

documenting our cultural heritage studies, allowing access to not just the final results, but also the complete corpus of interlinked knowledge to the community and to future generations.

REFERENCES

- Baracchini, C., Brogi, A., Callieri, M., Capitani, L., Cignoni, P., Fasano, A., Montani, C., Nenci, C., Novello, R.P., Pingi, P., Ponchio, F. & Scopigno, R. 2004. Digital Reconstruction of the Arrigo VII Funerary Complex. In: VAST 2004: The 5th International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Intelligent Cultural Heritage, Bruxelles (Belgium). Paris: Eurographics, pp. 145–54.
- Dutailly, B., Mora, P. & Vergnien, R. 2010. 3D Reconstruction of Archaeological Sites Using Photogrammetry. In: VAST 2010: The 11th International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Intelligent Cultural Heritage – Short and Project Papers. Paris: Eurographics, pp. 45–8.
- Gabellone, F. 2009. Ancient Contexts and Virtual Reality: From Reconstructive Study to the Construction of Knowledge Models. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 10 (Suppl. 1):112–7.

ROBERTO SCOPIGNO
CNR-ISTI, Pisa, Italy

DOI 10.1179/146195712X13524807927574

Stephen Trow, Vincent Holyoak and Emmet Byrnes, eds. *Heritage Management of Farmed and Forested Landscapes in Europe* (EAC occasional paper no. 4, Brussels: Europae Archaeologiae Consilium, 2010, 184pp., 111 colour illust., hbk, ISBN 978-963-9911-17-8)

Heritage Management of Farmed and Forested Landscapes in Europe touches vitally on the status quo, threats and various challenges we now face in managing the important archaeological and monumental heritage found in rural Europe. This heritage, as a whole, defines a large part of Europe's cultural landscapes.

The volume begins with an idea put forward in the introduction by Katalin Wollák (President of the Europae Archaeologiae Consilium – EAC) concerning the recent advances in scientific knowledge and legal protection of archaeological sites and historic monuments, thanks to efforts made in research, cataloguing, and legislation. Nonetheless, pressure on the rural environment is increasingly evident. This

is due to an array of causes, including the quest for increased productivity through continuous work 7 days a week, changes in the use of the countryside given new needs, such as residue recycling, as well as ecological sustainability or the implementation of new energy sources. The main challenge is slowing down the continual and silent disappearance of heritage under pressure from productivity, over-exploitation, abandonment, and changes in land use.

The inclusion of a total of twenty-two studies, some presented at previous meetings of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA), others commissioned by the editors, gives us an overview of the rural heritage situation in 13 European countries. A constant line of

reference throughout each of these studies is the role played by the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). The means of applying CAP through different avenues and programmes is resulting in new methods of managing cultural heritage located in agricultural and forest areas. It is worth highlighting that the main objectives pursued by these new managerial methods are the maintenance and improvement of the environmental conditions of farming operations, but also the conservation of historic and cultural elements, as well as landscapes.

Following the publication's structure, the first two essays by Trow serve as an introduction to and description of the problem. Trow initially provides quantitative data about what European agricultural and forest activity represents in territorial terms, before turning to the strategies presented by the various authors. In his second contribution, this analysis allows him to examine both the loss of heritage in countries where quantitative studies have been carried out, revisiting elements inventoried by land-use type, and also the great changes that have taken place in the rural environment in the past 50 years: abandonment of traditional practices, opening of new areas to cultivation and irrigation, increased mechanization of agriculture and forestry, use of agro-chemical products, etc. The author uses these data to establish the existing challenges for improving rural archaeology and other forms of heritage management, which have lacked a structured response to date. The key issues are: firstly, the need to continue to increase and qualify the knowledge and record of cultural heritage in areas of intense agriculture and changed use; secondly, the need to establish effective benchmarks for monitoring the state of conservation of archaeological elements and the impact of new chemical and mechanical practices; and, finally, the need

to create quality indicators that can be applied to landscapes with great historic and cultural value in Europe's rural environments that are undergoing severe change.

The following twenty contributions, which are grouped under the heading of national and local perspectives, comprise the bulk of this edition. Analysis of the country distribution mainly reflects the strong representation of papers from the British Isles (seven from the United Kingdom and four from the Republic of Ireland). North and central Europe takes second place (a total of seven, consisting of two from Norway, one from the Netherlands, two from Germany, and one each from the Czech Republic and Hungary) and finally, Western Continental Europe, with one contribution each from Belgium and France.

The subjects addressed reflect common points between most contributions. Here are three examples. (1) The work to contextualize the current agricultural or forest reality of each country, providing quantitative information about production, dedicated surface areas and uses. (2) The regulatory framework for historic-archaeological heritage and, where necessary, the more concrete aspects relating to de-centralized administration. (3) The methods of applying the Common Agricultural Policy, particularly the agricultural environment programmes under axis Two – rural development and the coordination methods used in guiding the application of funds between agencies responsible for land-use, ecology and the environment, agriculture, and cultural heritage management.

Differences can also be found in the most concrete concerns about landscape management and cultural heritage in the various contributions published. Particularly remarkable is the greater interest shown by recent members of the European

Union, such as the Czech Republic and Hungary, in having access to both improved, efficient and conveniently integrated heritage record systems, and in implementing sufficiently transversal mechanisms across different public bodies and private agencies for land planning and management. Other countries with a longer tradition and greater development of recording techniques go one step further. They approach these new rural challenges by creating specialized inventories and records. The English Heritage 'Scheduled Monuments at Risk' (SMAR) project provides periodic 'Heritage at Risk' reports to increase social awareness of the state of cultural heritage. Similarly, the cooperation between the Department for Agriculture and other entities in implementing the 'Conservation of Scheduled Monuments in Cultivation' (COSMIC) has increased. In other countries, such as the British Isles or the Netherlands, there is a notable interest in the tools of participation and governance. Numerous contributions present advanced practices involving various types of local stakeholders. These have given rise to programmes with a varied degree of territorial coverage and social implication. The most notable initiatives use the active surveillance of heritage by local people with some degree of training. Northern Ireland's 'Field Monument Wardens', the 'Field Monument Advisory' service in Ireland, and the 'Heritage Stewardship' in Belgium stand out. In other cases, dissemination by broadcasting good agricultural practice focused on landscape and heritage elements is used to try and involve farmers, who are informed in advance of the existence of historic and archaeological elements on their land, so that they can consider landscaping, maintenance, or conservation, and even work to enable the public to visit these sites. Participants are provided with the necessary technical

advice from the development programme and various kinds of economic subsidy. Here it is worth mentioning English initiatives under COSMIC, Welsh actions under the 'Glastir' programme, and Irish actions under the basic agricultural environment programme known as REPS (Rural Environment Protection Scheme).

Wherever it is possible to achieve benefits for the agricultural environment, these methods demonstrate how voluntary, subsidisable actions can be launched, leading to the appreciation of historic and cultural heritage in programmes that were initially designed to guarantee the eco-environmental sustainability of agricultural land. In this way, ecologists, farmers, and cultural heritage managers now agree on the eco-environmental benefits of maintaining protection around historical sites – fencing, hedging, and a buffer area around monuments and archaeological remains, etc. Such actions promote oases of wildlife for birds and insects that are beneficial for agriculture, while preserving the structure and appearance of valuable historic and cultural heritage.

The most recent forms of these programmes, which are linked to the CAP's axis Two, have managed to incorporate objectives targeting the maintenance and improvement of the perceived and visual conditions of cultivated fields and agricultural buildings. They aim to achieve respect for and maintenance of vernacular cultural traditions and the conditions of the natural environment, in line with the spirit of the Council of Europe's European Landscape Convention (2000).

Another set of contributions relating to applied research into the conservation of archaeological heritage in the countryside is also included. In England, within the framework of the COSMIC programme, the article dedicated to carrying out experimental tests to objectively measure the

effects of various ploughing techniques stands out, as does the Norwegian experience in analysing the chemical changes resulting from fertilizers and their effect on archaeological deposits. Furthermore, the Dutch study on the importance of maintaining underground water level and the influence of variations in this level on archaeological deposits is notable.

Other articles have a more local focus. One analyses agricultural, ecological, and heritage management in the Burren, Ireland, while another reflects on the conservation of archaeological structures in the framework of a research project about Bronze Age tumuli in southern Burgundy, France. Altogether, three papers dedicated to managing archaeological remains in forest environments in Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany are included.

The book closes with a third and final section called 'Looking to the future'. The selection of the two contributions that comprise this final section is most successful in serving as a warning in the face of certain processes – a principle of action that should be included in many interventions in the natural and cultural environment.

The first addresses the incentives policy for alternative energy facilities in Scotland. This contribution can serve as a warning to the acceleration of actions that are being carried out in increasing areas to reduce the effects of climate change, sometimes without considering landscape quality and historical surroundings or cultural interest.

The second illustrates a series of now unfortunately common situations, using examples of the heritage impoverishment of Swedish landscapes. Although it could easily form part of the previous section of this publication, this article gives the final section the necessary critical perspective in addressing the issues that need to be resolved in European agricultural and

forestry policy and its impact on landscape and rural heritage.

Some countries have come a long way. The UK provides some of the most interesting examples. In 2000, the process of reforming the national heritage law, the *Heritage Protection Bill*, began. A high level of discussion has been maintained on institutional coordination, particularly with the authorities responsible for town planning, land planning, and the countryside (English Heritage, 2000). From a very early stage, the concept of 'historic environment' was introduced to reinforce the 'sense of place' that allows citizens to connect with their historic and cultural heritage, demonstrating vision for the future. Readers can easily see the opportunity of this heritage-focused strategy, if they consider the framework for action set out by the European Landscape Convention and the methods of practical integration within the rural environment programmes implemented under CAP axes 2 and 4.

This volume can give the impression that it is a group reflection, limited to the European context, exclusive to members of the EAA-EAC working group. This publication presents the current state of historic-archaeological heritage management in the contexts of agriculture and forests, focusing basically on Northern Europe.

The absence of similar works providing a comparative viewpoint of the situation in Mediterranean countries with enormous cultural weight like Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, or Greece, should lead southern European heritage administrations and cultural heritage professionals to critically question the causes for this absence and the need for a responsible exercise of analysis and collective work similar to the one presented here.

Andalusia is the fourth biggest NUTS 2 European region in terms of surface area

(NUTS is the acronym of 'Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics', used to subdivide the territory of the EU into regions on three different levels, from larger to smaller). In this region, with 33.2 per cent of its total population living in rural areas (less than 150 inhabitants per km² in some areas, according to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development), the importance of rural environment and its management is quite obvious. In a de-centralized state like Spain, rural development policy, which is also known as CAP's 'second pillar', is the responsibility of the Autonomous Regions. In the period between 2007 and 2013, the various arms of the Andalusian *Plan de Desarrollo Rural* (Rural Development Plan) maintained shared characteristics with the rest of Europe, while implementing specific regional features. Consequently, the weight of European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD, or FEADER in Spain) co-financing, which is high in a convergent region (objective 1), together with the other public contributions, enables the implementation of cultural heritage policies through the *Local Action Groups* via strategies such as LEADER ('Liaison Entre Actions de Développement de l'Économie Rurale' – the French acronym, also used in Spain, meaning 'Links between Actions for the Development of the Rural Economy').

The outcome must be seen as positive. The number of interventions in monuments, traditional architecture, ethnographic elements, archaeological findings, etc. has been high. Numerous valorization, educational, and dissemination actions were made possible at a large number of cultural heritage sites. This progress towards territorial cohesion has created employment and a certain socio-economic stability through tourism in

areas that were previously profoundly depressed.

Nonetheless, actions for the pro-active protection and conservation of historic or archaeological heritage based not only on necessary, occasional actions, but also on the continuity of respectful agricultural or forestry practices and the application of governance methods like 'territorial contracts' are still virtually non-existent in a region like Andalusia. New methods of cultural heritage management in agricultural and forest environments demand more structured, long-term solutions and a change to greater public involvement in rural development policy, a greater integration between environmental and cultural management, a holistic and transversal vision that goes beyond the 'green' paradigm.

It is a unique opportunity. In the context of an economic crisis, each country is establishing its positions in the face of the forthcoming CAP reform post-2013. This reform will not overlook the great achievements and will announce the reinforcement of agricultural-environmental sustainability policies for farming, such as those related to rural development based on youth employment, entrepreneurs and the economic diversification of the countryside (European Commission, 2011).

Agricultural businesses are applying heavy pressure in Mediterranean countries such as Spain, France, and Italy, which have traditionally been major recipients of European rural funds. It would seem opportune to go beyond production-based perspectives and position ourselves more closely to landscape and heritage countryside management. In short, we must intensify awareness-raising actions in the face of threats and turn these into a stimulus and an opportunity for territorial development.

This book presents examples of the right direction and good management of activities carried out by the joint working group of the EAA since 2004, and the EAC since 2009. Its work has been and remains as necessary now as when this volume was published in 2010. Above all, due to the sense of reflection that reading this book gives those of us who work together with cultural heritage institutions, it is to be hoped that this sense will infect other institutions and groups – public administrations responsible for agriculture, environment, farming organizations, businesses and rural landowners – who will be our travelling companions in this exciting journey.

REFERENCES

- Council of Europe. 2000. *European Landscape Convention. Florence 20.X.2000*. [accessed 2 July 2012]. Available at <<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/176.htm>>.
- English Heritage. 2000. *Power of Place. The Future of the Historic Environment*. [accessed 2 July 2012]. Available at <<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/power-of-place/>>.
- European Commission. 2011. *COM(2011) 627 final/2. Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)*. [accessed 2 July 2012]. Available at <http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/com627/627_en.pdf>.

JOSÉ MARÍA RODRIGO CÁMARA
*Institute of Historical Heritage of Andalusia,
 Seville, Spain*

DOI 10.1179/146195712X13524807693097