

What is a monument worth? What is the monument value?

Archaeological heritage management between publicity, heritage law requirements and academic expectations

© Ulf Ickerodt

Archäologisches Landesamt Schleswig-Holstein, Ulf.Ickerodt@alsh.landsh.de

Abstract: With the amendment of Schleswig-Holstein's Monument Protection Act in the year 2012 the term monument value was revalued. Despite initial fears the term proved to be useful for archaeological monument conservation practice. Within the scope of this article the specialist, administrative, legal and public levels of this legally entrenched term determining professional practice are to be presented and then summarized in an analysis scheme focussed on heritage management.

Keywords: archaeological heritage management, value of monument, heritage law, Schleswig-Holstein

Introduction

Schleswig-Holstein's archaeological heritage management has been in what seems like a permanent state of transition for the past decade. At times it is the legal framework which is being changed, at other times it is the administrative assignment. In addition there are the important impulses from archaeological research or new strategies concerning heritage management. Alongside this are the intensification of renewable energies and the consequential results. While the industrialisation of the 19th/early 20th century had already left its mark on the state's monuments, leading ultimately to the state-run heritage management in Schleswig-Holstein (Kersten 1981; Ickerodt 2013a; *ibid.* 2013b), the present extension of renewable energy involves an unprecedented clearing-up operation of the historical cultural landscapes and the archaeological heritage. Wind energy plants, biogas plants and solar parks characterize the challenges which face the archaeological conservation of the state. The subject has also been taken up from political quarters and the consideration of heritage management issues in compliance with the heritage law of the state has been called for in the paper *Integriertes Energie- und Klimakonzept für Schleswig-Holstein (Integrated energy and climate concept for Schleswig-Holstein)* (Web 1: 18, 27, 37) in accordance with the legal principles.

Terms hailing from the field of spatial planning such as increasing pressure on landscape use, growing demands for space or spatial multi-functionality and terms like heritage management are replacing former language regimes, concepts and approaches. Thereby they characterize only very insufficiently the challenges facing the

Izvleček: S spremembo Zakona o varstvu spomenikov dežele Schleswig-Holstein leta 2012 je bil izraz vrednost spomenika prevrednoten. Kljub začetnim bojaznim se je izraz za konservatorsko prakso, povezano z arheološkimi spomeniki, pokazal kot uporaben. V prispevku so prikazane specialistične, upravne, zakonske in javne ravni tega zakonsko utemeljenega izraza, ki določa profesionalno prakso. Te ravni so na koncu povzete v analitični shemi, osredotočeni na upravljanje z dediščino.

Ključne besede: upravljanje z arheološko dediščino, vrednost spomenika, dediščinski zakon, Schleswig-Holstein

state archaeology as regards concepts as well as practicality. As the responsible body for public issues the State Archaeological Department for Schleswig-Holstein (referred to as ALSH) considers active planning control as a mainstay (for the 1996 Act: Schiller 2008). Thus in the past ten years the number of participatory proceedings processed has more than doubled from around 1300 to almost 2700. This transformation is accompanied by the increasingly consistent implementation of the so-called 'Polluter Pays principle' (Ickerodt 2010a).

Contrasting with this are the particular interests of the public. Heritage management in general and archaeological heritage management in particular are readily evaluated here subjectively. In order to understand this meshwork of relationships, the field of interaction between archaeological heritage management and the public on the one part and between heritage law and academic demands on the other part is examined.

The researcher sees the scientific potential, the heritage manager his protection aims, the jurist the question of legal principles and the public the so-called particular interests. The one sees their economic relevance, the others their new building, some attach no importance whatsoever to the whole issue while some others indulge in their amateur research in varying quality and others again discover archaeological monuments as places for their own religious experiences or as places for practicing their religion. To make matters worse, the function of monuments as collective carriers of meaning with their various levels and ranges of influence (e.g. Leggewie 2011) – key words here are *Semiophores* (K. Pomian), *Places of Remembrance* (Nora) or the *Collective Memory* (A. and J. Assmann), *Invented Traditions* (E. Hobsbawm) – is not

stable within collective identities and is characterized by interest-led appropriation processes.

Why archaeological heritage management?

If one considers the emergence of archaeological heritage management, this process, according to perspective, can be attributed for the European area to either the Middle Ages or the early 19th century (e.g. Hingst 1978; Kunow 2002; Pollak 2009; Schnapp 2009). Undoubtedly, however, the scientific and administrative process characterising present-day European heritage management attends the rise of the European nation states of the post-Napoleonic era. This process is accompanied by economic, political and social developments which are summed up here under the keywords industrialization, democratization, liberalization as too secularisation and, especially after the Second World War, individualisation, urbanisation, infrastructure expansion, etc. Meanwhile the keywords migration or gentrification are becoming increasingly important against the background of the demographic change. Thereby we are dealing not only with the preservation of heritage infrastructure but also with how mobile and immobile monuments are dealt with as carriers of meaning and places of remembrance. In so doing the heritage management of the state is also experiencing a broadening of its subject matter. Whereas in the past the focus of the archaeological heritage management lay, if anything, on the state's prehistory and early history and, in some hot spots, on the medieval history, today's legislative basis gives a limit regarding methods and contents: a historically self-contained epoch must be able to be studied using archaeological methods. Therewith the archaeology of The Third Reich in particular and, within a university project, the archaeology of the Cold War enter the heritage management stage and set the tasks which have to be professionally processed.

Alongside this is the non-professional perception of the archaeological heritage management which fluctuates between the demands of the public for participating in archaeology, the archaeological heritage management itself, the professional data, and transparent and comprehensible management practice. On the other hand the perception of these levels seesaws between scientific amateur research and processes of finding one's identity as well as pecuniary interests whose scope has been looked

at elsewhere (Ickerodt 2010b; *ibid.* 2011a; *ibid.* 2011b; *ibid.* 2012; *ibid.* 2013c).

Thereby the protection of our archaeological heritage is not only an important component of our cultural state's identity and for this reason a cultural-political objective whose contents and formal roots are to be sought in the 19th century. In an ideal case it should be impartial to individual subjectivity since interest-led perceptions function. Here it should be considered that the archaeological heritage can at the same time be integrated very diversely in the identity-finding processes at local, regional and nationwide levels, as seen from a geographical perspective, as well as in the different social classes, groups, etc. An example here is the Danevirke system. It constitutes an early historic/historic boundary line which in almost unbroken continuity represents the identity of the later Danish nation state and is thus a monument of international importance. What must be taken into consideration from the point of view of heritage management is that the public interest for participation is valid – insofar as it does not violate existing legislation or constitutional principles as a reference system. Without regard for the person it has to be treated firstly according to professional, administrative law and can then be dealt with on an abstract level in accordance with scientific-ethical criteria.

Formally the archaeological heritage management does not act in a vacuum. The state heritage management of Schleswig-Holstein is integrated into the European system of legal norms. At federal level Schleswig-Holstein is itself responsible for the organisation of monument protection in compliance with the German principle of federalism. Thus this area was regulated in Schleswig-Holstein as long ago as 1956 into a Monument Protection Act (Hingst 1974; *ibid.* 1978). A further benchmark is the State Administration Act in which the active administrative dealings are regulated (competence, administrative deed, questions of formal behaviour, etc.). Thereby Schleswig-Holstein is characterized by a tripartite system consisting of a Supreme, Higher and Lower Monument Protection Authority. The standard of the professional work is the respective current state of research. For the appraisal of the specialist activity the legislative authority sets as norm the judgment of an observer who is broad-minded vis-à-vis the concerns of monument protection. Alongside this is the planning legislation with its varying norms at federal and state level. Here the refer-

ence point is notably the German Planning and Building Regulations (BauGB).

The objectives of heritage management: Preservation and Comprehensibility

In principle the archaeological heritage is recognised in the different legal norms and various political papers as a *character-defining feature of our environment*. The long-term objective of heritage management is thereby the long-term preservation *in situ* in order to treat the non-renewable subjects of protection in a sparing and gentle manner according to the sustainability and precautionary principles – from the point of view of the individual find spots. From the spatial planning viewpoint this entails the preservation of the *spatial coherence, integrity and authenticity* as a quality attribute of our environment. Both aspects are at the same time important facets of the *experiential value* that can be harnessed for cultural tourism: one should be able to re-live and experience history.

A necessary standard is thereby the preservation of the special value of the monument. This is composed of different scientific, legal and practical aspects which substantiate the significance of the object or the structure in a genuine and credible manner without turning the landscape into a museum. They should (as the ideal goal) be preserved comprehensibly and completely. The aim here is the safeguarding of the substance for future generations who, in turn, should be able to continue conveying and communicating the value and the significance of the cultural assets. This theoretical proposition is illustrated below by means of two examples.

The first example is the so-called Kovirke. As an element of the Danevirke system, which crosses the Schleswig Isthmus as an east-west oriented boundary wall, it constitutes a very complex archaeological monument. Its quality formally consists of the walls and ditches which are protected as too the spatial references associated with the monument. However, the landscape setting of the Kovirke has changed dramatically in past decades. Although as a monument it is still a formative element spatially, it has been deeply affected by the expansion in infrastructure (airport, road building, etc.). This can be illustrated notably at its eastern section. If one analyses the area bordering on the Selker Noor one can see how a massive imprint has been made on the surroundings

by settlement activity, road building and gravel-mining, i.e. extensive parts of the original landscape have been completely cleared and simply no longer exist. Thus the context of the Kovirke within the landscape as a historically evaluable source of the Middle Ages and the Modern Age has been destroyed. Furthermore, the expansive stripping of gravel has undoubtedly affected the storage conditions of the remaining archaeological substance. In spite of this exceedingly negative impact there are plans for a new gravel field to be opened up in the southern area of the monument which is still visible above ground resulting in the destruction of the last remaining parts in the ground. This would mean that only the part of the monument lying south of a field path under a hedge-bank would remain without any reference to the landscape, thus robbing it of its intrinsic value as a monument to be experienced.

The second example is an area south of the town of Glückstadt founded in 1617 where planning is in progress. In the case of the object to be assessed, we are dealing with an ensemble consisting of the town itself, the modern fortification structures, the Elbe Dyke and the structures along the banks of the marsh bordering onto the dyke. The plan is to develop this whole area over the forthcoming years and decades for the paper industry and its suppliers. This economic development will also contribute to a massive loss in substance of the archaeological heritage. Even though the modern dykes will be preserved, the interaction to the *Marshhufenstrukturen*, through which the development of the Elbe Marshes can be still well experienced, will be discontinued and replaced by the infrastructure for industry. In actual fact this heritage management decision goes along with the historical development of Glückstadt from 1617 onwards and links the modern industry and its suppliers with the historical development of the town by connecting historical structures spatially and by continuing to tell the story of industrialisation and maintaining the local evolutionary logic.

Work objectives of archaeological heritage management

Derk J. Stobbelaar and Karina Hendriks (2006, 205) showcase four objectives of interdisciplinary spatial planning which should be taken into consideration with regard to the sustainable handling of spatial resources and which, in principle, also represent the assessment

principles of archaeological heritage management. With the protection of archaeological monuments the basic goal is to preserve the historical coherence of the space as this constitutes an important connecting point for social identity and land-use structures as too for the biological environment and its regenerative levels. Here monument protection and environmental protection overlap broadly as a matter of principle.

Indeed such a demand is not to be regarded as absolute from the specialist point of view against the background of the dynamics in society and in the natural environment. Rather it is necessary to portray the qualities of the archaeological heritage and to introduce them, evaluated, into the various levels of spatial planning (regional planning at state level, regional planning concepts, land development plans, land utilisation plans). In the Federal Republic of Germany it is the Code of Building Law (BauGB) that regulates this. Important strategies are the approaches dependent on the path of developments (*entwicklungspfadabhängige Ansätze*) and the landscape-biographical approaches (*landschaftsbiografische Ansätze*) which facilitate the heritage management balancing act between change and permissive preservation. From the point of view of the archaeological heritage management, however, they are paradoxical to some extent. Thus it is especially medieval, modern age and/or present-day wharves, dykes, sluices, drainage channels and marsh hoof structures that characterize the river and sea marshes while being, on the one hand, historical sources. On the other hand they are also objects with an environmental basis which maintain their ongoing palimpsest-like overprint through their being used day-to-day. So in this respect the landscape should not be made into a museum, as said before.

A further level of inspection is the aspect of *spatial coherence*. This is based on the demand for preservative development of evolved spatial structures and their reference to the landscape, and embraces the cultural, industrial and town landscapes and their constituent elements. This second level of inspection refers to material and immaterial characteristics which, when summarised, constitute the term monument value – which still has to be defined here. They form the basis for decisions made by heritage management. In addition there is the non-scientific assessment category of the experiential value which in its appraisal should be able to be understood by

a layman open-minded for the issues concerning heritage management.

From the perspective of heritage management and academic studies at least two different levels of perception come up against each other here. There are the historical perceptions which have to be studied scientifically and likewise protected by heritage management. The other is the present-day reception of the landscape (as a contemporary form of perceiving the past with its stories and narratives). In the case of the well-founded scientific perception it is the experience ability of the protected property (with its attributes which have to be qualified on a scientific basis) in the field that takes centre stage. In the second case we are dealing a category which represents the perception framework of the individual historical speculation and which accounts for a monument/an element of the cultural landscape/an archaeological find spot having to be understood as an emotionally charged place of self-reflection or self-affirmation or social carrier of meaning (memorial site, etc.). This aspect will be considered here later.

The examination of the *vertical* and *seasonal coherence* levels aims, from heritage quarters, at preserving the specific conditions in the field. The task here is to assess the impact that measures may have on the archaeological heritage and to prevent deterioration of the material preserved in situ.

The decisions that have to be made by heritage management have to be seen against the background of two further aspects. On the one hand it is essential to protect the landscape proportion (*landschaftliche Maßstäblichkeit*). On the other hand modern heritage management has had to free itself in the past two decades from the demand for absolute preservation and has had to replace this demand by the paradigm of advancement in monuments preservation ('Protection through Use'). However, this paradigm must not be understood as an invitation for uncontrolled destruction of historical cultural landscapes, their relicts and monuments. Instead it is necessary that the state-run heritage management works out development paths in the sense of narratives experienced in space, and in the process it should involve the community and the various representatives of interest groups (Ickerodt 2010b). This all comprises a very heterogeneous mix of interests, demands and problems, which will be looked at below in a differentiated manner.

Archaeological heritage management and the public

The perception of the archaeological heritage has undergone great change in recent decades. In the late 18th and 19th century it was the relicts of prehistoric times which concerned the antiquarians. This interest was carried by the historiography of landscape perception which originates in the Renaissance in Italy. In the further course of the 19th century they became *antiquities of the fatherland* and in the 20th century *monuments in the ground* (*Bodendenkmäler*) and *archaeological monuments* – depending on the legal framework and the scientific tradition. Today it is the abstract generic term *archaeological heritage* which has gained currency, in accordance with the Malta/La Valetta Convention as a specification of the term. Parallel to this the perception of the archaeological find spot has also changed. Formerly it was the place at which a find was made whereas it presents itself nowadays as a historical source and, as such, as an archaeological archive that stands on an equal footing with the museum repositories. A consequence of the intradisciplinary debate about the political significance of archaeology which started in the 1980s is the finding that historical research and the mediation of history are achieved according to different social categories and that they fulfil different social needs (Habermas 1990). Hence archaeology has turned to the concept of *Places of Remembrance* (Sites of Memory) in recent years (e.g. Pollak 2009; Schnapp 2009).

This term originates, despite earlier precursors, from the major research project *Les lieux de mémoire* by the French historian Pierre Nora (1986). He coined the term in the middle of the 1980s so as to characterize it as a causative element of the collective memory. Thereby it has more to do with communicating history than with researching it. This always aims at publicly exploiting history and, in so doing, at constructing history within a commemorative society with the intent of creating a social bonding force (Leggewie 2011).

In this debate on sites of places of remembrance and communities with a common remembrance archaeology assumes a special function. In the non-scientific perception and from its own perspective archaeology sees itself as an integral part of a process which per se and despite all delusions and confusions regarding research

history stands for scientific enlightenment. As a science, archaeology delivers ‘ultimate’ truths, i.e. scientifically verified truths on the history of humanity and its stages. The archaeological heritage is made a constituent of a myth of origin stimulated, or inspired by, or based on science upon which norms, values and explanations are substantiated, at times covertly and at other times openly. Whereas the 19th and early 20th century believed its stories and knowledge on the basis of the then scientific positivism, today’s archaeological research and heritage management have recognised the inherent danger which emanates from the narrative bondage of archaeological research, especially when the archaeological heritage is exploited for socio-political reasons (Ickerodt 2013b). In order to confront this problem fundamentally, the heritage management in Schleswig-Holstein is striving for transparent administrative behaviour.

Object of protection and legal framework for the evaluation

The starting point for the professional evaluation of the archaeological monuments is firstly their spatial positioning and, in association with this, their allocation of protective rights. This happens in Schleswig-Holstein in practice via its law for protecting cultural monuments (DSchG) (Web 2) in the amended version from 12. January 2012. As the law recognises the double meaning of the word monument (*Denkmal*), one has to differentiate between simple monuments and those of special importance, defined in § 1 and 5: In both cases it is their historical, scientific, artistic, urbanizational, technical value and/or the value owing to its impact on the cultural landscape which has to be preserved. Alongside this there is the option of protecting areas of monuments and/or cultural landscapes.

In practice these are excavation protection areas in accordance with § 19 (3) monument areas in accordance with § 1 (3). Only in the case of monuments of special significance can the surrounding landscape be examined as a feature of the monument’s value according to criteria yet to be described.

Most of the elements that have to be considered in spatial planning are the objects listed in the State Survey, numbering at present nearly 58,000. From the legal viewpoint they largely accord with the category of simple cultural

monuments. They have been ascertained in the past 90 years as a result of archaeological work and consist of single finds, find scatters and structures visible above ground and those proven through non-invasive methods such as LiDAR-Scandata, aerial photography and geophysical prospecting. Reporting finds lead to their registration. However, the picture as a whole is distorted as not all find spots can be identified in this manner and our state survey is selective and unsystematic in parts, despite intensive work. Taking monuments into account in the spatial planning process is done in accordance with § 8 DSchG (monument protection act) in the form of precise find spots or on the basis of reasonable suspicion (derived from the state survey) and leads to a rescue excavation with costs in accordance with the user-pays-principle.

The second group to be considered are the archaeological monuments of special significance which, as with the simple cultural monuments, in accordance with § 1 (2) 3 DSchG comprise finds and features which hail from the ground, moors or bodies of water in the state of Schleswig-Holstein and which can be investigated using archaeological methods. As tangible evidence they provide information about the history of mankind and are, when their special value is recognized, enlisted in the Register of Monuments in accordance with § 5 DSchG. These special cultural monuments which are to be protected in a constitutive process are mostly monuments which are visible above ground whose assessment level is their value in characterizing the cultural landscape. This attribute of a monument is based on a legal term which is undefined as regards contents and refers geographically to a cultural landscape entity, a section of a landscape or to an element characterizing a landscape, and which provides information about the prehistoric, early historic, medieval and modern time areas of life and living conditions.

Thus the chronological framework to be tackled by the heritage management extends from the Middle Palaeolithic to the relicts of the Third Reich. In fact a recent work records the relicts of the Cold War. The legal criterion here is the closure of a historical epoch.

Both the simple type of monument and those cultural monuments of particular significance can be subsumed to Excavation Protected Areas or Archaeological Monuments Areas. Their relationship is defined in the DSchG SH § 1 Abs. 3 as a case which through their appearance or their correlation to each other is of significance histori-

cally, scientifically, artistically or for urban development or which characterizes a cultural landscape. Thereby the emphasis is on the protection of the existing structure in the sense of the preservation of the exterior appearance if the design goal can still be recognised. The criteria here include conception, planning, functional context and design principle. As object to be protected it can be made up of things which singly do not comply with the requirements of a special cultural monument, according to § 5 (2). These structures are to be protected from direct physical interference. Therefore as well as monitoring possible effects on the substance of the archaeological heritage, the function must be checked. The basis for this is the surrounding environment.

The surrounding environment of a cultural monument is defined in the codes of practice for the Schleswig-Holstein's Monument Protection Law (DSchGDV) in § 9 Abs. 1 Satz 4 as the area upon which the cultural monument emanates and which, on its part, it characterizes and influences in terms of heritage law. Moreover one must bear in mind that the protection afforded the surroundings by heritage law is supplemented by the protection for surroundings provided by building legislation (BauGB §35 Abs. 3 Satz 1 Nr. 5).

Monument Value as a criterion

The monument protection law defines in § 1 section 2 those monuments of the state in terms of their historically, scientifically, artistically, urban, technically characterizing value or the value in characterizing the cultural landscape. From the professional point of view this monument value is classified in the sense of the scientific *archive value*. This archive value constitutes thereby to a lesser extent the pure material intrinsic value, and to a greater extent the information to be gained scientifically from its contents which 'slumber' in an archaeological monument or an archaeological find spot and which can be studied using the best available technology.

Besides this the value of an archaeological monument can be characterised by the criterion of the testimonial value. This means that the objects and structures are immediate and authentic evidence, thus reporting credibly about, or illustrating, the past. This statement is not confined to the monument as a historical source. Rather it

applies to those monuments which testify to events in the past or observable developments into the present day.

A Bronze Age tumulus cannot simply be assessed in terms of the scientific information it contains, i.e. the substance of the mound, remains of structures built into it or coffins/burials and the grave goods. Also view relationships, view axes or topographical idiosyncrasies which characterise the spatial relationship at the time the burial mound came into being have to be regarded as other important scientific facts. In addition later evident transformations or new conceptual designs as well as, as the case may be, their changing spatial relationships, are also constituents of the monument value which, where required, have to be considered. Here we are dealing with knowledge which has to be professionally defined and which enters into the description of the monument or the state records. The evaluation of this category is carried out by an expert.

Single monuments or groups of monuments can, on a higher-ranking level, be understood as part of a historical cultural landscape. The interplay of these cultural landscape elements in the sense of an impact shaping the landscape, can also be a component of the monument value and is then to be considered. Here it is essential from the professional viewpoint to depict the degree of spatial interconnectedness by means of the aspects *Au-*

*thenticity*¹, *Integrity*², *State of Preservation*³ and *Rareness*⁴ and *Perceptibility*⁵.

- 1 The question of authenticity of the archaeological heritage is primarily linked with the question of its *Wertfreiheit* (freedom from value judgment) and verifiability. It turns out to be problematical on the content level as it is also linked with our emotional relationship to the past and thus linked on a non-specialized level with expectations, perceptions and emotions. The reason for this lies in the relevance of the archaeological heritage for the public. In social perception the archaeological heritage is associated with a special quality. It comes from the past and is a haptically experientable testimony of one's own genesis. Against this background the archaeological heritage is approximated with an heirloom, an antiquity, and corresponds to Pomian's concept of semiphores.
- 2 The term of integrity or intactness outlines how expansive and complete are the features of an archaeological object which are important for assessing it as a monument. Heritage management objectives have to consider, where necessary, overlapping historical layers or overlapping situations. An important instrument in judging the integrity is the distinction of the time levels being observed and, as the case may be, their changing spatial references, the monitoring of the diverse possible factors of influence (agriculture, road-building, development in energy, etc.) and partnerships (e.g. nature conservation), the maintenance of the soil chemistry or the improvement of the state of preservation.
- 3 Assessment of the condition of features and components used in judging the value of the monument. For the assessment of the impacts of a measure, the observed state of preservation does not have to be the original condition. Instead, from the archaeological viewpoint, a multitude of successive phases must be reckoned with, which are invariably a constituent of the monument's value however. Poor preservation does not lead to a reduction of the monument's worthiness but it can impair its integrity. Here the rule of thumb is: the better the preservation, the more important the monument and hence worthier of protection.
- 4 The scarcity value is based upon the scientific evaluation of the frequency of individual object groups in the archaeological heritage and thereby takes into consideration the numerous diverse epochs and phases, the appraisable spatial references of the individual monuments as well as their existing significance for the cultural landscape, if applicable. Here the rule of thumb is: the less frequent, the more important and hence worthier of protection.
- 5 In the heritage management assessment of the experiential value we are dealing with the enquiry into a non-scientific category of perception based on the aspect of spatial character. As a test category in its own right it is of little scientific importance but, as a non-scientific perception category, it aims at conveying heritage management contents. It is based on the preservation of intact monuments, parts of monuments, monument ensembles or elements of the cultural landscape which are largely considered beautiful. However, it also recognises the so-called inconvenient monuments and unpleasant landscapes. This appraisal must be comprehensible for the observer who is unbiased towards the matters concerning monument protection and it is based on the ability of the assessment area to have an aesthetic effect.

Testing levels of the monument value

Ascertaining the monument value, as practised in Schleswig-Holstein, is orientated on the standards of the environmental impact studies and comprises essentially three levels of concern – the substantial, the functional and the sensory.

The term of substantial impacts on the archaeological heritage embraces all aspects of a physical interference of a monument. This applies too for the relevant surroundings of a listed monument if this is an element of the monument value and represents a suitable point of reference for the preservation of the spatial character. For changes in site conditions can also lead to short-term, medium-term or long-term negative impact on, or destruction of, the archaeological heritage including its spatial references. Here the guiding principle applies wherein a cultural monument can only unfold its character as a monument in its landscape context *in situ*.

Hence it is essential for the archaeological heritage management to protect the archaeological substance (which is to be scientifically assessed) from both direct and indirect intervention. What has to be considered thereby is that direct physical intervention in the monument's substance is mostly irreversible and should therefore be avoided or at least minimised. Nevertheless there are exceptional cases where the destruction of an archaeological monument can be approved in the sense of finding a compromise if the intervention in the monument's substance is combined with appropriate scientific documentation. Such a compromise is sometimes necessary in order to be able, where needs be, to solve selective goal conflicts.

The testing aspect regarding the functional concerns assesses the constriction of perceptibility of an archaeological monument or of the surroundings which are important for the archaeological heritage as a historical testimony by changes made by a measure taken. The investigations involve, apart from the impact on the archaeological substance, its attributes, its spatial networking as too its associative effect (*genius loci*) and its identity-giving impact.

Thus what has to be tested are scientific and non-scientific levels which are based on the archaeological monument's perceptibility, interpretation and impact on the area and which are an important element of the spatial character.

They are based on the material and immaterial attributes of the monument as well as on its topographical features. Hence the historical choice of location represents an aspect of the monument's value. Alongside this is the *genius loci*. It is of vital importance for how non-specialists perceive the monument and is borne by the aspect of the authenticity of history. As a historical testimony the archaeological monument conveys to the observer an emotional and occasional haptic access to the past, thus shaping local, regional or national identity.

As a constituent of the humanistic educational canon, the archaeological monument also stands for an experiential value anchored in cultural history which should be looked at in connection with its function as a place for local recreation or as touristic valorisation in the tourism state of Schleswig-Holstein. The basis for the evaluation is the premise that the spatial character of the archaeological heritage comprising monuments (*einfache und besondere Denkmale*) is the product of a unique historical development process which has moulded the character of our historical cultural landscape. The criteria used here in assessing, apart from that of value as historical testimony, include diversity, closeness to nature and uniqueness.

The examination of functional concern requires from the archaeological heritage management quarters the systematic compilation of spatial references including their different historical tiers and their significance on local, regional and national levels. The question to be answered is whether an archaeological monument correlates to the surrounding area and has therefore a spatial impact – or not. The valuation standard here is the question of the definability of the spatial impact of the monument. What must be clarified here is whether topography or landscape relief is an expression or result of a historical process in using space. Besides fortifications and sacred landscapes, these can be parks, path/road systems, waterways or railway expansion, etc. as persistent elements of the cultural landscape. However, the archaeological heritage is not necessarily visible above the ground and it can still have, as a non-visible object, i.e. an object preserved underground, just as much of an impact on the area by way of its exposed topographical location, in which case the *genius loci* is a component of the monument's value. One can think here, for instance, of fortifications now razed but in a prominent location within the landscape.

Heritage management would argue that this spatial reference is the product of decision-making processes within historical developments which finally led to the choice of site. These can be comprehended on the ground. However, layers of time can emerge from different, successive spatial references. They are all communicable properties of the monument which have to be scientifically recognized and defined or described.

The sensorial concern enquiry targets the assessment of the impacts of a proposal on the sensory perceptibility of a monument and is coupled with the expectations of an observer who is broad-minded for heritage management issues. These expectations have to be linked with the monument value which has to be protected from heritage management quarters as a historical attribute and which in terms of contents should be separated from the non-scientific expectations (e.g. aesthetic ideas of the landscape, science myths).

Special emphasis is placed here not so much on the historical view on the archaeological heritage and its spatial reference but rather on the visual expectations of the observer. These are influenced by the aforementioned ideas regarding landscape aesthetic and by social moral values. From the point of view of the archaeological heritage management it represents a legitimate concern of the observer but it has to be subordinated on a level of importance for the protection of the historical statement which is linked to the archaeological monument.

The examination of the sensory concern includes the testing of the adverse acoustic, optical and olfactory effects or deterioration of the monument qualities or of the monument value which are, for instance, based on the scale of the landscape, the visibility, view axes and view relationships. Furthermore there are such influences as optical disturbance (casting of shadows, flashing lights, etc.), noise or smell, which prevent a reasonable perception of the historical associative qualities of the monument.

The monument to be tested has to be monitored on these three examination levels, especially important for the construction, structuring and use phases, so that the degree of threat to the substance, function and sensorium may be ascertained.

Concluding remarks

In this contribution the issues concerning the question of the relationship of archaeological heritage management and practice and the legal term of monument value as defined in the Monument Protection Act of Schleswig-Holstein are raised. The focus thereby lies on the State Archaeological Department's (ALSH) attempt to link the various restructuring processes with each other. On the one hand the move towards heritage management orientated on spatial planning should be systemised. This has begun already, for instance, with the Lancelwad and Lancelwad Plan projects, leading over the past 7 years to a massive rise in participation procedures (i.e. involvement of citizens in planning procedures). Parallel to this was the expansion in renewable energy which also led to a clear increase in participation procedures which, on the other hand, had to also be conceptually accompanied by the same workforce.

This is why the urban land-use planning unit of the ALSH began a project study in 2009 to develop a standardised assessment procedure in which the legal, administrative and practical options were explored and collated with European practice. A point of reference was here the Environmental Impact Assessment standards. In this context the public exterior perspective was awarded significant importance (alongside the scientific perspective) which sways between the search for local/regional identity and generating value from cultural tourism. Thus the central question here is: for whom is archaeological heritage management pursued and what social responsibility does it have or can it have?

For this purpose the roots of Schleswig-Holstein's monument protection were likewise examined. These protection efforts were orientated on academic categories as had become usual with the university establishment of the subject at the University of Kiel at the end of the 1920s. Their roots lie in the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century had already led to a systemisation of the state survey, thus enabling active participation in urban land-use planning. In the course of this it seems that today's practice in archaeological heritage management is still occasionally torn in terms of content between the university claim to scientific rigour and its remit as an administrative authority.

Independent of this our society is changing. It is in an accelerated process of restructuring and reorientation. Whereas ca. 75% of the workforce were employed in agriculture at the beginning of the 19th century, today it is no more than 5%. Meanwhile the service and information sector as the formative economic fields have long since outstripped industry as the place for securing subsistence in the urbanized and globalized post-war society of the postmodern era.

This development has had especially dramatic effects on the medieval/post-medieval/modern relict landscapes and has two components which can only be separated analytically (and which have a massive influence of the archaeological heritage management). On the level of practical care and preservation of monuments there has been a growth in land consumption and shorter utilisation phases as well as an increase in spatial multifunctionality. Parallel to this has been the ensuing upgrading of infrastructure. The course of this change is being set by the global trading currents and cash flows, political control mechanisms like the facilitation, for instance, of renewable energy (wind power plants, cultivation of maize for energy, biogas plants, etc.) as well as individual self-interest of the various players.

The last-named component concerns the social framework. On the whole one may observe a growing decoupling of the economy from the social and local/regional surroundings and hence from its background rooted in the history and the cultural landscape. This process not only goes hand in hand with a demographic transition, keywords here being 'älter und bunter' (literally older and more colourful) or gentrification, but also with a changing spatial perception. This finds expression in the term of historical cultural landscapes and the increasing number of open-air archaeological museums in which one may assuredly see the attempt to offset this massive structural transformation.

This development has direct consequences for state archaeological heritage management and the tasks that have to be dealt with by it. For whom should archaeological heritage management be exercised? While the antiquities of the fatherland (*Vaterländische Altertümer*) deployed a model function for society as a whole in the 19th/20th century, the archaeological monuments have subsequently lost both regionally and all over Germany.

In fact, in reference to the Federal Republic of Germany the assertion has been made that the archaeological heritage management is most successful with regard to staffing and financial resources when it develops a relationship to the lived-in world, thus contributing to the direct social safeguarding of identity (and therefore enjoying high approval). This is especially so for the states in former East Germany. Such developments are not necessarily sustained - as attested by the changing dominant positions of the individual archaeological state agencies.

Looked at from the scientific theory aspect, this development turns out to be highly problematic as the content and formal questions outlined hitherto have neither been sufficiently investigated nor fundamentally explained. This applies all the more, as the participation of the archaeological heritage management in long-term and medium-term planning processes requires clear overall concepts and specified targets in accordance with comprehensible criteria and it must entail, in view of its sustainability, the involvement of the public. Not only must the quality standards presented be developed here, but scientific/ethical standards as well have to be defined.

References / Literatura

- FARO 2006, *Framework convention on the value of cultural heritage for society / Convention-cadre du conseil de l'Europe sur la valeur du patrimoine culturel pur la société*. – European treaty series 199, Strasbourg.
- HABERMAS, J. 1990, Geschichte und Evolution. – In/V: J. Habermas, *Zur Rekonstruktion des Historischen Materialismus*, Frankfurt am Main (5. Auflage), 200–259.
- HINGST, H. 1974, Die deutschen Denkmalschutzgesetze aus der Zeit nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. – *Offa* 34, 113–119.
- HINGST, H. 1978, Die Entwicklung der europäischen Denkmalschutzgesetze. – *Archäologische Information* 4, 150–154.
- ICKERODT, U. 2010a, „Wer soll das bezahlen? Wer hat das bestellt?... Verursacherprinzip und Bodendenkmalpflege. – *Archäologische Nachrichten aus Schleswig-Holstein*, 116–119.
- ICKERODT, U. 2010b, My Story – your Story: Contemporary Cultural Heritage Management as Sphere of Social-Interaction. – V/In: T. Bloemers, H. Kars, A. van der Valk, M. Wijnen (eds./ur.), *The Cultural Landscape Heritage Paradox. Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape and its European Dimension*, Amsterdam, 351–362.
- ICKERODT, U. 2011a, Meine Geschichte – Deine Geschichte: Quo vadis archäologische Dendenkmalpflege? – *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege* LXV (3), 240–251.
- ICKERODT, U. 2011b, Anmerkung zu Raimund Karls „Bekanntes Wissen oder unbekanntes Information“ und seinen Gedanken zum eigentlichen Ziel und zur bestmöglichen Umsetzung des Schutzes archäologischen Erbes. – *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege* LXV (3), 276–280.
- ICKERODT, U. 2012, Mythistory. Zur Mythifizierung archäologischer Forschung und der Polarisierung von Glaube und Wissenschaft. – In/V: C. Oberhauser, W. Knapp (eds./ur.), *Hinter den Kulissen. Beiträge zur historischen Mythenforschung*, Innsbruck, 279–320.
- ICKERODT, U. 2013a, Blick zurück im Spiegel – Seit 90 Jahren archäologische Landesaufnahme und seit 80 Jahren archäologische Denkmalpflege in Schleswig-Holstein. – *Archäologische Nachrichten aus Schleswig-Holstein*, 9–15.
- ICKERODT, U. 2013b, Zwischen Grabhügel, Ahnenkult, Weihestätte und unbequemen Denkmal ... – In/V: C. Boldt, S. Loebert, K. Puymann (eds./ur.), *Architektur*, Steinburger Jahrbuch 58, Jg., Itzehoe, 13–81.
- ICKERODT, U. 2013c, Frei Daten für freie Bürger – Ein Essay über archäologische Daten, die Öffentlichkeit und open data. – In/V: S. Winghart (ed./ur.), *Archäologie und Informationssysteme. Vom Umgang mit archäologischen Fachdaten in Denkmalpflege und Forschung*, Arbeitshäfte zur Denkmalpflege in Niedersachsen 42, Hameln, 28–33.
- ICKERODT, U., G. SCHILLER, T. ROOS 2013, Alternative Energien und nachwachsende Rohstoffe. Umweltschutz auf Kosten historischer Kulturlandschaften – Eine schleswig-holsteinische Perspektive. – *Archäologisches Nachrichtenblatt* 17 (4), 311–315.
- KERSTEN, K. 1981, Die archäologische Landesaufnahme von Schleswig-Holstein. – *Offa* 38, Stuve Festschrift, 17–20.
- KUNOW, J. 2002, Die Entwicklung von archäologischen Organisationen und Institutionen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert und das „öffentliche Interesse“ – Bedeutungsgewinne und Bedeutungsverluste und deren Folgen. – In/V: P. F. Biehl, A. Gramsch, A. Marciniak (eds./ur.), *Archaeologies of Europe. History, Methods and Theories*, Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher 3, Münster, New York, 148–183.
- LEGGEWIE, C. 2011, *Der Kampf um die europäische Erinnerung. Ein Schlachtfeld wird besichtigt*. Bonn.
- NORA, P. 1986, *Les Lieux de Memoire*. Paris.
- POLLAK, M. 2009, *Vom Erinnerungsort zur Denkmalpflege. Kulturgüter als Medien des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. Wien, Köln, Weimar.
- SCHILLER, G. 2008, Archäologische Denkmale und Planungskontrolle. – *Archäologische Nachrichten aus Schleswig-Holstein*, 93–94.

SCHNAPP, A. 2009, *Die Entdeckung der Vergangenheit. Ursprünge und Abenteuer der Archäologie*. Stuttgart.

STOBBELAAR, D. J., K. HENDRIKS 2006, Reading the identity of place. – In/V: W. van der Knaap, A. van der Valk (eds./ur.), *Multiple landscapes. Merging past and present*, Wageningen, 199–211.

Web sources / Spletna vira

Web 1/Splet 1:

http://www.schleswig-holstein.de/MELUR/DE/Service/Broschueren/Umwelt/pdf/Integriertes_Energie_und_Klimakonzept__blob=publicationFile.pdf (access/dostop 07.01.2014).

Web 2/Splet 2:

<http://www.gesetze-rechtsprechung.sh.juris.de/jportal/?quelle=jlink&query=DSchG+SH&psml=bssshoprod.psml&max=true&aiz=true> (access/dostop 08.01.2014).
