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Abstract: From Valletta to Faro, much has changed in Portuguese archaeology: legislation, archaeologists, heritage administration and communication with society. Several archaeological stakeholders recognise that dissemination is still one of the major gaps in post-Valletta Portuguese archaeology. This article will separately analyse the main problems and opportunities in disseminating archaeological knowledge in Portugal, using case studies and crossing data with some personal views. For different actors and contexts there are different challenges and opportunities many lost, others rediscovered.

The following scenarios will be retrospectively analysed:
1. Urban archaeology (Lisbon),
2. Rescue archaeology in major projects (EDIA – Alqueva Development and Infrastructure Company),
3. Archaeology in the municipalities (Mafra),
4. Archaeology in universities and research centres (UNIARQ – Centre of Archaeology at the University of Lisbon),
5. Archaeology by the cultural heritage authorities (IPA – Instituto Português de Arqueologia, IPPAR – Instituto Português do Património Arqueológico e Arquitectónico, IGESPAR – Instituto de Gestão do Património Arqueológico e Arquitectónico, DGPC – Direcção Geral do Património),
6. Community and associative archaeology.

This review will cover the period between 1997 and 2014, beginning with the date of ratification of the Valletta Convention in Portugal.
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1. From Valletta to Faro, making a stop at Lisbon: a retrospective of Portuguese archaeology

In Portugal, during recent decades there has been an almost ‘uncontrolled’ rise in archaeological activity: a sharp increase in the number of archaeological excavations and in the number of public and private archaeologists, the emergence of archaeology companies and an increasing number of universities offering degrees in archaeology. This growth was exponential until 2009, when it experienced a decline related to the financial crisis that led to the Portuguese financial rescue between 2011 and 2014 (Sousa 2013; Bugalhão 2011).

This quick growth has caused some discrepancies, particularly in the field of dissemination, which was clearly left behind, a fact recognised by the archaeological community locally and at a European level, according to the DISCO project (Discovering the Archaeology of Europe).

Portuguese archaeology has been losing part of the main role it had attained at the start of this growth process. With the actions taken by institutions within the public administration (Portuguese Institute of Archaeology – 1997 to 2006) and the subsequent implementation of a legal framework following the principles of the Valletta Convention, the conditions were laid for a growing assertion of archaeology in Portugal. However, the last decade has witnessed a reversal in the visibility of archaeology in the public sphere, as it has become obscured within other more general categories, resulting in a clear decline in its media presence. This situation can be explained by economic, organisational and social factors. However, in contrast to the public’s concern for other sectors, such as museums and libraries, there has been hardly any public reaction regarding archaeology.

Are we therefore condemned to archaeology merely for and from archaeologists? To assess this issue, we focused on the promotion of archaeological activity in Portugal, which is affected by a complex web of contexts, agents, processes and means. In terms of context, there are differences in the types of measures used to publicise archaeological issues: promoting archaeology in urban areas, in large enterprises and at local level are very different propositions. There are several means of disseminating information about archaeological activity. We should differentiate any actions targeting the archaeological/scientific community (databases, scientific publications, conferences) from the promotion of initiatives aimed at the general public (media disclosure, publications, public presentations, exhibitions, musealization
and enhancing of archaeological remains, heritage education, and new technologies).

A wide range of agents are directly involved in archaeological activity: we, the archaeologists (administration, companies, universities, associations), and others (developers, local government, the media, and the education system or tourism agents).

This article aims to examine the broad scope and perspectives for the development of archaeology in Portugal, somehow reflecting my own personal journey as an archaeologist. Declaration of interest: many of the reflections listed here are drawn from my own experience in the Municipality of Mafra (1997–2011), Directorate-General for Cultural Heritage – DGPC (2011–2013) and the Faculty of Letters, University of Lisbon (since 2008).

The analysis begins in 1997, when Portugal signed the Valletta Convention, and extends until 2014. The nature of this study will necessarily be broad and short, with references to particularly relevant case studies.

2. Different scenarios, different problems, different opportunities

2.1. Urban archaeology in Lisbon

Performing archaeology of cities is quite different from performing archaeology in cities (Martins & Ribeiro, 2009–2010), treating a metropolitan area as a sole archaeological document in spatial and temporal terms and with a technical and scientific specificity concerning intervention and interpretation.

The promotion of archaeological activity in urban areas is probably one of the greatest challenges that developers, archaeologists and public authorities face nowadays. Despite the existence of international conventions such as the Venice Charter (1964), the International Charter for the Protection of Historic Towns (Washington 1987) or the European code of good practice for urban archaeology (Archaeology and the Urban Project – a European code of good practice, European Council 2010), there are no specific guidelines for this discipline in Portugal (Lemos 2004; 2006).

The outlook of archaeology of cities in Portugal is very unequal as very different approaches to this topic coexist. Urban areas like Braga, Mértola and Beja have taken up an integrated management of archaeological activity, understood as a global research project. This is particularly relevant in Braga (Bracara Augusta), where, since 1977, a model of focused intervention has been developed by the Archaeology Unit of the University of Minho, with the collaboration of the Municipal Archaeology Office (Martins et al. 2013) from 1992. In the overall national scenario there is no integrated management of archaeological excavations, which are carried out by various parties: private companies, municipal archaeology centres, central...
administration. Elsewhere, actions directly related to archaeological research are almost non-existent, corresponding almost exclusively to preventive interventions.

Lisbon archaeology, naturally, assumes an unparalleled scale in terms of the extent and chronological spectrum of excavations undertaken when compared with other Portuguese urban centres (Bugalhão 2007). In this city, there is no integrated management, as archaeological work is developed independently by different public and private teams. This work fragmentation greatly affects the interpretation of data collected, particularly because the dissemination of technical and scientific documentation is time-consuming and in many cases non-existent. Since 2001, archaeological excavations have been carried out almost exclusively by private companies, with over 15 of these operating in Lisbon (Bugalhão 2007).

The competent cultural administration decides on a case-by-case basis what constraints are to be applied; it assesses work plans and defines minimisation measures. It seldom includes specific guidelines for enhancing and promoting archaeological assets.

Spatial planning instruments (municipal master plans, detailed plans) are often generalist and inadequate for furthering knowledge about the archaeological resources in Lisbon's subsoil. Examples of this inadequacy are the recent interventions on the riverfront, which led to constant underground works at important port-related sites.

Between 1997 and 2014 the number of archaeological excavations grew by 1,283%, reflecting the overall
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CSJ - A</th>
<th>MNA</th>
<th>MAC</th>
<th>NARC</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>MTR</th>
<th>BdP</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>37821</td>
<td>4918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>59653</td>
<td>4430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>54166</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>55465</td>
<td>9671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>50324</td>
<td>24180</td>
<td>9754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>72394</td>
<td>48701</td>
<td>8202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>75129</td>
<td>54052</td>
<td>9917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>46358</td>
<td>70263</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>61756</td>
<td>45589</td>
<td>6538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>102026</td>
<td>63803</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>129104</td>
<td>69990</td>
<td>4153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>125594</td>
<td>74852</td>
<td>4063</td>
<td>70610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>317001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>126140</td>
<td>82585</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>60761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>347273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>59279</td>
<td>93374</td>
<td>79009</td>
<td>8754</td>
<td>123192</td>
<td></td>
<td>39242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>402850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>213213</td>
<td>85343</td>
<td>78011</td>
<td>9733</td>
<td>76853</td>
<td></td>
<td>44902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>508055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>244212</td>
<td>79210</td>
<td>89000</td>
<td>8126</td>
<td>71828</td>
<td></td>
<td>47756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>540132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>269347</td>
<td>80139</td>
<td>103000</td>
<td>9087</td>
<td>70552</td>
<td></td>
<td>13721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>545846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>348955</td>
<td>103068</td>
<td>130000</td>
<td>11830</td>
<td>77674</td>
<td>18480</td>
<td>30250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>720257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17.1: Visitors to archaeological monuments and museums in Lisbon (CJS – Castle of St George; MNA – National Museum of Archaeology; MAC – Carmo Archaeological Museum; NARC – Archaeological Centre of Rua dos Correieiros; ML – Museum of Lisbon; CB – Casa dos Bicos; MTR – Roman Theatre Museum; MG – Geology Museum).

Figure 17.5: Núcleo Arqueológico da Rua dos Correieiros (NARC), archaeological museum with musealized archaeological structures. This museum is managed by Millenium bcp, a private bank located near the arch in Rua Augusta, occupying almost an entire block in the Pombaline historical centre of Lisbon. Between 1991 and 1995, the renovation works carried out there revealed 2,500 years of Lisbon’s history. Photo Jacinta Bugalhão.
trend of the national archaeological scenario. The type of intervention is dominated by archaeological monitoring of construction areas with underground impact in order to evaluate archaeological potential, with emphasis on large-scale underground projects, namely the construction of car parks or architectural remodelling, including construction of basements.

This type of intervention, usually carried out by private companies, is essentially influenced by the cost-speed trade off, and its principal aim is to comply with legal restrictions that only cater for ‘rescue by registration’.

The evolution of urban archaeology in Lisbon has been remarkable. Up to the late 1980s, emergency rescue and inadequate urban policy tools were the rule. Today, preventive archaeology is deployed (Bugalhão 2007), but despite positive developments, the overall picture is still very unsatisfactory (Fabião 2014).

While field activities are legally secured (excavation and monitoring), study, publication and dissemination are often postponed until better financial conditions arise. However, postponing the dissemination of urban archaeology is probably the worst scenario. From this point of view, the opaque nature of archaeological activity during the fieldwork stage jeopardises interest and awareness from the general public.

Archaeology often makes the news when a certain street is closed to traffic for months as it waits for completion of an archaeological work. On the other hand, there is rarely an option for in situ conservation, even when ongoing projects are considered. It seems that ‘rescuing by recording data’ is the only ‘reasonable’ solution for the interests of the developer and the community, as it ensures that sites are ‘unpolluted by ruins after the passage of archaeologists’ (Martins & Ribeiro 2009–2010).

The disclosure of information in scientific circles is dispersed in different media. As for technical and scientific data, only the Endovelico Information System, managed by the cultural heritage administration (IPA – Instituto Português de Arqueologia, IGESPAR – Instituto de Gestão do Património Arquitectónico, DGPC – Direcção...
Geral do Património), brings together all the information and makes it available on its website (Gomes et al. 2012; Link 1). It is expected that the scope of this tool will be increased in the near future with online reports and detailed georeferencing of interventions.

There is still room for improvement as regards the regularity and quality of the technical and scientific information produced, with long delays in reporting often complicating the interpretation of the archaeological remains found by different teams.

In terms of (scientific) publications, there is a general trend for growth, although the percentage increase is much smaller than the number of archaeological works actually carried out. Monographic studies have seldom been published, with preliminary reports predominating. A noteworthy exception is the case of the Archaeological Centre of Rua dos Correeiros, which has already published 48 titles (Bugalhão et al. 2012–2013).

Scientific meetings (congresses, conferences) are scarce. In this respect, the role played by the Association of Portuguese Archaeologists should be emphasised due to the regular conferences it promotes, where archaeological work and specific themes are presented. Archaeology companies also organise annual presentations of archaeological work, where archaeological work in Lisbon plays a prominent role.

In addition to these actions focused on the scientific community, some interventions have registered extensive impact in the media, especially during the construction phase. In most cases, the disclosure of information comes from outsiders, since developers tend to fear releasing information about the archaeological discoveries made on their sites.

The list of public spaces related to archaeology in Lisbon is relatively small, but it has a long history:

1. Museums: Geology Museum (1859), Carmo Archaeological Museum (1864), National Museum of Archaeology (1893), Museum of Lisbon – Pimenta Palace (1979);

With a total of 1,876 archaeological interventions at 340 sites, it would be expected that the increase in archaeological activity between 1997 and 2014 would translate into more visitable archaeological sites or in situ structures integrated into rehabilitation works. However, the list of such sites is very scant, with only two having been created following post-1997 interventions and subsequent enhancement projects: the Bank of Portugal and the archaeological museum at St George’s Castle. Furthermore, memory spaces in car parks have been registered.

Even in construction projects financed by public administration, such as Centro Cultural de Belém (1992) or the National Coach Museum (2015), contemporary architecture was chosen at the expense of preserving in situ archaeological remains relevant to the history of the city (port structures).

This approach is clearly divergent from the aforementioned international conventions, including the Valletta Convention. Attempts to reconcile new rehabilitation projects with pre-existent structures (underground or in the built environment) have not often been successful. This is currently a major threat to Portuguese historic centres: ‘the absence of knowledge acquisition and of the diachronic evolution of a site leads to the subordination of cultural and heritage values in favour of more aesthetic options devoid of historical context.’ (Martins 2012, 252).

The Museums of Lisbon have different institutional frameworks, bearing modest relation to the archaeology carried out in Lisbon in recent decades. Exhibitions related to preventive archaeology are very scarce. The first exhibition of this type, dating back to 1966, was organised by Irisalva Moita at Rossio metro station. At irregular intervals, some exhibitions have been held at museums managed by the city of Lisbon, such as Town Square – the archaeology of a location (City Museum, 1999) or The Archaeology of Lisbon – Sessions at the City Museum (2007). Despite their very limited number, a general reading of exhibition attendance allows us to verify the relevance of these cultural spaces in terms of visitor numbers.

Within this context, there are several challenges and opportunities as regards the promotion of archaeology and its accessibility to society, with various agents having different responsibilities. The increasing number of visitors to museums and heritage-related sites, coupled with the media impact of some findings.
in Lisbon, confirm the interest in these issues from the local community and visitors to Lisbon in general.

Promotion and social returns need to be addressed at all stages of the archaeological process: during planning and land use planning, when determining archaeological constraints, and during the implementation of archaeological work and its integration in multidisciplinary research projects with the participation of universities and research centres. Furthermore, there is a need to strengthen resources and expertise in urban archaeological management, both in terms of the heritage authorities and at the level of local administration.

It is anticipated that the newly created Archaeology Centre in Lisbon (CAL – Lisbon City Hall) will ensure the collation of all dispersed documentation concerning heritage and detailed georeferencing.

Despite the fact that improvements are required in urban archaeological management, in recent years there has been some good progress, with a number of initiatives that appear to demonstrate the commitment of various stakeholders in dissemination.

2.2. Rescue Archaeology in major projects: the Alqueva Dam

The Alqueva Dam project is to date the largest carried out in the country. This dam is located in southern Portugal in the Guadiana River basin, affecting a large area of Alentejo and the Spanish Extremadura. It is the largest artificial water reservoir in Western Europe, extending for 250 square kilometres. In addition, the reservoir involves a series of irrigation canals, still under construction. The total investment of the project amounts to €1 billion, of which 14 million is related to mitigating its impact on cultural heritage (Martins 2012, 40).

The construction of the project was phased under the management of the Alqueva Development and Infrastructure Company (EDIA). Construction of the heritage and economic framework dates back to 1985 (Silva 2002, 57), with amendments in 1996. An archaeological survey formed the basis for devising a heritage minimisation plan for the backwater area of the Alqueva Dam, involving the definition of 16 thematic/chronological blocks and 200 interventions developed between 1998 and 2001. The minimisation plan was supervised by a monitoring committee and also involved experts and representatives of municipalities and heritage associations.

The development of a minimisation plan for the Alqueva backwater between 1998 and 2001 was relevant in the national archaeological scenario, as it coincided with the beginning of so-called ‘contract archaeology’, at a time when archaeology companies were still embryonic and when archaeologists started...
being professionally recognised. The works were organised in blocks and awarded to universities, heritage associations, individual archaeologists and some private companies.

A second phase began in 2007 mainly corresponding to the construction of the overall Alqueva irrigation system extending for 120,000 hectares (Melro & Deus 2014). The new heritage monitoring committee became exclusively bilateral (EDIA/IGESPAR), with the administration ensuring the coordination process, according to a protocol signed in October 2007 (Melro & Deus 2014). Execution of the archaeological work focused exclusively on the business perspective, with payments for completed excavations being awarded by the cubic metre.

In comparison to the first phase, the second had a higher number of archaeological interventions. It should be noted that the type of intervention was very different from the earlier ones. In the 1998–2001 phase, the work focused on sites following a sample global intervention plan. In the subsequent phase, from 2007, the intervention was geared towards minimising impacts on linear channels, making site interpretation more difficult. The visibility of archaeological remains was higher in the second phase because it involved land mobilisation. For example, it was noted that in the area examined from 2007 onwards, ditches, enclosures and negative structures (pre- and proto-historic) proliferated, but these did not occur only in the backwater area: differentiated visibility or distinct land-use dynamics?

These are two completely different perspectives with regard to the management of archaeological work, research and promotion.

In terms of management, the first phase was monitored by a joint committee including various disciplines and organisations and a scientific committee. In the second phase, monitoring was carried out exclusively by the heritage authority and the developer along with the archaeological contractor. As the fieldwork was carried out exclusively by private companies, usually with confidentiality agreements, a blanket of silence covered the Alqueva Dam's archaeology, only interrupted by occasional news of spectacular discoveries.

As regards research, the intent was completely different. The first phase of archaeological work at the dam site involved some teams that had previously run research projects in the area, and thus they viewed the 'Alqueva period' as an extension of an integrated action. Other teams were formed by companies without research experience in the region, so that the Alqueva project provided leverage for start-up companies. After 2007, interventions were performed exclusively by private companies, with little or no coordination with academia.

Disclosure of information has always been the biggest obstacle of the whole project. In the first phase there was a plan and an agreement for producing monographic studies and setting up a regional museum. This museum was never built, assets were scattered and consequently there was a loss of an integrated view of the entire cultural heritage under study.

With regard to monographic studies, 80% of the teams concluded them, which was a rather time-consuming process (Silva 2014). Unfortunately, after completion of the monographs in 2007, they were not published until 2013/2014. Publication was made possible thanks to the patronage of the regional heritage body (Alentejo Region Directorate for Culture), benefitting from European funding.

Despite the delay in publication and problems of distribution, emphasis should be drawn to the enormous volume of published information from the Alqueva Dam project and its importance to Portuguese archaeology: 23 monographs and a special edition in an archaeological journal.

Regarding the second stage concerning Alqueva’s irrigation channels, there is less public information. Contracting model studies are unclear, with the whole process focused on the duality of excavation/monitoring and the production of technical and scientific reports. However, some information has been presented at congresses, but there is no known plan concerning the publication of monographs.

In terms of published material, there was an initial peak in 2002, corresponding to the end of the first phase of the Alqueva project. The publishing rate remained relatively stable (though lower than the level previously reached) up to 2010, when the first preliminary studies of irrigation channel interventions began to be published, as mentioned above (Silva et al. 2014). Public presentations at specially organised conferences were also irregular (1996, 1999, 2001, 2010). A lot of archaeological documentation remains unpublished, but the greatest weakness lies in delivering information to the general public. Some promotional material was published (CD-ROMs, DVDs, brochures and articles in special-interest magazines) but the impact on communities was not very significant.
The lack of a specifically dedicated museum was never overcome, despite the creation of a local museum in the new Aldeia da Luz, which plays an important role at local level and where some themed exhibitions have been held (Vinha das Caliças – The slow awakening, 24 February 2010, O Touro de Cinco Reis 8–27 April 2012, Barca do Xerez de Baixo: a testimony rescued from history: inaugurated 23 September 2013).

An evaluation of the whole ‘mega-operation’ in terms of disclosing information about the Alqueva project since 1998 shows some considerable changes in management models and communication strategy. The project promoter has disclosed the total budgets of the archaeological activity (Martinho 2002; 2014), but apparently delivering information to the general public is minimal. The full potential of delivering information for heritage education in the region and ensuring its socio-economic exploitation is yet to be achieved. Dissemination cannot once again be the end of the line after all the fieldwork, writing of reports and preparation of monographic studies. This issue should be very well outlined from the beginning of the project and integrated in a heritage conservation plan.

This problem is common to most environmental impact statements in Portugal, as a strategy to communicate findings to the public is usually omitted or too vague. A contrast to this reality, of which the Alqueva Dam is an example, is the situation in Brazil, where the funding of heritage education projects has been mandatory since 2002 (IPHAN Ordinance No. 230,2002), (Almeida et al., 2009, 37).

The participation of the archaeology authorities in environmental impact assessment committees has progressively increased since 1997, today reaching almost all of the regions of Portugal (Branco 2014, 247). The effort undertaken in the implementation of heritage protection measures was complemented by an increasing volume of projects which showed a shortage in human resources to supervise works, manage information, create methodology guidelines and to promote disclosure of information.

2.3. Act local, think global: Mafra and archaeology in the municipalities

After the Portuguese revolution of 25 April 1974, the local administration in Portugal took over an important role in land management, culture, education and social development. The existing 308 municipalities are characterised by their diversity, making it difficult to generalise about them.

With regard to archaeology, it is important to refer to the activity developed at municipal level in several areas: research, land management, enhancement and disclosure of information.

Figure 17.11: Zambujal fortress (Mafra, Lisbon): fortification inserted in the Lines of Torres Vedras – a system of defences created between 1809 and 1811 during the Napoleonic Wars. The regional project included excavation, restoration and creation of interpretive centres. Grants were funded by the EAA (Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein), and the project received an Europa Nostra award nomination. Excavation directed by Ana Catarina Sousa and Marta Miranda ( Câmara Municipal de Mafra).
It is very difficult to characterise archaeological activity in the municipalities, as there is no significant data available. There were several attempts to assess the pattern of archaeology in Portuguese municipalities, especially by the Professional Association of Archaeologists (APA), which conducted surveys in 2002 and 2006 (Almeida, 2006, 2007). Recently, under the DISCO programme, new surveys were carried out (Costa et al. 2014). It should be noted that these surveys were not exhaustive: in the 2006 survey 107 municipalities participated (Almeida 2007, 130), while in the 2014 survey only 53 did (Costa et al. 2014, 92).

From the data available in the Endovelico Information System (DGPC), Jacinta Bugalhão concludes that in 2010, about 12% of Portuguese archaeologists were working in local municipalities (Bugalhão 2011, 35). In 2014, the DISCO project estimates that 27.1% of archaeologists were working in local administration (Costa et al. 2014, 93).

It is difficult to perform diachronic readings very accurately. The 2006 survey revealed two moments of growth in the number of municipalities employing archaeologists: the 1980s and the period between 2000 and 2005 (Almeida 2007, 135). In the 2014 survey, there appears to be a reduction in archaeological activity in the municipalities (Costa et al. 2014, 17).

The first rise in archaeological activity in the municipalities, in the early 1980s, relates to the growing importance of the municipalities after the April 25 revolution, when they benefited from remarkable financial and administrative autonomy. Growth in the early 21st century seems to reflect the influence of the post-Valletta legal framework (Basic Law for Cultural Heritage – DL 107/2001 and Archaeological Works Regulation – DL 270/99) and the action of an independent authority for archaeological heritage – the Portuguese Institute of Archaeology. Economic recession in Portugal, culminating in the 2011 financial rescue, contributed to the reduction in municipal archaeological activity, as a result of an organisational reshuffle and budget constraints.

There are no accurate data on municipal funding for archaeological purposes, but it is generally agreed that municipalities were the major funders of research projects, development and promotion of archaeology.

Archaeology in the municipalities has very different organisational structures. In most cases it is included in the culture department, though it can also come under construction and planning (Almeida 2007). Archaeological work is carried out directly by municipal teams, through private companies or universities and research centres.

The general trend of archaeological activity seems to indicate a decline from 2009, coinciding with the financial crisis (Sousa 2013). However, in recent years there seems to have been an increase in heritage promotion and education, according to data available in the DISCO 2014 project (Costa et al. 2014, 102). This trend may also follow the evolution process of archaeological activity at local level: an initial phase of surveys and research studies, bridging century-old gaps until the early 21st century, followed by the last decade, where projects were aimed at generating social and economic return.

Nevertheless, the reality still points to weaknesses in this model, since many municipalities have promoted their own projects without liaising with other agents at regional level, thereby hindering the development of itineraries with national and international visibility.

Faced with so many variables, I chose to analyse a specific case: the municipality of Mafra, both a personal choice and one representing the national outlook.

The municipality of Mafra is located in the metropolitan area of Lisbon, just 40 kilometres from the capital. With a surface area of 291.66 square kilometres and 76,685 inhabitants (2011 census), Mafra is still essentially a rural landscape. The history of archaeological activity in this region dates back to the 19th century, but archaeological research was minimal until 1997, totalling only 4 excavated archaeological sites. From 1997, following the establishment of a municipal archaeology office, the situation changed significantly with the creation of a small technical team, laboratory infrastructure and backup, exhibition and educational spaces, and the enhancement of archaeological sites.

Excavation and archaeological monitoring at 35 sites was carried out for a total of 104 archaeological works, between 1997 and 2014, of which 57% were directly
run by the Municipal Office. The progress of this activity, in a way, followed the national trend. In the first phase (1998–2004), the archaeological work was aimed at conducting specific research projects and site prospection. From 2004 until 2008, preventive archaeology intensified, in particular the works on Highway A21 – the only motorway sponsored by a municipality in Portugal. From 2008 preventive and research works slowed down and heritage enhancement projects increased.

Efforts to publicise this archaeological activity sought to target a range of audiences and various forms of communication: scientific and popular publications, exhibitions, guided tours, education services including schools, teacher training, historical re-enactment with local community participation, enhancement of archaeological sites (Miranda 2009).

In terms of publications, two types of work were published: general interest and scientific publications. Only two titles were published in the first category: one for children and youth and one for heritage site visitors. The remaining 74 published titles took the form of books (4), chapters, scientific articles and academic theses.

During this period, 9 exhibitions were held at various locations, including an exhibition area staged in association with an educational workshop and a long-term exhibition programme. Education services included a programme for various levels of education, teacher training and family workshops.

Preventive archaeology has also been regularly promoted by the local press and in themed exhibitions; a noteworthy example was the A21 exhibition – Archaeology on the Highway, which was launched in 2009 and generated considerable impact in the national media given the rarity of such initiatives.

Despite this intensive activity, it was only possible to implement enhancement measures for the inter-municipal project Historic Route of the Lines of Torres Vedras, with funding from EAA grants – a project that won a Europa Nostra award.

In addition, the local population of Mafra was further encouraged to participate in heritage activities such as archaeological excavations and historical re-enactments.

The case of Mafra highlights the importance of maintaining a balance in archaeological heritage management, research and dissemination, and of developing a long-term plan. Unexpected funding cuts have led to the closure of exhibition spaces and to a reduction in staff – a trend that can be seen in many other municipalities. Unfortunately the picture is very unbalanced at national level, depending more on personal initiatives and executives than on national policies.

Figure 17.13: Historical re-enactment in Zambujal Fortress. Publicity about the Historical Route of the Lines of Torres has a strong local impact on the communities involved in the maintenance and animation of this heritage. Photo Marta Miranda.
3. We and the others: archaeological promotion agents in Portugal

Despite the long history of archaeology in Portugal (Fabião 2011) it is only in recent decades that there has been widespread dissemination of archaeological activity. Several interconnected factors can be mentioned in this respect: the Côa valley findings (1995–1997), the establishment of an autonomous archaeological authority (Portuguese Institute of Archaeology 1997) and specific archaeology legislation, the emergence of the first university degrees in archaeology (during the 1990s) and the professionalisation of archaeology. Together with the abovementioned circumstances, the economic contribution from European Community funds for the implementation of major archaeological projects has to be mentioned.

Currently, the majority of the Portuguese population is aware of archaeologists and archaeological activity. Even though the research process is widely recognised, the public tends to find it more difficult to understand and interpret the work details involved.

Communication in archaeology is primarily carried out by archaeologists and for archaeologists, which may make it less clear for large segments of the population. It is therefore important to broadly examine the promotion agents (us): the cultural administration (central and regional), museums, universities and research centres and businesses.

3.1. Promotion of archaeology by the cultural heritage authority

Currently, the Portuguese cultural heritage has a centralised administration bringing together architectural, movable, intangible and archaeological heritage. Management of these areas also has a regional component as regards museums, monuments and sites management (Decree Law 114/2012, Decree Law 115/2012).

Since 1997 the protection of the archaeological heritage has fluctuated between various organisations, as part of a major administrative reorganisation of the entire sphere of culture. As it is impossible to critically analyse the whole process, I will provide a brief overview of the main approaches to the promotion of archaeology during the study period (1997–2014).

Broadly speaking, promotion strategies are much more effective in the technical-scientific area, when targeting archaeologists or heritage technicians.

Implementation of the Endovelico Information System in 1995 (Bugalhão & Lucena 2006) was a milestone in archaeological heritage management, as it enables the inventorying, geo-referencing and publicising of land and underwater archaeological heritage, which currently amounts to more than 30,000 occurrences (Gomes et al. 2012). Its database is accessible via the Archaeologist’s Portal – an online platform that provides e-services to professionals and information about archaeological sites for users in general. It has proved to be an effective tool for heritage promotion and protection.

The Portuguese Institute of Archaeology (1997–2006) promoted an editorial plan for publishing archaeological work, thereby fulfilling the requirement set out in the Regulation on Archaeological Works (DL 170/99, Article 15, paragraph 3), including a monographic series (archaeological work) and a bi-annual magazine (Portuguese Journal of Archaeology – Revista Portuguesa de Arqueologia), open to all of the archaeological community.

The regularity of the publications and their wide dissemination through a European network of exchanges, apart from being available online, has made them a reference source for Portuguese archaeology.

Archaeological publications ‘survived’ the changes in the organisational structure of the archaeology authority, remaining under IGESPAR (2007–2011) and the DGPC (2012–), albeit with a substantial decline. The new Regulation on Archaeological Works (DL 140/2014) maintains a reference to the monographic series and the Portuguese Journal of Archaeology. Between the 1999 and the 2014 regulations there was a clear need to find other forms of promotion, particularly for rescue archaeology. The 2014 regulation also mentions the availability of online publications, in particular concerning rescue archaeology.

Although the editorial overview of scientific publications is positive, there is no strategy for promotional publications. These are restricted to itineraries of visitable sites, including the “Archaeological Route” Collection. This gap has not been filled by other sectors such as museums or commercial publishers.
Under the national heritage agency, 35 congresses took place (20 organised by the national agency and 15 co-organised with other partners). The enhancement and management policy for archaeological sites has changed over time according to their different governing bodies. Management of archaeological sites requires direct monitoring and significant investment in conservation planning. It has led to short lifecycles in various archaeological enhancement projects developed by the governing authorities, such as in the Antas de Belas circuit. The recent shift in the responsibility for archaeological heritage protection to the regional directorates tried to bridge the gap between managers and the territory within their remit. As a result, several regional directorates have established collaboration protocols with the municipalities.

Currently the DGPC has a very limited number of archaeological sites under its jurisdiction. They include sites located in the area of Lisbon and the Tagus Valley and those inscribed on UNESCO’s World Heritage List. A foundation model with an exclusively financial contribution was chosen for management of the only world heritage archaeological site in Portugal: the Côa Valley.

The outlook is somewhat different in the remaining regional directorates, which have a total of 26 visitable archaeological sites under their direct management.

About 500 archaeological sites have been legally protected by classification, but only a small number have been targeted for conservation, evaluation and interpretation.

In 2001 the Archaeology Centre of Almada conducted a survey of municipalities and cultural administration, having gathered an extensive dossier of 300 visitable sites in Portugal (Raposo 2001). This exercise brought together a number of archaeological sites with very different visitor access conditions. It refers to some unevenness in their geographical distribution (by district and municipality) and highlights the lack of regional and national plans. In 2001 only 20 sites were integrated in museums or associated to museum structures. In most cases visits are free (Raposo 2001, 104). Despite the undeniable economic impact of visitable archaeological sites through tourism, an investment by the public administration, namely by the heritage authority, will always be required.

3.2. Museums and archaeology
Archaeological museums are spread across the country with an estimated total of 208 museums in 2014 (Antas 2014, 226). This figure includes:

1. Archaeological museums, archaeological museums with musealized archaeological sites and multi-core archaeological museums;
2. Archaeology collection museums;
3. Interpretive centres (Antas 2014).

This multiplicity has been provided for by the Museum Framework Law (Law 47/2004 of 19 August), which
stipulates that an archaeological site or ensemble can be considered a museum.

Within the restricted Portuguese Museum Network (of accredited museums), 52 archaeology museums or archaeology collections are referenced, representing 37% of all museums in this network. The establishment of this archaeological museum network progressed at a relatively steady pace until the 1990s, registering a peak in the first decade of the 21st century. Many of the new museums are musealized archaeological sites and interpretation centres, and 71% were created by the municipalities. There are two main explanations for this situation: on the one hand, the increase in archaeological activity and, on the other, the European funding of the last Community Support Framework. After a period of strong growth, there is a current downturn, and various sustainability issues in this network (Camacho 2008–2009). Some of the museums that emerged between 1990 and 2010 were closed down and others recorded downsizings in financial and human resources. The excess of local museums with very similar content clearly limits their attractiveness for non-local audiences; recently, there has been a tendency to create small thematic museums, such as the Southwest Script Museum (Almodôvar) or the Discovery Museum (Belmonte). There is also a growing tendency to establish integrated routes between museums, archaeological sites and other heritage sites, such as the Historic Route of the Lines of Torres Vedras or the Romanesque Route.

It should be emphasised that there was a gap between the discourse of the museums and recent developments in archaeology after Valletta. Some of the main Portuguese archaeology museums were established in the 19th century and their collections were brought together between the late 19th century and the 1970s. These museums have become true repositories of Portuguese archaeological history and are in a way detached from the contemporary world. They have nothing to do with management policy regarding the holdings of preventive archaeology activity, which is one of the main difficulties of archaeological activity in Portugal. The Alqueva Dam, which does not have a regional museum or an integrated management of its assets, is an example. Besides, there is a limited perception of the concept of archaeological holdings, often perceived as works of art rather than scientific documents (Correia 2013–2014).

Against this background, it would seem clear that museums could develop a more active role in promoting archaeological activity (research and prevention). Mediators are needed to handle the technical and scientific findings from the fieldwork carried out in recent decades.

The work of these museums is particularly important for engagement with local communities in terms of identity and as a tourist development engine (see the paring identity/economy developed by Correia [2013–2014, 155]).

3.3. Research centres and universities
The growth of archaeological activity was followed by an increase in academic degrees (bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral) in archaeology. At the same time, there are new universities all across the country.

During the period from 1997 to 2014, archaeological academe expanded with the creation of new archaeology degree courses at the Universities of Minho (1998), Nova de Lisboa (1995), Évora (2000–2001) and Algarve (2008). However, most archaeologists graduated from the ‘old’ universities such as those in Lisbon, Coimbra and Porto, accounting for the number of entries and the results of the recent DISCO study (Costa et al. 2014).

Universities have a double impact on the promotion strategy. On the one hand they essentially have a training capacity (Diniz 2008). In addition to their skills in technical and scientific training, university studies also include social skills, such as promotion. Although there are no specific curriculum areas for science communication, these concepts are addressed across various disciplines. Students are also required to participate in promotional activities undertaken by universities/research centres.

The issue of publications (publish or perish ...), is naturally at the centre of university actions. The challenge of communicating science to the public (Public Understanding of Science) became important in the 1980s in the UK (Entradas 2015), as there was an attempt to find a relationship between scientific knowledge and the public’s attitude towards science.

In Portugal, communication science was developed by Mariano Gago (particle physicist, responsible for a scientific research agency between 1986 and 1989, and science minister for 12 years: 1995–2002, 2005–2011). In 1996 the creation of the Life Science Agency (Ciência Viva) set off an intense science education program, including the establishment of a network of 14 centres

Figure 17.16: Foundation dates of archaeological museums in Portugal. Source: Antas, 2014.
across the country. Even though social sciences were not a central core of these initiatives, some were dedicated to archaeology-related themes, thereby leading to archaeology communication beyond the sphere of cultural heritage. This trend was strengthened by specific guidelines for communication science developed by the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) during the process of evaluating projects and research centres.

These initiatives have recently spiked with projects such as the European Researchers’ Night (Researchers’ Night), promoted by the European Commission under the Marie Curie Actions since 2005 in order to celebrate science and engage in community outreach. This action, promoted by the Science Museums of Lisbon and Coimbra University included archaeological activities.

These actions were aimed at bringing together research archaeology and the local community. In addition, ‘open days’, mostly run by universities/research centres, have been developed in recent years to encourage visits to archaeological excavations. Beyond these occasional and seasonal initiatives, there is a strengthening of knowledge transfer in more permanent actions, such as scientific coordination of enhancement and musealization projects at several archaeological sites.

From this perspective, it seems that the coming years will register an increasing concern for communication science, a trend reinforced by Horizon 2020, – an EU programme aimed at capacitating European citizens, with specific funding lines (Reflective societies: transmission of European cultural heritage, uses of the past, 3D modelling for Accessing US cultural assets).

3.4. Archaeology companies

The free market model adopted by Portugal (Sousa 2013) led to the exponential growth of archaeology companies. In the absence of a permit or accreditation system, it is very difficult to quantify existing archaeological companies (Costa et al. 2014). DISCO 2014 reference frameworks are used suggesting that ‘at the beginning of the financial crisis, Portugal had 39 active archaeology companies, and in 2014, that number dropped to 25.’ (Costa et al. 2014, 79).

A total of 8 dozen archaeology companies have been active in Portugal, the majority being sole-trader companies, which have already closed down their business.

This scattering of micro-businesses naturally compromises promotion both in terms of organisational capacity and their financial capacity to invest in promotional activities. In most cases there is no communication strategy whatsoever.

Corporate communication has two main objectives: company promotion and social responsibility.

---

**Figure 17.17: Promotion actions by Portuguese archaeological companies. Source: Data from DISCO 2014.**

**Figure 17.18: Dissemination media used by archaeological organisations (adapted from DISCO 2014 – Costa et al., 2014).**
Using three simple indicators (website, social media, publications), it can be said that many archaeology companies do not pay particular attention to communication, even when investment is reduced, as is the case with virtual communication.

Websites and social media are currently the only vehicle for real-time dissemination of the biggest findings in preventive archaeology. As well as web promotion, community outreach has surfaced in recent years, particularly in the case of corporate research projects.

With regard to publications (online and print), the situation is more striking, as only 20% of companies have publications. As for printed editions, only two companies have published works for more than a decade.

In order to analyse scientific production in the corporate sector, especially as regards publications, it would be necessary to conduct a thorough literature inventory impossible in the current study. Antonio Valera attempted to make an analysis of the scientific production by Portuguese archaeological companies (Valera 2007), but inquiry-based surveys always have great representation issues.

This ‘low-cost’ archaeology (Almeida 2007) necessarily leads to a low social return rate, as repeatedly referred to by some Portuguese archaeological companies (Almeida & Neves 2006; Valera 2007; 2008).

Of course, the problem will always have to do with financial sustainability. If contracts make no mention of research and promotion, corporate archaeologists are not the only ones to be blamed.

### 3.5. Associations

Heritage protection associations, which are non-governmental organisations, played a major role in the post-revolution period (after 25 April 1974). Given the importance of these associations, the Law of Cultural Heritage (DL 107/2001) sets out the rights of those organisations in terms of the ‘right of participation, information and popular action’ and collaboration with public administration in promotion (art. 10). Nevertheless, they are not represented in the advisory bodies of the cultural heritage authority, including the National Council of Culture, section of Architectural and Archaeological Heritage.

In 1997, Jorge Raposo identified 45 heritage associations, most of them founded in the 1990s (Raposo 1997). Similar growth can also be observed in reference to Environment Protection Associations (Caninas 2011).

Concurrent to the associative movement of the 1990s and 1980s, local associations with direct impact on the archaeological heritage remain active to date.

The Portuguese Archaeologists Association (AAP) is the oldest heritage protection association in Portugal (established in 1863), being responsible for the Carmo Archaeological Museum (MAC) – the first art and archaeology museum in the country. In recent decades, the AAP has played an important role in disseminating information to professionals and the general public through lectures and seminars and by promoting initiatives such as the Festival of Archaeology.

The Mértola Archaeological Site and the Mértola Heritage Defence Association had a unique role in marking the boundary between academic and community areas. Established in 1978, they have implemented a research, enhancement and promotion plan. Contrary to what usually happens, their intervention in the territory is permanent, as researchers have settled down in Mértola. Their action programme includes rescue archaeology in the historic centre, enhancement and in situ conservation of archaeological assets, museum promotion and periodic publications.

The Archaeology Centre of Almada represents an exemplary case in Portugal as it combines research,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ARCH</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>ASSOCIATION</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>NATIONAL MUSEUMS</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2871</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17.2: Actions held on the International Day of Monuments and Sites in Portugal. Source: DGPC.
training and promotion, with particular reference to periodic publications.

3.6. The others
Archaeology promotion is also ensured by other agents not belonging to the archaeological community.

In addition to Heritage Protection Associations (many of which have no archaeologists), there is the ‘Groups of Friends’ movement, connected mainly with museums and musealized sites. A notable example is the Group of Friends of the National Archaeological Museum, established in 1999, which has considerable powers of mobilisation.

Large impact digital media (facebook, websites) have recently emerged, as is the case with Portugal Romano (60,000 followers, about 200,000 weekly views) and many embryonic themed platforms. These platforms play an important role in promotion and awareness.

4. General trends
Generally speaking, the Portuguese (and European) archaeological community recognise(s) that it is absolutely necessary to reverse the current situation regarding archaeological promotion. There is a clear increase in initiatives undertaken by all agents. We do hope that this new trend may reverse the declining presence of archaeology in the media and in political agendas.

Based on the survey conducted by the Professional Association of Archaeologists for DISCO (Costa et al. 2014), it can be said that the current promotion model is still very focused on the archaeological community and on scientific knowledge production. The great challenge will undoubtedly be to develop communication and mediation skills targeting the general public by means of an interdisciplinary perspective and with the support of communication professionals.

Heritage enhancement must also be encouraged. An archaeological site is only perceived by the communities as ‘their own’ if the right mediation strategy is used. This is probably why archaeology ranks low in heritage promotion schemes such as the International Day on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) or the European Heritage Days (Council of Europe and European Commission). Our indicators are based on the last five years of the International Day on Monuments and Sites in Portugal, according to which archaeology represents only 9% of the total activities between 2009 and 2014.

The International Day on Monuments and Sites undoubtedly reflects the current situation in terms of promotional dynamics.

It is without any doubt the municipalities that are leading the initiatives with 55% of all activities. This percentage reflects the special attention paid by municipal archaeologists to promoting the archaeological heritage.

The regional culture directorates should also be mentioned as they represent 15% of total activities. This percentage reflects a dynamic promotion strategy as regards the archaeological sites under their protection.

The DGPC – the central body organising this initiative in partnership with ICOMOS – is virtually absent from the picture as far as archaeological data is concerned. This is due to the current cultural heritage management competencies in Portugal: the central heritage administration only manages sites located in the area of Lisbon and the Tagus Valley and those inscribed on UNESCO’s World Heritage List. Foz Côa is the only archaeological site under this circumstance, but since 2011 it is managed by a foundation (included in the ‘others’ category).

Private companies are responsible for two major Portuguese archaeological sites that are under private management: the Roman ruins of Troia and the Archaeological Centre of Rua dos Correeiros.

5. Promotion by decree? Future prospects
Effective dissemination of information on archaeology cannot be ordered by law as it requires society to be convinced and get involved, and thus assimilate/appropriate the principles of the Faro Convention. Awareness of the need to change the current scenario led to the inclusion of promotion in the recently published Regulation of Archaeological Works DL 164/2014).

This concern can be found in the preamble of this decree-law:

According to the new Regulation of Archaeological Works, applicants for an archaeological work permit are required to submit a ‘Plan for disseminating archaeological work results to the community’ (DL 164/2014, art. 7).

The future will evaluate the contribution of this legislation for the promotion of archaeology. But there is no doubt that the task of dissemination cannot be left exclusively to the goodwill of archaeologists. This responsibility also lies with policy-makers, cultural heritage administration, developers and the local communities.
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