Agriculture's Role as an Upholder of Cultural Heritage

Report from a Workshop

Karoline Daugstad (ed.)

Agriculture's Role as an Upholder of Cultural Heritage
Report from a Workshop

TemaNord 2005:576

© Nordic Council of Ministers, Copenhagen 2005

ISBN 92-893-1232-7

This publication can be ordered on www.norden.org/order. Other Nordic publications are available at www.norden.org/publications

Nordic Council of Ministers

Store Strandstræde 18
DK-1255 Copenhagen K
Phone (+45) 3396 0200
Fax (+45) 3396 0202

Nordic Council

Store Strandstræde 18
DK-1255 Copenhagen K
Phone (+45) 3396 0400
Fax (+45) 3311 1870

www.norden.org

Nordic Co-operation in Agriculture and Forestry

Agriculture and forestry in the Nordic countries are based on similar natural pre-requisites, and often face common challenges. This has resulted in a long-established tradition of Nordic co-operation in agriculture and forestry. Within the framework of the Plan of Action 1996-2000, the Nordic Council of Ministers (ministers of agriculture and forestry) has given priority to co-operation on quality agricultural production emphasising environmental aspects, the management of genetic resources, the development of regions depending on agriculture and forestry and sustainable forestry.

Nordic co-operation

Nordic co-operation, one of the oldest and most wide-ranging regional partnerships in the world, involves Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, the Faroe Islands, Greenland and Åland. Co-operation reinforces the sense of Nordic community while respecting national differences and similarities, makes it possible to uphold Nordic interests in the world at large and promotes positive relations between neighbouring peoples.

Co-operation was formalised in 1952 when *the Nordic Council* was set up as a forum for parliamentarians and governments. The Helsinki Treaty of 1962 has formed the framework for Nordic partnership ever since. The *Nordic Council of Ministers* was set up in 1971 as the formal forum for co-operation between the governments of the Nordic countries and the political leadership of the autonomous areas, i.e. the Faroe Islands, Greenland and Åland.

Content

Preface.....	9
Summary	11
1. The cultural heritage of agriculture	19
2. Agriculture's role as an upholder of the Swedish cultural heritage	21
2.1 In what way and how is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage in Sweden?	21
2.2 What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	22
2.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	23
2.4 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures? Who will be in control of the measures and strategies?	25
3. Agriculture's role as upholder of the Finnish cultural heritage.....	27
3.1 Background information on the development of Finnish agriculture	27
3.2 In what way and how is agriculture seen as the upholder of agricultural heritage within the respective national context?	29
3.3 What are the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	30
3.4 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture, cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	31
3.5 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures (and policies) and who will be in control of the measures and strategies?	33
4. Agriculture as an upholder of the Danish cultural heritage.....	37
4.1 Introduction	37
4.2 Agriculture and the winds of change	38
4.3 Information as a proper tool	39
4.4 Measures to be taken?	40
4.5 Nature plans – the ultimate solution?	41
4.6 EU plays a vital role	42
4.7 Conclusions	42
5. Large scale maintenance of cultural landscapes	45
5.1 Protection and/or production?	45
5.2 The Akureyri-declaration	46
5.3 Unreliability of subsidy systems.....	47
5.4 Large scale maintenance of cultural landscapes	48
5.5 Relations to other Nordic projects	50
6. Agricultural heritage in Estonia.....	51
6.1 Introduction	51
6.2 Layers of heritage.....	51
6.3 Inventories.....	55
7. Agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage in Estonia seen from the agricultural authorities.....	57
7.1 Some basic facts of Estonia.....	57
7.2 Estonian population dynamics 1970 – 2003	58
7.3 Agricultural situation.....	58
7.4 Cultural heritage in agriculture.....	60
7.5 The most expressive examples of the cultural heritage related to agriculture.....	61
7.6 The main factors for the survival of village culture.....	62

8. Agriculture and cultural heritage in Iceland	65
8.1 Iceland	65
8.2 In what way and how is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage in Iceland?	66
8.3 What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	66
8.4 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	67
8.5 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures (and policies) - and who will be in control of the measures and strategies? ...	68
9. Agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage – a view from the Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage	69
9.1 In what way and how is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage within the respective national contexts?	69
9.2 What is seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	70
9.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	71
9.4 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures (and policies) – and who will be in control of the measures and strategies? ..	73
10. Agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage – The Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food	77
10.1 How and in what way is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage in the Norwegian context?	77
10.2 What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	77
10.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	78
10.4 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures (and policies)	79
10.5 Who will control future strategies and measures?	80
11. Agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage – the Austrian position	81
11.1 Introductory notes	81
11.2 The perception of “culture”, “cultural heritage” and “cultural landscape” in Austria	81
11.3 Different perceptions of agriculture as an upholder of cultural heritage	84
11.4 Influencing factors and actors	88
11.5 Relevant activities	91
11.6 Future trends	91
11.7 Summary and conclusions	92
11.8 Acknowledgements	93
11.9 References	93
12. Agriculture and the historic environment: The view from England	95
12.1 Agriculture and cultural heritage	95
12.2 Agriculture as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape	96
12.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape	98
12.4 Future trends in the thematic focus of measures and policies and the key actors	100
12.5 Literature	101
13. Landscapes of transformation: Reflections on agriculture and cultural heritage in a man-made country	103
13.1 Introduction	103
13.2 The Netherlands as a man-made country	103

13.3 Three alternative interpretations of cultural heritage.....	106
13.4 Recent policies	108
13.5 Literature	110
14. Lessons learned, recommendations	111
14.1 In what way and how is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage within the respective national contexts? (perceptions of this “link” from the authorities, the relevant sectors, organisations, public opinion)	111
14.2 What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?	115
14.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape? ...	116
14.4 Future trends and some recommendations.....	118
Sammendrag	121

Preface

In February 2 – 3, 2005, the Centre for Rural Research and Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research (NIKU) arranged a workshop in Oslo on agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage. This report is the result of the workshop and consists of twelve contributions from the invited participants at the workshop, an introductory chapter presenting the theme for the report and a final chapter drawing out some concluding remarks and recommendations for future policy and management regarding the cultural heritage related to agriculture. These two chapters are written by the workshop organisers.

The workshop is part of a three-year-long research project (2003 – 2005) run by the Centre for Rural Research in co-operation with NIKU. The research project is funded by the Research Council of Norway. For the workshop extra funding has been provided by the Research Council of Norway as well as the major financial contribution from the Nordic Council of Ministers. On behalf of the research team involved in the research project and the workshop I would like to express sincere thanks for the funding and not least to thank the twelve participants for their written chapters in this report.

Trondheim, Norway September 30, 2005

Karoline Daugstad
- project manager -

Summary

The report presents material from a workshop addressing agriculture's role as upholder of cultural heritage. This is part of a more general focus on agriculture's multifunctional role brought about by the ongoing restructuring processes in European agriculture. By bringing together policy forming bodies, managers and researchers, the workshop served as an arena for exchange and discussion of policies, measures and strategies for a sustainable development of agriculture and the agricultural landscape. The workshop had a Nordic flavour by highlighting challenges for the Nordic countries. To mirror the Nordic situation, and to bring out differences as well as common challenges within the Nordic countries and in what way and to what extent these are unique for Norden, experiences from four other European countries were included: The Netherlands, Austria, Estonia and UK. The workshop was embedded in a research project (funded by the Research Council of Norway), carried out by the Centre for Rural Research (CRR, project leader) and the Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research (NIKU).

All invited speakers were asked to address the following questions:

- In what way is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage within the respective national contexts?
- What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?
- Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?
- What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures and policies? Who will be in control of the measures and policies?

The chapter describing the Swedish status for agriculture and cultural heritage stresses the importance of agriculture as an agent forming the Swedish landscape since 4000 B. C. Extensive farming methods have influenced and maintained valuable biodiversity which now is threatened by abandonment of agricultural land as well as intensification. The Swedish Government expresses an awareness of farms producing "common pool resources" (biodiversity, cultural heritage, cultural landscapes). An important tool is the Environmental and Rural Development Plan, ERDP, for Sweden (2000 – 2006), based on CAP, with 13 agri-environmental

measures. Two important measures are Conservation of biodiversity and cultural heritage on grazing land and mown meadows, and Valuable natural and cultural heritage environments. The measures seem to work for upholding natural grazing land and meadows, but the most threatened types of land like woodland and mountain pastures are still endangered. The uptake of measures show a geographical pattern where northern Sweden has a low uptake. ERDP will continue to be an instrument of major importance in the future. The de-coupling of support from production will continue and will promote extensive farming systems. The implications will be positive for some parts of the cultural landscape of agriculture and negative for others.

The story told from Finland is from one of the most rural countries in EU. Finland is a forest dominated country, however, the agricultural part of the national heritage is important for most Finns. There is an increasing awareness in the population regarding the effect in the rural landscape of agricultural restructuring (empty houses, overgrowth). A voluntary environmental scheme for farmers (available since the EU membership in 1995) covers 90% of the arable land and involves 85% of the farmers. Special measures for management of traditional biotopes and for enhancing biodiversity have not been very popular so far. However, farming methods have developed in a more environmentally-friendly direction thanks to environmental support and its implementation through advice, training of farmers etc. Information, advice, interactive planning and sufficient financial initiatives are seen as important for promoting and upholding the cultural heritage of agriculture. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry drew up a Natural Resources Strategy in 2002 as an outline for actions towards sustainable use of natural resources. An important element in this is to develop indicators to reflect the state and development trends of the natural resources. So far the indicators for the more cultural heritage specific part of the strategy are lacking – for example agricultural buildings and constructed environments. Another issue is the need for developing national indicators which at the same time are taking regional variation into consideration. As for future trends, decoupling agricultural support from production is a dominant policy for Finland as for CAP in general. This will lead to a further reduction of farms where the remaining ones will become larger, corporate and will need to invest in modern buildings. Traditional small-scale farming will continue, but its significance both economically and in terms of the cultural landscape is likely to be quite marginal. Following these future trends, it is pointed out that in addition to conserving cultural heritage there is a need for designing and creating attractive rural landscapes for the future.

Denmark has the most intensively run agriculture of the Nordic countries. The Danish agricultural history is 6000 years old. Especially for the archaeological remains, the cultural heritage of agriculture has been heavily decimated through the period of modern agriculture. The development

the latest decades has been towards large-scale pork production - a mode of production with a further pressure on the archaeological remains of agriculture. As a consequence of restructuring, large former agricultural areas have been abandoned, however, some areas are experiencing reoccupation by resourceful urban people who buy abandoned farms. Following this development, some rural areas will have a different population in the future where the farmers become a minority – a relevant question is then who will be the upholder of natural and cultural heritage related to farming? In order to make the farmers more responsible for taking cultural heritage considerations, information is seen as a crucial factor. In addition, cooperation between the different Ministries and between the public bodies and the farmers' organisations is important. A pilot study with Nature Plans is being carried out where the farmer together with an adviser draws up a plan indicating nature objects on the farm in order to include this in the everyday planning. By including cultural heritage in the Nature Plans it would probably improve the status for both the visible and the invisible cultural heritage (under the surface), and in addition increase the awareness and sense of "ownership" of cultural heritage for the farmer. EU policy is seen as the major agent for linking agriculture and cultural heritage concerns, especially the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development shows a promising trend through the emphasis on bottom-up processes for the protection of historic sites. However, as the British example shows, the EU has set some barriers for linking cultural heritage preservation and economic development.

The chapter presenting the view from the voluntary Nordic Association for Cultural Landscapes express a belief in the principle "protection through production". This is to say that the protection of the cultural landscapes of agriculture must first of all be based on production as regards both the cultural historic dimensions and biodiversity rather than on nature preservation alone. Related to this, there seems to be a certain "nature bias" in the focus of landscape qualities, exemplified by the terming of meadows and other culturally influenced areas as "semi-natural habitats" instead of "semi-cultural habitats". The Nordic Association for Cultural Landscapes points out that by this conceptualisation one often misses the point that these habitats and landscapes can only be preserved and maintain their authenticity by being used according to the management systems that developed and preserved them through time. When it comes to future development of agriculture, modern agriculture in economical and organisational terms will still be the main focus, however, a growing trend is the increasing demand from the urban population for products, events and experiences from a "living countryside". This tourism and niche related window of opportunity must be recognised by the farmers and the public support system, and knowledge and information is needed to develop products, networks etc. In this way cultural heritage

and cultural landscapes can be upheld through a production system and not dependent solely on public funding.

From Estonia two chapters describe the status for agriculture and cultural heritage. Agriculture has been central throughout the Estonian history. Estonia was late urbanised and has been a poor country, this has most likely been beneficial for archaeological and natural sites in the countryside. However, the last decades agriculture has gone through substantial changes. The dramatic history of agriculture and also cultural heritage in Estonia is closely tied to the shifting regimes of ownership to land. Each regime and period of agricultural production has added a new "layer" to the Estonian landscape. The recent most substantial change has been the introduction of private ownership to land during the 1990s in transition between the centrally-planned economy and the market economy. The liberalisation of the agricultural sector and opening of markets has led to a dramatic fall in profitability in agriculture. To the Estonian people today, and especially the young ones, the interpretation of "future" is almost synonymous to "urban", and the rural is seen as backwards. For many Estonians, the link between agriculture and cultural heritage is rarely made, agriculture is seen as an economic sector. However, the European model of multifunctional agriculture is being adopted by the authorities. In order to uphold the cultural heritage related to agriculture moral and financial support is needed for extensive farming practices and more focus on training and information. Farming as an activity should be rated more highly, and, finally, general aspects of rural life (such as infrastructure, welfare etc) should be improved.

The Icelandic farming system has gone through the same changes as European agriculture in general with specialisation, concentration and globalization. The farms are getting fewer and larger, and many farmers have to rely on additional income. A paradox special for Iceland is that during 1100 years of settlement changing the Icelandic natural landscape to cultural landscape through deliberate introduction of plant and animal species, forest destruction, wetland draining and more recently forestry, the "man made" or cultural landscapes are still like small islands inside the large natural areas. Nature conservation has therefore not included the agriculturally influenced landscape. However, agriculture is seen as an important upholder of cultural heritage in Iceland. Much of this heritage is not visible and can only be upheld as long as the histories of land use and cultural life is passed on to the next generation. For future development of agriculture as a caretaker of cultural heritage cooperation is needed between the agricultural advisory service, the environmental administration, museum authorities, the agricultural university and other universities, the farmers organizations, the national heritage conservation, and NGOs. Further, giving priority to information, advice and financial support is vital.

The Norwegian context is presented in two chapters. Norway was a relatively late industrialised and urbanised, and farming has been a cornerstone business, and still is in many rural communities. Cultural heritage related to farming has been a crucial part of what has been defined as the national identity. Hence, the farmers are seen as central upholders of national cultural heritage. From the Norwegian viewpoint, the cultural heritage of agriculture consists of a living rural culture, the material cultural heritage and cultural landscapes, and the non-material heritage. In addition, archaeological cultural heritage is found in the agriculturally influenced landscape even if the objects and items are not related to farming. Cultural heritage can be seen in a local, national and international context. In order to uphold active farming and thereby the cultural heritage related to agriculture, one needs economic support and also moral support to farming. The latter refers to the role of the general opinion as an increasingly dominant factor for upholding public support to farming. So far opinion polls show a strong support to farming and agricultural subsidies. This is not least important given a development where the urban population increases and the population related to farming is dwindling. In addition to subsidies and the role of the public opinion, international factors like WTO is a major influencing force. The polarization within farming will most likely continue with increasingly larger farms, abandonment of others, and a small-scale farming more and more directed towards production of common goods, niche products and tourism.

From the Austrian point of view, cultural heritage as a concept is not tied to farming as such. Cultural heritage is mainly perceived in two ways: Related to the urban sphere, based on the notion of a “Hochkultur” and with a main focus on monuments, and on the other hand a rural related cultural heritage rooted in the “Volkskultur”. The cultural heritage aspects of agriculture can be seen indirectly as part of the existing conceptual link between *agriculture* and *cultural landscape* maintenance. In this way cultural landscape is a kind of “bridging concept” to cultural heritage. Also, the cultural heritage aspect of agriculture can indirectly be seen in the concept of *culture* where the main perception is that agriculture upholds culture defined as something traditional and non-modernised (customs, folklore etc). Different actors represent different understandings of agriculture and cultural heritage (the political authorities, the agricultural sector, the tourism sector, organisations and NGOs outside agriculture, the general public). The major negative factor for the agricultural cultural heritage of Austria is the structural changes in agriculture causing intensification and extensification. However, elements of CAP can lead to a positive development: the focus on the concept of the multifunctional role of agriculture, and the weight given to rural development instead of agrarian issues.

The chapter presenting the situation in England regarding status and development trends for the agriculturally related cultural heritage is from

a predominantly rural country – traditionally – but with low employment numbers in farming and also a rather intensive farming brought about especially by UK's entry into European agricultural policy in 1973. There has been a huge loss of especially archaeological cultural heritage due to intensive farming methods – in the post-war era agriculture has been more of a cultural heritage destroyer than an upholder. However, given the fact that farmers run 77% of the land area, farmers are the main actors for upholding cultural heritage. In this respect there are promising developments related to the UK government's full embracing of the CAP principle of modulation implying a shifting expenditure from production to rural development. Another positive element is a new scheme from the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra): Environmental Stewardship. Even if there are some shortcomings to this scheme (introduced in 2005), it represents an innovative and promising opportunity for taking cultural heritage considerations in farming. However, a very promising scheme for building restoration was not approved by the EU, as it was seen as interfering with business development. This is a crucial issue. In Norway, the major scheme for cultural heritage and landscape management (STILK/SMIL) is encouraging business development linked to the scheme's payments for cultural heritage, and especially linked to the use of historic buildings.

The Netherlands is presented as a man-made country referring to the fact that the history of the nation has been one of construction and reconstruction. The man-made character is central to the Dutch identity, it applies to the cultural landscape as well as the man-made natural areas (nature development is an integral part of the cultural landscape). The Netherlands is highly agricultural and urbanized. The agricultural activity is intensive and export related. In such a "constructed" country the concept of cultural heritage is not evident, either is the perception of the link between agriculture and cultural heritage. There are different interpretations of cultural heritage supported by different actors: 1) Cultural heritage is the total sum of "here and now landscapes": A view supported by the engineering discipline and not least landscape architects. 2) Cultural heritage as a selected set of outstanding landscapes: More broadly embedded in society, supported by state organisations and NGOs in the field of heritage, nature conservation, and agriculture. 3) Cultural heritage defined as a specific historic stage in the process of landscape development: Supported especially by actors (state as well as NGOs) in the field of heritage and nature conservation.

The last chapter summarises some of the main points brought about by the previous different national contexts and developments, and present some recommendations for future policies related to the agricultural cultural heritage. As a basic trend the rural and agricultural restructuring are leading to two major, opposite development trends in rural Europe; one of increasing abandonment of land and afforestation, especially in Nor-

way, Finland and Sweden, but also noticable in marginalised areas in England and Estonia. On the other hand there is still an ongoing rationalisation and industrialisation of production in other areas. Both the CAP reforms and the WTO negotiations point towards further decoupling of payments and subsidies from agricultural production, having more payments oriented towards environmental measures but not necessarily with links to production of food and fibre. This may to some extent provide a better climate for conservation and management measures per se, but it also raises several fundamental questions, it is challenging farmers' role and also the ideas of what culture actually is. Part of the cultural heritage is seen as dependent on an active agriculture, otherwise it becomes museum-like or potentially stereotyped folklore for tourism purposes. Some points of recommendation for future policies related to the agricultural cultural heritage are: The need for a cultural heritage lobby; Knowledge is a crucial prerequisite for taking cultural heritage considerations in farming, such knowledge also involves developing good indicators in order to monitor effects of incentives and development between the sectors; There is a need for an increased focus on the possibilities and limitations related to tourism; The public opinion is increasingly important; and finally, Active landscape design as well as landscape management must be given priority.

1. The cultural heritage of agriculture

By *Karoline Daugstad* and *Katrina Rønningen*, Centre for Rural Research, and *Birgitte Skar*, Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research

European agriculture is under tremendous pressure to change and restructure. In the western part of Europe its economic, social and environmental role has been facing great challenges and changes during the whole post-war period, and its environmental problems and responsibilities have especially been focussed since the 1980s. The history of rural areas in Eastern Europe saw a new and dramatic turn after restoration of national independencies in the beginning of the 1990s.

Internationally, it is increasingly recognized that agriculture does have a multifunctional role. In addition to producing food and fibre it is also important for providing, for example, environmental benefits and contributing to the socio-economic viability of rural areas. Cultural heritage has been defined as one of several non-commodity outputs of a multifunctional agriculture.

The point of departure for the workshop was agriculture's role as upholder of cultural heritage. This is part of a more general focus on agriculture's multifunctional role. By bringing together policy forming bodies, managers and researchers, the workshop served as an arena for exchange and discussion of policies, measures and strategies for a sustainable development of agriculture and the agricultural landscape. The workshop had a Nordic flavour by highlighting challenges for the Nordic countries. To mirror the Nordic situation, and to bring out differences as well as common challenges within the Nordic countries and in what way and to what extent these are unique for Norden, experiences from four other European countries were included. These countries were The Netherlands, Austria, Estonia and UK.

The workshop was embedded in a research project (funded by the Research Council of Norway), carried out by the Centre for Rural Research (CRR, project leader) and the Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage research (NIKU).

All invited speakers were asked to address the following questions:

- In what way is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage within the respective national contexts? (perception of this "link" from the authorities, the relevant sectors, organisations, public opinion)

- What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?
- Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?
- What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures (and policies)? Who will be in control of the measures and strategies? More specifically: What role will the European Landscape Convention play? Changes in CAP, WTO negotiations etc?

Chapters 2 – 13 present the experiences from the representatives of the nine different European nations at the workshop, while Chapter 14 is aiming to point out some of the lessons learned and to summarize and to give some recommendations for the future management of agriculture's cultural heritage.

2. Agriculture's role as an upholder of the Swedish cultural heritage

By *Ulrika Bergman*, Swedish Board of Agriculture

One of the foremost advocates of the old Swedish farmed landscape and the cultural heritage values within, is Astrid Lindgren. From her books about the children of Bullerbyn or Emil of Lönneberga, millions of people have come to know and cherish the idyllic picture of the traditional farmed landscape in Småland, Sweden. But much has happened since Emil scaled the fences on his horse Lucas with Lina the maid and her aching tooth trailing behind...

2.1 In what way and how is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage in Sweden?

The cultural heritage values of the Swedish farmed landscape are seen as all the varied remains from an traditional agricultural usage. These values are seen as biodiversity as a result of various types of land use, buildings and different landscape features as well as the landscape itself.

Biological values....

Tillage and the keeping of livestock in Sweden dates back to 4 000 B.C. Farming was the dominant industry for thousands of years and these activities have naturally played a crucial role in shaping the Swedish landscape of today. Semi-natural grasslands and mowed meadows that have not been subject to any production increasing measures such as fertilization, the use of lime, drainage or sowing to leys are rich in biological diversity. Some of the pastures and meadows of today have been in cultivation over generations and the flora and fauna that have evolved are living ancient remains of traditional agricultural practices.

...Maintenance...

Today 82% of Swedes live in densely populated areas, and only 3 % of the workforce work within the agricultural sector. However most people have their own picture or idea of what the farmed landscape looks like.

No matter what picture we have, we've more or less come to take it for granted, with its open fields, the meadows full of flowers and pastures with grazing cattle. But in order to keep the open, varied, biologically and culturally valuable landscape, a viable and active agricultural sector is needed.

...Threat

However, the traditional small-scale farming, with a remarkably high small-scale species richness, has changed in favour of rationalized agriculture. For example, the area of ley production is increasing at the expense of old meadows and pastures and many semi-natural grasslands, thus traditionally managed pastures and meadows, have become abandoned. Semi-natural grassland which does not have fertilizer added and is not ploughed has fallen dramatically, and remaining acreage of mown meadows only amounts to a fraction of the original area. Furthermore, there is now only a marginal need to use landscape features as a source of forage, for example lopping the branches off trees, within the framework of a rational agriculture.

Farming without livestock and mechanization has made demands on parcelling and accessibility of the fields. Parcels of land have become larger and fewer and obstacles to cultivation, such as landscape features and biotopes, have largely been removed. Thus a gradual change in the traditional agricultural landscape has come.

2.2 What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

In 1999 the Swedish Parliament established the 15 environmental quality objectives. The 15 environmental quality objectives are based on five fundamental principles, namely; promotion of human health, preservation of biological diversity, preservation of cultural heritage assets, preservation of long-term production capacity of ecosystems and wise management of natural resources. The overriding aim is to solve all the major environmental problems within one generation.

The 13th objective in particular concerns the agricultural landscape. It is entitled "A Varied Agricultural Landscape" and it states that: "The value of agricultural landscape and arable land must be protected for biological and food production at the same time as biological diversity and cultural heritage assets are preserved and strengthened."

The farmer of today produces more than just food. He also produces *common pool resources* such as maintenance of biodiversity and cultural heritage values such as an open and varied landscape.

One instrument in management of common pool resources and the most important instrument in achieving the 13th objective is the Environmental and Rural Development Plan for Sweden 2000 – 2006. The plan is based on two EU regulations and is part of the rural development policy within the framework of Agenda 2000 and the reform of EU Common Agricultural Policy. The measures within it co-financed by the EU.

The plan builds on an integrated course of action towards rural development, both economically and socially sustainable. The plan includes financial support to agri-environmental measures. Hereby the plan covers the farmer's costs, which arise from the farmer having to adapt the holding to the measure's specific environmental conditions. It also includes support for training of farmers, training that can be used to complement and increase the benefits of the agri-environmental measures.

2.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

Different types of national legislation provide the framework for the do's and don'ts. The two most important ones are the Environmental Code and the law on ancient monuments. The Code constitutes of a modernized, broadened and tightened environmental legislation aimed at promoting sustainable development. The law on ancient monuments states that it is a matter of national concern to protect and care for our cultural environment and that this responsibility falls on everyone.

EU Common Agricultural Policy also has a major impact on the values of the Swedish farmed landscape. It has supplied us with our most powerful tool, the Environmental and Rural Development Plan for Sweden 2000 – 2006. It includes, among other things, agri-environmental measures within article 22, article 33 and training in accordance with article 9. A new plan is shaping up for the next period, 2007 – 2013.

The plan contains 13 agri-environmental measures with different goals. In brief, an agri-environmental measure is a five-year commitment (wetlands 10 yrs + 10 yrs), to cultivate according to the rules of the measure, and you can apply for payment each year. Each year 5 % of participants are subjected to field controls and failure to comply with rules results in a reduction of payment or repayment of earlier payments.

Two important measures are: *conservation of biodiversity and cultural heritage on grazing land and mown meadows, and valuable natural and cultural heritage environments.*

The table below shows the amount of land as well as number of participants in the two measures. The acreage of natural grazing land and meadows is preserved largely with present measures. Improved grazing land is still increasing, but not as quickly. However, the areas of the most threatened types of land such as meadows, woodland pastures and mountains pastures are not increasing at a satisfactory pace. And although the quantity has increased, the qualities have been hard to measure. Evaluation methods and systems of indicators are under development. The budget of the whole period (2000 – 2006) for *conservation of biodiversity and cultural heritage on grazing land and mown meadows* is approximately 3 billion SEK and between 2000 – 2004 about 2.4 billion SEK have been paid out to participants of the measure.

The managed number of landscape features of certain types is increasing satisfactory, whereas for others it is not. Why that should be the case is yet to be found out. The goal of the measure for valuable natural and cultural heritage environments is to have 18,000 farmers farming approximately 25 – 30 % of Sweden's arable land. Although the number of participants are not yet 18,000, the acreage goal has been reached. The total calculated cost of the measure for *valuable natural and cultural heritage environments* over the period 2000 – 2006, is about 790 million SEK, and during 2000 – 2004, 625 million SEK has been paid out to participants.

Results...

Measure	Acreage/object that has been given support or is calculated to receive support				Goal	Preliminary goal compliance %
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2006	2004
Conservation of biodiversity ha	386,000	411,000	426,000	455,000	450,000	101%
Cultural heritage environments, no. participants	12,740	13,438	13,655	14,094	18,000	78 %

Source: SBA Annual Report 2004

Participation...

The maps below show, to the left, the percentage of agricultural enterprises that are participating in the measure for valuable natural and cultural heritage environments. To the right, is the percentage of arable land that has joined the measure. One of the conditions of the measures is that participants have to have at least 3,000 SEK worth of landscape features in order to participate. That excludes farmers with a low density of features on their holdings, from participating. Particularly the northern parts of Sweden are excluded due to this restriction.

Source: Martin Sjødahl, SBA, 2004. *Anslutning* means uptake.

2.4 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures? Who will be in control of the measures and strategies?

Agricultural reform is bringing big changes for Swedish agriculture. With the disengagement of support from production the system will promote extensive farming regimes. The implications for natural pastures and meadows are both positive and negative. Cross compliance will affect cultivation on semi-natural pastures and meadows. But other factors will also affect the outcome. There will be less support for grazing animals when the animal support is taken off and there no longer is any support for forage acreage. Increased profitability of ley production versus cereals will steer grazing animals towards leys on arable land. However the increased profitability of extensive use of land makes it increasingly profitable to keep grazers on low yielding natural pastures and that is very positive for pastures and meadows.

The next Environmental and Rural Development Plan for Sweden will continue to be an important instrument in the preservation of natural and cultural heritage values of the farmed landscape.

3. Agriculture's role as upholder of the Finnish cultural heritage

By *Raija Seppänen*, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

3.1 Background information on the development of Finnish agriculture

The administrative sector of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry comprises agriculture, forestry and horticulture, rural development, veterinary medicine and the related control and safety of foodstuffs, fisheries and reindeer and game husbandry, use and management of water resources and land surveying. The tasks also include the funding of agricultural building investments and the related training, cultural environment and rural landscapes.

The surface area of Finland is over 338,000 square kilometres, which makes us the 5th largest country in the EU. It is also one of the most rural countries in the EU. Most of the surface area is covered with forest (80 per cent), while the share of arable and other agricultural land is only 8 per cent of the surface area. Farming areas are mainly concentrated in the southern and eastern parts of the country and along the coast of the Gulf of Bothnia, Ostrobothnia. Even if some land is still being cleared, most of the cultivable land is already being used.

The Finnish population is 5.5 million, of which about 23 per cent live in the countryside. Migration to towns, cities and other population centres has been quite strong since the 1960s, and this trend continues. The share of agriculture in the gross domestic product is 1.3 per cent.

Archaeological findings show that in some parts of Finland there was farming already 2000 years B.C. Permanent farming has been practised for about 1,000 years, mainly in the lowland areas of south-western and southern Finland, from where it spread to the other parts of the country along with the settlement. The foundation of the Finnish farming landscape was created during the Iron Age. Prescribed burning was still common in the latter part of the 19th century especially in Eastern Finland, where the clearing of the rocky soil was very difficult.

In the 18th century the rulers of the time initiated land parcelling operations to improve the efficiency of agriculture, thus reinforcing the position of farmers and laying the foundation for the still prevailing farm entrepreneurship based on private ownership. At the same time powerful attempts were started to increase the area of agricultural land: land was

cleared, thousands of lakes were drained and the water level of lakes was lowered to increase the area of meadows. Dairy husbandry became increasingly common towards the end of the 19th century (after several crop failures) and the arable area doubled due to the determined reclamation efforts to 1.9 million hectares. Almost half of the meadow area of the time was converted to arable land (1 million hectares out of 1.6 million hectares). Meadows have been converted into arable land or afforested later on as well, which is why only some tens of thousands of hectares of old natural pastures still remain in Finland.

The area used for agriculture was greatest in the first half of the 20th century. In the Second World War Finland lost the Karelia region to Russia and over 400,000 Finnish citizens from the ceded areas had to be settled within the new national borders. The settlement of the people who had lost their homes and war veterans was an enormous task. The characteristic, still very common type of residential building in the countryside, the one and a half storey "veteran house", dates from this time. It is the most typical main building on farms created during this settlement operation.

The strong trend towards urbanisation since the 1960s has changed the housing and service structures of the countryside, as well as the rural landscape. Administratively, rural areas are divided into three types:

- urban-adjacent rural areas
- rural heartland areas
- remote rural areas

The number of farms continues to fall. At present there are about 72,000 farms in Finland. The arable land area has been about the same since the 1990s, about 2.1 million hectares. Most of the farms are in private ownership.

Today Finnish agriculture is faced with a number of significant changes and processes, caused by both European and global factors. The future agricultural policy in Finland will depend a great deal on the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy of the EU. The main issues in the next few years will be the future financial frameworks and the related forms of support. To an increasing extent the national agricultural policy will also be influenced by the decisions to be made in the WTO negotiations. However, the national policy objective according to which Finnish food will continue to be available in Finland is still valid.

At present various kinds of support represent about 50 per cent of farmers' income. The next programming period will bring along changes to the support levels of all the some 72,000 Finnish farms. Many farmers, especially the middle-aged ones, may be considering whether they should quit farming. The decisions to be made in 2006 and the age structure of farmers will be reflected in the rural environment in a number of ways.

3.2 In what way and how is agriculture seen as the upholder of agricultural heritage within the respective national context?

The intensity of farming and size of the arable area may depend on:

- natural factors influencing the farming conditions
- development of society, e.g. current policies
- innovation and know-how, including farming technologies
- appreciation of farmers' occupation and agriculture

The preconditions for agricultural production at different times are mirrored in the state and condition of the farming areas and buildings. The strong agrarian tradition in Finland is reflected in the fact that one or two generations back the family of the majority of today's middle-aged Finns was still living in the countryside. This is why agriculture is part of the normal national heritage for most Finns. However, the difficulties faced by agriculture are already reflected in the environment. People are becoming increasingly aware of the value of agriculture when they see empty farm buildings and how the open arable areas are disappearing in their childhood environments and areas surrounding their holiday homes. Besides being the producer of pure domestic and local food, agriculture is also valued due to its role in maintaining the rural population and environment.

The preconditions for farming are perhaps considered the most important factors in ensuring the maintenance of the cultural environment. Good operating conditions are reflected in a viable countryside, with cultivated land and well-maintained buildings. Area with relatively uniform land use, the traditional countryside, is also appreciated from the perspective of rural tourism. The researchers especially value the long farming history. For historical reasons, however, the age of the arable lands and farm buildings varies a great deal between different parts of the country. Most of the buildings in the economic centres of farms are about 50 years old or less. The costs of renovating old buildings are usually considered quite high relative to its benefits, which is the most important reason for people to tear down old farm buildings which are no longer being used.

3.3 What are the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

The current policies and tools for their implementation determine the general ability of agriculture to produce a high-quality environment. Oversupplies led to cuts in agricultural production in the 1960s and the measures undertaken at that time resulted in migration to the population centres as well as to Sweden. Unprofitable small farms were abandoned especially in Eastern Finland, where arable lands were left uncultivated under contracts made between the state and farmers in order to reduce oversupplies. These areas could not be used for grazing, and they were rapidly overgrown by bushes.

The environmental impacts of agriculture began to attract more and more attention during the 1980s. Eutrophication has increased in the abundant surface waters of Finland, and agriculture has been identified as one of the main causes of this. Farmers' organisations, advisory services and the administration joined forces to design and implement water protection measures and develop good farming practices. Work was done in full cooperation on a voluntary basis, as has also been the case with most of the environmental protection measures undertaken in agriculture later on. Farmers have been eligible for support for environmental protection measures since 1995, when Finland joined the EU. The conditions for the support include the drafting of an environmental plan for farms together with an agricultural adviser. The voluntary environmental support scheme covers about 85 per cent of Finnish farms and 90 per cent of the arable area.

The environmental support scheme includes certain special measures concerning, for example, the development and management of landscapes, management of traditional biotopes and enhancing biodiversity. These measures have not been very popular, mainly due to the work required relative to the amount of support. Thanks to the environmental support and its implementation through advice, farming methods have developed in a more environmentally-friendly direction. The scheme has led to the production of large amounts of campaign material and training of farmers and actors in different fields, as well as making more money available for landscape management in rural environments than ever before in our country.

Agricultural investment aids are also directed to building and restoration of residential and traditional built environments. Not very much support has been applied for the management of the residential environment due to the strict criteria, low economic support and lack of marketing efforts.

Private farmers have a central role in promoting the cultural heritage and developing cultural landscapes in the rural areas. According to the Finnish experience, the most important factors are interactive planning, voluntary action, increased information through advice directed at individual farms, and sufficient financial incentive. The measures must be such that they can be undertaken on the basis of regular farming activities and they must produce some kind of measurable benefits to the farm concerned. The agricultural administration has a challenging task in developing its own activities and steering systems so that the cultural aspects gain more weight. Communication can be organised, for example, through the agricultural advisory services, whose organisation covers the whole country. Many farmers have, however, certain reservations about the advice offered by the environmental administration and museum authorities.

3.4 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture, cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

I will answer this question by presenting a few examples.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry drew up a Natural Resources Strategy in 2002. This provides the outlines for the actions of the Ministry and its administrative sector for the use and management of renewable natural resources in the next few years so that the principle of sustainable development is being followed and we are preparing for the future as well. The realisation of the objectives set in the strategy is being followed by means of 39 natural resource indicators altogether. Some of these were selected as the so-called key indicators which are considered to reflect the state and trends of renewable natural resources the most accurately. A set of indicators has also been designed for the sustainability of Finnish forestry. At the moment indicators showing, for example, agricultural buildings and constructed environments are still lacking.

In the natural resource indicators, landscapes have been considered under the heading "natural resources as part of rural development". The two key indicators for arable landscapes have been selected from the perspective of biodiversity. One of these is "landscape biodiversity", which refers to the shape of the parcels and the resulting length of field margin zones, which in turn correlates with the species biodiversity. Another key indicator is "openness", which allows the monitoring of the afforestation of arable areas as well as using former fields for building, which is still happening especially in areas adjacent to the population centres. The shift of arable areas from agriculture to other uses may affect the "openness" of the landscape, but what is even more significant is the fact that this measure is final, that is, the area used for production is decreasing.

The work on the indicators for building and agricultural landscape will get started during this year as part of the strategy for rural building to be prepared at the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Primarily the strategy would be implemented by the Ministry and regional administration. The work on the programme for the strategy process is now under way. The division concerning the environment might be the following:

- building; both new building and existing buildings
- constructed environment
- agricultural and rural landscape

In the context of preparing the strategy we will need to consider very carefully the indicators through which the implementation of the objectives will be monitored. Important questions are who will be implementing the strategy, how many indicators can be monitored by means of the available resources and whether the selected indicators are the appropriate ones, that is, whether they describe the essential factors, from the perspective of future development as well.

In some cases the indicators showing relevant information are selected on the basis of what would be "nice to know". An experimental project steered by the Ministry of the Environment, which will be completed soon, will provide the tools for the monitoring of nationally valuable landscape areas. The indicators collected in this project describe the most important characteristics of the areas concerned, showing the current state of each characteristic. However, the collection of area-specific basic data on the basis of a system with tens of indicators may be a scientifically challenging task, but it may take so long that the information may be outdated by the time the monitoring gets started.

The history of farming in a specific country often differs considerably from that of the neighbouring countries due to, for example, the farming conditions and development of the society. The strategies adopted in different countries and procedures for monitoring their implementation should be taken advantage of in designing the national indicators, but the national selections and key areas should be founded on the objectives and conditions of each country.

When designing national strategies for cultural heritage, environmental protection, landscape or building we need to identify the history of agricultural production and requirements due to production conditions. The indicators must be such that they can be varied according to the level and context we are concerned with. National objectives and strategic indicators may not be appropriate when we are dealing with individual regions or farms. In Finland the regional differences in the landscape structure, viability of the production, types of production and buildings, and so on are considerable. Recognising and reinforcing the special regional characteristics poses significant challenges to the national indica-

tors to be selected. Regional rural development strategies need indicators of their own for monitoring the realisation of their objectives. Monitoring the development of culture and environment in even smaller regional units, such as villages or individual farms, differs a great deal from the larger regional levels. The steering capacity of the indicators, benefits derived from monitoring and available resources are key factors at the farm level as well.

3.5 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures (and policies) and who will be in control of the measures and strategies?

The objectives set for the activity determine how much we are producing something new, how this is assimilated to the existing structures and what is considered worth preserving. The impacts of agricultural policy and the resulting trends in production are seldom assessed from the perspective of cultural heritage or the future cultural environment. I shall deal with this last question through the challenges faced by agriculture in the near future.

The ministers of agriculture of the European Union reached an agreement on the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy in 2003. A number of important objectives were set for the reform. Agriculture should be competitive, in both internal and external markets. Food safety and quality, animal welfare and environmentally-friendly production practices must be promoted. Environmental objectives, especially those relating to the management of natural resources and rural development, must be incorporated into the Common Agricultural Policy. Attention needs to be directed at the income level of farmers, and the development possibilities of regions must be ensured.

The leading idea in agricultural policy reform is the decoupling of support from production. The objective is to improve the competitiveness of EU agriculture. The task of steering the production is to an increasing extent transferred to market forces.

The new structure of the Finnish agricultural policy system is also founded on the decoupling of the support from production. However, in Finland decoupling does not concern, for example, the environmental support of agriculture. The planning of the details of the new system is now under way under the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. The work is broadly-based, carried out in various working groups, and the advisory organisations and non-governmental organisations are also involved.

Changes in the support system and growing price competition are likely to lower the income level of most Finnish farmers. This, together with the age structure of Finnish farmers and relatively small average farm size, is very likely to lead to further reduction in the number of

farms. According to some forecasts, the number of farms may fall to about 40,000, which is only half of the present figure, by the end of this decade.

In order to succeed in the market, even an individual farm can improve its profitability by raising the efficiency of production, for example, by purchasing additional land or increasing the number of animals. In practice, however, purchasing more land may not be feasible or profitable in regions where arable land areas are small due to natural conditions and located far away from each other. This is the case especially in eastern and northern Finland, where the cultivated area in general is quite small. In these regions the development of the countryside is largely based on sectors other than agriculture, while farming may serve as an additional attraction for modern tourism. In any case, new industries and economic activities are introducing elements which deviate from traditional structures, both in the natural and built environments.

The practising of farming and other industries in the corporate form is going to increase. This may lead to a situation where the production buildings are located further away from the other infrastructure due to, for example, their large size or environmental impacts, such as odours produced, while the owners and persons caring for the animals live elsewhere. The concept of production buildings as just a workplace will become increasingly common, which is already the case in other parts of Europe. Until recently almost all Finnish farms have been owned by farm families. The new trend can be expected to show in many ways in the rural environment.

Expanding and more efficient production calls for investment. New buildings will be needed especially in the livestock sector. The development of the design and realisation of the buildings is a great challenge. Instead of "industrial hall" type of solutions we need models that are well suited to the Finnish farming environment, yet modern in terms of the solutions used and architectural features. Efforts will be made to encourage the use of wood in the cladding of the facades through regulation and instruction. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry may set certain conditions for the granting of investment aid concerning, for example, the qualifications of the builder, materials and architectural features. So far there are relatively few experts in agricultural building and the expertise and experiences are mainly focussed on solving technical problems. The awareness and interest of farmers in the history of their own farms should be encouraged so that they would be capable of assessing the impact of the different building alternatives on the built environment and landscape of the farm.

Rural environment changes as a result of changes in the preconditions for agricultural production. Small-scale, more traditional farming will also continue in the future, but its significance both economically and in terms of the cultural landscape is likely to be quite marginal. The "con-

trolled dismantling" of farms which quit production, especially in the remote rural areas, is a very demanding task for which no good solutions have been found as yet. Advice and guidance need to be increased in the future especially in regions and on farms which are improving their production efficiency so that we can have new kinds of cultural landscapes and constructed environments with special regional characteristics alongside the old and traditional structures.

Agriculture is constantly producing new cultural heritage, even if we did not set any specific objectives for this or steer it in any special way. The question is how satisfied we are with the quality and durability of the final result. If society sets certain demands to the producers relating to, for example, landscape management and preservation of farm buildings, it would be quite reasonable for farmers to be entitled to compensation for the cost of such measures.

4. Agriculture as an upholder of the Danish cultural heritage

By *Henrik Christiansen*, Historic Consultant/Rural Development Consultant for the Zealand Family Farmers Organization in Denmark

4.1 Introduction

In Denmark, the open land has been used more or less intensively for the past 6,000 years. As such the gradual destruction of traces of ancient societies has been an on-going process. Graves have been looted, mounds have been emptied already in the prehistoric times and the massive church buildings from the 11th century have taken their toll of stones from the ancient Stone Age mounds, just to mention a few examples. Farming tools have not had a big influence on the destruction of the historic sites on open land. They were too puny, and other factors such as the mental barriers of superstition kept the destruction at a relatively low level.

Threats to historic sites did come from farming methods though. It was a result of the development of society, which called for an expansion in the infrastructure of such items as bridges, roads and city development in general.

The speed of destruction increased however during the 19th century. Schools, better information combined with a rising awareness of their own situation amongst the peasants, combined with increased income led to general improvement in living conditions. As the farmers – especially the young educated ones – were not too busy in the wintertime it became their habit to dig the mounds for artefacts, which could be sold to the emerging museums. Eventually this development was stopped by the National Museum¹ and a protection act from 1937 formally protected the cultural heritage.

The situation is different today. After World War II and especially from the 1950s onward, Danish farmers experienced an expansion such as had never been seen before. The introduction of the tractor, more efficient tools and the large-scale use of pesticides etc led to a tremendous pressure on artefacts and historic sites. Thus the arable land was utilized to its maximum. At the same time the towns boomed and expanded and

¹ Thorsen, S. 1979: Opofrende venner og farlige fjender. 1890ernes højplyndringer, og et bidrag til arkæologiens socialhistorie. I: Fortid og Nutid, XXVIII, hft. 2, København.

thousands of hectares were taken out of production and converted into suburbs. The problem became ever clearer for the scientists and the institutions which are involved in the protection of the past². A preliminary research from 1998 conducted by the museums, indicated that soil erosion was occurring on the fields at the rate of 0.5 – 2 cm/year on flat land.

As a result of this research a case study was chosen for further investigation. The site chosen is Sorte Muld on Bornholm, which is a large settlement area that covers approximately 100 hectares. Over a period of 5 years this area will be monitored regarding cultivation methods and erosion will be measured in an attempt to document scientifically the relationship between cultivation and the gradual erosion of the national heritage³.

All in all the pressure on the cultural heritage has grown immensely within the past 50 years, and it is feared that if this development continues the destruction will be definite within 20 years, especially the part of the heritage which was under the soil and thus not visible⁴.

4.2 Agriculture and the winds of change

In Denmark nearly 62 % of the land is under cultivation. The remaining 38% is urban areas, forests, heath-land and coastal areas. 85% of the population is living in urban areas. The remaining 15% lives in the rural areas but only 1% are farmers. Due to the general development and globalisation and international competition in general more and more small-scale farmers are giving up farming or they are combining their income with part time jobs outside the farming sector. Most of those that surrender move into the town and sell their land and buildings to the emerging large-scale production farmers, who specialise in pork production. Consequently millions of square meters of farm buildings are being aban-

² Hvass, S. & Storgaard, B. 2000: *Før landskabets erindring slukkes – status og fremtid for dansk arkæologi*, København.

³ I wish to thank Anne Nørgaard, The National Cultural Heritage Board for in depth information on this matter.

⁴ Steen Hvass i: *Før landskabets erindring slukkes – status og fremtid for dansk arkæologi*, København, s. 7.

doned and the land is more or less deserted as people move out of the rural areas. However, many buildings and farmsteads are reoccupied by well-educated townspeople who live in the buildings and give new life to the rural areas. That is true for rural areas which are within driving distance of the big towns. When you pass this invisible line (driving distance) the villages are more or less empty and the buildings deserted⁵.

Reduction of farms 1990 – 2002

My point is that we should be aware that the traditional inhabitants (farmers) of open land are going to be scarce in the future. New inhabitants will arrive and consequently new concepts of nature and historic perception will also be introduced. Therefore it is difficult to say whether or not agriculture can be seen as a future upholder of cultural heritage in Denmark.

4.3 Information as a proper tool

If however we try to give an answer, I believe that agriculture can be seen as an upholder of archaeological cultural heritage given that the individual farmer is being *informed about historic traces on his land*. The generation of farmers of the 19th Century had a somewhat national romantic view of the past. They were connected to life in the open space in quite a different way from those of today. A farmer of the 21st Century may share this view, but he also has a very pragmatic approach to how to utilize his land. Providing information sounds very simple, but the fact is that many farmers are not aware of the “bumps” in the field. And if they are, it does not say anything to them, until you can inform them that this “bump” happens to be 5,000 years old. Only through *information* which

⁵ Tanvig, H. 2004: Tid til Tanker: Landbrugets Oplysnings og Kursvirkksomhed, København.

he can relate to his everyday activities on his land, will it be possible to reach him. Also through bottom-up processes which are activities that come from local actors, rather than from the administration, are we able to see them as upholders of cultural heritage. And finally, if we want to see results, the legal administration regarding vulnerable historic sites hidden under ground should be much more integrated in the planning process, and preservation activities conducted by farmers should be subsidized.

We must also recognize the fact, sad as it sounds, that the protection of the hidden cultural heritage, forms only a fragment of the problems in the rural areas now and in the years to come. There are other problems relating to open land which are far more important and the focus of countries as well as the focus of EU, will be directed towards problems such as rural development, nature protection and repatriation to rural areas.

4.4 Measures to be taken?

If we look at the measures to be taken to assist agriculture to be a provider of cultural heritage, first of all more focus should be set on the issue at the political level. The administration and the ministries should work together more closely. As the situation is now, administration of the open land is divided between the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture as the main actors. The Ministry of Culture has been given only responsibility for the cultural heritage, but there seems to be no or minimal cooperation between the political bodies. The Ministry of Culture is about to identify areas, which contain the most valuable historic sites. These "cultural heritage areas" are meant to be a tool for the planners and a means to integrate historic protection as an integral part of community land management. Attempts were made in 2001 to integrate the cultural environment in the EU's rural district policy⁶. The report was not acted upon, however, due to the government change that same year.

Furthermore the farmers' organizations should be alerted to this matter. Progress is slowly being made as the Board of Danish Farmers Organization just recently passed recommendations to its members that protection of nature and culture should have top priority in the years to come.

⁶ Christiansen, H. 2002: Strategi og handling for fortidsmindernes integration i landdistriktsprogrammerne. Afprøvning af fortidsmindeintegration i projektet "Naturforvaltning på bedriftsniveau", Kulturarvsstyrelsen (upubliceret).

4.5 Nature plans – the ultimate solution?

However the recommendations were implemented in the so-called "nature plans". A nature plan is written up by an individual farmer in cooperation with his agricultural advisor. After the plan has been drawn up, the farmer has a view of all the nature objects on his farm and he can include these in his everyday planning. By including the historic sites and monuments in these plans, it is also possible to protect the visible cultural heritage but more important – to inform him about all the non-visible sites and locations as well. By including the historic sites you not only protect the cultural heritage, but you also give him "ownership" of the sites and even more important you add an historic dimension to his land which he probably was not aware of before.

Nature plans are not yet a formal tool imbedded in the subsidiary measures within the rural district regulations. It is merely a pilot program which is about to be terminated. The preliminary results will be evaluated in the near future. After the evaluation the Ministry may turn the plan into a legal measure.

A few examples should be mentioned to show how integration of cultural heritage can be used in the nature plans. Two collective nature plans are in process. One is currently being drawn up in Jutland⁷ and a second in a remote part of southern Zealand. By working out plans in a collective way, it is possible for the farmers to organize better nature/historic protection over larger areas. Another type of nature plan is drawn up for a single farmstead. If these types of plans become a tool for future land management, there is a magnificent possibility for the farmer to protect the national heritage.

Agriculture can be a serious and responsible upholder of the archaeological cultural heritage provided that:

- Better information is provided through his advisory chain, that is within his own system
- More emphasis is put on integration and protection of the historic sites through the legal framework
- More funding is given for protection of the cultural heritage as in Sweden and England
- Training courses are run, showing how cross-compliance can relate to the historic structures in the landscape.

⁷ Christiansen, H. et al. 2004: Kollektive naturplaner – lokalt engagement for et bedre landskab. I: Byplan nr 6, København.

4.6 EU plays a vital role

It is obvious that the EU and its regulative function plays a major role as a measure for linking agriculture and cultural heritage/environmental values in the agricultural landscape.

The fact that millions of Euros are poured into rural areas as subsidies to European farmers every year shows the importance the Common Agricultural Policy. However the mid-term evaluation of the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development clearly states that the protection of historic sites should be emphasized through these funds through bottom-up processes. There is hope for the cultural heritage to be protected through these regulations. They do not however mention the invisible parts of the cultural heritage anywhere.

The farmers and their associations have been engaged in nature protection through the above mentioned projects set forth by the EU and the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries. In these projects the focus has been on nature protection conducted by the farmer or on a collective basis.

4.7 Conclusions

- Political bodies at the highest levels should join forces and work out serious recommendations for the protection of the cultural heritage.
- More information should be made available to the people who live in rural areas.
- More emphasis should be put on the use of the EU's new Agricultural Fund – both the advisory bodies within farming circles and the

museums should work more closely together in order to protect the crumbling traces of the past.

- The development within the Danish agriculture is similar to the development in other nations within the EU. The number of traditional farmsteads is decreasing and large-scale farming is becoming a normal sight in the landscape. The mono-cultural landscapes as we know them now will prevail for a while but we will probably see a gradual change to a more dynamic and multifunctional landscape where part time farmers roam the fields.
- The bottom-up processes as outlined in the EU's Rural Development Fund will have a decisive impact on the development and protection of the cultural heritage whether it is visible or not.

5. Large scale maintenance of cultural landscapes

By *Søren Espersen*, Nordic Association for Cultural Landscapes

The *Nordic Association for Cultural Landscapes* is presently preparing a workshop and a Nordic project, which is to develop new ways of organising maintenance of cultural landscapes on a larger scale. This project also aims to promoting development of local high quality food production, tourism, open air activities etc.

The *Nordic Association for Cultural Landscapes* is working to protect and enhance information on cultural landscapes in the Nordic countries. The aim is to promote protection and maintenance of cultural landscapes as living landscapes with a rich biodiversity and based on sustainable production, employment and on an active population in the countryside. It is the only voluntary organisation working at a Nordic level on these matters.

Some of the most attractive landscapes in the Nordic countries are the cultural and semi-cultural landscapes. Their history is first and foremost the history of agriculture.

5.1 Protection and/or production?

Protection of these landscapes should therefore first of all be based on production as regards both the cultural historic dimensions and biodiversity rather than on nature preservation alone. The concept of nature preservation tends to treat the impact of man as unwanted and harmful to the overall idea of nature as a relatively stable and self-sustaining system. Hence the apparent fear of many nature preservation organizations of using the word “culture” in their communications. They prefer to use terms like “semi-natural habitats” instead of “semi-cultural” or just cultural habitats and landscapes. In doing so they often miss the point: these habitats and landscapes can only be preserved and maintain their authenticity and values by being used according to the management systems that developed and preserved the areas through time. And more than that: the organizations often unintentionally create opposition among the local people by preventing the areas being used productively, thus creating a feeling among many that these areas are, though perhaps pretty and interesting, essentially useless in a modern society.

So preservation and maintenance of semi-cultural (meadows, heath-lands, commons etc.) and cultural landscapes is dependent on continued use for productive purposes. But production on the semi-cultural landscape types has not been “comme il faut”, nor economically worthwhile during the last 30 or 40 years of intense concentration and specialization in the agricultural industries. Also today and in the future, production must meet the demands of a modern agricultural system according to economics and income, organization, social and animal welfare etc. The difference is, that today we have a large group of citizens who are willing to pay for products, events, experiences, “good stories” and exclusive living quarters etc. which, at least taken together, can generate enough added value to make a small group of farmers more interested in farming systems with more respect for cultural landscape, cultural heritage and biodiversity.

But do we have the right knowledge, an efficient and practical organization and not least the necessary guts to promote this line of development? Or have we become so dependent on public money from the EU, on traditional nature conservation and on the fight against the on-going intensification of modern agriculture that we have lost sight of all the alternative ways of organizing agricultural production? Do we really have to re-invent multifunctional agriculture as more than a new scientific term? I am not sure.

There are many good initiatives among farmers, planners and managers, even in Denmark. But generally there is a lack of knowledge of what to do and perhaps more importantly, of what not to do. There is lack of organization and of common action between farmers, local organizations and entrepreneurs in most rural districts. This is a serious barrier when it comes to promoting modern, practically and economically applicable and viable management systems in the local political arena. These are some of the questions the Nordic Association of Cultural Landscapes will be dealing with in the project on large-scale maintenance of cultural landscapes in the Nordic Countries.

5.2 The Akureyri-declaration

In August 2004 the Nordic ministers of agriculture, forestry and food signed the AKUREYRI-declaration on *The Future Role of Agriculture and The Cultural Landscape as a Resource*. It was signed as a result of a conference in Norway 2003 on the topic *Agricultural Landscapes as a resource in the Nordic Countries*. It was the first time ever that the Nordic ministers had discussed a declaration on *cultural landscapes*.

The Council of Ministers gave their full support to increased cooperation between development of agriculture in the future and the protection and use of cultural landscapes as a resource in future development processes. This also includes a more conscious use of the cultural landscape –

and biodiversity as well – as a foundation for development of villages and rural districts. It also implies the need to protect and maintain the full variation of cultural and natural values in the agricultural landscape.

I will quote some of the more important points of the declaration:

“We declare that

.. there is a need to develop new forms of cooperation and a new way of sharing the functions between the authorities and the agricultural industries in the question of developing the countryside and agriculture in line with societies' new demands and wishes and in a way that takes the demands of the market into consideration.

... we will focus on the role of the agricultural industries in the management of the natural and cultural values in the landscape as a foundation for a long-sighted sustainable development and for the role of agriculture in the development of the countryside.

... it is a precondition to sustaining a living countryside that the inhabitants and the involved organisations in the Nordic countries have the opportunity to take part in the planning and decision processes involving the future developments and roles of the countryside, the landscapes and the agricultural industries.

... the Nordic countries must enhance focus on management, maintenance and development of important agricultural landscapes and the agricultural industries as a resource for identity, recreation and habitation for wider groups of people in society and as a potential for new services and enterprises. “

5.3 Unreliability of subsidy systems

For the moment the agricultural support systems are undergoing change. We know there will be less support for production and more support to individual farmers provided they accept and live up to the system of cross compliance. At the same time more money will be allocated to rural development. What effect these changes will have on the possibilities of keeping up a living cultural landscape is far from being known yet, at least not in Denmark. What we do know is, that in Denmark it will have an effect on the economy of grazing and meat- and milk-production. It may also be more difficult to develop new services and enterprises combining agricultural production and rural development as the support systems simply are not sufficiently coordinated. We also know, that in Denmark there will be no support for maintenance of cultural landscape elements, but this is more due to a lack of political will to allocate the necessary national co-financing.

This agricultural reform is just another broad hint to us that we should not rely on a public support system forever if we want to protect our landscapes and biodiversity. Historically the EU system was based on a food shortage after World War II. Now we have surplus production of mass-produced food at prices lower than ever.

At the same time the demand for luxury food, experiences, travel, good stories with authenticity, exclusive living in the countryside is growing more than ever. People are willing to pay almost anything to have a cheese made on top of a certain mountain in the Pyrenees, provided the cheese is of good quality and there is a story to go with it. But for how long is the taxpayer willing to pay for a landscape that his family left three or four generations ago, if he can't taste it, hear it, live in it, smell it (that is, if the smell is good of course). Not for very long, I'm afraid. The landscape must give the taxpayer something he really wants – something like a feeling of luxury and well-being that may – or may not – create a sense of belonging. The landscape can do so if we permit and encourage the farmers interested in developing sustainable production in the areas to do so. The farmer is there! Farmers prefer to produce and they deliver a unique amount of work for a very small amount of money – if they get the right incentives.

This is our only chance to maintain a living cultural landscape with rich biodiversity and an active rural population.

5.4 Large scale maintenance of cultural landscapes

The aim of our project is to develop a Nordic network of large-scale protection and maintenance of cultural landscapes including their biodiversity. The network should not only benefit specialists in agrarian history and scientists. It should first of all act as a framework or a basis for local farmers, voluntary organisations and entrepreneurs, who want to develop more commercially and production-oriented management systems in the local landscape. The network should ensure identification, registration and transmittance of knowledge about historical land-use systems and guarantee that adaptation of these systems will be applicable and functional in modern, multifunctional agricultural systems based probably mostly on small-scale production. Farmers who specialize in cultural landscape management may produce raw materials for the local food and craft industries, for tourists, urban dwellers in the region etc.

One of the more concrete results we are going after is the construction of local or regional “handbooks” on management of the different cultural and semi-cultural landscape types – heath-land, dry meadows, marsh-lands, areas with archaeological remains etc.

The first step in the development of these handbooks will be a description of the different aspects of the local historical land-use: techniques, crops, economy, organisation, impact on biodiversity etc. This will ensure that the subsequent implementation of modern management system will have an impact on landscape and biodiversity that is as close to the historical impact as possible (what ever period one chooses as a reference). The different elements in the landscape will be presented to the visitor in

relation to the landscape as a whole. This is an important part of the “good stories” that are to sell the local products in the end.

The next step will be to analyse what is left of the different landscape types. What state are they in? Are they scattered and isolated or is there still a fairly close connection between land use, hedges, fences etc. to be seen and understood? This might – but will necessarily – result in an evaluation and prioritisation of the areas in relation to future projects. It might also in some places result in an attempt to reconstruct e.g. old in-field-outfield systems

These two steps are not new. A lot of information is already there but it is not necessarily being used systematically in the development of local management strategies.

The third step is where we hope to be able to add a new dimension to the traditional systems of management. Can we, on the basis of our knowledge of the old historical land-use system, the genetic resources, the traditions for food production etc. develop and implement handbooks that will give the farmer a guarantee that adaptation of historical land use systems will be applicable and functional in his modern, multifunctional small-scale agricultural system? And can we in this way contribute to the development of local production of food, handicraft, tourism, open-air activities etc. that in its turn is dependent on a well-managed cultural landscape both in the production processes and in marketing and sales? This would create a new alliance in the countryside between the agricultural industries, the new entrepreneurs and the local organisations asked for by the Akureyri-declaration.

To do so the project will seek to establish lasting cooperation between regional museum farms and regional agricultural advisory services. Together these two institutions could form local centres of competence to facilitate further investigation, development and implementation of all the numerous types of production and services that alone or in combination could add the necessary extra value to all the numerous and necessary activities protecting and maintaining our cultural landscapes. Other partners could be local development- and distribution-centres for small food producers.

In France there are today 55,000 farm dairies, each producing their individual cheeses. They sell their cheese. In the Swedish county of Jämtland there are now about 25 producers. They also sell their cheese and their number is growing. And this is only cheese. It is very enlightening to see what this production means to the cultural landscapes when you compare it to landscapes without any production or a landscape influenced by modern, intensive large-scale farming systems.

5.5 Relations to other Nordic projects

The project can at some points be seen as a further development and concretisation of other projects initiated by the Nordic Ministers Council. One of these projects is “Fair is the blooming meadow – a study of traditional Scandinavian and Baltic Rural landscapes and biotopes and their survival in modern times” from 2004. This project was however more focused on the development of traditional financial incentives for better management and on research, planning, advising and monitoring. Each are necessary elements but they will hardly alone develop the positive interaction between production of high-value products based on the cultural landscape and a proper and lasting management of the same landscape. And they will still be totally dependent on public funding!

Another project that should be mentioned is the MANTRA-project: Management and conservation of traditional landscapes in the Nordic and Baltic countries and in the Republic of Karelia. The goal of this project is to promote networking and internet-based education on managing techniques for stakeholders and NGO's and to disseminate and exchange know-how and scientific information created by different projects.

A few other projects could be mentioned. They all, however, lack the idea of the direct connection between preservation, maintenance and development of high-value production for a market longing for events and experiences. The final aim of our project will be to develop the framework for this link.

6. Agricultural heritage in Estonia

By *Riin Alatalu*, Estonian National Heritage Board

6.1 Introduction

Cultural heritage, political and cultural history of any nation cannot be discussed and evaluated separately from the history of agricultural production and rural way of living. Agriculture has been very dominant in the cultural development of Estonia for thousands of years. Urbanization started in the late 19th century with industrialisation and building of railways.

We should consider the poor conditions throughout history to be beneficial in a sense as we still have today a large variety of archaeological and natural sites, traditional fields, pastures and rural architecture reflecting the ideas of different centuries. The rush “from folklore to modern society” that characterizes the development of our nation from the end of 19th century to the Soviet occupation in 1940 influenced mainly the facade of the cities; the Estonian countryside preserved its conservative traditions much longer.

The agricultural landscape has been rapidly changing in recent decades and it is our duty to consider what we must evaluate as cultural heritage, and why, and how to preserve this for the next generations.

6.2 Layers of heritage

Heritage can be divided into layers of main periods of agricultural production and adoption of new ideas through political events. Every change in political life or social structure has left its own layer and signs of earlier layers. These marks can still be recognized in our landscape, on the maps and in architecture. Many political and cultural changes and developments in Estonia are connected with the ownership of land.

- Pre-Christianization period is represented in landscape as archaeological sites- remains of *villages and ancient fields* (plough-land). Due to very thin, poor soils, the fields were harvested as barks. These unique fields are mostly found in north Estonia which lies on limestone, mainly in Rebala preservation area. Also *pagan graves* are very

often situated in the middle of cultivated fields. A burial place in the middle of one's fields might have been a symbol of power and property.

- After the conquest of the country by the German Order at the beginning of 13th century and during later domination by different political powers, the local habitants lost piece by piece first free use and later property of the land, becoming dependent on foreign landlords and later taken into serfdom. The traditional village structures were altered by erecting manors. The farm houses were pushed off to the edges of villages. Type of soil is another factor influencing the type of village. Until the middle of the 19th century, it was common to divide the land of a farm into numerous small fields - we have examples of farms cultivating 42 different pieces. This system forced common harvesting, and the main field-work had to be done by the whole village at the same time. Common pasture was typical of the northern and western part of Estonia. The planning and structure of a village and the number of farms in the village depended on how the land was divided - the villages never grew very big since in a large village the land in agricultural use would have been too far away. Estonia and northern Latvia have also a very unique building type, typical only to this area - a farmhouse and barn under the same roof. Due to serfdom and lack of experience and money, the farm buildings remained very archaic.
- Manors of the foreign landlords developed as production units. A typical manor consisted of several buildings for agricultural production and processing (barns, drying sheds, dairy, different mills, cattle sheds, stables, distilleries etc). Modern ideas, techniques and influences of the time were generally introduced by landlords. Earlier manors were quite modest, the fancy and luxurious main buildings were built only from the second half of the 18th century, when the income from distilling spirits for the Russian market made landlords very rich. The production of vodka also influenced cattle breeding. In the beginning of the 20th century Estonia was famous not only for meat, but also for butter production.
- The laws from 1816 and 1819 laid down by the Russian Emperor brought serfdom to an end, though real changes began only after 1849 and 1856 when the peasants were allowed to buy land according to new laws. By 1880 three quarters of all farms were consolidated. A lot of farms including the buildings were moved to the edges of villages to receive compact pieces of land. Separate districts in villages or even separate villages were formed by peasants without land, in Eastern Estonia mainly habited by Russians and soldiers.
- We can speak of improvements in the peasants' lifestyle resulting from the possibility of acquiring ownership of the land. The peasants started to improve their houses - chimneys had pipes on the roof, well

off peasants from fertile Central Estonia started to build opulent farmhouses following the example of manors. This was also the time of re-designing national costumes; the tradition of all-Estonian song festivals was started too.

- With the 1919 Land Reform the new-born independent Estonian state nationalized the majority of the land of the Baltic German landlords and divided the manors in the first place between those who had fought for Estonia in the War of Liberty. Compact fields and territories were divided into smaller lots and in many cases even given to people who were not interested in farming.
- The young state made big efforts to develop agriculture and rural society, special courses on modern agriculture were held, and support was given for co-operative systems such as common dairies and also loans to farmers. The state also efforts to promote a modern and “European” lifestyle, thus influencing architecture and modern commercial buildings in traditional landscape.
- In the 1940s the dramatic changes of the Soviet regime turned the established system upside-down. The majority of well-to-do and more active farmers were deported to Siberia, all the land was nationalized and people were forced to join the collective farms and sovkhoses. New people were moved into farms which had been family homes for generations. During 50 years of occupation typical farmlands and fields were changed a great deal. The collective farm fields were of enormous size and carelessly cultivated with heavy machinery meant for the Ukrainian steppes and the farming method was not in any way sensitive to cultural heritage remains like old graves etc. The architectural look of the countryside was ruined by enormous ugly cowsheds, factories and apartment houses suitable for the towns. The changes affected traditional village structures including roads and fences. In its peculiar way, the soviet system still preserved a lot of buildings with ethnographical significance; although unused, out of fashion and in poor condition, there was no owner to tear them down!
- The restoration of Estonia's independence in 1991 brought along great changes as the switch to a market economy supported urbanization. The Property Reform returned the land to the heirs of former owners. A majority of them had already been urbanized and did not have any knowledge about farming. The former Soviet market was closed down and this has influenced the living standard of country people. A lot of farms are now used only as summer cottages. Some owners are foreigners who have brought new ideas and traditions into the Estonian countryside.

Regarding the above-mentioned development we can consider as agricultural heritage the following:

- Ancient fields and villages
- Rural farm architecture
- Manors as agricultural production/processing units.
- Traditional village planning and structure, fences, fields and roads
- Social and agri-industrial buildings, significant landmarks such as windmills, watermills, dairies, smithies, and also different buildings related to the collective farms

Main problems in preserving agricultural heritage:

- The significance of farming as a way of living has been reduced
- Cultivation and cattle breeding may be a threat to archaeological sites and traditional village structures
- Many buildings are no longer functional today (mills, dairies, storehouses)
- Urbanization means that a lot of farmhouses are empty or used only as summer homes
- Countryside can be seen as a suburb, bringing new traditions to rural life
- New fashions and standards - buildings which are unique from the historical and ethnographic conservation point of view are rebuilt according to modern standards
- Traffic, widening of roads
- Strict hygiene regulations controlling food production in traditional industries - mills, dairies, milk posts etc.
- Lack of money for conservation
- Lack of knowledge

Estonian National Heritage Board (NHB) is in charge of preservation of listed monuments. The budget for supporting conservation covers only minimum needs. Majority of rural buildings are not under state protection and NHB acts in most cases as an advisory panel together with museums and other institutions. For example within nature protection areas local institutions also take care of traditional fields and buildings.

In recent years NHB has made efforts to gain an overview of the current situation, to evaluate the context of historical buildings, village structures etc as heritage and state regulations for preservation.

6.3 Inventories

In 2004, the inventory of all of the windmills on the islands of Saaremaa and Hiiumaa was concluded. (There are only some wooden windmills left on the mainland. The inventory excluded Dutch-type stone mills). Not all these windmills are under state protection. The goal was to list all windmills, their technical condition and possible sequence of restoration. Inventories will be used to apply for funds for restoration from different foundations and sources. Based on the data seminars will be held for the owners and local authorities to teach them about evaluating and preserving the windmills.

In 2002 – 2004 an inventory of Koguva village in Muhumaa was made. This is the only complete village in Estonia under state protection. Based on this inventory it was decided to grant special funding from state budget. To support a reasonable working plan for restoration of the Koguva farms, NHB held a seminar for the owners and gave every owner a description of the technical condition of the buildings.

In 2005 an inventory of dairies has been started.

In 2005 NHB has begun the project to evaluate Rebala Heritage Preservation Area. Rebala is the only protection area outside towns. Formed in 1987 mainly as an archaeological preservation area with over 300 archaeological monuments on 70 square km it has exceeded its original idea and is now protected as a landscape with nearly 2,000 years of habitation. The inventory is based on historical layers from the Stone Age to present times, including monuments, historical buildings, village planning and structure and valuable landscapes. The project will be carried out in cooperation with local authorities and local inhabitants. The evaluation will be the basis for the theme-plan of the area and also for regulating new housing areas.

We have to realize that agriculture has a very significant role in the preservation of cultural heritage. Farming provides income for people living in traditional countryside style and provides a use for the historical buildings which we identify as characteristic features of the landscape of our home. Supporting the rural people, the traditional and also modern agricultural production, means that cultural heritage is kept alive. National Heritage Board, Ministry of Agriculture, local authorities and other organizations are obliged to help people with funds for preserving and evaluating their heritage but also by continuing education and by providing written information about how to preserve the heritage of our forefathers.

7. Agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage in Estonia seen from the agricultural authorities

By *Eike Lepmets*, Ministry of Agriculture

7.1 Some basic facts of Estonia

The Republic of Estonia shares a common land border with Latvia and Russia (the latter is the eastern border of the EU) and a sea border with Finland and Sweden. The total area of Estonia is 45,227 km², including 43,200 km² of land area. More than a half of the land area is forestland, one-third is agricultural land, and mires and bogs cover one-fifth. There are 420 rivers and brooks in Estonia.

The population of Estonia was 1.361 million as of 1 January 2002. The population has significantly decreased after the country re-gained its independence (see figure); at first mainly because of migration, after that because of the negative birth rate. However, the demographic situation is less favourable in rural areas because of the bigger number of dependants. The ratio of people below and above working age to the population of working age is 54.6% in rural and 46.7% in urban areas. The reason behind this is the migration of young people to cities where the labour market has more to offer them.

7.2 Estonian population dynamics 1970 – 2003

Estonian population dynamics 1970 – 2003

The population density in Estonia is very low compared to the EU; the average population density (on the total land area of the country) is 31,3 person per km², while the rural population density is 10,4 person per km².

The monthly average gross wages have increased by nearly 11% a year in Estonian businesses. The monthly average gross wages of paid labour in agriculture have been about 40% lower than the average of all enterprises. The gap was the largest in 1999, when an agricultural worker was paid 46% less than the average wages of all firms. Studies show that the gap between the income of urban and rural households has constantly increased in recent years.

In 2001, the unemployment rate in rural areas was slightly higher among men (13.8%) than among women (12.8%) and the difference has remained stable over the past five years. The duration of unemployment in rural areas has increased, which complicates the situation on the labour market. The low employment rate has a negative impact on the revenue base of local governments and reduces their ability to provide rural population with adequate services. The high unemployment rate and the low quality of services make young people leave rural areas and the local social environment becomes even less attractive.

7.3 Agricultural situation

A crucial change in agriculture during the 1990s has been the reintroduction of private ownership of farmland in transition between the centrally-planned economy and the market economy. Buildings and machinery were privatised and the land was restored to former owners, if possible or privatised to current users. At the beginning of the 1990s, agricultural

production, which was highly subsidised in the Soviet period, became practically unsubsidised and prices began to form freely. Estonia opened its markets and applied a liberalised trade policy, while the major trade partners continued to subsidise their exports. The Estonian agricultural products had no access to the EU market for a long time. The Soviet markets were lost (but about a half of the former output volume was oriented to them); the Russian market closed almost completely for the Estonian agricultural products in the second half of 1998. Because of the situation described above, agricultural output has decreased year by year. As seen from the graph below, livestock production in general has decreased about threefold in the last 20 years.

Field crops area has decreased from 1993's 1,057 million ha to 0,810 million by 2000 and further to 0,517 million ha by 2003. In 2001, agricultural census identified agricultural land use on only 64% of the land used in 1993. Further decline of agriculture is not foreseen, increase is possible and logical in some cases, in other areas the agricultural land use will still decrease, overall area being restricted with support funding regulation.

Livestock dynamics

In Estonia, the structure of agricultural land by farm size groups is quite similar to the respective structure in the EU. The farmers who have more than 100 ha use a majority of agricultural land in both the EU and Estonia, and the percentage of land in size class under 2 ha is relatively small in both cases. However, smaller holdings have a relatively higher share in land use in Estonia: the farmers who use up to 20 ha of agricultural land account for nearly 30% of all agricultural land in Estonia and only 19% in the EU.

Structure of agricultural land, %

	Less than 2 ha	2<5 ha	5<10 ha	10<20 ha	20<30 ha	30<50 ha	50<100 ha	Over 100 ha
Estonia	2.8	6.0	8.7	12.3	7.0	7.4	7.6	48.2
EU	1.7	3.7	5.1	8.3	7.3	12.4	20.0	41.3

Source: 1997 EU census data, 2001 Estonian census data

However, when distributing agricultural holdings by size groups the situation is different. In Estonia, there are a relatively large number of very small holdings of less than 2 hectares. At the same time, there are 1,020 large farms of more than 100 hectares and only about 5,000 farms of 20 – 100 hectares in Estonia.

Agricultural holdings by size class of agricultural land

	<2 ha	2-5 ha	5-10 ha	10-20 ha	20-50 ha	50-100 ha	>100 ha	Total
No of holdings	27.515	16.545	10.818	7.759	4.239	973	1.020	68.869
Agricultural land, ha	24.325	56.658	76.356	107.814	125.751	66.346	422.549	875.799

Source: Results of agricultural census of 2001

75% of farmers are only farming the land they own, but its share of total agricultural land is only 32%. On the other hand, 16% of farmers have only rented land in their possession but this responds to 29% of the total agricultural land.

7.4 Cultural heritage in agriculture

If an inquiry was made among the Estonian farmers about what would be in their opinion the role of agriculture in the creation and maintenance of cultural heritage, it is not likely they could answer the question. Can agriculture really be related to culture?

First of all, agriculture is seen as a sector of the economy, of which the aim is to produce primary agricultural products. People grow cereals and vegetables, keep animals etc and do not analyse daily what would be the other valuable “products” of agricultural activity. Looking back in time, the relationship between agriculture and cultural heritage is absolutely clear. A greater part of cultural heritage is directly related to agriculture.

The Estonian writer Hando Runnel has said: "Culture is not only high level mental production but in particular home, the way a free person lives, operates and behaves." Therefore, above all culture indicates lifestyle and the signs of the lifestyle handed down by former generations and inherited by younger generations serve as its output. All the sectors of cultural heritage (real inheritance, structural inheritance, settlement system, language, history, traditions, folklore, life style) and agriculture have been closely intertwined in the past, are closely intertwined at present and will be closely intertwined in the future. Thus, cultural heritage also arises from the present agricultural activities, although it will not be valued until centuries have passed.

Besides traditional production-oriented agriculture, multifunctional agriculture is appreciated and supported more and more. The European model of agriculture has been defined by the EU Agriculture Council as follows:

European agriculture as an economic sector must be versatile, sustainable, competitive and spread throughout Europe (including the less-favoured and mountainous regions). It must be capable of maintaining the countryside, conserving nature and making a key contribution to the vitality of rural life and must be able to respond to consumer concerns and demands regarding food quality and safety, environmental protection and the safeguarding of animal welfare.

In that context the vital role of farmers with regard to countryside management, nature conservation and therefore also agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage is clearly expressed.

7.5 The most expressive examples of the cultural heritage related to agriculture

Agriculture as a landscape designer

Most of all, agriculture has been described as a landscape designer. When fields (including the smaller ones) are in use and different arable crops are grown there and grasslands are mown or grazed, with open landscapes the aesthetically enjoyable landscapes are preserved and the diversity of landscape patterns comes to the fore. If only some time ago 26% of the Estonian agricultural land was not used, then in the last couple of years lands have been put back in use again and at present, about 820,000 ha of agricultural land is occupied.

In particular, the semi-natural habitats in which the number of species is significantly bigger due to continual mowing or grazing, give colour to the great number of species in agriculture. A great number of rare plant and animal species can be found there and at the same time some of those meadows serve as important staging or feeding places for migrant birds.

If the end of the 19th century was the brightest period of semi-natural habitats making up about a half of land in Estonia, since the middle of the 20th century the importance of those lands has decreased a hundred times due to the new more intensive ways of management.

Landscape elements

Several landscape elements can be related to agriculture – different types of stone walls and picket fences for barriers to prevent access to the fields, heaps of stones, cattle trails, hay sheds, milk trestles, trees and tree groups in the fields etc.

Local breeds and varieties

The natural diversity of an agricultural environment can be measured on a genetic, population or ecological system level. Genetic diversity can be related to variety and animal breeding in agriculture. The Sangaste Rye, bred by Count Berg, is one of the oldest survived Estonian grain varieties. Two native breeds, the Estonian native horse and Estonian native cattle, have adapted themselves to our climate and plants, they are a part of our cultural heritage. The breeds referred to as well as the Tori horse and Estonian heavy draught horse and Estonian quail have been designated as endangered breeds due to significant falls in their numbers.

7.6 The main factors for the survival of village culture

- 1) Moral and financial support needed for:
 - Extensive farming practices
 - Advice, training and information materials
 - Less-favoured areas
 - Buying environmental and cultural services from farmers;
- 2) Farming as an activity should be valued more highly;
- 3) General aspects of rural life should be improved (new jobs, survival of village schools, improving cultural life etc).

One of the basic alternatives to supporting extensive farming, local breeds, varieties, landscape improvement, training etc. is agri-environmental support. Here society is buying environmental services from farmers.

Estonia has applied agri-environment support over three stages by:

- 1) Implementing certain measures nationally since 2000. Support was granted for organic farming and for Estonian native cattle; since 2001 support was granted for the management of semi-natural habitats;

- 2) Implementing the full set of measures in pilot areas, which have been selected in clearly defined and contrasting regions since 2001 (3 rural municipalities). Support was granted for environmentally friendly management, breeding of Estonian horse, restoration and maintenance of stone walls, management of overgrown agricultural land, also the establishment of ponds and mixed species hedgerows;
- 3) Full implementation of the programme at the stage of accession in 2004. In 2004, support was granted horizontally for environment-friendly farming, organic farming and breeding of Estonian horse. In 2005, support is granted in addition for breeding Tori horse, Estonian heavy draught horses, Estonian native cattle and for the establishment, restoration and maintenance of stone walls.

Agri-environmental support makes up 38% of the budget of the Rural Development Plan. The uptake of the environment-friendly farming was very successful, ca 55% of the utilised agricultural land is covered by the measure.

8. Agriculture and cultural heritage in Iceland

By *Ragnhildur Sigurðardóttir*, The Agricultural University of Iceland

The aim of this workshop is to address the multifunctional role of agriculture as an upholder of cultural landscape and heritage. Agricultural products are not only meat or milk, but also landscape, “living” traditions, place names and histories to give some examples. At the Agricultural University of Iceland we define agriculture as living and using the land.

8.1 Iceland

Iceland is an island of 103,022 km² and its most northerly extremes border the Arctic Circle. Despite the latitude the winters here are relatively mild with a mean January temperature of around 0 °C, owing to the warming influence of ocean currents. The mean July temperature in lowland areas is about 10 °C. Around 11 % of the surface of the country is covered with glaciers, 6 % with inland water, woods cover 1,3 % and lava 10,7 %. Only 1,3 % is cultivated land. Cultivable land below 200 m above sea level is 15 % of the total area (statistics from the Farmers Association of Iceland). The settlement is located mainly along the coast. Of the total population of 290,570, nearly 270,000 live in urban areas which leaves rural areas with only around 20,100 people. The current number of farms in Iceland is 3,286. Almost all farms are owned and run by farm families. A typical dairy farm has 25 – 35 cows and a typical sheep farm has 300 – 500 winter-fed sheep. The average age of farmers is now 53 years. For the younger generations in modern Icelandic society, it is strange to look 100 years back in time when Iceland was one of the poorest countries in the world and the nation depended on sheep farming.

The wind of change has affected Icelandic agriculture with for example specialization, concentration and globalizations. The farms become bigger and fewer. Many farmers have to rely on other income beside the farm. That will probably continue.

8.2 In what way and how is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage in Iceland?

During the 1,100 years of settlement Icelandic natural landscape has become cultural landscape. It is a paradox that even though we have changed the flora and fauna almost completely (foxes are the only land mammal that came on their own to Iceland, all other species have been brought by man), with forest destruction, wetland draining, and import of new species and more recently forestry, “man made”/cultural landscapes are like small islands inside the big natural areas in Iceland. Nature conservation policy has therefore not included agricultural landscape.

The authorities' relevant sectors and organizations, along with the general public opinion, seek to define agriculture as one of the main upholders of cultural heritage because:

- Agriculture is the glue that holds rural communities together
- Old traditions survive longer in a sector with deep historical and social roots
- Strong communities in rural areas are vital for ever-changing, living culture in those areas.
- Many modern people seek after “feeling of belonging” in the landscape, the landscape of their childhood and therefore dislike radical changes

The emphasis can be on the historical part (that buildings and other remains tell stories of life and work of past generations), on the vegetation, and the importance of cultural landscape for fauna and flora or the importance of cultural landscape for recreation and tourism. A big part of our cultural heritage is not visible. The remains from the earliest settlement are mostly ruins of grass and stones and stories about the settlement history. They will only live as long as there is someone living in the rural areas to pass them on.

8.3 What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

- Market needs, and their cultural, social and economical values are crucial.
- Technological development carries many possibilities and threats.
- Farmers are responsible for land use in big parts of Iceland and that makes them central actors. It is positive that many institutions now have come to that understanding.

- For further development of agriculture as a caretaker of cultural heritage as well as producer of other traditional goods, we need cooperation. Between the agricultural advisory service, the environmental administration, museum authorities, the agricultural university and other universities, the farmers organizations, the national heritage conservation, and non- governmental organizations.
- Farmers need increased information, advice and financial support.
- Especially important actors are the grassroots organisations, for example of women in agriculture. The framework established by the movement of women in Icelandic agriculture in 2002 is that everything that is undertaken in its name must have the object of promoting the role of women in the farming community, strengthening the farming community and agriculture as such, forcing positive links between urban and rural communities and ensuring that consumers of agricultural products are satisfied and well informed. Agriculture is an important profession which is rapidly losing people, and the group that is first to leave rural areas is young women. The lack of women in the front line of agricultural matters is harmful to the image of the sector. The agricultural sector survives on customers' goodwill and therefore needs to "keep up with the times" in order to survive.
- It is very important for rural communities that the people engaged in agriculture should be professionally and socially strong.

8.4 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

We need framework for cooperation within and between the agricultural, environmental, and heritage management sectors.

What should we do with reference to the landscape, and what should we not do?

What do we want to protect from changes?

How can we adopt the new to what is already there?

- Contracts
- Legal instruments
- Area planning instruments
- Property management plans
- Environmentally friendly guidelines, good farming practices, sustainable development
- Cooperation, training, information, digital pictures, data base
- National strategies with respect for special regional development for example in buildings

8.5 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures (and policies) - and who will be in control of the measures and strategies?

- The consumers seem to demand milk, meat and other products at a reasonable price. They also want animal welfare, sustainability, biodiversity and well-managed cultural heritage. The agricultural sector has to meet those needs.
- Cooperation with property management plans, worked by the farmers themselves with assistance from the agricultural- environmental-, and heritage management sectors and with use of the newest technology (project carried out at the agricultural university) has given good results.
- Changes in the support system, decoupling of support from production, influenced for example by the WTO negotiations and the EU policy.
- The awareness and interest of farmers and other people living in the country side, of the history of their own farms and surroundings.
- The growing understanding and respect from the urban population of the cultural importance of agriculture

9. Agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage – a view from the Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage

By *Even Gaukstad*, Directorate for Cultural Heritage

9.1 In what way and how is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage within the respective national contexts?

In what way does agriculture uphold cultural heritage?

It is upholding a *living culture* and carrying on an industry dating between 5,000 and 6,000 years back in this country. And – a living culture is a culture where changes occur all the time. These changes are however not always intended.

It is also upholding a *material cultural heritage* and a *cultural landscape* containing a wealth of irreplaceable sources of knowledge and experiences about past and present culture. And this landscape is ever-changing, an ongoing process shaped by a multitude of different actors and factors.

- This material cultural heritage includes dwellings and farm buildings, technical installations, gardens and farmyard trees, infield and outfield farmland.
- Also included is how land tenure, property structures and land consolidation are embodied in the landscape.
- The agricultural landscape in Norway also has an ethnic dimension related to the Saami population and two different national minorities of Finnish descent, living in Northern and Southern Norway respectively.
- We should also be aware of the social dimension in the landscape. Even in Norway not all those who farmed were free farmers, their history is also to found in the landscape. Do we recognize this?

Agriculture is also upholding a corresponding *non-material cultural heritage* related to a rich heritage of, amongst other things, traditional knowl-

edge associated with historical farming methods and the supplementary activities which were a normal part of Norwegian agriculture. This knowledge has a sustainability aspect which also ought to be of interest in our present situation.

In addition the agricultural landscape also holds an *archaeological heritage*, both with and without links to the history of farming. This represents a cultural heritage continually under threat from modern farming methods, a different challenge compared to the other points I have mentioned.

How do we see this?

This cultural heritage represents a cultural diversity based on adapting to a wide variety of *local* natural conditions in a part of Europe in many ways only marginally suited for agriculture. This applies both in the extreme north, up in the high mountains and on narrow patches of land along an exposed coast. The result is an especially rich cultural diversity.

In a *national* context the farming population with its cultural heritage has been a vital factor in our history and was central in the process of developing an independent Norway with a specific national identity during the 19th century.

We ought perhaps also to see this in an *international* perspective, even if the question was related to our national contexts. Cultural diversity has become more important and has gained international attention on a number of occasions. (I will here only refer to the world summit in Johannesburg 2002 and to the fact that both UNESCO and the Council of Europe are at present directing work towards conventions concerning cultural diversity.)

9.2 What is seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

The two central points relating to agriculture's role seem to be *where* we will have active farming in the future and *how* it will be done. From our point of view the obvious goal related to the second point is to promote activities that can safeguard the cultural heritage and prevent activities that are detrimental to the same heritage. These activities can come both from within the agricultural sector and from the outside. Reallocation of farmland to other uses is of course an example of the last category.

Some factors to consider

International factors and actors will of course to a certain extent define our national freedom of action, both concerning agricultural and environmental policies.

Within this freedom of action these points may become vital:

- The development of our agricultural policy and the practical balancing of the different elements within the scope of multifunctional farming and
- the development of regional and rural development policies, future trends concerning settlement patterns and industry in the different parts of Norway, changes in property structure and future regional differences in the level of active farming.
- Pressure on farmland around cities and densely populated areas is an important point of conflict. Farmland is turned into building land and is also disappearing because of new roads and other installations associated with transport and communications in different parts of the country.
- The position of agriculture in public opinion and the level of political support for different types of agricultural policies in the future will be vital. The need for moral as well as economic support.
- The development of a national policy concerning cultural heritage, with the sector responsibility for environment as a vital element. Norwegian agriculture has recognized this sector responsibility, and we regard them as a key partner in co-operation and an essential actor in the management of our cultural heritage.
- And a last point – the technological development will also be of interest. Some examples: Deeper ploughing will increase the threat to archaeological remains, new and bigger machines demand new or drastically changed buildings and new methods of farming may make traditional building types superfluous.

9.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

In our co-operation with the various sectors of society we usually relate the question of measures to what we see as *the three main perspectives in our sector work*:

- The sectors' management of their *own cultural heritage*.
- The sectors' management of their *own activities* to consider and take care of the total cultural heritage affected.

- The development of the potential for *employing the cultural heritage* in different activities, implemented according to the principles of sustainability:
 - In Norway we have created the word “verdiskaping” (= value development/value added) to describe a more active approach towards realising the cultural, social and economic values inherent in the cultural heritage.
 - I might also add that the introduction of the sector perspective in our environmental policy has underlined the necessity of paying attention not only to the objects – the cultural heritage as a material heritage, but also to the subjects that manage this heritage through their daily activities.

On a more *generalised level* this question concerns spatial planning and resource-development measures at all geographical levels, especially at the local level. The same concerns the measures for regional and rural development policies affecting settlement patterns and industry in farming areas.

What types of measures do we have?

- Legal instruments are important within both the agricultural and heritage management sectors.
- The deciding measures however will always be the economic instruments relating to the same sectors of society. Quite a lot has been said in the previous chapters, especially from an EU point of view.
- Various administrative measures:
 - Forms of co-operation. We have in Norway positive experiences from more than 15 years of direct co-operation between the cultural heritage and agricultural sectors.
 - Training – Ulrika Bergman mention this (see chapter 2) and
 - Information – Henrik Christiansen emphasise the need to supply the farmers with necessary information about the cultural heritage (see chapter 4). The availability of up-to-date cultural heritage data bases is of course crucial, and last year digitally available registers for archaeological monuments and sites, protected buildings and cultural environments were made available to the public here in Norway.

A specific challenge is related to what can be seen as two different principles in the development of measures, both seemingly necessary and being used today:

- We have measures aimed at many farmers and the total cultural heritage.
- We have measures aimed at few farmers and selected parts of the cultural heritage given special emphasis or priority.

A parallel division is seen between:

- Measures of an obligatory character with associated demands.
- Measures representing opportunities for the farmers, based on voluntary participation.

During the previous decade the researcher Katrina Rønningen used the terms:

- broad and shallow &
- deep and narrow

to describe two dominating strategies related to the development of economic measures in agriculture's management of environmental qualities.

9.4 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures (and policies) – and who will be in control of the measures and strategies?

People working with the past are perhaps not the ones best suited to predict the future. On the other hand we usually maintain that we cannot look further into the future than we are able to understand our past! I'll try to present a number of perhaps rather obvious points.

We will probably see a sharpened divide between a growing urban population and a dwindling population related to farming. Fewer people will have any deeper understanding of the realities of farming and the cultural heritage that is connected with this activity and way of living. Both for the agricultural sector and the cultural heritage sector this represents a challenge, as several of the contributors have touched upon. We need to uphold some such understanding to preserve a necessary "resonance" in the population for this field of work.

We have probably still to find good ways to reconcile the process towards:

- on one side, a more “globalised” agriculture with political and economic focus on food and fibre production at low prices, and on the other side
- a growing awareness in the population for the values of environment and for biological and cultural diversity supplemented by
- a growing willingness to pay for environmental goods, like food, experiences and beautiful landscapes based on the cultural heritage of the farming population. Søren Espersen mentions this last point (see chapter 4).

What will the international focus on cultural diversity mean here?

Will this produce a more clearly defined division between mass production and niche production? Will this have regional consequences when it comes to the question of where and how? Will measures in the future be better attuned to local distinctions and cultural diversity?

The development of various measures must incorporate the different perspectives of seeing the farming landscape as respectively:

- an arena for the production of cheap food and fibre and
- an arena for the “production” of recreation and experiences, quality of life etc.

How should this be done? Are we talking about different areas, different regions for different productions?

What about the wish some farm owners have to sell off their farmland and keep the farmyards or parts of it? With an increasingly liberalized farm land legislation, will this be possible in the future? Will the individual farmers and farm-owners have greater freedom of choice between different strategies, and what will be the consequences?

The point related to economic production based on cultural heritage seems to be gaining momentum, the demand for experiences, local and regional distinction, authenticity, more attention towards traditional food etc. is increasing. This seems to me a central trend to focus on, as is also the case in our Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

What will more power to the market mean? Will it concern all the products coming from agriculture, the total multifunctional palette including their cultural heritage and landscape production?

The connection between agriculture's primary function as a food producer and its function as a producer of public goods like cultural heritage is important for us. What about the initiatives of decoupling the management of agriculture's cultural heritage from active farming? Authenticity must surely be a central topic in the coming debate.

In that context I am tempted to finish with an assertion from the Norwegian researcher Arild Blekesaune: If farmers are to be responsible for the future production of non-trade concerns, it is obvious that they have to farm.

10. Agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage – The Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food

By *Frode Lyssandtræ*, Ministry of Agriculture and Food

10.1 How and in what way is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage in the Norwegian context?

Norway is relatively young as an industrialized and urbanized country. Most people have close relatives or relations to rural districts and to farmers. Norwegian identity as it was built up in the 1800s, was also related to farming societies. Many Norwegians therefore identify with rural landscape rather than cities. That is the reason why Norwegians value agricultural landscapes highly. The farmers are maintaining these physical and non-material values.

Since Norway just recently moved away from being a mainly rural society, the cultural monuments in Norway to a large extent are linked to the agricultural landscape. The farmers are in that way also stewards for a large share of our cultural monuments and landscapes. That gives them an important role as upholders of these values.

The agricultural community is also seen as an important upholder of non-material cultural heritage (cooking traditions etc.). Different farmers organizations and rural organizations take pride in making sure old recipes, traditional music, handcrafts etc. are kept alive and that the knowledge is passed on to the next generation.

10.2 What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

The main drivers for the change in the agricultural sector have (as for other sectors) been economic and technological development. Increased efficiency has made it possible to produce more food with much less

manpower. Only during the last 35 years we have seen large changes. The number of farmers in Norway in 1979 was more than 125,000, while the number has dropped to 58,000 in 2003. Many farms have also gone from being family farms to being one-man operations. These rapid changes make a big challenge for us in maintaining the cultural values related to farms and farming communities.

Looking into the future there are many activities that are important. One important factor is the international negotiations on trade issues (WTO negotiations) that can change the current agricultural policy, and can increase the pressure on efficiency in the sector. That again can increase the change rate in the sector. Fewer active farms and farmers will most likely increase the pressure for change on the cultural values of traditional farming and on cultural monuments and landscapes. But also the national agricultural policy is important in maintaining the cultural values. During the last 10 – 15 years environmental issues and cultural values have become a more important part of the agricultural policy. I will come back to that later.

The main actors in maintaining the cultural heritage related to rural life are of course the farmers themselves. They have the monuments on their farms; they maintain the landscape in their everyday activities and they hand their traditional craft skills on to the next generation.

In Norway, where the survival of an agricultural sector as we see it today is totally dependent on subsidies and payments from society, the politicians are very important actors. The politicians are dependent on the national agricultural authorities to get the necessary information from the sector and to carry out the policies. That makes the agricultural authorities important actors, as well. Because of the policy of making the different sectors responsible in the environmental policy, the cultural heritage/environmental authorities' direct influence has been reduced the last decade, but they are still important actors in administering the overarching policy and measures, and they provide an important knowledge base.

And last but not least society (public opinion) is an important actor in this aspect. The dominating values in society influence policies, and since agriculture is so closely linked to politics, people's opinions matter.

10.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

The legal instruments from the cultural heritage authorities underpin the valued physical cultural heritage. A large share of listed buildings etc are those connected to agriculture. The economic instruments from the cultural heritage authorities are also important. They are supposed to reduce and even take away the extra cost of having listed building, and even

though the amount of money in these measures today does not meet the demand, they are important signals to farmers that their farms are valued by society.

However, it is the general agricultural support that is the most important measure in the maintenance of these values. Without this support very few farms would stay in business, and it would be hard to maintain many of the traditional values. These measures also keep people living in rural areas, and that is probably the most important factor in maintaining these values. Without a permanent settlement in rural areas, it is hard to maintain the values over time. We have experienced that in the fishing villages all along the coast of Norway that were abandoned in the 1960s and 1970s.

A living countryside also helps in the upkeep of non-material cultural heritage and traditions. It is much harder to maintain traditions when they are taken out of their historical context.

When people can make a living on an historical farm they also maintain the cultural heritage on the farm. In that way society gets value back for the money they put into the sector.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Food also have targeted agriculture legal measures that are linked to the support schemes, so called cross-compliance measures. They make sure that the farms that receive support do not destroy cultural monuments or damage structures in the landscape that are important for wildlife. The Ministry also has targeted economic measures. These measures are administered in the municipalities and at the regional level.

The Ministry also has increased focus on business development in relation to cultural heritage. The measures are aiming at business development in general, but cultural-related business and tourism are important parts of regional development, and that the Ministry supports.

10.4 What future trends can be seen regarding the thematic focus of the measures (and policies)

It is always hard to predict the future, but if we only look a few years ahead it is very unlikely that the current trends are going to change. That means increased polarization and diversification with larger and more production-effective farms on one side and abandonment on the other. However, the trend also indicates a growing share of small-scale farming with focus on “producing” common goods (landscape, cultural heritage etc.), and providing goods and services for tourists. These services are often related to non-material cultural heritage such as local cuisine, craft, local traditions etc. It is important for the sustainable development of the countryside that a good proportion of the farms continue to have permanent settlement, even if they have stopped their conventional farming or

gone into more extensive farming. How few people there can be in an area before the community collapses (becomes unsustainable) is very hard to define, but it is a political goal to make it possible for people who want to live on a farm to be able to do so. It is however a big challenge for the society to develop job opportunities in many of these areas.

10.5 Who will control future strategies and measures?

The agricultural sector has the most important instruments today, and will continue to have so in the near future. The current trend is to regionalize many of the measures for business development and for environmental issues. Economic and legal instruments are also being moved from central and regional government and to the municipalities. The idea is that these issues are best solved close to the challenge. The money provided for these measures is however still under control of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

The measures are increasingly disconnected from agricultural production. This is also an international trend, so it is likely that the disconnection from production is going to continue.

The economic contribution from the cultural heritage authorities has been limited, but with a growing interest in cultural heritage there can be hope for increased economic support for the maintenance of cultural values in the countryside.

However, the objectives regarding maintenance of cultural heritage sites and buildings are very ambitious, and it is uncertain if the instruments we have today are sufficient to achieve these objectives. The Ministry of Agriculture and Food are going to work hard to obtain the high goals, but this is of course dependent on the willingness of society to provide the necessary resources for the job.

11. Agriculture's role as an upholder of cultural heritage – the Austrian position

By *Markus Schermer* and *Christoph Kirchengast*, University of Innsbruck, Centre for Mountain Agriculture at the Institute of Sociology

11.1 Introductory notes

The understanding of cultural heritage in connection with agriculture differs not only from country to country but is related to the cultural background of different societal groups. The task of this paper is to present the Austrian position on these topics.

A first brainstorming among colleagues suggested that the first thing related to cultural heritage which comes to ones mind is either classical music or arts and architecture. A more systematic search in literature and on the internet on the connections between cultural heritage and agriculture revealed that there are two strictly separated understandings of culture related either to the urban or to the rural sphere. The contribution of agriculture as such however seemed largely restricted to the preservation of cultural landscapes. Looking more closely again in these terms we tried to follow up the different expressions of culture in connection with farming.

The paper therefore starts off with a general discussion of the notions of culture, cultural heritage and cultural landscape in the Austrian context. It continues with the different understandings of the role of agriculture by various stakeholders and stakeholder groups. After a discussion of the factors influencing the connection between agriculture and cultural heritage and relevant activities to support this link the paper concludes with an outlook on future trends.

11.2 The perception of “culture”, “cultural heritage” and “cultural landscape” in Austria

As a first step we would like to discuss in general the understanding of the above-mentioned terms in the Austrian context. This general understanding forms the basis for special notions of their connection with agriculture.

a) Culture

In Austria mainly two relevant forms of “culture” (besides numerous “subcultures”) are strictly separated:

- Firstly an urban form of culture, which is often also termed *Hochkultur*, found in museums, concert halls and opera houses as well as in urban architecture.
- Secondly forms of *Volkskultur* (folk culture) which are mostly rural and often agricultural and alpine, and which preserve traditional folklore.

Both perceptions of culture have an idealised and romanticised past as an anchoring and starting point: For the *Hochkultur* this is notably the Habsburg Empire while for the folk culture this is the romantic stereotype of the “original” and “native” alpine farmer (as will be described later). Both, *Hochkultur* and *Volkskultur* today serve as important sales arguments for tourism industry and have hence a strong influence on the collective identity of Austrians as Köstlin notes: “(...) *the Alps, which - along with the imperial metropolis of Vienna - have become the main tourist attraction....*” (Köstlin 1999/2, p. 151) and “*As landmarks they activate touristic and identity-productive capital (...)*” (Köstlin 1999/2, p. 150).

Folk culture includes therefore also and especially the preservation of the alpine cultural landscape and the traditions and customs related to it. In many cases these customs are even rather recent but they are sold as original and are perfectly suited for the amusement of tourists. As farming used to be the main lifestyle of rural populations in the past, this attitude is also transferred to agriculture. Thus agriculture is perceived mainly as culturally valuable if it rejects modernity and technology and remains in a “traditional” form. More recently a new cultural task had been assigned to agriculture in conjunction with the preservation of a cultural landscape. Both understandings of *agri-culture* focus on the past and there is little evidence of modern cultural expressions.

b) Cultural Heritage

The classical perspective on cultural heritage starting from the inception of the term in the time of the French revolution up to the UNESCO convention for cultural heritage focussed on monuments and buildings which were by and large supplemented by other meaningful places as defined by various sciences like history, archaeology, natural sciences and ethnology (Temel, 2004).

The notion of cultural heritage still seems to be vague and not yet well defined. For instance only in October 2004 the Ministry of Education, Science and Arts commissioned a research project to conduct “a feasibil-

ity study on the collection and preservation of scientific and cultural heritage in Austria" (http://www.uma.at/press/releases/200410_kulturerbe.html). The first definition of cultural heritage used by this project is very encompassing and talks of an "*offer for identification for individuals and groups*" (Temel 2004, own translation). The project decided not to start with a normative definition, but from a series of "lead concepts" which will be established from two ends: firstly from the recent findings of cultural studies and secondly from a stakeholder-based process including as many persons as possible who are involved in practical aspects of cultural heritage.

A recent call for school projects initiated by the Ministry of Education, Science and Arts "cultural heritage - tradition with future" aims to raise the public awareness of cultural heritage in the current Austrian jubilee year 2005 (60 years of the Second Republic, 50 years since the state treaty that established an independent Austria after World War II) (http://www.bmbwk.gv.at/schulen/pwi/pa/kult_erbe.xml). It restricts its understanding obviously to the definition of monument. The project lists "*world heritage sites as well as local and regional buildings and art monuments but also 'land monuments' etc.*" as possible topics.

While there seems to be a good deal of uncertainty over the meaning of the term "cultural heritage", there is at least a legal definition of the term "monument". The Austrian federal law on preservation of monuments (Bundesgesetz betreffend den Schutz von Denkmalen wegen ihrer geschichtlichen, künstlerischen oder sonstigen kulturellen Bedeutung (Denkmalschutzgesetz – DMSG), BGBl. Nr. 170/1999) defines monuments as „*manmade immobile or mobile objects (including remnants and traces of forming human treatment as well as artificial buildings or shaped soil formations) of historical, artistic or otherwise cultural relevance*" (own translation).

c) Cultural Landscapes

The main agricultural contribution to cultural heritage according to the above mentioned definition can be understood as the production and preservation of cultural landscapes. Cultural landscapes are included in the legal definition of monuments as well as in the understanding of cultural heritage by the relevant ministry.

However a recent major government-funded interdisciplinary scientific research programme (Kulturlandschaftsforschung 1992 – 2003, www.klf.at) used a definition of "cultural landscape" which does not relate to cultural heritage at all. In the concept for this research focus cultural landscapes were defined as "*spatial structures which are perceived by man as a unit, consisting of natural conditions and human impact. Cultural landscapes develop and change over time as a result of the*

interaction of socio-economic, cultural and natural factor." (Begusch et al, 1995, own translation).

This definition obviously can include any landscape which was influenced by man and excludes only absolute wilderness areas. Cultural heritage however includes only certain forms of cultural landscapes which are highly valued by society, but certainly not all agricultural landscapes in general. Very often the value of a landscape is connected to a product which is unique (or at least advertised as "unique"). This applies for instance to the "Wachauer Marille" (apricot from the Wachau, a landscape by the Danube which was even awarded UNESCO world Heritage site status). Also the Bregenzerwald in the province of Vorarlberg applied to become a UNESCO world heritage site. One of the main features is the traditional form of "Stufenwirtschaft" where farmers migrate with the entire household in various stages seasonally between the farm in the valley and alpine summer farms. This practice is found all over the Alps but most pronounced in the Bregenzerwald (Geser, 2004). The key product (mountain cheese) is a basis for regional identity as well as for tourism development. A thematic route ("Bregenzerwälder Käsestraße") aims to link farms, dairies, restaurants and shops under the common theme of cheese and to promote the entire region by this means (Schermer et al. 2004).

11.3 Different perceptions of agriculture as an upholder of cultural heritage

In the Austrian context the connotation of agriculture and cultural heritage differs between stakeholder groups.

a) Perception by political authorities

Agriculture is perceived as a means to preserve the cultural landscape. The rhetoric of "cultural landscape" appears in many political statements, but it is not generally perceived as part of "culture" or of "cultural heritage". Sometimes however the two terms are used simultaneously. Then cultural heritage is connected to traditional patterns of land use and traditional patterns of settlement. For example the regional government of Lower Austria notes under the heading of "environment, nature and landscape quality" in the regional development concept cultural landscapes together with cultural heritage in one chapter:

"the cultural landscape, with agriculture and forestry as the features coining its image as well as the historically grown appearances of villages, is to be conserved. Changes should only happen under respect of their original character. The architectural - physical quality of a historically grown cultural landscape with its historical villages and towns is a prominent feature for cultural and regional iden-

tity. Preservation and maintenance of the cultural heritage have rightly a high political esteem in Lower Austria (for instance in the frame of village renewal). The cultural heritage is documented by the declaration of two special landscapes (Semmering and Wachau) as UNESCO world heritage sites. Characteristic elements of landscapes need therefore to be taken into consideration in all planning documents also in the future. (www.noel.gv.at/service/ru/ru/landesentwicklungskonzept/u-n-l-qualitaet.htm#9).

Especially in official documents dealing with regional planning this connotation is often found (eg.: Regionalprogramm Tennengau www.salzburg.gv.at/raum_tennengau). There the preservation of cultural heritage is also connected to the fostering of cultural and regional identity.

Also politicians sometimes have a more general understanding that traditional ways of living are part of a cultural heritage. For instance the Austrian federal president Dr. Thomas Klestil opened the agricultural fair “Agraria” in Wels in the year 2000 by saying that agriculture is not only a economic sector but also *a form of living which still determines our cultural self-understanding*. He criticised the results of an industrial agricultural policy, focussing on mass production and stated that with the loss of the cultural landscape the societal roots of farming would be dying too.

b) Perception of the agricultural sector

The agricultural sector itself found it difficult for a long time problems to accept the shift of duties assigned to farmers by the public which occurred from the end of the 1980s onwards. We can describe this as a shift from production to protection. By then the public support was more and more decoupled from production-related payments and tied to the sustainable management of landscapes which were generally dubbed “cultural landscapes” (implying that all landscapes traditionally formed by agricultural activities in the past result in cultural landscapes, not only those with specific aesthetic or biodiversity values). An empirical regional study (Burger-Scheidlin, 2002) has shown that farmers acknowledge that they are increasingly regarded by policy and society as “landscape stewards” but that even small-scale farmers in alpine regions cannot or only to a very limited extend identify themselves with this image. It is a mere economic necessity to accept the payments. A farmer once likened this shift of tasks assigned to them by policy and society to the following: *“it is as if a carpenter would be paid for producing shavings and not furniture”*. It seems however that this negative attitude towards landscape stewardship has considerably decreased at least in public statements. On the occasion of the 100 years jubilee of the biggest farmers union (the “Bauernbund”) in autumn 2004 a parade with more than 4000 participants was held in Innsbruck. The symbols used in the presentations were showing that the farmers are more and more defining themselves as protectors of natural resources and stewards of the landscape.

Also the “Forum Land”, an organisation which is part of the Bauernbund, describes land stewardship on the homepage of their Lower Austrian branch (a region where farming is more intensive) as a major task of agriculture.

c) Perception of the tourism sector

Interest in land stewardship is especially voiced by the tourism sector. The claims made for cultural landscapes as a basis for tourism are manifold. In Austria where almost the entire landscape (with the exception of the bare rocks) has been transformed by centuries of agricultural use, even what are commonly perceived as “natural” landscapes are in essence “cultural” landscapes. Together with traditional forms of land use they form the base for what Steckenbauer (2004) calls “natural and cultural heritage tourism”. He argues that the specific feature of this form of tourism is the search for an unique place in contrast to “history tourism”, which tries to find “places in the past”. Steckenbauer understands by cultural heritage the cultural traditions, which find their agricultural objectified expression in the cultural landscape. Probably the recently rising interest in holidays on farms (their tradition dates back to the 1970s in Austria) is part of this form of tourism. Steckenbauer equates “natural and cultural heritage tourism” with “sustainable tourism”.

The agricultural sector is trying to use the metaphor of “the cultural landscape as a basis for tourism” to gain more financial support or to forge new alliances with regional gastronomy to make better use of the regional products. In the later case the result can be a revival of the gastronomic cultural heritage.

There are a number of farmers’ initiatives which want to use the preservation of a cultural landscape as the base for economic activities. A good example is the “Bio-Heuregion Trumer Seen” in Salzburg. This initiative builds its activities around the generic topic of hay. They claim to be one of the largest regions where no silage is made but instead hay is produced. They relate the appearance of the cultural landscape to the practice of hay-making. There are several regional dairies which produce cheese from “hay milk”. Scientific evidence is used to support the idea of hay milk being of superior quality. They also elect a “hay queen” who, similar to the “wine queens” in wine-growing areas, has to open public events under the overarching theme of hay. The region has a high touristic profile and the initiative wants to build a form of endogenous sustainable development on “hay culture” and organic farming. They form the coordinating umbrella for a number of organic marketing initiatives which are trying to connect tourism and agriculture.

But the connection between agriculture and tourism has considerable repercussions on cultural expressions. Often it is not even clear any more for the local population whether traditional events (like the return of cows

from alpine pastures) are cultural expressions or tourist attractions. Sometimes agricultural traditions are even “reinvented” for tourist purposes or traditions are transferred from one place to another in the search of new tourist attraction. Often traditional customs form an empty shell which is filled only by economic considerations of tourist managers.

d) Perception of Organisations and NGOs outside Agriculture

Environmental organisations and non-traditional, oppositional farmers' organisations try to link *Agri-cultural* heritage with issues of biodiversity. This includes efforts to preserve the genetic resources especially old seed varieties and rare breeds. For instance the NGO “Arche Noah”, which is basically an organisation for seed-saving, explicitly claims the in situ cultivation of rare seeds as agricultural part of cultural heritage (www.arche-noah.at/)

Another biodiversity-related approach coming from various NGOs is to forge alliances in the rejection of the use of GMOs (Genetically Modified Organisms) in agriculture or of patents on life. In this case the preservation of a cultural landscape is connected to the halting or at least slowing down of structural change in agriculture which in itself is again connected to preventing the uptake of new biotechnologies. The use of GMOs in farming is perceived as a strong agent of structural change with a damaging effect on cultural landscape and traditional forms of agriculture in general. As organic agriculture is often seen as a tradition-related form of agriculture the rejection of GMOs is often linked with the preservation of production possibilities for organic agriculture.

e) Perception of general public

As already explained above for the general Austrian public “culture” in general is often restricted to arts (music, literature, paintings, sculpture, architecture etc.). If culture is related to the rural sphere, often folkloristic attributes of culture and tradition come to peoples' minds. Folk culture attributed to mountain farmers is perceived as more “original” or “natural” than the urban *Hochkultur*. In this sense especially mountain farmers are perceived in their task of landscape maintenance as stewards of nature and custodians of cultural heritage.

The general public views agriculture as a sector that maintains traditions and conservative values. The already-mentioned parade was described in the regional news media as bringing the traditional culture to town. This refers to a large extent to the participants wearing traditional costumes which are associated with farming.

Also the tacit agricultural knowledge of meteorological relations (“Bauernregeln”), the knowledge of the influence of the moon on growth

and quality, knowledge of medicinal plants etc. are often understood as part of cultural heritage.

Within agriculture specific notions of culture are attributed especially to two groups of farmers according to the sociologist Hermann Denz. These are hill farmers in mountainous areas and wine producers (viticulturists) (Denz, pers.communication). The common feature between the two groups is that they represent the romantic image of rural life which was common in the late 19th century. This was also the time of the “discovery of the alps” and early alpine tourism. In the historical tradition this perception was continued in the “Heimatschutzbewegung” (movement for the protection of home), which was active during the 1930s in what is called the Austrofascism and interrupted by the “Blut und Boden” ideology of the Third Reich. After World War II the romantic notion of “Heimat” in connection with mountain farming and viticulture was revived in literature and films to suggest continuity.

The strongest expression of cultural landscape in mountain farming is found in the alpine pastures (Alm or Alp) which form the linguistic base of the Alps and of all alpine activities (e.g. alpine skiing). The cultural landscape of alpine pastures is an immanent part of the societal concept of the alps and thus also of Austria which calls itself frequently an “Alp Republic”: *“Since Austria calls itself the Alp Republic, these Alps and their culture can be interpreted as the cultural focus of the country, even if only a minority of people live there”* (Köstlin 1999/2, S. 150).

In contrast to Switzerland where the high mountains are in the centre of public interest, Austria focuses on the cosy chalet where the original mountain cheese is produced: *“synonymous for the Austrian Alps is – not only in tourist's eyes- not the ice crust of enormous glaciers but the cosy mountain hut including schnapps and dirndl”* (Tschofen 1999, S 306, own translation). Besides the hut which obviously is the centre of the romantic stereotype “Alm”, also the (cultural) landscape attached to it is of great relevance. The pastures where traditionally healthy cows graze in summer and where the tasty cheese is made, are not only for tourists but also for the local population, a stock theme for nostalgic feelings of home.

11.4 Influencing factors and actors

There are negative and positive factors influencing agricultures' role as a provider of cultural heritage:

As already mentioned structural change in agriculture is widely seen as negative, not only for the upkeep of a cultural landscape but also in consequence for the more social cultural aspects. As culture is an effect of a common practice, the traditional rural culture is supposed to be vanishing with the declining number of farmers.

“ if today instead of invention and conquest of landscapes their preservation is on the agenda, then this is a reaction on the dynamics of the current structural change, which causes a loss of importance of landscapes as place of production, industrial sites becoming museums of cultural heritage and an endangered “culture” associated with a multifaceted European cultural landscape because it – for instance the work intensive and small structured Austrian agriculture - is hardly competitive” (Veichtelbauer 1999 p 37, own translation).

But it is not only the number of farms which is affected by the structural change, the change of farming practices also influences the use of farm buildings massively and therefore has an impact on the cultural heritage. For instance the change from hay making to silage making implies on one hand that new farm structures (silos) are erected or a large number of silage bales are stored around the farmhouse. On the other hand the traditional field sheds used for storage of hay and the connected drying rakes are redundant. Sometimes they are reused as machine sheds, which again changes their appearance. But intensification of agricultural practices is not the only effect of structural change. There is also extensification which takes place at the same time. The increase of part time farming and pluriactivity too results in a change from dairy-based agricultural systems to suckler cow systems especially in alpine regions. The process is ongoing at the moment. It brings again the necessity to change farm buildings, to rebuild barns for loose housing etc. Both, intensification and extensification result in a massive loss of the traditional farm buildings. The new structures reflect regional differences much less than the traditional forms did.

Besides these negative effects, the separation of farmers' tasks which is a by-product of the discussion on multifunctionality has also raised the public awareness of farm work for landscape maintenance. The public recognition of landscape stewardship by farmers is shown in the willingness to give public transfer payments. The recognition of organic farming is also playing a supportive role. Organic farming is, especially in the mountainous regions, associated with traditional farming practices but has elements of a more modern image. These factors try to link the conservative image of the “keeper of the tradition and heritage” with a future-oriented picture of agriculture.

The public recognition of the danger of rapid structural change and the design of counter strategies dates back some time in Austria. In 1987 the Austrian federal Minister of Agriculture, Riegler, introduced what he termed an “eco-social agricultural policy”. The main goal of this policy was to integrate ecological and in particular social aspects into the prevailing economic view on agriculture. The social dimension was defined as the protection of smaller farms in less favoured areas (Riegler, 1989). Direct marketing activities, innovation and organic farming were promoted as the new niche strategies.

This political orientation showed significant differences to most other EU-countries. It reveals that the market pressures reducing the gross value of production as described by van der Ploeg et al. (2000) were felt in the mountainous areas of Austria much earlier than in more advantaged regions. Consequently counter strategies were also applied at an earlier stage. One of the strategies proposed in the framework of the eco-social agricultural policy was already at that time organic farming.

By the end of the 1980s the discussion of possible EU-accession had just started. Farmers raised serious concerns about how to survive in the Common Market competing with more favoured regions. In preparation for the accession the system of agrarian support was changed. The Austrian agricultural policy decreased the support on production activities and compensated for that by introducing and expanding environmental payments. This indicated a shift in the orientation of the agricultural policy from production to protection. Subsequently public support was also introduced for organic farming; first subsidies were given for conversion and from 1992 onwards also direct payments for ecologically sound farming methods including organic farming.

Besides these national strategies later, after the accession to the EU in 1995 the shift in the CAP with a stronger bias to rural development also acted as supportive factor. Many of the documents traced on the internet, which contain a combination of “farming” and “culture” or “cultural heritage” refer to EU programs like LEADER. On their homepage they also publish a call for contributions to a European award for cultural heritage which includes a category on cultural landscape.

There is hope that the notion of multifunctionality of European agriculture and landscapes might reverse the current trends:

“in the course of a more often stated ‘multifunctionality’ landscapes are perceived economically as spaces of reproduction for (re)constructed goods, ecologically a refuge for multifaceted life, aesthetically more and more again an icon of national and cultural identity (Heimat) as well as the ‘atmosphere’ which opposes the alienations of the recent modernity” (Veichtelbauer 1999, p 37 own translation)

The Local Agenda 21 is strongly connected to these issues (see for instance the checklist for Agenda 21 projects used in Upper Austria where criteria like “preservation of farmers’ culture” together with “extension of natural production in agriculture” is mentioned in the category of ecology, <http://www.lebensraum-mit-zukunft.at/>).

It seems at least from the papers found on the internet, that the international year of the mountains (2002) had a positive influence on the notion of agriculture as a major factor to preserve the cultural heritage in mountain regions (which cover a large part of Austria).

11.5 Relevant activities

The Austrian Government has set out various measures to support agricultural activities related to cultural heritage. The central program to support agriculture in preserving cultural landscapes and cultural heritage is the national program for rural development. This is the major instrument for the implementation of the EU-rural development regulation. It includes agro-environmental measures like the “Austrian program for environmental friendly agriculture, ÖPUL” as well as the so-called “Article 33” measures. Both are “horizontal” measures available all over Austria. The official goals of the current ÖPUL programme include also:

- Maintenance of endangered, highly valuable agriculturally-used cultural landscapes
- Maintenance of landscapes and historical signs in agricultural areas (www.umweltbundesamt.at/fileadmin/site/umwelthemen/landwirtschaft/OEPUL/OEPUL_2000.pdf own translation)

The ÖPUL is the main measure for the link between cultural landscape and environmental values in the agricultural landscape. It does not talk explicitly of cultural heritage but includes at least the maintenance of cultural landscapes and historical signs.

Article 33 measures are designed to support the adjustment and development of rural areas and include amongst others things:

- The preservation of rural heritage and village development.
- Measures for preservation of cultural landscapes and landscape design. This measure includes for instance the multiplication of autochthonous wood species, preservation of old varieties of fruit species, preservation of lead species of fauna used for eco-tourism purposes.

Besides these national measures, based mainly on EU-programs, there are also a number of regional measures supported by regional governments roughly dealing with the same issues.

11.6 Future trends

The changes of the CAP-reform are officially viewed as supportive to the national framework which was already in place. Austria had already before the CAP Reform a substantial share of payments that are part of the rural development pillar.

On the other hand the change from a sector-oriented agricultural development policy to a territorial rural development policy evokes fears in

the agricultural sector. So far the agricultural sector was used to seeing support targeted at the specific interest of farmers, now that money is targeted at the development of rural areas, so the farmers are not the only direct beneficiaries any more.

More and more EU-instruments of the environmental sector are becoming relevant for the farming communities. Natura 2000 and the "life" program are key factors contributing to the preservation of cultural landscapes. In the case of Natura 2000 however there are marked regional differences. While for instance substantial parts of Lower Austria, a regional state with rather intensive agriculture, were designated as Natura 2000 areas, in the alpine region of Tyrol only existing nature reserves were nominated. This reflects the divergent perception of the chances of environmental protection measures for agricultural development.

Austria is not a member of the European Landscape convention. The regional states and the federal Government are in favour of its goals and objectives, but they are sceptical towards the administrative, regulative and financial implications. They advocate instead increasing the efficiency, coordination and transparency of the existing national, European and international tools and regulatory mechanisms (like international agreements) (<http://www.salzburg.gv.at/themen/nuw/naturschutz/naturschutzinternational/landschaftskonvention.htm>).

The WTO negotiations are more determined by EU policies than by national efforts. Austrian politicians hope that the environmentally-related payments for agriculture will remain. The discussion about the multifunctionality of agriculture, in particular, meets the long tradition of pluriactivity in Austria.

11.7 Summary and conclusions

The situation in Austria is characterised by a strict separation in the understanding of culture between the urban and the rural sphere. Cultural heritage is mainly related to the urban sphere. The notions of cultural heritage in connection with the rural world are mostly very traditional minded. The issue of cultural landscapes forms an important link between the two spheres, especially since the UNESCO includes cultural landscapes along with artefacts, monuments, cities etc. in their list of cultural world heritage sites. The perception of the role of agriculture has been shaped lately to a large extent by transnational issues and programs like the debate on multifunctionality under the heading of the European model of agriculture, rural development efforts like the LEADER+ program or sustainable development as for instance represented in Agenda 21 processes.

In future especially the new direction of the CAP focussing on rural development instead of agrarian issues will play a major role in shaping the self-understanding of agriculture. This might also influence positively the link between agriculture and cultural heritage

11.8 Acknowledgements

A number of colleagues supplied valuable comments on the paper. We want to express our gratitude especially to Georg Wiesinger from the Federal Institute of Less Favoured and Mountainous Areas in Vienna and Hermann Denz from the Institute of Sociology at the University of Innsbruck. However, the views expressed in this paper are the sole responsibility of the authors.

11.9 References

- Begusch, K., Pirkel, H., Prinz, M., Smoliner, C., Wrbka, T. (1995): Forschungskonzept 1995. Kulturlandschaftsforschung. In: BMWFK (Ed.): Forschungsschwerpunkt Kulturlandschaft 1, Wien.
- Burger-Scheidlin, H. (2002) Kultur – Landschaft(s) – Pfleger. Selbstverständnis, Image und Identität der österreichischen Bergbauern (Univ. Dipl.). Wien.
- Geser, M. (2004) Dreistufenwirtschaft im Alpenbogen, Studie des österreichischen Ökologieinstitutes für angewandte Umweltforschung im Auftrag der Regionalentwicklung Bregenzerwald
- Klestil, T. (2002) Rede von Bundespräsident Dr. Thomas Klestil zur Eröffnung der "Agraria" auf der "Welser-Messe 2000" <http://www.hofburg.at/de/praesidenten/klestil/reden2000/inla/Welser-Messe.htm>
- Köstlin, K. (1999) The Austrification of Austria: Promoting Differences. In: Daun, Ake; Jansson, Sören: Europeans - Essays on Culture and Identity. Nordic Academic Press. Schweden pp. 147-157.
- Ploeg, J.D., Renting, H., Brunori, G., Knickel, K., Mannion, J., Marsden, T., de Roest, K., Sevilla-Guzman, E., and Ventura, F. (2000). Rural development: from practices and policies towards theory. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40 (4) pp:391-409.
- Regionalverband Tennengau (ed.) (2002) Regionalprogramm Tennengau. Regionalplanung Heft 5 www.salzburg.gv.at/raum_tennengau
- Riegler, J., (1989). Das Prinzip der ökosozialer Marktwirtschaft. In Regenärmel G.; Schmid M. (eds.): Neuland - die Wiederentdeckung bäuerlicher Direktvermarktung, ÖAR, Vienna. pp 76-81
- Schermer, M.; Krenn, K.; Gleirscher, N. Fuchs, L.; Kempf, R.; Waldner, H. (2004) Case Study 1: Biobauern Sulzberg in the Vorarlberg Province of Austria In: Midmore P.; Foster, C.; Schermer, M. (eds.): Organic Producer Initiatives and Rural Development – four European Case Studies, OMIA RD Vol. 3, Aberystwyth: School of Management and Business (University of Wales). pp.: 21-55
- Steckenbauer G. (2004) Kulturtourismus und kulturelles Kapital. Die feinen Unterschiede des Reiseverhaltens. *Trans Internet-Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften* 15. Nr. Juni 2004 (http://www.inst.at/trans/15Nr/09_1/steckenbauer15.htm)
- Temel R. (2004) Schutz des Kulturerbes in Österreich - eine Machbarkeitsstudie über seine Definition, Erfassung und Erhaltung. Uma Information Technology GmbH, Vienna, (http://www.uma.at/press/releases/downloads/040824_kulturerbe_rt-1.pdf)
- Tschöfen, B. (1999) Berg Kultur Moderne. Volkskundliches aus den Alpen. Sonderzahl Verlag. Vienna.

- Veichtelbauer J. (1999) Erfindung, Eroberung, Erhaltung: (Kultur-) landschaften und ihre politische Instrumentalisierbarkeit. In: Haberl, H.; Strohmeier, G. (eds) Kulturlandschaftsforschung, IFF-Texte, Vienna

12. Agriculture and the historic environment: The view from England

By Vince Holyoak, English Heritage

12.1 Agriculture and cultural heritage

Historically and today, in terms of land area, Britain has always been predominantly rural, with only around 12% currently classed as urban. Despite this, by the first quarter of the 18th century the proportion of Britain's population employed in agriculture had dropped below 50%, and by 1900 it had shrunk below 10%. In other European countries this did not occur for at least another 50–70 years. The increasing need for workers in Britain's industrial centres and the much higher wages available for unskilled labourers were important factors in rural depopulation and the decrease in those actively working upon the land. The shortfall in the agricultural workforce was in part made good by increased agricultural mechanization, but a significant proportion of food for Britain's growing population was provided by its empire. However, following the strangulation upon maritime imports during the World Wars and the economic depression of the 1930s, in World War II and the immediate post-war era there was a rapid move towards much greater self-sufficiency. This aspiration was enshrined in the form of the Agriculture Act 1947, legislation founded upon the policy principles of farmers as producers, and for ever-increasing production at any cost. The UK's entry into the Common Agricultural Policy in 1973 and the support payments for production it brought with it gave further boosts to more intensive agriculture. As a result, whereas two-thirds of the UK's food requirements were imported prior to World War II, despite a population which has grown from 42 million in 1941 to 59 million today, food imports have shrunk to just under 50%, two-thirds from EU sources (Food Standards Agency 2001).

In England this intensification has not however been without social, economic and environmental costs. Concerns about the effects of increasing ploughing upon archaeological sites were raised as early as the 1970s (see Barker 1974). Their veracity was confirmed by the *Monuments at Risk Survey 1995* which estimated that one archaeological site has been destroyed every day since the end of World War II (Darvill and Fulton

1988). The follow-on *Monuments at Risk in England's wetlands survey* 2001 in turn showed that some 1.1 million ha of wetlands are now believed destroyed and only 4,380 out of an estimated 17,780 potential sites have escaped destruction from drainage or cultivation (Olivier 2002). But the losses to the historic environment brought about by intensive agriculture are not of course limited to archaeological sites and monuments. At a landscape level, around 94% of the ridge and furrow medieval strip cultivation once so distinctive of the English Midlands has been destroyed, most since World War II (English Heritage 2003), whilst one third of field hedges were lost between 1984 and 1993. The traditional farm building stock has also been affected with 17% of nationally important listed buildings described as "at risk" in 1992 and 24% as "vulnerable". The list is a depressing one.

In the post-war era, in England intensive agriculture has therefore been not so much an upholder of cultural heritage but a major factor in its wholesale or piecemeal loss. It has affected not only tangible assets – such as archaeological sites, historic buildings and landscape character – but also, inevitably, rural skills and traditions. Change is a necessary part of progress, but whereas for the natural environment any such losses can in part be made up for in part by habitat recreation or biodiversity enhancement schemes, there are no such opportunities for the historic environment. In terms of tangible assets at least, it is a finite, non-renewable resource. It is important therefore that there is an adequate dialogue before change takes place so that we can understand what might be lost, whether its loss is acceptable or whether it represents critical environmental capital, or more simply, something we cannot do without. The key difference is that in England much of the change to the urban historic environment falls within the planning or development control framework. The applications procedure allows an opportunity to consult, to consider each proposal on its merits and, where necessary, to refuse consent or impose suitable mitigation. This is not the case in the rural environment. Here the majority of change to features and landscapes is due to agriculture and is subject to neither consultation nor regulation.

12.2 Agriculture as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape

In England agriculture has therefore been demonstrably responsible for the piecemeal degradation and outright destruction of historic features and the landscape. However, in many cases farmers and land managers have simply been doing exactly as they were asked to do. Equally though, retaining is one thing, but if we want what remains to be actively managed and conserved, nobody but farmers – who are currently responsible

for managing 77% of the UK (National Farmers Union 2005) - have the ability to deliver. In this latter respect there is cause for increasing optimism. The UK government is the only one within the European Union to fully embrace the principle of modulation, that is the shifting of expenditure from Pillar I (production) to Pillar II (rural development), although even then this will increase to 4.5% over six years rather than the permitted 20%. Modulation will however see a gradual acceleration in a process first begun in 1984 with the agricultural reforms introducing quotas to limit production. Since 1986 the Agriculture Act has required Secretary of State to balance environmental issues, including heritage with the economic health of farming. In 1987 the first agri-environment schemes were introduced and in 1992 the MacSharry reforms brought about 'set-aside'. Many of these reforms, particularly the introduction of agri-environment schemes were primarily motivated by concerns over the effects of intensive production on the natural environment (Purseglove 1988). However, as a result of lobbying by the sector the historic environment had received a gradually increasing emphasis within the schemes.

In England, the controversies over Salmonella in eggs, BSE and the Foot and Mouth outbreak in 2001 unsurprisingly led to a public and political crisis of confidence in the agricultural sector. However, the effective shutting down of the countryside which accompanied the foot and mouth outbreak had one positive environmental outcome in so far as it confirmed the extent to which the rural economy was now much more reliant upon tourism than agricultural production. As such, although agriculture is responsible for less than 1% of gross domestic product nationally and employs less than 1.5% of the workforce, in the North West, one of the English regions hit hardest by foot and mouth it was estimated that tourism accounted for 5% of GDP with 6% of the population engaged in tourism-related industries (Defra 2004). Another outcome of the Foot and Mouth epidemic was the creation in June 2001 of the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), an amalgamation of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) and countryside and environmental business portions of the Department for the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR). As its name suggests, Defra has a more holistic remit than MAFF, and describes its role as working for the essentials of life: food, air, land, water, people, animals and plants. It is not solely concerned with agriculture. One of its first undertakings was the creation of a *Policy Commission on the Future of Farming and Food*. In its report of January 2002, a key recommendation of the Commission, which set out to develop a new strategy for sustainable, diverse, modern and adaptable farming was that more farmers should be given the opportunity to take part in agri-environment schemes. This and farm restructuring brought about by CAP reform have subsequently led Defra to introduce a new scheme for 2005 called Environmental Stewardship.

12.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape

Environmental Stewardship is innovative in several areas. In its lower Entry Level tier it is built upon the basis of low administrative overheads. In practical terms this means that farmers are provided with a handbook and a map of environmental features on their land holding and choose for themselves which management options they would like to adopt. Options for the historic environment include:

- Take Archaeological features out of cultivation - £460 (~~€~~90) ha
- Reduce Cultivation Depth to 10cm on archaeological features - £60 (~~€~~0) ha
- Management of scrub on archaeological sites - £120 (~~€~~80) ha
- Management of archaeological features on grassland - £16 (~~€~~4) ha
- 2m or 4m buffer strips around archaeological features on cultivated land
- Stone wall and hedgerow maintenance

Unlike earlier schemes, any farmer meeting a standard points threshold is guaranteed entry and agreements are offered on a 5 year basis. The UK government hopes for 70% take-up.

The upper tier of Environmental Stewardship, Higher Level Stewardship, is an amalgamation of the existing agri-environment schemes and has five main objectives; wildlife conservation; protection of the historic environment; landscape quality maintenance & enhancement; the promotion of public access and resource protection. Defra estimate that take-up amongst farmers will be around 20% and agreements will be offered for 10 years. Entry to the scheme is discretionary, based upon the quality of the application and regional and local priorities (established through targeting). It will include provision for comprehensive support and advice for agreement holders, and in addition to payments for day-to-day management, will also enable major repairs and restoration projects. As examples it offers an 80% grant rate for the restoration of non-domestic farm buildings and a 100% grant rate for the protection of archaeological features.

Unlike Entry Level, under Higher Level Stewardship farmers and land managers do not choose their own management options. These are identified through the production of a Farm Environmental Plan. In the case of the historic environment this contains professional advice delivered by local authority Historic Environment Records, paid for by Defra on a fixed-rate basis. Unlike the existing schemes suitable management must be delivered across the whole holding, not just on individual features

within it, meaning that it is not acceptable for one feature to be positively managed whilst another is being degraded.

The Farm Environmental Plan also seeks to introduce balance across the five objectives. It begins by identifying all environmental assets, it allows an assessment of their condition (based upon survival and risk) and indicates appropriate management options. Together the identification and condition assessment of assets provides an important opportunity for farmer education because, irrespective of whether farmers actually choose to be paid to manage them through the scheme or not, they are aware of the appropriate management, and might undertake it of their own volition.

As exciting and innovative as Environmental Stewardship is, there have however been some missed opportunities. One of the most popular options in the pilot for Entry Level Stewardship was that for the maintenance of traditional farm buildings. This offered a £2 (€3) annual payment per square metre of floor area to ensure that pre-1940 non-residential farm buildings were maintained and kept weatherproof, with repairs to be carried out on a 'like for like' basis using traditional materials and methods. Unfortunately the European Commission would not accept that this was appropriate for an agri-environment scheme, suggesting that it was more appropriate as a business aid, and it was therefore dropped for national roll out. Since abandonment and disuse are major factors in the dereliction and loss of such structures, this simple measure would have gone some way to preventing further degradation and longer term - on the basis that it is always cheaper to maintain something than to allow it to fall down, and then attempt to restore it - would have enabled significant cost savings. Clearly there is much further work to be done in raising awareness of this problem at a European level.

However, the opportunities for positive management available within the new scheme notwithstanding, there is still a basic need to help farmers find out about historic environment features on their land, and also to make simple generic advice on conservation more widely available. English Heritage has therefore produced a series of guidance leaflets under the title *Caring for Heritage on your farm* (available as pdfs at www.english-heritage.org.uk/farmadvice). These are not intended for the historic environment professional, but for farmers or farm advisors who might not have historic environment knowledge, but who might be called upon to manage such features. They offer a basic primer, highlighting the issues and providing guidance on where further information or advice might be obtained.

In England increasing efforts have also been expended upon understanding the historic dimension of landscapes, as a tool towards achieving appropriate management at a much larger scale. English Heritage has therefore undertaken a national programme of Historic Landscape Char-

acterisation (Clark et al 2004), which has currently been rolled-out to around half England's local authorities.

12.4 Future trends in the thematic focus of measures and policies and the key actors

It has already been noted that the initial moves towards more environmentally sustainable methods of farming in England in the 1980s were motivated primarily by concerns over the effects upon the natural environment, with landscape issues often seen as secondary. Despite huge public interest and goodwill, the historic environment has had even further to travel in respect of raising political and public awareness. Part of this might be due to a perception that heritage is a block upon development and progress. Part might also be due to a general wariness of the concept of heritage and its use – or misuse – in respect of political debates over nationality and culture. There is also a lack of consensus amongst the international historic environment sector and a belief that these are not matters for international legislation. This was certainly recognised in the context of the 1993 Maastricht Treaty, which although encouraging and supporting the cultural heritage activities of member states under Article 151, excluded the possibility of harmonising legal and regulatory provisions.

Whatever the reasons, over the last twenty years the natural environment lobby has been much more effective than that of the historic environment sector in mobilising support at European and national levels. As a result there has been successive European legislation for the natural environment, and none for the historic environment. This problem is exacerbated because where European natural environment legislation exists, in many cases this automatically takes precedence over domestic historic environment legislation. At the European and national levels therefore, whilst both the EU and Defra take their environmental responsibilities seriously, CAP reform and domestic rural development programmes have an in-built bias towards the natural environment. Recognising this, Defra have expended great efforts in making Environmental Stewardship much more balanced and multi-objective than its predecessors. It remains to be seen how successful these efforts will be. The EU and CAP reform will however continue to be the fundamental drivers. It might be, as analysts predict, that in England CAP reform will lead to major downsizing in specific agricultural sectors, notably livestock. If this is the case, then land abandonment might ultimately become as great an environmental challenge as intensive production has been. In order to avoid such an occurrence, whilst it is clear that national initiatives and CAP reform have much to offer in respect of positive management, it is just as important to raise the profile of the historic environment at the European level.

12.5 Literature

- Barker, Philip. 1974. The scale of the problem. In Rahtz, Philip (ed) *Rescue*, 28-34.
- Clark, Jo, Darlington, John and Fairclough, Graham. 2004. *Using Historic Landscape Characterisation*. English Heritage and Lancashire County Council.
- Darvill, Timothy and Fulton, Andrew. 1998 *The Monuments at Risk Survey of England 1995*. English Heritage.
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs 2004. *England Rural Development Programme Regional Chapters* (www.defra.gov.uk/erdp/docs/reg-chapsindex.htm).
- English Heritage 2003. *Ripping up History: Archaeology under the Plough*. London: English Heritage.
- English Heritage 2004. *Conservation Bulletin Issue 47*, Winter 2004-2005.
- Food Standards Agency 2001. PAPER FSA 01/03/03. Food Imports.
- Olivier, Adrian. 2002. England's Wetlands: Monuments at risk. *Conservation Bulletin Issue 42*, March 2002. English Heritage.
- National Farmers Union 2005. *Making Green Ground: what farmers are doing for you*.
- Purseglove, Jeremy. 1988. *Taming the flood: a history and natural history of rivers and wetlands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

13. Landscapes of transformation: Reflections on agriculture and cultural heritage in a man-made country

By *Marjan C. Hidding*, Wageningen University, The Netherlands

13.1 Introduction

In the whole range of contributions about ‘agriculture’s role as an upholder of cultural heritage’, the case of The Netherlands is a rather extreme one. This because the Dutch landscapes have a strongly man-made character and have been subject to rather radical changes and processes of ‘remaking’ through the ages. What does cultural heritage mean in such a context? In what sense could agriculture possibly be seen as an upholder of cultural heritage? And what about policies and measures in this field? Before discussing these questions, the idea of The Netherlands as a man-made country will be elaborated on somewhat further. Against this background three alternative interpretations of cultural heritage and agriculture’s role towards it will be presented. All three interpretations are reflected in today’s policies and measures.

13.2 The Netherlands as a man-made country

Without any doubt, the idea of a man-made country is part and parcel of Dutch identity. In some cases the man-made character of the land should be taken literally. This holds true for a considerable number of Dutch polders, created by reclaiming the land from a lake or the sea. In other cases, the mere existence of the land is dependent on the working of a complex system of technical, physical and societal infrastructure for water management, like mills, dykes and water boards. There is an old Dutch saying that there is always somebody awake in these low countries, to keep a sharp eye on the condition of the dykes. As you will understand this nice saying dates from before our modern, fully computerized 24 hours economy!

In the age-long process of making and safeguarding the land, agriculture has always been a major factor. The more so, as agricultural interests

have always played a prominent role in water management. For centuries farmers had a major say in the government of the water boards. In making the land fit for agriculture, inclusive of water management, the Dutch created typical Dutch landscapes. However, the original layout of these man-made landscapes has proven not to be a blueprint for ever. The history of Dutch landscapes is an ongoing story of constructing and reconstructing the land.

Partly these reconstructions took place because of problems of a physical nature. This was for instance the case in the peat areas in the lower parts of the country, where draining measures resulted in oxidation of the peat and a drop in the level of the land. As a consequence farmers in the peat areas were forced to switch from arable farming to dairy farming as early as in the Middle Ages. Regarding the 21st century, the continuity of even dairy farming is doubted, as ongoing drainage in favour of farming will result in a further drop in the level of the land and ultimately in creating wetlands. Because of the changing physical conditions in these lowlands the water boards had to regularly adapt their water management system, until this very day!

Beside physical factors economic factors have ever played a crucial role in the construction and reconstruction of Dutch agrarian landscapes. At this point, the historic development of Dutch agriculture is strongly intertwined with another aspect of Dutch identity, that of a trading nation. In the 17th century the reclamation of land from quite a number of lakes was financed through business capital of rich Amsterdam merchants (Van de Ven, 1993). At that time making new land for agriculture was obviously a profitable business! It is interesting to know that one of the Dutch world heritage sites, the Beemster polder (reclaimed in 1612), is a result of this kind of private investment! The relationship between the world of trade and that of agriculture also worked the other way around. Through the export of agrarian produce, agriculture also contributed to the welfare of the nation. In the Amsterdam merchants' times you may think of products like butter and cheese. Today The Netherlands are the foremost net exporter of agrarian produce in the world (with a credit balance of 20 billion euros) and the foremost exporter in the EU (De Bont & Van Berkum, 2004) Amazing facts, taking into account the small size of the country! One important explanation lies in the strong representation of highly productive forms of agriculture, like horticulture and pig-breeding, with an extremely high production per ha; another lies in huge imports of raw materials for the fodder industry through the Rotterdam harbour.

In creating the conditions for a modern, highly productive agriculture, especially in the second half of the 20th century, agricultural areas were transformed into agro-industrial landscapes: landscapes of glass, bulbs, milk-production, meat-production and so on. Projects of land consolidation played an important role in this process of reconstruction of agricultural areas. In its heyday – from the 1950s to the early 1970s - the instru-

ment of land consolidation, strongly supported by Dutch government, was the expression par excellence of a modernistic view of planning. It created the physical and spatial conditions for a rational agriculture, in terms of the goals as set by Brussels. At that time agricultural landscapes seemed to be more 'makable' than ever!

In The Netherlands, the man-made character of the land even applies to nature. As most of the land is intensively used by men, nature developed as an integral part of the cultural landscape. Meadow birds, the inhabitants of the Dutch peat polders, are a typical symbol of the way nature developed in Holland. Their habitat is created by specific forms of agricultural management of the land. However, due to far-reaching land use changes during the last few decades, specific qualities of Dutch nature, like the rich variety of species of meadow birds, are decreasing more and more. One of the main factors in the degradation of natural quality is the extremely intensive way Dutch agriculture developed. Another important factor is the fragmentation of natural areas, due to the ongoing urbanisation and expansion of infrastructural networks, like motorways, railways and canals. The national Nature Policy Plan from 1989 (Ministerie van LNV) meant a radical change in nature management policies. In this plan an offensive strategy was launched as an answer to the continuing threats of nature, in terms of creating an Ecological Main Structure. This structure would not only consist of existing areas, with high natural values. 'New nature' would be created to realize a coherent structure. Since then, 'nature development' has become a remarkable part of the Dutch narrative of a man-made country.

A final aspect of the man-made character of the land, to be mentioned here, is related to the transformation of The Netherlands into a highly urbanized country, economically, culturally and physically. This transformation is not of recent date, actually. As early as 1675 already more than half the population (61% to be precise) were urban dwellers (Stichting Wetenschappelijke Atlas van Nederland, 1984). Today this percentage is not that different. However, as the Dutch population has grown to more than 16 million now, the influence of urbanization reaches much further than in those days. Today urbanization processes are a dominant force in the making and remaking of Dutch landscapes. The most urbanized regions also offer good opportunities for the development of specific forms of agriculture. Highly productive forms of today's agriculture are part of agro-industrial complexes in which the primary production is only a small component. The areas involved are strongly integrated in urban networks and highly dependent of good infrastructure and the vicinity of Schiphol airport and Rotterdam harbour, the two Dutch main ports. Regarding the acreage, dairy farming and arable farming still play a leading role in agriculture. As no less than 65% of the total Dutch acreage is destined for agriculture, these forms of agriculture are still very important for 'the image' of the landscape. However, agriculture is no longer the one

and only function in rural areas. Beside agriculture these areas have attracted all kinds of other economic activities in the field of industries, trading and services. For urban dwellers they fulfil a whole range of functions, like opportunities to experience darkness, rest, fresh air, and to enjoy the landscape.

13.3 Three alternative interpretations of cultural heritage

Within the context of The Netherlands as a man-made country, the interpretation of the concept of 'cultural heritage' is not self-evident. And so, the role of agriculture as an upholder of cultural heritage is not a matter of course either. In my view at least three alternative interpretations of cultural heritage can be distinguished: cultural heritage as (1) the total sum of 'here and now landscapes', (2) a selected set of outstanding landscapes, and (3) a specific historic stage in the process of landscape development. Below each interpretation will be elaborated a little further. This section ends with discussing the question of societal support for each of these interpretations.

Cultural heritage as the total sum of 'here and now landscapes'

This first interpretation of cultural heritage is also the most encompassing one. No landscape is excluded from being a cultural heritage, as all landscapes are the historic products of ongoing processes of construction, reconstruction and management of the land. As agriculture has played an important role in this process, it is an integral part of the story. This interpretation of cultural heritage is fed by the idea that 'man-made landscapes' are at the heart of Dutch identity and culture. The man-made character is central to the way men give meaning to their environment.

Cultural heritage as a selected set of outstanding landscapes

The *second* interpretation is less encompassing. Only a restricted number of landscapes is defined in terms of cultural heritage. Here, the historic interplay between men and their physical environment has resulted in landscapes, characterized by a specific ensemble of characteristics that are highly valued in society. The contribution of today's agriculture towards the preservation of the qualities of the landscape concerned is not seen as a matter of course; policy measures are needed to safeguard these qualities.

Cultural heritage as a specific historic stage in the process of landscape development

The *third* interpretation is the most specific and may be the most problematic one. In this case a certain historic stage in the process of landscape development is seen as especially valuable. The endeavour is to keep the landscape in the same state or to restore historic landscape features. In Nordic terms we might speak here of 'frozen' landscapes. The problem is in the assumption that it is possible to keep a landscape in a stable condition, whereas the surrounding world, both from a physical as a societal point of view, is changing all the time. As stagnation means decline, the contribution of agriculture in keeping these landscapes in a stable condition is highly problematic too. It goes without saying that the conservation of these landscapes is often highly dependent on financial support by government.

In everyday practice all three interpretations of landscape as a cultural heritage have their own advocates. The first, most encompassing interpretation of the relationship between agriculture and cultural heritage is very much alive among representatives of engineering disciplines: civil engineers, agricultural engineers and probably most of all, landscape architects. They consider themselves as the makers of tomorrow's landscapes and as such, as typical purveyors of Dutch culture. In recent history, the reclamation of the IJsselmeerpolders from the Zuider Zee, highly in favour of agriculture, had undoubtedly been one of the most striking projects in this engineering tradition. This first interpretation of cultural history can also be found among farmers and their organizations, be it often in a less reflective way. They consider themselves and their ancestors to be the ones who by labouring hard made the landscape what it is. Managing the landscape is for them both a duty and a right. Outside the world of agriculture, many are critical about the idea that farm management as such will result in a decent landscape, because they consider the dynamics of today's agriculture to be a threat for environmental values of different kinds.

The second interpretation of the relationship between agriculture and cultural heritage is more broadly embedded in society. It is supported by state organizations and NGOs in the field of heritage, nature conservation, and agriculture and many others. Because of the inherent frictions between up-to-date farm management practices and the endeavour to keep certain historic landscape characteristics, policy measures of different kinds have been designed to overcome these frictions. For instance by subsidizing certain management measures, carried out by farmers.

The third interpretation of the relationship between agriculture and the cultural landscape is supported by a select set of actors, especially in the field of heritage and nature conservation, both state actors and NGOs. Specific farming management measures, common in former times, can play a role in the conservation of these landscapes. Sometimes these

measures are carried out by farmers, as a kind of sideline activity, but this is not necessarily so.

13.4 Recent policies

The awareness in politics and society that both cultural and natural values of our landscapes are vulnerable categories is not recent. One of our most prominent NGOs in the field of nature conservation, The Society for the Conservation of Monuments of Nature (Vereniging tot behoud van Natuurmonumenten) having a membership of nearly one million citizens, will celebrate its first centenary in 2005. Measures to compensate farmers for the loss of income due to specific management measures in favour of nature and landscape have existed since the 1970s. And new legislation on both the European and the national level for the conservation of heritage gave an impetus to our first National Policy Document on Heritage and Spatial Planning, entitled 'Belvedere', published in 1999 (Ministerie van OenW, 1999). Central in this document is the idea that the striving for mere conservation of heritage will not be successful in such a highly dynamic environment as The Netherlands. 'Conservation by Development' is the leading policy concept. In other words, only when cultural heritage can be made an integral part of new spatial developments, in both a functional and a cultural sense, it has a chance to survive.

The awareness that the natural and cultural values of our landscapes are vulnerable categories is also expressed in the most recent National Policy Document on Spatial Planning (Ministeries van VROM, LNV, VenW en EZ, 2004). In this document two policy categories can be found that deserve special attention here. The *first* category (related to the interpretation of cultural heritage as a specific historic stage) are the World Heritage Monuments. Some of these monuments are closely related to the historic development of agriculture. This is the case for the Beemster polder, and two monuments, related to the history of water management: the historic ensemble of mills in Kinderdijk, in the province of South Holland, and the so called Wouda Pumping Station in Lemmer, in the province of Friesland. They should be kept in a good condition as a remembrance of the making of land in historical times. The *other* category (related to the interpretation of cultural heritage as a selected set of outstanding landscapes) are the so called National Landscapes, highly valued because of their landscape characteristics, and qualities of nature and heritage. Here the paradoxical task of 'conservation by development' is present in all its facets. And so, the question of 'how to fulfill this task' is really an urgent one.

The answer that is given in the National Policy Document on Spatial Planning regarding the latter category, reflects the changes in planning theory and practice since the 1970ies when the idea of the welfare state

and of 'makeable' landscapes was still very much alive. While the selection of the areas involved is made by national government, the real thing has to be done on lower governmental levels, with an important role for the (12) provinces, the second tier of Dutch government. In accordance with the recent theoretical and practical developments in the field of societal steering, termed a transition from *government* to *governance*, the province has to fulfil its role in the interplay of governmental actors, representatives of civil society and the market.

Governance practices on a regional level have existed now for more than fifteen years in The Netherlands and are still evolving. I will restrict myself to only mentioning a few prominent characteristics of these kind of practices as they are now:

- policies and measures tailored to the conditions of the area involved;
- interactive and communicative approach;
- striving for innovation through bringing together knowledge of different actors;
- striving for consensus and support among the actors involved;
- combining planning and implementation at project level;
- combining fragmented (sectoral) financial sources into one project-bound budget;
- experimental forms of public-private partnership.

In the context of governance, too, new institutional arrangements have come into being. An interesting innovation is the growing number of environmental cooperatives, made up of groups of farmers and landowners on a local or regional scale, who take care of certain aspects of the landscape and are paid by government. For the members of the cooperative, it is a chance to generate income from sources other than only agriculture. That they are quite aware that they are managing a living and ever-changing landscape, is nicely illustrated by the next quote from a member of a Frisian environmental cooperative: "If they ask us to do something else in a few years, we will do that. We have a high sensitivity for developments in society" (Van der Ploeg et al., 2002: 48). Doesn't this remind us of the interpretation of cultural heritage as 'here and now landscapes', made by man?

It goes without saying that the transition from government to governance raises many questions too. Landscape can have quite different meanings for different actors. The same holds true for their interpretations of cultural history. As a consequence, very different answers may be given to questions like: 'which stages of the landscape should be kept or restored in an historic state and for what rationale?', or 'what landscapes and what interpretations of cultural heritage are to be considered justified?'. Questions like these arise in everyday governance practices.

Thinking and acting in the field of landscape, cultural heritage and agriculture; a challenging task!

13.5 Literature

- Bont, C.J.A.M.de & S.van Berkum (2004) *De Nederlandse Landbouw op het Europese Scorebord*. LEI-rapport 2.04.03. Den Haag, Landbouweconomisch Instituut.
- Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij (1989) *Natuurbeleidsplan, beleidsvoornemen*. Den Haag, Staatsuitgeverij.
- Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschappen (1999) *Belvedere, Beleidsnota over de relatie cultuurhistorie en ruimtelijke inrichting*. Den Haag, VNG Uitgeverij.
- Ministeries van VROM, LNV, VenW en EZ (2004), *Nota Ruimte*. Den Haag
- Ploeg, J.D.van der, A. van Cooten, T.Kierkels & A.Logemann (eds.) (2002) Stichting Wetenschappelijke Atlas van Nederland (1984), *Wetenschappelijke Atlas van Nederland deel 2*. s-Gravenhage, Staatsuitgeverij
- Ven, G.P.van de (1993) *Man-made lowlands. History of watermanagement and land reclamation in the Netherlands*. Utrecht, Matrijs.

14. Lessons learned, recommendations

By *Karoline Daugstad* and *Katrina Rønningen*, Centre for Rural Research, and *Birgitte Skar*, Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research

The workshop brought together people from nine European countries and put on the table twelve presentations of different realities and situations regarding the link between agriculture and cultural heritage. The presentations and following discussions revealed both mutual contexts and understandings of the subject matter as well as diverse and even contradicting views and situations. This chapter will summarise the different national inputs by relating them to the four leading questions the participants were asked to address. Further, we will elaborate on some major issues or points on the basis of the twelve chapters and the discussions during the two days in Oslo with special relevance for future policies for the management of the cultural heritage of agriculture – in a Nordic as well as in a wider European context.

14.1 In what way and how is agriculture seen as an upholder of cultural heritage within the respective national contexts? (perceptions of this “link” from the authorities, the relevant sectors, organisations, public opinion)

To shed light on this question it is necessary to raise a new question: What is regarded as the cultural heritage of agriculture - is such a notion existing and acknowledged by the various actors?

Within the Nordic countries the general view is that yes, there is a link between cultural heritage and agriculture and the link is by and large positive. In other words, agriculture does provide cultural heritage. There is however some variation between the Nordic countries typically related to the mode of production and intensity of agriculture which influences whether agriculture functions mainly as a destructive agent or preserver of the physical cultural heritage remains. This is particularly critical for remains from prehistoric time i.e. the archaeological remains. Concerning the buildings, technical cultural heritage, cultural landscape, cultural environments and including a holistic perspective comprising the non-

material cultural heritage and knowledge values, there is agreement that agriculture does provide and maintain a very important aspects of the cultural heritage and self-understanding of the individual nations.

Agriculture has a long history, it has been a major force in shaping national identities, and the agriculturally-influenced landscape is still a reference point for identity. There is an increasing awareness in general opinion and also among the relevant public management bodies in the Nordic countries of the link between active farming and the upholding of landscape and cultural heritage qualities. For example there is a growing concern for empty houses in bad shape in rural areas, overgrown derelict land, and a general emptying of the landscape. Other actors who express their view on this matter are for example those in the tourism business that live from selling the rural landscape, who are concerned when the rural traditional landscape changes. From Finland it is mentioned that the researchers are concerned when the cultural landscapes with landscape features and biodiversity conditioned by a long agricultural tradition are abandoned. Finland also goes furthest in expressing an awareness of the cultural environments shaped by today's farmers. It is recommended that farmers should be carefully guided in terms of basing new agricultural architecture and building-types on particular historically rooted Finnish building traditions.

Within all of the national contexts the cultural heritage of agriculture is defined as all-embracing in scale – from the smallest built structures (fences, individual buildings) to land use on infield as well as outlying land. The cultural heritage is defined as material as well as non-material, especially the tacit or experience-based knowledge of resource use, crafts etc that the farmers hold. Local breeds of plants and animals are also mentioned as included in the cultural heritage of agriculture.

When it comes to the main upholder of the agricultural cultural heritage the sole most important actor is the farmer. However, from Denmark it is stressed that a prerequisite for the farmer being the major upholder is sufficient knowledge about the cultural heritage on his/her property. Awareness and knowledge achieved through information and guidance from consultants etc is needed, as has been stressed by the farmers' organisations.

Looking at the countries outside Norden the Austrian situation is in many ways similar with a focus on the alpine farmer and the landscape of mountain pastures as central to national identity, and, hence, the alpine farmer has a role in upholding the traditional agricultural landscape (especially a parallel to Norway). However, this is applied to the traditional – and in many ways non-modernised – agriculture. It is also interesting to note that cultural heritage is not linked to agriculture in itself but cultural landscape can be seen as a bridging term in the sense that the attributes ascribed to the cultural landscape have to do with traditional (old-fashioned) farming, the mountain farmers, customs, folklore etc. A simi-

lar use of concepts can be read from Norwegian official documents, where the use of the term “landscape” or “cultural landscape” is all-comprising (Daugstad et al 2005⁸).

Another point especially expressed from Austria is the connotations of culture and cultural heritage in general. Regarding culture, there is a division between what is defined as ‘hochkultur’ and ‘volkskultur’. Hochkultur is urban and volkskultur is rural (typically the alpine agricultural landscape). When it comes to cultural heritage it is mainly understood as monuments (buildings etc) and not as landscapes, a phenomenon that helps to explain the aforementioned lack of a link between agriculture as such and cultural heritage. As for which actors address the issue of cultural heritage and agriculture, the political authorities see agriculture as a means to preserve the cultural landscape but, again, the term cultural heritage is not in the picture. The agricultural sector is to some extent familiar with the idea of being rewarded for producing cultural landscapes. Even before joining the EU, Austria did decouple public support to farming from production. However, being seen as “landscape stewards” still is a challenging issue for the farmers. From the tourism sector the need for land stewardship in order to maintain the basis for natural and cultural heritage tourism is evident. From organisations and NGOs outside agriculture (environmental organisations and non-traditional, oppositional farmers’ organisations) agricultural heritage is linked to biodiversity and preserving genetic material from old breeds. Cultural landscape concern is also related to NGOs who oppose the use of GMOs (Genetically Modified Organisms) in agriculture. Agriculture is seen by the public in general, as traditional and conservative, and the cultural heritage related to rural areas and the mountain farmers way of life as more original and natural than the hochkultur. The decoupling of incentives and the strong focus on tourism related to Austrian agriculture, is somewhat at the expense of the authenticity of agriculture as it exists. The cultural heritage related to agriculture is to some extent exposed to stereotyping, rather than being based on actual local modes of production.

This very strong differentiation was not mentioned by the other countries, not even Norway, which in many respects has many parallels to the Austrian situation. The strong alpine tourism tradition probably contributes strongly to this situation, in which certain elements of the volkskultur become strong symbols or even clichés, of a partly-commercialised cultural heritage or folklore.

For varying reasons the tales told from England, The Netherlands and Estonia are more on the negative side about the link between agriculture and cultural heritage. The Netherlands is in an extreme position as it is literally a man-made country, and farming has been of crucial impor-

⁸ Daugstad, K., Rønningen, K. and Skar, B. 2005: Agriculture as an upholder of cultural heritage? Conceptualizations and value judgements – A Norwegian perspective in international context. *Journal of Rural Studies* (in press).

tance. However, farming is today very intensive and highly modern. In general the man-made and agricultural character of the nation is important for identity, but The Netherlands also being highly urbanised makes the tensions between farming land and urban land more obvious. The man-made character also holds true for nature since nature development or re-naturalization (reclaimed "nature" from previously farmed land) is a major concern. According to this activity, agriculture is a threat and must be transformed to nature. When it comes to *who* supports a link between agriculture and cultural heritage, this is addressed through three interpretations of cultural heritage. In the first interpretation cultural heritage is seen as the total sum of the "here and now" landscapes. This is an all-embracing approach supported by the engineering disciplines and also by farmers. The second approach sees cultural heritage as a selected set of outstanding landscapes, a view broadly embedded in the society and supported by state organisations and NGOs in the field of heritage, nature conservation and agriculture. The third approach sees cultural heritage as a specific historic stage in the process of landscape development supported by a select set of actors within the fields of heritage and nature conservation.

For the intensively cultivated England the agricultural sector is mainly seen as a destroyer of the archaeological cultural heritage rather than an upholder. The English heritage management is however in accordance with the Nordic view when it comes to the close linkage between sustaining a living agriculture and the built heritage and know-how, and national subsidies have clearly been directed towards this purpose. Like The Netherlands, England is also to a large extent an agriculturally-influenced country. It is stressed that even if the farmers are seen as cultural heritage destroyers they are still the sole most important actors also for hopefully upholding cultural heritage, since they are responsible for managing 77% of the land area of England.

The dramatic story told from Estonia is, compared to the other eight national contexts, the most special one regarding the link between agriculture and cultural heritage. For once, the connection between cultural heritage and agriculture is not made. Basically agriculture is seen as an economic sector, a business actor, and for many not even remotely evoking connotations of cultural heritage. If the link is made, it is mostly negative implying that agriculture is a destroyer of cultural heritage. This view must be seen in relation to the long Estonian history of being under shifting ruling regimes and ownership structures dictated from the outside, and lacking of a large, local landowning class of farmers. The agricultural history has been one of discontinuities and of encroachments and injustice from intruders, and to many the later history of agriculture becomes a documentation and sad memorial of serfdom, poverty and lack of freedom. This can be expected to greatly influence the linkages and view of a heritage dimension. However, given the adaptation to the Euro-

pean model of agriculture with weight given to multifunctionality, viable rural areas and nature conservation, the opinion or at least politics towards agriculture and cultural heritage is expected to shift. The importance of maintaining some of this cultural heritage – including the bad and sad memories – for the future generations was pointed out.

14.2 What are seen as the main factors and actors influencing the development of agriculture's role as a provider of cultural heritage and the development of environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

The factor and actor most often mentioned is the EUs policy on agriculture and rural areas. From all nine countries it is reported that CAP is, has been and will be decisive for future development. This is stressed even for Norway and Iceland, being the two countries outside EU present at the workshop. WTO is also mentioned as a steering force. To a large extent as a part of CAP (at least as long as the countries have been part of EU) but also in general when speaking changes over the last decades, structural change in the agricultural sector is the main agent for change in the agriculturally-related cultural heritage. Processes of intensification create some problems while extensification creates others. In addition, especially for The Netherlands, urbanisation is also a major cause of change. CAP is seen as an agent causing some negative impact for cultural heritage, particularly where the natural conditions in the country promote agricultural intensification. Some positive effects or focuses are mentioned too: for example the term multifunctionality, and the shift of expenditures from Pillar 1 (production) to Pillar 2 (rural development). For the UK this principle of modulation is seen as promising to increase the focus on rural areas and farmers, and, hopefully, the cultural heritage values. In general, the decoupling of support from production to rural development and the multifunctions of agriculture is a trend that will be even stronger in the future. It is however realized that the inclusion of a cultural heritage perspective as part of the multifunctionality concept is in need of urgently raised awareness and in need of national advocacy in the European Commission.

Other actors and factors are also important: The cultural heritage sector itself, regional planning, environmental sector, general public opinion. Integrative approaches are asked for where several actors influencing the same landscape or cultural heritage co-operate. Bottom-up approaches and governance are called for too, especially regarding the farmers' role as caretakers of cultural heritage and environmental values. Participation, information, communication and knowledge are seen as central for success. In this respect the European Landscape Convention represent an important guideline on involvement and increased awareness in land-

scape management patterns - even for the European countries that have not so far signed on to the Convention.

Again, the Estonian situation is interesting. The shifting land ownership regimes came to an end with the year of independence 1991 and the following Property Reform. The reform gave the land back to the heirs of the former owners. However, the majority of them were living in urban areas and did not have any connections to or competence in farming. To many the new properties ended up as summer cottages or were sold. The mentality today among young people in Estonia is that urban life means modernity, progress and future prospects while rural life is seen as backward, old-fashioned and limited.

14.3 Which measures are relevant for the link between agriculture and cultural heritage and environmental values in the agricultural landscape?

By and large, the financial measures are seen as most important, and most of them within the framework of agricultural policy. Some examples of how CAP measures are being formed in national context are presented, such as ERDP in Sweden, ÖPUL in Austria and Pillar 1 and Pillar 2 in England. Today's CAP reform provides possibilities for sustaining linkages between agriculture and heritage preservation. It is an open question is, however, whether this will prevail under a future EU agricultural reform.

Another development is the focus on plans as a tool, not only at the national level, which has been so for long time, but an increased focus on plans at the farm level. This is a tool for increasing awareness, governance and acquisition of competence among the farmers as well as an instrument for the authorities when distributing agri-environmental support. It exists in some form or another in most of the countries, although with differing content. The Nature plans in Denmark have until now mainly focussed on nature values, but may be extended to include cultural values as well.

Concerning plans at the national level, indicator systems are mentioned (Finland) and recent plans (e. g. Belvedere in The Netherlands) and the need for further inventories. Most of the western European countries have relatively good coverage of cultural heritage inventories that represent an important basis for information in establishing environmental plans for each property while Estonia is still in need of such a facility. Several of the countries are presently developing or wish to develop a system of indicators to monitor the effects on heritage preservation of agricultural incentives and policy.

From the Nordic Cultural Landscape Association a warning is expressed about the danger of being too dependent on EU support, particu-

larly when subsidies are related to decoupling, as an active agricultural system is still the main goal. The point out the need for new ways of developing businesses, such as niche products, tourism etc. In this context it is worthwhile mentioning that a British scheme aimed at maintenance of traditional farm buildings was rejected by the European Commission because it was seen as more appropriate as a business aid. In other words, conservation should not interfere with economic development. The major Norwegian agri-environmental scheme SMIL (previously termed STILK) is spending about a quarter of its budget on farm buildings and a total of more than 50% on cultural heritage related enterprises, and coordination with rural development schemes is encouraged (Rønningen et al, submitted⁹).

A general issue concerns schemes being compulsory or voluntary. As many of the activities to be carried out related to cultural heritage require active participation from the farmer's side, a voluntary design will often be necessary. A combination of "broad and shallow" schemes with deeper and narrower ones may be the best strategy for meeting the various conservation and management requirements and the need to maintain a living agriculture. Otherwise we end up with a "preserve-the best-leave-the-rest" strategy in which it in the end will also be difficult to maintain the best as it has lost its functions.

A point worth noting is that there seems to be a tendency in some countries for environmental concerns in agriculture to be confined to nature qualities, natural biodiversity. Cultural qualities are not thought of or perhaps seen as secondary. This tendency is seen in the Nature Resource Strategy in Finland and indicators for biodiversity and in the Nature plans in Denmark. There seems to be a general bias towards nature, which might be at the sacrifice of cultural heritage, while it is still necessary to point out the mutual dependency between the two. This tendency can be observed in respect of lobbying, where the nature conservation actors have recognised the need to lobby effectively at a European level and alongside European legislation on biodiversity, EU rural development and agri-environment policy. An example of how the "nature bias" is manifested is the term semi-natural vegetation. The term semi-cultural vegetation would be more precise as one is dealing here with cultural landscapes. Strengthening cultural heritage qualities is however a promising feature of the English Environmental Stewardship Scheme, although the exact effects in relation to cultural heritage are so far not known.

⁹ Rønningen, K., Skar, B., Daugstad, K. and Risan, T.: Dependence between cultural heritage protection and "active agriculture" in the era of decoupling? An analysis of the Norwegian STILK scheme (submitted to journal).

14.4 Future trends and some recommendations

The rural and agricultural restructuring are leading to two major, opposite development trends in rural Europe; one of increasing abandonment of land and afforestation, especially in Norway, Finland and Sweden, but also noticeable in marginalised areas in England and Estonia. On the other hand there is still an ongoing rationalisation and industrialisation of production in other areas.

Both the CAP reforms and the WTO negotiations point towards further decoupling of payments and subsidies from agricultural production, having more payments oriented towards environmental measures but not necessarily with links to production of food and fibre. This may to some extent provide a better climate for conservation and management measures per se, but it also raises several fundamental questions, it is challenging farmers' role and also the ideas of what culture actually is. Part of the cultural heritage is seen as dependent on an active agriculture, otherwise it becomes museum-like or potentially stereotyped folklore for tourism purposes.

Some points of recommendation:

Cultural heritage lobbying

The bias that can be detected for environmental concerns and environmental qualities to be interpreted mostly as "pure" nature qualities when it comes to agri-environmental schemes, must be expanded to embrace also man-made environmental qualities – the cultural heritage of agriculture. The cultural heritage interests need to develop an effective lobby directed towards European and national rural development policy-making bodies and agri-environmental policy.

Knowledge as a prerequisite

Qualitatively good information based on inventories of the actual heritage in the individual geographical regions is an important input in the process of developing environmental plans based on local qualities. Experience shows that, approached in a respectful way, farmers and landowners tend to take cultural heritage into consideration if they are made aware of the cultural heritage qualities on their land. Increased knowledge leads to increased pride which leads to increased considerations in farmers' daily work. Although this may be an ideal more than a reality, there are positive indications from the various countries that this chain reaction works.

There is a general need to develop good indicators including heritage qualities in order to measure the effect of agricultural and planning measures in a general sustainability perspective.

Monitoring was not a focal point at the workshop, but it was touched upon through the discussion on indicators and measurements. Wide involvement of stakeholders in identifying heritage values and development trends in the process of establishing monitoring schemes is believed to lead to increased awareness and a better scoping in the use of incentives. Such processes may easily have positive spin off effects concerning commercialisation and economic development related to cultural heritage.

Increasing the focus on the possibilities and limitations related to tourism

A related issue is the role of cultural heritage in rural tourism. This highlights the question of what heritage we try to sell to tourists or what heritage is being actively upheld, managed or even developed to meet the tourists' needs. This phenomenon is exemplified by the Austrian example of selling the stereotype "rural Alp" image. Awareness of local and regional heritage qualities is an important factor for a growing tourism industry. It is the wide range of local modes of production, heritage, traditions and landscape qualities linked to agricultural activity that represents the attraction and the incentive to visit Europe's geographically varied landscapes, not the stereotypes.

The role of public opinion

Public opinion is becoming more and more powerful in decisions, justifications and legitimation regarding agricultural policies and possibilities for taking cultural heritage concerns into account. Hence, giving priority to spreading information on the linkage between agriculture and cultural heritage. This can be done without under-communicating the negative link but at least stressing the positive links is important.

Active landscape design or management

From Finland was pointed out the potential and need for active design of the countryside. Large areas are considered non-pleasant or unaesthetic. The issues debated here are also a part of the responsibility that the general land use planners have to consider. Carefully planning and design of the rural landscape may increase attractiveness both for dwellers, new incomers and visitors. These ideas may seem strange or contradictory to the need for conservation of cultural heritage, and it is important to take local and regional characteristics into consideration in order not to compromise towards stereotyping. Through many nature restoration projects in Europe, such landscape design is already taking place, however, mainly focussing on wildlife and biological diversity. A major challenge is how we can integrate agriculture's cultural heritage as well as biodiver-

sity conservation values into future planning, developing landscapes into places that are attractive and meaningful both for dwellers, visitors and those who actually live off the land. When basing such enterprises on local characteristics, cultural heritage contributes greatly to the landscape experience both related to time-depth, identity and meaning.

Sammendrag

Rapporten presenterer materiale fra en workshop med tema jordbrukets rolle som kulturbærer. Dette tema er del av et mer generelt fokus på jordbrukets multifunksjonelle rolle – et fokus utviklet som del av de pågående strukturendringene i europeisk jordbruk. Ved å samle sentrale forvaltningsaktører og forskere fungerte workshopen som en arena for utveksling av erfaringer og for å diskutere politikk, virkemidler og strategier for en bærekraftig utvikling av jordbrukets kulturlandskap og kulturarv. Workshopen hadde et nordisk fokus gjennom å vektlegge utfordringer for de nordiske land, men for å speile det nordiske og slik bringe frem både ulikheter og felles utfordringer innen Norden og Norden sett i forhold til en større sammenheng, deltok bidragsytere fra fire andre europeiske land: Nederland, Østerrike, Estland og England. Workshopen er forankret i et forskningsprosjekt finansiert av Norges forskningsråd, som gjennomføres av Norsk senter for bygdeforskning (prosjektleder) og Norsk institutt for kulturminneforskning.

Alle inviterte foredragsholdere ble bedt om å adressere de følgende fire spørsmål:

- På hvilken måte betraktes jordbruk som en opprettholder av kulturarv innen de ulike nasjonale kontekster?
- Hva er de viktigste faktorer og aktører som påvirker utviklingen av jordbrukets rolle som en opprettholder av kulturarv og som ivaretar av miljøverdier i jordbrukets kulturlandskap?
- Hvilke virkemidler er relevante for koblingen mellom jordbruk, kulturarv og øvrige miljøverdier i jordbrukets kulturlandskap?
- Hvilke fremtidige trender kan spores i forhold til virkemidlenes tematiske innretning, og hvem kontrollerer fremtidens virkemidler og strategier?

Kapittelet som beskriver status for jordbrukets kulturarv i Sverige påpeker jordbrukets betydning som landskapsformende faktor i Sverige siden 4000 f. Kr. Ekstensive jordbruksmetoder har påvirket og opprettholdt viktig biodiversitet som nå trues av at arealer går ut av bruk og at bruken intensiveres på andre arealer. Regjeringen er opptatt av jordbrukets rolle som fellesgodeprodusent (goder som biodiversitet, kulturminner, kulturlandskap). Et viktig redskap er Miljø- og landsbygdsprogrammet for Sverige (2000 – 2006), basert på EUs landbrukspolitikk (CAP), med 13 underliggende virkemidler rettet mot miljøverdier i jordbruket. To viktige virkemidler er Vern av biodiversitet og kulturminner i beite- og slåttemarker, og Verdifulle natur- og kulturmiljø. Disse virkemidlene ser ut til

å ha god effekt på å opprettholde naturlige beite- og engarealer, men de mest truede kulturmarkene som skogs- og fjellbeite er fremdeles truet. Bruken av virkemidlene viser en nord-sør forskjell hvor nord-Sverige gjør mindre bruk av midlene enn sør-Sverige. Miljø- og landsbygdsprogrammet vil fortsatt være et viktig instrument fremover. Trenden med å frikoble jordbruksstøtte fra produksjon til fortsette og vil fremme ekstensive driftsformer. Dette vil få positiv effekt for noen deler av jordbrukets kulturlandskap og slå negativt ut for andre.

Finland er et av de mest rurale land i EU. Finland er et skogdominert land, men jordbrukets rolle som del av den nasjonale kulturarv er viktig for de fleste finner. Det er også økt oppmerksomhet i befolkningen om hvilke effekter strukturendringene i jordbruket har for landskapet (tomme hus på landbygda, gjengroing av jordbruksarealer). En frivillig tilskuddsordning for bønder (tilgjengelig siden EU-medlemsskapet i 1995) dekker 90% av det dyrkede arealet og involverer 85% av bøndene. Spesielle tilskudd for ivaretagelse av tradisjonelle biotoper og for å fremme biodiversitet har ikke vært spesielt populære så langt. På den andre siden har driftsmetodene innen jordbruket generelt utviklet seg i en miljøvennlig retning takket være miljøvirkemidler og rådgivning, kurstilbud til bønder osv. Informasjon, rådgivning, interaktiv planlegging og tilstrekkelig økonomiske midler ses som avgjørende for å fremme og opprettholde den jordbruksrelaterte delen av kulturarven. Jord- og skogbruksdepartementet utformet en Naturressurs-strategi i 2002 som et grunnlag for tiltak rettet mot bærekraftig bruk av naturressurser. Et viktig element i dette arbeidet er utviklingen av indikatorer for å beskrive status og utviklingstendenser. Så langt mangler det indikatorer for de kulturarv- eller kulturminnerettede delene av (natur)ressursforvaltningen, eksempel-vis indikatorer for bygninger og andre bygde strukturer i jordbruket. Et annet aspekt er behovet for å utvikle gode nasjonale indikatorer som samtidig tar hensyn til regionale variasjoner. Hva gjelder trender fremover er fra-koplingen av støtte fra produksjon den dominerende politikk for Finland som for EU forøvrig. Dette vil føre til en ytterligere reduksjon av antall aktive gårdsbruk og en utvikling mot færre og korporative bruk som har mulighet for å investere i moderne drifts-bygninger. Tradisjonelt småskala-jordbruk vil fortsette, men i et omfang som har marginal betydning både økonomisk og for kulturlandskapet. I tillegg til å bevare kulturarvverdier, ble det trukket frem et behov for å designe og skape fremtidige attraktive landskaper.

Danmark har det mest intensive jordbruket i Norden. Det danske jordbrukets historie går 6000 år tilbake i tid. Spesielt for de arkeologiske kulturminnene har det skjedd en kraftig desimering i hele det moderne jordbrukets historie. Utviklingen de siste tiårene har gått i retning storskala svinproduksjon – en produksjonsform som setter arkeologiske kulturminner under ytterligere press. Som et resultat av omstruktureringen har store arealer med tidligere jordbruksland gått ut av bruk. Noen slike områder opplever imidlertid en tilflytting fra ressurssterke urbane men-

nesker som kjøper nedlagte gårdsbruk. Hvis denne utviklingen fortsetter vil den rurale befolkningen bestå av et krympende mindretall bønder – noe som aktualiserer spørsmålet om hvem som er den ”naturlige” opprettholder av natur- og kulturarv tilknyttet landbruket. For å få bonden til å bli en bedre ivaretaker av kulturarven er informasjon viktig, videre behøves et bedre samarbeid mellom ulike departementer, andre offentlige organer og landbrukets egne organisasjoner. Natur-planer er en pilotprosjekt som er under utprøving. Sammen med en rådgiver utformer bonden en plan som viser viktige naturobjekter på eiendommen, denne oversikten skal bidra til at disse kvalitetene tas hensyn til i den daglige drift. Gjennom også å inkludere kulturminner i planen ville trolig kulturminner både over og under jorda bli tatt bedre vare på, og i tillegg ville planen bidra til å øke bondens bevissthet og stolthet i forhold til kulturarvressurser på egen eiendom. EUs politikk ses som den viktigste arena for å koble jordbruk med kulturarvhensyn, spesielt fremheves EUs jordbruksfond for rural utvikling som lovende gjennom dets fokus på nedenfra-og-opp-prosesser i ivaretagelsen av kulturarv. Men som vi skal se i det engelske eksempelet, setter EU noen viktige barrierer for å knytte vern av kulturarv til næringsutvikling.

Kapitlet som presenterer synspunkter fra den frivillige organisasjonen Det nordiske kulturlandskapsforbundet uttrykker en tro på prinsippet vern gjennom bruk. Dette innebærer at vern av jordbrukets kulturlandskap først og fremst må baseres på produksjon og ikke på en verne-tankegang alene – dette gjelder både for den kulturhistoriske dimensjonen og for biodiversitet. I sammenheng med dette påpeker forbundet en tendens til at natur fokuseres mer enn kultur når det gjelder landskapskvaliteter – eksempelvis uttrykt gjennom bruken av begreper hvor kulturmarker kalles semi-naturlige habitater istedenfor semi-kulturskapte habitater. Denne begrepsbruken tar ikke inn poenget om at mange av disse landskapene og habitatene bare kan tas vare på og bevare sin autenticitet ved at de inngår i en jordbrukmessig bruk som skapte kvalitetene i utgangspunktet. Hva gjelder fremtidig utvikling av jordbruket vil moderne jordbruk i økonomisk og organisatorisk forstand fremdeles være hovedfokus, men samtidig ses en voksende etterspørsel fra en økende urban befolkning etter produkter, tilbud og opplevelser fra en ”levende landsbygd”. Dette mulighetsvinduet for nisjeproduksjoner og turisme må utnyttes av både bønder og det offentlige støttesystemet, det behøves kunnskap og informasjon for å utvikle produkter, nettverk osv. På denne måten kan kulturarv og kulturlandskaper opprettholdes gjennom et produksjonssystem, og ikke ensidig være avhengig av offentlig støtte.

To kapitler beskriver status for jordbrukets kulturarv i Estland. Jordbruket har vært sentralt i hele landets dramatiske historie. Estland ble sent urbanisert og har vært et fattig land – noe som viser seg å ha vært fordelaktig for arkeologiske kulturminner og for naturkvaliteter på landsbygda. Men de siste tiårene har jordbruket gjennomgått store endringer. Både

jordbrukshistorien og status og syn på kulturarv i Estland er nært knyttet til de skiftende eiendomsregimene. Hvert regime og hver epoke i jordbrukshistorien har avsatt sitt "lag" i landskapet. De siste og mest omfattende endringene har vært innføringen av privat eiendomsrett til areal på 1990-tallet, som del av en generell overgang fra en sentralstyrt økonomi til markedsøkonomi. Liberaliseringen av jordbrukssektoren og åpningen av markedsadgang har ført til et dramatisk fall i lønnsomheten i jordbruket. "Framtida" ses som synonymt med "det urbane", spesielt for unge mennesker, mens det rurale er ensbetydende med det tradisjonelle og tilbakestående. For mange estlendere ses ingen kobling mellom jordbruk og kulturarv, jordbruket betraktes som en økonomisk sektor. Imidlertid har myndighetene lagt seg på den europeiske modellen om et multifunksjonelt jordbruk. For å opprettholde den jordbrukstilknyttede kulturarven er både moralsk og økonomisk støtte viktig for å fremme ekstensive produksjonsformer og for å vektlegge opplæring og informasjon. Jordbruk som aktivitet må verdsettes mer enn idag, og leve-kårene på landsbygda generelt må forbedres.

Det islandske jordbrukssystemet har gjennomgått de samme endringer som europeisk jordbruk med spesialisering, polarisering og globalisering. Aktive gårdsbruk blir færre og større og mange bønder er avhengig av tilleggsinntekter. Et paradoks for Island spesielt er at etter en 1100 år lang bosettingshistorie hvor landet ble endret fra et naturlandskap til et kulturlandskap gjennom innføring av plante- og dyrearter, fjerning av skogen, drenering av våtmarker og i den senere tid skogbruk, er det menneskeskapte kulturlandskapet fremdeles som små øyer av kultur i et stort naturlandskap. Naturvern på Island har av den grunn ikke inkludert det jordbrukspåvirkede landskapet. Jordbruket ses imidlertid på som viktig for å opprettholde en del av kulturarven, mye av denne arven er ikke synlig i landskapet og opprettholdes bare så lenge historiene om bruk av landet og kulturen overføres til neste generasjon. For fremtidig utvikling av jordbruket som kulturarvbærer behøves samarbeid mellom veiledningsapparatet innen jordbruket, miljøadministrasjonen, museumsvesenet, landbruksuniversitetet og andre utdannings- og forskningsinstitusjoner, bøndernes organisasjoner, det nasjonale kulturminnevernet og ulike frivillige organisasjoner. Videre er det viktig å prioritere informasjon, rådgivning og økonomiske midler.

Den norske situasjonen presenteres gjennom to kapitler. Norge er et relativt sent industrialisert og urbanisert land og jordbruket har vært en av hjørnesteinsnæringene gjennom historien. Den jordbruksrelaterte kulturarven har vært sentral i defineringen av den nasjonale identitet, følgelig har bonden vært sett på som en sentral kulturbærer. Fra et norsk ståsted består jordbrukets kulturarv av en levende bygdekultur, materielle kulturminner og kulturlandskap, og den ikke-materielle kulturarven. I tillegg finnes mange arkeologiske kulturminner i jordbrukslandskapet selv om disse ikke er jordbrukstilknyttede i utgangspunktet. Kulturminner og kul-

turarv kan ses i en lokal, nasjonal og internasjonal sammenheng. For å opprettholde aktivt jordbruk og dermed jordbrukets kulturarv, trengs både økonomisk og moralsk støtte til jordbruket. Det siste refererer til opinionens rolle som en faktor av økende betydning for opprett-holdelse av statlig støtte til jordbruket. Så langt viser opinionsmålinger sterk støtte til jordbruket. Dette er ikke minst viktig gitt en utvikling hvor andel av befolkningen bosatt i urbane strøk vokser og andel av befolkningen tilknyttet jordbruket minker. I tillegg til subsidier og opinionens rolle, er internasjonale faktorer som WTO av stor betydning for framtiden. Polariseringsen i jordbruket vil trolig fortsette med færre og større gårdsbruk, og med et småskala-jordbruk stadig mer rettet mot produksjon av fellesgoder, nisjeprodukter og turisme.

Fra Østerrikes ståsted er ikke kulturarvbegrepet knyttet til jordbruk som sådan. Kulturarv oppfattes i hovedsak på to måter: Relatert til det urbane og basert på en forestilling om en "hochkultur" med hovedfokus på monumenter, og en rural kulturarv med røtter i "volkskultur". Kulturarv-dimensjonen ved jordbruket kan ses indirekte som del av den begrepsmessige forbindelsen som finnes mellom jordbruket og opprettholdelse av kulturlandskap. Slik sett er kulturlandskap et slags bro-begrep mellom kulturarv og jordbruk. Kulturarv-dimensjonen ved jordbruket kan også indirekte spores i kulturbegrepet; jordbruket opprettholder kultur definert som noe tradisjonelt og ikke-modernisert (skikker, folkløse osv). Ulike aktører har ulike forståelser av jordbruk og kulturarv (politiske aktører, jordbrukssektoren, turismesektoren, organisasjoner og NGOer utenfor jordbruket, opinionen). Den tydeligste negative faktoren for jordbrukets kulturarv i Østerrike er strukturendringene i jordbruket som fører til intensivering og ekstensivering. På den andre siden kan elementer av CAP føre til en positiv utvikling, eksempelvis fokuset på begrepet jordbrukets multifunksjonelle rolle og en sterkere vektlegging av bygdeutvikling heller enn jordbruksutvikling.

Kapittelet om England er en beskrivelse fra en tradisjonelt i hovedsak rural sammenheng, men der dagens rurale områder er karakterisert av lav sysselsettingsprosent i jordbruket og et relativt intensivt jordbruk særlig etter Storbritannias medlemskap i EU i 1973. Tapet har vært stort spesielt av arkeologiske kulturminner på grunn av intensive produksjonsformer i jordbruket – i etterkrigstiden har jordbruket mer vært en kulturarvødelegger enn en kulturarvopprettholder. Men gitt det faktum at bønder forvalter 77% av det totale landarealet så er bøndene de viktigste aktørene for å ivareta jordbrukets kulturarv. Her er det lovende utviklingstrekk knyttet til regjeringens fulle tilslutning til CAPs moduleringssprinsipp som innebærer å endre støtten fra produksjon til bygdeutvikling. Et annet positivt element er et nytt virkemiddel, "Environmental Stewardships", fra Miljø, mat og landsbygdsdepartementet. Selv om det er noen uheldige sider ved dette virkemidlet så representerer det en innovativ og lovende mulighet for å ta kulturarv-hensyn i jordbruket.

Imidlertid ble en svært lovende ordning for bygningsvern ikke godkjent av EU, da det ble sett på som en uheldig blanding av verne- og næringsutviklingstiltak. Dette er etter vår oppfatning et prinsipielt og praktisk sett svært viktig tema. Den norske STILK/SMIL-ordningen oppmuntrer nettopp til næringsutvikling knyttet til kulturarv- og landskapstiltak, og spesielt blir bygningstiltak sett som svært relevant.

Nederland presenteres som et menneske-skapt land, landets historie er en historie om konstruksjon og re-konstruksjon. Den menneskeskapte karakteren er sentral for den hollandske identitet og den gjelder både for kulturlandskapet og for naturelementene i landskapet (re-naturering er en integrert del av kulturlandskapet). Nederland er i høyeste grad et jordbruksland og et urbanisert land. Jordbruket er intensivt drevet og eksportrettet. I et slikt planlagt og bygd land er ikke kulturarvbegrepets innhold innlysende, heller ikke er forbindelsen mellom jordbruk og kulturarv entydig. Ulike oppfatninger av kulturarv får tilslutning fra ulike aktører: 1) Kulturarv er den totale sum av "her-og-nå-landskaper" – et syn som støttes av ingeniørdisiplinene og ikke minst landskaps-arkitektene. 2) Kulturarv er en utvalgt samling av unike landskap – denne oppfatningen er bredere forankret i samfunnet og finnes hos både statlige organer og NGOer innen kulturminnefeltet, naturvernet og jordbruket. 3) Kulturarv er et spesielt stadium i landskapets utviklingshistorie – denne oppfatningen finnes hos både offentlige aktører og NGOer innen kulturminne- og naturvernet.

Rapportens siste kapittel oppsummerer noen av hovedpunktene i de foregående kapitlene og presenterer noen tilrådinger for framtidens politikk rettet mot jordbrukets kulturarv. En hovedtrend fra de ulike landpresentasjonene er at strukturendringene som pågår i rurale områder og i jordbruket spesielt fører til to motsatte utviklingsløp: At jordbruksdrift opphører og arealene overlates til gjengroing eller andre formål, spesielt skogbruk, i Norge, Finland og Sverige - men også til en viss grad i England og Estland; På den andre siden er det fremdeles en sterk pågående rasjonalisering og industrialisering av produksjon på andre arealer. Både CAP-reformene og WTO-forhandlingene peker mot fortsatt fra-kopling av støtte og subsidier fra produksjon og flere virkemidler rettes mot "produksjon" av miljøkvaliteter. Denne utviklingen kan i en viss grad skape et bedre klima for virkemidler rettet mot vern og forvaltning men samtidig reises fundamentale spørsmål blant annet knyttet til hva som er jordbruket og bondens rolle og hva kultur og kulturarv egentlig er. Deler av kulturarven ses som avhengig av aktivt jordbruk, hvis ikke kan den ende opp som "museumisert" og stereotyp folkløse rettet mot turister. Noen tilrådinger for utforming av framtidens politikk for jordbrukets kulturarv er: Behovet for en kulturarv-lobby; Kunnskap er en avgjørende premiss for å fremme kulturarvhensyn i aktivt jordbruk – denne kunnskapen innebærer også å utvikle gode indikatorer for å overvåke effekter av virkemidler mellom sektorene; Det trengs et økt fokus på muligheter og begrensning-

er relatert til turisme; En erkjennelse av at opinionens rolle blir stadig mer viktig; Aktiv landskapsdesign og landskapsforvaltning må prioriteres.