

The Construction of Knowledge in Archaeology and Art History in Southeastern Europe:
A Research Programme (2021-2023) hosted by the Centre for Advanced Study Sofia and
funded by the Getty Foundation as part of the Connecting Art Histories Initiative

CLOSING CONFERENCE 2023

*“Local and Global in the Construction of Knowledge in Archaeology and Art History:
A View from Southeastern Europe and Beyond”*

**3-5 November 2023
Athens, Greece**

PARTICIPANTS AND ABSTRACTS

(in alphabetical order)

**Ana Veličković Kastratović/
University of Belgrade (Serbia)**

**PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF ANCIENT HERITAGE IN
THE TOWN OF RISAN – POSSIBLE CASE STUDY**

The town of Risan, on the territory of the present-day state of Montenegro, is an excellent example of a settlement with a long continuity of life from the ancient period of Greek colonies to the present day. Due to its long history, certain cultural phenomena have resisted the oblivion of time and survived even to this day. This is evident in the stories and legends heard from the local population, which talk about the glorious ancient past of their city. Those traditions are so significant that they materialized in the form of the names of apartments, hotels, shops and restaurants.

On the other hand, although local patriotism is present among Risan inhabitants, when it comes to cultural heritage, the practical results of heritage protection are weak due to lack of money and potential lack of interest. The remains of the Roman villa, which have been turned into a museum, fared best. It is also the only example of monetization of cultural heritage in Risan, regardless of the period. The remains of the settlement and the palace, discovered by Polish archaeologists, remained unprotected due to lack of funding. The exposed trenches periodically fill with rain, becoming deep pools and thereby endangering the children who pass there when going to the nearby elementary school. Because of this, there is a possibility that that area will be turned into a parking lot for the Teuta Hotel or a children's playground.

The aim of this paper is to showcase the ambivalence of cultural heritage in one place and how it changes. Hopefully, in the meantime, an ethnographic case study can be conducted in Risan to better understand the local perceptions of heritage and their expectations of it.

Ana Veličković Kastratović is currently a third-year PhD student of archaeology at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy (Serbia). At the same institution, she got her BA (2018) and her MA (eng. Possible new conclusions regarding the process of Romanization based on the research of Roman bi-ritual burials, 2020). During her studies, she developed special interests in topics like the development of the early Roman Empire, Roman Army, Roman Provincial Archaeology and Theoretical Archaeology. She also worked on a couple of archaeological sites – Karamburnaki site in Thessaloniki (Greece), Belgrade Fortress (Serbia) and Glac site in Sremska Mitrovica (Serbia). Through her PhD, Ana hopes to gain new insides regarding the cross-cultural contacts and transmissions on the territory of Risan in modern-day Montenegro during the last four centuries BC.

Bettina Arnold / University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee (USA) | **IN DEFENSE OF SCIENCE: U.S. ARCHAEOLOGY AND MORAL INJURY IN THE ACADEMY**

“For people on the left, (Diversity/Equity/Inclusion) has become their new religion. They no longer go to church on Sunday, but boy, are they trying to make sure that everybody is evangelized on campus, that there’s only one acceptable viewpoint. That’s not what I think taxpayers should be funding...” Wisconsin State Assembly Speaker Robin Vos, quoted in a Milwaukee Journal Sentinel article on June 17, 2023.

In the extremely polarized political environment in the U.S. today, academic disciplines that investigate gender or race from a scientific perspective have become a target for vitriol and punitive measures from the right but attacks are also leveled at scholars by Indigenous groups and other stakeholders who object to scientific analysis of human remains that are the basis of such research. The resulting barrage of hostile rhetoric has made it difficult for archaeologists to reconcile their training, which emphasizes the application of the scientific method to the recovery, recording and interpretation of material evidence, with the demands of the academic and political institutions on which they depend for their livelihoods. The term moral injury was originally coined by the psychiatrist Jonathan Shay to describe the wound that forms when a person’s sense of what is right is betrayed by leaders in high-stakes situations. Archaeologists are increasingly caught between the demands of various interest groups that require them to betray their professional standards and their sense of themselves as responsible scholars. A coordinated, politically motivated anti-science ecosystem has spread to all aspects of professional life in the U.S. and beyond, including eastern Europe. (How) can archaeologists reclaim their professional integrity in the face of such challenges?

Bettina Arnold obtained her BA in Archaeology from Yale University and her MA/PhD degrees in Anthropology from Harvard University. She is a Full Professor of Anthropology at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Adjunct Curator of European Archaeology at the Milwaukee Public Museum. Her research interests include the archaeology of alcohol, the archaeology of gender, mortuary archaeology, Celtic Iron Age Europe and the history of archaeology, especially its manipulation for political purposes in National Socialist Germany.

Recent relevant publications include the following:

2023 The perils of a usable past: archaeology's journey from culture history to culture wars. Getty-CAS Spring School Working Paper Series 14/2 The Impact of the Political on Archaeological Research, pp. 1-22. Centre for Advanced Study Sofia.

2022 National Socialist archaeology as a Faustian bargain: the contrasting careers of Hans Reinert and Herbert Jankuhn. In Bernard M. Levinson and Robert P. Ericksen (eds) *Betrayal of the Humanities under National Socialism*, pp. 332- 357. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

**Chris Gosden / University of Oxford
(UK)**

**TOWARDS AN EMANCIPATORY
ARCHAEOLOGY**

To some degree, the notion of modernity has been long critiqued, starting at least with Latour's *We Have Never Been Modern* and in Julian Thomas's *Archaeology and Modernity*. The notion of modernity was born in Europe, but has been exported in a surprisingly unchanged fashion to many other parts of the world, such as China or India, where local philosophical systems have had surprisingly little influence on archaeological practice. As an alternative a series of archaeologies are possible based on a great range of epistemologies around the globe, which will add range and depth to our notions of the past. The idea of emancipatory archaeology can help dismantle deeper systems of thought, including categories of action, cause and effect, race, gender and sexuality. A plurality of world archaeologies is obviously attractive, but we could ask how far plurality can stretch? Might it be possible, for instance, to identify varied epistemologies and approaches to the past within Europe? If this were possible, might it be feasible to see a Balkan archaeology which has a different grounding in thought to archaeologies as practised in other parts of Europe? This is a question I have some thoughts on, but would really welcome input from colleagues at the conference who are directly involved in Balkan archaeology what they think. The paper which sketch out a framework for thinking about a variety of archaeologies, which might liberate us in various ways from our general thoughts about the past and end with questions about how far this can be used in local contexts.

Chris Gosden has been in Oxford for the last 25 years, first as a curator-lecturer at the Pitt Rivers Museum and then as Professor of European Archaeology. Chris Gosden has carried out archaeological fieldwork in Papua New Guinea, Borneo, Turkmenistan and Britain, among other places. He is currently setting up research collaborations with China and Mongolia. While at the Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford he worked on the history of collections and their relevance to post-colonial relations and identity, including two large projects - Relational Museum Project. More recently he has run research projects on the history of the English landscape published by OUP in 2021 as *English Landscapes and Identities*, and on Celtic art both in Britain and in Europe including Eurasian links. He has recently published a book called *The History of Magic* (Penguin, 2020). He is currently writing a book called *Humans: The First Seven Million Years*. He is a trustee of the Art Fund, Oxford Archaeology and the British Museum, and a fellow of a number of learned societies, including the British Academy.

**Dimitra Mazaraki / University of Paris 1
Panthéon-Sorbonne (France)**

**ACCESSIBILITY, ENGAGEMENT, AND
PARTICIPATION IN SOUTH-EASTERN
EUROPE: WHO IS WELCOME IN
ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOURSES?**

21st-century archaeology, enriched by fruitful interactions with social and human rights movements, has reflected on more open approaches, proposing different levels of engagement, participation, and collaboration with non-specialist stakeholders.

However, archaeological research and sites remain mostly fenced and detached from their present context, forming a distanced past destined to be preserved undisturbed for future generations. As such, archaeology remains inaccessible on many levels (mental, sensory, and physical) for the various stakeholders, primarily for the non-specialists. It is supported that it is crucial to expand the dialogue on accessibility to ensure a more inclusive archaeology for all stakeholders.

In particular, this paper examines the current state of accessible archaeological discourses in South-eastern Europe, focusing on the possibilities and challenges of community engagement and participation in Greece. It also seeks to explore whether more active engagement of local non-archaeologists in research could foster a more accessible and inclusive archaeology aiming at the democratization of heritage. These issues will be discussed mainly through a case study at Malia in Crete, where mediation and collaborative projects focusing on the local population are underway. The possible dynamics between local and global community archaeology practices will also be explored.

Dimitra Mazaraki is doing a doctorate in archaeology at the University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne. She studied Archaeology at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (with a full scholarship) and Cultural Heritage and Museums in Paris 1 (with a full scholarship). She has worked at the Greek Ministry of Culture as a contract archaeologist (Ephorates of Antiquities) and museologist (Directorate of Modern Cultural and Intangible Cultural Heritage). Currently, she works in the Ephorate of Underwater Antiquities in Athens. Her doctoral research explores the dynamics between local communities and archaeological sites, focusing on the potential of community archaeology in Greece through the case study of Malia in Crete. She also examines issues of accessibility to the archaeological site, public participation, and awareness of the archaeological heritage through mediation and digital technologies.

Dimitris Plantzos / National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (Greece)

ARCHAEOLOGY AS ALT-KNOWLEDGE IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE: INVENTING THE ANCESTORS

Celebrating the completion of a three-year long project on the construction of knowledge in archaeology and art history in Southeastern Europe, this paper turns its attention to what may nowadays showcase itself as an “alterative” take on local / national history, but often enough emerge as the new orthodoxy. Part of the “Balkan disease” that has seemingly afflicted national(ist) historiographies across the region, a series of glorious, yet often elusive ancestors – Thracians, Dacians, Illyrians, Paeonians, Dardanians, Macedonians, not to mention the Greeks themselves – have been thoroughly imagined, imaged, and in the end archaeologically constructed to serve as vehicles of present-day politics. The aim of this paper is to draft a set of conclusions on the mechanisms through which such invention and rehabilitation of ancestral excellence has been effected, and on the roles state archaeology has played in this process (or not, as the case may be). It is upon such grassroots archaeopolitics, the paper maintains, that local, national, and regional histories tend to be mounted in our era.

Dimitris Plantzos is Professor of Classical Archaeology at the Department of History and Archaeology (Section of Archaeology and History of Art) of the School of Philosophy, at the National & Kapodistrian University of Athens. His research interests include ancient Greek art, archaeological theory, and modern receptions of classical culture. He has authored several monographs on classical art and its reception, as well as numerous articles and studies published in local and international scholarly journals, collective volumes, special journal issues, and university blogs. He has written entries for the Macmillan Dictionary of Art and the Oxford Classical Dictionary. He is the director of the Research Institute for Digital Humanities at the University of Athens, co-director of the Argos Orestikon University Excavation, and a member of the international archaeological mission to the Ptolemaic Cemetery of Shatby in Alexandria, Egypt.

**Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu /
"Vasile Pârvan" Institute of
Archaeology (Romania)**

**RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONS: THE PLEASURE OF
FINDING OUT AND THE DUTY TO KNOW**

Traditions of archaeological research tend to cluster in regions of relative immobility and reduced diversity, contrasting with regions in which there is theoretical diversity and that have produced the methodological equipment used now by all archaeologists of the world.

Explanations tend to revolve around the political conditions, but analyses seldom go to the specifics, to what makes researchers embrace stale ways of doing archaeology and reluctant to examine other ideas and practices.

Taking into account the distinctions between the disciplines and the professions that are supposed to be either entirely dedicated to research or include research as a major goal might be useful. Unlike disciplines, professions are administered by state institutions and reproduce attitudes and ways of thinking that figure among the vices discussed by virtue epistemologists. Some of them are incompatible with scientific attitudes. Perhaps the most important and one of the most perplexing is the readiness to imagine truth as coming from authority, even if that authority is obviously not supported by archaeological knowledge. Being a good professional means doing what other people tell you to do, especially those who are authorized by the states to impose their views on matters they usually do not properly understand.

Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu is a senior researcher at the Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology; educated at the University of Bucharest (1974-1978), Ph.D. in history (2000), archaeological training and research at the aforementioned institute (since 1985); teaches archaeological theory at the University of Bucharest; published research on ancient ethnic phenomena and on the impact of nationalism on archaeological research; published research on the politics of cultural heritage in Romania and its impact on the conservation and visibility of the artifacts; currently working on the global asymmetries of archaeological research and on the properties of typological thinking and its flattening consequences on the perception of the artifacts (preliminary findings presented at conferences held in 2016 and 2017).

**Hakan Tarhan / British Institute at
Ankara (Turkey)**

**(RE)NEGOTIATING THE 'DISSONANCE':
CONTEMPORARY PERCEPTIONS OF THE
OTTOMAN HERITAGE IN GREECE**

Nineteenth-century nationalisms, within which the dominant heritage discourse (Authorized Heritage Discourse, AHD) was born, considered heritage as a representation of national identity and utilized it as a tool of nation-building. This process involved creating discourses that glorify a shared national heritage, and eventually brought together the exclusion of the pasts and heritages that are 'dissonant' with the national historiography. Greece established its national identity on two core axes, namely, the Classical Antiquity and the Byzantium / Orthodox Christianity, by disregarding its Ottoman past and creating a linear story discourse of uniting modern Greek people and the state with the Ancient Greek Civilization.

This paper focuses on the Ottoman heritage in Greece and investigates the contemporary public (state and people) perceptions of this heritage. In terms of the official discourses, Greek cultural heritage regulations are discussed regarding their inclusiveness of the Ottoman heritage and the levels of protection they provide. In addition, the Greek state's practical actions in the protection, promotion, and management of 'the Ottoman heritage are investigated and exemplified. People's perceptions of the Ottoman heritage were investigated through public opinion surveys conducted with the residents of two cities (Trikala, Thessaly and Serres, Macedonia), which aimed to evaluate the values attached and interest shown to these monuments by the local public, the people's feelings of ownership regarding these monuments and feelings of responsibility in protecting them, and the inclusion of these monuments in the collective and personal histories and identities of the local community.

Hakan Tarhan received his PhD in Analysis and Management of Cultural Heritage (AMCH) from IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca in 2022. In his PhD research he investigated the relationships between official heritage discourses and people's perceptions of heritage by focusing on the Ottoman Heritage in Greece and the Byzantine Heritage in Turkey. After completing his PhD, he joined the British Institute at Ankara (BIAA) as a postdoctoral fellow, where he continues his research on public perceptions of heritage and archaeology. During his studies, he has also been participating in cultural heritage management projects taking place in archaeological contexts, where he investigated local communities' interactions with the material and immaterial remains of the past, their memories and personal stories associated with them.

**Hans Peter Hahn / Goethe-Universität
Frankfurt am Main (Germany)**

**WORLD HERITAGE OR NATIONAL IDENTITY?
SOME THOUGHTS ON MULTIPLE MEANINGS OF
MATERIAL REMAINS**

Material objects that have travelled through epochs gain special attention firstly because of their longevity. Of comparable importance are secondly the recognizable specificity of forms, their temporal continuities and regional clustering. As obvious as these contexts are, as ambiguous is the related interpretation. At least two approaches compete for dominance; each of them is taken into service for quite different contexts of interpretation.

The logic of the national museum uses as its dominant reference the continuity of a society and culture that is often given the label of a “nation”. The perspective of the “world cultural heritage”, on the other hand, is committed to a cosmopolitan perspective that sees very different groups, but also individuals, as producing outstanding objects. Whereas the first is part of the logic of belonging, the latter gives priority to the idea of “achievements on mankind”.

Both cases are to be understood as ways of appropriating the past. These arguments use a narrative defined from the present as an instrument for colonising the meanings of these objects. For sure, this is common practice and as such hardly can be criticised. The political consequences of such a colonial usurpation of the past should be seen as highly problematic, however. What new forms of legitimisation of nationalisms of the 21st century are drawn from such objects? How is it possible to redefine such objects so that they build bridges instead of separating?

Hans Peter Hahn is Professor of Anthropology with special focus on Africa at Goethe University of Frankfurt /M. His research interests are oriented towards material culture, consumption and the impact of globalization on non-western societies. He edited a book on “Ethnologie und Weltkulturenmuseum” (Vergangenheitsverlag, Berlin 2017), focusing on the history of museums with ethnographic collections. He is principal investigator in a research programme on virtual interfaces on museum collections (2017-2020), where the perception of things in their digital representation is under study. Until recently, he was speaker of the research training group “Value and Equivalency” at Goethe-University. In this context, he participated in the organization of several exhibitions on human action and materiality. Other ongoing research initiatives are linked with polysemic approaches to material culture studies. HP Hahn’s recent publications include an edited volumes entitled “Obstinacy of Things” (Neofelis 2015) and “Things as a challenge “(transcript 2018).

**Ivo Strahilov / Sofia University
(Bulgaria)**

**BEYOND BORDERS? EXAMINING
ARCHAEOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE CONSTRUCTION
AND HERITAGE POLITICS IN SOUTHEASTERN
EUROPE**

This paper examines the dynamics of heritage-making and knowledge construction in archaeology in Southeastern Europe, focusing on the ancient necropolis of Trebenishte in North Macedonia. The complex history of this site, marked by multiple excavations, changing national borders and interpretational paradigms, offers important insights into the appropriation and instrumentalization of heritage in and from the region.

The dispersal of the necropolis’ artifacts among museums in Bulgaria, Serbia and (North) Macedonia over the last century, combined with competing interpretations, has led to incoherence and contestation. National archaeological schools, influenced by culture-historical archaeology, have attributed ethnic characteristics to the ancient graves based on nationalistic and scholarly agendas. In 2018, however, a landmark agreement was signed between museums in the three countries, leading to a joint exhibition on the Trebenishte site and the first assembling of its finds. This initiative is politically imbricated in the context of the Europeanisation of the Balkans and in relation to respective national situations. Furthermore,

while it aims to promote European integration and cooperation, this project has been also affected by ongoing bilateral tensions between the states.

Drawing on the social life of Trebenishte necropolis, this paper highlights the historical and current trends in archaeological knowledge production and the uses of archaeological heritage for national, regional, and European goals. It is further situated within global heritage processes and considers the influences of “world” museums and research traditions on “local” archaeological finds.

Ivo Strahilov is assistant professor at the Department of History and Theory of Culture at Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski. He holds a PhD in Cultural Studies (2019) and works in the field of Critical Heritage Studies. His scholarly interests include contemporary uses of heritage, identity politics and performativity, minorities’ heritages, environmental heritage and mobilisations, and intangible heritage with an emphasis on masquerades. He is currently in charge of a research project that investigates the historical, socioeconomic, and cultural meanings of the Ottoman public baths and water heritage.

**Klaira Gianniri / National and
Kapodistrian University of Athens
(Greece)**

**TAKING CARE: ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE TIMES OF
THE ANTHROPOCENE**

In the recent times of polarization, referred to as Anthropocene and characterised by political and economic instability, social inequalities, climate change and health crisis, there is a general consensus across academia about the human-induced disturbance threatening every aspect of life on Earth. Although the transformative impact of the scientific discoveries and their subsequent technological acceleration on our planet, our societies and ourselves is now greatly evident, social and humanities scientists have only very recently entered this arena. Besides, it often goes unnoticed that it is not only the natural environment and the material heritage that is affected, but also the ideas, narratives, imaginations and discourses that different communities have built around that heritage and that particular local environment.

The aforementioned facts raise a set of questions about the role of archaeology in the times of the Anthropocene and the relations between communities and nature, communities and experts, experts and experts: In what ways is culture implanted in the natural environment? How the ideas, narratives and discourses of different communities are building around their natural environment? What can we learn about the community economies of the recent past, that were self-sufficient and respectful of the environment? How can we learn from each other? How can we take care of each other and our lifeworld?

These issues will be discussed in my presentation, based on two trans-disciplinary case studies in the insular environments of Lasithi (Crete) and Akamas (Cyprus), during which the communities and their lifeworlds were approached through the use of archaeological ethnography and in collaboration with archaeologists and artists.

Klaira Gianniri is a researcher, museologist and cultural manager. She has a background in Cultural Communication and Technology (University of Aegean, Lesvos) and in Social and Cultural Anthropology (Freie Universität, Berlin). She holds an MA in Museum Studies at the Department of History and Archaeology (University of Athens), while her PhD in the same

department focused on the Public Archaeology of mountain and remote communities. She has participated in numerous research projects and archaeological excavations, in the role of heritage outreach coordinator. The last couple of years she is leading the archaeological ethnography project in Anatoli region of East Crete. Another strand of her research has been focused on cultural management. Through her participation in START_Create Cultural Change program (Robert Bosch Stiftung), she managed to organize and implement an experiential cultural festival (ArchaeoLogic) in the region of Hierapetra, Crete. She is currently a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Tübingen (Germany).

**Michael Herzfeld / Harvard University
(USA)**

**A KNOWING LOOK: RHETORICAL
FRAMEWORKS AND THE ARTISANAL
PRODUCTION OF NEW KNOWLEDGE**

Archaeological and art-historical knowledge are subject to three major political forces. One is the “audit culture” that neoliberal economies increasingly use to reduce all intellectual and academic activity to administratively manageable units; this leads to quantification as a substitute for interpretation (“Italy has 70% of the world’s great art,” etc.). Another force is ethno-nationalism, which attempts to reduce all such knowledge to ethnic categories, a task greatly facilitated by the discipline’s long-standing taxonomic proclivities. These two forces converge and collude in much of the official production of such knowledge. The third – and countervailing – force is a fundamentally ethnographic understanding of social and political process. This critical perspective provides empirical evidence of how the other two forces suppress social experience and disguise the political influences that shape the publication and dissemination of knowledge. These forces, in turn, threaten the practice of ethnography, especially through the bureaucratization of ethical and other regulatory devices. Drawing on the parallel history of folklore studies in the Balkans, and utilizing models derived from the study of craft apprenticeship, I discuss the ways in which writing practices both reproduce and challenge the prevailing hegemonies. On this basis, I suggest that closer attention to the artisanal dimensions of academic writing might provide a strong counterweight to past and present hegemonies, from nationalist archaeology and folklore to discourses grounded in calculations of profit and cost and a publication regime that answers to “impact factors” rather than to the social value of new knowledge.

Michael Herzfeld is Ernest E. Monrad Research Professor of the Social Sciences in the Department of Anthropology at Harvard University, IIAS Visiting Professor of Critical Heritage Studies Emeritus, Leiden University; and a member of the doctoral program in Beni Culturali, Formazione e Territorio, University of Rome “Tor Vergata.” Author of twelve books (most recently *Subversive Archaism: Troubling Traditionalists and the Politics of National Heritage*, 2022) and numerous articles and reviews, and producer of two ethnographic films, he has served as editor of *American Ethnologist* (1995-98). He is currently editor-at-large (responsible for “Polyglot Perspectives”) at *Anthropological Quarterly*, co-editor of “Asian Heritages” (Amsterdam University Press) and “New Anthropologies of Europe” (Berghahn), and editor of the *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*. His research (primarily in Greece, Italy, and Thailand) has addressed historic conservation and gentrification, the dynamics of nationalism and bureaucracy, crypto-colonialism, and the ethnography of knowledge.

Nadire Aslan / Middle East Technical University (Turkey)

UNPACKING THE LEGACY OF ROMAN URBANIZATION: EXPLORING THE COMPLEX INTERACTIONS BETWEEN LOCALS AND NEWCOMERS

This research aims to examine the multifaceted dynamics between indigenous/local people and Roman settlers in urbanization processes within the context of some examples from Anatolia and to shed light on some approaches to the transformative impact of Roman urbanization on local communities and its legacy. This study will address the question of how we understand the interaction of individuals with the society in which they live and interact. How have researchers addressed this question in the past, and how should we address it now?

Roman settlers refer to communities that arrived on administrative or military missions or were settled as part of Rome's expansion policy. Research on Roman influence and urbanization processes has so far been assessed by focusing on the ruler's impact and effect. The concept of "change" in the dominant territory has mostly analyzed community dynamics with the factors related to Roman's powerful impact together. However, the change processes in urban and rural areas have not been comprehensively analyzed, considering their interconnectedness. Today, interdisciplinary collaborations and recent social studies give us hope that new and different methodologies can be incorporated into archaeological research questions. In this study, I aim to discuss alternative methodologies through which we can address the question of how to understand not only top-down change brought about by the locus of power but also the bottom-up structure.

Nadire Aslan is a PhD student at Middle East Technical University since 2021. Completed master's degree at Hacettepe University in 2019 on "The relationship between courtyard and cultural identity in Roman residential architecture: Ephesus, Priene, Aphrodisias, Kremna, Sia, Zeugma". She accomplished her undergraduate education at Ankara University Classical Archaeology Department in 2013. She participated in Salamis Ancient City Excavations between 2010-2012 excavation seasons and Alexandria Troas City Excavations in 2011-2012 as an intern archaeologist. She took part in 2013 Arykanda Ancient City and 2016 Aspendos Ancient City Excavations as an archaeologist. Also, she has been working as a volunteer manager at the Sharing Circle Association/Paylaşım Çemberi Derneği, a non-profit organization focused on the rights of human, animal, and inanimate beings since 2019.

**Nona Palincaş / "Vasile Pârvan"
Institute of Archaeology (Romania)**

POWER RELATIONSHIPS, REFORM AND PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE IN ROMANIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

Approximately 25 years ago, a small group of archaeologists started writing about the need for a deep reform in Romanian archaeology. They basically insisted that archaeology should be updated in theory and methods and made relevant for contemporary society as opposed to the dominant, but theoretically outdated cultural historical archaeology, which only benefited archaeologists due to the ratio of effort invested/outcome (number of publications). The discussion continued intermittently to the present day, with this Spring school included. Yet the reformers remained small in number and widely ignored by archaeologists in leading positions - whose career is based precisely on the advantages of perpetuating the old archaeological stereotypes - as well as, more recently, by younger colleagues, less interested

in a meaningful archaeology than in the good money they can make from the ever-increasing number of preventive excavations.

Recently, acknowledging the poor performances of Romanian research in general, the Romanian government sought aid at the European Commission and initiated measures for improvement. While it is too early to know the full extent of these measures, it is clear that they include scientometrics and that the promoters of the innovation are supposed to be the heads of archaeological institutions – i.e. precisely those who benefited from the ‘Old archaeology’ and fought for decades against reformers. And this, in a country where complying at the level of paperwork with the requests of the political leadership while avoiding any change of substance has a tradition that goes back at least as far as the Communist regime.

This paper looks at these new research politics and the chances of avoiding yet another faking of innovation – i.e. the perpetuation of the ‘Balkan disease’. It also raises the question of ‘Who cares about our debates?’

Nona Palincaş is a senior researcher with the “Vasile Pârvan” Institute of Archaeology of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest. Her research interests include both social archaeology (particularly gender, body practices, power, knowledge, agency and creativity in south-eastern European Bronze and Iron Ages and in contemporary archaeology) and archaeometry (primarily radiocarbon dating, stable isotopes for paleo-diet reconstruction and analysis of archaeological ceramics). She is a member and a former co-chair of the Archaeology and Gender in Europe (AGE) working community of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA). She conducts excavations in the pre- and protohistoric settlement at Popeşti (Romania), the Late Iron Age habitation of which was identified with Argedaon/Argedava – a proto-urban settlement linked to the political activity of the famous North-Thracian king Burebistas. In various publications she argued for the need of a profound reformation of Romanian archaeology, particularly for the stronger development of archaeological theory and archaeometry and the closer integration of these two domains.

Paulina Florjanowicz / Polish Academy of Sciences (Poland)

POLISH ARCHAEOLOGISTS IN THE FACE OF THE TOTALITARIAN SYSTEMS OF THE 20TH CENTURY: NAZISM AND STALINISM – CHOICES TO MAKE, LESSONS TO LEARN

The analysis of the impact of Nazism and Stalinism on Polish archaeology is an extreme case of ideology’s potential influence over a scientific discipline. The aim is to examine the attitudes of archaeologists towards both types of imposed totalitarianism, and to show the consequences of their choices on the development of this academic discipline in Poland. The time frame covers the period from the outbreak of The Second World War to the so-called ‘thaw’ in October 1956. Despite the highest level of terror, Nazism did not leave a lasting mark on Polish archaeology. Polish archaeologists definitively rejected the possibility of collaborating with the German occupiers, and mostly became engaged in conspiracy, including above all taking part in secret teaching. The nature of the Soviet Russia occupation differed from the colonial approach of the Germans. Scholars with communist views saw in Marxism the potential for the development of archaeology. Others firmly rejected the

possibility of collaborating with the occupier. After the war Marxism had a limited influence on the way archaeology was practised in Poland. This trend and the related historical materialism associated with it were mainly superficial. The authorities of post-war Poland, like those in the interwar period, did not perceive any propaganda potential in archaeology. The situations in which the state did become involved and supported archaeological projects, as well as noticing their political potential were initiated by the archaeologists themselves.

Paulina Florjanowicz, Ph.D. - Archaeologist, policy maker, expert on heritage management and remembrance policy

Her research focuses on the relation of archaeology and politics, especially regarding totalitarian systems of the 20th century and their influence on archaeology. She defended her doctoral thesis entitled "Polish Archaeologists in the face of Nazism and Stalinism" in the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences in 2022. She received her master's degree at the Warsaw University's Institute of Archeology in 2000, specializing in archeology of late mediaeval and modern times.

For the past two decades she has been working in the public sector for various state cultural institutions, including National Heritage Board of Poland (Director General 2010-2013), National Institute for Museums and Public Collections (2013-2016 and Director General since 2023) and governmental administration (Director of Department for Cultural Heritage of the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage 2016-2022). She is an expert on heritage policy issues for international and intergovernmental organizations including European Archaeological Council, Council of Europe and European Commission (currently on the European Heritage Label panel). Member of ICOM and EAA.

Predrag Novaković / University of Ljubljana (Slovenia)

LEARNING FROM FORMER YUGOSLAV ARCHAEOLOGY

Archaeology is still traditionally considered a national science, similar to history, ethnology, language and literature studies and many other humanistic disciplines. History of archaeology shows clear reasons for such consideration. To put it simply, archaeology participates in understanding the national past or that of the national territory and contributes to national heritage.

The situation becomes more complex in the multi-national countries. There, archaeology had (or still has) dual character – national and that of the state. In Czechoslovakia, there were Czech and Slovak archaeologies; in Spain, Catalan, Basque and Galician archaeologies; in the UK, there exist Scottish, Welsh and English archaeology; in Belgium, Valon and Flemish. The degree of the 'national' in these archaeologies varies from country to country, as well as their integration at the state level, but, nevertheless, they still keep their national dimension.

Former Yugoslavia was a particular case where national archaeologies existed or developed for the first time in a multi-national state with several languages and confessions. This cohabitation was a challenging process. Indeed, different (national) views of the past and different scholarly and cultural traditions, on the one hand, and integrating attempts of the Yugoslav stance, on the other hand, had to constantly seek balance in challenging social and political reality of the Yugoslav state during its existence. Today's question is not how archaeology functioned in former Yugoslavia but what we have inherited and learned from it.

Predrag Novaković is a Professor at the Department of Archaeology, University of Ljubljana, teaching theory and history of archaeology, archaeological methods, spatial and landscape archaeology. Guest professor at the universities in Pisa (1998 – 2000), Graz (2007 – 2008) and Sarajevo (2012 – 2013), honorary member of the European Association of Archaeologists (since 2008), currently President of the Slovene Archaeological Society. Author, co-author and editor of books on history of spatial archaeology, archaeology in Balkans, archaeological 3D recording, STEM teaching in archaeology.

**Staša Babić / University of Belgrade
(Serbia)**

**WHO AUTHORIZES THE DISCOURSE?
THE CASE OF AHD**

The concept of the authorized heritage discourse (AHD), proposed by Laurajane Smith in 2006, has profoundly changed (some of) the scholars' perception of the tangible traces of past human actions. Its main tenet is that heritage is constructed in an intricate interplay of various social actors in the present, some of them in possession of authority to single out, ascribe value, and solidify in the public discourse some aspects of the past, in accordance with a set of present concerns, while some other actors and their concerns are excluded from this process. Smith's work has opened up the path to fundamental reconsiderations in a number of disciplines, including archaeology, with beneficent results. However, in order to do justice to its author's theoretical position, firmly set in the constructivist realm, it may be instructive to take into consideration the context in which the concept of AHD was formulated and the problems it was originally aimed to solve. This is particularly important when it is applied in heritage studies of the regions that differ significantly from the original setting, both in terms of their past and present conditions. The contribution will therefore aim to discuss some of the possibilities, as well as limitations of the application of the concept of AHD in SE Europe.

Staša Babić – Full Professor of the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade. Served as Head of Department from 2009 to 2018. Her research focuses on theory in archaeology, Iron Age and Classical Archaeology of Greece. Her 2018 monograph *Metaarheologija* (Metaarchaeology) discusses the nature of archaeological knowledge, with an emphasis on the importance of collective knowledge versus paradigm shifts. One of the authors of the European Association of Archaeologists Statement Archaeology and the Future of Democracy (<https://www.e-a-a.org/BernStatement>).

**Susanne Grunwald / Independent
researcher (Germany)**

**IS THERE A GOLD STANDARD FOR GOOD
ARCHAEOLOGY? SOME REMARKS ON THIS
FROM THE HISTORY AND PRESENT OF
GERMAN ARCHAEOLOGY**

With some examples from the history of German archaeology I would like to show how often very different opinions about the quality of scientific work coexist. There are many examples of one group of scientists criticizing one kind of research as bad or even as a "disease", while another group values the same kind as the only correct one. In this context, the standards for good science developed for Western sciences such as physics, mathematics or medicine were received relatively late and also not continuously. This is because these sciences do not have an active audience like the various archaeologies with their museums or monuments and do not have to follow a cultural agenda of a government. Thus, for the question of what is good science, archaeology can rather be compared to Western medicine. Medicine as a natural

science is also assessed differently in its research than in its practice - medicine is good if it heals or alleviates pain, and the assessment is often made differently by the patient than by the critical professional colleague. As a kind of third judge of the quality of archaeology, forms of administration with growing bureaucracy increasingly appear. There, good science is described, among other things, as plannable and calculable, which is diametrically opposed to the old idea of open-ended research -and thus poses the question of good science in a completely new way.

Susanne Grunwald studied prehistoric archaeology, ancient history and medieval history in Jena and Leipzig. She received her doctorate in Leipzig in 2012 with a research history thesis on archaeological hillfort research in Saxony between 1900 and 1961. Currently, her work as researcher and editor focuses on questions concerning the reception of social science research in the various archaeologies, the global Cold War in different archaeologies, and the museum mediation of ideas on domination and power with different collaboration partners as the Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz or the Germano-Romanic Commission of the German Archaeological Institute.

**Zenta Broka-Lāce / University of Latvia
(Latvia)**

**HOW TO BE YOURSELF: THE LATVIAN
ARCHAEOLOGIST'S QUEST FOR SELF-
IDENTITY AMIDST IMPERIALISM,
COLONIALISM AND NATIONALISM**

Latvian archaeology has witnessed waves of culture-historical paradigm rooted in the German antiquarian tradition. Initially, local archaeological heritage was seen as imports from Scandinavia due to perceived barbarism. Collectors pillaged burials, amassing personal collections, and some artifacts were even sold to the British Museum. Latvians began exploring their own heritage only in the early 20th century. In the 1930s, exaggerated nationalism celebrated ancient history, Latvian archaeological heritage, and Indo-European origins as superior. During the Soviet occupation, local achievements were attributed to Slavic peoples. Post-liberation, archaeologists were expected to align with a pro-Western stance.

Understanding the trajectory of Latvian archaeology is challenging. Researchers prioritize new methods over theory. Presently, Latvian archaeology shows interest in natural sciences, investigating ancient DNA, ethnic and social processes, with a culture-historical theoretical approach. A scarcity of archaeologists and limited resources hinders theoretical innovations.

The Soviet occupation had a lasting impact, prompting a postcolonial interpretation. Engagement in archaeology offers emancipation from centuries of marginalization. With over 30 years of independence, younger generations are shedding apprehensions. However, integration into the international academic environment poses challenges. The complex history of the Baltic states defies the neat "good" versus "bad" division of the post-war world order. Aversion to leftist ideas excludes the Baltic states from many academic discussions. The conflict in Ukraine exemplifies Europe's divided memory, with deliberate destruction of cultural heritage echoing attempts to erase national existence. This paper addresses the ideological challenges of archaeological theory advocating for the continued relevance of the culture-historical tradition in academia.

Zenta Broka-Lāce I got my BA, MA and PhD from the Faculty of History and Philosophy, University of Latvia. My scientific interest in archaeology started during the first year of BA studies (2010-2013); all my course works were on archaeology. My first excavation experience dates from 2011. Almost each year I have participated in archaeological excavations in various archaeological sites in Latvia. Since my MA (2013-2015) studies I have focused more on theory and history of archaeology. After graduating MA (2015) I started working as Chief Specialist at the Ģederts Eliass History and Art Museum of Jelgava. In 2016 I got accepted in PhD program, but at the end of 2016 I was elected as a Scientific Assistant at the Institute of Latvian History at the University of Latvia, where I worked until 2022. Currently I'm still working on my PhD project: „The Development of Archaeological Thought in Latvia from 19th – 21st Century”.