

## **Notes of the Round Table Meeting of the EAA/EAC Working Group on Farming, Forestry and Rural Land Management. EAA Annual Conference, Oslo 2011.**

**The Round Table session was organized by Steve Trow, Ingunn Holm, Leif Gren and Jonathan Wordsworth and chaired by Emmet Byrnes. Notes by Hugh Carey. Photographs by Leif Gren.**

**The theme was:**

**Managing sites or managing landscapes: What is the proper concern for archaeologists?**

**Each of the four organizers gave a paper. Each pair of papers was separated by a question and answer session.**

**Participants in discussion: IH: Ingunn Holm; EB: Emmet Byrnes; ST: Steve Trow; GF: Graham Fairclough; AO: Adrian Olivier; CvR: Cees Van Rooijen; PH: Peter Herring; BD: Brian Durham; GE: Gerhard Ermischer; JW: Jonathan Wordsworth; MV: Michel Vorenhout; LG: Leif Gren; MG: Margaret Gowen; TR: Thomas Risan; KW: Katalin Wollák.**



### **Ingunn Holm**

How should Archaeologists decide their priorities and criteria for selecting historic sites and landscapes for conservation?

In Norway, archaeologists have mostly dealt with the impacts of large developments on archaeological monuments.

Large-scale landscape conservation is not common in Norway.

Under Norwegian legislation, all pre-reformation sites (pre-1537) are legally protected. In addition, all Sami heritage which is more than 100 years old is protected.

In cases where archaeology is uncovered in the course of a development, discussion takes place in

order to decide whether the development can proceed with mitigation or whether the remains should be protected.

The impact assessment system has been implemented in the Planning legislation in Norway. This has led to a broader view on heritage and landscape. Wider cultural environments are taken into account.

Landscape assessment is important in assessing the impact of wind farms. There is discussion about how to evaluate landscape so that it is regarded, not as a container for cultural and biodiversity values but as having a value in itself.

In the Norwegian system for protecting archaeological heritage, the knowledge value of areas is very important. Its importance was recognised in the original legislation in 1905 (the Heritage Act) and there is wide consensus on this point. Knowledge value is not used in the evaluation of landscapes.

Monument identity value has been used in Norwegian heritage management since the mid-1970s. This is the ability of monuments and sites to generate a feeling of belonging to an area. Obviously, this is something we ascribe to the monument and it is not inherent in the monument itself.

The term 'identity' is problematic when applied to national identity. Norwegian society is made up of a number of population groups. The oldest populations are Sami and Norwegian; followed by Finnish and Romani or Roma. In more recent years, immigration has added other population groups to the mix. The dominant group, (Norwegians), tend to ascribe the monuments identity value. The views of other groups are less represented.

It is important to have criteria in the evaluation of monuments and landscapes. The concepts underpinning these criteria should not, if possible be the product of current trends but should have potential to be relevant into the future. Problematic terms such as identity should be avoided. Priorities and arguments should be comprehensible to the rest of society.

### **Steve Trow.**

Spoke on the topic of managing cultural landscapes: farm management.

72% of the land of England is farmland. 36% is grazing land and 36% is intensively cropped. In grassland and moorland, there is good monument survival. In arable, survival consists of cropmarks mostly and some upstanding monuments.

There are large numbers of designated sites, including:

- c. 1.5 million monuments recorded.
- c. 300,000 substantive "sites"
- c. 20,000 legally protected monuments, plus more than 400,000 listed buildings.

There is a tradition of active management of field monuments, with small payments from heritage department funds.

From the late 1980s, funding came from the CAP-funded agri-environment (environmental farming) schemes. This really came to the fore after 2004, with bigger payments made from a bigger budget.

The payments are made on a whole farm and landscape basis. The system has two tiers, lower and higher. A system of management of monuments can be voluntary or required, depending on which tier the farmer is in.

More than 8,000 designated and undesignated sites are now managed through stewardship.

Many issues arise in the system, such as how to reach a compromise between the needs of farming and those of archaeology. How to strike a balance between a landscape approach and an approach that concentrates on 'dots on the map'.

These and other challenges are likely to become particularly acute at a time when the amount of money available to deal with them is likely to drop. Therefore should we restore, which is expensive, or maintain, which is less so? How often should we insist on an end to tillage at monuments?

Tools available that inform the approach to managing landscapes are:

National Character Areas

Historic Landscape Characterisation.

National Character Areas: There are 159 in England, with detailed narrative and (in part) quantitative descriptions of their character; they are cross-agency and multi-disciplinary and are used to target farming schemes. The historic environment including traditional buildings has been included in the descriptions for these areas.

Case Study: Dartmoor National Park.

The nature protection agency had achieved a reduction of grazing to enhance bio-diversity and, as a result, the archaeology was inundated with scrub.

The problem was discussed by all stakeholders, including the local farmers. Areas with special environmental issues were identified between the different conservation agencies. Some of these areas were identified as needing particular management for monuments.

---

## Q&A

Question from EB for IH: Is there a sense of ownership in Norway of the criteria outlined in her paper and a sense of involvement in decision-making?

**IH** Landscape is not a topic generally discussed in public debate. Local authorities are expected to address landscape considerations and they often involve the public in the decision-making. The criteria are mostly used by experts. There are moves to regulate some monuments locally and it is hoped that the criteria will be used.

**EB** asked **ST** to comment on relations and sources of conflict between farmers and authorities.

**ST** Farmers generally are of the opinion that there are too many agencies and too any conflicting views.

**GE** asked **ST**, What is the goal of archaeological conservation? Is it to restore monuments; restore landscapes to their condition of 20-30 years ago or have they a concept of the future state of the landscape?

**ST** Archaeologists have a tendency to concentrate on dots on a map. In considering landscapes, the camera has to be pulled back. Archaeologists can advise on the dots but using tools such as Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) to assess landscape brings a need for wider agreement and is hard to arrange.

**GF** HLC is not being used enough in formulating an idea of what landscape should be like in the future. Archaeologists do not have the desire to formulate a vision for the future of landscape.

**AO:** Archaeologists still want to tell people what to do. There is a need for a plan for the future. Archaeologists need to acknowledge that land-user needs might be more important than our wants. Until we acknowledge this, people won't listen.

**CvR:** The only continuity in the Dutch landscape is its change. Archaeologists can't decide for people. Instead, it is better to give them knowledge and a system and let local people deal with the issues.

**PH:** Mature discussion between agencies and landowners and archaeologists was important in his work on landscapes in Dartmoor and Cornwall.

**BD:** With regard to IH's points about national identity, we need national identity to inform policy, even if that identity is in a state of flux.

A general discussion took place around the subject of identity. Do we foist our own cultural identity values on to monuments, instead of trying to understand their real nature and significance?

**GE:** If people don't identify with monuments then they don't feel motivated to preserve it.

**ST:** Information is needed to inform people of the significance of monuments.

**GE:** There is a two-way flow of information. Local people often know more than him about the monuments but he can also be a source of information for them.

**JW:** Selling the idea of the importance of monuments with no surface trace to locals and getting them to identify with it is very hard.

**GE:** Knowledge and identifying a monument -versus- incentive and money. Of these, money will go away and incentive falls off. It is better to provide knowledge and to help people to identify with the monuments.

**ST:** Agrees with this. A lot of damage caused by farmers to monuments is due to a lack of knowledge of their location and extent.

**CvR:** It only takes one farmer not to be interested, for sites to be lost, despite time spent on education. The intention in Holland is to get monuments out of arable.

**MV?:** Some farmers don't want to be 'museum farmers', they want to be entrepreneurs. That is their identity.

**MG:** Brought attention to the importance of a sense of place in the discussion of landscape.

---

**EB:** Time depth is a value to archaeologists. Farmers feel that the production of land and its use is a vital value.

**ST:** In moving the focus from dots on maps to landscapes, the range of people whose views you need gets bigger. Therefore the archaeological voice gets quieter in this process.

**GF:** The CAP will come to look small and less important compared to food security.

**PH:** A quiet voice can be stronger. Listening to other disciplines is more likely to make them respect our point of view.

**EB:** Asked the Norwegian archaeologists present for their view from outside the EU.

**TR:** Farmers get financial incentives via an environmental plan covering natural and built heritage.

**IH:** 3% of the land cover is farmland. A lot of Norwegian heritage is on the 3% and a lot of it is in forestry. They don't pay people not to farm and they don't pay people not to plough. They do pay people to look after monuments, fences etc, both for biodiversity and built heritage reasons.

**TR:** More pressure can be applied in Norway if the monument is pre-1537. They try not to prosecute always but sometimes they have to.

**EB:** Is landscape legislated for in Norway?

**IH:** There is no protection for structures dating to the last 150 years.

**EB** asked **GF:** Is there a model approach to landscape?

**GF:** Most places have the same problems. Some farmers don't want to know. France seems to be trying a 'ground up' approach.

He disagrees that local people tend to know a lot. They tend to know about high profile sites and recent things and nothing in between.

**IH:** Norway is losing farmers. Holiday homes are being built on farmland. Forest is taking over on land which is not being used.

**GF:** Same problems are occurring in all countries. There is also deliberate re-wilding in some areas.

**ST:** Archaeological curation, is too often about stopping change. Landscape is about change.

**KW:** Asked **ST** how he thinks things will pan out when the CAP money drops.

**ST:** Choices on spending will be critical. More will have to be done with less.

---



### **Jonathan Wordsworth**

Spoke on the topic of 'Living Landscapes or Landscape Museums'.

Gave the example of the Orkney Islands, where there is a large natural heritage designation and quite a small archaeological area. In areas such as Orkney, which are relatively remote, built and natural heritage can be protected.

In more built up areas, it is harder to preserve monuments in their landscape context.

95% of monuments in Scotland have no statutory protection. Some are protected by being in areas protected for non-archaeological reasons. Battlefields and gardens and designed landscapes are protected, as are some individual monuments of national importance.

Less favourable areas are quite frequent in Scotland and there is often more upstanding archaeology in such areas.

Monuments are impacted on for business development reasons.

Initiatives supporting natural heritage can impact on archaeological areas. For example, the Central Scotland Green Network has the aim of creating woodland corridors. These cover large areas and can be difficult to arrange around archaeological monuments, particularly linear ones, such as the Antonine Wall.

New Woodland proposals will effect areas with good archaeological survival, e.g. less favourable areas.

Windfarms have both physical and visual impacts. The roads associated with them tend to be more of a problem than the turbines.

Pointed out the importance of addressing these issues in many countries simultaneously. There are many bodies in numerous countries with whom we can address these issues and find common

cause.

---

## **Leif Gren**

Spoke on the theme of reconciling archaeological concerns with the concerns of other land users.

Difficulties in reconciling the needs of designated land with those of land used for making money, such as farmland.

Archaeological aims: To prevent damage; to acquire knowledge; to encourage sustainable use and to manage the environment.

Environmental aims: Nature conservation; climate change (renewable energy).

10% of Swedish land is set aside for nature conservation, mostly forest and upland. In these areas, the aim is to allow the land to return from arable to 'jungle', covering up the archaeology.

The Swedish Heritage Board is trying to create links with the nature conservation sector and is bringing historic land use to their attention.

A problem is that the requirements of energy crops override all other considerations. There has been little impact on the growing of salix, although guidelines have been published. Guidelines have also been published regarding windfarms but their impact is limited as yet.

How can the situation be improved?

Continue with guidelines.

Implement the Landscapes Convention.

Education.

---

## **Q&A**

**JW:** There is a need for long term solutions. In some areas where management of monuments has stopped, for example areas where there are cropmarks, farmers have resumed ploughing.

**ST:** Co-operation with nature organizations is important. In England, the nature protection body is also the advisor to the government on landscape. This has caused some problems for archaeology, although they have been convinced to hire some archaeologists and this has helped considerably.

**CvR:** Change is part of the landscape in Holland. The Dutch are used to windmills. (This comment relates to concerns over the impacts of alternative energy sources mentioned particularly in LG's talk.)

**TR:** In Norway, there is some cross-over in their Landscape Characterisation Scheme, where personnel from both natural and built heritage are involved.

**IH:** In Norway, natural heritage personnel operate under some legal limitations. Local authorities have a lot of responsibility for natural heritage in their areas, in assessing proposals that might effect landscape. People in Norway do not like windfarms. All windfarm applications have to have

an EIS. The Oil and Energy Department make the decisions however and they do like windfarms. Windfarms tend to be on barren land. Concerns over visual impact, do not tend to impress the Oil and Energy Department.

**LG:** In Sweden, there is no strategy for an approach to planting Salix. There is not much of it being planted now but in 10 years, who knows?

**BD:** It can be shown that planting trees for fuel can have a greater CO<sub>2</sub> impact due to ground disturbance and it also lowers the ground level. This might be a bigger CO<sub>2</sub> impact than is saved by bio-fuel.

**JW** and **LG:** Salix tend to be planted on ordinary arable soils, so there is no great CO<sub>2</sub> release. Studies on the effects of Salix root systems suggest no great impact.

**GE:** The bio-fuel debate is ideological. It means a return to coppicing. It means bad effects on the landscape caused by erosion of land and of bio-diversity. The argument in favour of it is that it will save the world from climate change and put an end to nuclear power. It is impossible to argue against these benefits on aesthetic grounds.

Gave an example from Schleswig-Holstein, where church towers were the tallest buildings in the landscape. Each tower was slightly different from the others and people used them as a sort of road map. If they glimpsed a tower, they knew which town they were near. In recent times, wind turbines were built and competed in height with the towers, obscuring many of them. Local people said that the 'landscape had disappeared', when the church towers were hidden by the windmills.

Once a generation grows up without the church tower road map, it will be forgotten and the windmills will become normality.

Local objectors have the strongest voice in the planning process. They need to be given the right information, so that they can more effectively pressurize local officials.

**ST** asked what tools do archaeologists need to evaluate landscape?

**GF:** Archaeologists need to 'worry less about the physical effect on things and more about the mental effects on people.' Need to know what people think about landscape and what they want from it. Archaeologists should be talking to sociologists and ecologists for example, to get answers to these questions.

**TR:** It is important to find out what range of uses people want from the landscape.

**AO:** Need to teach archaeologists how to analyse this. It might prove of greater use than becoming an expert in metalwork typology for example.

**IH:** Norwegians are close to the landscape and have a bond with it. For this reason, archaeologists have proven to be quite good at working as planners.

**GF:** Archaeologists almost have the right skills but not in the right order. You can't conserve a landscape in the same way as you conserve a monument. Landscape must change and change must be managed.

**JW:** There are huge numbers of people in many countries who join organizations such as the National Trust. It would be useful to tap into this goodwill.

**EB:** In universities, the tendency has been to teach the technical aspects of archaeology and let people acquire the 'softer, wider' skills after their primary degree.

**AO:** The universities do not address the needs of the profession. They want only to get people in and paying.

**GF:** Archaeology is not only about the past. It is about survivals of the past and what to do with them today. Archaeologists are not like historians, who only study the past.

**ST:** Certain landscapes in England (National Parks and AONBs) have been designated, now, for over 50 years. Change is occurring in these landscapes as well and illustrating the difficulty of trying to 'preserve' landscapes.

**ST:** In the light of GE's story from Schleswig-Holstein, how can we get local people involved?

**GE:** Need a kit of techniques which will enable us to speak to people in a way that is not officious. Have to try and understand views that we might find unpalatable at first, e.g. 'this landscape is associated with poverty and has nothing good in it.' People have some basic appreciation of bigger monuments. Smaller features need to be pointed out to them and their significance explained. Need to empower people and boost their morale. We need people, as they have more information than we do.

We can get people more active by encouraging them to expand on a personal history and make it a cultural history. Encourage them to consider what a particular monument means to them. Have activities based around monuments.

The state can't do these things as it costs the state too much. Historical Associations are already involved but need an extra kick.

**TR:** It is important in these local situations to have ideas as to how to resolve conflict in a non-didactic way.

**AO:** We have tools for many of these issues in the Landscape Convention but it is being applied top-down by government offices.

**GF:** Recommended 'Landscape in a Changing World' (European Science Foundation), which can be consulted on the web and underlined the importance of the Faro Convention. These deal with populations, landscapes and ideas of landscape. There is a need for an interdisciplinary approach to landscape. There is a need for interaction and feedback on apps and web.

Geocache and the new i-phone app for the City of Lincoln in England are examples of technology which may point the way towards enabling large numbers of people to engage with the landscape. Perhaps archaeologists should investigate this potential, rather than focussing on impacts on individual monuments.

(Lincoln app:

<http://www.hlf.org.uk/news/pages/heritageconnectthepastwillneverbeapuzzleagain.aspx>)

**CvR:** In The Netherlands, a lot of their information is being put on the web and is being used by different groups. It does not necessarily make them better at looking at landscapes.

**BD:** Archaeologists should be able to assess the CO<sub>2</sub> value of organic soils. They need to know

about biodiversity, as information about it is often used against them. Undergraduates need to be taught some of this.

**EB:** Summed up. (The following text was provided by EB).

1. Archaeologists need to engage with other land-use managers and regulatory authorities.
2. Archaeologists should inform and educate communities and decision making bodies about the nature, scale, and value of the historic time-depth evident in their landscape. It is about making “communities expert” in their own landscape. We should encourage and empower local communities, historical associations, and other environmental NGOS to use their landscape, to engage with the cultural heritage features within it and to participate in public decision-making processes that help determine its future form and function.
3. At the same time archaeologists will have to respect the outcome of such public decision-making processes, recognising that landscapes are dynamic humanly influenced places and that change is inevitable.
4. In engaging with landscape-scale issue archaeologists need to develop new tools and skill sets. These include utilising complimentary inter-disciplinary models and approaches developed by other social sciences. Practical tools might include technical ways of capturing landscape-scale information, whereas broader conceptual tools could be models such as the COE Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro, 2005). The curriculums for archaeological education at University level, especially primary degree/undergraduate level, would benefit by the inclusion of relevant courses in life sciences (e.g. biology, ecology) and relevant aspects of the physical sciences (e.g. geology).
5. Archaeologists should be advocates for the implementation of the European Landscape Convention, in particular those elements that require the participation of the general public in the definition and implementation of the landscape policies.

