Session Comments

Questions and Doubts

Should we make an official position/statement about voluntary participation in archaeology (for EAA etc.)??

Can we understand the future of archaeology without participation? How important is it?

I would like to ask Jose his particular explanation for this professional reaction

What is the limit of the public participation in archaeology?

Expert legitimacy: Participation questions and threatens the disciplinary boundaries in Archaeology?

What is archaeology when anybody can participate?

Can economic value mean more than just MONEY $?

In a context where the impact of economic crisis is not that strong, one can ask: could participation lead to a big disengagement of the state? If so: is it a problem at all?

How can we practically deal with multivocality?...during heritagization processes...

What happens when the future is uncertain? During crisis, wars migration...

The mission of Sparta is the same for all the public? Or change according to age, sex...? With their participation what mission change?

How to deal with antagonist groups within a given community?

Would it make sense to associate specific words (outreach, collaboration etc.) to different level of participation?

How to engage migrant population in a historical past that is not their past?

What happen when people do not want a project to participate?

From “how do we involve the public” to “why should we involve the public”

Is it really so important the terminology? Public community?

Suggestions

It’s critically important to think about the methodologies for public participation. *Felipe*
Does the ease of participation in archaeology make strategies less creative? More standard? Maybe. Where it is harder practitioners are forced to be more creative because they don’t take it for granted.

Any discussion taking place should not only result to guidelines and recommendations but ways to reach policy makers.

Participatory/collaborative archaeology as a resilience strategy during the crisis.

Participatory archaeology needs to be taught at BA level *plus communication skills

There are different levels of participation.

Addressing to some entity (like EAA) the need of a statement about participation.

Public benefit in the present (& future) is important for participation (?)

Labour issues are a serious topic that should be involved in this discussion on participation. How can we learn from examples like the ban against unpaid internships in the UK? What is the difference between free labour, volunteers and unpaid interns? Is it about access?

Is the form of participation …… us ……. paper or were forms of colonial archaeology?

Relationship between nature-culture-environment-heritage

It would be interesting to share and exchange experience and methods with the field of design, where participatory processes are currently applied (urban design, social innovation...)

Suggestion for discussion: differences between countries, and institutional frameworks- and explore the historical reasons behind them

We need better and stronger answers for WHY we should involve the public or engage them, before thinking a lot. How to do it…local Vs global relevance etc.

There is a difference to be made between the participation of the audiences (= two ways of public outreach) and participatory heritage management (=co-creation of management tools by all stakeholders active in cultural heritage)

We should also speak about the porosity of positions and of roles in heritagization processes. Ellinor

Critics

I don’t believe in post-its

Interesting to hear that even in the UK so little is known about amateur associations

Would like to know in more detail about the regulations, the legislative framework, that regulates amateur activities

Sometimes an “academic” umbrella is not interesting in terms of accessibility to locals

The discussion on public archaeology is too dominated by the situation/experiences in northern Europe

Real participatory management = co creation of rules and tools based on the intervention of all stakeholders involved in the heritage operational chain. This condition seems to be seldom achieved in projects today
Likes

Very good to hear a detailed study of amateur archaeological societies, questions same established ideas
On Lisa’s presentation: interesting to see that this project started as a response to the crisis

Beer + archaeology

Erasure between boundaries, between disciplines, between roles, between terms

Grandparents ‘day is a very nice idea

The definition of actors involved in heritage management is useful. Actors are diverse!
Yes! Tours for workmen and workwomen around excavations in S Europe! Necessary!

Important: participatory archaeology very important in period of xenophobia, polarization, migration

On José &Lara’s project: archaeology meets local needs, but also brings to the surface forgotten local histories, skills and values. Great!

Telling, sharing, participation. 3 different models or “levels” that can interactuate

How does participatory heritage fit with Valletta and other European conventions

What are volunteer/ public needs Do we know?

I fully agree with collaboration rather than participation. Emphasis on mutuality

Arauz paper: agree with significance of the national, regional context - public archaeology different in different countries

How do we understand how our participants view the past? How does this impact on their participation?

We all want to know about what people think about archaeology

Another sort of comments