

Tutor: Dr Alexander Scott

Module: Heritage in the Political World: Communities and Comparative Aspects (HPHE7001)

Student: Andrew Ward (2112922)

Word count: 4453

A critical comparison of attitudes to portable heritage within the United Kingdom and Scandinavia

Portable Heritage in this essay refers to archaeological objects found outside of the official archaeological process, i.e., those finds made by members of the public, metal detectorists, mudlarkers – those who search the foreshore – and field walkers. While these objects are an important source of information, before the rise of metal detecting in the 1970s, they were often overlooked in official channels. The aim of this essay is to analyse the attitudes towards portable heritage, with a particular focus on metal detecting, as this method of interacting with the past is fraught with controversy. Two case studies will be used within this essay given their historical connections, similar legal frameworks, and comparative archaeological resource. The two case studies used will be that of the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian nations. The United Kingdom (UK) constitutes England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland (NI) while Scandinavia constitutes Norway, Finland, Denmark, Iceland, and Sweden. Throughout this work the legislative frameworks surrounding metal detecting in both geographic areas will be looked at to identify the Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD)¹ surrounding portable heritage. As well as the official legislative attitude towards portable heritage this essay will analyse the academic and archaeological adjacent or amateur attitude in both regions. Finally, this essay will seek to set out several potential directions for cooperation within a European framework, aimed at better integration between metal detectorists and archaeologists using the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) in England and Wales as a template.

Both case study regions, the United Kingdom and Scandinavia, cover the use of metal detecting through legislative frameworks however the legality of metal detecting varies even within the geographic boundaries of both regions. Metal detecting in England, Wales and Northern Ireland is governed by The Treasure Act (1996), which replaced the earlier Medieval Treasure Trove. The Act was further supported by the Treasure (Designation) Order (2002).² In Scotland portable antiquities are governed by Treasure Trove with the law originating in the Medieval period, followed by further enhancement in the 1990s and 2000s.³ However, even within the same legislative framework attitude to metal detecting differs between the

¹ Laurajane Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2006)

² DCMS, *The Treasure Act 1996: Code of Practice*. (1996)
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/77532/TreasureAct1996CodeofPractice2ndRevision.pdf. [Accessed 11 April 2022].

³ Treasure Trove Unit, *Treasure Trove In Scotland*. (2016)
<https://treasuretrovescotland.co.uk/sites/default/assets/File/tt-code-jan-2016.pdf> [Accessed 11 April 2022].

different regions. For example, while the definition of what constitutes Treasure is governed by the Treasure Act (1996) in Northern Ireland, metal detecting is a licenced activity meaning that unlike in England and Wales practitioners of the hobby must apply for a licence.⁴ This difference in law is governed by The Historic Monuments and Archaeological Objects (NI) Order 1995.⁵ This piece of legislation adds stronger protection to the historic environment when compared with the legislation governing England and Wales. The law in Northern Ireland is explicit in its desire to

support the interests of the public as a whole, to prevent damage to ancient sites, to prevent the looting of such sites for personal gain, and to encourage the reporting of discoveries of antiquities so that the information that such objects convey can be studied.⁶

This places the focus of the legislation on protecting and preserving portable heritage through robust enforcement and licencing while at the same time following the framework set out by The Treasure Act 1996. While licensing provides a strong reporting scheme for archaeological objects recovered in Northern Ireland the workload is directed solely to the National Museum Ulster whereas in England and Wales the casework is spread amongst regional Finds Liaison Officers (FLOs), who provide a more intimate relationship between finder and authority, a relationship which will be explored more deeply in this essay.

Each of the Scandinavian nations have their own legislative framework governing the use of metal detecting in comparison with the UK which, as a union of nations, has a combined approach albeit with framework variations. In Denmark metal detecting is governed by the Danish Consolidated Act on Museums (2006) and through this metal detecting is legal except on or within 2 metres of protected heritage monuments and sites.⁷ Under this legislation all finds that are potentially historically significant must be reported to the local museum within the district in which the object is found.⁸ In neighbouring Finland metal detecting is legal within the limit of everyman's right, but landowner permission is required before detecting can take place.⁹ How finds are dealt with differs in Finland in that artefacts over 100 years old must be reported directly to the Finnish Heritage Agency while military remains dating to after World War One, should be reported to the police, military, or border

⁴ Department For Communities, *Advice For Finders Of Treasure In Northern Ireland*, <https://www.communities-ni.gov.uk/articles/advice-finders-treasure-northern-ireland#skip-link> [Accessed 11 April 2022].

⁵ Department For Communities, *A Guide To Metal Detecting, Archaeology And The Law*, <https://www.communities-ni.gov.uk/articles/guide-metal-detecting-archaeology-and-law> [Accessed 11 April 2022].

⁶ Department For Communities, *A Guide To Metal Detecting*, (n.d).

⁷ Andre S. Dobat and Astrid T. Jensen, "Professional Amateurs". *Metal Detecting and Metal Detectorists in Denmark*, 2 (2016), pp 70-84 (p. 71).

⁸ University of Helsinki, *European Public Finds Recording Network – For Metal Detectorists* (2021), [https://www2.helsinki.fi/en/networks/european-public-finds-recording-network/for-metal-detectorists#:~:text=Metal%20detecting%20is%20permitted%20in,1996\)%20without%20a%20separate%20permit](https://www2.helsinki.fi/en/networks/european-public-finds-recording-network/for-metal-detectorists#:~:text=Metal%20detecting%20is%20permitted%20in,1996)%20without%20a%20separate%20permit). [accessed 12 April 2022].

⁹ University of Helsinki, 2021.

and customs authority.¹⁰ Sweden on the other hand has legislation similar to that of Northern Ireland. In that metal detecting is illegal except through the granting of a permit given by the county archaeologist, the *Länsantikvarien*. Metal detecting is also entirely illegal for amateurs on Gotland and Öland.¹¹

In Norway metal detecting is legal if the landowner's permission is gained, and the detectorist complies with the legislation under the Cultural Heritage Act 1978.¹² This act has a number of sections which govern where and when metal detecting can take place. The Cultural Heritage Act 1978 protects all sites and monuments predating the Protestant Reformation in Norway, which occurred in 1537 AD as well as all Sami sites older than 100 years under section 4.¹³ These sites and monuments are protected regardless of whether they are known or not, in essence restricting metal detecting on any known or suspected sites.¹⁴ Within the act there are three key sections which impact the practice of metal detecting within Norway. After section 4 which details what sites and monuments are protected, Section 12 of the act details how all objects older than 1537 and all coins older than 1650 are property of the state regardless of how they were discovered i.e., by chance, through metal detecting or official archaeological investigation.¹⁵ Finally, section 13 states that any damage to recovered objects is illegal and that the finder is obligated to report the find to an authorised museum or county archaeologist after which the finder will be eligible to a reward.¹⁶ Unlike in the UK and other Scandinavian nations the reward for reported objects under the act does not reflect the monetary or market value of the object, but instead, is seen to be a symbol of recognition and appreciation towards the finder.¹⁷ This suggests that the Norwegian authorities have taken the view that finders should be rewarded for doing the correct thing by reporting the find, however, they have taken the decision not to attach significant sums to the finds that might encourage unscrupulous finders to hunt for objects deemed to be of significant financial value. This could be understood to be an attempt to combat the perceived conflation between metal-detecting and looting.¹⁸

All the legislative measures detailed above, those in the UK and in Scandinavia, are designed to protect the archaeological record from damage given that this record is

¹⁰ University of Helsinki, 2021.

¹¹ Dr Martin Rundkvist, 'How to Metal Detect Legally in Sweden in 2021', *Aardvarchaeology*, 3 April 2021. <https://aardvarchaeology.wordpress.com/2021/04/03/how-to-metal-detect-legally-in-sweden-in-2021/#:~:text=Metal%20detecting%20is%20illegal%20in,and%20%C3%96land%20in%20the%20Baltic>. [accessed 12 April 2022].

¹² Jostein Gundersen, Josephine M. Rasmussen, Ragnar Orten Lie, 'Private Metal Detecting and Archaeology', *Open Archaeology*, 2 (2016), pp 160-174, (p. 160). DOI 10.1515/opar-2016-0012.

¹³ Gundersen *et al*, 'Private Metal Detecting and Archaeology', p. 161.

¹⁴ Gundersen *et al*, 'Private Metal Detecting and Archaeology', p. 161.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, p. 161.

¹⁶ Gundersen *et al*, 'Private Metal Detecting and Archaeology', p. 161.

¹⁷ Gundersen *et al*, 'Private Metal Detecting and Archaeology', p. 161.

¹⁸ Suzie Thomas, 'The Future of Studying Hobbyist Metal Detecting in Europe: A Call for a Transnational Approach', *Open Archaeology*, 2 (2016), 140-149 DOI 10.1515/opar-2016-0010.

irreplaceable. However, these finds bring the past into direct contact with us.¹⁹ The increased popularity of metal detecting in both the UK and Scandinavia will pose challenges in how best to meld the interest of metal detectorists and the public in archaeological objects with the concerns of archaeologists regarding the preservation of the past.

Metal detecting for archaeological objects by hobby detectorists is a contentious issue, not least in Europe.²⁰ Portable heritage, represented by stray archaeological objects and metal detected finds, forms an important aspect of cultural heritage. The ability for people to handle real objects connected to the past allows them to learn more about how people in the past lived, worked, and socialised. Internationally the Faro Convention (2005) aims to promote a wider understanding of heritage and its relationship to communities and society.²¹ Within the convention article 12, focused on accessing cultural heritage and democratising participation, asks signatories to:

- a - encourage everyone to participate in: – the process of identification, study, interpretation, protection, conservation, and presentation of the cultural heritage; – public reflection and debate on the opportunities and challenges which the cultural heritage represents.
- b - take into consideration the value attached by each heritage community to the cultural heritage with which it identifies.
- c - recognise the role of voluntary organisations both as partners in activities and as constructive critics of cultural heritage policies.
- d - take steps to improve access to the heritage, especially among young people and the disadvantaged, in order to raise awareness about its value the need to maintain and preserve it, and the benefits which may be derived from it.²²

It can be argued that metal detecting is the ultimate participatory avenue into cultural heritage and there are a number of schemes in place designed to allow hobbyist metal detectorists to record their finds and make heritage information available to more members of the public as well as professional researchers. For example, the heritage sectors in Denmark, England and Wales recognised how important it was for heritage institutions to cooperate effectively with metal detectorists in order to secure the best information of these finds.²³ The oldest scheme in existence is the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) established in 1997.²⁴ The PAS provides a

¹⁹ Dr Kevin Leahy and Dr Michael Lewis, *Finds Identified*, (Witham: Greenlight Publishing, 2018), p. 6.

²⁰ Dobat, A., Deckers, P., Heeren, S., Lewis, M., Thomas, S., & Wessman, A. (n.d.). 'Towards a Cooperative Approach to Hobby Metal Detecting: The European Public Finds Recording Network (EPFRN) Vision Statement.' *European Journal of Archaeology*, 1-21. doi:10.1017/eea.2020.1. p. 1.

²¹ Council Of Europe, *Convention On The Value Of Cultural Heritage For Society* (2022) <https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/faro-convention> [accessed 03 May 2022].

²² Council Of Europe, *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* (2011), <https://rm.coe.int/1680083746> [accessed 03 May 2022].

²³ Dobat et al 'Towards a Cooperative Approach to Hobby Metal Detecting: The European Public Finds Recording Network (EPFRN) Vision Statement.' p. 5.

²⁴ Portable Antiquities Scheme, *About The Scheme* (n.d.) <https://finds.org.uk/about> [accessed 03 May 2022].

unique resource that can actively be utilised by researchers as well as interested members of the public.²⁵ To date there are 868 projects using PAS data varying from undergraduate level work (142), PhD Level (180), and personal research projects (135).²⁶ This demonstrates how vital it is for archaeologists and professional institutions to engage with metal detectorists as the level of new research and information that can be garnered through the scheme is vast.

Other schemes within Europe, particularly the Danish *Digitale Metaldetektorfund* (DIME) or SuALT, the Finnish Archaeological Finds Recording Linked Open Database (Löytösampo/FindSampo) are much younger or still being developed using the PAS as a benchmark.²⁷ However, each of these recording schemes face unique challenges within their individual nations' legislative framework. For example, finds recorded in the DIME scheme belong to the state, whereas those recorded on the PAS belong to the individual or the landowner.²⁸ This means that hobbyist detectorists who may cross borders either within the UK or Scandinavia may feel unable to participate in neighbouring nations. Each of the schemes do share common aims particularly the desire to preserve through digital means the information that portable heritage objects can tell us about the past.²⁹ By engaging with metal detectorists these schemes allow them to participate in the study of history, providing new information on object types and potential sites.

Professional archaeologists and heritage institutions in both study regions have attempted to engage with hobby detectorists, aiming to bring them into the professional sphere. It has been argued that private metal detecting, especially in Norway, provides a valuable contribution to archaeological research and knowledge.³⁰ Furthermore, by helping to facilitate private metal detecting heritage institutions can be seen to be embedding archaeology within society.³¹ This action of facilitating responsible detecting meets the objective of the Faro Convention as well as increasing the nations' knowledge of its past. On the other hand, it has been argued that the increasing professionalism seen in the archaeological sector since the passing of the Valletta Treaty in 1992 has driven a wedge between professionals and non-professionals 'with the latter increasingly excluded from doing archaeology, and the former finding it harder to include the public.'³²

In regard to metal detecting, elements of the professional archaeological sector have attempted to integrate hobby metal detectorists into development-led fieldwork. One example is the British Archaeological Job Resource (BAJR) who produced a guide aimed at field survey techniques for amateurs and professionals which included

²⁵ Paul Bahn and Colin Renfrew, *Archaeology: Theories, Methods, and Practice*, (London: Thames & Hudson, 2012), p. 558.

²⁶ Portable Antiquities Scheme, *Research Using Scheme Data* (2022) <https://finds.org.uk/research> [accessed 12 May 2022].

²⁷ Dobat *et al*, 'Towards a cooperative approach', p. 3.

²⁸ Dobat *et al*, 'Towards a cooperative approach', p. 3.

²⁹ *Ibid*, p. 4.

³⁰ Suzie Thomas, 'The Future of Studying Hobbyist Metal Detecting in Europe: A Call for a Transnational Approach', *Open Archaeology*, 2 (2016), 140-149 (p. 163.).

³¹ Thomas, 'The Future of Studying Hobbyist Metal Detecting', p 163.

³² Dobat *et al*, 'Towards a cooperative approach', p. 9.

metal detecting.³³ The Council for British Archaeology (CBA) attempted to address one of the more controversial elements of metal detecting; commercial rallies. Unfortunately, little headway was made by the CBA in limiting the damage of rallies.³⁴ The CBA more recently produced a widely distributed article in *British Archaeology* lamenting the impact of commercial rallies on the archaeological resource using strong language such as “darkening fields with hordes of detector-wielding clients.”³⁵ Language such as this, that may be understood to be coming from a place of frustration, never-the-less does not help to alleviate the perceived animosity between detectorists and archaeologists. Furthermore, in a number of text books published in the last decade the reference to metal detecting as an archaeological tool is slim. For example, in the 6th edition of a much-utilised university coursebook metal detecting is only referenced on three occasions; as a method of site survey used by archaeologists and ‘non-archaeologist enthusiasts’, in reference to the Salisbury Hoard recovered by illicit detectorists, and in reference to the PAS.³⁶ In another textbook, only three brief mentions are made of metal detectors including one referring to ‘prodigious harvests...hitherto collected in secret.’³⁷ The mixed attitude found in these text books will continue to filter down to prospective archaeologists unless organisations, archaeologists, museums, and detectorists begin to work together more cohesively.

Increasingly detectorists are being welcome on to archaeological sites.³⁸ Guidance has been produced both for archaeologists using detectors and for amateur detectorists wishing to engage in heritage management.³⁹ This suggests that the professional sector do understand the value that metal detectorists, acting within archaeological guidance and methodology, can bring to the study of the physical past. However, the methodology used by hobby detectorists on their permissions and the methodology used by archaeologists on research or development sites varies greatly. As such caution should be applied to any project where amateurs are attempting to contribute, ideally these projects should be carried out with the awareness of archaeological methods, in close collaboration with professionals.⁴⁰ The two study areas within this essay have attempted to better integrate hobby detectorists into the archaeological sector, however, Denmark appears to be the leading nation in the collaborative approach.

Many European nations have sceptical attitudes towards amateur detectorists, leading to the refusal to cooperate or outright attempts to ban detecting by private

³³ Natasha Ferguson, *An assessment of the positive contribution and negative impact of hobbyist metal detecting to sites of conflict in the UK*. [unpublished PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, 2013] <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/4370/> [accessed 03 May 2022]. p. 59.

³⁴ Ferguson, *An assessment hobbyist metal detecting on sites of conflict*, p. 59.

³⁵ Michael Lewis and Dr. Mike Heyworth, ‘What To Do About Metal Detecting Rallies?’ *British Archaeology* No. 176, pp. 30-35. (p. 30).

³⁶ Bahn, P and Renfrew, C, pp. 99, 120, 547, 557-59.

³⁷ Martin Carver, *Archaeological Investigation* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2009), pp. 67, 95-5, 108. [ellipses added by author].

³⁸ Michael Lewis, ‘A Detectorist’s Utopia? Archaeology and Metal-Detecting in England and Wales’, *Open Archaeology*, 2 (2016), 127-139 (p. 134).

³⁹ Ferguson, p. 57.

⁴⁰ Suzie Thomas, ‘Collaborate, Condemn, or Ignore? Responding to Non-Archaeological Approaches to Archaeological Heritage’, *European Journal Of Archaeology*, 18 (2) (2015), 312-335 (p. 313).

individuals.⁴¹ However, as has been mentioned earlier in this essay Denmark has taken a significantly more liberal approach to the role of amateur metal detectorists. Following the professionalisation of the archaeology and museum sectors in Denmark a major characteristic of Danish archaeology has been the active participation and inclusion of metal detectorists, who are often highly engaged.⁴² On the other hand, in England metal detectors are rarely invited onto site although in recent years a project has been established by Historic England and the Association of Detectorists, to understand whether a research and training body could be established to teach best practice for metal detectorists wishing to work on archaeological sites.⁴³ In Denmark metal detectors have led to large scale, incredible archaeological discoveries. For example, a large, multi-period settlement was discovered in the Gudme area of Denmark after two metal detectorists reported a number of metal objects. The settlement site featured occupancy from the 1st century BC to the 11th century AD.⁴⁴ Subsequently [official] excavations by the local and national museum revealed the architectural elements of the settlement, building on the portable heritage discovered by the detectorists.⁴⁵ Discoveries such as those at Gudme demonstrate not only the close relationship between the Danish museums and the detectorist community, but also how small, individual objects can lead to large-scale settlement discoveries. Thus, telling Denmark more about its cultural heritage and historical past.

As well as Denmark, Norway has also incorporated metal detectorists within their archaeological fieldwork. Several of Norway's counties utilise private metal detectorists in archaeological surveys on a regular basis, albeit in a voluntary capacity.⁴⁶ This approach is similar to that used in England where trusted, responsible metal detectorists, will be invited to help on archaeological sites usually at the request of the Finds Liaison Officer. Furthermore, in Norway all interested parties focused on heritage management, including professional archaeologists, cultural heritage managers and private detectorists asked for national guidelines for private detecting.⁴⁷ This collaborative call resulted in the Directorate for Cultural Heritage (Riksantikvaren) published new national guidelines in 2017.⁴⁸ By collaborating together the three key communities were able to develop in partnership a guidance that all were happy with. This has not been the situation in the UK, particularly in England, where there exists multiple detecting organisations and archaeological organisations all with differing views on how the hobby should be

⁴¹ Andres S. Dobat, 'Between Rescue and Research: An Evaluation after 30 Years of Liberal Metal Detecting in Archaeological Research and Heritage Practice in Denmark', *European Journal Of Archaeology*, 16 (4) (2013), 704-725 (p. 705).

⁴² Dobat, p. 712.

⁴³ Rebecca Atkinson, *Historic England Invests £50,000 In New Metal Detecting Body*, Museums Association <https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/2020/07/16072020-historic-england-500000-metal-detectorist-body/#> [accessed 13 May 2022].

⁴⁴ Dobat, p. 705.

⁴⁵ Dobat, p. 706.

⁴⁶ Justein Gunderson "No Room for Good Intentions? Private Metal Detecting and Archaeological Sites In The Plow Layer In Norway" in *Competing Values In Archaeological Heritage* (Campbell, Stuart, White, Liz, and Thomas, Suzie (eds)). 125-138 (p. 135).

⁴⁷ Gunderson, *No room for good intentions?* p. 125

⁴⁸ Gunderson, *No room for good intentions?* P. 125.

managed. For example, The National Council for Metal Detecting (NCMD) aims to promote, protect, and encourage metal detecting.⁴⁹ This statement found on their website focuses solely on the promotion and protection of the detecting hobby with little to no reference about protecting heritage. Furthermore, their website strongly emphasises the voluntary nature of the PAS.⁵⁰ This is done rather than encouraging their members to always record regardless of the treasure status of the find. On the other hand, the proposed Association of Detectorists (AoD), describes itself as a 'future research and educational institute of Detectorists.'⁵¹ Both organisations do promote the voluntary code of conduct for metal detectorists⁵², however, both organisations approach metal detecting in slightly different ways with the NCMD viewing metal detecting as purely a hobby while the AoD believes metal detecting can and should be used as a tool of archaeological investigations. These differing views can cause conflict which is not seen in countries such as Denmark and Norway.

Amateur detectorists, as has been demonstrated above, can be key participants in the archaeological process for both research and rescue investigations.⁵³ Denmark's approach to metal detectorists on archaeological sites is a good blueprint for collaborative work, which if combined with the success of the PAS recording scheme and close contact between the scheme and professional archaeological units means that England and Wales could undertake a similar approach to their metal detectorists. This is particularly important as the knowledge and experience that metal detectorists carry in regard to portable heritage and its detection using metal detectors is often far superior to archaeologically trained museum [or museum] staff.⁵⁴

This essay has sought to investigate attitudes towards the access to portable heritage, particularly through aspects of the metal detecting hobby, in Scandinavia and the UK highlighting many of the positive aspects of the approach between heritage organisations and detectorists. Nonetheless, there are still many issues which need to be addressed in regard to metal detecting and portable heritage. Illicit metal detecting or 'nighthawking' is an issue in both study regions often driven by the black market, or the potential for illegal resale. However, Denmark has sought to mitigate this risk in the method they use to reward finders for reporting objects by not offering a reward based on market value. This means that compensation rarely outweighs the investment in person-hours rendering profit-motivated treasure hunting impractical.⁵⁵ On the other hand, the valuation process in England and Wales under the Treasure Act 1996 relies on market value – the price an object is

⁴⁹ National Council For Metal Detecting (NCMD), Home <https://www.ncmd.co.uk/> [accessed 13 May 2022].

⁵⁰ NCMD <https://www.ncmd.co.uk/> [accessed 13 May 2022].

⁵¹ Association Of Detectorists (AoD), Home <https://detectorists.org.uk/> [accessed 13 May 2022].

⁵² The Portable Antiquities Scheme Advisory Group, *Code of Practice for Responsible Metal Detecting in England & Wales* (2017) <https://www.ncmd.co.uk/code-of-conduct/>, <https://detectorists.org.uk/code-of-practice/> [accessed 13 May 2022].

⁵³ Dobat, p. 707.

⁵⁴ Dobat, p. 707.

⁵⁵ Andres S. Dobat & Astrid T. Jensen, "'Professional Amateurs'. Metal Detecting and Metal Detectorists in Denmark' *Open Archaeology* 2 (2016) 70-84 (p. 73).

most likely to fetch at auction.⁵⁶ This focus on market value presents issues for the archaeological sector, does it support the current scheme or look to shift the focus onto historical value with a compensation scheme similar to Denmark.

One issue which has become clear over the last two decades of the Treasure Act 1996 in Great Britain is that the increasing popularity of the hobby has required that the act needs review. This resulted in the UK government putting forth a consultation to the public on redefining the act, its associated code of practice and its definition of Treasure.⁵⁷ The new definition of treasure proposed by the consultation hopes to shift the focus onto a significance-based definition.⁵⁸ The government's response also highlighted how respondents from across the public, metal detecting and heritage sectors had concerns about the effect of the new act might have on archaeology and metal detecting, as well as attempting to clarify confusion regarding the Treasure Valuation Committee (TVC) who decide on reward value, the ownership of treasure finds belonging to The Crown and not the landowner or finder, and the 'risk' in the view of some metal detecting groups that a ban on metal detecting was being proposed.⁵⁹ The proposed changes were not due to be published until 2021,⁶⁰ however it would appear that the Covid-19 pandemic has caused a delay in this issue, suggesting that it is not a top priority for the government.

In conclusion this essay has assessed the attitude to portable heritage in The United Kingdom and the Scandinavian nations focusing on official responses to metal detecting, attempts at self-regulation by metal detectorists, integration between hobby detectorists and professional archaeologists, and portable heritage recording schemes. Scandinavia and the UK present potentially interchangeable methods for improving relationships between detectorists and archaeologists and therefore increasing the access to and understanding of the past. In particular, Denmark's liberal approach to metal detecting is an affective model for the management of portable heritage, however, just as in England and the rest of the study nations the increasing popularity of metal detecting has allowed the Danish recording scheme and those in England, Wales, Norway, and Finland to face significant delays in processing finds, dealing with treasure redemption, and conservation of objects.⁶¹ Adequate funding and support needs to be considered in each of the study nations in order for portable heritage to be protected and for metal detecting to continue to play an important role in archaeological investigation. An important framework aimed at supporting close collaboration between metal detectorists and heritage professionals

⁵⁶ Portable Antiquities Scheme, 'Memorandum On Valuation Of treasure', <https://finds.org.uk/treasure/advice/definition-of-value> [accessed 13 May 2022].

⁵⁷ Department For Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS), *Revising The Definition Of Treasure In The Treasure Act 1996 And Revising The Related Codes Of Practice – Government Response To Public Consultation* <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/revising-the-definition-of-treasure-in-the-treasure-act-1996-and-revising-the-related-codes-of-practice/outcome/revising-the-definition-of-treasure-in-the-treasure-act-1996-and-revising-the-related-codes-of-practice-government-response-to-public-consultation> [accessed 13 May 2022].

⁵⁸ DCMS, *Revising The Definition Of Treasure*, [accessed 13 May 2022].

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Anna Wessman, Leena Koivisto, and Suzie Thomas, 'Metal Detecting in Finland - An Ongoing Debate', *Open Archaeology*, 2 (2016) 85-96 (p. 85).

is the European Public Finds Recording Network which, alongside the counties studied in this essay, also covers Flanders, The Netherlands and Scotland all of which are characterised by liberal legislation towards metal detecting, inclusive attitudes, and being supportive of collaboration between heritage management, research, and the interested public.⁶²

⁶² University of Helsinki, *Visions and Aims*, <https://www2.helsinki.fi/en/networks/european-public-finds-recording-network/vision-and-aims> [accessed 13 May 2022].

Bibliography

- Ahmet, Jo. *50 Finds From Kent: Objects from The Portable Antiquities Scheme*. Stroud: Amberly, 2021.
- Andres S. Dobat, Astrid T. Jensen. "'Professional Amateurs'". Metal Detecting and Metal Detectorists in Denmark." *Open Archaeology* 2 (2016): 70 -84.
- Association Of Detectorists. *The Association Of Detectorists*. 2022.
<https://detectorists.org.uk/> (accessed May 13, 2022).
- Atkinson, Rebecca. *Museums Association*. 16 July 2020.
<https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/2020/07/16072020-historic-england-500000-metal-detectorist-body/#> (accessed May 13, 2022).
- Bahn, Paul, and Colin Renfrew. *Archaeology Theories, Method and Practice*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2012.
- Consolidated Act On Museums*. 2006.
- Council Of Europe. *Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. 2022.
<https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/faro-convention> (accessed May 03, 2022).
- . "Details of Treaty No.199." *Council Of Europe*. 01 06 2011.
<https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list?module=treaty-detail&treaty-num=199> (accessed May 03, 2022).
- Department For Communities. *A Guide to Metal Detecting, Archaeology and the Law*. n.d.
<https://www.communities-ni.gov.uk/articles/guide-metal-detecting-archaeology-and-law> (accessed April 11, 2022).
- . *Advice For Finders Of Treasure In Northern Ireland*. n.d. <https://www.communities-ni.gov.uk/articles/advice-finders-treasure-northern-ireland#skip-link> (accessed January 11, 2022).
- Department For Digital, Culture, Media & Sport. *Consultation outcome Revising the definition of treasure in the Treasure Act 1996 and revising the related Codes of Practice - Government response to public consultation*. 04 December 2020.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/revising-the-definition-of-treasure-in-the-treasure-act-1996-and-revising-the-related-codes-of-practice/outcome/revising-the-definition-of-treasure-in-the-treasure-act-1996-and-revising-the-related-codes-of-prac> (accessed May 13, 2022).
- Department of Media, Culture and Sport (DCMS). *The Treasure Act 1996: Code of Practice*. 2nd Edition. London, 1996.
- Dobat, A, P Deckers, S Heeren, M Lewis, S Thomas, and A Wessman. "Towards a Cooperative Approach to Hobby Metal Detecting: The European Public Finds Recording Network (EPFRN) Vision Statement." *European Journal Of Archaeology*, n.d.: 1-21.
- Dobat, Andres S, and Astrid T Jensen. "Professional Amateurs". Metal Detecting and Metal Detectorists in Denmark." *Open Archaeology* 2 (2016): 70 - 84.
- Dobat, Andres S. "Between Rescue and Research: An Evaluation after 30 Years of Liberal Metal Detecting in Archaeological Research and Heritage Practice in Denmark." *European Journal Of Archaeology* 16, no. 4 (2013): 704-725.
- Drewett, Peter. *Field Archaeology: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2011.

- Ferguson, Natasha. "An assessment of the positive contribution and negative impact of hobbyist metal detecting to sites of conflict in the UK." *Enlighten: Theses*. 2013. <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/4370/> (accessed May 03, 2022).
- Gunderson, Justein. "No Room for Good Intentions? Private Metal Detecting and Archaeological Sites in the Plow Layer in Norway." In *Competing Values In Archaeological Heritage*, edited by Stuart Campbell, Liz White, & Suzie Thomas. Cham: Springer, 2019.
- Justein Gunderson, Josephine M. Rasmussen, Ragnar Orten Lie. "Private Metal Detecting and Archaeology." *Open Archaeology* 2 (2016): 160-170.
- Leahy, Kevin, and Michael Lewis. *Finds Identified*. Witham: Greenlight Publishing, 2018.
- Lewes, Michael, and Mike Heyworth. *What To Do About Metal Detecting Rallies?* York, January/February 2021.
- Lewis, Michael. "A Detectorist's Utopia? Archaeology and Metal-Detecting in England and Wales." *Open Archaeology*, no. 2 (2016): pp. 127-139.
- National Council For Metal Detecting. *National Council For Metal Detecting*. 2021. <https://www.ncmd.co.uk/> (accessed May 13, 2022).
- Portable Antiquities Scheme. *About The Scheme*. n.d. <https://finds.org.uk/about> (accessed May 03, 2022).
- . *Memorandum On Valuation Of Treasure*. 29 May 2012. <https://finds.org.uk/treasure/advice/definition-of-value> (accessed May 13, 2022).
- . *Research Based on Scheme Data*. 2022. <https://finds.org.uk/research> (accessed May 12, 2022).
- Rundkvist, Dr Martin. *Aardvarchaeology – by Dr. Martin Rundkvist*. 03 April 2021. <https://aardvarchaeology.wordpress.com/2021/04/03/how-to-metal-detect-legally-in-sweden-in-2021/#:~:text=Metal%20detecting%20is%20illegal%20in,and%20%C3%96land%20in%20the%20Baltic>. (accessed April 12, 2022).
- Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge, 2006.
- The Portable Antiquities Scheme Advisory Group. "National Council for Metal Detecting." *Code of Conduct*. 2017. <https://www.ncmd.co.uk/code-of-conduct/> (accessed May 13, 2022).
- Thomas, Suzie. "Collaborate, Condemn, or Ignore? Responding to Non-Archaeological Approaches to Archaeological Heritage." *European Journal Of Archaeology* 18, no. 2 (2015): 312-335.
- Treasure Trove Unit. "Code Of Practice." *Treasure Trove Scotland*. Horisk Leslie Development. January 2016. <https://treasuretrovescotland.co.uk/documents/code-of-practice/> (accessed April 11, 2022).
- University of Helsinki. *European Public Finds Recording Network - For Metal Detectorists*. 4 September 2021. [https://www2.helsinki.fi/en/networks/european-public-finds-recording-network/for-metal-detectorists#:~:text=Metal%20detecting%20is%20permitted%20in,1996\)%20without%20a%20separate%20permit](https://www2.helsinki.fi/en/networks/european-public-finds-recording-network/for-metal-detectorists#:~:text=Metal%20detecting%20is%20permitted%20in,1996)%20without%20a%20separate%20permit). (accessed April 12, 2022).
- University Of Helsinki. *Vision And Aims*. 16 December 2019. <https://www2.helsinki.fi/en/networks/european-public-finds-recording-network/vision-and-aims> (accessed May 13, 2022).
- Wessman, Anna, Leena Koivisto, and Suzie Thomas. "'Metal Detecting in Finland - An Ongoing Debate'." *Open Archaeology*, 2016: 85-96.

