

S. Musteață, Șt. Caliniuc (eds.), *Current Trends in Archaeological Heritage Preservation: National and International Perspectives. Proceedings of the international conference, Iași, Romania, November 6-10, 2013*, BAR International Series 2741, 2015, 132 p.

Article 4 of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (revised) adopted on 16<sup>th</sup> January 1992 at La Valletta recommends: "Each Party undertakes to implement measures for the physical protection of the archaeological heritage, making provision, as circumstances demand: i. for the acquisition or protection by other appropriate means by the authorities of areas intended to constitute archaeological reserves; ii. for the conservation and maintenance of the archaeological heritage, preferably *in situ*; iii. for appropriate storage places for archaeological remains which have been removed from their original location." Following these recommendations, article 9 of the same documents highlights: "Each Party undertakes: i. to conduct educational actions with a view to rousing and developing an awareness in public opinion of the value of the archaeological heritage for understanding the past and of the threats to this heritage; ii. to promote public access to important elements of its archaeological heritage, especially sites, and encourage the display to the public of suitable selections of archaeological objects." Therefore, the specialists have to understand that the most important aspects related to the archaeological sites nowadays are the preservation, the conservation, the protection and the promotion of the archaeological patrimony, and not necessarily, and not all the time, the excavations.

In the last two decades, across Europe, and not only, the preoccupations for the protection of the archaeological patrimony have significantly increased. To sustain this statement, I will mention here only few books or other contributions focusing on these topics: J. Ashurst (ed.), *Conservation of ruins*, Oxford 2007; M. Gras, P. Liverani (eds.), *Il patrimonio culturale tra tutela e ricerca / Cultural Heritage between Conservation and Research. Atti del convegno internazionale Roma, 30-31 gennaio 2006*, Roma 2011; E. Korka (ed.), *The Protection of Archaeological Heritage in Times of Economic Crisis*, Cambridge 2014; N. Agnew, J. Bridgland (eds.), *Of the Past, for the Future: Integrating Archaeology and Conservation, Proceedings of the Conservation Theme at the 5<sup>th</sup> World Archaeological Congress, Washington D.C., 22-26 June 2003*, Los Angeles 2006; C. Borș, *Protejarea patrimoniului arheologic din România. Despre situri și monumente arheologice din perspectiva evoluției cadrului legislativ în context european*, Cluj-Napoca 2014; S. Musteață (coord.), *Arheologia și politicile de protejare a patrimoniului cultural în România. Culegere de studii*, Chișinău - Iași 2014.

Connected to this trend, in 2011, with the financial support of the Romanian National Council of Scientific Research (CNCS), the project *Current trends in the archaeological heritage preservation: the national and the international perspective* was implemented at the Institute of Archaeology of the Romanian Academy in Iași. In 2013, an international conference on this topic was organized here. Circa fifty

specialists in the protection of the archaeological patrimony participated, from countries as Romania, Moldavia, Germany, United Kingdom, Czech Republic, Netherlands, Spain, Portugal, Poland, Russia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, USA, and India. The volume published in BAR series groups 23 articles, representing the papers presented within the conference.

Michal Bureš, in his study entitled *Archaeological heritage management in Czech Republic - between centralism and liberalism* (p. 11-14) presents important data regarding the legislation concerning the protection of the archaeological heritage in Czech Republic, information about the Landmark Conservation Act, and some aspects regarding the spatial planning and the archaeological heritage management.

Sergiu Musteață published a study entitled *Preserving archaeological remains in situ: from the legal to the practical issues. The Romanian case* (p. 15-20). The key analysis of the author focuses on the problems of *in situ* preservation in Romania, especially in a more recent context, when rescue excavations in Romania extended because of various investment projects.

Hans-Ulrich Voß, Sergiu Musteață and Alexandru Popa presented the study *Forward-Looking for Conservation. Case Study: Landscape Archaeology in the Cubolta River Valley, Republic of Moldova - the Project "Cultural Relations of the Sântana de Mureș Culture between the Rivers Prut and Dniester"* (p. 21-25). The authors described the results of a terrain research realized in the Cubolta Valley, in the northern part of Moldavia, where several points with archaeological discoveries, belonging to the Sântana de Mureș-Chernyakhov culture were identified.

Asmita Basu from the Academy for Professional Excellence in Calcutta, India, published a case study entitled *Sustainable Development - a Challenge for Archaeological Site Management in the Coastal Areas of West Bengal in Eastern India* (p. 27-32). The author gives us a view of the main archaeological sites in the area and some proposals to follow strategic steps useful for the development and implementation of heritage management plans for the region investigated.

Fariz Khalilli and Shola Bayramova, in their contribution entitled *Research and Conservation of Public Buildings in the Medieval Agsu Town* (p. 33-36), offer some details regarding the conservation and the protection of some important buildings (the bath complex, the water reservoir) discovered during the archaeological excavations in the Medieval Agsu Town archaeological complex.

Giacomo Maria Tabita, from the Italian Society for the Preservation of Cultural Heritage, District of Sicily, Italy, presented some data regarding *Italian Civil Protection and Archaeological Heritage: Italian Experiences* (p. 37-40). The main focus of the study is the description of the activity of the Italian Society of the Preservation of the Cultural Heritage (Società Italiana per la Protezione dei Beni Culturali).

Ștefan Caliniuc from Arheo Management SRL Romania gives in his study entitled *Destruction of archaeological heritage sites by natural risk phenomena in north-eastern Romania* (p. 41-44) some examples of important archaeological sites located in the Moldavian Plateau (Cucuteni-Cetățuia, Băiceni-La Dobrin, Dealul Mare, La Iaz-Dealul Mândra, and Costești-Cier) affected by various causes, such as erosion, alluvial depositing, or landslide.

Davide Delfino, Luiz Oosterbeek and Nelson Almeida, in their study entitled *Yes, we can! Scientific Research and Public Archaeology between the Public and Private Sectors in Central Portugal* (p. 45–54), draws a point of view on the archaeology in Portugal. Their contribution refers to issues like state resources and competence, regulations and privates, or the public heritage in the region of the Middle Tagus.

Durga Basu pays attention on important aspects regarding *Public Archaeology; its Scope and Limitation in Regional Aspects in India* (p. 55–58).

Some facts about *The International Exhibition Project “The Terra-Cotta Army: Arms and Armour in Chinese Destiny.” Experiences, Results and Perspectives of an Archaeological Mobile Exhibition* (p. 59–62) are revealed in Alexey O. Pronin’s contribution.

Livia Ștefan and Dragoș Gheorghiu described in their article a mobile application, very useful for the e-cultural tourism (*E-Cultural Tourism for Highlighting the “Invisible” Communities – Elaboration of Cultural Routes Using Augmented Reality for Mobile Devices (MAR)*) (p. 63–66).

Another application of mobile devices is described in the contribution of Andrea Chiricescu, Alexandru Popa and Mihai Chiricescu, *The Archaeology Spets into the Smartphone Era! An Application for Mobile Devices, for Signalling, Tracking and Informing on Archaeological Sites from South-east Transylvania – a joint public-private research project* (p. 67–72).

E. M. P. González, M. E. C. Álvarez, M. D. C. Massieu, and D. M. Socas analyzed the *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Canary Islands (Spain) and Its Relationship with Tourism* (p. 73–76).

Andrey Borodovskiy offered a proposal of developing tourism infrastructure within the region of the Altai Mountains, in *Monitoring and Integrating the Archaeological Heritage from the Altai Mountains into the Tourism Infrastructure* (p. 77–80).

P. Kołodziejczyk presented some interesting data regarding the *Polish Archaeological and Scientific Achievements in the Research and Protection of World Cultural Heritage as a Marketing Product? Examples of Promotional Activities* (p. 81–90). He described the Polish Archaeological expedition to the Eastern Nile Delta.

Marta Lorenzon (*Arica and Parinacota: A Successful Example of Integration between Cultural Tourism and Heritage Preservation*, p. 91–96) investigates the modalities of preservation used in the region of Arica and Parinacota (Chile). This particular region, located between the plateau of the Andes and the so-called Pacific Great Desert, is remarkable because of its historical landscape, based on traces dating back over 10000 years. The author of the paper describes the activity of the Fundación Altiplano, born in 2005 with the main purpose focused on the protection and the development of the archaeological and architectural heritage. For example, the Fundación Altiplano initiated the restoration of thirty-one churches. The foundation also promoted the idea of the involvement of the community in activities aiming to sustain and promote the patrimony and the heritage of the area.

A very short note is provided by Irina Gusach, in *A New Direction of Archaeological Tourism in the South of Russia (On the Example of the “Tanais” Archaeological Reserve Museum* (p. 97–98), with reference to the discovery, in 2012, of an ancient

cult construction close to the Rostov-Don area. Fortunately, the Ministry of Culture of Rostov decided to preserve this newly found building, thus not only protecting the monument, but also decisively contributing to the development of the touristic activities in the area.

Projit Kumar Palit wrote a study about the *Cultural Tourism in Tripura, Northeastern India, with special Reference to Bangladesh: an Archaeological Study* (p. 99-103), where he described the touristic objectives located in the area of Tripura. Many of the sites known here were excavated since 1955, when the Archaeological Survey of Bangladesh carried out excavations and conservation works here.

Alexandru Popa provided an insight focused on the *Multidisciplinary Researches and the Question of Archiving the Analysed Samples and their Results. Case Study: the Roman Camps from South-east Transylvania* (p. 105-110). This study is related with the project entitled “*Roman Limes in Eastern Dacia*”, including several key objectives and a series of activities, based on multidisciplinary researches, such as archaeological and archaeometric prospections, the re-inventorying of older excavations, geomagnetic prospections, georadar measurements, and geochemical prospections. Data collected after these investigations are archived. The author enumerates these types of data and offers solutions regarding the interpretation of this information.

Monica Biră (*Seeing the Past through the Eyes of Media - Archaeology and Archaeologists as Depicted by the Romanian Online Press*, p. 111-115) offers some information regarding the perception of archaeology reflected in three online Romanian journals (Gândul.info, Adevărul.ro and Jurnalul.ro).

Suzie Thomas (*Multiple-Role Actors in the Movement of Cultural Property: Metal-Detector Users*, p. 117-124) approaches a very difficult aspect that became more and more a real problem - the trafficking of cultural objects. The author presents the “matrix” which functions on four stages and has as final step the traffic of objects. The first people involved in this “chain” are the extractors, who loot the sites and the monuments. Then, they are followed by the so-called “middle-men”, those who connect the extractors with the dealers. Then they are followed by the dealers/traders, and finally, in the fourth stage, by the buyers. The author of the paper also refers to the hobbyist metal-detector users in northern Europe.

Henrique A. Mourão (*The Incompatibility between the UNESCO Underwater Heritage Convention and Brazilian Legislation*, p. 125-128) refers to a document known as the Federal Bill 7566, which was adopted in 2005 by a small group of specialists, changing the Brazilian legislation with reference to the national underwater heritage.

The final article of this volume is signed by Sergey Tikhonov and it focuses on *The Preservation and Use of the Archaeological Heritage in West Siberia (Russia)* (p. 129-132). It reflects some aspects regarding the status and the state of the native archaeological heritage in Siberia.

Therefore, this book will be very useful for all those specialists interested in the preservation, the conservation, the protection and the promotion of the archaeological patrimony. I recommend it because it provides interesting aspects and it debates upon

---

various problems, and details about the legislation, presenting different approaches connected to the sites and the monuments all over the world.

**Florin-Gheorghe Fodorean**

Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca

fodorean\_f@yahoo.com