Johanna Enqvist
THE NEW HERITAGE: A MISSING LINK BETWEEN FINNISH ARCHAEOLOGY AND CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY?

Abstract

For decades archaeologists in Finland have discussed the purpose of archaeological research and expressed the urge to increase archaeology's influence in society. However, this exchange of views has not fostered systematic scientific attempts to analyse the societal aspect of Finnish archaeology or the complicated relationship between heritage management and academic archaeology. Finnish archaeologists are eager to promote the importance of academic research and expertise in heritage management, even if the concept and study of heritage has been almost entirely neglected in Finnish archaeology. Critical examination of dominant conceptions and ideologies in the intersecting fields of Finnish heritage management and academic archaeology could advance the understanding and the rethinking of archaeology's role in the heritage process, or in society for that matter. A 'democratisation' of heritage, that is, insights into community participation and social inclusion, the New Heritage, could establish a link between archaeological knowledge and the well-being of people in contemporary and future societies. This requires the concepts of heritage, archaeology and heritage management to be distinguished and understood as key elements of self-contained but overlapping and connected realms, which can be analysed by conceptualising them as discourses.

Johanna Enqvist, Doctoral Programme for History and Cultural Heritage, P.O. Box 3, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland: johanna.enqvist@helsinki.fi.

INTRODUCTION

The redefinition and re-theorisation of 'heritage' is one of the main objectives of the emerging discipline of critical heritage studies. This multidisciplinary field of heritage and museum studies, which came about in the late 1980s, is an organised effort to compile new ideas about heritage and heritage management – also referred to as 'the New Heritage' (Fairclough et al. 2008; Holtorf & Fairclough 2013). In their provocative manifesto, the founders of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies (ACHS), Gary Campbell and Laurajane Smith, urge scholars to question 'the received wisdom of what heritage is' (Association of Critical Heritage Studies [ACHS] 2014). Smith (2006; 2012) refers to these conventional conceptions of heritage and the institutional framework in which they are reproduced by using the concept of the 'Authorised Heritage Discourse' (AHD): the dominating, traditional and mainly 'Western' way of understanding heritage. According to Smith, the AHD privileges monumentality and expertise and represents heritage as an official canon of sites and artefacts that sustain the 'Western' narratives of nation, class, and science. However, the new vision of heritage, attained with the critical gaze, comprises heritage as a dynamic process of 'doing' related to human action and agency (Harvey 2001: 327) and as the interaction between people and the world and among people themselves (Holtorf & Fairclough 2013: 198), not just as static material objects or things (Waterton & Smith 2009a).

This criticism of existing conceptions also concerns the process of defining heritage. The emancipatory goal designated for critical heritage

studies aims to promote and advance the participation of people and communities who have been marginalised in the creation and management of heritage. In connection with this vision, the relationship between indigenous people and heritage professionals has been one of the starting points and key issues in critical heritage studies (Skeates 2000; Smith 2004; 2006). Northern Finland is one of the homelands of the indigenous Sami people, and there is a strong interest, also expressed in recent publications (Harlin 2008; Magga & Ojanlatva 2013; Potinkara 2014), in explicitly acknowledging the self-determination of the Sami with regard to their heritage. Nevertheless, I contend that the claimed exclusion applies not merely to indigenous people and other minorities, but to all local communities or members of our society who have been left out of the evaluation and decision-making concerning places or objects meaningful to them. In addition to the critical examination of the conceptions and representations of heritage institutions, I argue that endorsing open and free access to data and knowledge about heritage is another important aspect of furthering the democratisation of heritage and the emergence of the 'Democratised Heritage Discourse' (DHD): pluralist, multivoiced, inclusive and dynamic understanding of heritage.

The revised concept of heritage has not been acknowledged or cultivated in the Finnish texts relating to heritage management or academic archaeology, two institutions that share a long history and mutual starting points, as well as some serious disagreements and contradictions (e.g. Immonen & Taavitsainen 2011). Contributions in the field of heritage management tend to reflect the criticised 'old way of looking at heritage', the AHD (Smith 2006; 2012), while academic archaeologists seem to have difficulties differentiating at all between archaeology, heritage and heritage management. As a matter of fact, not only is the concept of heritage ignored in Finland, but also the word itself. The direct translation of the English term 'heritage' in Finnish is 'perintö', but this term is used mainly in legal contexts referring to inherited property. Instead, the terms 'cultural heritage' (Fi. *kulttuuriperintö*) and 'archaeological cultural heritage' (Fi. *arkeologinen kulttuuriperintö*) are in common use, especially in the context of heritage management.

Since archaeology is, and has been, one of the major disciplines engaged with heritage, its influence on heritage management is undeniable, and the two practices are deeply intertwined (Smith 2004; 2012). However, conflating the concepts of archaeology, heritage and heritage management causes misunderstandings and complicates communication about the roles and involvement of different actors and practices in the heritage process, although this conceptual confusion has its historical roots and causes. The emergence of archaeology as a professional academic discipline in 19th-century Europe was integrally linked to developing notions of nationalism and national identity, which is the case in Finland too (Härö 1981; 2010: 129; Salminen 1993: 11–2; Immonen & Taavitsainen 2011: 142, 158; Jensen 2012). This connection has supported the rise of institutionalised national pasts (Rowlands 1994; Jensen 2012), as well as the importance of 'archaeological stewardship' in heritage management and archaeology's role as the dominant 'protector' of that past and heritage (Smith 2004). In order to analyse and understand the crucial distinction between heritage, archaeology and heritage management, they can be conceptualised as self-sustained but overlapping and connected discourses. I suggest that understanding and becoming conscious of the distinction between these concepts and the discourses they represent is vital for development, constructive communication, mutual understanding and cooperation in the Finnish heritage sector.

The article is structured as follows: Firstly, I discuss the key concepts related to critical heritage studies, namely the definitions and redefinitions of heritage, perspectives on heritage management, the method of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and the concept of the AHD (Smith 2006; 2012). Secondly, I briefly review the history of Finnish heritage management and academic archaeology, as well as some current administrative initiatives for the future. To counterpoint academic archaeologists' conceptions of heritage, I also offer a look into the overall situation of heritage studies in Finland. In connection with the key concepts of critical heritage studies, I describe some dominant features of the Finnish version of the AHD with examples drawn from the empirical data I have collected for my dissertation in progress: texts and documents relating to Finnish heritage management and archaeological research, as well as interviews with academic archaeologists and archae-

ologists working as heritage officials. My premise is that the concept of heritage, regardless of how it is or has been defined, captures a unique phenomenon that should be differentiated from the subject, results or process of archaeological research and the practices of heritage management (Waterton & Smith 2009b). Thirdly, starting from this presumption, I discuss the prospects of redefined heritage, the New Heritage, in Finland in the future.

DEFINITIONS AND REDEFINITIONS OF HERITAGE

As a consequence of their contextuality, concepts and their meanings change in the course of time. Also, the definitions of 'heritage' are multiple, dynamic and dependent on historical, cultural, social and institutional contexts (on the history of heritage definitions, see e.g. Davison 2008). It is obvious that we have just one term, but several concepts of heritage. And these concepts do not have strict boundaries; instead, they demonstrate deeply intertwining, overlapping and interacting aspects of the phenomena called heritage. The contexts out of which these conceptions emerge may not be comparable in varying eras and countries or cultural areas; the meaning is bound to the situation. Nevertheless, when the numerous definitions of heritage are explored, it is essential to figure out whether they concern what heritage is or what it *ought* to be (Carman 2002: 5). In this article, for instance, the description of the AHD in present-day Finland answers the former question and the vision of the democratised heritage, the New Heritage or the DHD, is a proposal for the latter.

As stated by Lowenthal (1998: 95), heritage is a term that 'all but defies definition'. Perhaps defining heritage as a general concept is out of our reach or even unnecessary, if all that exists around us has the potential to become heritage, as Holtorf and Fairclough (2013: 199) argue. According to Skeates (2000: 9), heritage *can* be defined in general terms on two different levels constructed according to the established usages of the term: 1) as a description of a physical entity shaped by human action (Layton & Ucko 1999: 1, as quoted by Skeates 2000: 9) and 2) as an expression of the meanings, values and claims based on that material (Hodder 1993: 17, as quoted by Skeates 2000: 9). Skeates (2000:

9–10) also applies this division to archaeological heritage, which he defines similarly as 1) the material culture of past societies that survives in the present and 2) the process through which the material culture of past societies is re-evaluated and reused in the present. Redefined heritage, the New Heritage, assimilates these two levels, material things and the process they are engaged with, further into different aspects of one concept. They are complementary rather than exclusive.

The authorised and official definitions of heritage, used and maintained by Western heritage institutions and management agencies, have foundations in international conventions and charters, as well as in legislation and codes of conduct on the national level (Skeates 2000; Smith 2006). UNESCO's (1972) World Cultural and Natural Heritage Convention, for example, defines heritage broadly as an inheritance and 'our legacy from the past', but the term 'cultural heritage' is used in a more restricted way, to refer to 'monuments, groups of buildings and sites with historical, aesthetic, archaeological, scientific, ethnological or anthropological value'. The definition of 'World Heritage Site' narrows the scope further to 'the best possible examples of the cultural heritage' of 'outstanding universal value'. These definitions mirror UNESCO's global perspective towards humanity and the idea of the unity of humankind. But when considered critically, they also reflect and promote the political ideals and academic interests of UNESCO's advisors in the late 1960s and early 1970s Skeates 2000: 11–2). Thus, heritage is a context-bound product of categorisation: particular things placed in certain conceptual boxes and hierarchies (Carman 2002). However, institutionalised and authorised heritage, defined in international conventions, certainly is a political idea too (Davison 2008: 36), as presentations of heritage are always connected to the context of political agendas and wider conceptions of popular contemporary memory (Harvey 2001). After all, the social groups with the most power have the best opportunity to have their story or experience commemorated as the correct version of the past (Byrne 2008: 154).

Referring to Skeates' (2000) division of heritage definitions, authorised views tend to emphasise physical entities, whereas the critical perspective on heritage is focused on the concep-

tion of heritage as a process of constant meaning-making and evaluation in present-day societies. The viewpoint of critical heritage studies is refined in Smith's (2006) claim that heritage can be understood only within the discourses we construct about it, even if heritage has a physical aspect or reality. The discourse regulates not only the way we speak or write about heritage, but the whole process in which heritage is being produced and represented (Waterton et al. 2006). This means that conceptualising heritage as a discursive process is essential for understanding the dynamic and changing meanings of heritage and how the representations of heritage are created in certain socio-cultural contexts. According to this view, heritage is primarily a social construction and thus ontologically different from material entities categorised as heritage – or physical remains positioned as the subject of research in archaeology, for that matter.

Like heritage, discourse is a particularly broad analytical concept that has been widely used in the humanities and the social sciences since the 1960s. Norman Fairclough (1992), one of the founders of the method known as Critical Discourse Analysis, defines discourse as 'a practice not just of representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning'. According to Fairclough, discourse can refer to both the subject of knowledge and the conventions of producing knowledge (Fairclough 1992: 127–8). One of the most eminent contributors to the theory of discourse, Michel Foucault, defines discourse generally as conventional and consistent ways of talking and writing about something; however, Foucault's thinking was fluid and he used the word inconsistently throughout his career (Alhanen 2007: 48–9, 205; Foucault 1969: 105–6). Foucault's (1971) more ideologically charged definition describes discourse as 'violence against things', as he states that it is the discursive practice that guides the way we communicate but also alters the subject of the communication.

The analogy of discourse thus presents heritage as a series of situations in which we choose from resources enabled and limited by overlapping contexts: personal, institutional, natural, social and cultural, as well as those of time and space. These choices concern the tangible, any material substance, or the *things* that we want to interact with, and the intangible, the concep-

tions, meanings, intentions and values, to which we have committed ourselves. Consequently, the relationship between tangible and intangible, or the 'proportion' of material to immaterial, in the heritage process has been one of the key issues under discussion in the heritage field (e.g. Carman 2009; Smith & Akagawa 2009; Swensen et al. 2013).

Smith's notion of Stonehenge as just 'a collection of rocks in the field' is related to her claim that 'all heritage is intangible' (Smith 2006: 3, 54; for critique and discussion, see Solli et al. 2011 and Pétursdóttir 2013). This conclusion stresses the socially constructed and discursive nature of the concept: redefined heritage is not a 'thing' or a 'site'; it is a mentality, an experience or an act of remembering that engages with the present. Heritage is thus culturally ascribed, rather than universal and intrinsic to things (Waterton & Smith 2009a; Harrison 2010: 26). Accepting the intangible nature of heritage does not rule out the fact that intangibility needs to be attached to something tangible in order to exist at all (Smith 2006: 3; Carman 2009: 193). And these attachments do not appear randomly, the tangible matters as well. Material entities become elements of heritage when they are given meanings and attached to ideas, interpretations and identities of communities, groups and individuals. In this process, tangible objects can evoke emotions, values and memories, or they can be expressed as documents or embodiments of the intangible.

Immonen (2012) has aptly described the heritage process, 'heritageisation', as 'material-discursive processes in which both the matter and meaning are actively involved'. I agree with Immonen in casting aside such divisions as those made between the tangible and intangible. Nevertheless, he remarks that materiality has the potential to interfere and create, to advance new systems of signification for the process of heritageisation. It is noteworthy that this description of active and generative materiality, which is also the central idea behind the 'material turn' or 'symmetrical archaeology' (e.g. Witmore 2007; Olsen 2010; 2012), is different from the stagnated and frozen objects proclaimed by the AHD (Immonen 2012: 157). Nonetheless, Harrison (2013a: 113) has suggested that heritage studies have not yet adequately theorised the material affect of 'things'; the relationships between people, things and their

environment should be considered more thoroughly. This interaction between material things and humans – who are also material beings – is especially important in discussing the concept of archaeological heritage, as materiality is the essential element of archaeology.

Distinguishing between heritage and archaeology

Although the heritage process, archaeology and heritage management are tightly connected and overlapping social activities, they each occupy their own historically, culturally and socially constructed sphere with particular regulations, conceptual systems and inner coherence, which depend on their history, purpose and relation to society (Waterton & Smith 2009a&b; Watson 2009; Henson 2009). In the analysis of their substance and interaction, these realms can be conceptualised as discourses, in which their differing ontological and epistemological commitments create the frames guiding the classification of the world, actions and communication (Smith 2006). David Lowenthal (1998: 4) has pointed out that heritage and history 'serve quite different purposes'. The same can be claimed for heritage and archaeology. Archaeology is about searching for truth (Muurimäki 2007: 99), but heritage is about seeking meaning – in the process of which the truth of archaeology is not necessarily relevant.

A heritage object does not have to be old or 'authentic', and a fictional reference can also accord heritage status to a real location (Carman 2009: 196–7). However, some of the acts of meaning-making in heritage discourses may be archaeological, and archaeological excavation is a part of the process of creating heritage (Waterton & Smith 2009a: 16). For example, in the controversial case of the Susiluola Cave in Finland (Immonen & Taavitsainen 2011: 162–3), the cave is, and would continue to be, an element of heritage even if the alleged traces of a pre-glacial Neanderthal settlement site were somehow proven to be misinterpreted once and for all. Thus, the archaeological record (Lucas 2012), the interpretations and intellectual work of archaeologists, documentation and other practices, as well as all the representations produced by archaeologists – regardless of their 'truthfulness' – compose a type of heritage that can be called

the 'archaeological heritage' (Carman 2002). Or a tangible object in a heritage process can be 'archaeological' in the sense that it is abandoned, ruined or discarded, even if it has no or minimal value for archaeological research. The heritage process, which transforms archaeological objects into heritage, is based on negotiation in the processes of identity making, social change, ideology and performative interaction (Watson 2009: 28–31).

Nevertheless, it is problematic if the concept of 'archaeological heritage' is used to privilege and legitimate *only* archaeological interpretations of certain kinds of tangible entities, or to leave decisions concerning 'archaeological' objects to be made *only* by archaeologists. After all, archaeology is only one perspective, albeit an authorised one, into the construction of meanings (Waterton & Smith 2009a: 16). Consequently, the New Heritage is pluralist by nature; it is an amalgam of heritages that can be understood as a system of discursive processes in certain contexts. There are no 'rules' for the New Heritage, other than the ethical demand to respect the views and ideologies of other people, even ones that are different from or contradictory to our own. However, the moral demand for public participation in the heritage process resonates with the appreciation of universal principles of freedom, equality and human rights. If democracy is positioned as the ideological background for the New Heritage, it also means that duties and regulations set by the democratic system have to be respected.

Value is embedded within the concept of heritage, and heritage is a category of valuable things. But the values and meanings of heritage cannot be derived directly from material features or scientific facts – revealed, observed or stated by archaeologists. This is comparable to the principle known as Hume's Law or Hume's Guillotine (referring to philosopher David Hume, 1711–76), which states that 'no ethical or indeed evaluative conclusion whatsoever may be validly inferred from any set of purely factual premises' (Cohon 2010). Furthermore, studies with a perspective on community or public values remind us that because the heritage management process is often both emotional and conflict-ridden, it cannot be reduced to a scientific practice (Waterton 2005). The values and conceptions of the public or some interest group, such as metal detector users (e.g. Thomas 2012), can be studied and

thus 'converted' to factual data, which would be a useful, even necessary, basis for any ethical or evaluative decision related to heritage issues. But this data cannot be produced with the traditional methods of archaeology.

The idea of archaeology as a discourse is not a new one. In connection with the postprocessual theory of archaeology, it has been discussed, for example, by Shanks and Tilley (1987), who described the archaeological discourse as 'a structured system of rules, conventions and meanings for the production of knowledge, texts'. However, as Smith (2004) has stressed, postprocessualists (e.g. Shanks & Tilley 1989; Hodder 1999) reduced the concept of discourse to language issues only and failed to examine power/knowledge relations beyond academic archaeology. While postprocessual theory focused on archaeology and its texts, discourse, epistemology and ideology, it offered few clues for understanding how archaeological knowledge may move between contexts or what are the consequences of the interplay between archaeology and heritage management or wider social, cultural or heritage issues (Smith 2004: 56). Thus, archaeological theory, processual or postprocessual, cannot explain the consequences of archaeological practice within heritage management or the interaction of archaeological theory and practice with governmental and political concerns (Smith 2004: 34).

What separates the discourses of archaeology, processual or postprocessual, from the discourses of heritage, are their different purposes, contents, referents, range and scope. While heritage might refer to the same material culture as archaeology, it is broader in its range of both tangible and intangible referents. Only a small proportion of the archaeological record, the selection of objects that meet certain conditions, enters the wider realm of heritage within which it is entangled with social, cultural and more often economical values (Carman 2002).

KEY CONCEPTS OF CRITICAL HERITAGE STUDIES

The interdisciplinary academic field of critical heritage studies has grown out of critiques of the use of the past in nation-building, and questions concerning the politics of heritage representations remain of interest to research (for more detailed history, see e.g. Harrison 2013a). As

mentioned above, the perspective of the critical approach is based on the conception that heritage is a series of discursive practices, a cultural process implicated in power relations and ideological constructs. In addition, there has been increasing acknowledgement of the political aspects of 'doing archaeology' and the consequences of the archaeological discourse beyond the accumulation of knowledge about the past (Smith 2004). Studies and theorisations founded on these ideas, as well as critical analyses, have accumulated in the literature of the emerging heritage field since the 1980s (e.g. Lowenthal 1985; 1998; Wright [1985] 2009; Hewison 1987; Cleere 1989; Urry 1990; Byrne 1991; Fowler 1987; 1992; Miller et al. 1989; Bond & Gilliam 1994; Ashworth & Tunbridge 1996; Carman 1996; 2002). Therefore, it should be noted that Smith's (2006; 2012) approach regarding the AHD is just one refinement, albeit an influential one, of this body of work in heritage.

Theorisation of Heritage Management

The emergence of academic interest in heritage could be seen as a reaction to or a continuum of the increasing concern over the conservation of natural and cultural heritage and the institutionalisation of heritage management in the 1960s and 1970s (Smith 2008: 67). Heritage management, also called cultural heritage management (CHM) (in the UK and Australia) and cultural resource management (CRM) (in the US), or correspondingly archaeological resource management (ARM) and archaeological heritage management (AHM) when dealing with archaeological material, is currently one of the principal occupations of archaeologists outside of academia (Smith 2004; 2008). Most countries nowadays have heritage management systems that are typically state-run and based on the principles of value and significance (Schofield 2008: 27). Heritage management refers to all the practices, processes and procedures, usually informed and supported by legislation and public policy, used to protect, preserve and/or conserve cultural heritage items, sites, buildings, places and monuments. And AHM is the process through which the archaeological record is preserved and maintained, but also defined for future research. From the perspective of a critical theoretical framework, in the process archaeological knowledge and theory are

institutionalised within state institutions and discourses, and archaeology itself gains disciplinary authority and identity (Smith 2004; 2008: 62–3).

Thus, management is not simply a series of 'technical processes', as traditionally understood in established discourses of archaeology (e.g. Cleere 1989). Instead, management can be described more accurately as processes that manage and protect heritage, and in doing so, construct and define relations between archaeologists or other heritage professionals and stakeholders, public and community interests and government (Smith 2004: 6–9). Although management is separate from archaeological research, it is integral to the discipline. Nevertheless, heritage management carries the burden of being devalued as an activity that contributes little to archaeological research (Renfrew 1983; Carman 1991). And archaeologists working in management are often criticised for not doing 'real' archaeology (Clarke 1993) – a well-known accusation aimed at Finnish heritage officials as well.

However, as Smith (2004: 8) points out, the way in which archaeological sites are managed, what is chosen to be preserved or destroyed, has obvious and often irreversible impacts on archaeological research. And more importantly with regard to society, it is explicitly through the processes of management that archaeologists encounter other groups and interests who perceive the archaeological record not as scientific data but as heritage (Smith 2004: 2). Management, therefore, maintains heritage processes which function as one vital link between the contributions of archaeology and the interests of society. Since science is an integrated part of Western societies, it is justified to say that the discipline of archaeology itself is also inevitably influenced by political and ideological values or social and economical aspects (Jensen 2012: 22). Likewise, Smith (2004: 8) argues that archaeology cannot be seen as an 'innocent bystander', as archaeological practices, theories and knowledge have been the underpinning elements in the development and enactment of management processes. She asserts that especially processual theory, the science-based 'New Archaeology', has played a constitutive role in the creation of management policies (Smith 2004: 33–43; 2008: 67–9). Smith notes further (2004: 12; 2008: 68) that it is in the interests of archaeologists to persistently invoke the discourse of 'processual rationality' to maintain both their

authority as intellectuals and their access to the archaeological database.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Waterton, Smith and Campbell (2006) have advocated the usefulness of CDA in heritage studies. In a case study on the Burra Charter (ICOMOS 1979, revised in 1981, 1988, 1999 and 2013), they have demonstrated the capability of CDA to expose the underlying function of discourse as a framework that defines the creating of oral or textual expressions of heritage. International and national documents concerning heritage management and protection, such as charters, conventions, recommendations and legislation, reflect political atmospheres, intentions and interests. Together with texts interpreting and applying those documents, such as statements and opinions of the authorities, they form a complicated network of texts that are related and refer to each other intertextually (Fairclough 2003: 218; Waterton & Smith 2009a: 17). This body of texts also serves as empirical data for the analysis of discourses.

The CDA method emerged in the 1980s and 1990s to analyse how and why certain conventions of conceptualising reality gain their dominant position. In the 2000s the method has evolved to become more multidisciplinary, but the relationship between discourse and power has endured as the focus of research. The common principle for all approaches of discourse analysis is the conception of language as a social action constructing reality (Pietikäinen & Mäntynen 2009: 26). It is noteworthy that CDA represents a 'moderate' or 'contingent' form of social constructivism (Fairclough 2010: 5). This perception does not imply that *all* reality is socially constructed. Therefore, in the context of heritage, discourse could be understood as a frame that guides not only the acts of speaking or writing but also the way we interact with our environment, observe and experience things and engage with our surroundings. After all, we are material beings and our bodily and symbolic practices are deeply intertwined (Määttänen 2009).

Waterton, Smith and Campbell (2006) assert that becoming conscious of the discursive and multivoiced nature of heritage could provide solutions to conflicts and enable the social inclusion of communities with competing interests.

Analysing discourses reveals how they construct our social reality and conventions that are transmuted into an 'inevitable' and 'naturalised' way of organising the world (Waterton et al. 2006: 343). Thus, the subject of discourse analysis is society, power relations and ideologies, not language itself or other media of representations produced in the discourse.

The Authorised Heritage Discourse

Smith's (2006; 2012) concept of the Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD) is one of the most important contributions to the development of critical heritage studies and a widely accepted analytical tool. Smith draws on case studies from the UK, Australia and the USA to argue that the dominating and traditional way of understanding heritage, the AHD, privileges monumentality and expertise and represents heritage as an official canon of sites and artefacts that sustain the 'Western' narratives of nation, class and science. These 'heritage lists' and the practice of 'listing' are integral elements of the AHD. Within the AHD, the management and preservation of heritage is understood as the conservation of material remains and managing the physical entities in order to guard their authenticity (see also Skeates 2000: 62). Smith (2006,;2012) asserts that the dominating discourse is created and maintained by the authorising institutions of heritage, primary documents, processes and practices. This means that the significance of heritage and its management and use are defined in international conventions and charters (e.g. ICOMOS1964; UNESCO 1972) and key texts at a national level (e.g. heritage legislation, codes of practice etc.). And when these documents emphasise aesthetic and scientific values, monumentality and physicality, the alternative interpretations and meanings or the dark and dissonant nature of the past are excluded (Smith 2006).

As a form of heritage itself, the AHD varies in different situations and contexts depending on what kind of heritage and expertise it involves (Smith 2006). The social, economic and political development and history of the country in question all have an effect on the characteristics of the official heritage discourse as well. Thus, the ideas of the AHD are 'made operational' at national and local levels of heritage management (Harrison 2010: 29). Discourses are themselves redefined in communication, and they may have sub-discourses or opposing counter-discourses (Waterton et al. 2006: 340). Heritage management and academic archaeology could be understood as two intertwined but competing discourses, or sub-discourses within one dominant discourse defined by their institutional contexts. Smith (2004; 2012) argues that since archaeology is, and has been, one of the major disciplines engaged with heritage since the emergence of the concept, a critical understanding of the nature, history and consequences of archaeological interactions and practices is vital in order to challenge the AHD and improve communication between heritage officials, archaeologists and community interests.

HERITAGE MANAGEMENT AND RESEARCH IN FINLAND

Although the current general scope of institutional heritage is internationally agreed to include 'tangible' and 'intangible', as well as 'digital' and 'environments' (UNESCO 1972; 2003a; 2003b; Council of the European Union 2014), there is no uniformity with regard to the finer terminology of heritage between countries (Ahmad 2006). And the scopes and definitions of many concepts are bound to the arrangement and hierarchy of the national governments. Thus, 'heritage' or 'cultural heritage' and terms related to them can have several more or less explicit meanings in different administrative branches or agencies. The conceptual system admitted and applied by the Finnish heritage administration, for example, is one representation and an integral part of the AHD in Finland. It reflects the development of scientific, intellectual and political thought represented in texts and documents at the international and national levels, but also the history and arrangement of national institutions and organisations.

Archaeological research in Finland has a long engagement with heritage management (Immonen & Taavitsainen 2011). This intertwined relationship, also connected to nationalism, is the prevailing condition in many Western countries (Waterton & Smith 2009a: 10), and the foundation of the role of archaeologists as the main guardians of the past (Rowlands 1994; Smith 2004; Jensen 2012). The founding of the Finnish antiquarian administration and academic archaeology was closely related to the development of cultural and scientific policy in the 19th century. As part of the

Swedish kingdom until 1809, Finland had a long tradition of antiquarian interests, with the oldest antiquarian legislation originating in the 17th century. But it was the autonomous position of the Grand Duchy of Finland in the Russian empire, the Finnish 'national awakening' and the romantic 'Fennomania movement' that drew attention to the essence and roots of the nation (Härö 1981; 2010: 129; Salminen 1993: 11–2; Immonen & Taavitsainen 2011: 142, 158). This newborn nationalism led to the development of the 'national disciplines', of which archaeology focused on the systematic investigation of antiquities as tangible evidence for the construction of the nation's history and identity (Härö 1981; Immonen & Taavitsainen 2011: 158–9).

'The Archaeological Bureau' (renamed 'The Archaeological Commission' in 1908), the predecessor of the National Board of Antiquities (NBA), in Finnish Museovirasto, the Finnish cultural heritage state authority, was established in 1884 to manage the 'ancient relics' (Fi. *muinaismuisto*) of the nation (Härö 1981: 200; 2010: 131; Immonen & Taavitsainen 2011: 144). The Commission was reorganised as the NBA in 1972 (Härö 2010: 142). Today this same state authority defines itself as 'the nation's specialist, service provider, developer and authority in *material cultural heritage* and *the cultural environment* field' [emphasis by author] on its homepage (National Board of Antiquities 2013a). In the current organisation of the NBA, the Department of Cultural Environment Protection is responsible for expert and official tasks related to archaeological sites and finds; archaeological field services are provided by the Department of Cultural Environment Management. The director general of the NBA was traditionally given the honorary title of 'State Archaeologist' until the year 2010. This historically rooted tribute describes the influence of archaeology and archaeologists on Finnish heritage management in the past. Another relic from the early days of the antiquarian administration is the English translation of Museovirasto: 'National Board of Antiquities' – antiquities, not heritage.

The old sparring partners: management and academia

It is particularly interesting that before the appointment of the Archaeological Bureau in 1884, there was a difference of opinion about the roles of the Bureau and especially the head of the Bureau, the State Archaeologist – whether they would primarily act as administrative or scientific institutions. 'The father of Finnish archaeology', J.R. Aspelin, who also became the first State Archaeologist in 1885, underlined the importance of scientific research. He tried to gain an independent position with relation to the Bureau on the basis of his scientific expertise and international, especially Swedish, models of organising the administration. In spite of his efforts, the mandate was diminished in the final guiding principle concerning the authority and duties of the State Archaeologist (Härö 1981: 152–3; 2010: 130). More than a century later, the dispute about the primary agenda and objectives of Finnish heritage management still continues.

The department of archaeology at the University of Helsinki and the NBA worked in the same premises until the relocation of academic archaeologists in 1989. This final, concrete division sealed the juxtaposition of academic archaeology and heritage management in Finland, although a rift between the two was already growing before the transfer of the academia as academic archaeology was evolving and the number of archaeologists working in universities increasing. In the 1960s and 1970s, archaeology was accepted into the curricula of two other universities, the University of Turku and the University of Oulu, and permanent chairs in archaeology were founded in 1969 in Turku and in 1996 in Oulu (Immonen & Taavitsainen 2011: 155–6).

According to the Finnish Antiquities Act (1963), the NBA possesses the authority to define and identify archaeological heritage to be protected and preserved, but the academic community has constantly challenged this mandate and questioned the expertise of the NBA. Some of the research projects directed by the NBA's former Department of Archaeology were compromised by problems of credibility in the 1990s and 2000s (Immonen & Taavitsainen 2011: 162–3). The most debated projects were the excavations at the Iron Age site of Varikkoniemi in Hämeenlinna (e.g. Schulz & Schulz 1993; Taavitsainen 2005: 22–6) and the fieldwork conducted at the Susiluola Cave in Karijoki (e.g. Schulz et al. 2002; Donner 2007; 2008; Núñez 2007; 2008; Schulz & Rostedt 2008).

An expression of the persistent contradiction between management and academia was aired re-

cently, when a lecturer at the University of Helsinki, archaeologist Antti Lahelma, questioned the credibility and expertise of the NBA in Finland's leading national newspaper (Lahelma 2013). According to Lahelma, his text articulates 'the concern of academia' over the diminishing of scientific research in public administration, that is, heritage management, and demands a return to 'real expertise, which arises from research' [translations by author]. Lahelma's text (2013) perfectly demonstrates archaeologists' tendency to see heritage as a synonym for material remains and primarily as an object of archaeological research that can be managed and interpreted only with the appropriate academic education, professional ethics and experience in academic research.

This claimed lack of archaeological competence in the NBA, also expressed explicitly by the chair in archaeology at the University of Turku, Jussi-Pekka Taavitsainen (Taavitsainen & Immonen 2013: 10), is apparently based on the fact that the majority of the present-day heritage officials are educated in disciplines other than archaeology, as well as on the fact that most of the heritage officials trained as archaeologists do not have doctoral degrees in archaeology. If heritage and its management are conflated with the discipline of archaeology, these allegations might be pertinent. Probably for the same reason, some archaeologists consider the democratisation of heritage as a threat to professional archaeology – a challenge to archaeologists' monopoly of interpretation similar to the rise of postprocessual archaeology in the 1980s (Trigger 2006: 447–52).

Several initiatives on the way

Discussion about the nature of, and criteria for, evaluating, preserving and classifying archaeological heritage has accelerated in recent years, and there are several initiatives underway or to be launched in the Finnish cultural heritage sector. One reason for this activity is a generally acknowledged need to revise the Finnish Antiquities Act, which replaced the former Statute for Preserving Ancient Monuments (1883) in 1963. Prepared in the 1950s, the 50-year-old Act is a product of a completely different age and society than the Finland of our times. Applying it in contemporary situations causes serious difficulties, especially due to the obscure definitions of the remains to be protected, the criteria for their evaluation or

the demands for the sufficient research required (e.g. Halinen 2013). Related to the updating of the Antiquities Act, the NBA's department of Cultural Environment Protection is planning a 'Guide to Archaeological Cultural Heritage' (Fi. *Arkeologisen kulttuuriperinnön opas*), which would serve as an official catalogue for identifying and categorising archaeological sites and regulating their protection. The NBA is willing to produce the Guide in co-operation with academic archaeologists, and thus tools enabling broad participation, such as wiki platforms, will be used (pers.comm. Mikko Härö).

The Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture and the Ministry of the Environment have produced the National Cultural Environment Strategy, which was approved by the Government in March 2014 (Ministry of the Environment 2014). The strategy presents a slightly redefined concept of the cultural environment that includes intangible values and meanings in addition to the elements of archaeological and built heritage and cultural landscapes. Finland also joined the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO 2003a) in 2013. The identification and definition of various elements of intangible cultural heritage and the taking of national inventories are entrusted to the NBA's Department of Development Service (Ministry of Education and Culture 2013). In addition, Finland was elected to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee in November 2013, and the preparation of the National World Heritage Strategy 2015 is under way. The successful completion of all of these initiatives is an enormous mission that requires a profound understanding of the past, a rigorous examination of the present and visionary thinking about the future. Most importantly, these tasks cannot be carried out without contemplating the concept of heritage.

As an especially positive sign of political will and the government's potential to renew its conceptions of heritage, Finland is preparing the ratification of the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society – the Faro Convention (Council of Europe 2005). The Faro Convention's perspective on heritage is quite different from the more conservative views of the previous conventions of the Council of Europe (1992), ICOMOS (1964) and UNESCO (1972). It offers an alternative definition of heritage as part of the daily lives and experiences of people, 'heritage communities' consisting 'of people who

value specific aspects of cultural heritage which they wish, within the framework of public action, to sustain and to transmit to future generations' (Fojut 2009). The Faro Convention encourages the democratisation of heritage by promoting citizen participation and better governance based on more open, reactive and transparent institutions. These objectives have been actively pursued in Finland through launching an open web-based survey and maintaining a discussion group for citizens (Otakantaa.fi 2014). The Faro Convention also engages heritage with one of the major concerns of our time, climate change, when cultural heritage and culture in general are placed at the centre of a new vision for sustainable development. The Faro Convention stands out from UNESCO's Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) by focusing primarily on ascribed values rather than on the material or immaterial elements of heritage (Council of Europe 2014).

Scattered picture of heritage studies

Systematic investigation of heritage, especially from the critical perspective, is just starting to evolve in Finnish academia. The structures of higher education have recently been reorganised in Finland, and this reform led to the creation of new research schools and doctoral programmes in the universities at the beginning of 2014. The title of one of the recently launched doctoral programmes at the University of Helsinki, 'History and Cultural Heritage', implies that the old division between culture and nature is considered necessary in the context of heritage studies. Naturally, this idea can also be comprehended as a reflection of the distinctions still seen in many international conventions, such as UNESCO's (1972) World Heritage Convention.

Research that could be classified under the label of 'heritage studies' has been conducted at all universities in Finland that offer studies in humanities, social sciences, architecture or community planning. However, at the moment only the University of Turku offers doctorate-level education in a subject called 'cultural heritage studies'. Otherwise, heritage studies are scattered as a perspective within several subjects, such as museology (Vilkuna 2003), cultural anthropology (Korjonen-Kuusipuro 2013), history (Sivula 2010), art history (Pohjamo 2011), architecture

(Rönkkö 2012), landscape studies (Korhonen 2010), ethnology and folklore (Petrisalo 2001). To my knowledge, there is only one study, carried out by historian Tanja Vahtikari (2013), which applies the concept of AHD (Smith 2006) to a Finnish case, the World Heritage City of Old Rauma. However, the approaches of critical heritage studies, such as the AHD, are acknowledged in the most recent literature regarding cultural heritage (e.g. Tuomi-Nikula et al. 2013).

Research concerning the construction of the past and meanings, interests and intentions attached to archaeological heritage has been conducted by historians (Fewster 2006; Ahl-Waris 2010) and folklorists (Aarnipuu 2008), but the few contributions of archaeologists in the field of heritage have mainly been studies of the ideological and scholarly history of Finnish archaeology (Salminen 1993; 2003). The arguments that emphasise the significance of academic archaeology as a core of expertise in heritage management seem unfounded in the light of the academic dissertations in Finnish archaeology. In 2000–2014, a total of 39 dissertations were written in the universities of Helsinki (14 in total), Turku (9 in total) and Oulu (16 in total), of which only 19 dissertations are available in electronic form – perhaps symptomatic of the poor availability of, and restricted access to, the results of archaeological research in general. Searching for the word 'heritage' (or Fi. *kulttuuriperintö*) in these digital documents reveals that only two authors mention 'cultural heritage' or 'archaeological heritage' at least twice (Viitanen 2010:12, 17; Äikäs 2011: 129, 153) – but neither discusses these concepts any further.

In the rest of the dissertations, the authors make no references whatsoever to any of the concepts of heritage, cultural heritage or archaeological heritage. It is evident, although with some exceptions (e.g. Immonen 2012; Ikäheimo 2010), that Finnish archaeologists have not considered the concept of (cultural) heritage relevant for their research or worth exploring. Thus far it remains unclear what academic archaeology actually has to offer for heritage studies and heritage management in Finland.

The AHD in Finland

In the Finnish case, heritage is apparently one of the key concepts in the discourse of heritage management. But as heritage is hardly ever men-

tioned in the texts of academic archaeology, the conceptualisation on heritage in the academic discourse remains implicit and has to be reconstructed through analysis. My preliminary observations suggest that there is an interesting dissonance between the conceptions reflected in texts and the impressions archaeologists express in interviews. The archaeologists I interviewed (in 2013–14) were not familiar with the latest research in heritage studies, and could not provide sophisticated definitions of 'archaeological heritage' or 'heritage' in general when asked to define these concepts. Actually, some of the academic archaeologists had never really contemplated the concept of archaeological heritage, and could not indicate any difference between archaeological heritage and material remains of archaeological interest. The concept of archaeological heritage is merely used as a synonym for material remains and archaeological sites in written documents. However, especially archaeologists working as heritage officials had an intuitive understanding of the idea that *archaeological heritage is something more than just archaeological sites or objects*.

In spite of this apparent controversy, the offerings of the AHD are usually accepted when textual representations of archaeological heritage are created. After all, heritage administrators are not representing themselves, but the NBA and its 'official gaze' on heritage, or more precisely, their impressions of this 'authorised' perspective. Furthermore, some Finnish heritage officials with a degree in archaeology seem to have a strong identity as archaeologists that also binds them to the discourse of academic archaeology. As a consequence, when writing statements they promote the importance of 'scientific facts' by referring to observable and measurable features of archaeological sites or accepted interpretations in research. Understandably, the articulations of the academic archaeologists do not challenge the AHD, quite the contrary. Their critique focuses on the dominance and competence of the NBA and heritage officials in defining the heritage, not on the definition itself.

When Finland's Antiquities Act (1963) was prepared in the 1950s, the concepts of cultural heritage or cultural environment were not employed (Muinaismuistolainsäädännön uusiminen 1954). The same characteristic features of the AHD that can be seen in the contemporaneous Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964; Smith 2006; Harrison 2010: 27–9) can also be found in this key text of Finnish heritage management. The Finnish Antiquities Act begins with the words: 'Ancient monuments are protected by law as antiquities pertaining to the past settlement and history of Finland' [translation on the website of the National Board] (National Board of Antiquities 2013b). Like the first words of the Venice Charter, this quote reproduces the main characteristics of the AHD: emphasising monumentality, removing heritage objects from their historical context and encouraging people to view them as national symbols (Harrison 2010: 28). The inherent value of the material entities and the importance of physical authenticity is established in the passage of the Act that forbids excavating, covering, altering, damaging and removing ancient monuments or disturbing them in any other way.

Most archaeological field surveys carried out in Finland are related to land-use planning and concentrate on finding new (archaeological) sites, protected 'ancient monuments' according to the NBA's interpretation of the Antiquities Act. A notable exception to this practice, also for its volume, is the ongoing project of 'the Field surveys of cultural heritage in 2010–2015' by the Natural Heritage Services unit of Metsähallitus, the agency responsible for managing the state-owned lands and natural heritage in Finland. In these investigations, 'cultural heritage' is used as a general term covering not only protected archaeological sites and built heritage, but also all sites that have any kind of artefacts and archaeological features (abandoned structures, physical remains etc.), but cannot be classified as protected sites according to the NBA. These 'outlaw' archaeological sites are too recent, typically under a hundred years old, or for other reasons left out of the official heritage canon until further notice (Taivainen 2013).

In these surveys, means and methods are mostly traditional, although the stories of informants, especially in relation to 20th-century sites, are also gathered (Taivainen 2013: 27). Also, comprehensive inventories of 'spiritual' values are carried out in Northern Finland in the homeland of the indigenous Sámi people to preserve the integrity of sacred natural sites. According to Rauno Väisänen (2012), a director of Natural Heritage Services at Metsähallitus, this 'sacred'

dimension of protected areas is considered to have significant potential for benefitting the general well-being and mental and physical health of all people. It seems evident that Metsähallitus has recognised the plethora of values attached to nature, landscapes and archaeological sites, as well as the importance of opportunities to experience and express them. However, the practical implications of these acknowledgments are yet to be defined.

The NBA has also added a new category of sites, 'other cultural heritage site' (Fi. *muu kulttuuriperintökohde*), in the national registry of ancient monuments that it maintains (National Board of Antiquities 2014). According to the NBA (2013c), this new category is another component of archaeological heritage, in addition to the sites protected by the Antiquities Act. In the instructions on how to edit the registry (National Board of Antiquities 2013c), the category of 'other cultural heritage site' is defined as: 'place or structure that is not protected by the Antiquities Act, but that holds such historical significance and cultural heritage values (Fi. *kulttuuriperintöarvot*) that its preservation is justifiable' [translation by author]. The concepts of 'historical significance' or 'cultural heritage values' are not clarified, but it is noted that cultural heritage sites often 'resemble' protected archaeological sites and sometimes possess 'archaeological interest'.

While the preparatory work for the ratification of the Faro convention, the redefinition of 'cultural environment' in the cultural environment strategy 2014–20, and the most current uses of the term 'cultural heritage' indicate some shift or turn in the conceptions of the Finnish heritage institutions, the legal foundation, purpose and consequences of the 'cultural heritage label' that refers to sites and materials remain somewhat a mystery. In any case, the relationship between the concepts of 'cultural heritage site' and 'protected archaeological site' will have to be reconsidered and explicated at the latest when the Antiquities Act is revised.

VISION FOR THE NEW HERITAGE IN FINLAND

At the moment, there are many important initiatives and projects planned or under way in the Finnish heritage sector. Altering the old key texts or creating new ones provides a valuable possibility for contemplating and renewing the conceptions and practices concerning heritage, and there are promising signs that Finnish heritage management is willing to do this. In spite of their disagreements, Finnish archaeologists have shown their capability to unite and work together for issues that concern the whole field. An important task for the future is to engage also the public in these processes. I suggest that the use of the research framework and conceptual tools offered by critical heritage studies might be useful in working towards this purpose.

For decades Finnish archaeologists have been concerned about finding ways to increase the influence of archaeology in society to legitimate the discipline and to ensure the availability of resources for archaeological research in the future (e.g. Fewster 1985; Siiriäinen 1990; Räihälä 2000; Maaranen 2011). Nevertheless, discussion about the societal aspect of archaeology has not developed into systematic scientific attempts to analyse the connection between archaeology and society (except for some summaries and notes in Lähdesmäki et al. 2013). Keeping the concerns of Finnish archaeologists in mind, I share the emancipatory aspirations expressed in the manifesto of the ACHS (Association of Critical Heritage Studies [ACHS] 2014): the concept of heritage needs to be studied and redefined, also from the perspective of the national or local level, in order to include minorities, local communities, and every citizen in the democratic process of making, experiencing, enjoying and cherishing their heritage, our heritage.

However, if we are hoping to redefine heritage and to establish the 'Democratised Heritage Discourse' (DHD), the activities involved in heritage processes, for instance archaeology and heritage management, have to be reconsidered too. The objective is not just to ensure the availability of archaeological resources for archaeologists, but to embrace the New Heritage as an open and free resource for the whole society. As Carman (2002) has pointed out, we deny the purpose of heritage if we fail to share it. As a mutual, shared experience, the New Heritage could take part in forming a link between archaeological knowledge and the well-being of people in a culturally pluralist and prosperous community – thus establishing an interactive connection between archaeology and contemporary society.

The New Heritage of the open, participatory and democratic society

The framework for the 'Old Heritage', the AHD, is formed and maintained by heritage professionals, institutions and authorities (Smith 2006; 2012). Conversely, the outlines for the New Heritage should be drawn in the DHD, which would be founded on deliberative processes open to all members of society. Knowledge of the current situation and dominant heritage discourse in the Finnish context, acquired by means of analysis, is crucial in the forging of a vision for the future or shifting from the AHD to the DHD. Increased awareness of the historical background and contextuality of the Finnish AHD is a necessary step towards change – the authorised view is not indispensable or immutable. Likewise, acknowledging the contingent nature of the dominant definitions, classifications, representations and practices is a prerequisite for self-motivated encounters between people and heritage. Heritage ought to be experienced without regard to categories set up by organisational or disciplinary boundaries. Everyone should also be free to create their own understandings and representations of heritage, if a more multivocal and democratic heritage is to be promoted.

Nevertheless, change will not occur overnight, even with a common understanding of the goal and a mutual will to move towards it. If asked to define heritage, it is likely that people and communities would choose things, objects and attitudes that reflect the official definitions of heritage. This is because we are all somehow influenced by the AHD: our conceptions of the significance of 'old places' or 'traditional national landscapes' are structured by received concepts of heritage that in part constitute our identities (Byrne 2008: 164). These views reflect the AHD's long engagement with the ideological project of nationalism and the institutionalised national pasts that have been 'protected' by archaeological stewardship (Rowlands 1994; Smith 2004; Jensen 2012). Instead of this idea of a 'unified national identity', the New Heritage could be founded on democratic values and both culturally and ecologically sustainable development. Nonetheless, it is essential that the social and cultural identities of people are not ordained or predetermined, but constructed, explored and negotiated by people themselves in the socially inclusive heritage process, the DHD.

Heritage is a certain relation to the world and other people, and – most importantly – an attitude towards change: coping with the inevitable and constant alteration of matter, its transformation and impermanence. Although 'everything' could be heritage (Holtorf & Fairclough 2013: 199; Carman 2009: 196), the ubiquitous nature of heritage does not imply that everything should be regarded as heritage or protected by legislation and conventional institutional practices. As Harrison (2013a: 198–202; 2013b) notes, heritage is about both remembering and forgetting. In fact, change and transformation could be allowed as a vital aspect of the New Heritage, if impermanence is accepted as the inevitable nature of the heritage process. Furthermore, Harrison (2013b) provocatively argues that in order to deal with 'a crisis' of accumulation of the past, heritage management should consciously be prepared to delist or cease to conserve particular forms of heritage once their significance to contemporary and future societies can no longer be demonstrated.

Academic researchers and experts would have an important role in demonstrating that significance. However, treating heritage objects as valuable data with scientific significance is just one of the values of heritage, a type of sociocultural value in the provisional typology of heritage values suggested by Mason (2008). In addition to scientific values, heritage can have, for instance, political, economical, educational or commercial values at individual, community, local and global levels (Mason 2008). Acknowledging the variety of values as an essential aspect of heritage is necessary in the creation of guidelines for the evaluation, protection and management of the New Heritage. Byrne (2008: 167) has stated that societies are dynamic by nature, and likewise, the social significance of a heritage place should not be thought of as a social fact, but part of a social process. Thus, the values of a community cannot be 'downloaded', but instead discussed in dialogues between communities and heritage professionals.

The ideas of social inclusion and participation associated with the New Heritage are in line with the principles of the Open Knowledge movement; and to my mind, the New Heritage also includes endorsing the openness of digital heritage (digitally created or digitised), as well as the accessibility of other forms of heritage. There is a grow-

ing interest and specialised initiatives within the movement, such as OpenGLAM, that promote free and open access to digital cultural heritage held by galleries, libraries, archives and museums (OpenGLAM 2014). In his recent study on open digital heritage, Ari Häyrinen (2012) has distinguished two views, 'Free culture' and 'Open Data', both of which are needed for dealing with digital heritage. With 'Free culture', Häyrinen refers to the non-technical, human-centric view that concerns the role of heritage institutions and their practices of encouraging people to participate in digital heritage. In contrast, the 'Open Data' view covers the technical issues of open digital heritage and concentrates on restrictions and possibilities set by the technology.

An example of a participatory project combining these two views is the interactive map of war remains in Finland, maintained in the internet by the Finnish state broadcaster and news service YLE (2014). In October 2014, Finns had marked over 2000 war remains, comments and pictures on the map. The 'Free culture' attitude can be applied to all heritage in the creation of practices of enabling people to participate in heritage processes. This has already been demonstrated in the Adopt-a-Monument programme administered by the Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum (2014). The Adopt-a-Monument scheme gives the stewardship of ancient monuments to voluntary citizens to include cultural heritage in their everyday lives. The programme has created one possible model for civic participation in archaeological heritage in Finland (Nissinaho 2013).

Archaeologists in defence of materiality

The New Heritage is at odds with traditional definitions of heritage as the material sites, places or monuments that archaeologists study and care for (Carman 2002; Smith 2012). Nevertheless, as researchers of material culture, archaeologists are bound with the tangible, and to them, heritage may appear as a fundamentally material phenomenon (Carman 2009; Immonen 2012: 144). Archaeology feeds heritage processes by revealing, presenting and producing potential heritage material, which would not be accessible by other means (González-Ruibal 2013: 22). This material consists of artefacts and sites or representations and research documents. While heritage and archaeology are not equivalent, archaeology

can be considered as a kind of heritage: a certain way to interact and engage oneself with the world, especially with its materiality. Studying this engagement and our own materiality related to tangible things in the heritage processes could be the very essence of the contribution archaeology could make to critical heritage studies (Harrison 2013a: 113). Hamilakis' (2013) proposal for 'a sensorial archaeology', for example, points the way to reconstituting archaeology as a sensorial and affective multi-temporal practice.

Rethinking the role of archaeology and archaeologists in the future world may not be an empirical question as much as a philosophical one (for example, see the essays in González-Ruibal 2013). Over the past decades, there have been a number of major shifts in how material culture is studied, which have been referred to by some authors as a 'return to things' or 'symmetrical archaeology' (e.g. Witmore 2007; Olsen 2010; 2012). Central to these new ideas is the exploration of the agency of objects and relationships between objects and human actors within the actor-network framework without prioritising any particular actor. When these ideas are applied to heritage, human and non-human agents could be seen as working together to recreate the past in the present. Hence, heritage could be understood not only as a product of human creativity, but also as the entanglement of humans and objects, pasts and presents (Harrison 2013a: 36–8). Archaeology could thus collaborate with other 'heritage disciplines' in the emergence of the New Heritage (Holtorf & Fairclough 2008) and bring the past to life in the light of contemporary needs in a situation where the dichotomies of nature/culture, past/present, and mind/matter no longer hold and the separation between experts and the public begins to dissolve (González-Ruibal 2013: 16; Harrison 2013a: 44–5).

Especially in Finland, archaeological sites are generally very modest, often with very few visible features above the ground. They are literally hidden and can be found and recognised only with specific knowledge and skills. This is 'the performance of archaeology' (Tilley 1989). This rituality of scientific practice strengthens the authority and role of professional archaeologists as guardians and primary interpreters of archaeological heritage (Smith 2004). Additional and challenging views and values of archaeology enthusiasts, local communities, the entertain-

ment business or so called pseudo-archaeologists are often condemned as threatening or simply 'wrong'. And this might be a pertinent judgment for someone who explicitly participates in academic discourse but fails to meet the established requirements and conditions for scientific research (for one such case see Ikäheimo & Perttola 2010). Nonetheless, seeking a dialogue with the 'heritage communities' does not imply ignorance of expert knowledge or wreck the foundations of science.

A globally growing approach of 'community archaeology', also emerging in Finland (e.g. Siltainsuu & Wessman 2014), is trying to engage communities in the archaeological process in order to increase archaeology's relevance in the minds of taxpayers and citizens (Marshall 2002; Atalay 2010: 419). Atalay (2008) has argued that this commitment to public engagement constitutes a paradigm shift within the field, also occurring within the social sciences: the shift away from research 'on and for' communities toward research 'by and with' them. She points out that making archaeology relevant to the communities whose heritage archaeologists are privileged to study is a key concern (Atalay 2010). However, Atalay (2010) also notes that acknowledging these points in a theoretical sense is very different from putting them into practice in the field in an archaeological setting.

The emphasis on archaeology in the context of heritage management and its privileged rights to validate, conserve and study material remains has led to archaeology's becoming elitist and exclusive (Henson 2009: 119). To enable the emergence of the new, democratised heritage, archaeologists would have to accept the fact that they cannot regulate the ways archaeological objects are interpreted or used after the artefacts exit the scientific sphere and enter heritage processes. Some of the interpretations can be disturbing or contradictory in the light of the scientific worldview or archaeological truth, but they may be consistent and coherent within another conceptual system, which holds epistemological and ontological positions different from those of archaeology. This interdependence of scientific knowledge with other forms of knowing should be one issue of critical interest as well (Atalay 2010). Archaeology, as a producer of archaeological knowledge, could have more impact on the interpretations it fosters and on society in general, if its position as

a part of the wider realm of heritage studies and heritage processes were understood and appreciated. But in order to claim this more efficient role, archaeologists may have to rethink the purpose and scope of archaeology. Archaeology's objectives could be restated as the use of the objects of the past for researching and understanding human behaviour, not only in the past, but also in the present (Henson 2009: 117, 133).

Heritage management: negotiator, enabler and facilitator

If the Finnish heritage management is to adopt the concept of the New Heritage, it would also have to reassess the objectives, techniques and practices of heritage protection. Case studies from Australia (Grimwade & Carter 2000) show that even relatively modest recent industrial and historical archaeology sites can be conserved and presented to the benefit of both the sites and the local communities. However, providing socioeconomic advantages to local communities calls for a broader recognition of site values, pragmatic management and proactive presentation. The seeking of active dialogue, not only with academia, but also with the public, might produce new and creative ways of encountering heritage in the process of management. Although management is different from science and research, it could and should be studied and theorised as well in order to understand and develop its role in heritage processes (Smith & Campbell 1998; Smith 2008).

Immonen and Taavitsainen (2011: 163) summarise their review on the development and current situation of Finnish archaeology and heritage management by passing a judgment according to which: 'In the process of archaeological knowledge production, the universities are now the places of academically ambitious fieldwork and research, while the NBA is becoming simply an institution for collecting and administering fieldwork data in a framework specified by the legislation.' While Immonen's and Taavitsainen's critique of the NBA depicts Finnish heritage management as some kind of failed science, it belittles the importance and meaning of administrative work as knowledge management and constant reconciliation of values in negotiations with society and its interest groups. It is obvious that scientific research has

to be evaluated with the same criteria, shared and approved by the scientific community, whether the research project is conducted in universities or in the NBA. But these criteria cannot be applied to other tasks and processes performed by heritage management.

Management works as a mediator, somewhere in between heritage or heritages, archaeology and other disciplines related to heritage, and other actors or institutions producing and requiring knowledge (Smith 2004: 2). Management enables and facilitates access to and availability of tangible objects that are, or have the potential to be, substantial elements of heritage processes. Nevertheless, heritage management, or archaeology for that matter, cannot take the authoritative role in ruling or deciding alone what heritage includes. It is undeniable that heritage management will need experts and scientific knowledge in the future as well, but the field of expertise and research most urgently required might be something other than archaeology (Emerick 2009). For example, environmental ethics and environmental aesthetics could offer useful perspectives and concepts for analysing and organising the tasks of defining and evaluating heritage sites and environments. Political or sociological, even psychological studies could produce important knowledge about the interpretations, experiences, meanings, values and demands of ordinary people: the societal aspects of heritage.

Likewise, if the New Heritage is to be connected to the well-being of people, the link could be demonstrated with the aid of scientific research. It is acknowledged that the environment has a significant effect on individual health and well-being, and the idea that objects could have therapeutic value was noted already by Florence Nightingale in the 19th century (Chatterjee & Noble 2013). The connection between well-being and culture more generally has been studied in Finland (Hyyppä 2013), but more empirical data and research, especially on heritage engagements' contributions to better health and well-being, is needed. Heritage should thus be understood as part of our social capital, since museums and heritage-sites have potential in promoting well-being, as have been shown by Chatterjee and Noble (2013) in their summary of existing research and best practices in the area of museum interventions in health and social care.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Social, economic, ideological and structural changes are occurring in our society, and they are reflected in the fields of heritage management and academic archaeology. Baby boomers have retired, but the economic crisis prevents employing younger generations into permanent positions. The privatisation of the public sector, the new financing model of universities and the increasing share of contract archaeology provoke questions about the quality of research and the lack of publications. The strong influence of economic and business life forces the heritage sector to prioritise, measure and compare immeasurable values. Severe concerns over the consequences of climate change force us to reassess our energy production, consumption and lifestyles to meet the requirements of sustainable development. Information technologies and social media are enabling new ways of implementing democracy and enabling public involvement. The role of professionals is changing as citizens take part in processes that were previously carried out only by experts.

In addition to all the uncertainties the above-mentioned decline and progress may cause, they also force us to rethink our society and its functions. This mandatory renewing could generate possibilities for a new kind of prosperity, improve our mutual understanding, co-operation and communication and create new prospects for the research, management and uses of heritage in Finland. Critical analysis of discourses has the potential social impact of raising people's self-consciousness and helping people to become more aware of the causes and consequences of their own discourse. That awareness may be a key for change, enabling more open and constructive discussions about the ideologies, power relations, values, meanings and roles of institutions and people: the Democratised Heritage Discourse. As or if we are hoping to broaden the concept of heritage to let not only experts, but the whole community become involved in 'doing' heritage, this does not mean excluding or diminishing the value of the contributions of archaeologists and other experts. In the future, some archaeologists will undoubtedly continue to solve the puzzles of the past, while others may be more intrigued by fitting those pieces into the present-day processes of heritage for the benefit of contemporary society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Personal communication

Härö, M., director of the department of Cultural Environment Protection at the National Board of Antiquities, 18 March 2014.

Unpublished sources

Korhonen, P. 2010. *Nähtävyydestä matkailukohteeksi: Suomenlinnan matkailun kehittyminen 1700-luvulta 1980-luvulle*. Unpublished licentiate thesis. University of Turku, Turku.

Vahtikari, T. 2013. *World Heritage Cities between Permanence and Change: International Construction of `Outstanding Universal Value´ and Local Perceptions at Old Rauma from the 1970s to the 2000s*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Tampere, Tampere.

Internet sources

Association of Critical Heritage Studies (ACHS) 2014. Association of Critical Heritage Studies Manifesto. http://criticalheritagestudies.org/site-admin/site-content/about-achs. Accessed 13th March 2014.

Cohon, R. 2010. Hume's Moral Philosophy. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2010 Edition), E. N. Zalta (ed). http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2010/entries/hume-moral/. Accessed 9th August 2013.

Council of Europe 2014. The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention, 2005). http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/default_en.asp. Accessed 1st April 2014.

Council of the European Union 2014. Conclusions on cultural heritage as a strategic resource for a sustainable Europe. EDUCATION, YOUTH, CULTURE and SPORT Council meeting in Brussels, 20 May 2014. http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/142705.pdf. Accessed 29th June 2014.

Halinen, P. 2013. Muinaismuistolain epämääräisiä ilmaisuja. In J. Enqvist, J.Ruohonen & M. Suhonen (eds.), *Suomen muinaismuistolaki 50 vuotta: vetreä keski-ikäinen vai raihnainen vanhus? & Arkeopeda - opetusta, opastusta, oppimista:* 21–5. Arkeologipäivät 2012. Suomen arkeologinen seura, Helsinki. Available in the Internet at http://www.sarks.fi/ap/ap2012/ap2012_04_halinen.pdf.

Lahelma, A. 2013. Museoviraston uskottavuus asiantuntijana alkaa karista. Helsingin Sanomat, Vieraskynä 1.7.2013. http://www.hs.fi/paakirjoitukset/Museoviraston+uskottavuus+asiantuntijana+alkaa+karista/a1372560441785. Accessed 9th August 2013.

Maaranen, P. 2011. Tulevaisuus ja arkeologia: mitä haluamme – mitä saamme? In E.-M. Viitanen (ed.), *Arkeologia ja geenitutkimus, Suomalaisen arkeologiantutkimuksen tila & LiDAR-ilmalaserkeilaus*: 16–22. Arkeologipäivät 2010. Suomen arkeologinen seura, Helsinki. Available in the Internet at http://www.sarks.fi/ap/ap2010/ap2010_03_maaranen.pdf.

Ministry of Education and Culture 2013. Finland joined the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. Ministry of Education and Culture, Press release. http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Kansainvaeliset_asiat/kansainvaeliset_jaerjestoet/unesco/aineetonkulttuuriperinto/?lang=fi. Accessed 26th March 2014.

Ministry of the Environment 2014. ENVIRONMENT.fi – Joint website of Finland's environmental administration. Suomelle ensimmäinen valtakunnallinen kulttuuriympäristöstrategia. http://www.ymparisto.fi/fi-FI/Elinympariso_ja_kaavoitus/Suomelle_ensimmainen_valtakunnallinen_ku(28695). Accessed 7th April 2014.

National Board of Antiquities Finland 2013a. Homepage. http://www.nba.fi/en/index. Ac-

cessed 11th August 2013.

National Board of Antiquities 2013b. English translation of the Antiquities Act. http://www.nba.fi/en/cultural_environment/archaeological_heritage/official_protection/the_antiquities_act. Accessed 9th August 2013.

National Board of Antiquities 2013c. Muinaisjäännösrekisterin täyttöohje, versio 13.3.2013. http://www.nba.fi/fi/File/2051/muinaisjaannosrekisterin-tayttoohje-2013.pdf. Accessed 8th April 2014.

National Board of Antiquities 2014. Kulttuuriympäristön rekisteriportaali. http://kulttuuriymparisto.nba.fi/netsovellus/rekisteriportaali/portti/default.aspx. Accessed 8th April 2014.

OpenGLAM 2014. Homepage. http://openglam.org/. Accessed 6th May 2014.

Otakantaa.fi 2014. Kaikkien yhteinen kulttuuriperintö. Kysely Faron sopimuksen ratifioinnin valmisteluksi. https://www.otakantaa.fi/fi-fi/Selaa_hankkeita/KAIKKIEN_YHTEINEN_KULTTUURIPERINTO_Kysely_Faron_sopimuksen_ratifioinnin_valmisteluksi. Accessed 5th July 2014.

Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum 2014. Adoptoi monumentti. http://adoptoimonumentti.fi/?lang=en. Accessed 11th November 2014.

Smith, L. 2012. Discourses of heritage: implications for archaeological community practice. Nuevo Mundo Mundos Nuevos. http://nuevomundo.revues.org/64148; DOI: 10.4000/nuevomundo.64148. Accessed 11th August 2013.

Taivainen, J. 2013. Muinaismuistolain suojelema tai ei – Metsien kulttuuriperintö on moninaista ja arvokasta. In J. Enqvist, J. Ruohonen & M. Suhonen (eds.), *Suomen muinaismuistolaki 50 vuotta: vetreä keski-ikäinen vai raihnainen vanhus & Arkeopeda - opetusta, opastusta, oppimista*: 26–8. Arkeologipäivät 2012. Suomen arkeologinen seura, Helsinki. Available in the Internet at http://www.sarks.fi/ap/ap2012/ap2012_05_taivainen.pdf.

YLE 2014. Etsi kartalta, onko naapurustossasi sodan jälkiä – kiinnostavia merkintöjä ja kommentteja yli 2 000. Yle News 8.10.2014. http://yle.fi/uutiset/etsi_kartalta_onko_naapurustossasi_sodan_jalkia__kiinnostavia_merkintoja_ja_kommentteja_yli_2000/7513141. Accessed 11th November 2014.

Literature

Aarnipuu, P. 2008. *Turun linna kerrottuna ja kertovana tilana*. Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seuran toimituksia 1162. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Ahl-Waris, E. 2010. *Historiebruk kring Nådendal: och den kommemorativa anatomin av klostrets minnesplats*. Societas Sanctae Birgittae, Vadstena.

Ahmad, Y. 2006. The scope and definitions of heritage: From tangible to intangible. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12(3): 292–300.

Äikäs, T. 2011. *Rantakiviltä tuntureille – Pyhät paikat saamelaisten rituaalisessa maisemassa*. Pohjois-Suomen historiallinen yhdistys, Rovaniemi.

Alhanen, K. 2007. *Käytännöt ja ajattelu Michel Foucault'n filosofiassa*. Gaudeamus, Helsinki.

Ashworth, G. & Tunbridge, J. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage: The management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Wiley, Chichester.

Atalay, S. 2008. Pedagogy of decolonization: advancing archaeological practice through education. In S. Silliman (ed.), *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*: 123–44. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Atalay, S. 2010. 'We don't talk about Çatalhöyük, we live it': sustainable archaeological practice through community-based participatory research. *World Archaeology* 42(3): 418–29.

Bond, G.C. & Gilliam, A. (eds.) 1994. *Social Construction of the Past. Representation as power*. One World Archaeology 24. Routledge, London.

Byrne, D. 1991. Western hegemony in archaeological heritage management. *History and Anthropology* 5: 269–76.

Byrne, D. 2008. Heritage as Social Action. In G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J.H. Jameson Jnr. & J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*: 149–73. Routledge, London.

Carman, J. 1991. Beating the bounds: archaeological heritage management as archaeology, archaeology as social science. *Archaeological Review From Cambridge* 10(2): 175–84.

Carman, J. 1996. *Valuing Ancient Things: Archaeology and Law*. Leicester University Press, London.

Carman, J. 2002. *Archaeology and Heritage: An*

Introduction. Continuum, London.

Carman, J. 2009. Where the Value Lies: The Importance of Materiality to the Immaterial Aspects of Heritage. In E. Waterton & L. Smith (eds.), *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*: 192–208. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Chatterjee, H. & Noble, G. 2013. *Museums, health and well-being*. Ashgate, Surrey.

Clarke, A. 1993. Cultural resource management as archaeological housework: confining women to the ghetto of management. In H. Du Cros & L. Smith (eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique*. The Australian National University, Canberra.

Cleere, H.F. (ed.) 1989. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. Unwin Hyman, London.

Council of Europe 1992. *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage of (Revised) (Valletta Convention)*. Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe 2005. *The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention)*. Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Davison, G. 2008. From Patrimony to Pastiche. In G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J.H. Jameson Jnr. & J. Schofield (eds.) *The Heritage Reader*: 31–41. Routledge, London.

Donner, J. 2007. On the lack of evidence of artifacts in the Susiluola Cave in Finland. *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* XXIV: 53–6.

Donner, J. 2008. Some comments on the contribution by Hans-Peter Schulz and Tapani Rostedt on Susiluola. *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* XXV: 83.

Emerick, K. 2009. Archaeology and the Cultural Heritage Management "Toolkit". The Example of Cawood, North Yorkshire. In E. Waterton & L. Smith (eds.), *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*: 91–116. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Fairclough, G; Harrison, R; Jameson Jnr, J.H. & Schofield, J. (eds.) 2008. *The Heritage Reader*. Routledge, London.

Fairclough, N. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change.* Polity Press, Cambridge.

Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* London, Routledge.

Fairclough, N. 2010. *Critical Discourse Analysis.*

The Critical Study of Language. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow. 2nd edition.

Fewster, D. 1985. Arkeologin i Finland, en vetenskap? *Muinaistutkija* 2/1985: 17–9.

Fewster, D. 2006. V*isions of past glory: nationalism and the construction of early Finnish history*. Finnish Literature Society, Helsinki.

Fojut, N. 2009. The philosophical, political and pragmatic roots of the convention. In Council of Europe (2009), *Heritage and beyond*: 13–21. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.

Foucault, M. 1969. *L'archéologie du savoir.* Gallimard, Paris.

Foucault, M. 1971. *L'ordre du discours: lec on inaugurale au Collège de France prononcée le 2 décembre 1970.* Gallimard, Paris.

Fowler, P.J. 1987. What price the man-made heritage? *Antiquity* 61(233): 409–23.

Fowler, P.J. 1992. *The Past in Contemporary Society: Then, Now*. Routledge, London.

González-Ruibal, A. (ed.) 2013. *Reclaiming Archaeology. Beyond the Tropes of Modernity.* Routledge, London.

Grimwade G. & Carter B. 2000. Managing Small Heritage Sites with Interpretation and Community Involvement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 6(1): 33–48.

Hamilakis, Y. 2013. *Archaeology and the Senses: Human Experience, Memory, and Affect*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Harlin, E-K. 2008. *Recalling Ancestral Voices – Repatriation of Sámi Cultural Heritage. Prosjektets Interreg IIIA Slutrapport*. Siida Sámi Museum, Inari.

Härö, M. 1981. *Suomen muinaismuistohallinnon synty*. Helsingin yliopiston arkeologian laitos, Moniste No 28. University of Helsinki, Helsinki.

Härö, M. 2010. Maan museotoimen kivijalka eli Museoviraston ja Suomen kansallismuseon historiaa. In S. Pettersson & P. Kinanen (eds.), *Suomen museohistoria*: 129–52. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Harrison, R. 2010. What is heritage? In R. Harrison (ed.) *Understanding the Politics of Heritage*: 5–42. Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Harrison, R. 2013ba *Heritage. Critical Approaches*. Routledge, London.

Harrison, R. 2013b. Forgetting to remember, remembering to forget: late modern heritage practices, sustainability and the 'crisis' of ac-

cumulation of the past. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* (19) 6: 579–95.

Harvey, D.C. 2001. Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* (7)4: 319–38.

Häyrinen, A. 2012. *Open sourcing digital heritage: digital surrogates, museums and knowledge management in the age of open network.* Jyväskylä studies in humanities 187. University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä

Henson, D. 2009. What on Earth is Archaeology? In E. Waterton & L. Smith (eds.), *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*: 117–35. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Hewison, R. 1987. *The Heritage Industry. Britain in a Climate of Decline*. Methuen, London.

Hodder, I. 1993. Changing configurations: the relationships between theory and practice. In J. Hunter & I. Ralston (eds.), *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK: an Introduction*: 11–18. Sutton Publishing, Gloucestershire.

Hodder, I. 1999. *The Archaeological Process: An Introduction*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Holtorf, C. & Fairclough, G. 2013. The New Heritage and re-shapings of the past. In A. González-Ruibal (ed.), *Reclaiming Archaeology. Beyond the Tropes of Modernity*: 197–210. Routledge, London.

Hyyppä, M.T. 2013. *Kulttuuri pidentää ikää.* Duodecim, Helsinki.

ICOMOS 1964. I*nternational Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice Charter)*. ICOMOS, Paris.

ICOMOS 1979, revised in 1981, 1988, 1999 and 2013. *Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter)*. Australia ICOMOS, Burwood.

Ikäheimo, J. 2010. Kulttuuriperintöpesulan isot pojat ja imaginäärinen uusmuinaisjäännös. *Muinaistutkija* 4/2010: 14–21.

Ikäheimo, J. & Perttola W. 2010. Näennäisarkeologisia linjanvetoja Suomen muinaisuuteen. *Muinaistutkija* 4/2010: 22–33.

Immonen, V. 2012. Heritageisation as a material process: the bishop's crosier of Turku Cathedral, Finland. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18(2): 144–59.

Immonen, V. & Taavitsainen, J.-P. 2011. Oscillating Between National and International: The Case of Finnish Archaeology. In L. R. Lozny (ed.), *Comparative Archaeologies: A Sociological View of the Science of the Past*: 137–77. Springer, New York.

Jensen, O.W. 2012. A thematic and theoretical introduction to histories of archaeological practices. In O.W. Jensen (ed.), *Histories of archaeological practices. Reflections on methods, strategies and social organization in past fieldwork*: 9–51. The National Historical Museum. Studies 20. The National Historical Museum, Stockholm.

Korjonen-Kuusipuro, K. 2013. *Yhteinen Vuoksi – Ihmisen ja ympäristön kulttuurinen vuorovaikutus Vuoksen jokilaaksossa 1800-luvulta nykypäiviin*. Acta Universitatis Ouluensis B Humaniora 109. University of Oulu, Oulu.

Layton, R. & Ucko, P. J. 1999. Introduction: gazing on the landscape and encountering the environment. In P. J. Ucko & R. Layton (eds.), *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Sharing your Landscape*: 1–20. Routledge, London.

Lowenthal, D. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lowenthal, D. 1998. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lucas, G. 2012. *Understanding the Archaeological Record.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lähdesmäki, U., Raninen, S. & Nordqvist, K. (eds.) 2013. *Archaeology in Society and Daily Life. Challenges and Co-operation in the 21th Century*. Tampereen museoiden julkaisuja 133. Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum, Tampere.

Määttänen, P. 2009. *Toiminta ja kokemus. Pragmatistista terveen järjen filosofiaa*. Gaudeamus, Helsinki.

Magga, P. & Ojanlatva, E. (eds.) 2013. *Ealli biras – Elävä ympäristö. Saamelainen kulttuuriympäristöohjelma*. Sámi Museum – Saamelaismuseosäätiön julkaisuja n:o 9. Sámi Museum – Saamelaismuseosäätiö, Inari.

Marshall, Y. 2002. What Is Community Archaeology? *World Archaeology* 34(2): 211–19.

Mason, R. 2008. Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological issues and choices. In G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J.H. Jameson Jnr. & J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*: 99–124. Routledge, London.

Miller, D., Rowlands, M. & Tilley, C. (eds.) 1989. *Domination and Resistance*. One World Archaeology 3. Unwin Hyman, London.

Muinaismuistolainsäädännön uusiminen 1954. *Komitean mietintö* 22. IV.1950. Helsinki, Valtioneuvosto.

Muurimäki, E. 2007. Cornelius Holtorf: Archaeology is a Brand! The meaning of archaeology in contemporary popular culture [Book review]. *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* XXIV: 98–100.

Nissinaho, A. 2013. Experiences of the Adopt-a-Monument Programme in Finland. In U. Lähdesmäki, S. Raninen & K. Nordqvist (eds.), *Archaeology in Society and Daily Life. Challenges and Co-operation in the 21th Century* 65–73. Tampereen museoiden julkaisuja 133. Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum, Tampere.

Núñez, M. 2007. My problem with Susiluola. *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* XXIV: 84–91.

Núñez, M. 2008. Susiluola – The poblem persists. *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* XXV: 84–5.

Olsen, B. 2010. *In Defense of Things. Archaeology and the Ontology of Objects*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek and Lanham.

Olsen, B. 2012. Symmetrical Archaeology. In I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological Theory Today*: 208–28. Polity Press, Cambridge. 2nd edition.

Pietikäinen, S. & Mäntynen, A. 2009. *Kurssi kohti diskurssia*. Vastapaino, Tampere.

Petrisalo, K. 2001. *Menneisyys matkakohteena: kulttuuriantropologinen ja historiatieteellinen tutkimus perinnekulttuurien hyödyntämisestä matkailuteollisuudessa*. Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seuran toimituksia 802. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Pétursdóttir, Þ. 2013. Concrete matters: Ruins of modernity and the things called heritage. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 13(1): 13–53.

Pohjamo, U. 2011. *Esikaupunki moniäänisenä kulttuuriperintönä: Oulun Hietasaari*. Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia 43. Taidehistorian seura, Helsinki.

Potinkara, N. 2014. Oikeus omaan kulttuuriperintöön. Saamelaismuseot identiteettipolitiikan näyttämöinä. In T. Steel, A. Turunen, S. Lillbroända-Annala & M. Santikko (eds.), *Muuttuva kulttuuriperintö – Det föränderliga kulturarvet*: 277–98. Ethnos-toimite 16. Ethnos ry, Helsinki.

Räihälä, O. 2000. Mikä onkaan suomalaisen arkeologian tila? *Muinaistutkija* 3/2000: 52–6.

Renfrew, C. 1983. Divided we stand: Aspects of Archaeology and information. *American Antiquity* 48(1): 3–16.

Rönkkö, E. 2012. *Kulttuuriympäristöselvitykset: tieto, taito ja ymmärrys maaseudun maankäytön suunnittelussa*. Oulun yliopiston arkkitehtuurin osaston julkaisuja A 56. University of Oulu, Oulu.

Rowlands, M. 1994. The politics of identity in archaeology. In G.C. Bond & A. Gilliam (eds), *Social Construction of the Past. Representation as power*: 129–43. One World Archaeology 24. Routledge, London.

Salminen, T. 1993. *Suomalaisuuden asialla. Muinaistieteen yliopisto-opetuksen syntyvaiheet n. 1877–1923*. Helsinki Papers in Archaeology No. 6. Helsingin yliopiston arkeologian laitos, Helsinki.

Salminen, T. 2003. *Suomen tieteelliset voittomaat; Venäjä ja Siperia suomalaisessa arkeologiassa 1870–1935*. Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen Aikakauskirja 110. Suomen muinaismuistoyhdistys, Helsinki.

Schofield, J. 2008. Heritage management, Theory and Practice. In G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. & J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*: 15–30. Routledge, London.

Schulz, E.-L. & Schulz, H.-P. 1993. Hämeenlinna Varikkoniemi: Eine späteisenzeitliche-frühmittelalterliche Kernsiedlung in Häme: Die Ausgrabungen 1986–1990. *Suomen Museo* 99: 41–85.

Schulz, H.-P., Eriksson, B., Hirvas, H., Huhta, P, Jungner, H., Purhonen, P., Ukkonen, P. & Rankama, T. 2002. Excavations at Susiluola Cave. *Suomen Museo* 109: 5–45.

Schulz, H.-P. & Rostedt, T. 2008. Debating Susiluola – Some Commentary. *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* XXV: 73–82.

Shanks, M. & Tilley, C. 1987. *Social theory and archaeology*. Polity Press, London.

Shanks, M. & Tilley, C. 1989. Archaeology in to the 1990s'. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 22(1): 42–54.

Siiriäinen, A. 1990. Onko arkeologiassa yhteiskunnallista relevanssia? *Muinaistutkija* 3/1990: 2–4.

Siltainsuu, J. & Wessman, A. 2014. Yhteistapahtumia ja esineiden tunnistusta Espoon kaupunginmuseon metallinilmaisinyhteistyö vuonna 2014. *Muinaistutkija* 3/2014: 34–40.

Sivula, A. 2010. Menetetyn järven jäljillä. Historia osana paikallista kulttuuriperintöprosessia. In P. Grönholm & A. Sivula (eds.), *Medeiasta pronssisoturiin. Kuka tekee menneestä historiaa?*: 21–39. Historia mirabilis 6. Turun Historiallinen Yhdistys ry, Turku.

Skeates, R. 2000. *Debating the Archaeological Heritage*. Duckworth, London.

Smith, L. 2004. *Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage*. Routledge, New York.

Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge, New York.

Smith, L. 2008. Towards a Theoretical Framework for Archaeological Heritage Management. In G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J.H. Jameson Jnr. & J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*: 62–74. Routledge, London.

Smith, L. & Akagawa, N. (eds.) 2009. *Intangible Heritage*. Routledge, Abingdon.

Smith, L. & Campbell, G. 1998. Governing material culture. In M. Dean & B. Hindess (eds.), *Governing Australia. Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*: 173–93. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Solli, B., Burström, M., Domanska, E., Edgeworth, M., González-Ruibal, A., Holtorf, C., Lucas, G., Oestigaard, T., Smith, L. & Witmore, C. 2011. Some Reflections on Heritage and Archaeology in the Anthropocene. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* (44)1: 40–88.

Swensen, G., Jerpåsen, G.B., Sæter, O. & Sundli Tveit, M. 2013. Capturing the Intangible and Tangible Aspects of Heritage: Personal versus Official Perspectives in Cultural Heritage Management. *Landscape Research* 38(2): 203–21.

Taavitsainen, J.-P. 2005. Roska ei valehtele: nuoret ajat ja arkeologia. *Tieteessä tapahtuu* 5/2005: 19–26.

Taavitsainen, J.-P. & Immonen, V. 2013. Looking at archaeology through 30 years of Fennoscandia archaeologica – an interview. *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* XXX: 3–11.

Thomas, S. 2012. Searching for answers: a survey of metal-detector users in the UK. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18(1): 49–64.

Tilley, C. 1989. Excavation as Theatre. *Antiquity* 63(239): 275–80.

Trigger, B. 2006. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge University Press, New York. 2nd edition.

Tuomi-Nikula, O., Haanpää, R. & Kivilaakso A. (eds.) 2013. *Mitä on kulttuuriperintö?* Tietolipas 243. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

UNESCO 1972. *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. UNESCO, Paris.

UNESCO 2003a. *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*. UNESCO, Paris.

UNESCO 2003b. *Charter of the Preservation of the Digital Heritage*. UNESCO, Paris.

Urry, J. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze*. Sage, London.

Väisänen, R. 2012. Diversity of sacred lands and meanings in Northern Europe: Challenges for the managers of protected areas. In J.-M. Mallarach, T. Papayannis & R. Väisänen (eds.), *The Diversity of Sacred Lands in Europe. Proceedings of the Third Workshop of the Delos Initiative – Inari/Aanaar 2010*: 205–15. Gland, Switzerland, IUCN and Vantaa, Finland, Metsähallitus Natural Heritage Services.

Viitanen, E.-M. 2010. *Locus Bonus. The Relationship of the Roman Villa to its Environment in the Vicinity of Rome*. University of Helsinki, Helsinki.

Vilkuna, J. 2003. Täytetyn tiikerin äärellä – museologia, mitä se on? *Tieteessä tapahtuu* 7/2003: 5–10.

Waterton, E. 2005. Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural Landscapes in England. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11(4): 309–25.

Waterton, E., Smith L. & Campbell, G. 2006. The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12(4): 339–55.

Waterton, E. & Smith, L. 2009a. There is no such thing as Heritage. In E. Waterton & L. Smith (eds.), *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*: 10–27. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Waterton, E. & Smith, L. 2009b. Introduction: Heritage and Archaeology. In E.Waterton & L. Smith (eds.), *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*: 1–7. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Watson, S. 2009. Archaeology, Visuality and the Negotiation of Heritage. In Emma Waterton & Laurajane Smith (eds.), *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*: 28–47. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Witmore, C. 2007. Symmetrical archaeology: excerpts of a manifesto. *World Archaeology* 39(4): 546–62.

Wright, P. [1985] 2009. *On Living in an Old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain*. Verso, London and New York.