

Legislation in Archaeology: Overview and Introduction

Carman, John

DOI:

[10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2)

Document Version

Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Carman, J 2013, Legislation in Archaeology: Overview and Introduction. in C Smith (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Global Archaeology*. Springer, New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Chapter Title	Legislation in Archaeology: Overview and Introduction	
Copyright Year	2013	
Copyright Holder	Springer Science+Business Media New York	
Corresponding Author	Family Name	Carman
	Particle	
	Given Name	John
	Suffix	
	Division/Department	Institute of Archaeology and Antiquity
	Organization/University	University of Birmingham
	City	Birmingham
	Country	UK
	Email	j.carman@bham.ac.uk



2 **Legislation in Archaeology:** 3 **Overview and Introduction**

4 John Carman
5 Institute of Archaeology and Antiquity,
6 University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

7 **State of Knowledge and Current** 8 **Debates**

9 **Introduction**

10 Every country in the world has some form of law
11 relating to its cultural heritage. These range from
12 the draconian (and sometimes relatively ineffec-
13 tive: Cleere 1984: 130) to the more loosely for-
14 mulated and generally respected. In between lies
15 the majority, more or less complex and more or
16 less complied with. Some are “homegrown” and
17 reflect particular local circumstances; others else-
18 where are copied from neighboring or more dis-
19 tant places; others again have been adopted from
20 past rulers but remain in place nonetheless. Law
21 has been very important to the development of
22 the idea of preserving material from the past
23 (Carman 2012): laws have always proved a key
24 means by which that preservation was effected.
25 Laws also serve to legitimize the idea of that
26 preservation.

27 This entry will look at the different kinds of
28 laws that apply to the material heritage in differ-
29 ent parts of the world and how they operate. In
30 doing so, it is an exploration and celebration of
31 difference rather than similarity. The common

thread, however, lies in the adoption of law – of 32
whatever kind and however written – as the key 33
method of dealing with the cultural heritage. It 34
has been the promulgation of laws to preserve old 35
things – whatever the motivation driving it – that 36
turns a mere private or sectional interest into 37
something like heritage management as we 38
know it. In the current state of heritage manage- 39
ment, laws are even more crucial to the preserva- 40
tion of our heritage: without them, it can be 41
cogently argued, there is no heritage (Cleere 42
1989: 10). At the same time, these laws need to 43
be overseen and put into effect by appropriately 44
empowered agents, whether of the state or inde- 45
pendent. These agents too have their powers and 46
duties defined by the laws that govern them and 47
the material on which they act. Accordingly, even 48
in so-called “non-statutory” systems of heritage 49
management, law is the underlying mechanism 50
and the ultimate repository of authority. 51

52 The sections of this entry will offer introduc-
53 tory outlines to some of the forms which laws in
54 this area can take, how they are organized and to
55 be interpreted, and the relations between laws at
56 the national and international level. The opening
57 section will examine some of the justifications for
58 laws in this area, a truly global discourse. 59
A section on interpretation of laws will expose
60 the clear differences that exist between legal sys-
61 tems and which necessarily affect our under-
62 standing of them and any attempt at
63 international comparison: these include the legal
64 structures of federal versus unitary states, laws
65 derived from traditions of Roman (and other)

66 law, and those grounded in English “Common
67 Law.” An overview of international regulation –
68 global in nature but subject to interpretation at the
69 national level – follows. The laws of national
70 territories will then come under scrutiny,
71 representing different systems of laws: those
72 assuming the state to be the proper owner of
73 material versus those where private ownership
74 is held to be the ideal, those favoring direct inter-
75 vention and control versus more indirect and
76 administrative mechanisms, and so on. Overall,
77 the paradox of the ubiquity of laws to achieve the
78 same ends that take a remarkably diverse set of
79 forms will become clear. A final section will
80 review the effect the promulgation of legislative
81 control has had on the field in terms of the devel-
82 opment of professional agendas and associations,
83 both national and international, and the ways
84 these too regulate the practice of heritage
85 management.

86 This aspect of heritage management is very
87 well documented. This is partly inevitable: laws
88 are usually written documents and to ensure com-
89 pliance must be made widely available to their
90 intended audience. The literature of heritage
91 management, therefore, abounds with summaries
92 and commentaries at the national level (for the
93 UK, see Carman 1996; Pugh-Smith & Samuels
94 1996; Hunter & Ralston 2007; for the USA, US
95 Dept. of the Interior 1989-90; for France,
96 Rigambert 1996; for Austria, Hocke 1975; for
97 German states, Dörge 1971; Eberl et al. 1975;
98 for Switzerland, Hangartner 1981; for Mexico,
99 King et al. 1980; etc.) and at the international
100 and comparative level (Burnham 1974; Prott &
101 O’Keefe 1984; Cleere 1984; Carman 2002:
102 68-76; and on underwater archaeology
103 Dromgoole 1999).

104 **The Role of Law**

105 Despite the ubiquity of legislation as
106 a foundational tool of heritage management prac-
107 tice, very little of the literature of the field con-
108 cerns the purpose of such laws or, to put it another
109 way, explains why we pass laws on this matter
110 rather than tackling it in another way. McGimsey
111 (1972), for instance, argues powerfully for legis-
112 lation as a key component of a state preservation

113 program but also argues against legislation alone 113
114 since it would be an entirely “negative approach” 114
(McGimsey 1972: 33 & 46) lacking the necessary 115
116 support from the wider public. Prott and O’Keefe 116
(1984) go further: they argue that the dangers 117
118 facing the archaeological resource are ever 118
119 greater and that accordingly “some of them can 119
120 only be controlled by governments” and therefore 120
121 require legislation (Prott & O’Keefe 1984: 13). 121
122 At the same time, they recognize the valuable 122
123 role laws play in resolving key conflicts over 123
124 material – especially issues of ownership 124
125 and control – and the setting of policy aims, as 125
126 well as the increasing requirements of national 126
127 governments to comply with international 127
128 treaties concerning the heritage (Prott & 128
129 O’Keefe 1984: 14). None of these is, however, 129
130 a reason for law *as such*: both McGimsey and 130
131 Prott and O’Keefe offer programs of public 131
132 education and the mustering of political support 132
133 as alternatives (McGimsey 1972: 29-31; Prott & 133
134 O’Keefe 1984: 145-15). 134

135 In so far as McGimsey does provide a reason 135
136 for legislation, it must be as part of the requisite 136
137 “administrative structure” (McGimsey 1972: 27) 137
138 for such a program, which includes its establish- 138
139 ment as a legally recognized authority with its 139
140 own budget. Pickard (2001: 4-10), reviewing 140
141 a sample of European states with a view to their 141
142 response to new international agreements on cul- 142
143 tural heritage, expands on this theme by 143
144 presenting a number of areas where legislation 144
145 has a valuable defining role: 145

- 146 • Of definition of the heritage, concerning the 146
147 attributes and characteristics a heritage object 147
148 should have or be deemed to possess 148
- 149 • Of identification of the heritage, especially the 149
150 means available of inventory and recording, 150
151 and the making of lists and schedules 151
- 152 • Of preservation and protection of the heritage, 152
153 whether through systems of designation or by 153
154 regulating development 154
- 155 • Of the philosophy of conservation in place, 155
156 including attitudes to restoration and 156
157 reconstruction 157
- 158 • Of appropriate sanctions against breaches of 158
159 the law and the means – coercive or other- 159
160 wise – to encourage compliance 160



- 161 • Of the integration of cultural preservation with
- 162 other government policies and imperatives
- 163 • Of financial aspects
- 164 • Of the specific powers and duties of govern-
- 165 ment and nongovernmental agencies in
- 166 respect of the heritage
- 167 • Of educational and other aspects

168 From this functionalist perspective, the law in
169 this area can be seen not so much as a mechanism
170 of heritage management but as a facilitator for
171 systems of heritage management to come into
172 being: on its own, it seems, law does nothing
173 but requires other agencies in order to put heri-
174 tage management into effect. This is perhaps one
175 reason law should so often emerge first in systems
176 of heritage management: it provides the frame-
177 work on which the other aspects of heritage man-
178 agement can hang. On the other hand, it would
179 seem that other components of a heritage man-
180 agement system could exist independently of leg-
181 islation to put them into place. The question “why
182 law?” remains.

183 Although in general sympathetic to heritage
184 management as a practice (and whatever they
185 may choose to call it), others have taken a more
186 critical view of the role of law in this field.
187 A study of English law in this area (Carman
188 1996) concluded that its main purpose was to
189 give value to archaeological remains. Though
190 a continually reductive process of selection of
191 certain kinds of object from all the things in the
192 world, subsequent categorization of those things
193 into legal terms and allocation to particular agen-
194 cies for a limited range of treatments, archaeo-
195 logical sites, and monuments would emerge with
196 a new meaning and a new set of values placed
197 upon them. In doing so, they became officially
198 recognized as important and worthy of protection
199 and preservation. This is a reversal of the usual
200 understanding of the sequence, whereby things
201 that are important are chosen to be preserved by
202 law: here, it is the law that makes certain things
203 important. A similar view was reached in respect
204 of legislation to govern the heritage of indigenous
205 populations in Australia and the USA (Smith
206 2004: 125-155). As Smith puts it, legislation
207 “plays a key role in the management of Indige-
208 nous material culture, as... it establishes the need

for management procedures and processes” 209
(Smith 2004: 125). Such law therefore goes on 210
to define who will manage indigenous culture and 211
how those involved – archaeologists, indigenous 212
people, and government agencies – will interact. 213
This means law sets “the parameters of accept- 214
able management practice...[and] the scope of 215
policy debate, and influences the way in which 216
debate is conducted between the three actors” 217
(Smith 2004: 125). Overall, “legislation provides 218
governments and bureaucracies with terms, con- 219
cepts and guidelines against which competing 220
claims to material culture may be assessed” 221
(Smith 2004: 126) and ultimately “provides the 222
conceptual frameworks that must govern debates 223
within” heritage management which “institution- 224
alize and regulate the discipline [of archaeology] 225
as a technology of government” (Smith 2004: 226
154). Similarly, Fourmile (1996) has reviewed 227
the role of Australian legislation in denying the 228
indigenous population any access to or control 229
over their cultural heritage. These readings of the 230
place of legislation in heritage management 231
locate it at the service of requirements external 232
to the discipline itself and closer to those of 233
government. In other words, rather than law serv- 234
ing the needs of archaeology, archaeology is 235
made to serve the needs of government. 236

237 Interestingly, however, it is not just those who
238 are critical (or indeed suspicious) of law who see
239 it in this light. Breeze (1996) – writing on the
240 definition given in Scotland to the British legis-
241 lative category of “national monument” – is clear
242 that the purpose is “to ensure that all people have
243 access to [Scotland’s built] heritage [of all
244 periods] and are able to enjoy it, regardless of
245 their own origins and background” (Breeze 1996:
246 102). He also acknowledges that “preserving
247 monuments... is not entirely an end in itself”
248 and cites government reasoning behind it (Breeze
249 1996: 102). Accordingly, the idea of a “national”
250 archaeological resource based in law is seen here
251 not as a limiting and exclusive concept but
252 nevertheless one that remains at the service
253 of government agendas. This same idea is
254 reflected in Knudson’s (1986) review of cultural
255 resource management practice in the USA. As
256 a result of success in “persuading the major

257 policymakers... of the public significance of
258 archaeological resources... the implementation
259 of such policies will not leave anyone... out of
260 the process of public accountability for the treat-
261 ment of those resources,” and “this will be
262 conducted within the context of multiple public
263 objectives” (Knudson 1986: 399). The public
264 referred to here is taken to be the Euro-American
265 population of the USA, excluding its indigenous
266 population whose cultural works are under dis-
267 cussion. Accordingly, even though it is acknowl-
268 edged that conservation of cultural remains is
269 a globally endorsed project, the target of conser-
270 vation practice in the USA and what flows from it
271 is directed at a particular audience, at least partly
272 the result of “a lack of genetic continuity between
273 the dominant political community in the United
274 States and prehistoric Americans” (Knudson
275 1986: 396). Here, as elsewhere, law drives the
276 heritage management process rather than provid-
277 ing support for it.

278 In most writing on heritage management,
279 a legislative basis for preservation practice is
280 taken for granted. The literature is therefore for
281 the most part descriptive rather than critically
282 discursive and does not ask why laws are in
283 place in such profusion. One reason is simply
284 historical: it is “the way it is done.” Other reasons
285 emerge from a closer reading, however, whether
286 from an overtly critical or a more sympathetic
287 perspective: laws serve, as it turns out, not the
288 needs of heritage management but rather
289 the agencies – and in particular national govern-
290 ments – who promote them. This is not an issue of
291 effectiveness, but may have an impact on the way
292 heritage management is done in different
293 contexts.

294 **How to Approach, Read, and Interpret Laws**

295 Laws are technical documents rather than discus-
296 sive texts, which means they are not only written
297 in a particular way but also designed to be read in
298 a certain way (see, e.g., for the USA, Dickerson
299 1975; for the UK, Cross 1995; for Italy, Tarello
300 1980; for international comparisons,
301 MacCormick & Summers 1991). Indeed, “read-
302 ing” in its conventional everyday sense may not
303 be quite the right word: they are usually designed

304 to be used more like a technical manual than read
305 as a linear narrative. Moreover, the particular
306 manner in which such texts should be read varies
307 from jurisdiction to jurisdiction so that an ability
308 to operate in one legal system does not automati-
309 cally imply an ability to so operate in a different
310 one. The aim of this section is to outline some of
311 the ways in which laws relevant to archaeology
312 can vary from country to country across the
313 globe.

As I have argued elsewhere (Carman 1996:
17; 2002: 102-103), to have a truly meaningful
comparison between the practices of archaeolog-
ical heritage management, it is necessary to take
three factors into account:

- Differences between legal and regulatory systems
- Differences in the nature of the material record of the past between one territory and another
- Differences in the traditions and historical development of archaeology between one territory and the other

The first of these covers such things as the
basic assumptions relating to the interests to be
served by law, the degree of appropriate state
control held to be applicable in an area, the
weight to be given to private property laws, or
the expected powers and duties of state and other
agencies. All of these will differ between one
territory and another, or one legal system (e.g.,
Common or Roman) and another. In the UK or
USA, for instance, the usual style is to provide for
legal protection without taking material directly
into state ownership, but in other territories all
archaeological remains and other heritage objects
are held to be the property of the state. In the UK,
the USA, and Australia, this reflects the ideolog-
ical authority of private property upheld by
a system of Common Law, as against the author-
ity of the state more typical of systems deriving
from the European continent. Here, the difference
lies in expectations of what is right and proper
and more fundamental social values. Where it is
expected that heritage objects should belong to
the state, the kind of system operated in the UK or
USA makes no sense; in the UK or USA, the
adoption of a system of generalized state owner-
ship would be seen as an attack on private



352 property. An attempt to assess the merits of one
353 system against another therefore runs up against
354 these fundamental differences in understanding
355 of what laws can and should do and to whom
356 legal authority should be given.

357 The second and third factors are linked. They
358 concern the nature of the archaeological record
359 and how it inevitably differs in different terri-
360 tories and the understanding given to the purpose
361 and focus of archaeological research which will
362 differ in one country from another, so that very
363 different research traditions may exist, leading to
364 a differential emphasis on types of material. In
365 the UK, for instance, the treatment of different
366 types of material is very often the same regardless
367 of physical form or age. Prehistoric structures in
368 the countryside can be treated in exactly the same
369 way as medieval ruins in a city, and ancient
370 monuments (a legal category that in England
371 now includes some material from the twentieth
372 century) can be placed upon a schedule, while
373 standing buildings can be placed upon a list, both
374 of which offer some form of legal protection.
375 There are other territories, however, where dif-
376 ferences in age make a substantial difference.
377 Material from a preliterate past may be treated
378 very differently from material emanating from
379 historical times, or one period of history – or
380 material representing a particular way of life –
381 may be more highly valued than another, making
382 one subject to legal control and protection, while
383 the other is abandoned to its fate. In the USA, for
384 instance, buried remains of the indigenous popu-
385 lation are subject to forms of federal legal control,
386 while the remains of (sometimes contemporary)
387 colonizing Europeans are excluded from this cov-
388 erage. Such differences will make any direct
389 comparison of UK and US laws rather meaning-
390 less, since they are grounded in very different
391 historical circumstances, are driven by very dif-
392 ferent political and cultural imperatives, and con-
393 cern significantly different categories of person.
394 At root, therefore, UK and US legislation in this
395 area do not concern the same types of material.

396 Any set of national laws will also need to be
397 read in accordance with specific standards. These
398 “rules of construction” are quite precise and are
399 often themselves enshrined in law, ensuring that

any law of the particular state will be interpreted 400
in the same way as any other and thus guarantee 401
consistency in application. These rules do not, 402
however, cross territorial and jurisdictional 403
boundaries. A brief introduction to some of the 404
key differences that can exist is set out by Prott & 405
O’Keefe (1984: 150-151) and another by 406
Summers and Taruffo (1991: 501), but for 407
specific advice on how to read laws in particular 408
jurisdictions, more precise legal guidance needs 409
to be sought. In particular, there are gross differ- 410
ences between the manner of interpreting laws 411
between systems of legal Codes and the princi- 412
ples of Common Law. All start from the premise 413
that laws are written and composed of words: the 414
question arises as to how to understand the mean- 415
ing and intent behind certain words and phrases. 416

Codification of Law: France 417

As conveniently summarized by Troper et al. 418
(1991: 171), a distinguishing feature of French 419
legal culture is that it is “one of written law. . . to 420
a large extent codified.” The effect of codification 421
is to offer a body of law that is complete and 422
contains no contradictions or elisions: it therefore 423
does not allow opportunities for avoidance or 424
evasion, or for circumstances that are not covered 425
by it. Accordingly, where the law is silent on an 426
issue, it becomes the task of interpreters to fill 427
that silence: either by simply not recognizing the 428
omission or – more likely – by recognizing that 429
the “gap” in legal coverage is a result of the 430
legislator’s inability to think of everything in 431
advance and thus prevailing upon the interpreter 432
to do so (Troper et al. 1991: 175-176). It is gen- 433
erally assumed that the legislators intend all 434
laws to comply with the Constitution, and so 435
laws will be interpreted to ensure this (Troper 436
et al. 1991: 195), and that the administration 437
works for the good of the common interest 438
(Troper et al. 1991: 196) although laws restricting 439
liberties are interpreted more strictly (Troper 440
et al. 1991: 202). 441

Although as elsewhere in the world (see 442
below) interpreters seek the “true” meaning of 443
a law and the intention of the lawmaker, the 444
materials they are allowed to draw upon 445
are very wide rather than being constrained 446

447 (as elsewhere) by tight legal rules (Troper et al.
448 1991: 184-189). These may include:

- 449 • The historical background to the law
- 450 • Documents used in drafting the law, including
451 drafts and consultations
- 452 • Interpretations by users of the law, especially
453 public officials
- 454 • The language of other, related, laws
- 455 • The language of laws amended by the one in
456 question
- 457 • The history of legal terminology
- 458 • The effect particular interpretations would
459 have in terms of the national Constitution or
460 international treaty obligations
- 461 • Customary procedures and practices that
462 would otherwise be affected

463 Interestingly, especially for comparison with
464 the USA and UK (see below), interpretations by
465 other courts are rarely drawn upon, although
466 those of superior courts within the same hierarchy
467 may be.

468 Overall, French law is seen as a unity that
469 governs all those it rules. Interpreters of law –
470 that is, the courts – are seen not at all to make law
471 but simply to seek the lawmaker’s intention.
472 Accordingly, in filling “gaps” not covered by
473 a specific legal phraseology, they are seen only
474 to be expressing the will and intent of the legis-
475 lator rather than making new law or extending its
476 coverage. All laws are interpreted in the light of
477 the overarching Code of which they are a part: it
478 follows that no French law “stands alone” but
479 must be read as part of a coherent and cohesive
480 system that effectively recognizes no differences
481 of status or standing or of exception. As Summers
482 and Taruffo (1991: 501) see it, in French law
483 there are no genuine issues of interpretation, and
484 only one meaning is ever possible, and it is this
485 that interpreters must seek.

486 A Federal Common Law State: The USA

487 The French case is very different from that of the
488 USA. While France is a single state, the USA is
489 a federal one, divided into 50 jurisdictions
490 governed by a federal Constitution. All laws of
491 every state and federal law (a jurisdiction in
492 itself) must ultimately comply with the Constitu-
493 tion: as in France, compliance will generally be

494 assumed unless demonstrated otherwise (Sum- 494
495 mers 1991: 443-444). In the case where a state 495
496 law is in conflict with a federal law, the federal 496
497 law prevails, but a statute will prevail over 497
498 administrative regulation and usually the Com- 498
499 mon Law which underpins all law (Summers 499
500 1991: 444-445). Whereas in French law gaps in 500
501 legal coverage are acknowledged, in the USA 501
502 such gaps are generally treated as if they are 502
503 simple matters of textual interpretation (Sum- 503
504 mers 1991: 411-412): the issue is one of particu- 504
505 lar words and their meanings rather than attempts 505
506 to meet the standards of an overarching Code. 506

The materials that a US court may draw upon
in making interpretations are at once wider than
that in other territories and more tightly regu-
lated. Materials that must be taken into account
include:

- 507 • The language of the text and any titles, sub- 507
508 headings, and other terms relating directly to it 508
509 (compare with the UK, below) 509
- 510 • Dictionaries and grammars which set out the 510
511 “ordinary” meanings of words under 511
512 examination 512
- 513 • Any legal definitions of terms 513
- 514 • The text of other related statutes 514
- 515 • Any prior, repealed, or modified laws 515
- 516 • Any official history of the passage of the law 516
- 517 • Particular historical circumstances the law 517
518 was intended to address, which may now 518
519 have altered 519
- 520 • General legal principles 520
- 521 • Interpretations by similar or higher courts 521
- 522 • Interpretations by officials charged with admin- 522
523 istering the law (Summers 1991: 422-427) 523
524 524
- 525 • In addition, interpreters are expected (but not 525
526 required) to take into account interpretations by 526
527 other (nonofficial) users of the law, by courts in 527
528 other jurisdictions, and those of senior legal aca- 528
529 demics. There are also materials expressly for- 529
530 bidden from consideration, such as the testimony 530
531 of legislators as to what they believed the law to 531
532 be and nonofficial documentation relating to the 532
533 history of the legislation. 533

534 In addition, interpreters are expected (but not
535 required) to take into account interpretations by
536 other (nonofficial) users of the law, by courts in
537 other jurisdictions, and those of senior legal aca-
538 demics. There are also materials expressly for-
539 bidden from consideration, such as the testimony
540 of legislators as to what they believed the law to
541 be and nonofficial documentation relating to the
542 history of the legislation.

543 By contrast especially with France, the US
544 system is one that openly acknowledges the pos-
545 sibility of alternative readings of legal texts
(Summers & Taruffo 1991: 501). It follows that



542 US courts have more of a lawmaking role than
543 their French counterparts. The prior interpreta-
544 tion by other courts has also a much more impor-
545 tant role here than is evident in the French
546 system, and the authority of officials over legal
547 interpretation is much less evident. Similarly, no
548 requirement exists to make the law fit part of a
549 broader code despite the overarching commit-
550 ment to constitutionality.

551 A Unitary Common Law State: The UK

552 The role of the courts in the UK is not to make law
553 but, similar to their role in France, only to inter-
554 pret it. Accordingly, it is not the place of the
555 courts to fill gaps in coverage but to leave this to
556 legislators (Bankowski & MacCormick 1991:
557 362). The law is not codified, and therefore, in
558 large measure, each piece of legislation stands
559 alone and separate from others except where con-
560 nections are expressly drawn (Bankowski &
561 MacCormick 1991: 363); the focus of interpreta-
562 tion is therefore very much upon the strict inter-
563 pretation of particular words and phrases rather
564 than seeking to contextualize the whole
565 (Bankowski & MacCormick 1991: 382). Interpre-
566 tation is therefore an essentially pragmatic pro-
567 cess of seeking the “ordinary signification” of
568 words (Bankowski & MacCormick 1991: 382-
569 386) rather than being driven by broader princi-
570 ple, as in France, or constitutionality, as in the
571 USA. Nevertheless, there are certain underlying
572 presumptions that guide the interpretive process:
573 that absurdity is not an intent of legislators; that
574 laws are designed to operate fairly; that laws do
575 not (unless specifically indicating otherwise)
576 operate retrospectively; and that existing laws
577 remain unaffected unless the law specifically
578 indicates otherwise (Bankowski & MacCormick
579 1991: 391-2). In the UK system, statutes will
580 prevail over all other kinds of law but increasingly
581 need to comply with laws made elsewhere, in
582 particular EU legislation and certain international
583 treaties (Bankowski & MacCormick 1991: 375).

584 As in the USA, interpreters may draw on cer-
585 tain materials, may use others or are barred from
586 using others: however, the range of materials
587 differs from that elsewhere. The primary source
588 is the specific substantive language of the law

589 itself, excluding any subheadings, titles, or mar-
590 ginal commentary which is only present to guide
591 users to relevant texts and not to determine its
592 meaning (Cross 1995) but including any “Inter-
593 pretation” section which sets out the precise
594 meanings certain words and phrases may carry.
595 Any previous interpretation by a similar or higher
596 court must also be drawn upon, together with any
597 relevant subsidiary legislation which may bring
598 the law into force (Bankowski & MacCormick
599 1991: 375). They may (but are not required) to
600 refer to other laws on the same topic, government
601 guides on good practice, any previous legal his-
602 tory of the terms, current usages of officials, and
603 scholarly writings (Bankowski & MacCormick
604 1991: 376-380). Material expressly barred from
605 consideration includes any information on the
606 history of the law and economic or sociological
607 data on the effects of particular readings
608 (Bankowski & MacCormick 1991: 380-382).

609 In general, UK law is seen as a body of sepa-
610 rate regulations, some of which stand entirely
611 alone, and others which are grouped together,
612 and are interpreted accordingly. Although gen-
613 eral principles and assumptions guide the pro-
614 cess, the focus is very much upon the specifics
615 of individual provisions rather than the creation
616 of a unified whole. Only those materials directly
617 relevant to the point at issue are taken into
618 account: extrinsic factors are barred because the
619 courts would then be involved in making policy,
620 which is not their role. The assumption – as in
621 France – is that there is a single meaning lying
622 behind a particular provision and the function of
623 interpretation is to find it.

624 Differences in Reading Laws

625 These three examples offer a taste – albeit a small
626 one – of how different sets of laws represent
627 different legal ideologies and are therefore to be
628 read differently from one another. In particular,
629 the clear differences between laws that operate as
630 part of a codified system and those that stand
631 alone need to be taken into account, as do the
632 specific materials that can be drawn upon for
633 interpretation and those that cannot and the extent
634 to which underlying principles regarding the
635 presence of “gaps,” absurdity, and contradiction

636 may be applied. Although Summers and Taruffo
637 (1991) take France and the USA as exemplary of
638 opposed legal systems, here I have used them
639 merely as examples, placed alongside a third, to
640 illustrate diversity. An area not mentioned here
641 has been international law, which is the topic of
642 the next section.

643 **International Laws and Their Coverage**

644 Technically those materials referred to by (espe-
645 cially but not exclusively) heritage practitioners
646 as “international law” in the field of heritage are
647 not in fact law: rather, for the most part, they are
648 sets of agreements between nation states whereby
649 those states agree to a common standard of treat-
650 ment for certain classes of object, either generally
651 or in defined sets of circumstances. They may be
652 agreements that are designed to operate globally –
653 such as those promulgated by the United Nations
654 or UNESCO – or regionally, such as those relat-
655 ing to Europe or the Americas. These laws are
656 important in the field because they are taken to
657 represent the global principles to which all those
658 concerned with the heritage subscribe. Increas-
659 ingly they are also taken as the basis for the
660 passage of law at the national level. The main
661 international laws in force at present are set out
662 in [Table 1](#).

663 Since they are promulgated by organizations
664 composed of individual nation states, these inter-
665 national agreements are binding only upon the
666 states acceding to them: they cannot be enforced
667 against individuals or agencies unless they have
668 also been incorporated into national laws,
669 although this does not lift the responsibility
670 from national governments to put in place appro-
671 priate arrangements to ensure compliance below
672 the level of government. They are to be read and
673 interpreted in a distinctive manner which reflects
674 in many ways their purpose as setters of norms
675 and guidance. Each such document begins with
676 a preamble which sets out the conditions under
677 which it was brought into existence and the pur-
678 pose it serves: its specific provisions must be read
679 in the light of these opening statements as to
680 function rather than as stand-alone imperatives.
681 This contrasts with the way in which laws are
682 read at the level of some nation states which are

binding on individual citizens and state and non- 683
state agencies. 684

In addition to Conventions, the membership of 685
international bodies such as UNESCO and the 686
Council of Europe may also adopt Resolutions, 687
which have much less legal force than 688
a Convention but nevertheless provide guidance 689
as to norms and expectations. These too are not 690
binding upon individual and state and non-state 691
agencies unless their provisions are adopted into 692
national law, but they may also provide the basis 693
on which future Conventions are constructed. 694
Other international organizations also contribute 695
to international law in this area, in a more sub- 696
stantive manner. The European Union is 697
concerned primarily with economic and political 698
issues, leaving matters of culture to the broader 699
membership of the Council of Europe, but recent 700
changes in the EU have allowed it to consider 701
cultural matters, and these may become more 702
significant as time moves on. However, as part 703
of its economic remit, it brought forward in 1992 704
two legal instruments relating to the movement of 705
cultural items into and out of the EU and between 706
member states. The terms of the Directive on the 707
Return of Cultural Objects Unlawfully Removed 708
from the Territory of a Member State will need to 709
be incorporated into national laws before it takes 710
full effect, but this must be done to a set timeta- 711
ble; the Regulation on the export of cultural 712
goods – which places limitations on the export 713
of such items outside the EU – had immediate and 714
direct effect on member states and their citizens. 715

Like all legislative arrangements, some inter- 716
national instruments purport to relate to all 717
aspects of heritage, such as the UNESCO World 718
Heritage Convention, the European Cultural 719
Convention, and the OAS Convention. Others 720
concern all matters relating to particular types 721
of heritage object, such as the RAMSAR Con- 722
vention on Wetlands, the European Conventions 723
which separately treat the archaeological and 724
architectural heritage, and the UNESCO Conven- 725
tions on underwater and intangible heritages. 726
Others attempt to address particular issues that 727
affect cultural objects, such as the UNESCO 728
Hague and Paris Conventions, the UNIDROIT 729
Convention, and the European Union measures 730



731 in relation to the movement of cultural objects.
 732 The Paris and UNIDROIT Conventions and the
 733 EU measures all relate in particular to the issue of
 734 the illicit acquisition, movement, and transfer of
 735 cultural objects from one state to another:
 736 whereas most international law seeks to provide
 737 guidance and to set standards, these measures
 738 endeavor to go further by regulating behavior.
 739 In this way they are acting much more like
 740 national laws.

741 Not all states choose to accede to all interna-
 742 tional laws in this field. In some cases it will be
 743 because they consider they lack the resources to
 744 meet the standards required by that law; in
 745 others – particularly developed states in the
 746 West – that they already have laws and mecha-
 747 nisms in place that meet or surpass those of the
 748 particular instrument. In some cases it may be felt
 749 that the particular instrument – although perhaps
 750 introduced by the state in question – is aimed at
 751 the practices of other states who do not meet the
 752 standard set. In others it will be because it chal-
 753 lenges or threatens a particular national interest,
 754 such as an economic interest. Failures to accede
 755 inevitably weaken the effect of such laws since
 756 they cannot be enforced against states that have
 757 not done so. In turn this may affect the capacity of
 758 the instrument to act as a measure of minimum
 759 performance and an international standard. At the
 760 same time, such laws have been criticized for
 761 adopting a specifically Western approach to
 762 ideas of cultural heritage, constructed around
 763 notions of the built and monumental heritage,
 764 rather than heritages of practice and belief. Such
 765 criticisms have led to a refocusing especially by
 766 UNESCO on such ideas as the “intangible heri-
 767 tage” and “cultural diversity,” reflected in instru-
 768 ments promulgated in the early part of this
 769 century. These represent new approaches to the
 770 cultural heritage which can be expected to have
 771 influence at the level of the nation state, although
 772 not all Western states have yet acceded to these
 773 new principles.

774 **National Laws and Their Differences**

775 Although references in the literature of the field
 776 to international measures are extensive and such
 777 laws are invariably treated in the literature of the

field as significantly influential (e.g., Cleere 778
 1989; Skeates 2000; Carman 2002; Smith 2004: 779
 106), nevertheless attempts to assess their effect 780
 on law and practice at the key level of the nation 781
 state are limited. A project by the Council of 782
 Europe nevertheless attempted to do this for the 783
 European Conventions relating to the archaeo- 784
 logical and architectural heritage, by a process 785
 of comparison of how different states put the 786
 requirements of the Conventions into effect 787
 (Pickard 2001). As would possibly be expected, 788
 the range of 13 countries from all parts of 789
 Europe – some well established, others newly 790
 emergent – provided evidence of a wide diversity 791
 of treatment, organization, and focus together 792
 with different levels of compliance with the Con- 793
 ventions. The project focused in particular on the 794
 following aspects of heritage management in 795
 each territory: 796

- Definition of the heritage, including systems 797
 of categorization and selection criteria 798
- Processes of identification and styles of inven- 799
 tories and recording 800
- Measures to protect, preserve, and prevent 801
 damage 802
- Conservation philosophy, including attitudes 803
 to reconstruction and refurbishment 804
- Sanctions for breach of regulations and coer- 805
 cive measures in place 806
- Integration of conservation with other plan- 807
 ning and land-use regulation 808
- Financial provisions, including sources of 809
 funding, tax regimes, and economic develop- 810
 ment programs 811
- The role and structure of relevant agencies and 812
 organizations 813
- Provision for the education and training of 814
 staff 815

The discussion usefully highlights differences 816
 between individual countries but also indicates 817
 areas few or none have yet addressed, pointing to 818
 the future influence likely to be wielded by 819
 regional rather than purely national approaches 820
 (Pickard 2001: 4-10). Here, I wish to outline the 821
 areas where legislative provisions can take 822
 a different approach in different parts of the 823
 world. These areas are in particular: 824

- 825 • Ways of defining and specifying the object of
826 such laws
- 827 • How different bodies of material are
828 addressed in laws
- 829 • Issues of rights of ownership and control
- 830 • The kinds of sanctions which may be applied
831 Depending on the system of law in place, the
832 approach taken in these areas will correlate quite
833 closely.

834 Defining and Specifying Material

835 There are several ways in which the material
836 covered by a law or a body of law may be
837 described, set out by Prott and O’Keefe (1984:
838 184-187) as enumeration, categorization, and
839 classification. *Enumeration* is a system of lists
840 of the kinds of material to be covered: this is
841 typical of US federal laws in this area (US Dept.
842 of the Interior 1989-90) and has been to some
843 extent adopted in the UK for the purpose of
844 describing the kinds of objects that can be con-
845 sidered for the purposes of legal protection
846 (Carman 1996: 120-124 & 187-192). The prob-
847 lem with this approach is that it leaves open the
848 question of whether items not on the list but of
849 a similar kind can be included: for example, if the
850 list specifies “graves and burial sites,” does this
851 also cover aboveground disposal of the dead?
852 *Categorization* is a looser approach whereby
853 a broad description of types of material is pro-
854 vided, into which a range of particular objects
855 may fall. The problem of this approach is that
856 too narrow a definition may exclude objects of
857 concern, while too broad a definition may include
858 too much material. By contrast with both, *classi-*
859 *fication* is not concerned with the form of the
860 object, but with actions taken towards it: in such
861 a system, only those objects officially recognized
862 and designated as such by a responsible authority
863 can be granted protection. While convenient and
864 transparent, the system has the flaw of only rec-
865 ognizing those objects that have been specifically
866 designated, leaving others of similar nature to
867 their fate. At the same time, it is worth noting
868 that these different systems are by no means
869 exclusive. It is possible to use them in combina-
870 tion, so that the list under an enumerative scheme
871 may include categories, while a scheme of

categorization may also enumerate particular 872
types of object, and a classificatory scheme may 873
operate in respect of items enumerated or 874
categorized. 875

These differences represent contrasting 876
approaches to the cultural heritage as 877
a phenomenon as well as the structure of law. 878
Where only designated material is covered by 879
law, the emphasis is placed upon the relevant 880
authority and its decisions; where material is 881
enumerated, anything included is automatically 882
covered, removing authority from agencies and 883
placing it more generally; under schemes of cat- 884
egorization, a measure of interpretation is 885
required, placing some but not all focus upon 886
agencies. An enumerative scheme assumes 887
a solid understanding of the kinds of materials 888
and places constituting the heritage: by its nature, 889
anything not listed is excluded. A scheme of 890
categorization has a greater capacity for the 891
inclusion of new types of material, especially if 892
the categories are drawn not on the basis of phys- 893
ical form or attributes (e.g., state of ruination or 894
age) but on value ascriptions (e.g., “of architec- 895
tural, archaeological, etc., interest or impor- 896
tance”). Paradoxically, the greatest flexibility 897
may exist under a scheme of designation, so 898
long as the capacity to designate is drawn widely: 899
if it is limited by enumeration or categorization, 900
then it is significantly less able to include new 901
types of material. 902

Addressing Different Bodies of Material 903

The range of objects that can be classed as cul- 904
tural resources is wide, ranging from individual 905
moveable objects singly or in groups; to upstand- 906
ing buildings in use, ruined buildings and struc- 907
tures, earthwork sites, buried features, scatters of 908
material, and natural features used by humans; to 909
entire landscapes, built and natural (Carman 910
2002: 30-57). Under systems of law, the ways of 911
treating them may be as varied as the material 912
itself. In some regimes, all cultural material of 913
whatever kind is treated under the same body of 914
law: while different objects may be treated in 915
particular ways, the overall scheme is common 916
to all classes of material. By contrast, others 917
make a clear distinction between particular 918



919 kinds of object, so they are not only treated dif-
920 ferently but are also subject to different bodies of
921 law. In those cases where a single, overarching
922 national antiquities law covers all cultural
923 objects, no distinction is drawn between individ-
924 ual bodies of material. Regardless of whether the
925 object is a moveable object, a scatter of material,
926 a ruin or a buried feature, an upstanding building,
927 or a landscape, it will be subject to the same
928 regime, effectively rendering them all a single
929 class of object for legal purposes.

930 By contrast, other regimes make a clear dis-
931 tinction between particular kinds of object, so
932 they are not only treated differently but are also
933 subject to different bodies of law. Distinctions
934 may be drawn on the basis of the physical prop-
935 erties or attributes of the material, so that move-
936 able objects are differentiated from fixed
937 monuments and sites, and the latter perhaps
938 from upstanding buildings in use. While move-
939 able objects are subject to laws concerning own-
940 ership and their placement in museums or other
941 archives, fixed sites and monuments may be sub-
942 ject to official protection in the care of the state,
943 while buildings in use are subject to controls on
944 use and alteration. Alternatively, distinctions
945 may be drawn on the basis of whose heritage
946 the object represents: in states where an indige-
947 nous population may claim rights over its cultural
948 material, such as the Americas or Australia, such
949 material will be treated differently from the his-
950 toric heritage of the incoming European popula-
951 tion. Here, a distinction between prehistoric (i.e.,
952 pre-European contact) material and historic
953 (colonial period) material is effectively drawn:
954 but it is in fact not a distinction based upon age
955 but upon putative cultural origin. European
956 states – except those where an indigenous popu-
957 lation dwells, such as in northern Scandinavia
958 and Russia – and numbers of states in Africa
959 and Asia (although not all), generally have no
960 need of such a distinction, and material of all
961 periods is capable of treatment under the same
962 regime, although distinctions between different
963 types of object may also be maintained.

Ownership Versus Control 964

As Prott & O’Keefe (1984: 189) point out, “it is 965
not usually necessary to have ownership of 966
[material] in order to regulate what may be done 967
in relation to it.” Nevertheless, as they go on to 968
add (Prott & O’Keefe 1984: 191), a number of 969
states across the globe do claim a right of owner- 970
ship of certain classes of cultural material from 971
the moment of discovery. While in most cases 972
this right of ownership applies only to removable 973
material – which will most likely find its way into 974
a museum or archive – in some cases it applies 975
also to the land on which they were found 976
(Prott & O’Keefe 1984: 195). Alternatively, 977
material and land may become subject to 978
compulsory acquisition by the state unless certain 979
conditions (such as the deposition of material in 980
a suitable archive) are met. This “nationalization” 981
of the cultural heritage has a number of 982
advantages: 983

- It is a coherent and transparent process applied 984
equally to all. 985
- It ensures full control by appropriate agencies 986
over the fate of material. 987
- It associates such material with the entire com- 988
munity as represented by the nation state. 989
- It is simple. 990

However, it rides roughshod over private 991
rights and may encourage finders to fail to report 992
or record finds. 993

An alternative to state ownership is to provide 994
for the regulation of the treatment of cultural 995
material while allowing private ownership of 996
that material. This may involve drawing distinc- 997
tions between material on the basis of its type and 998
circumstances of discovery so that some material 999
is the property of the state, while other material of 1000
similar kind is not: this is the case, for instance, 1001
with the laws of Treasure Trove and Treasure in 1002
England (Carman 1996: 55-61; Bland 2004). 1003
Alternatively, the “cultural” component of the 1004
material may become controlled by state agen- 1005
cies, while the object itself remains the property 1006
of another: this is sometimes the case with 1007
upstanding monuments, where the land on 1008
which it stands and in which it is rooted remains 1009
the property of the landowner, but the monument 1010
passes into state control; in such cases, the 1011

1012 landowner continues to have use of the land but is
1013 subject to limitations on treatment of the monu-
1014 ment. A third way is to place controls on the use
1015 of land either to prevent damage to existing
1016 archaeology or such that the presence of archae-
1017 ology is so far as possible taken into account
1018 before the discovery of cultural material: deci-
1019 sions regarding the fate of any such material will
1020 therefore have been taken before any work com-
1021 mences, and where significant material is to be
1022 encountered, work likely to damage it may be
1023 completely prevented. In cases such as these,
1024 laws and administrative arrangements to put
1025 them into force will be more complex and poten-
1026 tially more costly but if effective can develop
1027 a measure of public support for the project of
1028 cultural heritage protection, limiting the prob-
1029 lems of avoidance.

1030 Public and Private Agencies

1031 The role of state agencies will differ whether the
1032 laws provide for state ownership or state controls
1033 on private ownership of cultural material. In the
1034 first case, all authority over cultural remains will
1035 lie with the state. In the second, state agencies
1036 will need to interact and compromise with others
1037 who retain an interest in the material.

1038 By far the most common approach is that of
1039 central regulation by state control, in which her-
1040 itage objects are deemed to be the property and
1041 thus the responsibility of the nation state and its
1042 agencies. Under such a system, only those
1043 accredited by the state – frequently its employees
1044 but also those granted specific licences – are
1045 entitled to conduct archaeological or conserva-
1046 tion work. Accordingly, excavation by anyone
1047 else is commonly a criminal activity. In theory
1048 at least, all building and other work will cease
1049 when archaeological remains are encountered
1050 and state-employed archaeologists will move
1051 onto the site. In practice, however, limitations
1052 apply on this potentially draconian system.
1053 Small developments will be allowed to proceed
1054 unhindered, government-sponsored projects may
1055 also proceed without the interference of an
1056 archaeologist, and, in many countries where
1057 such systems apply, lack of resources will result
1058 in incomplete coverage. Nevertheless, the ideal

of such a system is a very powerful idea and 1059
dominates much thinking in the heritage field. It 1060
is the ideal assumed to exist by most international 1061
agencies such as UNESCO, and very often those 1062
territories or areas not applying this approach can 1063
be thought to be deficient. Here, archaeology is 1064
a cost carried out of taxation levied on the entire 1065
community in whose service it is deemed to exist. 1066

The alternative system, which applies mostly 1067
in Anglophone countries such as the UK, USA, 1068
and Australia, is that of a partially privatized 1069
archaeology. This is essentially a private enter- 1070
prise system under a measure of regulation by 1071
state and state-empowered authorities. In general 1072
there will be no limitation on who may carry out 1073
archaeological work, although professional bod- 1074
ies will seek to encourage the employment of 1075
those accredited by them. Excavation itself will 1076
most often be carried out as a result of the need to 1077
mitigate the damage of archaeological remains 1078
by development projects. In the USA material 1079
of “scientific significance” may need to be 1080
retrieved or preserved; in the UK, the emphasis 1081
is theoretically upon preservation in situ but fre- 1082
quently results in rescue excavation and so-called 1083
preservation by record. Where development work 1084
reveals archaeological remains, the developer 1085
will be responsible for employing archaeologists 1086
to carry out appropriate work, monitored by the 1087
local authority to ensure proper standards of 1088
recording. Here, archaeology is a cost levied on 1089
the developer, treating damage to the heritage as 1090
a form of pollution and applying the principle of 1091
“the polluter pays” for restitution. This is archae- 1092
ology as enterprise, although never completely 1093
unregulated, and much of the discussion of such 1094
systems turns upon issues of regulation and con- 1095
trol rather than freedom of action. 1096

Sanctions and Penalties 1097

There are two aspects to the issue of sanctions 1098
and penalties applied for breach of laws relating 1099
to the archaeological resource: to what kinds of 1100
offences they relate and the types of sanction 1101
applied. Depending on the kind of regime in 1102
place – a state-ownership regime or 1103
a “privatized” regime – particular attitudes as to 1104
the severity of breach and what types of breach 1105



1106 are more serious will prevail, reflected in the
1107 sanctions applied both theoretically and in prac-
1108 tice. The range of sanctions available runs the full
1109 scale of penalties for breach of any kind of law:
1110 from prison terms through fines where breach is
1111 considered a criminal matter to civil remedies
1112 such as damages and carrying the cost of restora-
1113 tion and repair and the confiscation of material.
1114 Such penalties may be combined so that a person
1115 in breach may have to carry out reparation and
1116 pay a fine or serve a prison term. As Pickard
1117 (2001: 329) points out, however, such powerful
1118 sanctions tend not to be applied: prosecutions may
1119 be rare and the penalties awarded relatively light.

1120 Where archaeological material is held to be
1121 the property of the state, criminal sanctions are
1122 more likely to apply to those who claim it for
1123 themselves. It is frequently a breach of criminal
1124 law to export such material without the proper
1125 authority, and sometimes any private appropria-
1126 tion of such material will be considered a form
1127 of theft. In some territories, although private
1128 ownership is allowed, penalties apply for the
1129 non-reporting of finds (Pratt & O'Keefe 1984:
1130 209-10 & 215-216). An alternative is to reward
1131 finders for reporting: they may be allowed to
1132 retain the find without penalty, or receive pay-
1133 ment for its delivery to a suitable repository.
1134 Where private ownership of material is the
1135 accepted norm, specific provisions may apply to
1136 particular classes of material – either on the basis
1137 of its attributes, such as its form or material, or on
1138 the basis of its context of discovery, such as its
1139 location when found, or the process by which it
1140 came to light. Accordingly, for the bulk of
1141 archaeological material, normal rules for the
1142 allocation of ownership will apply, but certain
1143 material may become the property of the state.
1144 In such cases a need to report may apply to all
1145 material or only that owned by the state: in the
1146 latter case, provision may nevertheless be made
1147 for the voluntary reporting of finds.

1148 Penalties also accrue to those who may dam-
1149 age or destroy archaeological sites and monu-
1150 ments and historic buildings. In some cases,
1151 where these are owned by or in the care of the
1152 state, the penalties will be criminal, involving
1153 fine or prison. In other cases they will be civil,

1154 such as reparation or damages. Where arrange-
1155 ments are in place for the control of construction
1156 and development work, archaeological remains
1157 may be included among those factors to be con-
1158 sidered. In such a case, where the likelihood of
1159 damage to archaeological remains is envisaged,
1160 the proposed work may be prevented altogether
1161 but is more likely to have controls placed upon it:
1162 for redesign to avoid affecting significant archae-
1163 ological material, or for advance investigation of
1164 such material at the cost of the developer. Failure
1165 to comply may result in a fine or the imposition of
1166 further controls on development work. In similar
1167 vein, some Latin American states may apply
1168 sanctions to unsatisfactory excavators for poor
1169 quality archaeological work (Pratt & O'Keefe
1170 1984: 305): such penalties will involve the can-
1171 cellation of licences to conduct work in the terri-
1172 tory concerned.

1173 Conclusion

1174 It is likely that the kinds of differences between
1175 national laws outlined briefly here in some way
1176 correlate. Accordingly, where a single body of
1177 law applies to all cultural objects, they may also
1178 be subject to direct state ownership and control,
1179 allow for no non-state agency involvement, and
1180 apply at least theoretically strict criminal sanc-
1181 tions. Where distinctions are made between types
1182 of object, different ownership regimes may exist
1183 side by side, there may be a measure of non-state
1184 involvement in archaeology, and sanctions may
1185 be relatively light and civil rather than criminal.
1186 To date, however, and despite the work of Pratt &
1187 O'Keefe (1984) and others (e.g., heritagelaw.
1188 org), no substantial work of this nature has yet
1189 been completed, so these suggested likely corre-
1190 lations remain only as plausible assertions.
1191 Nevertheless, whether or not these types of cor-
1192 relations exist in reality, the crucial point is that
1193 differences between legal regimes are not mere
1194 matters of administrative convenience: in the
1195 same way as the differences of legal interpreta-
1196 tion covered above, they represent fundamental
1197 differences of ideology in terms of what law is
1198 for, where authority resides, and the nature of the
1199 cultural heritage. In thus approaching national
1200 laws, it is necessary to be sensitive to the kinds

1201 of ideology represented and the attitudes towards
 1202 and expectations of both law and heritage they
 1203 carry.

1204 **The Professionalization of Archaeology**

1205 The application of legislation in the field of
 1206 archaeology and its regulation under law is one
 1207 of the factors that has encouraged the increasing
 1208 professionalization of the field. The regulatory
 1209 influence of official organizations allows them
 1210 to produce standard-setting documentation
 1211 which influence practice and require to be met if
 1212 work is to be granted to those at whom they are
 1213 aimed: a number of state agencies accordingly
 1214 have adopted such a nonlegislative approach
 1215 to controls on archaeological work. Parks
 1216 Canada, for instance, publish as part of their
 1217 website ([http://parkscanada.pch.gc.ca/library/](http://parkscanada.pch.gc.ca/library/PC_Guiding_Principles/)
 1218 [PC_Guiding_Principles/](http://parkscanada.pch.gc.ca/library/PC_Guiding_Principles/)) their *Cultural*
 1219 *Resource Management Policy* setting out the
 1220 principles guiding their treatment of the historic
 1221 places in their care. In the UK, English Heritage
 1222 seek to guide the conduct of publicly funded
 1223 archaeological work by encouraging a particular
 1224 managerial approach (English Heritage 1991).
 1225 English Heritage were also responsible for pro-
 1226 ducing the nationally applicable guidelines for
 1227 local authorities on the treatment of archaeolog-
 1228 ical sites under threat from development projects
 1229 (DoE 1990), and their application and effective-
 1230 ness is monitored by them. The message of such
 1231 products – whether international or national – is
 1232 that of the particular expertise of the people
 1233 responsible for them, which in turn further
 1234 encourages the professionalization of the disci-
 1235 pline as a whole.

1236 In combination with laws and regulatory pro-
 1237 cedures, systems of self-supervision and over-
 1238 sight create a climate where archaeology
 1239 operates inevitably as part of systems of gover-
 1240 nance. Although not widely discussed in these
 1241 terms (but see Smith 2004: 58-80), the point is
 1242 recognized by others with an interest in the mate-
 1243 rial remains of the past. Especially in those juris-
 1244 dictions governed by a tradition of Common Law
 1245 and private property rather than state control and
 1246 ownership, those who object to giving control
 1247 over the past to a “closed” profession, and despite

their own inclination towards individualism, 1248
 organize themselves into groups who may then 1249
 propagate their own codes of practice and stan- 1250
 dards of behavior, effectively “professionalizing” 1251
 an anti-archaeologist stance. This is to some 1252
 extent the situation in the UK in respect of ama- 1253
 teur metal detectors and treasure hunters, many 1254
 of whom work in association with archaeologists 1255
 and others. The voluntary Portable Antiquities 1256
 Scheme – whereby finds are reported and the 1257
 information made publicly available ([www.](http://www.finds.org.uk) 1258
[finds.org.uk](http://www.finds.org.uk); Bland 2004) – is given support by 1259
 the code of practice of the National Council for 1260
 Metal Detecting (www.ncmd.co.uk) among 1261
 others. 1262

1263 **Conclusion**

1264 The key points to note from this overview of law
 1265 and regulation in archaeology are the variations
 1266 in approaches to law in the field: these in turn
 1267 represent not mere habit and local practice but
 1268 real differences in ideology and approach. Where
 1269 a system is based upon close control by central
 1270 government, it represents a very different under-
 1271 standing of the purpose and role of archaeology in
 1272 society from one where private ownership is
 1273 upheld and regulations are looser and more flex-
 1274 ible. These are differences that matter, especially
 1275 in relation to study or work in an area new to one:
 1276 ideas that are the norm in one territory do not
 1277 transfer simply to another. Such differences are
 1278 reflected in how archaeologists are trained and
 1279 qualified, the relations between archaeologists
 1280 and the state, relations between archaeologists,
 1281 between archaeologists and others interested in
 1282 the past, and between archaeologists and the
 1283 wider public.

1284 **Cross-References**

- 1285 ▶ [African Continent, Archaeological Heritage](#)
- 1286 [Management Law on the](#)
- 1287 [Athens Charter \(1931\)](#)
- 1288 ▶ [Australia, Domestic Archaeological and](#)
- 1289 [Heritage Management Law in](#)
- 1290 ▶ [Australia, Indigenous Cultural Property](#)
- 1291 [Return in](#)

1292	▶ Burra Charter (1999)	▶ International Cultural Tourism Charter Managing Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance (1999)	1338
1293	▶ Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (1987)	▶ International Journal of Cultural Property	1339
1294	▶ Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage (1990)	▶ Latin America, Indigenous Peoples' Rights in	1340
1295	▶ Charter for the Protection and Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (1996)	▶ Legislation in Archaeology: Overview and Introduction	1341
1296	▶ China, Domestic Archaeological Heritage Management Law in	▶ Machu Picchu Artifacts, Repatriation of the	1342
1297	▶ Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites (Legislation)	▶ Museum Security Network	1343
1298	▶ Continental Europe, Domestic Archaeological and Heritage Management Law in	▶ Norms of Quito (1967)	1344
1299	▶ Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)	▶ Parthenon (Elgin) Marbles, Case Study of	1345
1300	▶ Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970)	▶ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Convention	1346
1301	▶ Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001)	▶ International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT) Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects (1995)	1347
1302	▶ Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage and Society (2005)	▶ United States Domestic Archaeological Heritage Management Law	1348
1303	▶ Cultural Property Protection during Wartime: The Second Gulf War (US/Iraq)	▶ USA and Mexico (1970): Bilateral Treaties and Patrimonial Property Restitution	1349
1304	▶ Cultural Property Repatriation and Restitution: Relevant Rules of International Law	▶ Vermillion Accord on Human Remains (Legislation)	1350
1305	▶ Cultural Property Repatriation in the United States: A Case Study in NAGPRA (US)		1351
1306	▶ Cultural Property, Trade and Trafficking: Introduction		1352
1307	▶ European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (1996)		1353
1308	▶ European Union Directive 93/11/92: Export of Cultural Goods		1354
1309	▶ Florence Charter: Historic Gardens (1982)		1355
1310	▶ Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954)		1356
1311	▶ ICOMOS Charter on Cultural Routes		1357
1312	▶ International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice 1964)		1358
1313	▶ International Council of Museums (ICOM): Code of Ethics		1359
1314			1360
1315			1361
1316			1362
1317			1363
1318			1364
1319			1365
1320			1366
1321			1367
1322			1368
1323			1369
1324			1370
1325			1371
1326			1372
1327			1373
1328			1374
1329			1375
1330			1376
1331			1377
1332			1378
1333			1379
1334			1380
1335			1381
1336			1382
1337			1383
			1384
			1385
			1386
			1387

References

BANKOWSKI, Z. & D.N. MACCORMICK. 1991. Statutory interpretation in the United Kingdom. 1991, in D.N. MacCormick & R.S. Summers (ed.) *Interpreting statutes: a comparative study*: 359-406. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.

BLAND, R. 2004. The Treasure Act and the portable antiquities scheme: a case study in developing public archaeology, in N. Merriman (ed.) *Public archaeology*: 272-291. London: Routledge.

BREEZE, D. 1996. Archaeological nationalism as defined by law in Britain, in J.A. Atkinson, I. Banks & J. O'Sullivan (ed.) *Nationalism and archaeology* (Scottish Archaeological Forum): 95-103. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.

BURNHAM, B. 1974. *The protection of cultural property: handbook of national legislations*. Paris: ICOM.

CARMAN, J. 1996. *Valuing ancient things: archaeology and law in England*. London: Leicester University Press.

- 2002. *Archaeology & heritage: an introduction*. London & New York: Continuum.

- 2012. Towards an international comparative history of archaeological heritage management, in R. Skeates, C. McDavid & J. Carman. (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of public archaeology*: 13-35. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 1388 CLEERE, H.F. (ed.) 1984. *Approaches to the archaeological heritage*. Cambridge: University Press. 1427
1389
1390 -1989. *Archaeological heritage management in the modern world* (One World Archaeology 9). London: 1429
1391 Unwin Hyman. 1430
1392
1393 CROSS, R. 1995. *Statutory interpretation*, 3rd edn. London: 1431
1394 Blackwell. 1432
1395 DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT. 1990. *Archaeology and 1433*
1396 *planning: planning policy guideline note No. 16*. Lon- 1434
1397 don: Department of the Environment, November 1990. 1435
1398 DICKERSON, R. 1975. *The interpretation and application of 1436*
1399 *statutes*. Boston: Little Brown. 1437
1400 DÖRGE, H. 1971. *Das Recht der Denkmalpflege in Baden- 1438*
1401 *Württemberg*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. 1439
1402 DROMGOOLE, S. (ed.) 1999. *Legal protection of the under- 1440*
1403 *water cultural heritage: national and international 1441*
1404 *perspectives*. The Hague: Kluwer. 1442
1405 EBEL, W., W. SCHIDERMAIR & M. PETZET. 1975. 1443
1406 *Bayerisches Denkmalschutzgesetz*. Munich: Deutscher 1444
1407 *Gemeindeverlag*. 1445
1408 ENGLISH HERITAGE. 1991. *Managing archaeological pro- 1446*
1409 *jects (MAP2)*. London: English Heritage. 1447
1410 FOURMILE, H. 1996. The law of the land: whose law? 1448
1411 Whose land?, in A. Clark & L. Smith (ed.) *Issues in 1449*
1412 *management archaeology*: 45-50. St. Lucia: Tempus 1450
1413 *Publications, University of Queensland*. 1451
1414 HANGARTNER, Y. 1981. *Rechtsfragen der Denkmalpflege*. St 1452
1415 *Gallen: Schweizerisches Institut für Verwaltungskurse 1453*
1416 *der Hochschule St Gallen*. 1454
1417 HOCKE, M. 1975. *Denkmalschutz in Österreich*. Vienna: 1455
1418 *Jupiter-Verlag*. 1456
1419 HUNTER, J. & I. RALSTON. (ed.) 2007. *Archaeological 1457*
1420 *resource management in the UK: an introduction*, 1458
1421 *2nd edn*. Stroud: Sutton. 1459
1422 KING, J.L., R.L. GONZALEZ & M. DEL R. GONZALEZ. 1980. 1460
1423 *Archaeologia y Derechoen México*. México: 1461
1424 *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*. 1462
1425 KNUDSON, R. 1986. Contemporary cultural resource man- 1463
1426 *agement*, in D.J. Meltzer, D.D. Fowler & J.A. Sabloff 1464
(ed.) *American archaeology past and future: a celebration of the Society for American Archaeology 1935-1985*. 395-414. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution. 1465
MACCORMICK, D.N. & R.S. SUMMERS. (ed.) 1991. *Interpreting statutes: a comparative study*. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.
MCGIMSEY, C.R. 1972. *Public archaeology*. New York: Seminar Books.
PICKARD, R. (ed.) 2001. *Policy and law in heritage conservation*. London & New York: Spon.
PROTT, L.V. & P.J. O'KEEFE. 1984. *Law and the cultural heritage, Volume 1: discovery and excavation*. Abingdon: Professional Books.
PUGH-SMITH, J. & J. SAMUELS. 1996. *Archaeology in law*. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
RIGAMBERT, C. 1996. *Le droit de l'archéologie française*. Paris: Picard.
SKEATES, R. 2000. *Debating the archaeological heritage*. London: Duckworth.
SMITH, L. 2004. *Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage*. London: Routledge.
SUMMERS, R.S. 1991. Statutory interpretation in the United States, in D.N. MacCormick & R.S. Summers. (ed.) *Interpreting statutes: a comparative study*: 407-460. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.
SUMMERS, R.S. & M. TARUFFO. 1991. Interpretation and comparative analysis, in D.N. MacCormick & R.S. Summers. (ed.) *Interpreting statutes: a comparative study*: 461-510. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.
TARELLO, G. 1980. *L'interpretazione della legge*. Milan: Giuffry.
TROPER, M., C. GRZEGORCZYK & J.-L. GARDIES. 1991. Statutory interpretation in France, in D.N. MacCormick & R.S. Summers (ed.) *Interpreting statutes: a comparative study*: 171-212. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR. 1989-90. *Federal historic preservation laws*. Edited by S.K. Blumenthal. Washington: US Department of the Interior.



t1.1 **Legislation in Archaeology: Overview and Introduction, Table 1** Main international instruments relating to the cultural heritage

t1.2	Date	Promoted by (international organization)	Title
t1.3	1954	UNESCO (portal.unesco.org)	Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (Hague Convention)
t1.4	1970		Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Cultural Property (Paris Convention)
t1.5	1972		Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage
t1.6	2001		Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage
t1.7	2003		Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
t1.8	2005		Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions
t1.9	1971	RAMSAR (www.ramsar.org)	RAMSAR Convention on Wetlands
t1.10	1995	UNIDROIT (www.unidroit.org)	Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects
t1.11	1954	Council of Europe (www.coe.int)	European Cultural Convention
t1.12	1969 (revised 1992)		European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage
t1.13	1985		European Convention on Offences Relating to Cultural Property
t1.14			Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe
t1.15	1976	Organization of American States (www.oas.org)	Convention on Protection of the Archaeological, Historical, and Artistic Heritage of the American Nations

Uncorrected