

Landscapes Under Pressure

Ludomir R. Lozny (Editor)

Landscapes Under Pressure

Theory and Practice of Cultural Heritage
Research and Preservation

With revised and updated Introduction

 Springer

Ludomir R. Lozny
Department of Anthropology
Hunter College
New York, NY 10021
Ludomir.Lozny@hunter.cuny.edu

ISBN: 978-0-387-75720-9

e-ISBN: 978-0-387-28461-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2007940851

© 2008 Springer Science+Business Media, LLC

All rights reserved. This work may not be translated or copied in whole or in part without the written permission of the publisher (Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 233 Spring Street, New York, NY 10013, USA), except for brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis. Use in connection with any form of information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed is forbidden.

The use in this publication of trade names, trademarks, service marks, and similar terms, even if they are not identified as such, is not to be taken as an expression of opinion as to whether or not they are subject to proprietary rights.

Printed on acid-free paper

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

To Leki and Darek

Contributors

Peter Bogucki School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

Colleen Beck Desert Research Institute, Las Vegas, NV, USA

Craig H. Bullock Department of Socio-Economics, Macaulay Land Use Research Institute, Craige buckler, Aberdeen, Scotland, U.K.

Harold Drollinger Desert Research Institute, Las Vegas, NV, USA

Susan-Allette Dublin Croton Point Nature Center, Croton-on-Hudson, NY, USA

Thomas E. Emerson Department of Anthropology, Illinois Transportation Archaeological Research Program, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL, USA

Graham Fairclough English Heritage, London, U.K.

Nick Hanley Department of Economics, University of Stirling, Stirling, Scotland, U.K.

Zbigniew Kobylński Department of Archaeology, The Stefan Wyszyński University, and the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

Thomas F. King Environmental Consultant, USA

Ludomir R. Lozny Department of Anthropology, Hunter College, New York, NY, USA

Christopher N. Matthews Department of Anthropology, Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY, USA

Thomas H. McGovern Department of Anthropology, Hunter College, New York, NY, USA

David Parsisson Department of Economics, University of Stirling, Stirling, Scotland, U.K.

Nan A. Rothschild Department of Anthropology, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

John Schofield English Heritage, London, UK

Ian A. Simpson Department of Environmental Science, University of Stirling, Stirling, Scotland, U.K.

John A. Walthall Illinois Department of Transportation, Springfield, IL, USA

Thomas R. Wheaton New South Associates, Stone Mountain, GA, USA

Contents

Introduction.....	xi
<i>Ludomir R. Lozny</i>	
PART I THEORY	
Introduction.....	3
<i>Ludomir R. Lozny</i>	
1 Place, Problem, and People: Issues in Interdisciplinary Cooperation.....	5
<i>Thomas H. McGovern</i>	
2 Place, Historical Ecology and Cultural Landscape: New Directions for Applied Archaeology.....	15
<i>Ludomir R. Lozny</i>	
3 The Colonial Southwest: Pueblo and Spanish Shared and Separate Landscapes.....	27
<i>Nan A. Rothschild</i>	
4 A New Landscape for Cultural Heritage Management: Characterisation as a Management Tool.....	55
<i>Graham Fairclough</i>	
5 The Idea of the Site: History, Heritage, and Locality in Community Archaeology.....	75
<i>Christopher N. Matthews</i>	

PART II METHODOLOGY AND PRACTICE

Introduction..... 95
Ludomir R. Lozny

6 Changing Places: A Cultural Geography of Nineteenth-Century Zuni,
New Mexico..... 97
Susan-Allette Dublin

7 Envisioning Future Landscapes in the Environmentally Sensitive
Areas of Scotland: An Introduction..... 115
Ian A. Simpson, David Parsisson, Nick Hanley, and Craig H. Bullock

8 Critical Data for Understanding Early Central European Farmers..... 135
Peter Bogucki

9 Alternative Archaeologies of the Cold War: The Preliminary Results
of Fieldwork at the Greenham and Nevada Peace Camps 149
John Schofield, Colleen Beck, and Harold Drollingr

10 Archaeological Practice in Large Transportation Related Corridors:
The I-270 Archaeological Mitigation Project..... 163
Thomas E. Emerson and John A. Walthall

PART III LEGAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CONSTRAINS
OF CULTURAL HERITAGE PRESERVATION PROGRAMS

Introduction..... 189
Ludomir R. Lozny

11 Private Sector Archaeology: Part of the Problem or Part of
the Solution? 191
Thomas R. Wheaton

12 Protection, Maintenance and Enhancement of Cultural Landscapes
in Changing Social, Political and Economical Reality in Poland..... 213
Zbigniew Kobyliński

13 Cultural Heritage Preservation and the Legal System With Specific
Reference to Landscapes..... 243
Thomas F. King

Afterword 255
Ludomir R. Lozny

Index..... 259

Introduction

LUDOMIR R. LOZNY
Hunter College

This book has a long history. In December 1998 I organized a two-day international symposium at Hunter College, New York to discuss issues related to research and preservation of cultural landscapes. The symposium was sponsored by a grant from the Wenner-Gren Foundation, and co-sponsored by the North Atlantic Biocultural Organization and the Department of Anthropology, Hunter College, CUNY, New York.

Several scholars from the USA and Europe accepted my invitation to participate. Problems discussed oscillated around the idea of cultural landscapes and issues related to identifying, researching and preserving cultural landscapes. Among most frequently asked questions were: What constitutes cultural landscapes? How do we recognize cultural landscapes? How do we define cultural landscapes? The concept of cultural landscape has been discussed by human geographers, historians, archaeologists, environmentalists, preservationists, etc. The consensus was that cultural landscapes are multivocal and incorporate elements which are generally classified in two groups: tangible empirical evidence of human behavior, and intangible, not always recognized symbolic meanings. It is worth keeping in mind that in addition to all material evidence, the most appealing identification of cultural landscapes (or places) includes memories and variety of meanings. "Landscapes under Pressure" presents ideas and pragmatics applied to research and preservation of tangible manifestations of cultural landscapes, but it also points out the significance of their nonmaterial elements.

The approach to investigate and preserve cultural resources is known as culture resource management (CRM). This approach has also been labeled as compliance archaeology, commercial archaeology, professional archaeology, and even "paycheck archaeology." CRM is a part of the applied outlook on the human condition past and present. With its emphasis on "management," it seems like a business activity with strict protocols and deadlines (several authors in this volume indicate such constraints), with not much room for scientific creativity and innovation (theoretical and methodological). Instead of Culture Resource Management I am in favor of using the term applied archaeology. Applied archaeology is multifaceted. It employs the anthropological theoretical outlook on the human condition and archaeological methodology and field techniques to collect data, in order to answer questions that modern societies have about their past. The domain of applied archaeology extends beyond compliance-driven

identifying, researching and protecting of cultural resources. Besides being a platform for constant struggle between the sponsor and the researcher, both pursuing different goals, applied archaeology is about the public. Public goals contribute to the recognition of cultural resources and their historic meanings that matter at the time, while the researcher's goals generate research and identify the significance of the resource in a larger scale. Applied archaeologists are obligated to identify those multiple meanings of the resource and select which of those meanings will be researched and preserved. In pursuing such managing applied archaeologists are not free from making biased decisions and favoring personal research agendas over public interest. We manipulate the past (some say that we create the past), for it is difficult, or perhaps impossible, to identify all culturally significant symbolic meanings contained within a cultural landscape or place.

The presented book only partially reflects the 1998 debate at Hunter College. Since then I have been in contact with other scholars who share similar interests in pursuing the research of cultural landscapes and related issues. The Hunter symposium was oriented towards discussing archaeological problems related to landscape modifications due to big-scale infrastructural changes. I observed those changes while on a Fulbright fellowship in Poland in 1997-1998 and was overwhelmed by the magnitude of infrastructural changes and terrified by the range of problems the changes created for local archaeologists often unable to cope with them. Such inability is endemic to all industrialized regions. It is built in the commonly used concept of cultural heritage research and preservation, concept that is strictly regulated by the current political and economic conditions. To discuss the problem comprehensively I have assembled a group of specialists who review philosophies and pragmatics of cultural heritage research preservation from a larger perspective.

The book is divided into three sections: the theoretical section, the methodological part and the third part which presents thoughts on the economic, political and legal constrains of cultural heritage research and preservation programs. All parts present a balanced view of the current *status quo* of cultural heritage research and preservation programs. In the theoretical section the authors discuss the need and significance of a multidisciplinary approach to research cultural landscapes (McGovern), the idea of understanding the essence of the key cultural resources like archaeological sites (Mathews) and their meanings (Lozny and Rothschild). This section also presents discussions on the idea of place, space, and cultural landscape (Lozny, Rothschild, Fariclough,).

The second part of the book contains several chapters on practical/methodological aspects of investigating cultural landscapes and problems related to their preservation. Among topics discussed are issues related to selection criteria in the approach to investigate one of the most significant problem in European archaeology - neolithization of Europe (Bogucki), creation of cultural landscapes and their meanings (Schofield, Beck and Drollinger), and problems encountered on large scale projects related to infrastructural change (Emerson and Walthall).

The third section of the book contains papers on rarely discussed topics in archaeology – economic, political and legal constrains of applied archaeology (Wheaton, Kobylinski, King). The significance of those constrains becomes

obvious as environmental pressures increase and funds used for research and protection decline. Sustainability of past cultural landscapes becomes reality. The most pressing problem for now is to balance the level of pressure with feasible cultural landscape protection plans.

Part I. Theory

Drawing on his experience from the North Atlantic Biocultural Organization (NABO), Tom McGovern opens up with a discussion which emphasizes the significance of international cooperation in regard to research and cultural landscape preservation. He further points out to the superficial gap between academic and applied archaeology which in fact is a distinction between archaeological practice and theory, or more specifically, the difference between problem-oriented research and research and preservation of endangered cultural resources. Such disparity emerges from the fact that applied archaeology is not driven by research agendas but by its economic, legal and political contexts. One of the most common arguments used against applied archaeology is about its quality, the methods used to collect data and validity of explanations offered. The quality of research is questionable on both sides of the divide although applied archaeology is commonly considered as the lesser kind. I was once asked to contribute a paper on the reasons of limited use of Harris' matrix in the CRM context in contrast to projects controlled by academic archaeologists. My explanation was simple; it is not the CRM or academic context that stipulates the use of the method, but the category of a site. It is not necessary to use the matrix on a single-layer lithic scatters or plough-zone scatters, which are so common in North America, and this type of sites is mostly encountered by applied archaeologists. On the other hand, if the Harris' matrix was taught in the field method classes I am sure many archaeologists, applied or not, would try to use it. One of the points made by McGovern seems especially interesting, namely that academic and applied archaeologists are being perceived as members of different social classes: elite vs commoners, so to speak. I can very clearly see such situation in the context of European archaeology, especially British, German or French (my most recent experience) and in countries that follow some of those models (Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Russia, etc.). Therefore McGovern's point on bridging the gap between the academic and applied archaeologies is very timely and necessary. He outlines the agenda for a more integrated and interdisciplinary in its outlook approach to our common goal – research of the human past.

Lozny focuses on discussing the concept of place and its multiple meanings that matter to people differently. One of the principles followed in the applied approach is the criterion of "significance." Archaeologists are obligated to identify site's significance and argue why the site should be investigated and preserved. The choice is highly subjective and on many occasions depends on what is valued at the time. Is a Native American sacred ground more significant than a half-ruined pueblo? The obvious question is: significant to whom? Because in our scientific, empirical approach we favor the material evidence, the

choice seems simple – preserve the pueblo. But can we (archaeologists) ignore the symbolism of a place because we do not recognize its multiple meanings? If we miss the sacred ground, we miss an important part of the culture represented in the material record. Those are difficult choices especially recently when the pressure for land for commercial developments is increasing. I favor the historical ecology approach used to investigate landscape's history, but I also recognize the significance of the human ecology approach which stimulates questions like: How the landscape and its history is perceived today? What matters to people here and now? How do they place themselves within the landscape they inhabit? Therefore, I argue that in our pursuit of cultural landscapes we should not ignore the significance of local indigenous knowledge and its potential contribution to policy-making.

Nan Rothschild discusses the Native American and the Spaniards interactions during the 17th and 18th century to present the issue of people's creation of their own perception of landscape and space, especially when they occupy the same space. Pueblo incorporates a variety of meanings and dimensions and the full understanding of the structure is not simple. The Spaniards had a different view on the conquered landscape. If the Natives appreciated their place in a more "spiritual" and social way (kinship structure, relationships with neighbors, location of sacred grounds), the Spaniards approached it pragmatically where economic aspects and social status become the major factors. In one case however, as Rothschild points out, the Natives and the Spaniards followed similar approach – using religious places to manifest power. In expressing their power over the conquered land the Spanish missions were built in the place previously occupied by a native sacred place. On the other hand, the Pueblo people built *kivas* in abandoned churches. Interestingly, Spaniards built their churches utilizing the indigenous idea of sacred space, like orienting churches N-S instead of E-W (traditional Christian orientation). In such cases there is clear continuity of space and its meaning (religious), but it probably did not matter much what sort of religion was practiced. The Catholic Church had used such policy in Medieval Europe (cf. christianization of the Slaves) and other places. The case presented by Rothschild clearly illustrates the invaders policy to adopt elements of the traditional landscape to their own political and economic needs. Such clash of cultures promotes diffusion of some elements of the indigenous culture and promotes cultural change.

Graham Fairclough reviews the use of the concept of landscape by archaeologists. He emphasizes the multidisciplinary nature of landscape studies and makes a point that working with landscape requires new objectives. He uses the Historic Landscape Characterization (HLC) as the new approach to deal with historic landscapes. The HLC approach relates to the issue of managing cultural landscapes at times of change. The principles of this approach are sustainability and integrated management. Fairclough reminds us that all landscapes, especially European, are results of human intervention. The human context is dominating. It might not always be the case in North America, where pristine landscapes are still visible. Nonetheless, landscape is a complex whole where both elements, natural and cultural coexist sometimes peacefully and sometimes with a great deal of hostility. The HLC approach seems to be oriented on what is the most interesting aspect of the landscape. But interesting to whom? Fairclough assumes that

landscape is not real in a sense that it is not material. It does exist as an idea, place filled with meanings. Our job as anthropologists specializing in the research of the human past is to identify those meanings and preserve them. The problem of course is how can we preserve meanings? What meaning do we preserve? Who makes decisions about preserving what landscape? Landscapes are ever-changing and traditional methods of preserving and protecting a landscape might not be adequate. The key problem seems to be not in identifying a site to be preserved but in identifying the context in which the site functioned. Only in such context of its cultural landscape is the site meaningful.

Chris Matthews discusses the idea of archaeological site. Archaeological sites are useful classificatory units that help the archaeologist to design a research plan, choose field methods, and propose chronological timeframes. There are several site characteristics that most archaeologists take for granted, like that the site represents historic human activities that is complete and has been sealed from other destructions, etc. Matthews argues that archeological sites are in fact products of archaeological imagination and that many other processes despite human intervention might impact the site integrity and content. He relates the idea of a site to the concept of heritage – culturally defined social conscious about the past. Archaeological sites are localities where the past is linked to present. They became places of a discourse between archaeologist's interest and social interests. Such polarization contributes to politicization of a site, the use of the site in the local politics. Localities became symbolized accordingly to current political needs (cf. Aztec and the modern state of Mexico, or Greek city-states and modern Greece, etc.). Using two case studies from Annapolis and New Orleans to illustrate his theoretical approach, Matthews points out that sites do not just exist in the time context but also in a social context and that context might give a site its significant meaning.

Part II. Methodology and Practice

The second part of the book contains five case studies that present issues related to cultural heritage research and preservation. Susan Dublin opens this section of the book by discussing the cultural geography of the Zuni of New Mexico. The leading idea presented in her paper is the concept of place as an integral component in the construction of social identity. Dublin uses her own research at the Lower Prescado Zuni Village to demonstrate that places are cultural constructs and composed of two elements that contribute to the significance of place: symbolic meanings and pragmatic choices.

Ian Simpson points out that landscapes are cultural assets to us all. Present landscapes have to be managed accordingly to certain economic, political, and cultural criteria. Simpson indicates that with new perceptions of land as assets, come new challenges for environmental policy makers concerned with the use of land resources and their management. The paper presents predictions of future landscape research scenarios as a requirement for an integrated approach to land resource decision-making, using the example of the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) of Scotland where farmers are awarded annual payments in return

for following a set of land management practices designed to protect and enhance the conservation value of the landscape. Among the issues that arise for policy-makers are: what future changes these payments will bring to the landscape, whether local and national communities value these changes, and what modifications should be made to existing policy mechanisms to further achieve conservation and environmental benefits. Simpson presents a model of predicted visual changes in Environmentally Sensitive Area landscapes as a basis for policy evaluation.

Peter Bogucki examines one of most critical issue in managing cultural landscapes – decision-making and selection criteria that stimulate research and preservation. He uses data on one of the most extensively studied prehistoric periods, the European Neolithic. Europe is saturated with archaeological remains; there is not one inch of land that has not been somehow modified by humans in the past. Economic growth presently observable in several European regions like Ireland, or Eastern Europe, which includes large-scale project, contributes to collecting quantities of data on the past. Bogucki emphasizes the need to employ specific field methodology in order to capture cultural events from the past that are vulnerable parts of historic cultural landscapes presently under a great deal of pressure. One of the most pressing questions in European prehistory is on the appearance of agriculture in Central Europe. Bogucki sets the agenda for the research on the foraging/agriculture transition in Central Europe by asking significant questions about the origins of food production in Central Europe and offering suggestions on the research process. With increasing spending on infrastructure and limited, as they always are, for archaeological research, such focused approach seems a well thought-out option. Gathering quality data must also be supported through the use of modern technologies like GIS systems.

John Schofield, Colleen Beck and Harold Drollinger discuss the project they conducted in Nevada. They identify this project as representative of alternative archaeologies. Alternative here is the subject of research. The authors examine the Cold War era peace camps as material evidence of a protest against specific ideology existing during the second half of the twentieth century. When they began their study, there was little information available about the camp or generally about alternative archaeology of the Cold War. The authors analyze the artifacts found on camps and make interpretation on the site's symbolism. They made observations about sites preservation, their complexities, diversity of remains and the difficulty of interpreting field remains of such recent date. The archaeologists received help from former occupants of the camp, and from the Western Shoshone. Their guidance and oral historical evidence was critical for interpretation. Such study appears critical to the knowledge on the contemporary past. This research has been underway for over a decade now and is critical to a wider research on the social perception and interpretation of nuclear test site remains, for example at the new Atomic Testing Museum, that opened in Las Vegas in 2005 (www.ntshf.org). The archaeology of these peace camps is an opportunity to understand the material remains of a significant twentieth century minority political movement. The authors emphasize that instead of engaging in acts of destruction to express their desires, the people at Peace Camp have put their efforts into creating symbols in the desert as testimony to their intent, establishing their own permanent cultural legacy. Recording this legacy and

interpreting this archaeology of opposition is every bit as significant as the more substantial remains inside the fence.

Thomas E. Emerson and John A. Walthall discuss problems that archaeologists encounter on projects related to large-scale landscape modifications. The case discussed is the ongoing I-270 mitigation project launched in 1975. Two aspects of this project need to be emphasized: 1. its location – the American Bottom, one of the most densely populated with archaeological sites area in North America, and 2. the type of landscape modification – adverse effects due to the construction of a wide corridor highway. The year 2004 was the thirtieth year of fieldwork on what has become colloquially known as the “I-270 Project”. The authors point out the scale of the project - over 970 ha of terrain has been investigated in the main corridor transect reaching ca. 77 km north-south - and its contribution to the knowledge of the prehistory of the American Bottom which was not well understood prior to the launching of the I-270 project. Despite broader scientific advances in the discipline from the 1960s onward, our knowledge of the American Bottom Archaic and Early, Middle, and Late Woodland cultures and sequences was virtually nonexistent. Previous research had been concentrated on the large Mississippian mound centers with sites from other time periods and areas outside the centers noticeably neglected. Although it was the location of the largest mound centers and most complex cultural formations in North America, we had little or no knowledge about the development or collapse of the Cahokian Middle Mississippian culture. The archaeological work performed on the massive I-270 corridor and its northern extensions to the east of Cahokia Mounds drastically transformed our archaeological perspective on cultural development in the American Bottom. This focus on building a culture history through the investigations of prehistoric communities was combined with an intensive research program of archaeobotany and zoology, physical anthropology, and regional geomorphology. By 2004 the project has impacted several hundred sites. Using earth moving equipment, archaeologists had removed overburden from 1,539,479 m² (ca. 153 ha) of the project area. The whole stripped area was investigated and 149 recorded sites were subject to large-scale investigations which yielded 15,216 houses, pits, and other features; 200 ¹⁴C dates have been obtained. This research contributed to identifying 27 new cultural phases in the midcontinent and a reorientation and reformulation of the trajectory of Eastern North American archaeology. This project might serve as a model for similar large-scale projects elsewhere. I encourage the reader, especially CRM planners and policy-makers, to carefully read the section of this chapter in which the authors present their arguments on why this large-scale project turned out to be a great success for both archaeologists and developers.

Part III. Legal, Economic and Political Constrains of Cultural Heritage Preservation Programs

The third part of the book is about specific economic, political and legal concerns that applied archaeologists encounter. Thomas R. Wheaton discusses

the economic and political conditions for applied archaeology in the U.S. By contrasting the private and state controlled projects Wheaton points out the positive aspects of the for-profit solution to cultural heritage preservation and research. As the author points out, countries have increasingly passed laws requiring that earth disturbing projects be subjected to archaeological salvage, or management of their archaeological and other cultural resources. Some international organizations have promulgated conventions that countries are urged to sign, and instituted preservation procedures that are required before the granting of development loans. Within the past couple of decades it seems that many countries are coming to grips with an increasingly aware public that, quite apart from international conventions, is demanding a say in the preservation of their heritage. Just as development is not going to go away any time soon, neither is this demand that people's history and material heritage must be considered by governmental bodies. And many governments are also recognizing the importance of heritage to their citizens' well-being, sense of place and self-esteem, so essential for economic and political development. Wheaton further emphasizes that salvage is not conducive to good management and therefore specific modifications in the legal aspect of cultural heritage preservation seem necessary. He agrees that the National Heritage Preservation Act effectively moved public archaeology from salvage archaeology to archaeological heritage management (AHM), which is grouped with other heritage resources under the term cultural resource management (CRM) in the United States. Wheaton concludes that the advantage to the United States' system is that it is flexible and ideally includes public input, but the disadvantage is that it only covers a small part of the total of cultural heritage destroyed each year.

Zbigniew Kobylinski discusses the new economic and political context that emerged in Eastern Europe since the systemic transformation of the early 1990s. He is developing an idea of preventive conservation or sustainable conservation. The idea has been presented in September 2000 at Vantaa in Finland during the international conference on the European strategy for preventive conservation. In the final document of this conference the preventive conservation has been defined as a "multi-disciplinary management to reduce the loss of cultural heritage, with the aim of benefiting the public". Preventive conservation has been recognized as a "cornerstone of any European policy of heritage preservation". The key question the author asks is: What would therefore be the requirements of management of archaeological landscapes, which would be publicly acceptable, effective and proper from the point of view of preventive conservation philosophy? And he answers that such demands can be summarized by means of a few obvious key-words: conservation, organisation, enhancement, interpretation, reconstruction, and promotion. Kobylinski points out that cultural landscapes are dynamic entities and therefore multivocality of cultural landscapes should be assumed. In the second part of the paper Kobylinski discusses the current state of applied archaeology in Poland. The country is going through a systemic change that includes modernization and development. He points out to a variety of problems encountered by Polish archaeologists and policy-makers that seem parallel to those pointed out by American scholars in the 1980s and 1990s. This part of the paper also contains a

short discussion on the use of European archaeology for political gains. Finally the author examines the role of archaeology in creating cultural identities and asks the fundamental question: What is the future of cultural past under the newly emerging economic, social and political pressures?

The book ends on the high note with Thomas F. King's contribution on the most significant aspect of applied archaeology – its legal context. It is obvious that no cultural heritage research and preservation programs would exist without their legal foundations. It is not enough to have archaeologists and other preservationists willing to do something. They need credibility to operate and the legal context offers such very much needed basis. But as King points out, the legal protection has its good and bad sides. One of the not very well understood legal constrains is that we cannot preserve everything but that preservation rules and laws are based on certain criteria. Those criteria, on the other hand, are founded on certain outlook on what matters at the time. In other words our approach to preservation changes with the political and/or economic context of the law that regulates the rules of preservation. King points out that all legal systems offer common rules on registration, administration and control of cultural change. Other laws might be different. It is also significant to mention that the private sector might participate in the preservation process by being allowed to purchase monument and maintain them according to the legal responsibility. Certain incentives exist to encourage private owners to take care of historic monuments. King further points out that legal systems, as pragmatic as they are, do not however protect all aspects of cultural heritage. For instance one of the most significant cultural traits – language, especially the one without its written form - is doomed to parish. No protection exists to preserve intangible elements of the cultural landscape. In other words, legal systems are set to preserve the tangible while the intangible, which exists in people's memories, eventually vanish without a trace.

All of us who are concerned about research and preservation of cultural landscapes recognize that the biggest challenge imposed upon preservationists of the 21st century will be an approach in which control of the pressures that impact cultural properties will be balanced with well designed cultural heritage preservation laws and research methodologies. Since the time when first heritage protecting laws were introduced we have learned a great deal about constrains of cultural heritage research and preservation and it seems logical to turn that knowledge into practice.

I would like to thank all the participants of the Hunter symposium and contributors to the book. Some participants decided not to contribute to the book but their participation in the symposium and insight into the discussed issues is very much appreciated. Among the original participants who are not present in this book are Carole Crumley, Christian Keller, Jerzy Gąssowski, Przemysław Urbańczyk, Gavin Lukas, Elaine Sruogis, Orri Vésteinsson, and Irene Clark. Most of them published their papers elsewhere. Additionally, I have invited a group of scholars who are interested in pursuing topics close to the theme of the book – theories and methods of cultural landscape investigations and preservation - and they responded by sending their contributions. I hope that the book will be of interest to a variety of specialists who deal with cultural resource investigations and preservation. The group includes students, policymakers-makers and planners

who create the rules as well as archaeologists, historians, human geographers, etc. who, obligated to follow these rules, try to investigate and preserve cultural landscapes.

My sincere thanks go to The Wenner-Gren Foundation for writing the check and to Dr. Thomas McGovern and the NABO for participating in sharing the cost and organizational efforts. The symposium and this book would have not materialized without the help and encouragements I received from Dr. Daniel G. Bates the Chair of the Department of Anthropology at Hunter in 1998, and Dr Gregory A. Johnson who helped with the organizational tasks. I thank the reviewers who made comments on the book proposal which guided me in the final preparation of this volume. My special thanks go to Dr Jim Fenton for introducing me to the CRM and for his friendship and to Ms Teresa Krauss, editor at Springer, whose kindness and patience allowed me to finish this project. For all that I remain grateful.

The book is dedicated to my sons Leki and Darek.
Argèles-Gazost and New York 2005.