



Agricultural Journals

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Zemědělská ekonomika

[home](#) [page](#) [about us](#) [contact](#)



us

Table of Contents

IN PRESS

**AGRICECON
2014**

**AGRICECON
2013**

**AGRICECON
2012**

**AGRICECON
2011**

**AGRICECON
2010**

**AGRICECON
2009**

**AGRICECON
2008**

**AGRICECON
2007**

AGRICECON

2006
AGRICECON
2005

AGRICECON
2004

AGRICECON
2003

AGRICECON
2002

AGRICECON
Home

Editorial
Board

For Authors

- **Authors Declaration**
- **Instruction to Authors**
- **Guide for Authors**
- **Copyright Statement**
- **Submission**

For
Reviewers

Guides for

· [Reviewers](#)
[Login](#)

[Subscription](#)

Agric. Econ. – Czech

T. Hájek

Care for monuments in Central Europe regarding the revitalisation of the countryside

Agric. Econ. – Czech, 49 (2003): 317-322

The cultural landscape and rural areas are considered to be a key component of the European cultural heritage. The European Landscape Convention, which the Czech Republic signed in the autumn of 2002, was also formulated in this

sense. Consequently, the reform of care of monuments cannot be left entirely to official workers, but is becoming an important subject from the standpoint of maintenance of the functional and demographic stability of rural areas. It is necessary to point out that the care for monuments in Central Europe is at a crucial point, that could be described as a crisis. The reasons are as follows. 1) Time extension of care for monuments as well as the spatial extension of care for monuments. 2) Care for monuments has somewhat neglected to explain and defend its significance – consequently, a great many private owners of cultural monuments are not fully aware of the ideas, on the basis of which limitations are placed on their rights to manage their property, for the good of the cultural heritage. 3) Aesthetic conclusions are increasingly important in deciding what is and what is not a cultural monument. However, this can readily be influenced by the influx of very attractive, but worthless “popular” architecture, currently being introduced by a great many development companies. 4) Care for monuments represents the execution

of a particular activity rather than a fixed formulated intellectual system of canons.

5) Even under the best economic conditions, the state as such does not have the means to provide appropriate care for the cultural heritage in state ownership (including state land in the poorer areas) and is certainly not capable of creating a motivation system within its framework for searching for new ways of using this property without abusing it.

6) In general, it can be stated that condition of democratisation within the care for monuments certainly does not attain the level of participation in environmental protection.

7) Care for monuments, especially in Central Europe, tends to continue to emphasise simple conservation of monuments and is minimally concerned with reanimation of the monument fund. This is why the care for the cultural heritage must again formulate its purpose, especially in relation to the decrease in the importance of national states, globalisation and, simultaneously, regionalisation of the world.

Keywords:

cultural heritage, countryside, state

ownership, democratisation, reanimation

[[fulltext](#)]

© 2011 [Czech Academy of Agricultural Sciences](#)

XHTML1.1 VALID

CSS VALID