

Monuments in the Landscape: Some Thoughts on the Practical Management of the Historic Environment.

Paul Frodsham

If archaeology is to be anything it must be rooted in ideas and driven by a curiosity to know the past.

Extract from the introduction to the session 'Archaeology and Ideas: Please Mind the Gap', IFA conference booklet 1994.

The management of heritage management itself is becoming a challenge in its own right.

P. J. Fowler, 1992 p93.

Note. This paper was originally written for a volume entitled 'Theory in Practice: a Professional Obligation?'. That volume has been delayed indefinitely for technical reasons, and will have a very restricted distribution when it eventually does appear. As the paper uses examples exclusively from the Northumberland National Park, it was thought that it may well be of interest to NAG members who would be unlikely to come across it in the above-mentioned volume. Consequently it is included here, and any feedback from readers would be gratefully received.

This paper is an attempt to fuse two presentations, one given at TAG 1993 entitled 'The thick red line: some thoughts on the management of archaeological landscapes in the real world' and the other from IFA 1994 entitled 'Why bother recording historic landscapes?'. These papers covered similar ground, with their main objective being to examine and constructively question current attitudes towards the management of archaeological sites and landscapes. The effective management of the archaeological resource should be of paramount importance to all archaeologists, yet it is rarely covered in detail by undergraduate courses and is simply taken for granted by many professionals. I believe that the subject should be discussed more widely within the profession as a whole, and this paper is offered as a contribution to that discussion. My views are based on a decade's work in various positions throughout England, and although I will attempt to illustrate my arguments using current issues in the Northumberland National Park most of the principles involved should be of equal relevance elsewhere.

This is not the place to enter into a detailed discussion of conservation theory, and I trust that anyone reading this paper will not need convincing of the many justifications for conservation work. However, we should remember that conservation (however defined) is only one aspect of the duties of the professional archaeologist

and a theme running through this paper is the concern that archaeology as a subject is increasingly in danger of losing out to 'heritage management'. What I hope to demonstrate is that when sites are placed back into their local landscapes rather than being considered in isolation then the opportunity arrives for a much more considered approach to their management, so that archaeological research and conservation need not necessarily be seen as in conflict with each other and effective archaeological conservation can be achieved through integrated environmental conservation projects

The concept of dealing with the management of the heritage in terms of 'sites and monuments' is now firmly entrenched, so that we think of the archaeological resource in terms of numbers of dots on SMR maps. These sites tend nowadays to be viewed as a resource to be either protected or exploited (HBMC 1991 p34), with a heavy emphasis on the former. It may well be that certain areas of the country are best managed in this way, but archaeological sites never existed in isolation, so to attempt to manage them as islands of interest in an otherwise sterile sea is in most cases going to be unsatisfactory.

No archaeologist would argue against the concept that a site is of greater value when viewed as a whole rather than as a series of independent features or finds. In the same way, these sites come together within landscapes, and the study of these landscapes has much more to tell us than the isolated study of individual sites. Recent programmes of archaeological conservation have, with a few notable exceptions, tended to focus resources on a series of specific sites rather than on more extensive landscapes. We can easily schedule ancient monuments and where necessary, consolidate them to ensure their survival for the short term future, but what real use are a

series of isolated areas (theoretically protected from damage through the thick red line drawn on the map but still subject to natural erosion) while their surroundings remain unprotected? While the protection afforded to scheduled sites may in theory cover 'the monument and its setting', in practice this is not sufficient to ensure the effective management of important archaeological landscapes. For example, we schedule prehistoric homesteads but often do nothing about nearby field systems or environmental deposits which could potentially tell us more about the occupants of the homesteads than excavation of the scheduled site ever could. To an extent this is an unfortunate result of the Ancient Monuments legislation which only allows us to schedule certain types of site, but there are alternative management options which will be discussed below.

The need to manage landscapes rather than sites may be particularly obvious in upland areas rich in visible remains, but is equally valid when dealing with, for example, buried sites under alluvium or historic city centres. This is not to say that special protection should not be afforded to particularly important sites (it most certainly should), but that the allocation of resources must not be aimed simply at the management of such sites at the expense of wider landscape conservation issues. If we are to move away from a site-based approach to management to one encompassing a more realistic (though admittedly perhaps not so easily administered) wider landscape basis then it should become easier to find a happy medium somewhere between the two apparently irreconcilable extremes of protection and exploitation. Put simply, which is of more potential use to society: an unclassified but immaculately managed earthwork, or the knowledge gleaned from the excavation of such a site? As with so many things, the answer has to be a compromise whereby some sites are conserved while others are (at least partially) investigated. An landscape based approach, ideally based on locally produced strategies, should allow us to target those sites at which investigation would be potentially most rewarding, and also to identify those sites or areas at which consolidation work to allow public access and interpretation would be most suitable.

Recent initiatives to define various types of historic landscapes (placing emphasis on, for example, patterns of old hedges or fieldwalls) are of considerable interest, but we must guard against the danger of treating such landscapes as somehow separate from ancient monuments, with the implied suggestion that each requires a separate form of designation and management (a recipe for bureaucratic chaos). I would argue that an effective form of heritage management should start with the concept of the historic landscape and provide for the particular requirements of individual sites within this framework. Such an approach demands the integrated input of a variety of local experts, and while there would doubtless be occasional conflicts of interest this approach would, I believe, be far more acceptable to landowners and heritage managers in the long term. The suggestion that we should draw up a national list of historic landscapes is fraught with difficulty, and it would surely be preferable for the

identification of particularly important areas to be drawn up at the local level, leading to negotiations between local conservation officers and landowners. The management of such areas can then be based on local initiatives which build on the framework provided by central legislation. With regard to the ongoing management of such landscapes it is important to note that decisions are constantly being taken regarding the amount of time and resources to be expended on the conservation of landscape elements such as rigg and furrow or old plantation walls, all of which are integral features of the historic landscape but which enjoy no statutory protection.

Some of the above issues can be illustrated by a brief consideration of the conservation of Hadrian's Wall and its constituent monuments. Hadrian's Wall is, quite rightly, a World Heritage Site, and is also a major tourist attraction. Consequently, it is easy to justify, in conventional terms, the expenditure of relatively vast sums of public money on its conservation. However, we all know where Hadrian's Wall is, what it looked like, when it was built, and even (to a large extent) what it was for, so should we worry too much about conserving every single stone of the complex when there are so many other sites about which we know virtually nothing? In effect, the conservation of Hadrian's Wall involves the resetting of 'Roman' stones in modern mortar: what the visitor sees as time goes by is increasingly a modern construction which looks like what the Wall, in an advanced state of decay, happened to look like at the time the conservators got to it. Yet, in this age of replicas (when we can visit Stonehenge or the Parthenon in North America) nowhere can the visitor see more than a few metres of replica Hadrian's Wall showing how it must once have appeared. I am not suggesting that vast lengths of Hadrian's Wall should be 'rebuilt', but the level of interest generated by the few reconstructed sites suggests that, while we must guard against a profusion of ill-conceived pastiches and facades, further work to increase levels of public interest may not be an altogether bad thing. The question of which elements of the landscape should be consolidated for display has already resulted in controversy on the Wall, most notably at Sewingshields milecastle where the attempt to interpret the Roman remains in association with later (but still archaeologically important) medieval shielings has resulted in a confusing structure which most visitors fail to comprehend (Fowler 1992 p13).

For most of the last 1500 years the Wall was an attraction chiefly due to its availability as a ready supply of finely worked building stone. It is only recently that we have developed this strange concept of conservation, so that, for example, Thirlwall Castle, built entirely of stone plundered from the Wall, is now a major conservation headache in its own right. This example serves to illustrate the point that the Hadrian's Wall landscape is not a Roman landscape: it is a historic landscape with considerable time-depth stretching from prehistoric times (although many of the interesting prehistoric remains have never even been surveyed due to the virtual monopoly on resources enjoyed by the Wall) through until the recent past.

To a large extent the interest in landscape archaeology comes from a desire to identify, and then to explain, changes in the landscape over the millennia. In many cases these changes resulted in the destruction or the re-working of older sites. It could be considered something of a paradox, therefore, that in many cases we now seek to conserve archaeological remains (and their settings) by attempting to prevent developments in the landscape. Indeed, it could be argued that the late 20th century is one of the few post-Roman periods not represented architecturally in the Hadrian's Wall landscape, as the conservation ethic dictates that nothing is built that would detract from the setting of the Wall. Arguably the most noteworthy contribution to the history of the Wall landscape in the 1990s has been the 'creation' of 'Kevin Costner's tree' at Sycamore Gap, which has become a tourist honeypot since a scene from the recent Robin Hood movie was filmed here. The roots of the tree may well be disturbing archaeological deposits, but it would be a brave heritage manager who chooses to fell this tree in the interests of heritage management. To an extent this example illustrates a further quandry faced by the heritage manager: who decides what should be conserved? If the general public want to see a tree conserved on an ancient monument, or rabbits left alone to live happily inside an old earthwork, then what right does the archaeologist have to remove either? And does tourism in itself provide justification for the vast expenditure of resources on particular sites? The commercialisation of the heritage was perhaps an inevitable result of the 1980s, but there are dangers in allowing commercial considerations to lead the way in heritage management. Councils throughout the land pride themselves on their local heritage (especially where archaeological remains are spectacular and readily interpretable) and are keen to attract grants to ensure that this heritage is conserved. The motive for much of this activity is clearly economic, with the heritage theme guaranteed to provide a boost for the local economy. But as archaeologists how much priority should we give to such demands for funding when other, less spectacular, sites and landscapes are constantly under threat? The recently approved Hadrian's Wall National Trail provides a classic example of this quandry: should areas of Hadrian's Wall be protected from the increased pressure of more visitors' feet at the expense of natural erosion on less visited sites elsewhere, or should less visited sites be accorded equal importance?

When considering the conservation of the Hadrian's Wall landscape it is of course quite silly to discuss the management of the area in terms solely of its archaeology. The area is made up of many diverse interests and is, as it always has been, a living, working landscape. The problems here are only exaggerations of the issues facing those responsible for the management of ancient monuments everywhere. In some cases the archaeological remains will be deemed to be the most important features of a landscape, but in all cases the key point is to move away from a concept of *managing monuments* to one of *managing land on which there are important ancient monuments*. There is only one landscape, whether we

chose to call it historic or natural, and trees and birds are as much part of the former as megalithic tombs are of the latter. Similarly, as noted by MacInnes (1993 p101), '*Depending on your perspective, a green patch of grass breaking up the purple-brown of a heather moorland may be a productive oasis, a degraded piece of land or the platform for a prehistoric house*'. This is by no means a new concept, and the potential for integrated archaeological and ecological conservation has been stressed by several writers over a number of years (see, for example, the various papers in Lambrick 1985). However, there is still considerable potential for further work in this field, and archaeologists and ecologists must do more to raise mutual awareness of each others' priorities so that greater emphasis can be put on integration.

When a large landscape unit, for example a single farm or estate, is the subject of an overall conservation plan then a number of options often become available which are not possible when discussing the management of an ancient monument in isolation. For example, a particularly interesting hillfort in the north west corner of the Northumberland National Park was planted with trees about a hundred years ago and these trees have now reached an age at which several are blown over each winter causing serious damage to the buried deposits within the fort. The farmer is keen on conservation, both ecological and archaeological, and wishes to restock this woodland as both a valuable landscape feature and a haven for wildlife. The fort is scheduled, and scheduled monument consent, not unreasonably, will not be granted for further planting within the protected area. If things are left alone then the trees will continue to blow over, further damaging the archaeology, the farmer will get more irate (and blame the archaeologists) as each year goes by, and (even allowing for some natural regeneration, causing further archaeological damage) the value of the woodland habitat will continue to decline. The answer is surprisingly simple when a wider landscape approach is adopted. The farmer, in the knowledge that he will not get consent for further planting in this wood, has been more than happy for the National Park Authority to fell all the remaining trees in the fort (following a detailed topographical survey of the site) while at the same time planting a new woodland (with grant aid from the Woodland Grant Scheme) elsewhere on his farm. The result is good for archaeology, for nature conservation and for public relations, and this kind of solution is only possible when the management is controlled at a local level and when an overall landscape approach to conservation is in operation. Through such management decisions we are, of course, creating the archaeology of the future: our concern to plan woodland to avoid damage to archaeological remains will in future be seen from a historical perspective as illustrative of a period during which serious concern was afforded to conservation issues (and only time will tell whether or not our commitment to conservation is in some cases deemed to be excessive). Although it is easier to operate such a scheme within a national park, where there are naturally more resources available for conservation, any local authority with an archaeologist and an ecologist should be

able to adopt a similar approach.

This discussion leads logically to a call for integrated designations for archaeological, ecological and landscape conservation together with access provision where relevant (Miles 1992). Hadrian's Wall is a World Heritage Site and a scheduled ancient monument: its central section is partly within a National Park, passes through two large Sites of Special Scientific Interest (which actually overlap each other), has several sections in the Guardianship of English Heritage, is largely owned by the National Trust, and is now followed by two National Trails: is it any wonder that landowners occasionally despair? Unfortunately, given the current state of the legislative framework within which we must work, there seems little likelihood of integrated designations in the near future. On a local level though, we are able to put together integrated management agreements under Section 39 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act or, in some cases within the terms of Countryside Stewardship or Environmentally Sensitive Area schemes. In many cases such agreements can be linked to the English Heritage 'Survey Grants for Presentation' scheme, adding considerably to the archaeological interest of the areas concerned. Such agreements offer real potential for the conservation of extensive archaeological landscapes, and a further example from the Northumberland National Park will serve to illustrate the point. Lordenshaws Farm (Topping 1993, Frodsham *et al* 1995) on the Simonside Hills is of considerable archaeological, geological and ecological interest, and is relatively easily accessible and consequently very popular with walkers. It is also a working farm used essentially for the raising of cattle, sheep and grouse. The management agreement between the Park Authority, the landowner and the farm tenant covers all of these factors, by, for example, limiting stocking levels and rationalising car parking and public access in addition to undertaking practical conservation work such as infilling erosion scars and tree planting. Particularly important ancient monuments within this landscape remain scheduled, but now with the added advantage that their context is secure at least for the time being. Such agreements often also include provision for drystone walling or the conservation of ancient agricultural buildings, thus helping to ensure the continuation of craft skills within the local community.

The main concern with management agreements like that at Lordenshaws is that they are voluntary and only of fixed duration. For this reason any particularly important sites should be scheduled regardless of whether or not they are covered by such an agreement. Some may raise the objection that these agreements are elitist as they often provide grant aid to large estates and owners of historic mansions. However, I have no doubt that integrated management agreements, some of which will inevitably involve the spending of considerable sums of public money, are the best way to ensure the effective management of extensive archaeological landscapes for at least the short term future. The thinking behind this approach is summarised by Kristainsen (1993 p58) in his discussion of the Danish situation: *'we have reached the point in Denmark at which the most crucial task is to bring about*

a rational relationship between future agricultural production, the preservation of the landscape and leisure activities: that is between protection and production. This requires the development of a more holistic and dynamic view of nature, based on an historical perspective, and beyond this some breaking down of disciplinary boundaries and attitudes'. The potential for integrating agricultural production with archaeological conservation in this country depends to a large extent on decisions taken with regard to the Common Agricultural Policy (see Owen-John 1994 for an outline of current issues), and we must hope that future developments make more allowance for long term landscape conservation.

Lordenshaws contains several examples of the prehistoric rock carvings commonly known as 'cup and ring marks', and these can be used to further illustrate some of the concepts outlined in this paper. These carvings are still one of the great mysteries of British prehistory. This is not the place to consider them in any detail, suffice to say that they are found on outcrop rock, large boulders, standing stones and other monuments throughout several areas of Britain (notably Northumberland, Yorkshire, Galloway and Argyll), and they range from small apparently insignificant cup marks to extensive complicated designs consisting of concentric rings and other motifs. The way in which these sites are distributed throughout the landscape is far from random and they have the potential to provide a unique insight into prehistoric society (eg Bradley 1991). While academic interest in the phenomenon is growing, little is being done (except in Scotland and in the Peak District National Park) with regard to the conservation or interpretation of the known sites. Most are in upland areas where the likelihood of damage or destruction through human interference is relatively slight, but nevertheless they illustrate a number of issues of relevance here. For example, while the most complex examples are scheduled as ancient monuments, the phenomenon as a whole will never be understood by studying these alone. There is a need to study the simple examples as well as the more complicated, yet these simple, relatively unspectacular examples are not protected in any way. The schedule certainly does not contain a representative sample of the surviving sites. What should be done to rectify this imbalance? Is it enough to simply record all the carvings and then not worry if some examples get destroyed? Should such recording consist simply of photography, or should we make use of expensive laser techniques so that future rates of erosion can be measured? Regardless of whether or not the rock art sites are scheduled, they will continue to deteriorate through natural erosion, and eventually (not too far into the future judging by the current condition of many examples) they will disappear. Should we remove some of the originals and place them in museums, perhaps placing accurate casts on the original sites? Or should the originals be buried in situ and have replicas placed on top of them? If they are buried then might this adversely affect possible future dating techniques based on relative lengths of exposure of rock faces? Does the average member of the public care whether he or she is confronted by an original

or a replica, and if it is a replica should we say so on an information panel or not bother? Is it satisfactory to conserve such sites within small clearings in forestry plantations, when one of the keys to their interpretation probably lies in the views originally obtainable from them? It is interesting to consider that many of these carvings were reused in prehistoric times, often incorporated into monuments as powerful symbols of the past, and here we are in the late twentieth century still reusing them: this time in a way which reflects our own society's values, as museum exhibits. A final observation on the management of the rock art sites relates to their study as an independent phenomenon rather than as one facet of neolithic or bronze age studies, something which is finally changing for the better. Rock art sites did not exist in isolation, and the surrounding landscape still contains fragile evidence (in the form of buried sites or flint scatters) for contemporary patterns of land use. Indeed, dozens of forestry plantations created in north Northumberland since the 1940s have resulted in the disturbance of countless flint artefacts, and many important sites must have been damaged or destroyed. Forestry is not the threat it once was, but landowners are being encouraged, quite rightly, to create new deciduous woodland. Such woodland creation does not provide a sufficient return to allow the funding of archaeological evaluations or excavations, so how should we be addressing such issues from the landscape management point of view? These are all issues which relate equally to many other classes of monument, and which require further discussion.

It is pertinent at this point to consider in some detail the concept of 'scheduling', and to introduce into our discussion the issue of PPG16 (Dept. of the Environment 1990) and the various assumptions contained therein. As we all know, monuments are scheduled to protect them from damaging development, and considerable resources are currently allocated to the Monuments Protection Programme which is engaged in the essential and much overdue task of updating the Schedule. This is fine in theory, but raises serious ethical issues where the legislation is used to deny archaeologists access to sites for important archaeological research. Of course, where the Secretary of State for National Heritage (and his advisers) see eye to eye with an academic applying for scheduled monument consent then there will be no problem, but it may well be only a matter of time before we have a high profile case of the 'custodians' engaged in direct confrontation with the 'academics' over the excavation of a scheduled monument somewhere. I am aware of one very recent case of a university department apparently being threatened with court action while undertaking fieldwork in the vicinity of a scheduled area, despite the facts that care was taken not to stray into the scheduled area and that English Heritage had been notified of the project well in advance. This issue is not raised to imply criticism of either party (each is doing what it regards as its duty to the best of its ability) but the point to stress is the potential conflict of interest created by the conservation ethic.

The release of '*Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning*' (PPG16) in 1990 marked a watershed in the history of 'rescue' archaeology. This guidance should ensure that all developments requiring planning permission take due account of archaeological remains, so that no archaeological deposits are destroyed by such developments without provision for their proper recording. However, the direction within PPG16 that important sites (both scheduled and unscheduled) should be preserved *in situ* wherever possible carries several potentially dangerous assumptions, as well as being arguably anti-intellectual in its basic foundation (Biddle 1994). Obviously, there are a few sites which are so important that the assumption should be against any kind of exploitative intervention, and these should only be the subject of destructive excavation where particularly important academic questions cannot be answered in any other way. However, the crucial issue here is whether or not this assumption should apply to each and every one of the 60,000 or so scheduled ancient monuments which we are told to expect by the conclusion of the Monuments Protection Programme (and remember in addition that PPG 16 refers to 'nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not')? The Ancient Monuments legislation was originally intended to ensure that important sites were not damaged or destroyed without the provision for adequate archaeological investigation. This is a long way from saying that a particular development (or archaeological excavation) should not take place in the vicinity of a monument because that monument happens to be there. It must seem to some that the monuments themselves are taking over the management of the landscape.

The need for lead roles in archaeological projects to be taken at the local level is made on a number of occasions throughout this paper. All English county councils and national parks now have permanent archaeological staff, with many having two or three full time posts, and we should not lose sight of the fact that this healthy situation is largely due to the foresight of English Heritage over recent years. What is now needed is for these locally based staff, in consultation with relevant academics and English Heritage, to produce detailed archaeological strategies for their regions. No national strategy (eg HBMC 1991) can hope to deal in sufficient depth with the variations in priorities between different parts of the country, but local strategies can provide a detailed framework for the research and conservation of the local historic environment. These should explain the general circumstances under which certain sites may be investigated prior to development while others should remain undisturbed under all but the most exceptional circumstances. PPG16 related fieldwork will necessarily feature more prominently in some such strategies than in others, and funding can be sought from elsewhere for important research which is unlikely to be funded through developments (see Bishop 1994 for a wider discussion of PPG16 and research). Ideally, the question of whether or not particular excavation projects should be supported should then be addressed by reference to these regional

archaeological strategies, which must be updated regularly to take account of changing circumstances.

Such strategies should also help us to guard against any suggestion of double standards. If a respected academic wishes to undertake a carefully planned and clearly justified research excavation at a nationally important site then surely most of us would agree that he or she should be supported. However, if the very same project is proposed on behalf of a developer who wishes to build a housing estate on the site then the current assumption is that it should be turned down. In my opinion, the existence of concise local strategies should help to remove any such potential for confusion. In addition we should not lose sight of the fact that neither the Ancient Monuments legislation nor PPG16 were originally intended to restrict serious archaeological fieldwork.

While encouraging fieldwork under suitable circumstances, local strategies must also stress the need for conservation. This can include the consolidation of sites for interpretation (while always considering carefully the option of excavating any deposits which are to be effectively entombed by the consolidation) as well as the preservation of deposits to ensure their survival for future archaeological investigation. Conservation in the latter respect is very much a means to an end and, while it can certainly be a long term policy, it should not be the ultimate aim of any archaeological strategy. Consequently, we should never dismiss the opportunity for archaeological fieldwork (whether development related or not) without serious consideration. If a proposed project is likely to contribute usefully to the study of our past, without the probability of destroying particularly important information which is unlikely to be obtainable elsewhere, then I would argue that consent (whether scheduled monument consent or planning permission) should not normally be withheld on archaeological grounds. This approach demands the adoption of a more positive attitude towards excavation, and may, in fact, be what is actually happening throughout much of the country. Indeed, such an approach may not necessarily be incompatible with a basic assumption of conservation *in situ*, but it does require a liberal interpretation of the guidance.

A major assumption underpinning the 'conserve *in situ*' argument is that there will be more effective scientific techniques, enabling the more comprehensive analysis of sites, at some distant point in the future. If important remains are carefully buried under a multi-storey tower block then never mind: the remains are safe and can be examined, possibly using currently unknown techniques, when that tower block is eventually demolished. Therefore, so the argument goes, it is better to see a site buried and conserved than excavated, even in cases where the developer of the site is prepared to pay the full costs of excavation. While agreeing that it is better to conserve remains beneath modern buildings than to see them destroyed by development, I do wonder whether it is always better to bury a site beneath a road or a housing estate (or to refuse planning permission on archaeological grounds) than to investigate those remains once and for all. In many cases considerable expense goes into the

conservation of such sites which remain poorly understood and which may never be seen again. A few such locations may be redeveloped in the future leading to opportunities for investigation, but it is surely just as likely that someone will slap a conservation order on the later development, thus effectively sealing in the old buried remains forever. We should also bear in mind that there is no guarantee that PPG16 type policies will be in operation in the distant future. Consequently, there is a distinct possibility that by denying ourselves the option of investigating sites now we could effectively be permanently denying ourselves access to the knowledge obtainable from them.

Many of the most difficult archaeological problems faced by our planners relate to large scale developments (such as building work in historic city centres, gravel extraction or road construction) where the sheer costs of excavation can be prohibitive and a strong case can often be made for attempting to conserve remains beneath the ground: every such case has to be considered on its own merits. It is essential for our planners to have PPG 16 and the SAM legislation to fall back on when dealing with such cases, and both instruments are crucial to the protection of the heritage. However, a local strategy should enable certain sites to be hallmarked for conservation while others are set aside for excavation and possible subsequent renovation: in other words, it would allow for a more flexible interpretation of the planning guidelines and the scheduling legislation. I am not, of course, arguing for excavation for the sake of it: all archaeologists should now agree that progress in understanding the past relies as much if not more on theoretical developments than on the simple acquisition of more data (eg Hodder 1993 p13). However, the collection of data, when this is provided by the development process should not be automatically discouraged due to current conservation dogma. In many cases the chance to excavate in advance of development should be seen as a once in a lifetime opportunity rather than as a last resort to be turned to only when all else has failed. In general terms the principle of preservation *in situ* may well be a fair one, but it must not be rigidly applied in all cases.

The problem of the resource manager's attitude towards archaeological investigation is accurately (though possibly inadvertently) illustrated by Mills (1993) in his discussion of the aims of the Cultural Resource Management Group of the Institute of Field Archaeologists. To summarise his views, the group exists to *encourage* appreciation of the resource, to *promote* the nature of archaeological evidence, to *encourage* research and training in management and tourism etc, and yet it only *accepts* the need for investigation and exploitation of the resource (my italics). This is not, in my view, the way in which an archaeologist should be approaching this 'resource'. I do not believe that we should consider our role as solely one of stewardship. While future generations may well thank us for a responsible attitude towards heritage management, they will not necessarily thank us if such an attitude results in our failure to reasonably progress the study of our past.

The balance between conservation and investigation has been discussed on many occasions, perhaps most eloquently by Startin in one of the more entertaining presentations yet seen at an IFA conference (later published in *Antiquity*: Startin 1993). Startin describes the dilemma of 'study and thus destroy' versus 'preserve and thus severely restrict study'. He quotes from a variety of conventions and codes of practice which appear in some cases to be in direct conflict with each other with regard to the archaeologist's prime responsibilities of research and conservation. He goes on to consider the occasions on which excavation can be justified, and makes the crucial point that without a certain amount of destructive investigation we cannot hope to be in a position to draw up efficient conservation priorities: how can we judge the importance of a site if we don't even know what it is? And if our conservation strategies are based on unsound foundations through lack of knowledge, then how on earth are we to justify using those very strategies to restrict study in the future? This problem can be illustrated through a brief consideration of current policy on round barrows. So far as I can tell, round barrows and cairns of all shapes and sizes (with a handful of exceptions where contrary dating evidence has been obtained from excavation) are considered by the Monuments Protection Programme to be bronze age burial monuments. The sample of such monuments is then analysed and a *representative* sample is identified for scheduling. The main problem here is that this representative sample contains those which gain the highest score in the comparative league tables. Individual sites therefore fail to gain legal protection through, for example, being relatively small and unspectacular, through being in 'poor condition', or through apparently being single examples rather than part of a cemetery complex. The situation here is more complicated than that already discussed for rock art, as the actual importance of any one individual barrow cannot be assessed without its excavation: the current external appearance of a mound may offer no clues to the importance of the deposits buried within or beneath it. The conventional view of round barrows, as with so much British prehistory, is based on the situation in southern England, yet we now know that round barrows are far from being exclusively bronze age (many, especially in the north, are known to be neolithic and others even iron age in origin). This may appear to be unnecessary bickering, but how do we know that the relatively poor examples of barrows are not a particular class of monument distinctive from the more grand examples, possibly different in function as well as chronology? We should also bear in mind that the potential value of any given barrow is influenced by its relation to other classes of monument (such as linear earthworks, field systems or panels of rock art) so that a damaged barrow in a particular location can be of considerably greater academic value than a pristine example in a less interesting location. These problems are particularly relevant where certain sites, having been protected for decades, have in effect just failed to muster sufficient points to avoid relegation and are being descheduled forever. I don't pretend that there is an easy

answer to this problem, given the legislation with which we have to work, but surely any sample for scheduling has to be truly representative and not just include what appear to be the 'best' examples of any particular class. There is also the issue of which classes of monuments within the landscape should be considered for scheduling: at a time when we schedule industrial sites and list very recent buildings how long is it going to be before we hear calls for the protection of, for example, historic golf courses, motorway architecture or nuclear power stations (many of which may themselves have been the subject of much planning controversy at the time of their construction)?

In spite of the above observations, scheduling remains the best form of legal protection for important sites. The management of scheduled sites is overseen by the English Heritage Ancient Monuments Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State for National Heritage. In practice the management of scheduled sites becomes the onerous responsibility of a single individual (albeit with the considerable support of a field monument warden), based in London, covering a vast area and dealing with hundreds of different people and organisations. No Inspector can be expected to develop an in depth knowledge of the landscape context of every scheduled monument in his or her area, so any landscape approach to the management of areas including scheduled sites must involve close liaison between locally based archaeologists and the relevant Inspector. Where it is an option such an approach makes much more sense than the alternative of a series of small scale agreements for specific scheduled areas between owners and English Heritage. For such a system to succeed there is obviously a need to ensure that resources are available for projects other than those dealing specifically with scheduled sites. As already noted, considerable progress is being made in this direction although there is still a great deal more to be done.

Just as it was never intended to preclude research, the Ancient Monuments legislation was never intended to hinder conservation work. The idea that any work affecting scheduled sites requires the government's prior consent is fine in theory, but unfortunately the scheduling of sites can result in frustrating delays when conservation work is required. The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1994 has introduced new Class Consents whereby certain operations are permitted on scheduled monuments without the need to set in motion the cumbersome scheduled monument consent (SMC) procedure. These are to be welcomed but do not, in my opinion, go far enough and effectively only remove the need for SMC where English Heritage is contributing to the cost of works. There is still the risk of considerable delay for conservation work undertaken by organisations other than English Heritage. Of course it is important that any archaeological work affecting a scheduled monument (be it conservation, excavation or survey) should be monitored and be of a sufficient standard, but it would surely be in everyone's best interest to design a system whereby local authorities or owners can undertake small scale conservation work to scheduled ancient monuments with the approval of the relevant Inspector but without the need for the full

scheduled monument consent procedure. I fully sympathise with any farmer who is told 'yes, your proposed new fence will be good for the management of the adjacent ancient monument and you will get consent for it, but no, you can't start building it until you've got your letter from the Department of National Heritage which should arrive some time over the next three months'. A delay of two or three months to undertake conservation work may not seem excessive, but it can be crucial when trying to fit work into the farming calendar.

English Heritage's senior archaeologist, Geoff Wainwright (1993), tells us in a recent paper that '*not only would it be onerous for the landowners in a scheduled landscape to apply for scheduled monument consent each time they wished to carry out works but it would be an administrative nightmare to process and would bring the legislation into disrepute*'. It may surprise some readers to learn, therefore, that there is still a need for a full SMC application for every stile or finger post erected, or (some would argue) for every dead tree felled in the Hadrian's Wall area, even where such work is obviously in the best interests of the conservation of archaeological remains. While the Hadrian's Wall area is without doubt something of a special case, I can confirm that such extensive scheduled areas do indeed cause major problems for farmers and others with responsibility for landscape management in the area, the vast majority of whom are interested in the archaeological remains and who do not wish to see them damaged. Indeed, the transformation in the attitudes of many farmers towards archaeology, often resulting from only a brief conversation and a short walk around the farm, has been a pleasure to behold. Through being in the position to take time to explain why things are important, and illustrating how different features fit together to tell the story of an area over thousands of years I have heard the same reaction on so many occasions: 'if only someone had told me that before'. The average member of the public, be they a farmer or not, is intrigued to see ancient monuments interpreted not as elements of an alien world (or even of a foreign country) but simply as parts of a chronological and spatial jigsaw which can be put together to demonstrate the development of human societies through until the present day. My aim (which I believe is gradually being achieved in the area for which I am responsible) is to ensure so far as is possible that '*farmers become enthusiasts for the landscapes they farm rather than victims of bureaucratic repression*' (Morris 1993 p13). Such a situation will only come about through the development of mutual trust between farmers and archaeologists, and this will only develop through extensive personal contact. If more resources were to be allocated to the education of land managers, in the attempt to win them over to the principle of support for the cultural heritage, then I suspect that the results could be exceptional. This must be one of our key objectives as a profession for the next decade: to take time to gain the interest and support of those who manage the land on a day to day basis. The support of such individuals is of incalculable value to the aim of landscape conservation. This is a task which must be directly addressed by local

archaeologists, and it means making a real effort to get out and about meeting landowners and farmers to put our case. And we shouldn't stop with the education of landowners: it is also essential to educate the public in general. It is important, though, that this education is achieved through popularisation rather than trivialisation: I suspect that I am not the only archaeologist who found it disappointing when, with all the images available to it, English Heritage chose to illustrate its tenth anniversary advertisement in the national press with a picture of a teddy bear holding a balloon.

All of the above discussions depend to a very large extent on the adequate initial recording of what is actually visible in the historic landscape. No programme of conservation or investigation can really expect to succeed unless such a database of the basic archaeological resource is available to it. The recording of the historic landscape was the main subject of the second of the two presentations from which this paper has been cobbled together. That discussion identified three basic justifications for the expenditure of resources on the recording of historic landscapes: academic research (easily justifiable, but for which funds are always going to be limited despite the best efforts of our Royal Commissions); interpretation for the public (but should tourism be a justification for recording work, or is this a classic case of putting the cart before the horse?); and management or conservation initiatives (for which relatively vast sums of money are currently available). The conclusion of this paper was that projects should be designed where possible to include an element of each of these justifications, and priority is given to such projects within the Northumberland National Park. The paper also argued that excavation must sometimes be used as part of the process of recording the historic landscape, and not always viewed as a luxury to be considered once the various forms of non-destructive survey have been completed. The Monuments at Risk Survey (MARS), funded by English Heritage, provides a good example of the kind of management project to which considerable financial resources are currently allocated. The MARS project aims to assess the current condition of the national archaeological resource, and has an initial budget not far short of a million pounds. If this work eventually results in considerably more resources becoming available for archaeological work then it will have been worthwhile, and I await with interest the eventual conclusions which are presented to justify such expense. In the meantime it will be interesting to see how the theory outlined in the first issue of the *Martian Chronicle* (such as the attempt to measure the surviving percentage of various monuments and landscapes) actually works in practice, and how it is intended to use the information thus generated to inform future management work.

It should have become obvious from the above discussion that one of my main concerns is the desire for a suitable compromise between, on the one hand, archaeological research, and on the other, heritage management. It may seem absurd that such an apparent split has occurred between the two, but it could be argued that such an argument is both essential and potentially

beneficial to future landscape management. The problem can perhaps be well illustrated by reference to a further example from the Northumberland National Park: a scheduled hillfort which is currently in the process of being destroyed by rabbits whose burrowing activities are causing the impressive stone faced ramparts to tumble into the ditches at an alarming rate. I have in the past allocated resources to the repair of erosion scars in ancient earthworks (Frodsham 1993), and would now question the value of some of this work. As noted by Lowenthal (1985 p385) *'To halt demolition and stave off erosion approaches a precious permanence, a virtual immortality that defies the tooth of time'*. Sure, erosion is temporarily halted by such work, but permanence or immortality will never be achieved for a stone structure let alone a 'soft' earthwork site: surely it is better to allocate some of the currently available resources to enable research now rather than simply continue to pass the buck for further conservation work to future generations. When the hillfort in question is related to its contemporary landscape it soon becomes apparent that there have been no recorded excavations at any of half a dozen nearby hillforts, and that we know virtually nothing of the detailed chronology of these sites. At a time when academics are increasingly directing resources abroad (there seems to be no objection to our students learning excavation techniques by digging up 'foreign' sites) a local university department has expressed interest in undertaking an excavation of a short stretch of the damaged ramparts in order to investigate the level of rabbit damage and to attempt to glean some information about the date and function of the site. It is, in my opinion, unfortunate that current theory demands preservation *in situ* and thus risks losing opportunities such as this. On a more general level, how are we to reconcile the fact that our university departments are undertaking increasing levels of work abroad while many of our own important sites continue to fall apart without any adequate recording due to a lack of resources? I am certainly not suggesting that our students should not have the opportunity to work abroad, but I believe that opportunities for stimulating fieldwork projects in this country must be provided if we hope to encourage students to stay within the profession. While I would be the first to agree that any such projects must be of an acceptable academic standard, and where scheduled sites are concerned should perhaps be monitored by English Heritage, I do not believe that this should provide an insurmountable problem as anyone incapable of working to such a standard should not be teaching excavation techniques in a university in the first place.

Closer working relationships between academic archaeologists and heritage managers at a local level can prove beneficial in a number of ways. Any university department with genuine research interests in its immediate environs (a criterion which would currently exclude many) could surely find liaison with a local authority of considerable interest at a time when budgets are so tight: this could result in much useful evaluation work of mutual value to archaeological research and development planning while also introducing students to the real world

of archaeology. While there are certainly some tasks which should be reserved for professional contractors, I see no reason in principle why local authorities (or even perhaps developers) should not seek to develop links with academic institutions in certain cases. The Northumberland National Park Authority (with considerable financial assistance from English Heritage) is currently running a long term research and conservation project at Bremeium (High Rochester) Roman Fort which involves the Archaeology Department of Newcastle University along with professional geophysical and consolidation contractors. This project focuses on the fort, a scheduled monument, but it also encompasses the landscape approach alluded to earlier as it aims to study the fort within its surroundings and incorporates the recording of pre-Roman and post-Roman remains. The project is of considerable educational value to those students involved in it, is undertaking genuinely important academic research, and is also essential to the future management of the area as it should lead to a management agreement to include low key access and interpretation.

Bearing in mind the local priorities for archaeological work, the Northumberland National Park Authority has been the major influence in setting up a long term project to study the archaeology of the Breamish Valley in the Cheviots, an area particularly rich in visible field monuments. This is a project which I believe embodies a number of the concepts discussed above, and which also fulfills the call in the Edwards Report (Edwards 1991) for National Park Authorities to undertake more archaeological research and to work more closely with academic institutions. It involves the Northumberland National Park, The University of Durham, RCHME, the Northumberland Archaeological Group, and various other individuals and organisations. The project has been designed to study the development of the local landscape up until the present day, and to provide information essential to future landscape management. It has been made possible by the recent RCHME South-East Cheviots survey which provides large scale mapping of the visible archaeological remains over an immense area and which is in itself of outstanding interest. However, such surveys can only be regarded as the first phase of the recording of the landscape, and the current project aims to take this process a stage further. The research design has been carefully drawn up to tackle, at least in its first three years, landscape features such as ancient boundaries, field systems and cairnfields. As it happens these are also the sites currently ignored by the scheduling process, although they certainly hold many of the keys to understanding past patterns of activity in the landscape. The project area contains four 'hillforts' and several other settlements, all of which are scheduled, and it may well be that in its later phases the project will wish to undertake limited excavation within one or more of these to enable them to be related to their landscape context. The onus will, quite rightly, be on the project to justify the granting of scheduled monument consent for such work, but I do not believe that we should be starting from a point where the presumption is so firmly set against the granting of such consent. The

results of the project even in the first year have proved that the potential of such upland areas for archaeological research is immense, with at least one apparent prehistoric settlement site having been discovered which has absolutely no surface trace. This site can now be considered in the future management of the landscape, and similar locations elsewhere can be earmarked as potential sites where previously nothing was suspected. Regardless of the above discussion, I have expressed to various colleagues engaged in this project what I describe as a nagging feeling that although we are doing so many good things we are still somehow doing something a little bit naughty: a feeling reinforced by the shoestring budget resulting from the failure of the project to secure any external funding. However, I firmly believe that the results of the project will eventually provide more than sufficient justification for its existence, and I hope that once it is completed it will only be a question of time before further work is initiated to study the landscape in even greater detail.

The Ingram project has also led to much greater public awareness of, and interest in, the archaeological heritage of the Cheviots. Archaeology features strongly in the recently revamped Ingram Visitor Centre, and an access agreement covers much of the project's core area. Renfrew and Bahn (1991 p481) make the straightforward but all too often ignored point that *'although the immediate aim of most research is to answer specific questions, the fundamental purpose of archaeology must be to provide people in general with a better understanding of the human past'*. This is a fundamental aspect of all archaeological work in the Northumberland National Park. If public support for archaeological work declines, then the availability of resources will fall accordingly. It is our duty to justify our existence as professional archaeologists to the general public, and by so doing to ensure that resources are available for further study in the future. The use of the term 'general public' here is not intended to imply any major difference between professional archaeologists (or even archaeology students) and the rest of mankind, and in fact any member of the public can become involved in the Ingram project by joining the Northumberland Archaeological Group which is undertaking its own programme of fieldwork alongside that of the University. The recent appearance of a booklet (Council for Independent Archaeology 1994) on the potential role of amateur societies in development related fieldwork is of some significance here. While several of the suggestions contained within this booklet are questionable (and one or two could reasonably be described as outrageous) its conclusion is sound: *'The pendulum has swung too far. For long, archaeology has lacked a professional basis and relied too much on the amateur. Now that professional archaeology has expanded it is the grassroots that are in danger of withering away'*. It is the responsibility of the professionals to ensure that the demand for amateur involvement in the subject is met in a constructive manner.

I am drafting the final section of this paper during a lunch break sitting in the remains of what is thought to

be a bronze age hut (we can't be certain without excavation) below the impressive hillfort of Yeavinger Bell on the northern fringes of the Cheviots. Within a few hundred yards of here there are also several late prehistoric villages, a neolithic henge, a standing stone, and of course, the famous Saxon palace of Gefrin where Paulinus preached to Edwin's people in the seventh century. This is a landscape of immense wealth which simply cannot be adequately recorded in terms of its constituent 'sites'. Its sublime location, its ecological value as heather moorland and upland pasture together with ancient woodland and even its surviving herd of feral goats, all add to its value as one of our most exquisite 'historic landscapes'. Yeavinger is special in many ways, but lots of places in England offer an essentially similar value: one that cannot really be recorded or expressed in conventional terms. Indeed, by the very act of attempting to classify such landscapes in terms of conventional site types for inclusion in, for example, county sites and monuments records we are producing artificial divisions which can easily lead to unnecessary problems of both research and interpretation. Such places must not become fossilised, and we must avoid any tendency towards Pitts' (1991 p211) *'soap opera view of the past'*. These places, along with other areas such as battlefields or literary landscapes which are subject to similar demands for conservation, should continue to be exploited for agricultural or other reasons as they have been throughout human history. However, their management should also involve locally based authorities with the collective expertise to undertake the necessary integrated approach to landscape conservation and research.

Given that its subject matter has been so wide ranging this paper has proved particularly difficult to write, and much relevant material has been omitted from the final draft. To sum up as briefly as possible, my two main concerns are that conservation of the historic environment must not be seen as somehow distinct from general environmental conservation, and that archaeological research is not seen to lose out to so-called 'heritage management'. The production of local archaeological strategy documents should be considered as a priority, and these should explore opportunities for integrated conservation initiatives while also stressing archaeological excavation as an essential aspect of heritage management. I believe that the above discussion has raised a number of important issues of relevance to any worthwhile theory of archaeological resource management, and while many of these are already being addressed in certain quarters I await developments to see how others are to be tackled. In the meantime I submit that it is through an integrated approach to landscape management, like that operated by the Northumberland National Park Authority, that we will achieve the combined aims of recording and conserving our heritage while also studying the evolution of our landscape and of our society.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Andy Wilson for commenting on an early draft of this paper.

Please note that the views contained within this paper are of a personal nature and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Northumberland National Park Authority.

References

- BERRY, A.Q. & BROWN I.W. (eds), 1994 *Erosion on archaeological Earthworks: Its prevention, control and repair*. Clwyd County Council.
- BERRY, A.Q. & BROWN, I.W. (eds), 1995 *Managing Ancient Monuments: An Integrated Approach*. Clwyd County Council.
- BIDDLE, M., 1994 'Challenging the normal presumption' in *British Archaeological News*, March 1994.
- BISHOP, M., 1994 Research - Holy Grail or Scared Cow? in *The Field Archaeologist* no. 21 (Autumn 1994).
- BRADLEY, R.J., 1991 Rock Art and the Perception of Landscape. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* vol 1 no 1 (April 1991).
- COUNCIL FOR INDEPENDENT ARCHAEOLOGY, 1994 *The Role of Local Societies in PPG16*
- DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT, 1990 *Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning*. HMSO.
- EDWARDS, R., 1991 *Fit for the Future: report of the National Parks Review Panel*. Cheltenham.
- FLADMARK, J.M., 1993 *Heritage: Conservation, Interpretation, Enterprise*. Donhead.
- FOWLER, P.J., 1992 *The Past in Contemporary Society: Then, Now*. Routledge.
- FRODSHAM, P., 1994 Monument Management in Berkshire, in Berry and Brown 1994.
- FRODSHAM, P., MILLER, A., & WEIR, A., 1994 Lordenshaws: a management agreement for an historic landscape, in Berry and Brown 1995.
- HBMC, 1991 *Exploring our Past: Strategies for the Archaeology of England*.
- HODDER, I., 1993 Changing Configurations: the relationship between theory and practice, in Hunter and Ralston 1993.
- HUNTER, J., & RALSTON, I., 1993 *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK*. Alan Sutton.
- KRISTIANSEN, K., 1993 From Romanticism, through Antiquarianism to an Historical View of Nature: the Case of Denmark. In MacInnes and Wickham Jones 1993.
- LAMBRICK, G. (ed), 1985 *Archaeology and Nature Conservation*. OUP.
- LOWENTHAL, D., 1985 *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge University Press.
- MACINNES, L., 1993 Towards a Common Language: the unifying perceptions of an integrated approach. In Fladmark 1993.
- MACINNES, L., & WICKHAM JONES, C.R. (eds), 1992 *All Natural Things: Archaeology and the Green Debate*. Oxbow.
- MARTIAN CHRONICLE (the bulletin of the Monuments at Risk Survey), vol 1 (June 1994). Bournemouth University.
- MILES, J., 1992 Environmental conservation and archaeology: is there a need for integrated designations?, in MacInnes and Wickham Jones 1992.
- MILLS, N., 1992 Work of the Cultural Resource Management Group of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, in MacInnes and Wickham Jones 1992.
- MORRIS, R., 1993 A public past? in Swain (1993)
- OWEN-JOHN, H., 1994 Archaeology and Agriculture: some current issues. in *English Heritage Conservation Bulletin*, issue 22 (March 1994).
- PITTS, M., 1992 Manifesto for a green Archaeology in MacInnes and Wickham-Jones 1992.
- RENFREW, C., & BAHN, P., 1991 *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice*. Thames and Hudson.
- STARTIN, B., 1993 Preservation and the academically viable sample *Antiquity* 67, p421-6.
- SWAIN, H. (ed), 1993 *Rescuing the Historic Environment (RESCUE: The British Archaeological Trust)*
- TOPPING, P., 1993 Lordenshaws Hillfort and Its Environs. A survey by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England. *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 5th series vol XXI.
- WAINRIGHT, G.J., 1993 Managing Change: Ancient Monuments in the Countryside, in Swain 1993.