What do archaeologists do when approached by groups or individuals with unorthodox, or even simply inappropriate, approaches to, and ideas about the past? What should they do? While much guidance and literature points to education and engagement, in some of the more sensitive or difficult cases it is often more appealing, and simpler, to ignore the issue, in the hopes that it will simply go away. Similarly, on occasions when archaeologists step forward to criticize alternative approaches to archaeological heritage, this does not always meet with positive or desired results. In this paper, in light of recent personal experience with a controversial piece of television programming, I discuss different approaches to responding to challenges to the expertise (and authority) of archaeologists by problematic encounters with concepts of the past. I suggest that while there are arguments in support of (and against) all three of the approaches that I identify (collaboration, condemnation, or ignoring), none provide an absolute solution. In order to discuss these approaches, I draw upon key cases from the literature, as well as personal reflection.

INTRODUCTION: AN APPROACH FROM A TELEVISION PRODUCTION COMPANY

In early 2013, I was approached by a television production company, having been recommended to them by a colleague at a different institution. I had several conversations with the company with regard to the programme that they were planning to shoot (which, at that point, was still very much in outline). They explained that they wanted to explore the work of groups who search for and repatriate fallen soldiers from the Second World War's Eastern Front. This would involve use of metal detectors, and there were plans to visit countries such as Latvia and Estonia.

After some discussion, I agreed to take on a small piece of paid consultancy work for them, through my then employer, to offer advice to the planned programme within the parameters of a number of questions that the production company asked me to look into for them. I decided to become a consultant only after careful consideration, and weighing up the advantages and disadvantages of my alternative options, knowing that the producers planned to go ahead with making the show in any case. As an academic who has researched the role of metal detectorists with regard to archaeological practice and community engagement within the UK, I am very aware that such individuals can, and often do, have a useful contribution to make to archaeological research (see, e.g., Richards & Naylor, 2009). I am also aware of the debates that exist concerning understanding the alternative values that treasure-seeking groups place on archaeological heritage, and on their perceived entitlements to it (e.g. Goddard, 2011).

From the perspective of responsibility to the archaeological resource (e.g. King, 1983: 146), contribution to projects by metal detectorists and other non-professionals should be handled carefully, and carried out with awareness of archaeological methods, ideally in collaboration with qualified archaeologists. This is particularly the case in countries where sites of twentieth-century conflict are increasingly of interest to relic hunters and collectors (Seitsonen & Herva, 2011:178, for example, noted the vulnerability of Second World War sites in Finnish Lapland to the interests of militaria enthusiasts). In some cases, non-professional groups have actively engaged with the material remains from twentieth-century conflict with official and

legal authorization to do so, in apparent harmony with the authorities, as has been seen with the First World War sites such as at Fromelles in France (Price, 2005: 189).

There has been extensive discussion about the particular ethical considerations required for the study of human remains (e.g. Scarre, 2006), and great sensitivity is needed when addressing this issue. As Tarlow (2006) and King (1983) have noted, balance needs to be made between the ethical responsibilities of archaeological practice to living communities in tandem (and often overlapping) with responsibility towards and respect for the dead themselves. Furthermore, in the case of remains from twentieth-century conflicts, a number of national organizations exist that have responsibility for the management of human remains from these conflicts (Price, 2005: 183).

In March 2014, many months after I had completed the consultancy work, the pre-launch information about the new programme appeared on the National Geographic Channel's website, including much emphasis on the biographies of the main 'stars' of the show. This included description of one as a 'militaria dealer', accompanied by a worrying quote regarding selling Nazi artefacts for large sums of money, accessed on 26 March 2014, but since removed from the website. Another presenter was clearly a metal detecting enthusiast. I was disturbed at the crass presentation of the programme (not least its poorly thought-out title, 'Nazi War Diggers'), and its apparent trivialization of the treatment of human remains and their associated archaeological assemblage, by untrained individuals in the name of entertainment. When the programme was announced, immediate outcry, primarily by archaeologists, across social media, and through a number of news providers (suchas the UK's Daily Mail (e.g. Walters & Kisiel, 2014) and the USA's New York Times (e.g. Mashberg, 2014)) was enormous and, aside from some of the more over-the-top reactions, also understandable. The programme was soon dropped before ever being broadcast.

My role with regard to the now infamous but also cancelled (for now) Nazi War Diggers, produced by ClearStory for the National Geographic Channel, was limited to alerting the company to the debates around both illegal and responsible metal detecting, and to signposting them to the different codes of practice concerning discovery of human remains and the various laws in the countries in which they were considering filming. I also made recommendations of colleagues that I thought they should contact for other specialist information. We exchanged emails, and telephone and Skype conversations were held. I had no physical involvement in the filming or investigation of sites, and had no contact or interaction with the programme's presenters. I probably spent no more than half a day sourcing the information that I was asked to provide.

All decisions with regard to the programme itself, such as content, script, the final title, and marketing, were those of ClearStory and the National Geographic Channel. I mention these particulars here partially as an emphatic disclaimer on my part, but also as an observation that advisory roles are just that. Decisions are made with regard to a programme to which a minor contributor is not (and cannot be) privy. This means, as I found out, that there is high risk involved with engaging with media companies in this way. As a consultant charged with a specific task, there was no control over how the final product looked or was presented.

While the production company have been quick to point out to me the sections within their programme in which my advice has been taken on board (for example, contacting the national and regional authorities regarding repatriation of human remains and avoiding, to a large extent, discussion of the collectors' market or market 'value'), much still remained to cause me grave concern. I had of course imagined that the end programme would at least be slightly controversial (working with metal detecting enthusiasts usually attracts at least a few raised eyebrows from the archaeological community, not to mention positive uproar from the more extreme ends of the spectrum of archaeological viewpoints), but I had not been prepared for just how unacceptable the final product appeared to be.

I had heard from the production company in early 2014 that the programme would soon be announced, but I was not privy to the text or images that they were planning to use for the online publicity. I was utterly horrified when I saw this material, which included, for example, footage of one of the presenters handling a human bone with his bare hands while talking to camera, and biographies of the presenters which in one case emphasized a presenter's overtly commercial interest in cultural material from the Second World War. I was especially shocked, since early on in the process there had been assurances from the company that they were making every effort to treat the subject matter with care and sensitivity. My horror was a feeling shared with many of my archaeological colleagues across the globe. On top of this, on a personal level, I experienced a terrible worry. Had my contribution led to this display of irresponsible and inappropriate handling of human and cultural remains? Had anything I had said to the production company ultimately directly influenced the poor choice of marketing clip from the show that went viral (beforebeing removed) for all the wrong reasons? After some anxious talking with a few close and trusted colleagues, I realized that I needed to reflect on and learn from this experience. This has led me to consider within a broader context the role of archaeologists with regard to groups, not only the media, that have other motives towards and understanding of archaeological heritage.

No doubt, having even minimal input from somebody like me, an apparent specialist holding a university position, assists on one level to help legitimize what are otherwise highly questionable projects. On the other hand, is ignoring or reacting with hostility towards such projects any more constructive? My instinct at the time told me that the programme would be made regardless of whether academics engaged in discussion with the producers, and therefore I had at least some responsibility concerning making sure that the company were at least made aware of ethical and legal requirements. I do not know if I had refused any involvement at all it would have had any effect on the final programme. Equally, it is unclear whether more sources of specialist advice, and perhaps even involvement from other archaeologists, would have ultimately led to a very different end product. However, I am sure that my refusal to cooperate would not have prevented the pilot episode from going into production.

In this paper, I wish to explore the different debates for and against engagement with groups that many in the archaeological community perceive to be problematic for various reasons, including treasure hunting communities and 'alternative' or 'outsider' archaeologists, the media, those with commercial interests in archaeological material, and even the military in active conflict zones. I reflect on my own recent experiences and also those of others. While each of these points could be elaborated upon further, space does not permit me to do so here, in this admittedly reflexive account. Furthermore, there are connected issues, such as the challenge of handling frustrated human communication and relationships, and the psychology of this, which also lie outside the scope of the paper. After discussion of the media and ethical considerations more broadly, I consider the types of reactions that characterize archaeologists' responses to approaches from non-archaeolgists under the three subheadings of collaborating, condemning and ignoring.

ETHICS AND THE MEDIA

Many archaeologists today accept, and possibly even expect, that at least part of their work is connected to engaging with the public in some way. This is exemplified at an international level in codes of practice and responsibility to which practitioners are expected to adhere. These include Principle 4 of the Society of American Archaeology (SAA) Principles of Archaeological Ethics (1996). In a less direct manner, section 1.3 of the European Association of Archaeologists' (EAA) Code of Practice (2009) also suggests that archaeologists should engage with the public and inform them about the 'objectives and methods' of archaeology. This has the ultimate goal, outlined in Section 1.2, of ensuring preservation of archaeological

heritage. Within the largest archaeological organizations, committees also exist specifically to address publicfacing and public-engaging archaeology.

Notwithstanding wider questions of who the public actually are (e.g. Atalay et al., 2014: 9), 'public education', a popular way in which to frame public archaeology, at least for committees, addresses public awareness of ethical concerns in archaeological practice and interpretation.

When trying to engage with the wider public, archaeologists realize that sometimes the audience is engaged and interested, eager to learn from trained archaeologists, and keen to apply this new knowledge and skill set to their own research (Aston, 2012: 450). There are 'community archaeology' groups in countries such as the UK, for example, that follow their own research programmes with significant independence and autonomy from professional archaeologists, while maintaining communication with, for example, local government archaeological services (see Reid, 2012).

Aside from this engaged public—those who become actively involved in archaeological activities as volunteers and even students, there is a larger group of passive, but still interested, members of the public. These are likely to watch archaeological documentaries on television, read articles about archaeology and history in newspapers and magazines, and visit heritage sites and museums as a leisure activity, without feeling the need (or perhaps finding the opportunity) for more active engagement with the discipline. These individuals may never have the urge to join a local archaeology project and engage in fieldwork of some sort, or to volunteer in some way at their local museum, but they nonetheless have an appetite for information about the past as transmitted through popular media. Indeed, studies have suggested that television, magazines, and media may be the most common ways for the public to learn about archaeology (e.g. Ramos & Duganne, 2000; Balme & Wilson, 2004).

Digital engagement through social media, as well as accessible reports and other sources of information through the Internet, also increasingly open up opportunities for further engagement, learning, and ultimately participation (Richardson, 2013). In addition, there are people, working individually or in groups, who engage with archaeological heritage in ways with which professional archaeologists are less comfortable, including treasure hunters, collectors of antiquities, and subscribers to fantastical interpretations of the past. Cooper (2006: 133) has noted that if archaeologists are to be inclusive of non-professionals, they have to be open to accepting that sometimes the non-archaeologist may come up with a stronger analysis, while at other times these interpretations may 'only be regarded by the archaeologist as an exercise in myth or superstition'. At the farthest end of this spectrum are the so-called 'pseudoarchaeologies', providing inflexible interpretations of the past with often bizarre or spectacular-sounding conclusions drawn from very specific ways of viewing particular aspects of archaeological material (see Fagan, 2006, for an excellent discussion of this).

These different groups often compete with professional archaeology for media attention and coverage, and, in many cases, archaeologists are left dissatisfied with the messages that are conveyed to the public. Corbishley (2011) has stated that, in regard to television productions containing archaeology:

> The overriding problem, at least for archaeologists, is that they generally expect current archaeological programmes to be 'educational' and that what most archaeologists mean by this is that programmes present a true picture of how archaeologists work and an accurate account of their findings and introduce viewers to the issues which confront society in respect of, for example, the destruction of evidence without recording and the long-term future of national and international sites. (Corbishley, 2011: 53)

He notes that the archaeologists' frequent expectation is for 'television programme commissioners and makers to consult archaeologists at every stage' of production (Corbishley, 2011: 53). Some archaeologists

have even been derided by their peers for over-engagement with the media. Aston (2012: 454), for example, noted continuous criticism of the UK television series Time Team, despite its mainstream success and high concentration of direct involvement by archaeologists with every stage of production and presentation. Holtorf (2004: 47) has also noted that:

> […] it is of little use to complain that people who are not professional archaeologists themselves may have an in some respects badly informed view of professional archaeology and what it has achieved. Instead, these views are significant in themselves and ultimately an important part of the current fascination and popularity of archaeology as a whole.

Indeed, there is merit to working to understand the ways in which non-archaeologists perceive both archaeological material and archaeologists. Flatman et al. (2012: 67), for example, have observed that a fundamental issue with metal detecting for many archaeologists in the UK is that they 'simply don't get' the appeal of the hobby, nor the fundamental motivations of the hobbyists, while at the same time it is clear that others, including the UK government, 'simply do get it'. This indicates further the importance of taking the time to understand alternative perspectives on and approaches to, the past, not least for ease of communication with decision-makers.

It may be difficult at times for non-archaeologists to differentiate between an archaeologically acceptable treatment of the past, and an approach that is instead regarded by the academy, with its collective years of knowledge, training and experience, as fundamentally flawed. There is increasing emphasis on the value of knowledge held by non-professionals (e.g. Greer, 2014: 65; Schmidt, 2014: 38), as well as criticism by some heritage professionals for seemingly institutionalizing both what should be considered heritage at all and influencing the ideological and legal frameworks through which 'heritage' is understood (e.g. Smith & Waterton, 2009; Ferris & Welch, 2014: 223). Of course, being aware of other interested parties' goals for, interpretations of, and requirements from archaeological heritage is not the same as acknowledging that they necessarily all have an equal footing in terms of their validity or verifiability.

Fagan and Feder (2006: 719–21) make it clear that some 'alternatives' may be deliberately misleading in their presentation as accurate interpretations of the past. Nonetheless, it should not be a surprise that, for those from outside the academic or professional archaeological community, it is increasingly difficult to spot the difference between 'good' and 'bad' archaeological practices and outcomes (Wilson, 2012: 73).


MEDIA AND THE PROLIFERATION OF 'EXPERTS'

It is worth remembering at this stage that television producers and commissioners, as well as journalists and other media professionals, are faced by, and in contact with, other groups that also have an interest in historical and archaeological subject areas. Many of these people, in their own opinion at least, also have some expertise regarding the subject matter. One such group, that has proven to have had success in both recent times and historically with the media, has been the treasure hunting community. By this, I mean the largely legal activity of treasure seekers, often aided by the metal detector, rather than perpetrators of looting, which involves the breaking of a law. Recently, Hart and Chilton (2014: 2) suggested that labelling certain activities as 'looting' gives them 'a negative connotation and imbued it with the heritage values of archaeologists and preservationists', which, they argue, has often precluded the study of looting activities as anything other than a negative activity at variance with acceptable practices. Certainly, research has shown that treasure hunting groups often regard themselves as both experienced and knowledgeable, and feel professional in their attitude towards their hobby (e.g. Dobat, 2013: 713). As Rasmussen (2014: 97) has noted, the interaction of hobbyists with professionals from museums and heritage agencies at once verifies

the cultural significance of metal-detected finds, 'and serves to legitimize, rightly or not, the material in question as well as the method of procurement'.

It is not my place, nor my intention, to advocate the production company's use of individuals with limited or no archaeological training for Nazi War Diggers. However, in the context of discussions that may have taken place with the final selected presenters of the programme, I think it is plausible to speculate that these individuals may well have presented themselves as knowledgeable specialists, without acknowledging or indeed being fully aware of their lack of archaeological experience. It is also probable that they were unable to predict what the implications of this lack of professionally acceptable expertise might have meant for the reception of the programme by the archaeological community, or for the artefacts and remains with which they worked on camera. In a world where anyone can create a convincing-looking website or blog, write an authoritative-sounding book, form an official-sounding organization, or openly challenge 'established' wisdom (think, for example, of the often-successful strategies of so-called 'pseudoarchaeologists', cf. Reece, 2006), it should be less surprising that otherwise (we can hope) well-intentioned ventures take unfortunate turns. This is different to excusing a lack of due diligence, but we still should remember that archaeologists' priorities and needs are not those of everyone (Holtorf, 2005: 549; Clauss, 2014: 39). With these issues in mind, I wish now to discuss the three response modes that seem to me to be available to archaeologists who are put in situations involving non-archaeologists, where ethical dilemmas may present themselves.

COLLABORATING

In light of the recent concerns around the production of Nazi War Diggers, the Society of Historical Archaeology published a blog post by archaeologist Charles Ewen (2014). This reflected on how dialogue with the National Geographic Channel might have helped to improve the tone and message of the programme, in a similar vein to the discussions concerning the programme's controversial National Geographic Channel predecessor (Diggers, 2012). He suggested that discussion is essential with organizations such as the National Geographic Channel in order to minimize the proliferation of such programmes and their messages: 'Is this only a temporary reprieve till the next outrageous show comes along? Will this be a rolling battle against edutainment with no end in sight? Perhaps not, but we are going to have to be willing to work with the networks' (Ewen, 2014). This call to engage is not too uncommon, and in her discussion of public archaeology in Mexico and Guatemala, McLung De Tapia (2002: 28) urged archaeologists to 'exit the ivory tower' and engage in collaboration with television and other media as a means of increasing engagement with archaeology, although she was likely not considering such problematic programming in her particular call to action.

Lynott (1997: 589) observed that 'most archaeologists develop their own ethical codes through informal observation of their faculty role models and postgraduate, on-the-job training'. Similarly Pyburn (2014: 208) has noted that research ethics themselves are problematic, since 'no single set of rules can serve all circumstances'. Collaboration, especially where it crosses over into territory that throws up controversial questions that may result in less-than-perfect treatment of material culture, is one such area where an archaeologist's personal views regarding ethical decision-making may be put to the test.

How archaeologists choose to respond to these dilemmas inevitably varies depending on both the circumstances and the individual. With regard to my own involvement with the programme, my decision was informed by previous experience (or lack thereof with regard to working with media companies), the information that I had to go on from the company at the time, and examples from the literature of archaeologists in settings other than mine, who had in their careers faced comparable dilemmas. Examples

that sprung to mind came from encounters of archaeologists with other groups and communities with different needs and agendas concerning archaeological heritage, not just the media.

A well-known and well-documented case where collaboration, and indeed compromise, has come into play has been the Portable Antiquities Scheme (DCMS, 1996) in England and Wales. It has received criticism from some sectors of the archaeological community for apparent compromise of both archaeological methodology and authority (Aldeman, 2008: 524; Flatman et al., 2012: 67). However, proponents of the scheme have argued that its approach, while indeed a compromise, has nonetheless been largely positive (and, importantly, pragmatic in the circumstances), not least in facilitating communication and collaboration between different groups, including metal detectorists, that otherwise might not have taken place (Bland, 2005: 446).

In interactions with the serious matter of international conflict, there have also been animated debates over whether it is desirable, or even ethically acceptable, for archaeologists to enter into collaborative relationships with invading military forces and their governments. Stone (2005: 934) observed, around the time of the 2003 Iraq invasion by coalition forces led by the USA, that the 'public expressions of anxiety by numerous institutions were not necessarily intended to add opposition to the war, but to offer advice and assistance in the business of protecting sites'.

Perhaps giving what advice could be given was more realistic than taking a moral stand against the prospect of war, which at that point seemed inevitable. Others gave advice to their respective governments and authorities, and Hamilakis (2009: 43) noted that many archaeologists who collaborated argued that without collaboration, 'ignorant military personnel and their political masters would have destroyed valuable antiquities, of importance not only to the Iraqis, but to the whole world, or they could have succumbed to the pressure of collectors' lobbies'. However, he also suggested other motivations, such as the need to be seen to be involved, either from a national, institutional, or individual perspective (Hamilakis, 2009: 43). At Dublin's World Archaeological Congress meeting of 2008, some years after the initial invasion, a heated, often emotional, open debate ensued in which the issue was raised of whether it was acceptable to collaborate with the military in times of conflict. There were archaeologists present who felt that it was never morally acceptable, since it could imply a complacency towards warfare, while others argued that in the spirit of 'community archaeology', itself a constantly growing and evolving concept, surely the military were just another community with whom to collaborate.

Stone (2005: 935) stated that trusted colleagues with whom he was able to talk about the request from the Ministry of Defence, such as illicit antiquities trade expert Neil Brodie, had warned of the vulnerability of Iraq's museums in the aftermath of invasion, warnings which Stone passed on to his government contacts. It is tragically ironic that, despite this and likely many other warnings from concerned heritage professionals and organizations, the Baghdad Museum was indeed looted. This caused reflection from Stone and others on the frustrations associated with seeing cultural heritage destroyed in times of conflict, despite concerted efforts to avoid this (Moshenska, 2011: 69).

In other forms of collaboration, scholars who have worked with unprovenienced antiquities, for example through cataloguing, have come under sharp criticism for enabling the authentication of, and creation of publication provenance for, possibly looted antiquities (e.g. Renfrew, 2000: 10). This stance is supported by a number of academic journals actively adopting a policy of refusing to publish papers based on looted data (Lynott, 1997: 591). Others have written, however, in support of museums and scholars who collect and research objects 'without knowledge of their exact provenance' (Boardman, 2007: 39), dismissing arguments that this assists the illicit trade in antiquities, and warning that the alternative of not publishing or researching objects unless their exact find spot data are known, would ultimately cause more loss to scholarship than it would save. In spite of such arguments, the collaboration of professionals, such as

academic researchers and museum curators, with individuals such as private collectors and dealers of cultural objects will continue to attract controversy and criticism, and even contribute, in some cases, to criminal activity (Brodie & Proulx, 2014). Therefore, while collaboration may be appealing as a form of damage limitation, it is also arguable that a line must be drawn in the sand with regard to when this approach actually becomes unacceptable. However, the area up to and including this notional line evidently may feature several shades of grey depending on what the individual archaeologist is comfortable with doing.

CONDEMNING

Archaeological codes of ethics, as discussed above, can offer some guidance for the decision of whether or not to condemn a particular activity on ethical grounds. Historically, there have been instances across the world where the archaeological profession has come together apparently in unison against particular activities or groups that have posed a threat to archaeological practice. Most well known to me from my own research is the UK case of the Stop Taking Our Past (STOP) campaign, which a collective of archaeological and heritage organizations launched in 1980 against the hobby of metal detecting for material. As others have noted (e.g. Addyman & Brodie, 2002; Bland, 2005), for various reasons, this campaign was not successful in swaying public opinion against the metal detecting hobby. This was not least because of the activities of the British metal detecting community itself at that time, through concerted coordination of proponents through its hobbyist magazines and a campaign group called Detector Information Group. The metal detecting community arguably carried out a much more effective campaign, in terms of its use of local press and even through coordinated political lobbying, to make their point of view known. They adopted a more populist tone than the seemingly intellectually elite archaeological lobby, but notably also had stronger financial backing (see Thomas, 2012, for a more in-depth account). Equally of note, though, was the approach adopted by the STOP organizers, who seemingly misjudged the opinions of the wider public in assuming that they would automatically agree with the archaeologists', rather than the treasure hunters', perspectives (Gregory, 1986: 26).

This assumption on the part of archaeologists—that they have an apparently obvious right and authority to interpret heritage, albeit on behalf of and for the perceived benefit of the public—has been problematized elsewhere (e.g. Ferris & Welch, 2014: 223–24; Hart & Chilton, 2014: 3). Archaeologists have also to face continued arguments with proponents of the antiquities trade through press and other media (see, for example, Wallwork, 2014, a recent opinion editorial in the Los Angeles Times that was highly critical of stricter import and export regulation).

Such arguments, whether based on flawed data, as was suggested by many online commentators on Wallwork's piece, or simply on different ideological priorities, further demonstrate that the archaeological community is not the only one with opinions concerning the treatment of cultural property and heritage. Nor are they the only people with the resources to make these arguments known. Simply criticizing a particular action, whether publicly or privately, cannot necessarily ensure that it will not take place. In the age of social media visibility, it may sometimes seem important to be seen to be condemning loudly an objectionable point, especially if peers have also done so. However, when other groups are sometimes larger, more influential and ultimately more powerful than the archaeological community, it should be questioned whether this approach alone is sufficient.

That said, archaeologists have used the instantaneous nature of social media and the editorial freedom of blogging to their advantage as well. When Nazi War Diggers was announced, condemnation of the programme spread rapidly through Twitter and Facebook, and effective investigative blogging, perhaps most notably from Hardy (2014a, 2014b), led to swift responses both within national and international

press, and from the National Geographic Channel itself. Within a few days the company had removed all references to the planned programme from their website.

Some have made positive appraisals of the collective online action against Nazi War Diggers, and how it enabled a collective and united criticism of the programme and its 'catastrophically misjudged' promotion, by archaeologists and military historians across the globe (Brockman, 2014). However, Ewen (2014) observed that the 'howls of righteous outrage began almost immediately' from the online archaeological community, and he noted that these 'howls' were based only on the scant information on the National Geographic Channel web pages.

Holtorf (2005: 550) has suggested that 'critical understanding and dialogue' are preferable to 'dismissive polemics' in engaging with alternative or outsider archaeological approaches, and it is to be wondered whether the veracity of some of the responses, while ultimately successful on their goal of seeing the programme cancelled, were in some cases verging on the extreme.

In the case of Nazi War Diggers, the success of the collective condemnation was assisted by the particularly ill-informed nature of the marketing (showing human remains handled in an overly casual manner, for example). However, the ability of social media to spread news and messages quickly was also an advantage. This can also be a weakness of social media, especially when flawed or false information is rapidly shared.

IGNORING

The ethical dilemma of deciding when to become involved and when to ignore or choose to do nothing can be challenging for archaeologists in many situations. Pyburn (2014: 198) has noted that 'doing nothing is not necessarily more ethical than trying to do something and failing'. However, opting to avoid a situation may be preferable to many for reasons of time, resource, and avoiding potentially damaging outcomes (particularly with regard to reputation). I imagine that these concerns, especially regarding reputation, lead many archaeologists to avoid media requests, especially if the request reveals a lack of understanding of archaeological principles.

Experienced archaeologists such as Brian Fagan (Fagan & Rose, 2003: 163) have noted the potential drain on time, perhaps with no financial compensation or, indeed, final output in many cases that engaging with television production companies can produce. In addition, many caution against involvement with what at first glance are programmes concerned with treasure hunting, or programmes that deal with pseudoarchaeology or 'nonsense' (Fagan & Rose, 2003: 163–64).

It is arguable that taking the time to engage in debate with alternative, untrained approaches to archaeology runs the risks of both giving more publicity to the theorists behind the spurious proposals being offered (especially if their motivations seem less than honourable), and also wasting one's own increasingly pressed-upon time. Flemming (2006: 49) has noted of pseudoscientists and pseudoarchaeologists that such an individual 'loves the limelight, seeks publicity by whatever means, and often challenges the boffins and nerds to come out of their laboratories and conduct the debate in public'. In this context, it is perhaps an understandable reaction of archaeologists not to wish to give these people attention (and hence the publicity) that engagement in discussion with them might elicit. There is also the risk of intellectual entrapment that becoming involved in such debates poses. However, opting not to engage with such voices comes with its own risks.

In a fascinating paper, Wilson (2012) discussed the case of Burrow's Cave, at once an extreme and outrageous example of pseudoarchaeology, while also a cautionary tale for refusing to engage with or talk to non-archaeologists. The south Illinois 'cave' filled with antiquities and treasures from hugely variant

cultures and time periods, alleged by some to be a real place (Wilson, 2012: 92), has been examined and discussed in a large number of popular amateur archaeology publications, while the archaeological profession have largely ignored it (Wilson, 2012: 74). Wilson's abstract to his paper ends with the observation with regard to non-professional engagements with archaeological activity that reside entirely outside of the academy, termed in the essay as 'out-sider archaeology', that:

> Professionals' disinterest has resulted in a dismissal of outsider archaeology en masse, leaving the worst abuses unchecked. This leaves the public with few clues to distinguish the impossible from the improbable, unorthodox, or iconoclastic. Audacious enterprises such as Burrow's are left to flourish, driving wedges between archaeologists and the interested public, preventing effective collaboration and dialogue. Burrow's Cave is a lesson for aspiring archaeologists: proof of what happens when professionals turn up their noses at opportunities for engagement with community interests. (Wilson, 2012: 73)

Many archaeologists will have come across cases of particular individuals, seemingly convinced of their own abilities and of the veracity of their theories. In many cases, archaeologists and archaeological organizations most closely affected by them may feel that they have little recourse for challenging these individuals or their activities, which can be small and local in scale. The hope generally seems to be that no adversity will result from their antics, and such individuals and groups are sometimes dismissed as eccentric and harmless.

Some archaeologists may even hope that, by ignoring a seemingly outlandish request, the exponent will take the hint that their idea is not acceptable or viable, and drop it all together. However, the reality may be that they are causing a lot more damage, if not always physically to archaeological heritage, then certainly in the message they are spreading about what archaeology is, apparently free of intervention or objection from the professionals. The same may be said of media production companies who produce television shows with little or no consultation from archaeologists. There is no guarantee that our views will be taken on board, or that programmes that result will be acceptable to archaeologists. However, of the three approaches that I have discussed, ignoring or refusing engagement seems to me to be the most problematic. This is due to the loss of opportunity to offer opinion, whether that is through an offer of collaboration or in the form of clearly expressed objection to a programme or concept. I am inclined to agree with Ewen's (2014) closing statement concerning engagement of archaeological organizations with the National Geographic Channel:

> Let's keep working with the National Geographic Channel to help them make shows that, if not something we want to watch, is at least something that doesn't offend our sensibilities. If this is a trend in programming, we need to take a proactive stance and work to make these shows less about finding past things and more finding things out about the past.

FINAL REFLECTIONS

It is ultimately difficult for me to say whether my decision to advise, based on the information that I had at the time, was the right one, and I am sure that different readers will have a variety of views on this matter. Certainly my intentions were well meant, although clearly good intentions do not prevent deplorable outcomes, whether it is a shocking television programme or the looting of a museum in a conflict zone. Considering the risk to my professional reputation posed by the notoriety of the programme, hindsight would scream at me to have simply said no. Distancing myself from the programme altogether, joining the highly vocal condemning of it without acknowledging my own role, would be disingenuous in the extreme.

Therefore this paper, I hope, helps to address, with reference to other experiences and contexts, the dilemma with which I was faced, and what lessons I may take from it.

Immediately following the release of the publicity material pertaining to Nazi War Diggers, I made it clear to the production company that I was deeply troubled by the presentation of the programme. This was such that I did not feel that I could conceivably have any continued connection whatsoever with the programme, its production, or any future plans the company might have. It is perhaps a lesson that I have learned the hard way, with regard to engaging with a project that, it appeared later, many refused to have any involvement with. Notwithstanding arguments to try to appreciate and understand alternative and non-archaeological approaches to the past (e.g. Holtorf, 2005), it is clear, not least from the responses to Nazi War Diggers when it was announced, that some of these perspectives are simply not acceptable to archaeologists. Certainly, at the time, I did not feel that I could justify refusing to engage in the pre-production process, knowing the potential scope within the chosen topic for unethical and even illegal activities, especially if the only other voices influencing the direction of the programme were those of non-archaeologists.

It is easy now for me to see why many archaeologists are reluctant to become involved with enquiries from media companies and others. Interestingly, I have heard anecdotally since the announcement of the programme of at least one individual who refused to be involved when asked, based on a previous experience in which the final programme had no resemblance to what they had hoped would be produced. I heard that another archaeologist had been in discussions to work with the company on future series development, until they had seen the publicity and footage, at which point they hastily withdrew. I have also seen through personal communications and internet discussions that yet more archaeologists, many with field experience of conflict sites, had opted not to advise or work with the production company to any great extent when approached. Of course, it is unclear whether greater engagement from the archaeological community would have produced a better programme or not. Nonetheless, it was enlightening for me, as someone who had recommended that the company seek the advice and assistance of archaeologists with appropriate field experience in this area (aware that I myself did not have this expertise), that seemingly this may have been attempted.

The experience has also been valuable intellectually, in that it has spurred me to think more deeply about the variety of approaches that are available to archaeologists when faced with requests or other interactions from problematic quarters. By broadly dividing the range of options into three categories—collaborating, condemning, and ignoring—I hope that I have demonstrated that ultimately it is not always possible to achieve the desired outcome, no matter how well-intentioned or conviction-led one's response may be.

REFERENCES

Addyman, P. & Brodie, N. 2002. Metal Detecting in Britain: Catastrophe or Compromise? In: N. Brodie & K. W. Tubb, eds. Illicit Antiquities: The Theft of Culture and the Extinction of Archaeology. London: Routledge, pp. 179–84.

Aldeman, K. 2008. Ethical Issues in Cultural Property Law Pertaining to Indigenous Peoples. Idaho Law Review, 45:515–38.

Aston, M. 2012. Publicizing Archaeology in Britain in the Late Twentieth Century. In: R. Skeates, C. McDavid & J. Carman, eds. The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 442–60.

Atalay, S., Clauss, L.R., McGuire, R.H. & Welch, J.R. 2014. Transforming Archaeology. In: S. Atalay, L.R. Clauss, R.H. McGuire & J.R. Welch, eds. Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 7–28.

Balme, J. & Wilson, M. 2004. Perceptions of Archaeology in Australia amongst Educated Young Australians. Australian Archaeology, 58:19–24.

Bland, R. 2005. A Pragmatic Approach to the Problem of Portable Antiquities: The Experience of England and Wales. Antiquity, 79(304):440–47.

Boardman, J. 2007. Archaeologists, Collectors and Museums. In: E. Robson, L. Treadwell & C. Gosden, eds. Who Owns Objects? The Ethics and Politics of Collecting Cultural Artefacts. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 33–46.

Brockman, A. 2014. Springtime for Hitler and Nazi War [Death Porn] Diggers. Heritage Daily [blog; online]. March 2014 [accessed 4 May 2014]. Available at: <http://www.heritagedaily.com/2014/03/springtime-for-hitler-and-nazi-war-death-porn-diggers/102632>

Brodie, N. & Proulx, B.B. 2014. Museum Malpractice as Corporate Crime? The Case of the J. Paul Getty Museum. Journal of Crime and Justice, 37(3):399–421, (ahead of print):1–23. DOI:10.1080/0735648X.2013.819785.

Clauss, L.R. 2014. Betwixt and Between: Archaeology's Liminality and Activism's Transformative Promise. In: S. Atalay, L. R. Clauss, R.H. McGuire & J.R. Welch, eds. Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, pp. 29–44.

Cooper, D.E. 2006. Truthfulness and 'Inclusion' in Archaeology. In: C. Scarre & G. Scarre, eds. The Ethics of Archaeology: Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 131–45.

Corbishley, M. 2011. Pinning Down the Past: Archaeology, Heritage, and Education Today. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport. 1996. Portable Antiquities Scheme. [online] March 1996 [accessed 24 July 2014]. Available at: http://finds.org.uk

Diggers. 2012. National Geographic Channel. [online] [accessed 4 May 2014] Available at: http://channel.nationalgeographic.com/channel/diggers

Dobat, A.S. 2013. Between Rescue and Research: An Evaluation after 30 Years of Liberal Metal Detecting in Archaeological Research and Heritage Practice in Denmark. European Journal of Archaeology, 16(4):704–25.

European Association of Archaeologists. 2009. The EAA Code of Practice [online] [accessed 19 April 2014]. Available at: <http://e-a-a.org/EAA_Code_of_Practice.pdf>

Ewen, C. 2014. Nazis, Ethics and Tolerance. Society of Historical Archaeology Blog [online] April 2014 [accessed 4 May 2014]. Available at: <http://www.sha.org/blog/index.php/2014/04/nazis-ethics-and-tolerance>

Fagan, B. & Rose, M. 2003. Ethics and the Media. In: L.J. Zimmerman, K.D. Vitelly & J. Hollowell-Zimmer, eds. Ethical Issues in Archaeology. Walnut Creek: Altamira, pp. 163–76.

Fagan, G.G. 2006. Diagnosing Pseudoarchaeology. In: G.G. Fagan, ed. Archaeological Fantasies: How Pseudoarchaeology Misrepresents the Past and Misleads the Public. London: Routledge, pp. 23–46.

Fagan, G.G. & Feder, K.L. 2006. Crusading Against Straw Men: An Alternative View of Alternative Archaeologies: Response to Holtorf (2005). World Archaeology, 38(4):718–29.

Ferris, N. & Welch, J.R. 2014. Beyond Archaeological Agendas: In the Service of a Sustainable Archaeology. In: S. Atalay, L.R. Clauss, R.H. McGuire & J.R. Welch, eds. Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, pp. 215–37.

Flatman, J., Chidester, R.C. & Gadsby, D.A. 2012. What Public Engagement in Archaeology Really Means. In: M. Rockman & J. Flatman, eds. Archaeology in Society: Its Relevance in the Modern World. New York: Springer, pp. 65–76.

Flemming, N.C. 2006. The Attraction of Non-Rational Archaeological Hypotheses: The Individual and Sociological Factors. In: G.G. Fagan, ed. Archaeological Fantasies: How Pseudoarchaeology Misrepresents the Past and Misleads the Public. London: Routledge, pp. 47–70.

Goddard, J. 2011. Anticipated Impact of the 2009 Four Corners Raid and Arrests. Crime Law and Social Change, 56(2):175–88.

Greer, S. 2014. The Janus View: Reflections, Relationships and a Community-Based Approach to Indigenous Archaeology and Heritage in Northern Australia. Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage, 1 (1):56–68.

Gregory, T. 1986. Whose Fault is Treasure-Hunting? In: C. Dobinson & R. Gilchrist, eds. Archaeology Politics and the Public. York: York University Archaeological Publications, pp. 25–27.

Hamilakis, Y. 2009. The 'War on Terror' and the Military–Archaeology Complex: Iraq, Ethics, and Neo-Colonialism. Archaeologies, 5(1):39–65.

Hardy, S. 2014a. National Geographic's Preparing a Q&A on Nazi War Diggers. It Can Use Mine. Conflict Antiquities [blog; online] 27 March 2014 [accessed 4 May 2014]. Available at: <http://conflictantiquities.wordpress.com/2014/03/27/national-geographic-clearstory-nazi-war-diggers-q-and-a>

Hardy, S. 2014b. The Latvian War Museum Does Not Approve of Nazi War Diggers. Conflict Antiquities [blog; online] 31 March 2014 [accessed 4 May 2014]. Available at: <http://conflictantiquities.wordpress.com/2014/03/31/national-geographic-clearstory-nazi-war-diggers-latvian-war-museum-contact>

Hart, S.M. & Chilton, E.S. 2014. Digging and Destruction: Artifact Collecting as Meaningful Social Practice. International Journal of Heritage Studies, DOI:10.1080/13527258.2014.934267.

Holtorf, C. 2004. Doing Archaeology in Popular Culture. In: H. Bolin, ed. The Interplay of Past and Present. Hiddinge: Södertörns högskola, pp. 42–49.

Holtorf, C. 2005. Beyond Crusades: How (Not) to Engage with Alternative Archaeologies. World Archaeology, 37(4):544–51.

King, T.F. 1983. Professional Responsibility in Public Archaeology. Annual Review of Anthropology, 12:143–64.

Lynott, M.J. 1997. Ethical Principles of Archaeological Practice: Development of an Ethics Policy. American Antiquity, 62(4):589–99.

Mashberg, T. 2014. National Geographic Channel Pulls 'Nazi War Diggers' Series. The New York Times [online] 31 March 2014 [accessed 4 May 2014]. Available at: <http://artsbeat.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/03/31/national-geographic-channel-pulls-nazi-war-diggers-series/?_php=true&_type=blogs&_r=0,>

McLung De Tapia, E. 2002. A First Look at Public Outreach in Mexican and Guatemalan Archaeology. SAA Archaeological Record, 2(2):27–29.

Moshenska, G. 2011. 'Impudent Lies': Rhetoric and Reality in Wartime Heritage Protection, 1943–2003. Present Pasts, 3 (1):68–70, DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/ pp.46.

Price, J. 2005. Orphan Heritage: Issues in Managing the Heritage of the Great War in Northern France and Belgium. Journal of Conflict Archaeology, 1(1):181–96.

Pyburn, K.A. 2014. Activating Archaeology. In: S. Atalay, L.R. Clauss, R.H. McGuire & J.R. Welch, eds. Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 197–213.

Ramos, M. & Duganne, D. 2000. Exploring Public Perceptions and Attitudes About Archaeology. Harris Interactive, Prepared for the Society of American Archaeologists [online] February 2000 [accessed 19 April 2014]. Available at: <http://www.saa.org/Portals/0/SAA/pubedu/nrptdraft4.pdf>

Rasmussen, J.M. 2014. Securing Cultural Heritage Objects and Fencing Stolen Goods? A Case Study on Museums and Metal Detecting in Norway. Norwegian Archaeological Review, 47(1):83–107.

Reece, K. 2006. Memoirs of a True Believer. In: G.G. Fagan, ed. Archaeological Fantasies: How Pseudoarchaeology Misrepresents the Past and Misleads the Public. London: Routledge, pp. 96–106.

Reid, P. 2012. Performance or Participation: The Relationship between Local Communities and the Archaeological Domain. In: G. Moshenska & S. Dhanjal, eds. Community Archaeology: Themes, Methods and Practices. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 18–27.

Renfrew, C. 2000. Loot, Legitimacy and Ownership. London: Duckworth.

Richards, J.D. & Naylor, J. 2009. The Real Value of Buried Treasure. VASLE: The Viking and Anglo-Saxon Landscape and Economy Project. In: S. Thomas & P.G. Stone, eds. Metal Detecting and Archaeology. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, pp. 167–79.

Richardson, L. 2013. A Digital Public Archaeology? Papers from the Institute of Archaeology, 23(1):10.

Scarre, G. 2006. Can Archaeology Harm the Dead? In: C. Scarre & G. Scarre, eds. The Ethics of Archaeology: Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 181–98.

Schmidt, P.R. 2014. Rediscovering Community Archaeology in Africa and Reframing its Practice. Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage, 1(1):37–55.

Seitsonen, O. & Herva, V-P. 2011. Forgotten in the Wilderness: WWII German PoW Camps in Finnish Lapland. In: A. Myers & G. Moshenska, eds. Archaeologies of Internment. New York: Springer, pp. 171–90.

Smith, L. & Waterton, E. 2009. Heritage, Communities and Archaeology. London: Duckworth.

Society of American Archaeology. 1996. Principles of Archaeological Ethics. Society of American Archaeology [online] [accessed 19 April 2014]. Available at: <http://saa.org/AbouttheSociety/PrinciplesofArchaeologicalEthics/tabid/203/Default.aspx>

Stone, P. 2005. The Identification and Protection of Cultural Heritage During the Iraq Conflict: A Peculiarly English Tale. Antiquity, 79(306):933–43.

Tarlow, S. 2006. Archaeological Ethics and the People of the Past. In: C. Scarre & G. Scarre, eds. The Ethics of Archaeology: Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 199–216.

Thomas, S. 2012. How STOP Started: Early Approaches to the Metal Detecting Community by Archaeologists and Others. In: G. Moshenska & S. Dhanjal, eds. Community Archaeology: Themes, Methods and Practices. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 42–57.

Wallwork, A. 2014. The Archaeology Paradox: More Laws, Less Treasure. Los Angeles Times [online] 7 April 2014 [accessed 4 May 2014]. Available at: <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/commentary/la-oe-wallwork-antiquities-law-downside-20140407,0,2487941.story#axzz30luESvKt>

Walters, G. & Kisiel, R. 2014. Fury Over the National Geographic Channel Historians Digging Up Second World War Graves. The Daily Mail [online] 28 March 2014 [accessed 4 May 2014]. Available at: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2591894/Fury-National-Geographic-channel-historians-digging-Second-World-War-graves.html

Wilson, J.A. 2012. The Cave Who Never Was: Outsider Archaeology and Failed Collaboration in the USA. Public Archaeology, 11(2):73–95.