

REPLY TO COMMENTS ON THE ARTICLE 'ASSESSING AND MEASURING: ON QUALITY IN DEVELOPMENT- LED ARCHAEOLOGY'

Carolina Andersson, Agneta Lagerlöf & Eva Skyllberg

It has been very rewarding to read the four comments on our article. The editors of CSA are to be applauded for engaging persons who, from both a Swedish and an international perspective, discussed so interestingly not only the concept 'quality' but also the specific concept 'scientific quality', as well as the particular characteristics of 'quality within development-led archaeology'. Many interesting views and angles have been presented, and though it would be very instructive to comment on all, for reasons of space we must confine ourselves to a few.

As we emphasised in our article, the revised regulations for the Swedish Heritage Conservation Act (KML) have broadened the aim of development-led archaeology to include scientific documentation and dissemination of the results; and the overall goal is to interpret and present the investigation results for different target groups in an accessible and relevant way. This slightly new focus was introduced to highlight the fact that development-led archaeology can and should also strive to achieve the expressed overall goals of cultural heritage management: 'each and everyone's understanding of, participation in, and responsibility for the own cultural environment'. In his comments, Håkon Glørstad takes issue with that view and instead points out that

the production of knowledge within development-led archaeology is a self-attaining goal in itself and should not be linked to the various needs of different user groups seeking knowledge. Glørstad argues that the augmented goal of Swedish development-led archaeology is an expression of a market-oriented view that focuses on consumption rather than production. He claims that if the developers' responsibilities include financing the interpretation and dissemination of the results of development-led archaeology, then critical and independent research becomes impossible. He advocates instead for the adoption of the Norwegian system for development-led archaeology. There, according to Glørstad, the primary goal is to secure threatened source material for future research. Therefore the developer pays only for the actual retrieval of the source material, while the interpretative process is the responsibility of the universities.

In our opinion, a source material can never be retrieved in a purely objective manner. The objectives and questions posed by the archaeologist direct the choice of methods and the way in which the excavation is carried out, and are thus decisive for the creation of the archaeological material that is the outcome of the excavation. How an archaeological material is recovered affects future queries and conclusions, both during the excavation and in regard to future research. In other words, no archaeological material is independent of the values prevailing at the time of its retrieval. Since development-led archaeology is carried out for the good of society, it is our duty to ensure that the results will be of the greatest possible use for researchers as well as for planners, state authorities and society in general.

In his comments Joakim Goldhahn discusses a series of problems within Swedish development-led archaeology. His rather discouraging picture corresponds with the views that were put forward at the National Heritage Board conference on 'quality in development-led archaeology' in November 2009. Goldhahn concludes by emphasizing that the county administrative boards need additional financial resources in order to ensure that the intentions of the Heritage Act are followed. Even Nathan Schlanger and Kai Salas Rossenbach note the importance of a perceptible State presence to make sure that the high quality of development-led archaeology is sustained. All measures to improve the system, for example to strengthen quality assurance control at various levels, are vital and must be further discussed. The demands that are placed on development-led archaeology today, with

tender procedures and target group amendments, make it especially imperative that the issue of quality be constantly debated.

Finally, a few words on terms and definitions: In his comments Fredrik Stjernberg discusses the hallmarks of good scientific quality. We agree on how scientific quality should be achieved, generally, and that it is important that the archaeological work be characterized by transparency and openness. However, a clarification is called for. The definitions of the terms 'quality' and 'good scientific quality' which are given in the Regulations must be seen not as universal definitions of these concepts but as clarification of how these terms are to be understood and applied with reference to specific points in the Regulations. Formulation of the more precise connotations of the term 'quality' is a matter for the scientific debate and the various stakeholders. That is the point of our article.

Nathan Schlanger and Kai Salas Rossenbach discuss the best English word with which to translate the Swedish term '*uppdragsarkeologi*'. There is a Swedish saying, '*Kärt barn har många namn*' ('A beloved child has many names') which certainly applies to development-led archaeology. In its early years, at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 70s, the term '*exploateringsarkeologi*' (lit. development archaeology) was coined for the archaeological work regulated by the Ancient Monument Act of the time, whereby a developer must finance all the necessary archaeological surveys or excavations he engenders. The expression '*räddningsgrävningar*' (lit. rescue excavations) was also used but the term 'development' allowed a desired emphasis on the fact that the archaeological work belonged to the planning process and did not merely involve rescuing a site from bulldozers in a construction project that was already underway. During the course of the 1980s the terms '*undersökningsverksamhet*' (lit. investigation services) and '*uppdragsverksamhet*' (lit. commissioned services) began to appear, perhaps in response to the fact that archaeological surveys and excavations had now become so complex that they represented a special type of enterprise. When translated into English, these concepts were usually grouped under the term *rescue archaeology*, which was the current term in English-speaking countries during the 1970s, 80s and 90s, and which was also the term used in the Valletta Convention of 1992. The term '*uppdragsarkeologi*', which had begun to be used on a more regular basis in Sweden in the 90s, has tended to be translated as '*contract archaeology*', the term found in the EAA's *Principles of Conduct* (1998). In re-

cent years two new terms have emerged in English-speaking countries – ‘*developer-funded archaeology*’ and ‘*development-led archaeology*’. We chose the latter term in our article because we consider that it is a more precise description of archaeological work prompted by land and town development. Nathan Schlanger and Kai Salas Rossenbach consider that ‘*commissioned archaeology*’ might be a better term since it makes it clear that an authority has made the decision and given the order that the archaeological work be carried out. The above exposition illustrates the many different terms used over the years, and how the need to update our terminology is associated with changed attitudes to the archaeological work itself and to its purpose. Operating from a small country on the periphery of Europe, we would welcome if initiatives were taken to find a universal term in English for what we in Sweden call ‘*uppdragsarkeologi*’.