of tombs and other structures. These kind of reconstructions are ‘bottom-up’ instead of ‘top-down’, because the data and documentation are the starting point, not the reconstruction itself (although they can be combined).\textsuperscript{150} An example of the digital recording of an excavation is “3D archaeology at Çatalhöyük”. In this project several types of scanners (phase, optical) and 3D modelling were used to record the excavation of a Neolithic house.\textsuperscript{151} The eventual outcome is to be a completely virtualised museum presentation of the entire site. Next to reconstructing and recording in excavations, existing structures can be 3D digitised as a means of preservation.\textsuperscript{152} Although problematic in terms of size and budget, there are several techniques that can be utilised here as well. At the Baptistery of St. John, a basilica in \textit{Florence} (Italy), LIDAR (laser) scanning has been combined with high-definition photography and thermal imagery.\textsuperscript{153} The result is so detailed that it shows things invisible to the naked eye, like later reconstructions, fragile points in the construction and more. The project has been proven to be important as digital preservation of architecture, but also in the process of restoration, the study of ancient structures and in making the basilica accessible to the public not able to visit Florence. The ultra-realistic 3D image of the baptistery has been presented in a virtual reality environment called QI WAVE (fig. IV.13). The result shows that research can be combined with public presentation, especially in the case of digital scanning and modelling.

\textbf{IV.2.11.5 Concluding digital presentation}
Digital presentation is incredibly versatile and there are endless opportunities. The development of digital techniques are happening at such a pace that the future may hold an ever wider and impressive set of tools for archaeologists to work with and to present archaeological stories to the public. With the development of digital technology, the public will also demand more detailed, precise, photo-realistic and interactive presentations. Archaeologists will continue to be involved in digital developments to stay up to date and create worlds and stories that remain to be interesting and immersive. The use of digital presentations at this moment in time can hardly be avoided when engaging in a public archaeology project. At the very least a website and activity on social media should be part of any interactive project. These forms of presentations offer further information and PR for the entire project. It becomes easy to gather more ‘fans’ and invite large amounts of people for special events with the click of a button. With digital presentations comes the problem of easy access: access
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IV. Methods in Public Archaeology

is easy in theory, but when the user does not know how to engage with the presentation, an opportunity is lost. Although, digital technology is made more user-friendly in recent developments (with touch screens and ‘hidden’ software; computers, phones and tablets now offer a service instead of being a tool) and more people are able to handle digital formats of all kinds. While archaeological practices are also developing, chances are excavations may be rendered obsolete at some point (for the archaeological process) and archaeologists have to rely on digital presentations for outreach. The combination of several digital techniques usually works well, for example 3D scanning and 3D printing or virtual reality. I am certain that at least a website and/or social media will find their place in the pilot plan for a public archaeology project for the Hunze valley.

IV.2.12 Success stories

In order to find out more about the current state of public projects in the field of Dutch archaeology, I have contacted several specialists (Kris Förster, Marie-France van Oorsouw and Marjolein van den Dries). These specialists are operating in the field of commercial archaeology and heritage in the Netherlands, offering services such as advice, communication, several forms of presentation, event organisation, design of exhibitions, etc. I have asked each about projects, preferably related to landscape, that have been (in their personal opinion) successful in fulfilling its goals and involve the public in a durable and interactive way.

Förster, Van Oorsouw and Van den Dries all mention projects that have a certain degree of interactivity with the public (appendix II). Förster mentions digital projects that incorporate apps for smartphone or tablet to engage and involve the public. The user determines how much and what kind of information is viewed. Van Oorsouw discusses excavation related projects that incorporate other methods to involve the public, like Kerk Garsthuizen and Çatalhöyük. Finally, Van den Dries pointed out the successful Oer-Vlaardinger project, which combined innovative research with a public project. For most of these success stories counts that a local target audience was selected, but also that they were accessible to all audiences (with

Figure IV.13: “A visualization of the Florence Duomo as seen on the QI WAVE virtual reality tool, a 70 megapixel resolution virtual reality environment that provides an unprecedented degree of presence.” (after Fox 2015 [online]).
IV.3 Conclusion

In the previous chapters we have discussed the Hunze landscape, its stories and the stakeholders (audiences) involved. At the end of these chapters it was decided which stories and stakeholders would best be incorporated in a public archaeology project for the Hunze valley. I decided that the ‘story’ theme should be “Prehistory & water” and that the main target audience should be local inhabitants.

Prehistory & water is a theme, both versatile and vague enough to be employed in a large number of ways. Of course, the landscape plays a major role here; it is the canvas on which Prehistoric populations and water have left their subtle strokes. Remnants that, without guidance, are hardly visible to laymen. The archaeologist’s role is that of storyteller, using methods like those described in this chapter. The selected stakeholder is the local population, a group of people very versatile and with different interests. Every person in this public has its own interests and demands. It will be impossible to please everyone from this group, but an effort can be made to create a project that appeals to the majority of this stakeholder. The local population should have a large part of the authority over the past in a region, and by involving them in a public archaeology project their interest may increase. The locals can be engaged long-term, for example for yearly events, which can increase the chances of making a project successfully durable. Prehistory is hardly visible to the locals, as described in chapter III, which makes it all the more important to increase awareness and interest of the local past. To create a project that incorporates the public in an engaging and interactive way, it is crucial to take careful consideration in choosing the manner of execution. In other words, what methods should be utilised for a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley?

Above an extensive (but not exhaustive) list of methods applicable in public archaeology projects have been discussed. All of them have advantages and disadvantages. The criteria for a possible public archaeology project in the Hunze valley are at least that 1. the public must be involved in an interactive and engaging manner, 2. the theme of the project must be reflected in the ‘stories’ told and 3. preferably the project must be durable. In the list of methods many examples of projects were mentioned, by which it became clear that often a combination of methods is most effective. Next to interactivity, the ability to tell a story and durability, the required funds and project awareness must be kept in mind. The possible types of methods employed will be restricted by the available funds, while other methods may be incorporated simply for PR reasons. If the target audience is not aware of the project, engaging it will be very hard. To complicate things a little, the Hunze landscape is not situated in a village-settings. In fact, the landscape truly comes to its own in the wide agricultural and natural landscape outside the villages. Thus, there is a diversity in landscape settings to keep in account as well.

Of the above described methods, I believe the following are most suitable for implementation in a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley: portable heritage, reenactment, reconstructions, presentation of information and digital presentation. These methods meet the contemporary public expectations, while also being able to convey an interactive and ‘close-up’ story. Digital presentations, like websites, have the ability to reach a large public and spread information about events and news to whomever it may concern. Together with portable heritage, they are also able to offer an interactive and immersive platform to the public, for instance in combination with digital reconstructions, games and/or digital film. Reenactment at locations in the landscape are key to conveying a story to young and old participants, allowing for a high level of engagement. In combination with workshops and/or experimental archaeology, interactive events can attract an audience to come to the ‘natural’ Hunze settings and enjoy a nice day out. The result of workshops and/or experimental archaeology events could be reconstructions of structures, historical events or archaeological sites in the landscape, that could also be visited afterwards.
signs with QR codes, references can be made to an app or website with more information about the past, the events that took place at the site or images. Based on the examples and success stories discussed in this chapter, I believe a combination of digital/portable presentations and interactive events in the field could lead to a fruitful public archaeology project in the region.
In this chapter a specified ‘pilot plan’ for a public archaeology project in the Hunze will be presented, based on the decisions made in chapter II to IV. In this way, the landscape and its archaeological stories, the public and methods for involving and reaching out to the public will be combined. Also, a general framework is formed of the steps and choices many aiming to create a public archaeology project will have to deal with. These steps have been discussed in the previous chapters as well, but will be joined here as clearly and legibly as possible.

While this thesis has not been designed to come to an actual public archaeology project for the municipality of Aa en Hunze, there could be possibilities of incorporating it or the steps taken towards the pilot plan in a future project. The initial aim of my thesis is to investigate the thought-process, research and steps involved for coming to an well-founded public archaeology project. So far this crucial part of the process leading up to a project seems to have been little discussed in literature. While our knowledge of individual public archaeology projects is increasing as more is being documented, evaluation and planning are often left out.

The process of planning a public archaeology plan is, like the term public archaeology itself, very fluid and dynamic. In this thesis I have begun with analysing the landscape and its archaeology, and moved on to the stakeholders and eventually the methods for outreach and involvement from there. However, these three themes in the process are heavily dependent on each other. A different choice for each of them could greatly influence the eventual pilot plan or project. The reason the landscape and its ‘stories’ have been the starting point in this case, is that it has been the inspiration for my thesis from the beginning. The other factors (stakeholders and methods) are equally important, but were not yet determined. As my research continued, I became (sometimes painfully) aware of their tightly knit connections and interdependency. For any other project steps in the process could have a different order, depending on the cause of inspiration leading to a project among other factors.

### V.1 Recapitulation
Chapter II discussed the landscape of the Hunze valley and its past. The municipality Aa en Hunze has proven to be positive in their views towards archaeology and history. This, together with the recent development of the Geopark de Hondsrug, creates an array of opportunities for public archaeology projects in the area. In recent years steps have been taken to recreate natural environments in and near the Hunze, to increase biodiversity, manage water and water extraction and to enjoy for recreationalists. Because these parts of the Hunze already draw a crowd for hiking, cycling, canoeing, etc., they might make excellent locations for incorporating in a public archaeology project. While knowledge of the past has helped revive the meandering Hunze in parts, the past has played only a little role in the process. In chapter II ‘Prehistory & water’ has been chosen to be a good theme for a public archaeology project in the Hunze. The relationship between the Prehistoric peoples and the water was inevitably strong and complicated, although only hints about this relationship can be seen through the archaeological data available to us. The landscape acts as a ‘canvas’ on which the Prehistoric population and the water have left their marks. Now it could act as a canvas on which the stories of the past will be told.

In chapter III the stakeholders of the municipality Aa en Hunze were investigated, after discussing the theory behind public archaeology and public archaeology projects. The stakeholders were divided in eight groups in which inevitably some overlapping took place. A selection was needed to focus on one stakeholder as the target audience of a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley. I have chosen to incorporate the local inhabitants, because of their roots in the local past and the benefit of their increased knowledge of and support for archaeology. Chapter IV has been all about the practical side of public archaeological projects. An
extensive list of methods for public outreach and/or involvement in archaeology presented the large number of possibilities available to archaeologists. I concluded a combination of methods usually seemed most effective; a combination of digital/portable presentations with interactive and recurring events in the field, could lead to a fruitful and durable public archaeology project.

V.2 Similar public archaeology projects

For inspiration, we could look at the case-studies mentioned in chapter IV and see if any of them come close to the theme, stakeholders and selected methods of this pilot plan, that also fit in with the criteria determined in chapter IV. Unfortunately, the goals and targeted audience for these projects are not always known, which means that some assumptions have to be made. Also, to my knowledge the projects are not clearly evaluated, making the assessment of their success difficult for third parties. For detailed information about the following projects, please see chapter IV.

V.2.1 Via Belgica Digitalis

KF inHeritage’s project to showcase the Roman remains among the *Via Belgica* in *Limburg* has much in common with the goals of the *Hunze* pilot plan. It is based on a landscape element; in this case not a river, but a Roman road (although the road itself has been the starting point of the project, not the landscape itself). It also works with both archaeology in the field and on a digital platform. The mobile app (portable heritage) is connected to a website offering a lot of information, from short animated videos and images to text and further explanation. Spots on the interactive map can be visited on the website, or in real life with the mobile app. The target audience is probably the group of people travelling around *Limburg* and interested in history and archaeology (tourists), but the local population is also able to make use of the app and website.

What could be applicable to the *Hunze* valley project, is its interactivity and use of both in the field methods as digital methods. Users are able to select the amount of information they wish to see, but there is no real way to register interpretations. The use of an interactive map makes the landscape dynamics apparent and makes access to hotspots easy and clear.

V.2.2 Çatalhöyük, Turkey

This project was mentioned by Marie-France van Oorsouw (chapter IV). The *Çatalhöyük* project is based on the findings within an archaeological landscape, in which locals as well as tourists and other stakeholders are involved. Excavations, together with room for individual interpretations and personal exhibitions ensured the locals were engaged in an interactive and dynamic way. Excavations are unlikely in the *Hunze* valley, but the way in which the locals were involved was very successful in *Çatalhöyük* and could possibly be used as inspiration for incorporation in the *Hunze* valley project. The implementation of exhibits of personal interpretations is a nice touch, as well as the incorporation of several groups of stakeholders. Of course *Çatalhöyük* is a very large, famous and versatile site.

V.2.3 Anno Drenthe App

This project combined a website and a mobile app to offer the public hiking, cycling and canoeing trails through *Drenthe*. The *Hunze* valley is also incorporated in the trails. The trails have various themes and even trails made by members of the public can be downloaded. The app functions as a carry-on map and as a tour guide, as it gives information about several ‘hotspots’ in the landscape. Because the project revolves around trails, the landscape is inevitably a focal point. Hotspots in the landscape are then used to educate and entertain the user. The target audience is recreationalists (tourists), but overlapping with locals who may wish to investigate their area. The combination of portable heritage and a website has been quite successful in this project, although its main function is to offer trails. For the *Hunze* valley public archaeology project, the way in which the public is allowed to add something to the project, as well as be able to make use of other’s creativity through the app, could be a nice addition.

V.2.4 Grafheuvellijn Vaassen

The line of burial mounds in *Vaassen* has been highlighted with the use of information signs in the landscape. The information signs are a kind of cylinders which are ‘hidden’ and need to be pulled up to be viewed. The cylinders
contain text and images, but also items and small reconstructions or reproductions to tell the story of the Vaassen ceremonial landscape. A hiking trail leads along the signs. The information signs are a nice addition, because they do not disturb the ‘natural’ environment in which the burial mounds are set. The obvious disadvantage is that they are easily overseen, especially when not aware of the presence of the signs. The combination of a hiking trail with information signs works well. For the Hunze valley, ‘hidden’ information signs may be an option, especially since many of the landscape elements are rather ‘horizontal’, meaning that there are little vertical elements, such as trees or structures. A sign could disturb this horizontal landscape, but the same disadvantages remain. A hiking trail among hotspots in the landscape could work, but draws the attention of a limited audience.

V.3 Framework and Pilot Plan
Below the steps and processes that are involved with planning a public archaeology project are discussed. After each step, the decisions made for the Hunze valley pilot plan are shown. I am aware that other archaeologists might approach a project in an entirely different manner, but I can only present the processes and steps that have been subject of this thesis. The addition of this framework could be beneficial to others dealing with public archaeology projects. Hopefully, they will be more prepared for the difficulties facing them in planning a project after reading this thesis.

As mentioned before, it is important to clearly explain the process of planning and the factors that lead up to a public archaeology project. This, together with the evaluation of a project’s success, are crucial in understanding what works and what does not work in public archaeology. Still, these things are little discussed in literature concerning public archaeology and public archaeology projects. I am hopeful that more public archaeology projects will be documented extensively in the future, as the demand for public archaeology is increasing. In the Netherlands an increase in public archaeology’s popularity among archaeologists and archaeologists-to-be can also be felt.

V.3.1 The three determining factors
Figure V.1 shows the realistion I have had after working on chapter II, III & IV: the landscape and its stories, the public(s) and the method(s) are woven into an interdependent web. Any changes in one of the three factor’s contents will also make changes in the other two factors. For example, did I not choose ‘Prehistory & water’ (archaeological stories) as the theme of my pilot plan, but ‘canals’ in stead, it is likely the decisions for the other two factors would have been different as well. It is important to be aware of this, as it will have effects on the outcome of a public archaeology project in many ways. The three topics are determining factors of the project. As discussed previously, my thesis was focused on the Hunze as a landscape in the first place, only after which the other factors came into play. The landscape determined the archaeological ‘stories’ to be told. In other cases, for example when an archaeologist is approached by a historical society to be involved in a public archaeology project, it would be logical to start with the public as a starting point and move on to the other factors afterwards. Therefore, the three factors combined can be seen as a ‘step 1’.

In my thesis landscape and the archaeological stories came first, the public second. The reason stakeholders came second and not methods, has to do with my personal learning curve. I haven’t been intensively involved with public archaeology before, meaning that this thesis is a personal study to learn more about the processes and theory behind the discipline. ‘The public’ as a term, as described in chapter III, is a very vague and dynamic one, subject to a lot of theory and a popular topic in many public archaeology related articles. It felt important to investigate the nature of the public and the theory involved to be able to write a thesis on the topic of public archaeology. For this reason, the public was number two on my list; I even wrote parts of chapter III while I was working on chapter II. Methods came last, because there is less theory concerned with them and they act more as a tool than as the focus of a project. Figure V.2 displays the steps that have been taken through the course of this thesis.
Figure V.1: chart showing the three determining factors that to a public archaeology project: archaeological 'stories', method(s) and public(s). The contents of each individual factor heavily influence each other to a level of interdependency.

1. Archaeological 'stories'
   - A. Study theory concerning landscapes, sites or objects
   - B. Describe the landscape, site or object
   - C. Investigate the different 'stories' at hand
   - D. Choose the 'story'/'stories' or theme(s)

2. Public(s)
   - A. Study theory concerning the public & public archaeology
   - B. Determine the role of the archaeologist(s)
   - C. Describe the concerned stakeholders/publics
   - D. Choose public(s)

3. Method(s)
   - A. Determine what criteria the project should abide to
   - B. Determine the available funds
   - C. Investigate methods for outreach/engagement
   - D. Choose suitable metod(s)

Figure V.2: Graph/flow chart describing the processes and steps concerned with the three determining factors in a public archaeology project. The project processes are found in figure V.3.
In this thesis the factor is concerned with the Hunze landscapes and the archaeological ‘stories’ that have played out there.

A. To begin, landscape theory and landscape biographies were investigated. I felt this was important to understand how a landscape is being perceived and how it gets its identity. As it turns out, the identity of the landscape is partially shaped by the past, as well as by the present and how many traces the landscape still shows of past activities. Finally, of course, the mindset of the people residing there determines what the identity of the landscape is. Needless to say, landscape identity is a dynamic phenomenon. In this case a landscape would be the focus of the public archaeology project, but it is possible for it to be an archaeological site or an object or group of objects. The theory concerned there would vary.

B. Next, the landscape and its genesis were described. The processes that have caused the current appearance of the landscape have been described, as well as explaining its main features. For sites or objects, one could imagine a similar descriptive process.

C. Then the past of the landscape has been investigated; chronologically and generally first, later also with case-studies. The landscape acts as a canvas on which stories of the past have left their marks. For sites a very similar process would have made sense. For objects slightly different, yet equally interesting approaches could work, such as: stories concerning its use, who it belonged to and eventually the end of its use-life and deposition.

D. After the history of the landscape has been researched, it is time to choose which of the story/stories is most suitable to incorporate in a public archaeology project. A lot of factors are involved in this, including the archaeologist’s own preferences and criteria. For example, I personally think Prehistory is more interesting than relatively modern peat reclamation, so I settled on the Prehistory, combined with water as a binding element to the landscape. If other factors of the project are already known, they could help in the decision making process of the theme. For example, if it is known that farmers make up a large part of the local community, it could be interesting to adjust the theme to their interests or wishes. As an example, such a theme could be ‘local agriculture through the ages’.

The public, or target audience, is a major factor in any public archaeology project. Locals, farmers (and landowners) and tourists were selected as the suitable stakeholders to be incorporated in a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley (or more specifically, the municipality Aa en Hunze).

A. In the first step it is important to evaluate the theory concerning ‘the public’ and public archaeology. Public archaeology is a relatively young discipline, which means new theories and information could be available. Case-studies are especially important in this light. Because I had no in-depth knowledge about the theory behind public archaeology and the public, this became an extensive part of my studies.

B. The role of the archaeologist, or in better words, his/her authority in the project, will affect the manner in which an audience is involved. As described in detail in chapter III, the public could have a range of ‘levels’ of authority. The audience could be leading the project, have an impact on the decisions made by an archaeologist involved in the project, or have nothing to say at all. More and more the individual interpretations and opinions, combined with the level of experience, are becoming important features within public archaeology projects. In the pilot plan for the Hunze valley, the archaeologist acts as story-teller, offering experiences and knowledge to be interpreted by the public. Interpretations are presented, but also alternatives and the data leading up to these interpretations.

C. The stakeholders were already described in-depth in chapter III. For every public (eight of the stakeholders of the municipality Aa en Hunze were discussed) the advantages as well as the disadvantages of incorporating them in a public archaeology project were presented. With ‘disadvantages’ is meant the factors that makes incorporating said public difficult. Investigating the available stakeholders will also shed light on the nature of the community in a region and what stakeholders are expected to play at least some part in the project, even if not as a target audience.

D. Finally, the most suitable public(s) are/is selected. For most public archaeology projects that focus on landscape or regional activities, the local community is involved as a target audience. The same counts for the pilot for the project proposed in this thesis.
V.3.1.3 Method(s)
Selecting what methods to use in a public archaeology project usually comes last of the three main factors, as it was in this thesis (chapter IV). Some exceptions are imaginable, perhaps in the case a certain type of method is absolutely crucial, for example in a museum setting, the exhibition method may have to be incorporated. In most cases, however, the methods are selected after the archaeological stories and the public are decided on. While methods are important in the sense that they are the means through which a story is told to the public, they should not be the center of the project.

A. As a first step, the criteria of the project should be set. Methods can be weighed against these criteria during the selection process. In this manner the danger of using a method, for the sake of using a method (because it’s ‘new’ or popular for instance) can be avoided. The goals of the project will stay the focus. In this thesis, the project would have to involve the public in an engaging and interactive manner, while still reflecting the theme of the project in the methods as durable as possible.

B. The financial means for a project should be clear. Funding is usual, but the numbers depend a lot on the scale and goal of a project. If funds are limited, crowd-funding can sometimes be an option to increase public involvement as well as creating more options for suitable methods. Some methods can be quite expensive and there is usually no financial pay-back at the end of a public archaeology project.

C. As discussed in chapter IV, there are many different methods available for public archaeology project. All of them have advantages and disadvantages. I have looked at various categories of methods and case-studies, and concluded a combination of methods is most effective.

D. Presentations of a digital/portable nature, such as QR-codes and websites, in combination with interactive and recurring events in the landscape were selected as suitable methods for the Hunze valley. Dealing with landscapes and public archaeology offers some challenges that differ from dealing with sites or objects. A traditional exhibit, for example, is not always possible.

V.3.2 The following steps: description of the project processes
The next steps, which are necessary to come to the actual execution of the project, are presented in figure V.3. The three determining factors (landscape & stories, the public and methods) have already been selected in chapters II, III and IV. Here, the project processes as described below will be implemented for the situation in the Hunze valley. The last few project processes, steps 10-12, will not be incorporated, because the ‘pilot plan’ worked out here will not actually be realised (for now). This means steps 10, 11 and 12 are not necessary to elaborate on in the context of the Hunze at this time.

V.3.2.1 Authority of the public
The target audience is already chosen, but its level of authority is not. While in some projects the role of the public is set at the beginning of project planning, in other cases it remains obscure and should be determined at an early stage of the project processes. The level of involvement and the say the public gets in a project also depend on the role of the archaeologist (as already discussed in the three determining factors). In chapter III some theory behind the authority of the public has been discussed, which concluded that the higher the public’s authority is, the lower the archaeologist’s authority is (fig. III.1). This is not necessarily a bad thing, but depends on the goals of the project and the wishes of the parties involved.

For the Hunze valley public archaeology project, the archaeologist acts as a storyteller in the first place. The archaeologist provides information, so there is room for personal interpretations of members of the public. For the Hunze, I propose a format that allows people to access as much, or little, information as they desire; their own view of the past can then be formed in combination with a growing understanding of archaeological processes and heritage protection. There are several ways to give the public authority, such as giving the public the opportunity to make decisions within the project or allow them to form their own interpretations based on archaeological data. The problem is that only a portion of the public or targeted audience feels confident enough to make such decisions or interpretations, or question the interpretations given by the archaeologist. The way in which the information and the ‘official’ interpretations are supplied are therefore very important.
V. Public Engagement in the Hunze Valley

One could imagine that the skeleton of the ‘Hunze man’ could be subject of a kind of ‘CSI’-esque investigation, in which the public is inspired to form their own interpretation and engaged in an interactive manner.¹

V.3.2.2 Select specific stories to tell
A main theme is selected, but specific stories need to be adjusted to the level of authority of the public, as well as the specific methods selected for use in the project. In this sense, step 2 and 3 are interchangeable, or (like the three determining factors) depend on each other for their selection. This means that in determining the specific stories, the specific methods must be kept in mind, and vice versa. Specific stories work well when elements of personhood, individuality and emotions are involved. In other words, the story about an individual going through parts of their life that might be conceived as difficult, dangerous or even traumatic, will work better than a story about a general, nameless group of people and their daily practice (f.e. weaving). The stories that have archaeological data to back them up work well, because the remains that exist in our time act as a connection to the past, making it more tangible, and possibly even leading to a ‘historical sensation’.

Of the pasts as described in chapter II, several seem fit for stories fitting in with the theme ‘Prehistory & water’. The Hunze man discovered at Bonnerklap is perhaps the best example yet, but also the deposition of objects in the Hunze will speak to the imagination of the public. Other discoveries from the past have may also been very suitable, but do not fit in with the theme, such as the verlaat near Bonnerklap and the voorde in Toreven.

The Hunze skeleton has only recently been discovered and for that reason little is yet known. However, in my eyes Hunze man will be the best example of archaeology within the valley to present to the public, because of its rarity and location. Furthermore, human remains in the archaeological record have a large appeal to the public. The skeletal remains act as a bridge between the landscape and the activities that took place there. It is a recent discovery, found during the archaeological investigations involved with the remeandering of the Hunze river. This makes it especially relevant in highlighting the relevance of archaeology and the past in the Hunze valley project, which is more focused on the ecological and hydrological properties.

In combination with other Iron Age elements in the Hunze valley, the story of the Hunze man could be expanded to incorporate the larger story of Iron Age life in the north of the Netherlands. Such elements, like deposition of valued or ritual items (such as bog bodies and weapons) in wetlands, lost

¹ After an idea of W.A.B. Van der Sanden, personal communication (meeting), January 20, 2015.
ornaments (like small items such as bronze fibula) and tools (such as rotary querns) will be able to give hints about what Hunze man’s life and the society he was part of looked like.

V.3.2.3 Select specific methods to use
While in the three determining factors the categories of methods have been selected, the actual execution needs a more specific plan. As mentioned above, this step is interdependent of step 2, as is step 2 interdependent on step 3. It would be wise to select both at the same time during the project processes. ‘Specific methods’ means now the exact methods are determined from the categories selected earlier. Examples of specific methods are: books, information signs and temporary exhibitions in a museum.

A selection of methods have been deemed suitable for the Hunze valley, but their precise implementation needs additional planning. The selected methods should be able to convey the story according to the set theme and the goals of the project. During this step the eventual order and use of the methods is not discussed, as this will follow in step 4.

A website will be able to offer the public the most important information. They will be able to reach the website on their devices at home or on mobile devices by means of a mobile website. A separate app is not necessary in that case, unless there are demands for a functional interactive map on the mobile divide as well. The website will provide information in different ‘layers’. This means that the user can determine how much archaeological information is viewed. The Hunze man within his context will be the focal point of the website. The website should at least contain a blog and archaeological information. The blog and other features of the website, for example a comments section, will help in reaching out to the public and getting the public involved.

Reenactment would play a good role in the project’s activities outside in the landscape. The activities will have to revolve around the theme of the project and the Hunze man. The Hunze man lived during the Iron Age, which means the reenactment should focus on this period. Iron Age activities in and near the water could be played out, in which the public can try their hand as well. In this way, memorable experiences are offered to the audience that will contribute to their understanding and appreciation of the Iron Age past.

An information sign at the location where Hunze man was found will be a nice touch for visitors to the area. Because of the ‘natural’ environment in Bonnerklap, the sign should be as little intrusive as possible, while still visible. A Prehistoric inspired information sign, equipped with a QR code leading to the website, could be an alternative to the old-fashioned square or rectangular signs known from other sites in the Netherlands.

V.3.2.4 The order and manner in which the stories are told
The logical next step would be to choose in what order the stories selected in step 2 are told. Is there a logical order? A chronological? In a hiking trail, it might make sense to follow adjacent sites and their associated stories as an order. The implementation of the stories into the methods is next. Sometimes there are several ways to tell a story through a specific method. Some stories may be better told through another selected method. These decisions have to be made in consideration of the goals of the project.

For the Hunze valley project, the website will be the start of the project and will be the main platform in order to ‘tell’ the story. In fact, it will be the public that writes the story, based on archaeological data. The skeletal remains of the Hunze man, together with the environmental situation and Iron Age finds from near the site, will all be explained by text, images, video, professional reports and interviews with specialists. The finds will be plotted on an interactive map, on which the several ‘hotspots’ can be selected by the user. From there a whole range of information is available to the user, depending on how much or little he/she wishes to view at that time. The text and other information on the website should be easy to understand for laymen, including children from the age of 12 and up. Therefore, they should be written by someone who has a good understanding of the Dutch language and is able to write for such an audience.

Archaeological interpretations will be part of the information, but some gaps are left intentionally. A competition will be held among the locals in the municipality to see who can write the best ‘story’ (interpretation) of the
Hunze man’s life and eventual death. What was Hunze man’s occupation? What role did he have in society? Did he have a family? Why did he die? And why did his body end up in the Hunze? The stories will be uploaded on the website where other users can rate them. The two stories with the highest ratings will then be ‘acted out’ (or at least the end of his life and deposition of the skeleton) by Iron Age reenactors, and the winners awarded with a prize, such as reproductions of Iron Age items, like an iron dagger, axe or fibula.

During the activities at Bonnerklap, also specialists will shed light on what they believe is the right ‘story’ of the Hunze man. This will be best done in the form of a short lecture, focused on the target audience. Though the specialist’s interpretation might be different from the public’s preferred story, it should be stressed that the public’s interpretation is not necessarily wrong. Of course it could be debated whose opinion is more meaningful, but such a discussion would be out of place at this event. Hopefully, an increased appreciation of archaeological practices will be the result.

An information sign will be revealed during the Iron Age activities at Bonnerklap. To make the information sign as little intrusive as possible, the information sign can be shaped like a wooden anthropomorphic figure, in the likes of Dagenham idol, Ralaghan man, Broddenbjerg idol or the Wittemoor timber track way figurines (fig. V.4 A, B & C). While they were never found near the Hunze, such wooden idols are known from large parts of Europe and occurred during a large period of time (Neolithic-Middle Ages), mostly in wetlands. At this moment around a 100 have been found in Northwest Europe. At the back of a wooden ‘idol’ a QR code linking to the mobile website and the name of the website can be put, together with a short introduction about the nature of the site (the find location of Hunze man). Visitors of Bonnerklap are able to visit the website and learn more about the area’s past. The idol will also highlight the likely spiritual meaning of wetlands in Prehistoric society.

The Iron Age reenactment camp would be able to return to the site once or twice a year (perhaps the start and end of summer), offering the public a time to come to the landscape and learn about Prehistoric activities in and near the water. Fishing, hunting, cooking, swimming, washing, canoeing, deposition ceremonies and possible burials are examples of such activities. Visitors can try their hand at several of them and are engaged in an interactive manner. The experiences will last longer than dry facts. It is possible to combine the camp with a small market with prehistoric items such as reproductions and naturally dyed wool, perhaps also local products from the Hunze region.

V.3.2.5 The amount of information available to the audience

This depends on the theme of the project (the amount of archaeological data available) as well as on the authority of the public in the project. If the public has a lot of authority and wishes to see all the basic archaeological data available to a site, it will have to be provided. In other cases, the archaeologist may decide to offer a selection of archaeological data, so that members of the public are free to make their own interpretations, next to being offered the ‘original’ interpretation of the archaeologist. This is not always possible, such as in the case of a very small public archaeology project, in which there is no funding, nor time to shed light of the archaeological data backing up the interpretations of the ‘stories’.

During the previous steps already some thoughts about this issue in the context of the Hunze have been mentioned. The website in combination with the competition will encourage the public to form their own interpretation and create their own ‘story’, based on archaeological data. For this reason, it is very important to offer a range of archaeological information, from in-depth professional reports, to images and perhaps 3D models of objects, to video interviews with specialists and pollen diagrams. The Iron Age camp events at Bonnerklap will be less suitable to present this wealth of information. Instead, the archaeological interpretations will be acted out by the reenactors. The information there will be provided in the form of performing likely Iron Age activities and explanations by the reenactors themselves.

2 Van der Sanden & Turner 2004.
3 Van der Sanden & Turner 2004, p. 84.
Figure V.4 A, B & C: Wooden anthropomorphic figures from Europe. A (top left): Dagenham, United Kingdom, Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age; Flickr, Doilum “photo” 2007-2017 [online]. B (top right): Ralaghan, Ireland, Late Bronze Age; Na rudaí ata i mo cheann - the things that are in my head, Síle Ní Chorcráin “Ralaghan man” 2014 [online]. C (bottom right): Wittemoor trackway, Germany, Iron Age; Wikimedia Commons, Bullenwächter “File:Wittemoor Stelen.jpg 2006 [online].
V.3.2.6 Determine how to maintain the project (durability)
It should be the goal of most public archaeology projects to be ‘durable’; have long-lasting effects. Attempts can be made by archaeologists involved, but it works best when planned on the drawing board, prior to execution of the project. It requires in-depth knowledge of the target audience, as well as high organisation and planning skills. To maintain projects, volunteers can be used, but the disadvantage is that these can opt out at any moment. Funding is not always available to provide for employees to keep a project running, such as a website or a yearly event. The durability of a public archaeology project depend greatly on its first time success, as well as the willingness and effort of the archaeologists involved and the attitude of the involved stakeholders.

To ensure a durable project, the recurring events in the field of the Hunze valley are a must. If they are organised well and manage to draw a decent crowd, they might become popular among locals and tourists alike. In step 9 the manner of evaluation will be discussed and this will play a large role in determining if any changes need to be made to the events in the field (or even the website). In general, the public likes to be among reenactors and learn by doing and asking questions, instead of being offered dry facts in textual form. Reenactment groups are usually happy to join such a project, but there are not many Prehistoric reenactment groups in the north of the Netherlands. The most logical location to look for Iron Age reenactors would be the Hunebedcentrum in Borger, where a recent expansion of the outdoor museum includes an Iron Age farm. A group of volunteers is already reenacting there, and the museum is currently looking for more volunteers to complement the existing team. The Hunebedcentrum may be willing to have volunteers set up an Iron Age camp in Bonnerklap in exchange for some kind of advertising for the museum or the associated Geopark de Hondsrug.

The website will need to be maintained in order for it to be durable. News about the Hunze’s past and new research about the Hunze man should be published on the site, as well as videos and news about the recurring Iron Age camp events at Bonnerklap. The information on the website will continue to provide information to new visitors. The problem is finding someone willing to maintain the website and check up on it so now and then. A suitable volunteer will be a godsend, but on the long term employees are more reliable, since their paycheck depends on them doing their job well.

The wooden idol information sign placed at Bonnerklap would have to be checked up on so now and then to see if it needs any repairs or replacement. The benefit of using a wooden sign will be that it is cheap to produce, but it is also more susceptible to damage from weather conditions, vandalism and theft. Placing the idol on a long pole and digging it deep in the ground could prevent theft.

Eventually no project is durable into infinity. However, precautions and continual evaluation could aid in keeping a project going for a longer period of time. The enthusiasm of the organisation and the public involved are an absolute necessity. No matter how well-planned the public archaeology project may be, it is hard to predict how durable and successful the project will end up to be. This is another reason why publication of planning, execution and evaluation of public archaeology projects are so important.

V.3.2.7 Draw the public (PR)
Without any knowledge of an upcoming public archaeology project, the target audience will not take part in it. Therefore, it is important to invest in PR: reaching out to the public via several platforms to make the imminent opening of the project known. What platforms are selected for this will depend on the target audience, the area in which the project will take place and the available funds.

That being said, figuring out in what way to draw the public is tricky, if not nearly impossible. Simply sharing the news of an upcoming project is not enough. Some members of the public will never feel an interest in archaeology, while others are easily interested. To find out what it takes to encourage the public to get involved, an extensive knowledge of the target audience is needed, as well as knowledge about PR methods. Inevitable some assumptions have to be made as well.

The target audience of the Hunze valley project is the group of local inhabitants living in the municipality of Aa en Hunze. There are several ways to reach out to them, and
a combination of methods would probably be most effective. The use of social media such as Facebook, Twitter and Instagram will be indispensable in sharing information about upcoming events and the archaeology of the Hunze in general. The social media will refer to the website and its blog often, but will also share information from other sources. In my personal experience of using Facebook as a platform to share information and news (for the Groningen Institute of Archaeology), it seems most effective to share an article at least once a day, varying between news, video segments and upcoming events. ‘Likes’ gathered by users will be a form of word-of-mouth advertising, and with each new ‘like’ new fans to the page will emerge. The advantage of social media is that it is free, although someone, possible an employee, needs to maintain the pages. Local newspapers and TV/radio can be used to spread the word about the project. A newsletter system via the website will allow non-social media users to still be updated about the project through email.

To draw a large crowd to the events in the field, advertising through the website, social media, local newspapers and TV/radio will be the best option. Associated institutions can advertise as well, for example the Hunebedcentrum and Geopark de Hondsrug, but also smaller corporations who might be able to reap the benefits, such as local restaurants and pubs. In order for easy advertising in this way, flyers will be a relatively cheap and simple way to spread the word. The chance of winning a prize for a good story will hopefully entice people to participate in the project.

V.3.2.8 Determine how to register interpretations
This step might not be necessary for every project, but in the case where the public is encouraged to form their own interpretations, it will be good to have some kind of plan of how to register these interpretations. Not all the interpretations have to be documented; a sample can be made, for example by video recording or an internet survey. The interpretations could be useful during step 9, or may be used in some other way during the project. Adding another ‘story’ to the project based on the interpretations, is a possibility.

In the Hunze valley pilot plan, personal interpretations are important to engage and involve the public. To encourage the public to share their own interpretations, all basic archaeological data available will be shared and a competition will be organised to see who comes up with the best ‘story’ to give Hunze man a face. Those who do not wish to write a story, may share their opinion through voting on other people’s stories. Therefore the website will be the main means to register interpretations. The two most popular stories will be acknowledged through living history, but the other stories will also remain to be viewed on the website and could be used for future research.

V.3.2.9 Determine how to evaluate the project
The project must be evaluated during and after its execution. This will aid the development of public archaeology in general and the organisation of other public archaeology projects. For now, the results and an evaluation of public archaeology projects are not often published, which means this valuable information is not accessible to others. At this stage evaluation is not yet necessary, but determining how to evaluate a project is useful, as it is not often straightforward. Clear goals set at the beginning of a project, will aid in evaluation and could be checked for their success.

However, how to ‘measure’ success remains problematic. The success of a public archaeology project is not exactly measurable in numbers (as with the value of archaeology, see chapter III). No real protocol exists for measuring the success of projects, even though news reports will often speak of “a great success”. Visitor numbers of events and websites are usually taken as indications of success, but these are not representative of the durable effects of the project and whether the goals have been met (unless the goal is to have a certain number of visitors). With recurring projects, it might be interesting to work with percentages; if visitor numbers increase, that could be seen as a success. Yet even these cases are not measurable, unless a desired percentage is determined with which the visitor numbers should rise.

For the Hunze valley project, visitor numbers will be an indication and can be counted from the website and the events in the field,
although the latter will probably be an estimate. ‘Likes’ and ‘followers’ on the social media pages will also give an indication of how many people are interested in the project. There will definitely be some overlap between followers on the several social media pages, visitors of the website and the events, which will be hard to overcome. Were the project to accomplish some recurring events, that could also be seen as a success.

Eventually, the evaluation needs to determine how many of the set goals of the project have been achieved. For the Hunze valley pilot plan, the goals are to engage the public in an interactive way in their local past and to create an increased appreciation of archaeology and the archaeological process. A way to find out if these goals were met, is by handing out questionnaires to the public, through the website or at events. However, this method is not without problems. Writing a to the point and clear questionnaire is difficult, encouraging the public to answer them near to impossible and interpreting the results time consuming and prone to errors.4 Even with questionnaires it will be hard to determine if the goal of increasing archaeology’s support base has been met. Looking up local news reporting archaeology in a positive manner before and after the project could give an insight in the local’s change of perception.5 Yet this method will also be flawed, as the media is a fickle representation of the local mentality and percentages will only be indicative if investigated over a longer period of time.

Therefore, I propose a sort of combination of the discussed methods above. Visitor numbers of the website, events and the followers on social media will be tracked, in combination with test sampling opinions of the public at the events (and possibly a poll on social media). These together should be able to give at least an indication of the level of success of the project. A visitor number of at least 200 during the first events in the field will make me very happy.

V.3.2.10 Execution
Finally, it is time to execute the project. Of course, there is a lot of planning involved, such as the order in which to do things, notify all the people involved, make sure everyone knows what to do and keep track of all the events. Sometimes parts of the project will play out differently than expected, but this does not have to be a bad thing. In some cases it might be necessary to adjust the project to be more functional or please all the parties involved. Regardless, the initial goals of the project should be kept in mind at all times. How well the project fared will be examined later during the evaluation phase.

V.3.2.11 Evaluate and publish
After the project has come to an end, it is time to investigate the project’s success. This depends a lot on the kind of project and the goals that were set at the beginning of the project. In the case of recurring projects or events, yearly evaluations or quarterly evaluations may be a suitable alternative. The evaluation, together with the planning process and other information, should be published. There are several international journals dedicated to public archaeology or community archaeology, but also national journals offer a great platform for such articles. It is important to remember that not only the academics might be interested in the results, but also the target audience that has been involved in the project. If there is a project website, that will be a good spot to publish an article, but newsletters (whether it is in the mail or as email) are also an option.

V.3.2.12 Repeat
I have added this last step to stress that a single project is not the end; it is nearly the beginning. The best of durable projects will be able to exist for quite some years and continue to engage the public. Some projects are seasonally oriented and comprise of yearly events. For these a repeat phase will be very beneficial. The goals of a new project may change depending on the evaluation of the last, or on the organisation or wishes of the target audience. Public archaeology is an ongoing process.

V.4 Costs
Funding in this case could be possible through the local governmental bodies, considering the municipality of Aa en Hunze are positive towards archaeology. The pilot plan also offers opportunities for local institutions and corporations who might be willing to provide funding in the form of financial aids or
otherwise services and materials. An example would be the Iron Age living history, which could be provided by the *Hunebedcentrum* (although because this research concerns a pilot plan and not an actual project, the *Hunebedcentrum* has not been asked to consider funding of services or material at this time). In some cases volunteers could substitute employees, for example for flyer design or installing the information sign. Below I have tried to estimate the costs of the pilot plan proposed above, based on a variety of sources and over the course of the first year and subsequent years. Possible income, for example from charging exhibitors at the Iron Age market or donations, have not been calculated.

### V.4.1 Costs of the first year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website</strong></td>
<td>33,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Design (including text, images, video interviews, interactive map):</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bandwidth 5GB/email address:</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintenance:</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition prizes</strong></td>
<td>410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Iron Age dagger:</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Iron Age axe:</td>
<td>130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Iron Age fibula:</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information sign</strong></td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wooden carved figure on pole:</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Plaque with text &amp; QR code:</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Installation:</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iron Age living history</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reenactors: free (<em>Hunebedcentrum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Material for activities: free</td>
<td>(Hunebedcentrum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PR</strong></td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social media maintenance:</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local newspapers, Radio, TV:</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flyers:</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flyer design:</td>
<td>175.00-200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total costs</strong></td>
<td>35,960.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Website costs are based on an estimate by Kris Förster, owner of KF in Heritage; Kris Förster, personal communication (email), May 25, 2015.
7 Costs based on two prizes and requested at ARRE Remaining History, owned by Sebastiaan Pelsmaker; Sebastiaan Pelsmaker, personal communication (email), May 27, 2015.
8 Based on an estimate by Sebastiaan Pelsmaker; Sebastiaan Pelsmaker, personal communication (email), May 27, 2015.
9 Estimate based on a stainless steel plaque of around 25 x 10 cm with laser etching of text and QR code, as offered by Gravure ’85; Ernst Hendriks (Gravure ’85), personal communication (email), May 27, 2015.
10 Based on the costs for maintenance for a website as estimated by Kris Förster, KF in Heritage; Kris Förster (KF inHeritage), personal communication (email), May 25, 2015.
11 5000 copies on 250 gr A6-paper, double-sided full colour; Druk Zo, Flyers bestellen 2017 [online].
12 Basisreclame, flyer ontwerp + flyers drukken 2013 [online]; Inktvis, prijslijst Inktvis grafisch ontwerp 2015 [online]; Highflyer, ontwerp en druk van flyers 2017 [online].

### V.4.2 Costs of subsequent years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website</strong></td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bandwidth 5GB/email address:</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintenance:</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information sign</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintenance:</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iron Age living history</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reenactors: free (<em>Hunebedcentrum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Material for activities: free</td>
<td>(Hunebedcentrum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PR</strong></td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social media maintenance:</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local newspapers, Radio, TV:</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flyers:</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flyer design:</td>
<td>175.00-200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total costs</strong></td>
<td>5,350.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above estimate makes clear that the largest expense will be the design of the website. This can be explained by the amount of man-hours that go into the design of the website, images, videos, and writing of text.

13 Website costs are based on an estimate by Kris Förster, owner of KF in Heritage; Kris Förster (KF inHeritage), personal communication (email), May 25, 2015.
14 Based on the costs for maintenance for a website as estimated by Kris Förster, KF in Heritage; Kris Förster (KF inHeritage), personal communication (email), May 25, 2015.
15 5000 copies on 250 gr A6-paper, double-sided full colour; Druk Zo, Flyers bestellen 2017 [online].
16 Basisreclame, flyer ontwerp + flyers drukken 2013 [online]; Inktvis, prijslijst Inktvis grafisch ontwerp 2015 [online]; Highflyer, ontwerp en druk van flyers 2017 [online].
V.5 Conclusion

In this chapter a so-called pilot plan has been proposed for a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley. A framework has been described discussing all the steps to come to such a project, which could be useful to others organising public archaeology projects. All the steps have also been worked out for the situation in the Hunze, in particular the municipality Aa en Hunze. An estimate of the involved costs has been added as an insight in the required funding.

The steps described in this chapter are based on the situation in the Hunze valley, its stakeholders and the wishes of the initiator. This means that any other organisation of a public archaeology project might take different steps or follow steps in a different order. Still, I am hopeful that the framework presented above will be an aid to others who are involved in planning such a project. The presented framework can be divided into two categories: the three determining factors and the project processes. The first consists of the decisions towards the landscape/stories, the public and the methods. These are all interdependent. The project processes follow afterwards and include steps to come to the actual execution of the project. Important steps include the evaluation and publication of a project, as this information will be important for the development of public archaeology as a discipline.

The pilot plan for a public archaeology project for the Hunze valley follows the steps as set in the framework. The result is a plan de campagne that will both engage the public in an interactive and dynamic way in the local past, while increasing their understanding and appreciation of archaeology and archaeological practice. In other words, the local support base for archaeology should be increased. The Hunze man, the skeleton retrieved from Bonnerklap during research there last year (see chapter II), will function as the focal point of the ‘stories’ within the landscape setting. Instead of offering the public with ready-made stories, people will be encouraged to form their own interpretations and stories by looking into the archaeological information, presented on a website. The website will offer a whole range of information from which the user can select as little or as much as he or she wishes. The Hunze man is a mysterious figure; what will the public decide what his role was during his life? How will the story of his death and deposition come to be? Persons can send in their stories, which will then be uploaded on the website and voted on by others. The two most popular stories will then be acted out ‘in the field’ at Bonnerklap by an Iron Age living history camp. To encourage the public further, prizes in the form of reproductions of Iron Age items will be awarded to the winners. During the activities at Bonnerklap an information sign will also be revealed, made to resemble a wooden idol and carrying a little plaque with a short informative text, a QR code and the name of the website. Lectures by specialists, other Iron Age activities and possibly a market with Prehistoric items or local produce will contribute to the durability of the project, as these can easily be repeated in subsequent years. Social media, local media and advertisement by flyers will help to notify the public of the existence of the project. To evaluate the success of the project, visitor numbers of the website, the events in the field and the social media pages will be compared, together with asking a number of visitors their opinion. The costs for such a project (for the first year) are hard to predict, but an estimate has been made of around €35.960,00, of which the majority of the expenses are involved in the realisation of the website. Subsequent years will cost around €5350,00, of which most will be invested in maintenance of the website and social media.
VI. Conclusion

In this thesis many of the problems and opportunities when dealing with public archaeology have been discussed. These had mainly to do with landscape, the ‘stories’ of archaeology, the public and available methods for public engagement. The goal was to come to a ‘pilot plan’ for a public archaeology project for the Hunze valley. This valley is subject to extensive renovation, including the ‘remeandering’ of the river itself, through the vision of nature organisations, municipalities and water management organisations; the Hunzevisie.¹ Nature and ecology, water retention and extraction, but also recreation are all part of the vision. The past deserves a place in the Hunze and should be available to the local population. This idea is what sparked the theme of this thesis, but it is not the sole reason I chose public archaeology as my subject. The sub-discipline has increasingly awoken my interest over the course of my study years, probably because of an increased interest in what drives people to like or dislike certain aspects of life. Archaeology seems to be liked by many, but it is only relatively recently that archaeologists have begun to engage and involve the public. Therefore, this thesis was a way for me to study public archaeology and become more acquainted with it.

In the introduction (chapter I) a main research question and several sub-questions have been formulated to guide the research. These questions will be answered in this chapter. Here are the questions once again:

What strategies and what methods of interpretation should be utilised to engage the public in the archaeological heritage of the Hunze landscape, in the context of the Hunze river?

The following sub-questions have been formulated to answer the specific problems which are relevant to this research and are associated with the above research question:

1. How can be determined which pasts of the Hunze are most suitable to present to the public?
2. What are the target audiences for public engagement and what are the demands for knowledge and presentation for the archeology of the Hunze?
3. What are the possible methods to involve the public in archaeology and how efficient are they?
4. How can the strategies and methods proposed for the Hunze valley be useful to other projects?

VI.1 Answering the research questions

The questions set at the start of this thesis and again above, were the basis of the previous chapters. The questions have been largely answered in the chapters, but for clarity will be recapitulated here. First, the sub-questions will be answered, after which the main question will be answered.

VI.1.1 How can be determined which pasts of the Hunze are most suitable to present to the public?

The first sub-question focuses on what archaeological ‘stories’ should be selected for a public archaeology project. This, together with the theory concerned with landscapes and archaeology, is the focus of chapter II. The landscape is the canvas on which the pasts of the Hunze have left their marks, although for laymen these marks may not be easily recognisable. Other pasts, such as the activities of Palaeolithic hunter & gatherer societies, are entirely invisible in the landscape. Determining which pasts would be most suitable to present to the public is not a simple task, because of the multitude of factors involved. For example, the other two

¹ Bilt & Glastra 1995; Stichting het Drentse Landschap et al. 2014.
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determining factors (the public and methods), the preferences of the archaeologist or organiser in question and available funding, all play a part.

The Hunze landscape has been subject of a plan in which several municipalities in Drenthe are involved (Tynaarlo, Aa en Hunze & Borger-Odoorn). In this plan the Hunze is transformed from a straight canal into a meandering stream, as it used to be prior to canalisation. Recreation, nature and water are now the focus and are causing the landscape to change rapidly in many places of the Hunze. Species diversity increases, water management is improved and tourism stimulated.

The investigations associated with the renewal of the Hunze has also caused an increase of archaeological data. Together with the earlier findings from the area, the data tell a story about the past of the Hunze. Among them several themes can be detected. The better known local past is that of the peat reclamation, which became a true industry in Drenthe. Yet most finds listed in Archis near the Hunze originate from Prehistory and Middle Ages.

In order to find out which ‘stories’ of the past could find a place in a public archaeology project, first the past of the Hunze had to be investigated. In Prehistory and the Early Middle Ages people formed their lives around the valley, weighing the advantages and disadvantages of the area and using it to its potential. At these times the valley was a source of water and food gladly exploited. During the Middle Ages people have begun to change the landscape to their advantage. The most extensive adaptations consisted of grazing animals and draining peat. During the subsequent ages peat reclamation became a true industry. The Hunze itself was adapted accordingly and made navigable for boats of considerable size which transported the peat. After the height of the peat reclamation, agriculture took its place as the leading market in the province of Drenthe. In the modern era the canalisation and land consolidation created a straight, flat landscape. Next to the general study of the landscape’s past, I have investigated several archaeological case studies within the municipality of Aa en Hunze, such as data from Archis as well as data from archaeological reports.

Which theme or stories eventually make it to a public archaeology project are very dependent on the nature of the project’s goals, initiators, target audience, methods and funds available and many other factors. Therefore it is impossible to state that there is one true way to determine what stories are most suitable. The steps taken and presented in this thesis are therefore very specific to the context of the research area and the preferences of the author.

The renewed parts of the Hunze are very attractive and feel more ‘authentic’ than the straight canalised parts of the Hunze. For that reason these locations are especially suitable as the setting for a public archaeology project. Of the two main themes (Prehistory and peat reclamation), peat reclamation has received the most attention in the area and has been discussed extensively already. Perhaps this is not surprising, as the industry has left visible marks in the present landscape all over. It is partially because of my own preference that I chose to focus on Prehistory. Prehistoric settlements are known from the higher and dryer grounds nearer the Hondsrug and consist mainly of the remains of the Funnel Beaker Culture. However, the wet valley must have been essential for the Prehistoric societies roaming its area, not just those from the Neolithic. The relationship between the Prehistoric people and the Hunze’s waters is what interests me a lot and offers a lot of opportunities for subjects in a public archaeology project, while also focusing on the landscape. Therefore the theme selected is Prehistory & Water.

In November 2014 the skeleton of a male from the Iron Age was discovered at Bonnerklap, where the Hunze was given back its meanders at the time. It became known as the Hunze man and proved to be a very special find; the skeleton is very well preserved and near complete. Its location in an old river arm of the Hunze is also peculiar. Hunze man seems to be a great subject for a public archaeology project, as its often human remains that trigger the imagination of laymen to a great extent. Hunze man would thus become the focus of the project’s story.
VI. Conclusion

VI.1.2 What are the target audiences for public engagement and what are the demands for knowledge and presentation for the archeology of the Hunze?

In chapter II I have discussed the complicated issues concerning the ‘public’ and ‘public archaeology’. The public seems to appreciate experiences and dynamics over objects or property and statics nowadays and public archaeology projects should be adjusted accordingly. This also means there are a lot of new opportunities available for archaeologists, but they need to be flexible. Archaeology is very popular among the public, so when archaeologists assume the role of story-teller of the past and function as guides through these stories, many more people will be reached.

When trying to select a suitable target audience for a public archaeology project, certain assumptions have to be made. While it is impossible to divide the public into clear, demarcated groups, an attempt to categorise the publics or stakeholders in the municipality of Aa en Hunze has been described in chapter III. Eight groups could be named: local inhabitants, politicians & policy makers, tourists, (local) corporations and institutions, amateur archaeologists & volunteers, farmers, landowners & ‘destroyers’ and finally archaeologists. Some overlap between these groups is unavoidable. The degree and nature of segmentation of the public is again highly dependable on the goals and other factors of the public archaeology project. In the thesis each of the aforementioned publics were described, each with their advantages and disadvantages for incorporating in a public archaeology project, in order to select the most suitable. All of the publics are relevant, but it is most beneficial to the project to choose one public to focus on. For this pilot plan, the local inhabitants have been selected as the most suitable public. The main reason for this is that by involving the locals and increasing their appreciation of archaeology and the archaeological process in general, the local past will be better protected. In other words, locals who care about their local past will also be willing to take steps to protect this past. That does not mean that other groups are not welcome; of course any public, whether it be tourists, farmers or politicians, are more than welcome to join in on the public archaeology project in the Hunze.

VI.1.3 What are the possible methods to involve the public in archaeology and how efficient are they?

Chapter II has been entirely dedicated to methods for public outreach, but some of the other issues concerning the use of methods have also been discussed. Among other things, the available funding needs to be kept in mind. There are many creative ways to fund projects and find sponsors, but archaeologists are often not aware of these. Potential sponsors are also not aware of what archaeologists can offer them. Smaller businesses are usually more willing to provide services than financial aids, such as the printing of brochures or models. A relatively new way to gather funds is the popular crowdfunding, in which anyone can make a small donation to aid a project. This has proven to be successful in several archaeological cases, such as at Dreumel, where the excavation process was threatened by a lack of funds. Next to money issues, the role of the archaeologist and the opportunities for making a project durable are also relevant for selecting suitable methods. In any case it seems that offering experiences is more effective than stating facts. The closer the public can get to archaeology (touching it, instead of seeing it or hearing about it), the more profound the experience will be. This could even lead to a historical sensation. To increase my personal understanding of what makes a public archaeology project successful, I have contacted several specialists from the Netherlands and asked them what examples they could name of projects that were successful in their opinion. The specialists are Kris Förster (KF in Heritage), Marie-France van Oorsouw (Weleer) and Marjolein van den Dries (PITT). They were very helpful in naming projects, including some of their own.

It was impossible to mention all methods available to public archaeologists in this thesis, but quite a number of them are mentioned in chapter IV. The methods have been discussed for their advantages and disadvantages and where possible examples and an estimate of the involved costs. The methods were divided into categories: (multi)media, portable heritage, classroom projects, reenactment, publications, art, reconstructions, archaeological excavations, presentation of information, exhibits and finally digital presentations.
It became clear from examples of success stories that a combination of methods would be most successful for a public archaeology project. Of the mentioned methods the most suitable for implementation in the Hunze valley seem to be portable heritage (apps, etc.), classroom projects, reenactment, reconstructions, presentation of information (information signs) and digital presentations (websites, etc.). Of these a website in combination with some sort of portable heritage and events in the field will be most likely to come to the desired result. Offering experiences in the field as a way to convey archaeological stories will appeal to both young and old participants and allow for a high level of engagement. Not only being educational, such events will hopefully draw people to the Hunze and enjoy a nice day out. The website will be a treasure of archaeological information and a way for people to get involved, while the portable heritage will help in creating the link between the website and the events in the field.

VI.1.4 How can the strategies and methods proposed for the Hunze valley be useful to other projects?
The information gathered for the previous research questions are indispensable for answering the fourth sub-question. It has helped find a way to create a framework or plan de campagne for composing a public archaeology project, as described in chapter V. It must be noted that the framework presented in this thesis was designed specifically for the Hunze case-study. It is therefore not a framework that could be used for any public archaeology project, considering the amount of factors that lead to the eventual creation of a project. In the framework I have simple laid out the steps concerned with the decision-making process I have been through to come to a pilot plan for a public archaeology project for the Hunze valley. The framework consists of two separate parts: first the three determining factors (landscape/stories, the public, methods) and the execution processes. The determining factors are highly inter-dependent; their selection will influence the selection of the other determining factors. As their name suggests, they are an important part of the process, since they determine what the project will eventually look like. After their selection, during the execution processes 12 steps are taken to come to the actual creation and carrying out of the project. They revolve around careful planning of the project, including its outlook, evaluation and PR.

The resulting framework, which can be found in chapter IV, results in a clear set of steps that have led to the pilot plan presented in this thesis. This framework could be beneficial to others involved in public archaeology projects, because of the explanations offered for each step. While for other projects other factors are relevant and other steps may be required, the framework could be used as a starting point for the planning of a new project. I have attempted to present most of the factors that are important to consider in creating a plan for a public archaeology project; for that reason many parts of this thesis, as well as the framework, will be beneficial to anyone organising a public archaeology project.

VI.1.5 Main question (the pilot plan)
The answers to the sub-questions above are all needed to answer the main question:

What strategies and what methods of interpretation should be utilised to engage the public in the archaeological heritage of the Hunze landscape, in the context of the Hunze river?

In other words, what would a public archaeo-logical project in the Hunze valley look like which aspires to involve the public in an engaging and dynamic way? In chapter V a pilot plan has been made that attempts to shed light on precisely this matter. The pilot plan is formed after taking many of the factors that influence the planning and outcome of a public archaeology project into consideration. These have been discussed in chapters II-V and concern for instance the selection of the suitable 'stories', a target audience (public) and methods to present the stories to said audience. These selections have been used to form the following pilot plan:

Hunze man, a skeleton of a male from the Iron Age has been discovered during archaeological excavation in Bonnerklap (municipality Aa en Hunze) in context of the renovations of the Hunze's course at the same location. His skeleton is remarkably well preserved and complete. Skeletal remains from this
The two best rated stories will then be played out live at Bonnerklap, the find location of Hunze man. A living history team will be responsible for this, as well as an Iron Age camp in which all kinds of Iron Age water associated activities will be played out, as well as daily activities, which the public can join in on. The winners will receive an award in the form of a reproduction of an Iron Age artefact, for example a dagger, axe or fibula. Competing in a contest will further motivate people to join in the project. At this first event, also lectures by specialists and possibly a ‘Prehistoric’ market and local produce market can take place. The revealing of an information sign in the form of a wooden anthropomorphic icon will be a special occasion on this day. The icon is inspired by similar wooden icons found throughout Europe in Prehistory, often in wet conditions. On it a QR code will link to the website and a short text will explain the importance of the site of Hunze man’s discovery. Such an icon will be less intrusive to the natural environment of the Hunze landscape than a regular information sign and preserve the experience of the landscape by visitors.

For the durability of the project, the website will remain accessible to anyone looking for information on the Iron Age in the Hunze valley. The uploaded stories by contestants will remain on the website, also after the competition has been closed. Of course, the information sign (wooden icon) will remain standing. The Iron Age camp activities at Bonnerklap can be repeated once or twice a year (for instance in early and late summer). At these recurring events the Hunze man’s stories do not necessarily have to be repeated. A ‘Prehistoric’ market and local produce market are also good contenders at the recurring events.

To evaluate the project, mostly visitor numbers of the website will be used. Also the visitor numbers, views and ‘likes’ on the social media platforms will be kept in mind. An estimate of the people visiting the events in the field will be made, in combination with a small sample study in which visitors are asked their opinion of the project.

The estimated costs of such a project are about €35 900,- for the first year and €5 300,00 for every subsequent year the project will run with the website and the recurring events in the field.

VI.2 Concluding

In this thesis I have attempted to investigate public archaeology within a landscape setting, as well as the discipline itself. Research after the nature of the public, landscapes and the relation with archaeology was a great opportunity for me to get acquainted with the subject. The often underestimated Hunze valley will receive more attention during the coming decade as more of the Hunzevisie² will become reality and the natural environment will grow and prosper. More people will visit the area for its nature and opportunities for recreation, while flooding is reduced and more sources for drinking water are available. It is my hope that archaeology will be

---

² Hunze ‘vision’, as proposed in 1995 and updated for 2030; Bilt & Glastra 1995; Stichting het Drentse Landschap et al. 2014.
part of this picture and allow visitors, both local and from far, to experience the past in an interactive and dynamic way. While at this time there are no plans to execute the project as proposed above, there are certainly possibilities for this and other public archaeology projects. The associated provinces and municipalities seem to be quite open to these possibilities and I have faith they will continue to do so in the future to insure the safety and awareness of archaeology and the local past.

I would like to conclude this chapter by emphasising several points made in this thesis. First of all, it becomes apparent that public archaeology is teamwork. It would not have been possible for me to gather all the information set out in this thesis and create a framework and pilot plan for the Hunze, without receiving all the aid I have had. The unlimited enthusiasm and open mind the people I have had the pleasure of talking to shared with me proved that to me. For that, I am very thankful. Furthermore, I would like to add that while I limited myself to the municipality of Aa en Hunze in this thesis, it would have been better to include larger parts of the Hunze valley, for example most of Drenthe or even the province of Groningen. However, because of time restraints and the size of the thesis this was not possible for this research. For public archaeology in general, especially in the Netherlands, I would like to ask anyone involved in the discipline to publish more about the plans and organisation, realisation of projects and eventual evaluation. Especially the evaluation of a project’s success is essential to the development of public archaeology. Finally, historic societies have played no role in my thesis, which is unfortunate. It would be wise for upcoming projects to take these societies in account, especially when the societies are active and interested in taking part of the organisation of public archaeology projects.

The contents of this thesis have hopefully demonstrated what factors play a role in coming to a public archaeology project, in particular those set in landscapes. The Hunze as a case-study proved to be excellent in this light, but it is after this case-study that the framework and pilot plan have been formed. This means that the initiators of other projects may approach different tactics and strategies for the realisation of public archaeology projects. The Hunze man within the main theme of Prehistory & water show the relationship between Prehistoric people and their environment. The local population, which is the target audience for the proposed pilot plan, was the most suitable public to include, since the increased awareness and appreciation of the local past and archaeology as a practice can result in better preservation and protection of archaeology in the region. A combination of methods to present the archaeological information is proven to be most successful. For the pilot plan the use of a website, portable heritage in the form of a QR code, a wooden information sign and living history in the field will be part of the project. Additional methods need to be employed to draw the public to the project as a form of PR, such as awards for the winning contestants (reconstruction of Iron Age items), flyers spread among corporations and institutions in the area and articles on local radio/television and in local newspapers.

The pilot plan has been carefully constructed to keep many of the factors influencing the outcome of a public archaeology project into consideration. The main goals are to involve the public in an interactive and dynamic way while increasing their appreciation of the local past and the archaeological process in general. Whether the proposed plan will succeed in doing so, can only be determined by evaluation afterwards, but I am convinced that the steps taken will assure the project’s success. The processes described in this thesis will hopefully be helpful to anyone interested in initiating or taking part in a public archaeology project. I believe the processes offer a realistic view of what is involved in the planning and organisation of public archaeology projects. There are a lot of factors involved, which inevitably means that the framework will have to be adapted or completely changed for any other public archaeology project. This does not mean that the framework has no purpose for others, as many of the same steps will be involved and many of the same issues will play a part in other projects.

Naturally, the possibility of executing the proposed pilot plan for the Hunze valley (in the municipality of Aa en Hunze) is one I would gladly accept, as well as any other challenges concerned with public archaeology. For now, this thesis has allowed for my interest and
knowledge concerning the discipline to grow. It has become clear to me that the discipline is very much in a relatively early state and needs much more research to be successful and well-grounded in the Netherlands. It is my hope this thesis will have sparked the interest and imagination of others and may lead to more archaeologists and laymen to take an interest in public archaeology and its execution in the ‘real’ world.

**VI.3 Further research: some suggestions**

During my research and the writing of my thesis, several topics have come to light that deserve additional research. Here I would like to mention a few of these topics which I consider very important.

In this thesis I have limited my research to the municipality of Aa en Hunze. This is a relatively small area to base a public archaeology project on, especially when concerned with a large landscape element as the Hunze river. It would be better to incorporate other areas through which the Hunze is running, for example the same areas in which the Hunze is scheduled to be renovated (in Groningen and Drenthe). The limitations of this research have also caused only a portion of the available archaeological record from the Hunze to have been incorporated. There is a wealth of information hidden in different archaeological articles and reports, which could do with some organising and analysing so that the data may be more available. This will be useful not only for public archaeology projects, but also for Dutch archaeology in general and specifically the status of river valley archaeology in the north of the Netherlands.

A recurring problem in public archaeology projects in the Netherlands seems to be that the early Prehistory (before farming techniques took hold in the Neolithic) is grossly undervalued and little represented. In the pilot plan presented in this thesis the Iron Age is the time period of choice, which, rightfully observed by Jan Jaap Hekman, is a relatively safe option.¹ The Hunze valley’s older time periods, mainly the Late Palaeolithic and Mesolithic, are incredibly interesting and deserve similar attention as the younger periods. However, it is these periods that are hardest to present to the public; partially because of a lack of visible material, but also because of the nomadic lifestyle the early Prehistoric people have lead. This type of lifestyle does not correspond with our own (sedentary), which makes it harder for modern people to understand and be engaged. Therefore, a real challenge would be to introduce a successful and early Prehistoric project in the Hunze valley, or another part of the Netherlands. Research into what parts of the nomadic Prehistory are most relevant and how to convey these stories in an attractive way to the public will be very useful.

Furthermore, it has become clear that it is hard to track successful projects, because of the lack of good evaluation techniques applied to public archaeology projects. Very little initiators consider how to evaluate the success of a project. Such projects are often hard to evaluate, because evaluation methods are often based on financial values, which are not usually important to satisfy in public archaeological projects. More research is needed in how to set up adequate evaluation methods for public archaeology projects. The data from such evaluations can be used to improve future public archaeology projects all over the world; at least as long as the data is being published.

---

¹ Jan Jaap Hekman, personal communication (letter), July 20, 2015.
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Appendix II: Interviews with specialists: Kris Förster, Marie-France van Oorsouw and Marjolein van den Dries

Kris Förster
Kris Förster owns a business called KF inHeritage, which is involved with advice and production of projects in heritage communication. He mentions some projects he has worked on personally, like “Expeditie Limburg”, a TV documentary series about the pasts of Limburg. It is broadcast on regional television and already has two seasons, covering all kinds of subjects from the history of the province, such as early hominids, Roman history and the history of science. The Via Belgica Digitalis project is centered around a website and a mobile app, investigating a Roman route (the Via Belgica) from east to west Limburg. A map offers several waypoints loaded with layered information; videos and visuals, in-depth historical information, audio comments by experts and ‘story-telling’ about a Roman main character. The project offers extensive information for everyone who is interested in Roman history and archaeology. The visitor can choose the information to a degree he or she is most comfortable with. Whether this is a short overview, a video or more elaborate information to read, is entirely up to the visitor. This makes the website very user-friendly, also because it has been executed in a practical manner. Another project Förster has worked on is the MaastrichtMap. This website offers a wide range of information about the city of Maastricht in Limburg, not limited to archaeology and history. The website is divided into three categories: tourism, history and practical information. The website is relatively hard to navigate and not as straightforward as the Via Belgica Digitalis. Still, it combines archaeological and historical information with other information, perhaps persuading those visiting Maastricht for other reasons to take a look into archaeology and history. The website also has a map to show the location of the several sites to visit (whether it be shopping, eating out, or a museum or archaeological site).

Marie-France van Oorsouw
Owner of Weleer and with an impressive portfolio, Marie-France practices heritage communication, presentation and advice. She has been involved in a range of projects, such as exhibitions and other public manifestations, events and project management. She starts out by mentioning the Garsthuizen project, ran by Henny Groenendijk and students at the University of Groningen (Lars Jetten & Alexander Zagkotsis). In this project an old church and the terp beneath it in Garsthuizen have been investigated. Restoration was no longer an option so the church had to be demolished, leaving many of the locals devastated. To make up for this, archaeological investigations were organised, combined with presentations, tours and opportunities for volunteers. At the same time a website was set up, containing a blog with information, pictures and videos of the archaeological investigations. The organisation has baptised the project as a “civilian participation project” and thus locals were actively asked to participate in the project. Eventually, a new building will be erected at the location of the old church. The project was a big success as many locals took part in a variety of available activities, not limited to excavation only. A small documentary, titled “Deelnemen in Erfgoed” (Taking part in Heritage), was made by the same team as an impression of the participation project. Marie-France also mentions VINDplaats Zenit, a park built over an archaeological site in Almere with all kinds of facilities and opportunities for events and civilians’ initiatives. The park is a meeting place, had educational and recreational purposes and is being maintained by the neighboorhoud itself. In this way the site receives a new purpose for the local inhabitants, with the past as an ever-present constant. There is an archaeological playground, fire place, vegetable gardens, fruit trees and more. Regular events ensure that the park
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has become a true part of the neighbourhood and it is visited and maintained often. The public ‘digging’ day organised in Dreumel already mentioned, is another successful project in the eyes of Marie-France. Projects like this, in which excavations take place, are very effective to attract the attention of the media and the locals. That being said, this project is also unique in many ways. For one, a local historical society (Tremele) was involved and it was an entirely private project (the local government was not involved in the organisation). Most impressively, it was largely paid for by crowdfunding. It is one of the most successful crowdfunding archaeological projects in the world, raising around €5500,- in just a week to keep investigating the precious remains uncovered at the location of what would become a new village center. As a foreign example, she mentions a project at the famous archaeological site of Çatalhöyük in Turkey. Its starting point is that of an archaeological landscape. The project is not only interdisciplinary, but also involves not only local volunteers (and employees), but also tourists from Turkey and abroad, fashion designers, etc. Local female workers were given the opportunity to shed some light on their personal interpretations and perceptions with photography, leading to a community exhibit. In subsequent seasons the project will allow different groups to be part of an exhibition to showcase the differences that exist between perception and the changes that occur in interpretation over time. For the Hunze landscape in particular, Marie-France suggests looking into the possibilities for creating an ArcheoHotspot. The idea is that several hotspots will be scattered around the country, creating a network of hotspots of interesting archaeological nature, like museums. The project aims to make archaeology available to everyone and offer an interactive platform for archaeologists and whoever else has an interest in the past. The Allard Pierson museum in Amsterdam is the first ArcheoHotspot and opened in December 2014 and the second will open in May 2015 in Den Bosch. Each hotspot consists of an ArcheoLab, ArcheoScope and ArcheoCommunity. As the last term implies, interaction with the public is a key point of the ArcheoHotspots. It is a well-funded and partially governmental project, with many possibilities for incorporating other archaeological and heritage related projects.

Marjolein van den Dries

Working in her own business, PITT (“publieksarcheologie in de tegenwoordige tijd”), Marjolein arranges anything from temporary communication in companies, municipalities or for projects, up to advise, organisation and more on all aspects of public activities involved with archaeology and heritage. She also has experience with digital projects, such as websites, apps and social media. Marjolein mentions the “zoektocht naar de oer-Vlaardinger” project (search for the ancient Vlaardinger) initiated in 2006. This project was set up by city archaeologist Tim de Ridder and city archivist Harm Jan Luth came up with this project after 24 individuals from an 11th century burial yard were found to still contain well-preserved DNA. The aim of the project was to compare the DNA with current inhabitants of Vlaardingen, with the help of the Leiden University Medical Center, to see if any descendants of the Medieval Vlaardingers exist today. The project was a great success and more than 80 men (all with a local family history going back to the 16th century) volunteered to be examined. The result was astounding as a rare DNA match was found between a contemporary citizen and an anonymous Medieval skeleton: the Oer-Vlaardinger was found! For its innovative research and the interaction of the public with the past, the project even won a prize: the Bob Verbiest Cultuurprijs. The project’s success has lead to succeeding projects in Oldenzaal and Vlissingen. Marjolein continues with some advice for aspects of a public archaeology project in the Hunze valley, such as to focus on local target audiences, incorporate education and/or schools, tell a ‘story’ rather than facts and to create opportunities for interactivity as opposed to only “sending” information. Finally, cooperation
with local (archaeological) parties such as antiquarian circles or historical societies can pay off, as these can offer a lot of knowledge and enthusiasm.
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