Appendix K

Mark Beattie-Edwards- Chief Executive Officer- Nautical Archaeology Society

Q1

DN: Mark, thank you very much for taking the time to come and talk to me. Could you start by describing some of the work that the NAS does?

MBE: The NAS is a non-governmental body, a registered charity and a ltd company. We focus our activity on trying to raise awareness of maritime cultural heritage and raising an interest in it. This is primarily done through two mechanisms, one is publication of people's activities and the results of those activities and the other through a training programme whereby we train members of the public in various techniques so that they can participate.

Q2

DN: Can you tell me a bit more about the training programme and how it's evolved to meet the needs of the public?

MBE: Ok, well I wasn't around when the programme was first created but I do know from conversations that I had with people at the time, primarily Christopher Dobbs who now works at the Mary Rose Trust who was the first person along with Ian Oxley and Martin Dean to convert ideas into a syllabus that divers could be taught. The origins stem from the Mary Rose Project, which Chris was working on. here weren't enough archaeologists who could dive to excavate the Mary Rose. There were enough divers to go and find the Mary Rose but not enough qualified archaeologists to excavate it or even survey it. So they needed recreational scuba divers as well as military divers, to understand the basics of archaeological surveying, archaeology, stratigraphy, keeping an accurate record of where every object comes from, where it's been recovered, as well as recovering the object itself. So what used to happen, as I understand it, is that they would literally phone up, volunteer their services and get told "Great, could you come down Sunday and we'll start on Monday". They would be briefed, their archaeological training, would be about an hour on the boat before they then jumped in and did their first archaeological dive on the Mary Rose. (Both laugh) Which as a student of maritime archaeology sounds amazing!! Imagine that? Now that would never happen now, but that was the norm. That was what happened? And they did that for years, five years, six years. Christopher Dobbs and the other archaeologists who could dive already would sit around in the evening over a beer and wish they had a formal training programme for divers so they could be trained before the project existed, so that when they arrived they already knew the basics and they wouldn't have to teach them one end of the tape measure from other, or an airlift or air dredge or whatever. They wouldn't have to describe the principles of stratigraphy because they would already know. So they kind of vowed to themselves that after they finished work on the Mary Rose they would design something and they did! And we still have in the office the formal, first drafts of that training programme. All written up on typewriters. And that first training programme, when

they had it, they applied to the British Sub-Aqua Jubilee Trust for a grant to enable them to make materials so they could make handouts and teaching materials. It was a very small grant at the time and must have only just covered it. They probably put a bit of their own money into it, but anyway that resulted in a formal training programme under the NAS's name. The first course itself was then guinea pigged to Bristol University students. In fact, we've got the course records and they were not all students. There were, in fact, some well known names who had worked as recreational divers on the Mary Rose and came and did that first course. It was in April 86, so in fact next year is the 30 year anniversary of that taking place. That was taught by Professor Toby Parker, from Bristol University, who many years later became an NAS president. I think he taught archaeology and classics, or Latin, at Bristol itself but he had done a lot of maritimy things in the Mediterranean and elsewhere. So he would have been able to teach it, and was a diver as well. I think about 18 people or so attended that first one. That was received very positively and resulted in the second one being done in Gosport with Ian Oxley and Alex Hildred, who again works at the Mary Rose. She's the ordnance expert at the Mary Rose. They did the second course, and then the third course and it just grew and grew. I think within the first five years about 500 people had gone through.

DN: Wow.

MBE: Not all here on the south coast, of course. I think the fourth course was in Dublin. Soon they were going all over the world. There are records of Chris Dobbs, for course number 20 or so, going to India. So word must have spread, lots of word and publication, and it just stems from there.

DN: Well, the NAS really is an international organization now. There are courses offered in Canada, Australia and all sorts of places.

MBE: Yes, we have an international profile and international activity. But, and this is not to diss the society, but we like to think of ourselves as an international organization but if you look at the current members then we are not an international membership organization. We have maybe 200 members overseas and the rest are in the UK. That's really small numbers. You look at America and we have 25 members. 10 in Germany. It's actually quite small. But the training programme is a success globally. I don't know of any other programme that has developed it's own and is teaching its own training programme that is then exported through a franchise system, which is effectively how it's done, which is being taught overseas. What's nice is that the programme is being taught in peoples mother tongue, using local examples and case studies and modifying it to their own needs. I don't know of anyone else who has done that. I think, globally, it may be what we are most known for. Maybe more than the journal, more the IJNA. Amongst the lay person, certainly. Academics would know us for IJNA But when you think about it, the academic audience for maritime archaeology around the world is tiny. Compared to the number of both divers and non-divers who have gone through the training programme. So I think that globally we are

more well known for this training programme that we run, which allows anyone to participate. Now there are problems with that, because there are some countries where people can't participate because the legislation doesn't really allow them. And yet, courses are still run. In that case, it's about raising awareness as opposed to how you can participate. In this county it's always been about participating, if you think of how the course was created, it was all about participation. But there are some counties which teach it for awareness and not just for participation. Just because a recreational diver who has no formal training, Argentina would be an example, because there if you don't have a degree, in fact likely if you don't have a doctorate, you can't practice. So they still run training courses but it's not about physically doing archaeology, it's more about if you find something who you should report it to, and isn't it important that it's there, and it should be protected and not pillaged.

Q3

DN: What percentage of divers vs. non-divers do you think do the course?

MBE: In the early days it was predominately targeted at divers. But the economics don't stack up and you start to realise there aren't enough divers. At some point in time you have to diversity and start looking at intertidal and foreshore archaeology. So now the first course is all about an introduction to underwater and foreshore archaeology, but that's not how it started. It was targeted at underwater archaeology and divers, to get them to participate and be useful tools and fieldworkers on archaeological projects. But, what is it? 0.01% of the population is a diver? If you think that only 10% of those might be interested in doing it? Your percentages come down really small and pretty soon you run out of people and have to look elsewhere. I've worked for the NAS for 15 years now, and by the time I started, at the Millennium so at 2000, it was already underwater and foreshore. There are problems with that, because you get divers who just want to do the underwater and don't care about the foreshore and you get people who come who are non-divers who like the fact there is archaeology underwater but don't want to do it. So teaching a programme that is for both is quite hard. In fact, you won't know this, but the training programme is undergoing a review and next year will relaunch for the 30th anniversary separating out those two. So in the future, someone will come and do an introduction to maritime, which is very much a big picture, and then they will chose if they want to do underwater, because they are a diver, or do you want to do your intertidal. Someone could still do both, but they will be very different courses with very different techniques and methodologies specifically for purpose.

DN: But it will be really interesting to see how that divides up, what the main interest is….

MBE: It will make it interesting, because right now I can't give you any figures. But it will allow us very easily from that point onwards to go "Well, these are the number of divers who do the programme and this is the numbers of non-divers who do the training programme." So long as we can keep track of the people who are divers who are doing the non-diver programme. Do you see what I mean?

DN: Yup, yup.

MBE: Because presumably the non-divers won't do the diving programme, because they can't dive. But the divers could do the non-diving one. I would have to give you the results of the survey that was done two years ago, which not everyone participated in, but it was about a 70/30 split. 70% were divers. And actually, when we delved further into the question and asked "Well, you consider yourself a non-diver now but when you did your course were you a diver" and it actually changed to 80/20. So 80% were divers and 20% were not. That survey is all part of this review and lead to this decision. Because if we are only attracting 20% of our participants as non-divers and the vast majority of the population are non-divers then we need to cater to their needs, specifically to their needs of working on the foreshore, and not just go "Oh, you're not a diver? That's a shame. Just come on the course anyways and we'll show you lots of lovely photos of wrecks and diving kit, talk about decompression tanks and you won't have a clue." Well, we don't want to do that anymore. We want to be targeting them. So it's quite an interesting time. I've spent all day working on this today, trying to sort out the timetable and seeing what can be done in a day. We're also looking at the overlap, so what bits we can keep the same. Like legislation, a dating methods and stratigraphy.

DN: I suppose it's going to be quite the task to retrain everyone that you have teaching.

MBE: Yeah, well, we've got the instructors and that process will start at the end of this year so that some of them are ready teach. And globally they don't have to take it up straight away, but they'll be encouraged. So the way the franchising system works is that they've got a five year term, which is then renewable for another five years, so they will be encouraged to cross over to the new system when their renewals are up. So they've already signed a contract to deliver what we've given them but we don't want to change the goalposts while they are still under contract. When they renew they can make a decision, because this does involve them having to relearn some things and teach two different courses. And some of them might not want to do those things. But the nice thing is that an organization, say the Underwater Society for Divers in British Colombia, well, they are all about divers. So why would they want to do an intertidal course? They could decide that as an organization they are only going to take up the diving side. Which is fair. So we have to work out a system of transition, which will be quite quick in the UK, but will take time to filter overseas. If someone's renewal is up in two years' time, well they are going to transition quite quickly. But someone who has 4.5 years' time have got a while to get used to the idea.

Q4

DN: Changing track a little bit, do you think that the challenge of providing access to sites dictated how the programme has evolved?

MBE: Not really, because I'm not sure that the programme provides access to sites. There is nothing in law which says that in order to access this site in the UK you have to have done

an NAS training course. People ask us why they should do our course, and I find it very difficult to answer them. There is no mandatory reason why, except if you have an interest in it and want to expand your knowledge and skills then sure. On the application form for accessing a protected wreck it does say that if you apply for a visitor licence, so if someone was to write to Alison James for a visitors licence, have you done an NAS course? So you could tick that or untick that. And I think, actually, the Martime Archaeology Sea Trust, want it to say have you done their course. It's not a question of a pass or fail though, if you haven't done this course you can't access the wreck. I think what we would tell people is that if you want to access a historic wreck site then by having done NAS courses and having had your mind expanded then you are much more likely to understand what you are looking at. Then if you have the desire to work on that site you become are much more useful asset. If you want to volunteer or be paid, you've done a course which shows, like the guys back in the 80's on the Mary Rose, I've done this course and I know how to survey. I can do a good sketch, read a tape measure etc. So the person running that project can say "Actually, that person is quite useful", because they all need volunteers. I'm not really sure that access and the training programme are intertwined with each other. One of our included lectures does talk about access to protected wreck sites, to actually highlight the ease of it. To take some of the fear out of it. Because a visitor liscense is relatively easy to get, and it just gets a little bit harder with each increasing tier of access and the more skilled and qualified they are the easier it might be to get that access.

Q5

DN: Looking more broadly, do you think it's difficult for the average person to have access to maritime heritage?

MBE: Oh, maritime heritage? That's different. Underwater heritage, yes. Maritime heritage, no. It's everywhere. We are a little island nation and you only have to sit here, in the Jolly Sailor pub, and I can the Elephant boatyard where the Elephantine, one of the Nelson's favourite ships, was built right here. Nowhere is greater than 70 miles from the sea, and we have a massive canal system. It's all around us so it isn't difficult to access.

DN: But do people recognise that it's here?

MBE: I know it's here, but I'm not the right person to ask.

Q6

DN: Do you think we are doing enough to promote the maritime heritage that is here?

MBE: That is a tricky question. You can always do more, and these things are so limited by budgets. Every organization that we speak to will say that we'd love to do more. But that takes people: people who have to be paid, people who will need pensions, it takes travel costs, it takes resources, promotional materials, websites, reconstructions. All this stuff costs, even if it doesn't cost actual money it costs people. For me, on a pessimistic note, as

my bugbear, the NAS is supposed to be THE organization for the promotion of maritime cultural heritage for everyone and we should be acting as the hub. And that all takes recourses that we don't have. We are struggling since the financial crash, in fact, to be honest, we have been struggling since 2007/2008. We haven't recovered and outreach is one of the first things that goes. It isn't a mandatory deliverable. We are required to public a journal and teach a training programme, really, since otherwise a lot of money would dry up. We are required to produce a newsletter for members. But we are not required do school sessions. Although you could argue that we would lose our charitable status if we stopped doing free things for schools. We were at Reading on Wednesday doing at outreach session, where they did a day of activities about why someone would want to be employed in the maritime sector. If we stopped doing those things, completely free, you could argue that we are not a charity and we do no charitable good works and there for we should be stripped of our charitable status. So we have to do a little. But it does suffer. We can't afford to go to the dive show because that costs £1000 without even taking into account staff time. So if we don't have £1000 we can let out the door with no guarantee or any return then we won't go. But that means we aren't talking to people about why underwater archaeology shouldn't be recovered and stuck on their mantelpiece and we're not talking to the person who's decided that this year they are going to do maritime archaeology because we're not there. So they go talk to the marine biologists instead. Outreach is one of those things we'd all love to have amazing programmes in. And some organizations have and some have still got, at least for the time being, have still got great programmes. But it's all linked to grants and it's all linked to budgets that are tighter and tighter.

Q7

DN: Do you think the level of outreach is going to shrink?

MBE: Have we reached a high point? Is it going to go down from here? I think this year might actually be a high point, because you have two quite high profile and big money projects that have been funded by the HLF. One on underwater with MAT and the First World War, which is all first world war shipwrecks off the south coast that will involve a huge number of people. And then you also have the CitZan project, which has also been funded by the HLF and is running in Portsmouth, London and York. They again have a big budget and have to reach a large number of people in those three years they are running on an intertidal project. That may not be purely maritime, but at least it's on the coastline. So those big, multimillion pound projects, don't come along that often so to have two going on at the same time is pretty good. If the HLF kept those kinds of statistics, of how many people have been involved, have participated or have been reached, by a maritime outreach type project then maybe this year might be…well, the next few years since CITiZAN has three years and MAT has until 2019? I think? Because they are coinciding with the end of WW1 and the last shipping loss. So maybe between now and 2019-2020 you will have this high peek and then I wouldn't be surprised if we have a dip.

Q8

DN: What do you think the most effective way of changing the public's perception of maritime heritage is?

MBE: Do you think the public has a perception of what maritime archaeology is?

DN: That is a good question! I suppose if you think of it on an even more basic level, what do you think the public thinks when you say Maritime Archaeology?

MBE: In this country? I think the public's only real perception of maritime archaeology is the Mary Rose. Inevitably. If I meet someone that I've never met before and they ask "So what do you do?" and if I say that I'm a maritime archaeologist they would automatically come back and say "So did you work on the Mary Rose then? Are you a Mary Rose diver? That was amazing, wasn't it?" Now, that's all generations. Everyone from their 80's down to teenagers who have been to visit the museum here on the south coast. That's the big grand one, and it will never happen again because the budget isn't there anymore. There facilities and the museum just isn't there. So the publics perception is stopped in time, it's finished at the Mary Rose. There is no next big thing that can be on television and in the newspapers, that people can come down and see and get excited about. As exciting as a finding a log boat is, it doesn't attract public audiences and it doesn't make prime time news or appear on the One Show. It doesn't do these big things. The public do get to see diving a lot and I think there is a fair bit of interest in the underwater world that is put through the media that people are then exposed to through the internet and television. But I don't think, I'm not sure, that it's about archaeology as such, about the discovery of these new parts of the human endeavour that we've never found before. The public doesn't think "Oh, if it wasn't for those great underwater archaeologists"

Q9

DN: Do you think that maritime archaeologists often get lumped in with the treasure hunters? In terms of the publics perception?

MBE: Yeah, yeah, yeah! I think so. But I think that's more of the design of the treasure hunter, that's their cleaver little ruse to become more bonafide to become psudoarchaeology which is then funded through the sale of material that comes off the sea bed. And they call themselves archaeologists! There are well known treasure hunters who call themselves that on the internet and on, what's that well-known TV network in the states? CNC?

DN: CNN

MBE: Yes. Well, they are listed as being a maritime archaeologist. And I'm sure there are maritime archaeologists going around going "But, ack! They are not maritime archaeologists!" And that's why we get lumped in with treasure hunters. Because people can't necessarily differentiate between people standing there with nice shiny stuff and

being bracketed with a job title as a maritime archaeologist. Or their expertise being compared to someone who wouldn't even dream of selling the materials. Maybe that's our communities fault, the maritime archaeology communities fault for not standing up for itself and not publicly stating that. But that's probably fear of lawsuits.

Q10

DN: It's interesting because we've been doing collective outreach type things since the mid-80's. Do you think that given the publics perception of maritime archaeology is still the Mary Rose that we've accomplishing anything?

MBE: In all honesty?

DN: Yeah.

MBE: No, not really. I don't think so. It's only from an underwater perspective. Divers not reporting what they find, forget recovering, even reporting what they see. There is still a definite weariness to even reporting what they see. And these important sites underwater aren't going to be found by maritime archaeologists, generally speaking it's fishermen and divers. They are the people who are finding these things, particularly the fishermen, because they are the people who are out in the water all the time.They know, like the back of their hand, what the seabeds are and what the navigation and snag hazards are, which are likely to be cultural heritage. Despite things like the Fisheries reporting protocol, that the Crown Estates and Wessex Archaeology have, I'm sure the number of reports they get are actually tiny compared to the number of finds and sites that fishermen do know about, but would have no reason or desire to tell anyone about. We are kind of running to a standstill, beavering away and doing all we can, and trying to reach all the people that we can. But in the grand scheme of things we're not really making a lot of difference in the publics perception of how important their maritime heritage is, be it on the forshore or underwater. If the numbers have grown, we don't see it in our membership, of people saying "Oh this is really important I'm going to support one of these organizations". I don't think anyone has seen growth in membership. If you compare that to land, in terms of the National Trust, wereby their membership has gone "puff!" and soared. I mean, their membership has doubled and moved well out a recession since 2008 because people have gone "Well, since I can't afford a holiday abroad so I'm going to have to stay in the UK. So I'm going to go see things! Well, what can I go and see? I can go to this house and that house and that castle, but then I have to pay this much for entry. But if I join for the year then I can go to all of them for one lump sum." That's a good investment, for £150. They've seen their membership skyrocket, it's huge.

Q11

DN: How do you think we go about re-addressing that balance? Is there any way that we can?

MBE: I think the only way for the public to get a better perception of what maritime archaeology is and believe that supporting it is a good thing. Whether that support is voting or supporting a change in legislation, or making a donation or visiting a museum, is through having high profile, exciting and interesting things Archaeology is all about things, it's all about physical objects, and if you come up with boring and mundane objects then people just aren't interested. Now you could say that's the archaeologists fault for not making that object interesting, that every object should be exciting, but…we talked earlier, before the recording, about the Franklyn Exhibition ships and Parks Canada. Now, if you actually look on the bottom of their website and see the discussions going on, clearly there are a lot of people who are really interested and really excited and think it's a great thing. We've also got the other half of the people going "What a waste of money". And that will be the case everywhere, if we have a big scale project that money has to be thrown at, you'll still have half the people saying that it's great and half saying it should be spent on the NHS. I think, have you heard the quote by I think Winston Churchill, it may not even be a quote but it goes along the lines of that during the second world war, it was suggested to Winston Churchill that the arts budgets that the government gave to museums and art galleries should be cut to fund the war effort. To which he said, what are we fighting for then? If we do that then we may as well just give up. And I think that's the same sort of reasoning that I have, if the Heritage Lottery Fund gets smaller and smaller and we start putting more money into the NHS or the military or benefits or whatever else well then why are we here? What are we existing for? The whole point is that we have a culture and that culture should be something that receives some sort of public support through our taxation system. And I've got no problem with that. But I think what I would really love, and this comes into your Blue Sky Thinking and is probably one of the reasons why the NAS hasn't been as successful since the days of the Mary Rose when we had our biggest membership, because masses of people were involved and excited and wanted to learn more. We haven't done another one since then. So the other good international example of "Oh, I wish we had that" would be the Mars Project in Sweden, and the team they have working with that and the support they now have with National Geographic. They are effectively getting money thrown at them, because it's beautiful and the photographs are amazing. It's so photogenic and it's like the Vasa all over again and the public interest in it.

DN: Well, it's really funny but on the wall of the CMA washroom someone had written "Where is our Mary Rose?" and it's one of those things where you realise as you move along in your year you realise that yeah, there is no massive training project.

MBE: Exactly, you wonder why you are training for this? You wonder where is my Mary Rose? I don't want a log boat. I kinda have a Mary Rose, because I'm a licensee of a protected Wreck, the Norman Bay Wreck down in Eastbourne, which at the moment is 49 iron cannon on the seabed, a large anchor, ballast bricks. A few other bits and bobs…a section of wood, and we are fairly certain we have now identified what the ship is. But it's just in really terrible visibility. So the two days we've seen in it good vis in the last five years it's just like

“Ahhhh” . You swim over it and there are cannons everywhere, and they have starfish over them and they are beautiful. But that’s two days in five years. Most of the time it’s not like the Mars site, it’s not like in the arctic on the Investigator. You don’t get that clarity of photos and of video to get the stuff you need to inspire people to go “Wow, isn’t that amazing”. You’ve got closeups of about 30 cm of something because that’s all you can get. In fact, last time we dived it the visibility was about 10 cm. I could have told you it was a cannon, but I couldn’t tell you which one it was because I had absolutely no idea where I was on the site. Because when you can only 10 cm…I think that’s a problem for us because when we go down here, unless it’s somewhere like Scotland with excellent visibility, or the Scilly isles, where the photographs and the imagery is great. Where you can do photogrammetry or something, to get the amazing visualisation that really gets people going “wow, that’s on the sea that’s amazing”. But most of our coastline, it’s just not like that. So I would love…you know HMS Victory 1744? The site that was found by Odyssey when they deliberately went looking for it and then has been worked a little bit and then work has been stopped? That’s, if you really wanted to change the public’s perception and get the public’s support you do that job properly. You kick Odyssey off the site because the project design is useless, and they didn’t provide any budgetary information about how they were going to fund it. And you do the job properly with government support and private sponsorship. The hull probably isn’t there anyway, or at least very little of it is, so you are recovering the material and putting it in a museum and you are researching it. But most importantly, you get people excited about it again. But you need a Bill Gates foundation type thing again. In fact, is it Bill Gates partner, the one who set up Microsoft with him, you has set up a foundation that he supported some maritime things? I’m not sure if they are archaeology or not, but I know someone said “Oh you should contact him! He’s been well known to fund to the tune of millions of dollars in his philanthropic foundation that he’s set up.” But that will never happen, I’m afraid. A few little bits and a bobs will come up, and then the rest of it will just get left on the seabed I’m afraid.

Q12

DN: You’ve talked a bit about how practicalities have affected the running of the NAS. I was wondering if you might be able to into a few more details about how issues like target audiences, funding and staffing have affected what you’ve been able to do.

MBE: The NAS is a small organization now, and certainly always has been. When I joined 15 years ago there were 4 of us, and now 15 years later there are 4 of us. We only ever grew by one extra person, and that was for an HLF funded project, for a Project Officer who when that project came to an end was made redundant. So those peoples salaries have got to be paid somehow. When the NAS was first around it was a completely voluntary organization. And it was only actually a grant to the training programme which resulted in the first paid member of staff, which actually was Jon Adams from the University of Southampton, as the first Training Officer. And, in fact, the training programme is in the fact what caused the NAS to delve into having paid staff. Having to pay wages and now pensions and that sort of

longer term commitment to your staff. But we have to divide up those staff by activities that generate income. So we have to say “Well, training generates this much income so that will fund one and a half members of staff to run that training programme.” To administer it, to run it, to develop it, to create next years timetable. So that will then generate their salary and create a 20% surplus which can then cover the cost of running the organization. We then have an administrator, who is funded through the membership side of things. So we have this number of members who will generate this amount of income, but we have to pay for the member of staff to administer those members because each of them wants to be treated as an individual and likes emails and phone calls and likes to receive things in the post. So there are costs to having those members and we look at that and go, well, how much can we afford to pay somebody? And then on top of that we have me, who, and I’m being realistic right now, I don’t consider that I work as a maritime archaeologist anymore because eight years ago I became a charity director. So now I run a company, I run a business, which also acts as a charity. The amount of time I get to work as a maritime archaeologist is actually quite small. It wasn’t always like that, but it is now. But my time has got to come from all the other little bits of activities like the IJNA publication, like trading books and selling survey equipment and doing project type activities, like members being able to be involved in projects that are potentially grant funded or not. Sometimes they pay, sometimes if it’s grant funded they volunteer, and make sure that’s run on budget or under budget so that it generates a surplus to cover my wages. And certainly, since I took over in 2008, which is seven years ago? Only two of those years has the NAS made a surplus. All the other years its been a small loss, or it’s not been a cash loss it’s been an accounting loss because of depreciation on the assets that you’ve got. You own a boat and it’s 20 grand one year but the next year it’s only 15 and you go “What? I’ve lost 5 grand by buying a boat?!” Well, you never had that five grand but as far as the accounts are concerned you’ve lost it because if you try to sell that boat now it’s 5 grand less. o you make a bookkeeping loss. And if that carries on, which is most certainly will do, then eventually you run out of money. So you get to a stage where everything you do, everything you chose to spend your money on, who to recruit, where to do, what to attend you have to go “Yes, we’ll do that, or no we won’t or if you’ll pay for us come” is really important. If you are a big multimillion pound organization, if you are Historic England, don’t really make, on an individual level, they don't really make much of a difference. Whether Alison James goes one route or goes another to claim millage makes no difference what so ever. But in a very small organization with very small budgets, that are so tight, it makes a big difference. Chris Underwood, my former boss, used to not let anyone buy plastic wallets or paper clips because every time you need one you should be able to find one on something you don’t need anymore. See what I mean? Something that was printed out 7 years ago that you don’t really need anymore, like your old tax records you only have to keep for so long, there are probably 100 of each. So you should never need to buy anymore. They are not biodegradable, so there is no reason why you should ever need to buy them. Now I’ve never done that, but I always hold that idea in

my head. When someone says “Can we get some this?” I always think…well, do you really need to buy those?

DN: Or could we just find it around here.

MBE: Exactly, I mean pencils. There are companies which give away promotional pencils. Can we not just go and get some? They are only pencils. So you have to be really, really tight on what you do. And outreach is just one of those. We get invited to go to historical societies and archaeological societies, the WI, yacht clubs, schools, groups, cub scouts and every year we get more of these requests. And often it comes from members. We get members who come and say “My club is having a session, can we do something on archaeology or on diving.” And you go “We’d love to, but if we come and do a session on that but if we do that means we’re not doing something that might cover the cost of that staff members day.” And you might say well, a member of staff only costs £150 per day, but that’s just for delivery. What about the time they actually prepare it? You don’t just rock up and do something. I generally think people spend about three times as much preparing for the thing they are going to do. So if you are going to do a one hour lecture, you’ll probably spend at least three hours preparing that. And I know some people, Rachel (Quick) is one of them, who will spend a whole lot more because she wants to make sure when she’s standing up front that she knows everything because she hates being under prepared. I can wing it a bit more, but spend a lot of time that people don’t really appreciate when they ask you to come up completely for free. Well, most people expect to pay a contribution to travel. They expect it’s going to cost to travel. But what they don’t appreciate is that we are a small charity that has running costs that is not run by volunteers. Even if the volunteer was someone coming to deliver it, the person who’s answered the phone, the person who’s coordinated it and put them in touch with each other costs time. It’s their job and they are being paid. And most members of the public who contact us don’t get that, they don’t understand and appreciate that. Which is why I’m doing this in the evening, this isn’t overtime and I’m not claiming this, so I’ve done a days work and now I’m doing this.

DN: A good charitable donation.

MBE: A good charitable donation to your PhD! *laughter* So I’m not sure that answered your question.

DN: It does, it does.

MBE: It’s tight. It’s really tight. I mean, our accounts are publicly available. We turn over something like £200,000 a year, but we made a loss of £14,000 last year. I think the highest we ever peaked was a £250,000 and that year I think we made £7000 surplus. So it’s tiny little profits and losses, but those losses will add up and add up and we’ve got to do something to try and stop it. But we are not unique in this situation. The Maritime Archaeology Trust have got big budgets but they also have big projects and they don’t make

any profit. The costs of running these things are big. You get an HLF fund for a million, well that's match funding and you have to find that million from somewhere else. In people, in time, in other donations. And if you don't, then you make a loss. So we look at other organizations, at other projects, and go "Well, that's amazing and it's great publicity for them but as a business they'll still struggle and make a loss." Because they won't be able to generate a surplus out of that activity. We consider ourselves quite lucky because we have the training programme, and the IJNA and the membership. That's not a grant and we are more in control of our destiny with those because we can push and promote and control and expand and improve. We can improve our market reach, globally, and those are business streams. If you look at MAT they are much more about grants then we are. We'd like to think of ourselves as off that treadmill of grants and we'd like to get off it even more. We're probably about 20% on grants and we'd like to reduce that even more so we don't have to rely on grants at all. And then that gives you a bit of freedom, it's a weight off your shoulder, you are not then struggling to get that next grant to pay that persons salary, that pays their mortgage because they are relying on you to keep them employed.

Q13

DN: what do you think the role of the NAS is in the big picture of maritime archaeology?

MBE: I don't think I'll roll anymore is really to be this one organisation that anybody and everybody can tap into to be involved and access maritime heritage. Those days are gone and we've now got organisation that have been built up over the years and some that suddenly appeared on the scene. And we are all trying to do the same thing. So the two things for us at role are the journal, because other than the University of Southampton and the journal of maritime archaeology, no one else has yet delved into it. And we hope that no one else will. Monopoly may not be good and competition is healthy thing, but personally for us we quite like it. And the other thing is the training programme. Projects have got little individual training programmes, I know the first world war project for the maritime Trust has its own training programme. The maritime archaeology sea Trust has its own training programme based around PADI. But at the moment we still have a big role to play and a big market share for that side of heritage in participation. So that certainly will be what we as an organisation are concentrating our efforts on. We've looked at what are our core brands and what are core activities and what generates income for us that's not related to grants. And those of the two things that we should be pushing. The publication, the journal, is more about pushing its global reach in two different market places around the world that are building up their maritime archaeology. So places like Japan and China and Vietnam, all of these places who have got maritime archaeology but it's in its infancy. They are the places where we have a new audience and potentially a big audience that hasn't yet subscribed. here is no point in as pushing it in Germany because if you lived in Germany and you were interested you would already be a member. We are pushing it into areas around the world that are growing and not those that are statics. For as much maritime archaeology as Greece has it's not really the place to target our journal. And with the training programme we are doing a new 30th anniversary launch which will focus on underwater and intertidal and should expand our role in that respect because we are an organisation

that is known for being able to provide that kind of training. Whether you are alone person or a group doing stuff you're interested in a specific part of the coastline and that's where who would you go to? Hopefully those people will just put it into Google and find us and see that we've been doing this for 30 years and probably know what we're doing by now and just go to us. When the Maritime Archaeology Sea Trust started there a PADI course the person who said it up was one of our trustees and the society wasn't pleased when they set up a competing archaeology course. Yes it is under a PADI name but in actual fact it may have been a good thing because we're now thought about it and gone well why don't we develop a PADI course. So we have just launched a new PADI course called Wreck Detective, which only launched a few months ago. We have 15 instructors around the world right now from Malta to Malaysia to Canada and for us it's not an archaeology course, it mentions the word archaeology about 4 times, it mentions the NAS about 100 times, but about people taking more than interest about what they are diving on. If you love wreck diving wouldn't it be great to know more about the wreck that you've just dived on. So was introducing an audience that's really at the bottom of the pyramid which is another target for us, just making people aware of the bits that they're looking at. The worst case scenario is that we get a few PADI instructors who go well this is where you'll find all the interesting shiny stuff. We will have very little control over who does the course, but hopefully the instructors that do chose to become Wreck Instructors will be good ones. The course is aimed at the very early divers, so you only need to have your open water in order to do it and it's supposed to compliment the wreck diver course that they do. So one is on how do you dive the wreck and the other is on what you are seeing. if you were going to sketch it how are you would you sketch it? How would you photograph it? So I certainly hope that are audience will grow as a result of that. I don't see it is really having a heritage management role, though we did get a lot of money from English Heritage at the beginning. We've had funding from CADW in Wales and historic Scotland and in fact we get a small grant from both of them each year still and they probably found us because it takes a box for them. So if you were going to speak to people from a heritage management perspective, say Alison James at Historic England, or Phil Robertson and Historic Scotland because he certainly for the last 20 years has been the person who is really supported underwater archaeology and divers up in Scotland for the last 20 years. He advocates using us as a vehicle whenever regulations change and so on and so forth. Polly Groom at CADW, who is been there about 5 years now, is responsible for pitching for a maritime grants and she is actually the only person for the whole of Wales who works for them on maritime. So she has to do everything from diving stuff to Commercial stuff to wind farms to desk assessments, to foreshore material all by herself. So it's a nightmare for her but Polly is the person who would say that the reason they fun the NAS to do things in Wales it's because they don't have much capacity so they will outsource to us to do education. Because we've worked with them before and they know that we are ethical and that will do a good job. It's a small grant, only about 10k a year, but for that we can do four or five activities for non-divers that can be a lecture based or it can be going to see a site or visiting museum or developing diver trails or talk. We've just done a diver trail up in The Sound of Mull, another hugely exciting site but you can still see 8 cannon or so and an anchor but we set up a divert rail for them funded by historic Scotland. And they are doing it for kicks they are doing it to promote diver access and to show it's not just about a castle on the land there is a wreck under here that divers can legally access in look but don't touch way. So they can set it up themselves because they don't have a dive team and so they need to

outsource it to an organisation that is known involving the public. I mean they could outsourced to Wessex Archaeology in Edinburgh if they wanted to but they aren't known for engaging with recreational divers and includes in public access where as we are. But that's not to say that they don't because they do Project Samphire, which is funded by crown Estates and they have great capacity to do it. But Historic Scotland recognise that we don't have his huge overheads that a commercial project has so a grant will go a bit further through the NAS then perhaps doing it through a commercial organisation. Although the dive tail on the Iona went out to tender. So English Heritage put it out to tender a few years ago and the tender document was sent to the likes of the maritime archaeology trust and us and Wessex archaeology and Cotswold archaeology. And Wessex actually won the tender to do it. In the end we didn't end up for it because I didn't think it could be done for the amount of money they were offering and I was amazed at Wessex could. What happened was that we had factored in going to the site and diving it and they had dived it many times before and had archive footage and video and stills and site drawings and plans that they're archaeologist had done. So they could do it all without even going to Lundy. Well we would have had to start from scratch. Wessex can do things on a relatively cheap budget but that's because they've got all of these resources at hand from previous work because of their contract on the protected wreck sites.

Q14

DN: Why do you think that the general we are engaging with the public?

MBE: I'd like to think that it's because we are virtuous and this is what we do as archaeologists. It's a shame that I can't give it to you because the editorial of our latest newsletter has been done by Professor Toby parker from Bristol and actually it's all about being an archaeologist and why we do what we do. It won't come out until next month. I think we all probably graduated as idealists and felt that involving the public and having a huge outreach component is really important to what we do as archaeologists. Archaeology is the sum of human knowledge and therefore if we don't tell other human beings about it and what was the point? We may as well not have bothered. But I don't know, if you graduated 20 years ago the word outreach didn't even exist and people just did it. They gave lectures some of them grand and some of them down in the pub. I gave lectures and they answered questions when someone asked what they were doing. Materials went into museums and they went on display but they didn't have these formal outreach components, that I'm not sure when the word outreach came into existence? You probably know. But we have members of our Society, some of the older members who are kind of contracted staff like Angela Croome who works on our publication, who will ask what is this word? What is outreach? And we tell her it's going out and talking and she goes well we do that anyway. Well yes, but we don't really do that in a formal way and we probably should as a trust. I think if we put hands on our hearts though we would all like to say that we would like to be research archaeologists. We all went to university to study archaeology to research and find things and outreach is a necessary evil. I don't know how many people would actually say that on the record but it's become a necessary evil and it always comes back to this statement that if you want to get funding then you need to tell the world about what you've done, particularly the little beautiful children that will photograph very well. The promotors want that promotional leaflet that they can send out to make them

look environmentally and ethically sound. They want of minority audience there that can be photographed and you have to know the numbers, whether that's for a commercial organisation or something like the HLF, because we don't know those numbers then you're not going to get grants. You don't go get sponsorship for a project and then say we're going to keep it really secret. We're going to find some amazing stuff and we'll bring it around your office to show it to you but we're not going to tell anyone. You don't get that. In July we are going to spend a week at sea having a go with some geophysics and we are going to look for... an 1801 shipwreck. If we find it will tell Alison James at Historic England and that's it. So how are we going to get funding for this because you can't go into someone's office and say will you fund a secret mission? We know what we find is going to be too far off shore to be protected, so if we find it and announce to everyone then people are going to say where is it. And suddenly who knows what happens? Who then goes in claims a stake and starts to work on it? We can't police it. We just want to find it and we want the challenge of doing that. We want to prove that we can do what Odyssey does and look at the weather patterns and look at the log books and look at the tides from 1801 and look where the ships are going to be. We want to find the magnetometry targets and we want to dive them. We want to be able to tell Odyssey look we found it and it is possible for someone else to find it. You're not the only organisation who can do it and we did it with a much smaller budget. Of course they'll come back and say well what are you going to do with it now? And thankfully that's the problem for Historic England to deal with *laughter*

Q15

DN: Do you think in some ways the engagement was easier before it was tied into the whole grant system? And in some ways maybe it was a little bit better when it was less structured?

MBE: I'm not sure never was. In my experience, but maybe I'm not old enough maybe I don't remember enough of the good old days. For at least the last 15 years that I've been involved and a bit before that when I was in Wessex the non-commercial projects that paid my salary were all grants that required outreach. That's a question is best suited for someone who was around in the 60s and 70s where you hear the things were a bit less structure than formal. Think those days of great discoveries and people being wowed....

DN: We're back to the Mary Rose aren't we?

MBE: We really are. Where's my Mary Rose? And hopefully if we find this 1801 wreck then depending on what condition it's in, possibly all under a sandbank of course, then that could be the next big thing. It could help change public perception about how maritime archaeology should be done but I suspect what will happen is that it will be reported to the authorities and they all go well we don't have any money to do anything. We don't have the budget deal with the wrecks we have already, let alone new ones. And that must be a juxtaposition for people like Alison James who want people to report shipwrecks. Not recoveries but discoveries because that justifies her existence there and Historic England's existence as well. But on the other hand, her budget is only so big and it's restricted. So they spread it across 60 or 64 sites... If people start discovering and things get reported and then they get protected her budget won't grow exponentially. The government is not going to

go “you have another protected wreck here's another 25k”. So she then have to spread her budget even more thinly around the sites that are deemed to be needing work. It must be such a quandary for her to want people to tell her stuff but also want people not to tell her anything. I had a really nice case study, right near where we're going to look for this 1801 wreck, there is a D class submarine. Now the skipper that we are using said on one of the dives when they are not trying to look for this wooden shipwreck would you like to dive this D class submarine we think it's the D5. And I go that would be great depth of 25m no problem. And he goes we think it's the D5 though we've only identified it from photos. Dr. Innis McCartney has identified it, from Bournemouth, and he's the country's leading historian and archaeologist for submarines. So I just do some Googling for D Class and couldn't find anything really. But what I do find is that Historic England have got a project that's looking at First World War submarines and identified as one of the ones they are interested in is the D5. So I contact Historic England, Alison James and Mark Dunkley, and say I think I'm going to be diving on the D5 in July do you have any information. To which I discover they don't have any information on the D5 but they have Wessex Archaeology going to do a geophysics survey of it in June. and I go that's great where are they going? And they don't know but they say they'll try and find out and let me know where it is. So I contact the boat skipper and I say Wessex Archaeology are being commissioned to go do a geophysical survey and that would be great because when we go in July we can have a multibeam survey of what it looks like. For divers in poor visibility that would be wonderful. And he starts laughing and says I bet they're not doing a geophysics scan of the right thing because where the UK hydrographic Office has the D5 wreck on the seabed and where Wessex are going isn't where this D class has been identified. It's about 14 miles away. It works out ok though don't worry. Because I go back to the skipper and I say we won't have the survey, be great if we had it. And apparently, they only have the bow of the submarine not the stern. But if we have the Wessex multibeam then we can go down on the stern as well So I say to the skipper wouldn't it be great if we could get Wessex to dive on your target. And he says well it wasn't really mine, it belongs to a Belgian diver named Kenneth who found it and who has helped identify it I'll have to ask him. Do they really want Historic England to know? But actually, it's turned out really well because so long as the Belgians get credit for discovering it and as long as a big deal isn't made about it then they have provided the coordinates for Wessex archaeology to go and have a look. So we are all hoping that they are right because if Wessex goes and does a geophysics on the side and it's just a sand bank it'll be a little embarrassing. But what I like about the story is that it's a really good example about how we can work in the middle and act as a go between. Because there is no way that the boat skipper or Kenneth would have reported their find, well they reported it to the UK Hydrographic Office under a five year non-disclosure. So there is a 5-year ban on releasing the coordinates. So I thought there is no way they're going to tell Historic England or Wessex Archaeology where they are. But through me acting as the go between and confirming that Kenneth would get the credit, we would get to dive and get the multibeam sonar as quickly as possible so that when we did dive we will have that data and that things won't be publicly announced about the location. And when I managed to arrange that it was a good day in the office. Because I thought if we didn't exist and if we hadn't built a good relationship with all the people involved in this, we might never have found this hopefully very unique site. I'm 99% sure that it is the D5 because really that's all I can be. So that's a positive outcome for our role. It's much like when we get phone calls from people who say I found something but if I

tell Historic England will I get kicked off the site? And we can tell them that actually the majority of the people who have reported the site and are designated the finder has been able to play an active role in working the site and have become the licensee. So I actually say you had might as well tell them because if you do chances are they will come and visit and you'll get access to a professional dive team, footage, photographs, multibeam. You could get all of this thrown at your site which you would never get otherwise. It doesn't work that way all the time but every once in a while you get a win and people say that they're happy they reported it. It's a positive part of our existence.

Q16

DN: We are onto a little bit of blue sky thinking now. So if you a public access initiative without any concern about mitigating issues like funding or staffing or where was in the world what would you design?

MBE: it's actually a project that we are trying to design and that someone has almost taken on. In 2006 we created something called Wreck Map Britain and it stemmed from... I was actually thinking about this before I came in and thought rather than start from the beginning I would think of something that we wanted to do that really had legs but didn't happen. Wreck Map Britain stemmed from a couple of smaller projects we had in Dorset called Wreck Map Portland. We took recreational divers who dived on sites year in year out and thought they knew them really well. We took them for a week and I actually train them how to record it and understand it better, so they could enjoy diving a site again and again. So they could really take pride in being the person or the group who knew that site better than anyone, who could draw it for you or take you on a guided tour. So we did that for three years in a row and we had 12 people who came and had an amazing time. They got some great mapping skills and became really good illustrators and Surveyors. Some of them took up photography and became really good at that. We have a couple of marine biologist come along and really teach that. And we thought that was really cool and wouldn't it be really good if we could roll that out over the whole country. Just keep expanding that concept and do all of the dives and learn all of the wrecks around the country that people dive on. And having an online repository because this was in 2006 when people were really starting to put things online and using it to drop all of the data. Digital photography had only really started, I was still using an analogue camera with 36 photos on a roll. And sharing photographs was becoming a possibility. So we approached the Crown Estate for Wreck Map Britain 2006 and we got a fair grant of about 20k to develop some formal recording forms that people could then scan in or send in that could then be recorded onto a database which would have a Google Earth layout and could be searched through by name or something else. And he could see what other people had done on the site. So if a diver said that we want to dive this site this weekend they could go online and find all the information that had been gathered so far. So we did it and we got a little bit of money for publicity and we got a few articles and we got a big print run done of these recording forms. We even had it Diver magazine for a month which has a circulation of about 40000 so everybody got a form for Wreck Map Britain. I'm sure the majority tossed it in the bin which is a real shame. But the funders seemed to like it and we thought it was a really good way of getting it out to the audience that would potentially use it. The majority of people who took it up and actually did it were people who knew us. We ran a little competition so the first

place person got a camera and we had the president of the British sub Aqua Club announcing it at the Dive show and it was a big hooha. We had lots of quotes in newspapers were people were saying about how they changed how they dived and they enjoyed going to the same site again and again. They were really proud to know the site so well and were happy for people to come and ask them for help for diving on it. But then it died. The Grant money ran out and Crown Estate didn't want to fund it again. The member of staff that was work on it 2 days a week to promote it couldn't be paid. The database ended up with less than 100 entries sent in. But it showed me that actually you could crowdsource and people were keen to share. Some of the pictures and some of the drawings are beautiful and you felt that you could go dive of that tomorrow. I could maybe add a little extra to what have been done and then someone else could add little more. So I would probably do that. You have British divers who dive all year round all around the coastline in varying conditions and they nearly all do wreck diving. I bet not a single diver in Britain doesn't do a wreck dive every year. So there is all of this information on their cameras and their hard drives and their brains they could be mined. And I think lots of people are sharing it in their own little ways. I've always wanted to bring that back and relaunch it. I quite like the term wreck map because that's what it is a map of wrecks. There is an organisation called wrecksite.eu and I think it's a Dutch guy and a Belgian guy who run it. And they are much less about what's on the seabed and much more about the history. It's a members things that you have to pay for but if you know where you want to dive if you can look on their site and see what's around where you are. So you pay for it and you can see these little dots and click on them and it will tell you when the best time of day to dive is. they've done a lot of research but there isn't much on what you will actually see. Tt's much like Pastscape where you trying to see what's on the sea bed and you'll get nothing. But I bet you're someone does know. I bet you are a actually a lot of people know. And I bet if they knew there was a web resource where they would be credited they would upload things. For a diver visiting a site most of them don't care what it used to look like they want to know what it looks like now. We followed up that idea with something called the Big Anchor Project where we designed a recording form for all sorts of anchors and then I had an online Data Base. Again that was Grant funded and we only had 6 k to do it. It's still there but there's no money behind it. We get about 50 entries per year coming in from around the world. That's one of those projects were anchors are everywhere because they are an iconic symbol and you see them everywhere. Imagine how wonderful it would be if the Big Anchor project had a layer in Google Earth and was being supported by Google and you could navigate the world and do geocaching. And the wreck project would be something that all divers could get involved in whatever their abilities or their levels are. They can all contribute to the sum of human knowledge and would help improve the historic records because at least we have some information about what these things looks like on the sea floor. It would be all inclusive of all diving communities. And we proved it worked we did get results. If we have the money and we have the people we have the capabilities to visit communities and enthuse them. We can communicate with them and tell them what happened to the data and the results. It's taking the citizen science that's coming out of TDP and the CITiZAN Project but putting it under water. But having said all that it'll never happen. Trying to convince somebody.... Because it's one of those things but someone has to commit the funding forever. I'm not interested in funding it for 3 years I want to know that every year money is coming in. I want 50k every year until I retire or die, whichever comes first. But you won't get that so then the project has to become self-

sustaining or at least self-supporting and you have to crowdsource and get donations and personally have never found that works. Maritime heritage isn’t a heart wrenching enough cause for people to put 10 quid in. We are not curing cancer. This is a white middle class activity so people won't donate to it. So if you turn this into a grant and get funding for it you can come work for us.