

## ARTICLES

Kornelia Kajda\*, Mikołaj Kostyrko\*\*

### CONTEMPORARY DIMENSION OF HERITAGE PROMOTION – TOWARDS SOCIALLY ENGAGED ARCHAEOLOGY

#### ABSTRACT

Kajda K. and Kostyrko M. 2016. Contemporary Dimension of Heritage Promotion – Towards Socially Engaged Archaeology. *Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 68, 9-23.

In this paper we present the outcomes of a public archaeology project entitled: *Applied archaeology: Society-past-remote sensing*. The project aimed to study the social dimension of archaeology and ways of popularizing knowledge of the past within society. In the article we present the results of the interviews and polls that were carried out with the inhabitants of the region in which archaeological work was carried out. On the basis of these results we present and analyze the social expectations towards archaeology as well as the kind of challenges presented to archaeologists by local communities. We also describe how an archaeologist and his work are perceived and ask whether society needs this kind of scientist and this kind of knowledge. Additional issues concern the boundaries of archaeological research and public perception of archaeological research methods.

Key words: knowledge popularization, heritage, popular archaeology, applied archaeology, local communities.

Received: 10.03.2015 Revised: 04.12.2015 Accepted: 18.04.2016

\* Institute of Prehistory at Adam Mickiewicz University; Umultowska st. 89d, 61-809 Poznań, Poland; kornelia.kajda@gmail.com

\*\* Institute of Prehistory at Adam Mickiewicz University; Umultowska st. 89d, 61-809 Poznań, Poland; mkostyrko@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION: THE POPULARIZATION OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Spectacular archaeological researches often excite social interest. However, most of the results of archaeological survey will be never noticed or remembered by people from 'outside' the world of professional archaeologists. Research into the traces of the past requires detailed knowledge and skills to interpret the impact of geomorphological and other processes as they affect cultural deposits. These processes are often hard to understand for people who have no experience of archaeological methods. Nonetheless, archaeologists themselves have a huge responsibility for this lack of proper understanding of the processes that are inherent in archaeological research. They often isolate themselves behind a high fence from the potential stakeholders, such as regional populations, youngsters and other potential audiences (see also Czerniak 2011; Kajda and Kostyrko 2015). Moreover, society most often encounters the final outcome of the research only either through reading an article in a newspaper or perhaps while visiting an exhibition in a museum.

In Poland, to date, the ways of popularising knowledge about the past have relied for the most part on archaeological festivals organized close to the archaeological sites concerned, or on the publication of popular-science articles. People have also been engaged in the role of volunteers taking part in the excavations, however on a small scale. Most archaeological activities have not been preceded by surveys asking local people or the public at large about what they need or expect to receive from archaeologists, or through which archaeologists could check public understanding about the past of the region that was to be popularized. In consequence, today it is difficult to study and assess the efficiency and potential social impact of such activities in popularising archaeological knowledge. Raphael Greenberg (2009) proposed a different way of conducting and popularizing archaeological research, stressing the importance of preparing society for the archaeologist's entrance into the local community's area. Taking this into account we present in this article the results of the project "Applied archaeology: society – past – remote-sensing", conducted in 2013 in the villages of Bieniów and Biedrzychowice Dolne in the province of Lubuskie. The project aimed at the mutual preparation of the local community and the incoming archaeologists to take part in a process of socially driven and engaged archaeological research. Its goal was also to explore ways of possible popularization of archaeological understanding by means of socially involved archaeology.

The introduction of the World Heritage Convention in 1972 changed the way of perceiving and treating of the objects and places of historical, cultural and natural value (Belcher 2014, 181). The Convention contributed to the protection of the cultural and natural heritage and gave it a special cultural value and meaning. Its ratification was a result of the damage done to the Egyptian cultural and natural heritage during the building of the Aswan Dam across the Nile. The Convention was introduced in the same year as the

publication of a book entitled: *Public Archaeology* (1972) by Charles McGimsey – a book that was later to provide a basis for further studies on popularising archaeological knowledge. One of the values of the book was a preparation of legislative modules which were thought to help in protecting the cultural heritage in cooperation with the society. McGimsey (1972, 27) put a special emphasis on the significance of collaboration between archaeologists and society because, according to him, this would create a special atmosphere of common respect for cultural heritage; he maintained that it should have been a ‘must’ that academics transfer their knowledge throughout society and communicate directly with various stakeholders. Thus it was just at the beginning of the 1970s that there appeared the first work which stressed the meaning of cultural heritage as the ‘common good of humanity’ and suggested that society might play an important role in archaeological research (McGimsey 1972; Rathje 1979). However, it was not until the 1990s, when postmodern (or post-processual) reflections were spreading throughout archaeological thought, that archaeologists started to pay close attention to public perception of the knowledge and understanding of the past that the archaeologists themselves had created (Kristiansen 1993). Over time, studies on the connections between archaeology and society created another subfield within archaeology – *public archaeology* (Merriman 2004; Matsuda and Katsuyuki 2011). From that time onward public archaeology has formed a basis for studies concentrating on the ways of creating knowledge about the past, about its perception within society and about ways of transferring and using the accumulated knowledge (Russell 2002; McDavid 2010; Pawleta 2011; Puyburn 2011; Kobińska 2014a).

It was thanks to this and other research that archaeologists changed their way of understanding heritage and its management (Gutkowska and Kobyliński 2011). This change was based on two basic assumptions. The first one was connected to the unavoidable variability of the landscape. This assumption maintains that the landscape has been changing all the time, all of the actions which led to its preservation in an unchanged form create the so-called ‘frozen landscape’ which is only an artificial human concept (Bender 1993; Bender 2001; Gutkowska and Kobyliński 2011). Thus, all actions in the name of heritage should be of possibly diversified character, all decisions should be made at a local government level, taking into account the future and social perception of the place concerned (Gutkowska and Kobyliński 2011, 54). The second notion, directly related to the first, proposed that regionalists, archaeologists and historians should ‘create’ an interest in the region’s past and its surviving heritage among local communities. This interest might then help the communities to see themselves as ‘hosts’ of the local landscape. This, of course, would require cooperation on various levels, such as between academics and local governments as well as between archaeologists and local communities (Gutkowska and Kobyliński 2011).

These pro-social tendencies stressing the participatory role of society in protecting the common heritage are also visible nowadays within international politics. Having regard to the Council of Europe Framework Convention of 27 October 2005 on the Value of the Cultural Heritage for Society (the so-called ‘Faro Convention’), not yet ratified by Poland,

every member of society has the right to determine what he/she perceives as heritage and to participate in its protection. This right is in line with the basic human rights (Schofield 2015, 199). This way of understanding heritage has in turn prompted changes in its perception and treatment by scientists. Today, artefacts and other features from the past are no longer 'untouchables' which can only be studied by academics, they are instead 'living creations' which serve and enrich society. The concept of heritage as part of the 'common human good' is also underpins the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act ratified in the USA in 1990. According to this act, all material and nonmaterial heritage representing the religious life (especially human remains) of past communities should be returned to the communities to which they traditionally belonged. In line with this act, local communities and tribes began to see themselves as the legal owners of such artefacts, often requiring their return. The communities are also the main stakeholders and decision makers in the matters connected to the definition of what heritage is, what it is not, and how it should be treated (Brown 2014, 177). Therefore, it can be said that through this act cultural heritage and its management has been delegated to the local communities. Moreover, in the USA their will is binding for both the archaeologist and for government.

The meanings of cultural heritage and the ways of managing are still in a process of change and development. Together with the occurrence of new trends in archaeological practice such as this kind of 'inclusive' archaeology, management strategies progressively more often take into account the existing differences in the perception of heritage within individual ethnic communities (McDavid 2002; Philips and Gilchrist 2012) or within differing social groups (such as people with physical impairments, intellectual disabilities or problems of educational or social adaptation (Kajda *et al.* 2015). Thus, today, cultural heritage management is concerned not only with the most efficient protection of specific heritage features but also with the best ways of sharing their heritage value with society at large. Cultural heritage is not understood only as 'common good of humanity' which has to be protected for future generations but also as an object or place which needs to serve the people of the present day.

## TOWARDS PARTICIPATORY ARCHAEOLOGY

Over time, in the academic discussions, pro-social and promotional tendencies have been noticeable (see also Fikus 2008). In archaeology there have been more and more projects which open up science to a wider group of recipients and which change the social image of the researcher (such as the *WEA Inclusive Archaeology Education project* or *Archaeology for All. Inclusive, Accessible Archaeology*). These project are sometimes supported by scholarships, grants and contests which promote pro-social activities, such as the Science Popularization Contest INTER developed by the Foundation for Polish Science, or the Science Populariser contest by the Ministry of Science and Higher Educa-

tion and Polish Press Agency). Moreover, among scientists and society generally there appears to be a growing awareness of science as a process serving not only scholars but equally importantly a larger group of people. This applies also to archaeologists. Over time various academic publications concerning the means of promoting archaeology within society have been published (Hoffman *et al.* 2002; Derry and Malloy 2003; Mackay 2003; Merriman 2004; Chirikure, Pwiti 2008, Zdziebłowski 2014). Additionally, during the conference discussions archaeologists have been commenting that greater attention should be paid to cooperation with society and the facilitation of access by a wider audience to archaeological knowledge and understanding. It has also been said that archaeology should go beyond 'behind the fence' practice, with visitors having to crane their necks to see archaeological excavations (Czerniak 2011). More and more scholars are also suggesting that archaeology, like other fields of study, is not an 'innocent discipline' and that it does not produce a 'pure knowledge' (Said 2005). On the contrary, it influences society in a physical way, through the impact of work in the field, as well as in an ideological way, in changing perceptions of a given place, cultural heritage and the past (Hodder 2003; Sroka, Rączkowski 2003, Minta-Tworzowska and Olędzki 2006, Greenberg 2009; Ireland and Schofield 2015).

Alongside these publications and academic discussions, Polish archaeological practice has been becoming more open to cooperation between archaeologists and society. In our country there have been more and more projects which, at least in part, are directed towards society. One such undertaking has been an educational project entitled *Archeologia jako antidotum na zapomnienie i wandalizm. Pierwsza wojna światowa na Rawkę i Bzurę (1914-2014)* (Archaeology as the antidote to oblivion and vandalism. The First World War between the Rawka and Bzura rivers (1914-2014)). This involved [?] roadside history lessons organized by Anna Zalewska from the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (UMCS) in Lublin. The project included workshops and lectures, such as: *Recovering the memory about the Great War on the common cemetery of Poles, Germans and Russians (100th anniversary of the Assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria)*. In this case the goal was to collect, through volunteers from the local community, all of the available material and conceptual remains of the First World War. This undertaking not only spread knowledge of military actions during WWI but also raised public awareness on the issue of taking care of the past.

Another example of an action which has popularized knowledge and understanding of the past in an interesting way is a project promoted by the Archaeological Museum in Poznań *Moja wieś, moje dziedzictwo* (My village, my heritage) led by Agnieszka Krzyżaniak. The aim of this initiative was to 'turn local communities on' to the past of their villages, as well as to create special ties with their 'little homeland'. Most of the project's actions concentrated around lessons with pupils in chosen schools of the Wielkopolskie province.

The project *Rośliny w pradziejach* (Plants in prehistory) was a similar initiative. Katarzyna Radziwiłko, from the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Science, organized lessons for pupils and students during which they could hear and

learn about the prehistoric herbalism. During practical workshops they could themselves collect herbs and learn about their positive impact on our present-day health. The project's organizers also paid attention to the popularization of knowledge through social media. After each meeting they updated their Facebook site.

Another way in which archaeologists have been communicating with the society has been through the organization of the first Polish edition of the Day of Archaeology as part of the international project NEARCH in which Poland is a participant. This initiative aims to show what archaeologists really do and what are their goals, at the same time as initiating a dialogue between archaeologists and society about the meaning of the past and the nature of cultural heritage.

## TOWARDS SOCIALLY ENGAGED ARCHAEOLOGY

The potential that the society can offer to academic research has also been noticed. Activities which increase social awareness about cultural heritage and ways of protecting it have become more important nowadays. Many scholars accept that cultural heritage should not be protected by prohibitions and orders. Rather it should be done through encouragement of people who will become fully aware of its significance (Agnew and Bridgland 2003; Sroka and Rączkowski 2003).

In this regard, public archaeology and community archaeology, as well as more generalized concepts of 'inclusive' archaeology, have gained in popularity within academic discourse. According to these approaches, archaeology should engage socially in a way which builds cooperation between scholars and the citizens of the region under study; archaeologists should also listen intently to the voice of local communities. Assuredly such collaboration is likely to be profitable for both groups. The two learn from each other, archaeologists get information about ways of seeing and treating cultural heritage, the community learns more about the past of the region or land that they inhabit. One of the initiatives which fulfils these goals is the project *Public Archaeology 2015. Public Engagement with Archaeological Themes and Practices*. This project involves six archaeologists and six non-archaeologists, each leading his or her own small project for one month in a way responds to their own interests. The project's aim is not to write another research paper but to practice archaeology in a way that is appreciated by a variety of stakeholders. Its organizers know that the future of archaeology lies in the hands of non-professional archaeologists and that it is therefore high time we opened our minds and actions to the needs and aspirations that inspired them to work on behalf of the cultural heritage.

Coming back to the argument put by Greenberg (2009, 46), before starting their field-work archaeologists who want to conduct their research in a proper and ethical way should ask themselves the following questions:

- Who are our clients, in the broadest sense?
- What kind of impact are we making on the place in which we have chosen to excavate (or carry out other kinds of research)?
  - Have local people been involved in the decisions that will affect their environment?
  - What is being done to enhance the positive effects of our work?
  - What is being done to mitigate negative effects of our work?
  - What is our legacy to the site and its surroundings, after we have left it?

Taking into account these postulates the authors spearheaded the project that forms the subject of this article, aiming to fulfil the assumptions of public and community archaeology and that responds to the questions raised by Greenberg. Its main goals have been to open up archaeology to society and to listen intently to people's ideas and opinions as indicating possible avenues of cooperation. Moreover, the project was organized to learn about society's ways of perceiving archaeologists and to show that archaeology has a series of different faces and uses a wide range of research methods, not just excavation.

## PROJECT APPLIED ARCHAEOLOGY: SOCIETY-PAST-REMOTE SENSING

The project *Applied archaeology: society–past–remote sensing* was developed by the Institute of Prehistory at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (ArchaeoLandscapes Europe) and the Association for Village Development “Razem” (Stowarzyszenie na Rzecz Rozwoju Wsi “Razem”) from Bieniów. The endeavour was inspired by the Association and the inhabitants of Bieniów village. They asked archaeologists from the Institute of Prehistory to conduct research on an archaeological site (ring fort known as Biedrzychowice Dolne no. 5) which is located on the border between the villages of Bieniów and Biedrzychowice Dolne, in the south-western part of Lubuskie province. Because it was a society-driven initiative we were happy to respond positively to their request.

We decided to conduct a research initiative using entirely non-invasive archaeological methods. The choice of remote sensing techniques was inspired by the facility and speed of conducting such research, its relatively low costs and, most of all, it's virtually non-existent impact on the physical structure of the site. Additionally, this was seen as a great opportunity to carry out anthropological and sociological surveys in the form of interviews and anonymized questionnaires in the villages located in the vicinity of the archaeological site. From the very beginning we planned that our activities would concentrate not only on the archaeological site but also on archaeology in its broadest sense as a field of knowledge and social activity (Shanks and Tilley 1992). Furthermore, most of the people who live near our research area came to the Lubuskie province from the eastern parts of Poland or the western parts of today's Ukraine after the Second World War. This inspired us even more

to consider and study relations between society and cultural heritage within this region, especially at a locality which has been re-inhabited and in a sense re-created during relatively recent decades as a result of forced resettlement.

## HOW TO ENGAGE ARCHAEOLOGY AND SOCIETY?

Archaeology is characterized as an academic discipline (humanities and historical sciences) which study human's culture and its history. Unfortunately, it is rarely described as a social science which concerns society and studies it. Therefore, in our project, after W. Rathje (2004), we proposed the concept of *integrated archaeology* which joints the archaeological research methods with the ones commonly associated with cultural anthropology and sociology. Applying such perspective obliges archaeologists to learn about the researched region before starting the fieldwork. This learning refers not only to the phenomenological sense (experiencing the landscape), but mostly to its contemporaneous social meaning. It implies opening up to the members of local community, informing them about the planned research, as well as making interviews and/or questionnaires about the archaeological site, common knowledge about it, along with the various ways in which it is perceived and the ways in which there are expectations about what the archaeologists might do..

In our project we conducted anonymous surveys (we received 54 filled questionnaires) and we made interviews with 20 people. The project consisted of three stages: 1) surveys before starting the archaeological research on the archaeological site (anonymous questionnaires, meetings with the members of the Association for the Village Development "Razem", searches in the archives), 2) researches and surveys conducted during our stay (interviews, non-invasive archaeological research, meetings with the local community), and 3) studies made after the fieldwork (organization of the conference directed to the local community, conducting a second survey).

Before our arrival to the villages, we sent 150 questionnaires to the inhabitants of Bieńków and Biedrzychowice Dolne. After filling them, they were collected and sent back to us. Thanks to this, already before our fieldwork we knew what the local community expected from us and what people knew about the site, how they saw it and what they thought about archaeology and archaeologists. We learnt how to act during our research and how to engage in a dialogue with the local community. When we came to the site our activity concentrated on two levels. The first one was the non-invasive research conducted on the archaeological site (the medieval ring fort), and the second one was interviewing the local community.

We wanted to socially engage archaeology through the cooperation with the inhabitants of the studied region, so we had to consider whether local community wanted such

collaboration, or maybe it was just an official approach that had been recently popular and desired only among scholars (and not all of them). In the prepared questionnaires we asked a question: "Should archaeologists cooperate with the society? How?". Among 54 of respondents, 52 answered that they expect cooperation between archaeologists and the society. In the later interviews some of them added that such collaboration is significant because archaeology is a discipline which arouses public interest and society would like to know more about the results of archaeological works. Responders also stated that archaeology is especially valid for them because it gives them a possibility to learn more about the past of the lands that they inhabit. Moreover, prehistory is not a part of historical education in schools, therefore, learning it might be specially interesting and valuable. Two responders also argued that integration of archaeologists and society is significant because only then people would respect the places of cultural heritage and would understand its importance. One person noticed that archaeological researches are often conducted for money from taxes (which means that the whole society pays for it), thus, scientific studies should not be limited to the academic world. Moreover, scholars should be obliged to open up to the society and its needs. While answering to the second part of the question, concerning the forms of cooperation, most of the people (56 persons in total) indicated meetings (in the place of archaeological research or in other places) and conversations with local communities, informing people about the researches and its results. Many people (22 persons in total) were in favour of the possibility of visiting archaeologists during their work. Eleven inhabitants of Bieniów and Biedrzychowice Dolne stated that it would be a great opportunity for the visitors to join some archaeological works, or just to create a place in which the volunteers could help archaeologists in their work.

This analysis shows that the emphasis on cooperation and the promotion of science in society is not just a result of theoretical assumptions made by academics but that it truly answers to the needs and expressed desires of society. The awareness of the importance of knowledge and the will to educate constitute specific demands towards academics. These demands refer also to archaeology. Local community want and expect from archaeologists that they will share their knowledge and they will familiarize the society with their research methods and results of the studies conducted in the region of their inhabitancy.

Taking into account these responses, during our project we organized archaeological field lessons for the pupils of the Primary and Secondary School in Bieniów. During the field walking survey and workshops we introduced them to the landscape of the heritage site, the work of archaeologists and our research methods. We also taught them how to operate the equipment (total station and GPS RTK – children themselves determined and collected the points) that is used during the non-invasive archaeological research. While we were working we also entered into contacts with the inhabitants who sometimes came to the site and asked us questions about our work and its possible results. Moreover, we organized a conference for the inhabitants of the surrounding villages and towns to which we invited people from outside of the project (archaeologists who deal with the Lubuskie

province in their work). During our conference we familiarized local communities with the results of our research and we also discussed about the possibilities of promoting cultural heritage.

## IS CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPORTANT TO ANYONE?

A lot of archaeological attention is devoted to the issues of the meaning of cultural heritage to the society (see also Leniaud 2009; Goddard 2009). It is often said that cultural heritage has to be preserved because protection is a sign of our respect to the past. It is also noted that each day some archaeological site, a fragment of cultural heritage of the humanity, is damaged and thus it should be protected in the best possible way to stop its vanishing. On the other hand, such approach is posing more and more problems (see also Holtorf and Högberg 2013). While protecting heritage we omit the changes that occur in the society's perception of the past and we also ignore that today the society has different needs than a few years ago. Additionally, we also assume that we know the needs of the future communities: saving everything that refers to the past events. Taking into account various approaches towards cultural heritage, we decided to ask the local community about the importance of heritage for them and about the appropriate ways of treating it. Another interesting issue was the question of what is thought to be heritage for the local community and what is not.

Most of the responders (54 persons in total) answered that heritage is important and it should be treated with respect because, among other responses, it is something that can be left for the future generations. However, some people stated that heritage should not be protected "at all costs". It was argued that this imposed protection could be perceived in a negative way by the society and that some places should "sink into oblivion" and "live their own lives". Thirteen people indicated that heritage should not be forgotten but we need to remember that the past should not rule our lives and we cannot subordinate everything to it. These people also stated that cultural heritage should be protected "in a limited way" and only when "the need of protecting it really exists" or when an artefact is a "unique specimen". Seven people stated that heritage lost its importance nowadays and that it is not significant for them. They also noticed that society is tired of looking back to the past and it should zero in on what is happening today and will happen in the future.

These results of the study show that cultural heritage plays an important role for the society and that people want to protect it. However, saving cultural heritage should not vent on the society. Maintenance and preservation of unique artefacts seem to be expected by people but devoting too much attention to it and creating new restrictions on it is undesired.

It seems that archaeologists are more into protecting and saving cultural heritage than the non-archaeologists. In people's opinion some monuments should "get old" in their natural way. Such approach to cultural heritage and interest in the past is supported by

groups (e.g. Urbex Poland, O.P.S.F., or Urban Hitcher Exploration) which promote visiting post-industrial and forgotten places. These places, due to the lack of specific law regulations, interest of the local authorities and funds for developing them, “get old” in a natural way. This abandonment, social oblivion and “ageing” make them so intriguing and attractive to the “urban hunters” (see also Kobińska 2014b).

To analyse how the society perceives archaeologists, in the questionnaires we asked for answering the following questions: “Are archaeologists needed in the society? Why yes/no, to a small extent?”, as well as: “What do you associate with archaeologists?”. Sixty-six people answered “yes” to the first question. Four people stated that archaeologists are needed but only to a small extent, and the next two persons answered that archaeologists are not needed in the society at all. The justifications of the answers were very diverse. Those who stated that archaeologists are needed in the society said, e.g. that: “thanks to them we can get to know about past landscapes”, “archaeologists see the things which are invisible to the others”, or that they are important because “thanks to them we can learn about the history of life and output of the past generations”. People who need archaeologists to a small extent argued that the law is oppressive and it demands from people to conduct archaeological investigations when somebody wants to build, e.g., a house. Similar arguments were put forward by people who do not need archaeologists at all. For them “archaeologists only make troubles and hinder works”, they are also unwanted because “nobody buries valuable goods today”.

Seventy-four responders answered also the second question concerning the importance of archaeologists and the ways of seeing them. Many people had various associations with archaeologists and archaeology. Excavations and digging in the ground were the most popular indications (68 people). Furthermore, archaeologists were associated with discovering the mysteries (45 answers), artefacts (16 answers), finding valuable things/objects (10 answers) and laborious work (6 answers). Indiana Jones as the association with archaeologists was indicated only two times.

Additional question concerned the period of time with which deal archaeologists. We wanted to know if archaeologists (in the society’s opinion) may deal with the present times or maybe archaeology is a discipline which interest is strictly directed towards the prehistory and ancient history. Answers to this question signalled how archaeologists and their work are perceived in the society. Forty-eight responders and ten interviewees stated that archaeology deals with the present times as well. It was argued that archaeologists should excavate the relicts of the World Wars (especially the Second World War). Five people noticed that the 2010 Polish Air Force Tu-154 crash was also researched by archaeologists thus they may also deal with the contemporary happenings.

People who indicated that archaeology should not deal with the present times (6 responders and 10 interviewees) reasoned that archaeology is a discipline which studies the distant past and that cultural anthropologists are those who research the contemporary times and society.

The most significant information of this study is that the society recognises archaeologists as relevant. They are not just scientists whose work is uninteresting or incomprehensive and who just sit behind the desk in the museum and study archaeological material. Conversely, archaeologists are those who can bring the past closer to the society and can help to understand it.

## ARCHAEOLOGIST IS (NOT JUST) INDIANA JONES

In popular archaeology it is widely stated that archaeologists are commonly associated with the Indiana Jones and Lara Croft figures which created the social image of archaeologists and archaeology itself (Holtorf 2005, 34; Kobińska 2011, 135). Our interviews and questionnaires show something different. Of course, in some cases archaeologist is associated with adventures, treasure hunting, working in exotic countries and mysterious places. Nonetheless, it is not the only, and primarily, not the most popular image of archaeologist which exists in the society's imagination. Many people notice that an archaeologist is a person who deals with the past and he/she studies this past through excavations. Thus, despite the again and again repeated statement that it was a cinema that created the image of an archaeologist, it is not Lara Croft and Indiana Jones who appeared to be the first association with this profession. It is the research method which archaeology uses, namely excavations. In the society's opinion, archaeologist is associated in people's minds with the kind of the archaeological exploration which the films about Indiana Jones and Lara Croft often omit entirely.

The responses which indicate that archaeologist is not unequivocally associated with the past (this very distant) seem to be very interesting for archaeologists themselves. It shows that the image of archaeologist is not only a result of the way in which he/she is presented in the TV (National Geographic, Discovery programmes, or films such as Lara Croft, Indiana Jones or Stargate) but rather that the associations come from the demands and expectations of the society.

## APPLIED ARCHAEOLOGY – A SUMMARY

Archaeology is a discipline which (as not many others) does not have to cope with the lack of social interest. It also does not have to undertake special activities which would encourage the society and make it more attractive to it. Archaeologists have an easier task to start cooperation with the society, than representatives of other academic disciplines. The society itself initiates archaeological activities and expects results from them. Taking into account the above mentioned, archaeologists should take such opportunity and create spaces of collaboration with local communities. These activities will popularize archaeo-

logy as an academic discipline and will raise social awareness of the cultural heritage that surrounds us. It will also allow widening of the knowledge and understanding of archaeology in the society. However, not only the benefits of the mentioned approach should motivate archaeologists to change their attitude towards society. We must remember that by entering into a certain cultural landscape we change its meaning, recreate the ways of its understanding and the appearance of the place. We cannot leave the ever-changing cultural landscape for itself. Society must be taken into account in the research processes and informed about the ways of doing it because people are the integral part of the subject that we are studying. Furthermore, archaeologists must conduct their research in such a way so that the results can be made readily available to others so that the landscape which we inhabit and the cultural heritage that we inherit can be properly acknowledged within the society of the present day.

## References

- Agnew N. and Bridgland J. (eds.) 2003. *Of the Past for the Future: Integration Archaeology and Conservation*. Washington: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Belcher G. 2014. Values in World Heritage Sites. In C. Sandis (ed.), *Cultural Heritage Ethics: Between Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: OpenBook Publisher, 181-196.
- Bender B. 1993. Introduction: Landscape – Meaning and Action. In B. Bender (ed.), *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg, 1-17.
- Bender B. 2001. Landscape on-the-move. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(1), 75-89.
- Brown M. 2014. The Possibilities and Perils of Heritage Management. In C. Sandis (ed.), *Cultural Heritage Ethics: Between Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: OpenBook Publisher, 171-180.
- Chirikure S. and Pwiti G. 2008. Community involvement in archaeology and cultural heritage management. An assessment from case studies in southern Africa and elsewhere. *Current Anthropology* 49(3), 467-487.
- Czerniak L. 2011. Dla kogo są wykopaliska? Profesjonaliści i społeczeństwo. In A. Marciniak, D. Minta-Tworzowska and M. Pawleta (eds.), *Współczesne oblicza przeszłości*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 177-185.
- Fikus M. 2008. Popularyzacja nauki. Dla kogo, przez kogo, jak i dlaczego? *PAUza Akademicka* 12, 1-4.
- Gutkowska K. and Kobyliński K. 2011. Zarządzanie dziedzictwem kulturowym: nowa dziedzina nauczania akademickiego i badań naukowych, *MAZOWSZE Studia Regionalne* 6, 51-72.
- Goddard S. 2009. Heritage Partnerships – promoting public involvement and understanding. In *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 141-148.
- Greenberg R. 2009. Towards an inclusive archaeology in Jerusalem: The case of Silwan/The city of David. *Public Archaeology* 8(1), 35-50.
- Hodder I. 2003. Archaeological reflexivity and the “local” voice. *Anthropological Quarterly* 76(1), 55-69.

- Hoffman T.L., Kwas M.L and Silverman H. 2002. Heritage tourism and public archaeology. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, 30-44.
- Holtorf C. 2005. *From Stonehenge to Las Vegas. Archaeology as a Popular Culture*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.
- Holtorf C. and Högberg A. 2013. Heritage futures and the futures of heritage. In S. Bergerbrant and S. Sabatini (eds.), *Counterpoint: Essays in Archaeology and Heritage Studies in Honour of Professor Kristian Kristiansen*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 739-746.
- Ireland T. and Schofield J. 2015. The ethics of cultural heritage. In T. Ireland and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Springer, 1-11.
- Kajda K. and Kostyrko M. 2015. Jak się napracować i nie zaangażować, czyli badania archeologiczne – wstęp wzbroniony. *Biografia Archeologii* 1(1), 13-18.
- Kajda K., Michalik T. and Kobiałka D. 2015. Heritage for all. A contribution to the inclusion of people with intellectual disabilities in archaeology: a Polish perspective. *Current Swedish Archaeology* 23, 131-156.
- Kobiałka D. 2011. Społeczny wizerunek archeologii – o rzeczywistości w fikcji. In A. Marciniak, D. Minta-Tworzowska and M. Pawleta (eds.), *Współczesne oblicza przeszłości*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 133-148.
- Kobiałka D. 2014a. Archaeology and communication with the public: archaeological open-air museums and historical re-enactment in action. *European Journal of Post - Classical Archaeologies* 4, 359-376.
- Kobiałka D. 2014b. Let heritage die! The ruins of trams at depot no. 5 in Wrocław, Poland. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 1(2), 351-368.
- Kobyliński Z. 2011. Czym jest, komu jest potrzebne i do kogo należy dziedzictwo kulturowe? *MAZOW-SZE Studia Regionalne* 7, 21-47.
- Kristiansen K. 1993. 'The strength of the past and its great might'; an essay on the use of the past. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1(1), 3-32.
- Leniaud J.M. 2009. Heritage, public, authorities, societies. In *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 137-140.
- Mackay R. 2003. Whose archaeology? Social consideration in archaeological research design. In N. Agnew and J. Bridgland (eds.), *Of the Past for the Future: Integration Archaeology and Conservation*. Washington: The Getty Conservation Institute, 131-135.
- Matsuda A. and Okamura K. 2011. Introduction: new perspectives in global public archaeology. In Matsuda A. and K. Okamura (eds.), *New Perspectives in Global Archaeology*. New York: Springer, 1-18.
- McDavid C. 2002. Archaeologies that hurt; descendants that matter: a pragmatic approach to collaboration in the public interpretation of African-American archaeology. *World Archaeology* 34(2), 303-313.
- McDavid C. 2010. Public Archaeology, Activism, and Racism: Rethinking the Heritage "Product". In M. Jay Stottman (ed.) *Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeologists Change the World?* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 36-47.

- McGimsey C. 1972. *Public Archaeology*. London: Seminar Press.
- Merriman N. (ed.). 2004. *Public Archaeology*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Minta-Tworzowska D. and Olędzki Ł. (eds.) 2006. *Komu potrzebna jest przeszłość?* Piła: KNSA przy IP UAM w Poznaniu.
- Pawleta M. 2011. The Past Industry: selected aspects of the commercialisation of the past and products of archaeological knowledge in contemporary Poland. *Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 63, 9-54.
- Philips T. and R. Gilchrist. 2012. Inclusive, Accessible Archaeology. In R. Skeates, C. McDavid and J. Carman (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 674-691.
- Pyburn K. A. 2011. Engaged archaeology: Whose community? Which Public?. In K. Okamura and A. Matsuda (eds.) *New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology*. New York: Springer, 29-41.
- Russel M. 2002. No more heroes any more: the dangerous world of the pop culture archaeologist. In M. Russel (ed.), *Digging Holes in Popular Culture. Archaeology and Science Fiction*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 38-54.
- Rathje W. 1979. Trace measures. In L. Sechrest (ed.), *Unobtrusive Measures Today: New Directions for Methodology of Behavioral Science*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 75-91.
- Rathje W. 2004. Archeologia zintegrowana. Paradygmat śmietniskowy. *Czas Kultury* 121(4), 4-21.
- Said W. 2005. *Orientalizm*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka.
- Schofield J. 2015. Forget about 'heritage': place, ethics and the Faro Convention. In T. Ireland and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Springer, 197-210.
- Sroka J. and Rączkowski W. 2003. Wypełnić pustkę – przywracanie wymazanego dziedzictwa kulturowego – kilka uwag wprowadzenia. In W. Rączkowski and J. Sroka (eds.) *Historia i kultura Ziemi Sławińskiej 2*. Sławno: Fundacja Dziedzictwo, 7-9.
- Zdziebłowski S. (ed.) 2014. *Cyfrowy archeolog. Podręcznik promocji archeologii w nowych mediach*. Poznań: Muzeum Archeologiczne w Poznaniu.

