

Chapter 1

Rewilding Abandoned Landscapes in Europe

Laetitia M. Navarro and Henrique M. Pereira

Abstract For millennia, mankind has shaped landscapes, particularly through agriculture. In Europe, the age-old interaction between humans and ecosystems strongly influenced the cultural heritage. Yet European farmland is now being abandoned, especially in remote areas. The loss of the traditional agricultural landscapes and its consequences for biodiversity and ecosystem services is generating concerns in both the scientific community and the public. Here we ask to what extent farmland abandonment can be considered as an opportunity for rewilding ecosystems. We analyze the perceptions of traditional agriculture in Europe and their influence in land management policies. We argue that, contrary to the common perception, traditional agriculture practices were not environmentally friendly and that the standards of living of rural populations were low. We suggest that current policies to maintain extensive farming landscapes underestimate the human labor needed to sustain these landscapes and the recent and future dynamics of the socio-economic drivers behind abandonment. We examine the potential benefits for ecosystems and people from rewilding. We identify species that could benefit from land abandonment and forest regeneration and the ecosystem services that could be provided such as carbon sequestration and recreation. Finally, we discuss the challenges associated with rewilding, including the need to maintain open areas, the fire risks, and the conflicts between people and wildlife. Despite these challenges, we argue that rewilding should be recognized by policy-makers as one of the possible land management options in Europe, particularly on marginal areas.

H. M. Pereira (✉) · L. M. Navarro
German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher
Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig, Germany
e-mail: hpereira@idiv.de

Institute of Biology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Am Kirchtor 1, 06108
Halle (Saale), Germany

Centro de Biologia Ambiental, Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa, Campo
Grande, 1749-016 Lisboa, Portugal

L. M. Navarro
e-mail: laetitia.navarro@idiv.de

Keywords Farmland abandonment · Land-use change · Passive management · Ecosystem services · Land sharing · Land sparing

1.1 Introduction

Deforestation and the loss of natural habitats remain major global concerns. Nonetheless, although scenarios for the next decades project the continuation of these dynamics in tropical ecosystems, the projections made for much of the Northern Hemisphere are quite the opposite (Pereira et al. 2010). In fact, most deforestation in Europe occurred before the industrial revolution (Kaplan et al. 2009), and the amount of forests and scrubland is now increasing following the land abandonment that began in the mid-twentieth century (FAO 2011), a trend that is expected to continue over the next few decades (van Vuuren et al. 2006). Natural vegetation recovery is a complex process that occurs during the progressive alleviation of agricultural use (Hobbs and Cramer 2007; Stoate et al. 2009). This reduction in land-use intensity, including abandonment at the extreme, is, at the local scale, explained by a combination of socio-ecological drivers (MacDonald et al. 2000; Rey Benayas et al. 2007) such as low productivity and aging of the population. These factors interact between them and with the ecological dynamics of succession, creating positive feedback loops, which increase the irreversibility of farmland abandonment in marginal areas, and reduce the effectiveness of subsidies awarded to farmers to halt abandonment (Figueiredo and Pereira 2011; Gellrich et al. 2007). In Europe, there has been a decline of 17% of the rural population since 1961 (FAOSTAT 2010). Some parishes of Mediterranean mountain areas have lost more than half of their population in a similar period (Gortázar et al. 2000; Pereira et al. 2005). At the regional scale, the current farmland contraction is best explained by an increase in agricultural productivity and the slowing of population growth in Europe (Keenleyside and Tucker 2010).

Landowners and managers facing increased agricultural market competition have resorted mostly to one of three active management strategies (Fig. 1.1): intensification, extensification, and afforestation. Intensification is often chosen on the most productive soils and where good conditions exist for mechanization (Pinto-Correia and Mascarenhas 1999). Extensification consists of obtaining higher productivity by expanding the area of the farm through land consolidation or in developing multiple uses of the land. This has happened in the Montado and Dehesa areas of Portugal and Spain, an agroforestry system that integrates animal production, cork harvesting and cereal cultivation, while hosting high biodiversity and providing recreational and aesthetic benefits (Bugalho et al. 2011). Finally, in some areas with poor farmland soils, the option has been to plant forests, often of fast growing species (Young et al. 2005).

In this article, we discuss a fourth option: rewilding abandoned landscapes, by assisting natural regeneration of forests and other natural habitats through passive management approaches. Rewilding has seldom been considered as a land management policy, as often it faces resistance from both the public (Enserink and Vogel 2006; Bauer et al. 2009) and the scientific communities (Conti and




Fig. 1.1 Landscape management strategies plotted against agricultural use intensity and level of management (from active to passive): agricultural intensification, agricultural extensification, afforestation, and rewilding

Fagarazzi 2005; Moreira and Russo 2007). Arguments against rewilding include the loss of the traditional agricultural landscape and negative impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services (for example, Conti and Fagarazzi 2005). This situation has given rise to a pattern of double standards: developing countries are asked to halt deforestation while some developed countries are actively fighting forest regeneration on their own land (Meijaard and Sheil 2011).

Here, we critically examine some of the arguments used in support of the maintenance of the traditional landscapes and contrast those arguments with the potential benefits for ecosystem services and biodiversity that could accrue from rewilding. We conclude with an analysis of the main challenges associated with rewilding abandoned landscapes.

1.2 European Landscapes: Examining the Paradigms

The cultural importance of traditional agriculture landscapes has been widely recognized in Europe and the world. As of 2011, 76 of the 936 UNESCO world heritage sites are in the “cultural landscapes” category (<http://whc.unesco.org>), and 29 of those because of traditional or symbolical agricultural practices. Examples include the “Causses and Cevennes Mediterranean agro-pastoral cultural landscape” in France or the “Mont Perdu” in the Pyrénées. As much as 15–25% of the European farmland can be classified as High Nature Value farmland (EEA 2004).

Of the 231 habitat types listed in the European Habitats Directive, 41 are associated with low-intensity agricultural management, including semi-natural grasslands and hay meadows (Halada et al. 2011).

This has led to a generalized push towards policies embracing the protection of extensive farming systems with the dual-role of protecting biodiversity and ecosystem services. Here we argue that not all socio-ecological aspects of the maintenance of these landscapes have been taken into account because our perceptions of these landscapes have been biased by our own cultural experiences. We question three ideas associated with current policies: (1) the idea that traditional agriculture practices were environmentally friendly; (2) the idea that traditional rural populations lived well; (3) the idea that traditional landscapes can be kept despite the context of recent rural exodus and future socioeconomic trends.

Were Traditional Agricultural Practices Environmentally Friendly?

In Europe, pre-Neolithic Holocene landscapes can most likely be described as a mosaic of old-growth forest, scrubland, and grasslands, maintained by the grazing of large herbivores and by fire (Svenning 2002; Vera 2000, Vera 2009), although the relative amount of open area is debated (for example, Hodder et al. 2009). Later on, and much before the onset of modern agriculture, European inhabitants destroyed most of Europe's forests on usable land. Europe is now the continent with the least original forest cover (Kaplan et al. 2009).

The process of forest clearing might be as old as human's making of tools (Williams 2000). It started in the Neolithic with the use of fire to open areas for grazing and hunting (Pereira et al. 2012). Forest loss was accelerated during Antiquity, when the rise of classical civilizations led to large-scale deforestation (Williams 2000; Kaplan et al. 2009). After a brief interruption caused by the breakdown of the Roman society, the deforestation trend continued in the Middle Ages (interrupted only by the Black Death), with an estimated loss of 50–70% of the European forest during this period.

Hence humans amplified the disturbance regime of European ecosystems and expanded the open area considerably (Pereira et al. 2012, see Chap. 8), creating and maintaining "traditional" landscapes such as the alpine grasslands (Laiolo et al. 2004), and the agro-silvo-pastoral systems of Mediterranean regions (Blondel 2006). These extensive farming systems have higher species diversity than intensive farming systems (Batáry et al. 2012; Tschardt et al. 2005), and, at the local scale, often have higher species diversity than non-managed ecosystems and natural forests (Blondel 2006; Höchtl et al. 2005; Lindborg et al. 2008). Therefore, it has been suggested that biodiversity peaks for low levels of land use associated with these extensive farming systems (Fig. 1.2), following the intermediate disturbance principle (Wilkinson 1999).

This pattern has been used as an argument to maintain the active management of extensive farmland and halt ecological succession. However at regional scales, this relationship is likely to exhibit a different pattern (Fig. 1.2). The habitat turnover of wild landscapes can be a mosaic of closed forest and open areas, which should




Fig. 1.2 Conceptual representation of the response of current species diversity to land-use intensity at the local and regional scales, and of the hypothetical regional response if Holocene extinctions had not occurred. The response at the local scale is adapted from EEA (2004), whereas the current and historical responses at the regional scale are discussed in the text

accommodate many of the species that can usually be found in extensive farmland habitats. In the early Holocene, the regional diversity of wild landscapes would have been even higher (Fig. 1.2). Several species have now disappeared due to the expansion of human activities, including the auroch (*Bos primeginius*), the Tarpan (*Equus ferus ferus*), or became extinct in most of their former ranges (for example, wisent, *Bison bonasus*).

Deforestation also had important impacts on ecosystem services. In the Mediterranean basin, deforestation is thought to have caused desiccation and soil erosion (McNeely 1994; Blondel 2006). In the Middle Ages, timber shortage is likely to have played a role on the impulse to conquer new territories (Farrell et al. 2000). To build naval fleets, countries such as Portugal and Spain had to resort to importing wood from colonies from the sixteenth century on (Devy-Vareta and Alves 2007). By the end of the nineteenth century, the dimension of the erosion problems in mountain slopes and associated silting in rivers and floods downstream led to large state sponsored afforestation programs in Portugal and Spain.

Did Traditional Rural Populations Live Well?

For centuries, populations inhabiting marginal agricultural areas organized their lives in a self-sufficient manner (Blondel 2006). The industrial revolution and the globalization of the food and labor markets brought many of these regions to an economic disadvantage with urban and peri-urban areas: increasing wages associated with economic growth and the low food prices in global markets rendered the low-productivity farmland uncompetitive.

Nowadays, marginal agricultural areas throughout the globe are classified as “poverty traps” where households suffer from scarcity of resources, low return on investment, lack of opportunities, and reduced social services (Conti and Fagarazzi 2005; Ruben and Pender 2004). For example, in mountains of Southern Europe, rural populations are constrained by the low productivity of small-scale parcels and the limited opportunities for mechanization and intensification (MacDonald et al. 2000). On average, across European mountain areas, the income per hectare is about 40% lower than in other, non-disadvantaged, areas (809 €/ha vs. 1370 €/ha in EC 2009). The young have limited access to education and employment while the elders experience isolation and difficulties to access services (EC 2008a). This results in out-migration and aging of the population, leading to an inverted population pyramid. This rural exodus is driven by a “circle of decline” where low population density limits business creation, causing fewer jobs and more out-migrations which, in turn, accentuates the decrease in population density (EC 2008a).

Rural populations still value the quality of their environment and its scenic beauty (Bell et al. 2009; Pereira et al. 2005), but the working conditions in many of these regions have always been difficult. Terraces are some of the most admired cultural landscapes in Mediterranean areas, but locals often use the expression “slavery land” to describe the harshness of the working conditions (Pereira et al. 2005).

Are Current Efforts to Maintain Traditional Landscapes Likely to Succeed?

Traditional agricultural practices were characterized by being labor intensive for relatively low agricultural yields (MacDonald et al. 2000; Gellish et al. 2007). These characteristics played a key role in the demise of many of the traditional practices when labor costs rose due to economic growth, an effect that contributed to and was exacerbated by rural exodus. Large numbers of livestock kept vegetation succession on hold for centuries, but in the past few decades livestock numbers have declined in many of these regions (Cooper et al. 2006). In Europe, the number of livestock (cattle, goats and sheep) declined by 25% between 1990 and 2010 (FAOSTAT 2010).

Still, recognizing the role of European farmers in maintaining these landscapes (Daugstad et al. 2006), several measures have been implemented to limit farmland depopulation. As part of the European Common Agriculture Policy, Less Favored Areas (LFAs-Regulation 1257/1999) were designated mainly to prevent rural abandonment and maintain cultural landscapes (Dax 2005; Stoate et al. 2009). LFAs went from representing a third of the European Utilized Agricultural Area (UAA) in 1975 to more than half in 2005 (Dax 2005; MacDonald et al. 2000). Though the LFA classification often happens to match High Nature Value farming systems and extensive agriculture, it poses no limit to intensification and overgrazing (Dax 2005).

In the Rural Development Plan for 2007–2013, the payments to farmers in LFAs totaled € 12.6 billion (DG Agriculture 2011). Though the sum of these subsidies is substantial at the European scale, at the individual level they might not be enough




Fig. 1.3 Past and future trends of European agricultural area and rural population. Agricultural area (lines): land-use change predicted in the four scenarios of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (van Vuuren et al. 2006). The projections are based on the area of food crops, grass and fodder, and biofuels crops, between 1970 and 2030. OS order from strength, AM adapting mosaic, GO global orchestration, TG techno-garden. Rural population size (bars): historical values (*dark gray*) and future projections (*light gray*) (FAOSTAT 2010; past data for the Baltic countries from <http://www.nationmaster.com>)

to maintain young farmers or attract new residents (Cooper et al. 2006), especially in areas where the farm size is small. For example, when considering an average farm size of 23 ha in mountain areas (MacDonald et al. 2000) and an average LFA subsidy of € 100/ha (Dax 2005), the average payment is of € 2,300 per farm/year. This value can be higher if farmers also adhere to agri-environmental schemes, but overall LFA farmers still have lower incomes (Cooper et al. 2006): the Farm Net Value Added is 13,056 €/ Annual Work Unit in mountain LFAs, 14,174 €/AWU in other LFAs, and 18,923 €/AWU in non-LFAs (average for the EU25 countries between 2004 and 2005 in EC 2008b).

Hence the decrease in rural populations that started in the 1960s is projected to continue into the next few decades (Fig. 1.3). Future scenarios predict that the contribution of agriculture in regards to GDP and employment in Europe will continue decreasing (Eickhout et al. 2007; Nowicki et al. 2006) and the young generations will keep migrating to the cities, as long as their life quality and income prospects are higher there (EC 2008a; Keenleyside and Tucker 2010) resulting in the non-replacement of the aging population of European farmers.

Following the decrease in the rural population, agricultural area in Europe is also expected to keep contracting (Fig. 1.3), despite an expected increase in the global demand for agricultural goods, because enough food is obtained either directly by production on competitive land in Europe or elsewhere in the world (Keenleyside and Tucker 2010). Regionally labeled and organic products could help maintain

Table 1.1 Projections of future change in the agricultural area (arable land and pasture) from different studies

Region	Variation in the agricultural area	Initial agricultural area (Mha)	Period	Reference
EU15 + Norway and Switzerland ^a	−6%/−10% for cropland −1%/−10% for grassland	142.5	2000–2080	Rounsevell et al. 2006
EU15 ^b	+5.5%/−15%	82.5	2000–2030	Eickhout et al. 2007
EU27	−5%/−15%	198	2000–2030	Verburg and Overmars 2009
Europe	−5%/−24%	235	1970–2050	MA 2005
Developed countries ^c	+8%/−20%	183	2000–2050	Balmford et al. 2005

^a Initial agricultural area estimate obtained from FAOSTAT (2010)

^b These values are only for arable land

^c This study looked at the 23 most important food crops worldwide, corresponding to 44% of the cropland area in developed countries

certain forms of extensive agriculture but this market remains restricted (Strijker 2005). Projections also take into account an increasing demand in biocrops (Rounsevell et al. 2006; Schröter et al. 2005; Verburg and Overmars 2009), which can explain a moderate increase in the predicted agricultural area in some scenarios.

The dimension of the agricultural area abandoned or converted into production forest varies widely between scenarios (Table 1.1). If we use the intermediate scenarios in Verburg and Overmars (2009), between 10 and 29 million ha of land will be released from agriculture between 2000 and 2030. Areas particularly susceptible to the decline of agropastoral use include semi-natural grasslands and remote or mountainous areas with poor soil quality (Keenleyside and Tucker 2010; Pointereau et al. 2008; Stoate et al. 2009). Some of these areas are located in Northern Portugal, Northwestern France, the Alps, the Apennines and Central Europe (Fig. 1.4).

1.3 The Benefits of Rewilding

Defining Rewilding

Rewilding is the passive management of ecological succession with the goal of restoring natural ecosystem processes and reducing human control of landscapes (Gillson et al. 2011). Note that although passive management emphasizes no management or low levels of management (for example, Vera 2009), intervention may be required in the early restoration stages.




Fig. 1.4 Localization of the hotspots of abandonment and rewilding in Europe. Those hotspots are areas categorized as “agriculture” in 2000 that are projected to become rewilded or afforested in 2030 and that are common to all four scenarios of the CLUE model (Verburg and Overmars 2009). Hotspots are expressed as a percentage of each 100-km² grid cell. Agricultural areas correspond to “arable land (non-irrigated)”, “pasture”, “irrigated arable land” and “permanent crops”. Rewilded and afforested areas correspond to “(semi)-natural vegetation”, “forest”, “recently abandoned arable land”, and “recently abandoned pasture land”. Countries in grey have no data

In contrast, much of the biodiversity conservation efforts in Europe emphasize active management, by maintaining low-level agricultural practices (Fig. 1.1). Active management also differs in goals, targeting the increase of the abundance of specific taxa or the maintenance of particular habitats, using approaches such as vegetation clearing and construction of artificial habitats, often working against successional processes.

Natural succession on abandoned farmland and pastures often leads to scrubland and sometimes at a later stage, to forest (Conti and Fagarazzi 2005). Passive forest regeneration restores almost as much forested areas globally as active tree plantation (Rey Benayas and Bullock 2012). Nonetheless, “wilderness” is not a synonym of “continuous forest” (Sutherland 2002). The European megafauna played a role in maintaining open landscapes, before being brought to global or local extinction by humans and replaced by domesticated grazers (Johnson 2009; Vera 2000; Bullock 2009, see Chap. 8).

This does not mean that rewilding should aim at rebuilding Pleistocene ecosystems, an approach which has been proposed elsewhere (Donlan et al. 2006), but that faces many difficulties (Caro 2007), including the lack of many of the original keystone species, a different climate, and ecosystems modified locally (for example, changes in soil caused by agriculture) and regionally by humans (for example, the global nitrogen cycle). Instead, the emphasis is on the development of self-sustaining ecosystems, protecting native biodiversity and natural ecological processes and providing a range of ecosystem services (Cramer et al. 2008). These novel ecosystems may be designed to be as similar as possible to some historical baseline in the recent or distant past, but they will often involve the introduction of new biotic elements (Hobbs et al. 2009).

Benefits of Rewilding for Biodiversity

Rewilding will cause biodiversity changes with some species declining in abundance, that is, loser species, and other species increasing in abundance, that is, winner species (Russo 2006; Sirami et al. 2008). We reviewed 23 studies identifying a positive response of species to decreasing human pressure or to restoration of their habitat following land abandonment (Supplementary Information¹, see also Chap. 4 to 8). In total, we identified 60 species of birds, 24 species of mammals, and 26 species of invertebrates that could benefit from farmland abandonment (Supplementary Table 1). We also identified 101 species negatively affected by land abandonment (Supplementary Table 2), but 13 of those species can be classified as both “winner” and “looser” depending on the study and the region. Much of the agrobiodiversity associated with High Nature Value Farmland will be in the “loosing” category. In contrast, many of the winner species have declined or became functionally extinct in traditional agricultural landscapes, such as large carnivores (see Chap. 4). These species will benefit from forest regeneration and the connection of fragmented natural habitats (Keenleyside and Tucker 2010; Russo 2006).

Revegetation promotes the increase of the organic matter content and the water holding capacity of soils (Arbelo et al. 2006). This can lead to higher biomasses and densities of earthworms (Russo 2006) and other invertebrate families (Supplementary Table 1.A).

Some forest birds benefit from forest regrowth after farmland abandonment (Pointereau et al. 2008), such as woodpeckers, treecreepers, and tits (Supplementary Table 1.B). Some birds of prey have benefited from increases in rodent populations (Pointereau et al. 2008). Perhaps more surprisingly, populations of several bird species of the Eastern European steppe have increased after agricultural activity decline (Hölzel et al. 2002). Some, such as the Little Bustard (*Tetrax tetrax*), have benefited from the tall and dense grassland of the regrown steppes. This contrasts with the concerns that the decrease of open areas in Western Europe is contributing to the decline of steppe species. Therefore the biodiversity consequences of rewilding depend on the geographical context.

¹ <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10021-012-9558-7>.

Likewise, rural abandonment makes the land suitable for a comeback of large mammals (Supplementary Table 1.C). Large grazers are benefiting from the lower hunting pressures that usually accompany abandonment (Breitenmoser 1998; Gortázar et al. 2000). European carnivore species have been increasing since the 1960s in abundance and distribution, as stable populations of Eastern Europe are naturally recolonizing abandoned landscapes of Scandinavia, the Mediterranean, and the Alps (Enserink and Vogel 2006; Boitani 2000; Stoate et al. 2009).

It is also important to consider the trophic interactions between species and the cascading effects driven by rewilding. For example, amphibians and otter (*Lutra lutra*) populations are known to benefit from the restoration of ditches by beavers (*Castor fiber*) in abandoned areas of Eastern Europe (Kull et al. 2004). The presence of lynx in some parts of Switzerland reduced the roe deer and chamois browsing impact by regulating both populations (Breitenmoser 1998).

Benefits of Rewilding for People: Ecosystem Services

Abandoned farmland is often perceived negatively as it is associated with the perception of unkept land and with the decrease on the economic usability of the land, particularly by the rural populations (Hochtl et al. 2005; Bauer et al. 2009). However there are many ecosystem services that are provided by this type of landscapes, particularly indirect and non-use services, which are often disregarded in the process of policy-making (TEEB 2010).

Rewilded areas can, at the regional scale, provide habitat for biodiversity with conservation results as high or higher than other land management options (Figs. 1.2, 1.5). This supporting service can lay the foundations for some cultural services (Fig. 1.5), because some of the species benefiting from abandonment are linked with recreation through hunting and tourism (Gortázar et al. 2000; Kaczennsly et al. 2004). For instance, in the Abbruzze region of Italy, tourism has benefited from the advertisement of the presence of bears and wolves (Enserink and Vogel 2006). In addition to these direct and indirect use values, the large mammal species brought back by rewilding are amongst the species with highest existence values (Proença et al. 2008).

Forest regrowth promotes carbon sequestration (Kuemmerle et al. 2008). The carbon stock in European forests has grown from 5.3 to 7.7 PgC between 1950 and 1999 (Nabuurs et al. 2003). Nonetheless, active afforestation can potentially yield higher carbon sequestration rates than rewilding by using fast growing species (Fig. 1.5). Natural regeneration allows soil recovery and nutrient availability, though erosion can increase in the first years following abandonment (Pointereau et al. 2008; Rey Benayas et al. 2007). Forests regulate hydrological cycles, particularly in mountain areas (Körner et al. 2005) and water quality is expected to locally improve in abandoned fields (Stoate et al. 2009). Nonetheless, the transition from grassland to forest, a higher water-use system, can reduce the quantity of water (Brauman et al. 2007). Afforested areas managed for timber provisioning are disturbed both for plantation and management, thus providing qualitatively less water and soil related services than rewilded areas (Fig. 1.5).




Fig. 1.5 Qualitative assessment of the ecosystem services provided by rewilding, afforestation, extensive agriculture and intensive agriculture in Europe. The relative values given to the provision of each service by the different land management strategies are discussed in the text

Intensive agriculture areas and planted forests are designed to focus on specific provisioning services. Extensive agriculture offers a tradeoff between food provisioning, cultural services, and habitat for biodiversity, whereas rewilding provides a wide range of supporting, regulating and cultural services (Fig. 1.5 and see Chap. 3).

The passive management associated with rewilding has much lower maintenance costs than other management options, and therefore significant returns of regulating and cultural services are obtained for limited levels of investment. Still, these services have characteristics of common goods (TEEB 2010), and therefore are rarely advantageous for the individual land-owner. Nonetheless, wilderness is linked to amenity-based growth and attracts urban individuals seeking different environments to both visit and work (Rasker and Hackman 1996): North American counties favoring wilderness showed faster growth in their employment and income level than counties in which the economy is mainly based on resource extraction.

1.4 The Challenges of Rewilding

Rewilding as a landscape management option does involve several challenges. Our understanding of those challenges and how they can be overcome depends on the relationship between humans, the landscape and the biodiversity that it sustains.

Conflicts with Wildlife

Conflicts occur when wildlife overlaps with human activities such as hunting and farming (Gortázar et al. 2000; Linnell et al. 2000; Schley and Roper 2003). Those conflicts are age-old in Europe and negative perceptions were transmitted through generations via folklore and tales (Wilson 2004; Boitani 2000). Hunting wild species, and particularly carnivores, was socially enforced (Enserink and Vogel 2006), which led in many cases to their local extinction by the nineteenth century.

Though many European countries have implemented regulations to protect large carnivores, such legislation is not understood and accepted by all (Breitenmoser 1998). In particular, they accentuate a cleavage in opinions amongst countries and between rural and urban populations (Bauer et al. 2009; Wilson 2004) the latter being usually more favorable to a wildlife comeback.

The conflicts with carnivores are largely explained by the fact that they prey on domestic animals due to the scarcity of wild prey (Russo 2006) but also by the loss of traditional livestock-guarding knowledge in several countries (Fourli 1999; Kaczensky et al. 2004). Nonetheless, the level of depredation of livestock by carnivores is generally low, often less than 10% of their diet (Wilson 2004). Still, the impact at the level of the livestock owner can be high (Wilson 2004). To compensate for these impacts, several countries pay for damages caused by wildlife. For bear and wolf damages, an average of € 2 million/year were compensated in Europe between 1992 and 1998 in France, Greece, Italy, Austria, Spain and Portugal (Fourli 1999) while € 2.15 million were spent in preventive measures.

Large grazers such as deer and wild boars can also cause significant damage to crops, pastures and forest plantations (Goulding and Roper 2002; Kamler et al. 2010). As for the carnivores, a combination of preventive measures such as electric fencing (Honda et al. 2009) with compensation payments can contribute to decrease the levels of conflict.

Fear of attacks on people also play a factor in this conflict, but this often can be improved with better information to the public as there is a correlation between the fear of an animal and a lack of knowledge of its behavior (Decker et al. 2010; Kaczensky et al. 2004).

Limits to Ecological Resilience

In many regions of Europe, the transition from abandoned to semi-natural land takes less than 15 years, followed by another 15–30 years before reforestation (Cramer et al. 2008; Verburg and Overmars 2009). Passive regeneration can therefore be a slow process, particularly in a dry environment such as the Mediterranean (Rey Benayas et al. 2008), or when the soils have been modified by past agriculture, that is, the "cultivation legacy" (Cramer et al. 2008), or the "grazing history" (Chauchard et al. 2007). The revegetation also depends on the availability and quality of the native seed bank (Rey Benayas et al. 2008).

If the abandoned land is too degraded assisted regeneration may be needed (Cramer et al. 2008). Active restoration would involve large-scale native trees plantation and tree growth management (Rey Benayas et al. 2008). An intermediate level of intervention involves the creation and management of forest regeneration sources or “woodland islets” (Rey Benayas and Bullock 2012; see Chap. 7). Another problem often requiring intervention is the vulnerability of intermediate stages of natural succession to natural perturbations, such as invasive species (Kull et al. 2004; Stoate et al. 2009) and fire (Pausas et al. 2008). Fire is a particularly acute problem as it has impacts not only on biodiversity but also on human health (Proença and Pereira 2010b). If fire regime is not appropriately managed, frequent fires will favor fire-prone scrubland and halt succession towards forest, in a self-reinforcing feedback loop (Proença and Pereira 2010a).

One of the strategies to manage fire regimes is to maintain open spaces in the landscape (see Chap. 8), minimizing also the impacts of revegetation on species that prefer open areas (Fig. 1.2). This strategy can be implemented by increasing the populations of large herbivores (Hodder and Bullock 2009; Sutherland 2002), including reintroduction of extinct species (Svenning 2002). In the case of species regionally extinct, it is possible to use individuals from other populations. For instance, seven European bison were recently reintroduced in northern Spain, 1,000 years after their extinction (Burton 2011). A more complex situation occurs with species that are globally extinct, such as wild relatives of some domesticated species. A possible solution is to release into the wild individuals of breeds that are most likely to be successful in replacing the ecological role of their wild ancestors. For instance, Iceland ponies have been released in the former arable fields of the Dutch-Belgian border (Kuiters and Slim 2003): their grazing favored a dense grass sward and after 27 years open grassland still represented 98% of the area.

Natural colonization of abandoned land by carnivores can also be limited by the availability of prey, as is the case for the Iberian lynx (*Lynx pardinus*) currently negatively affected by the scarcity of rabbits, decimated by diseases (Delibes-Mateos et al. 2008), or as can be expected for some populations of wolves and bears currently preying on livestock (Russo 2006).

Rewilding may be a future option in areas that are undergoing agricultural development or intensification today. There is currently a debate between land sharing and land sparing approaches to reconcile food production with biodiversity (Phalan et al. 2011). In land sharing, biodiversity conservation and food production goals are met on the same land, with biodiversity friendly agricultural practices and extensive agriculture, whereas in land sparing, land is divided between areas of intensification and of exclusion of agriculture. In practice, it is difficult to determine which is the best option because species respond differently to the alteration of their habitat (Phalan et al. 2011). To maintain future options for rewilding, both land sparing and land sharing are needed. On the one hand, land sharing is essential to limit land degradation and to maintain the appropriate seed bank for future passive revegetation (see Chap. 7). On the other hand, land sparing would allow for the conservation of populations of species that are currently in conflict with human activities, making “cohabitation” very difficult.

1.5 Final Remarks

Most landscapes are evaluated and protected according to emotional and aesthetic values that societies attribute to them (Antrop 2005; Gobster et al. 2007) and conservation programs are determined by people's perceptions of what should be preserved (Gillson et al. 2011) and depend on shifting baselines of what nature should be like (Vera 2009). Thus, the values that Europeans give to farmland and wilderness landscapes are based on tradition and history but also on socio-economic backgrounds (Van den Berg and Koole 2006). Yet, considering that landscapes result from the dynamic interaction of natural and cultural drivers (Antrop 2005), they cannot be perceived as anchored in time and we should anticipate occasional changes that will force us to reevaluate their definition.

Rewilding appears to be a viable management option for some of these transitions with important benefits for biodiversity and ecosystem services. At the local scale, some species will decline and other increase, eventually leading to local species diversity decreases in some taxa (Fig. 1.2). We lack research studies looking at the regional scale dynamics, but we hypothesize that no significant loss in species diversity is expected as long as mosaics of open spaces and forest are maintained, and that some dimensions of biodiversity may even improve, such as the average size of populations of wild species. At the global scale, many species have already gone extinct and it will be impossible to get them back, but the release into the wild of breeds of some domesticated species may allow recovery of some historical losses (Fig. 1.2). In terms of ecosystem services, rewilding allows for a wide range of regulating and cultural services (Fig. 1.5).

The extent and outcome of rewilding will be heterogeneous across Europe (Fig. 1.4) as different regions will have different departing points of post-farmland abandonment and varying limitations to natural forest regrowth. For example, on some abandoned areas of Southern Europe, the availability of forest tree seed banks can be a limiting factor due to little natural forest left and the frequent fire regime may delay ecological succession. In contrast, the relative scarcity of open areas in much of Northern Europe may render the intensification or reestablishment of natural perturbations, such as grazing by large wild herbivores and fire (for example, prescribed burns), priority goals for management. Rewilding can also be considered on available land that does not necessarily result from farmland abandonment, such as national forests previously managed for timber production, decommissioned military areas, salt ponds and other wetlands, thus increasing the level of heterogeneity of European wild landscapes.

From a conservation standpoint, the option between rewilding and active management will depend on the goals and the local context. Active management is likely to be preferred when the goal is to restore specific species or maintain early successional habitats and other habitats associated with human activities. Passive management emphasizes dynamic ecological processes over static patterns of species or habitat occurrence and can be more sustainable in the long term or at large spatial scales.

Despite many benefits, rewilding has been disregarded as a management option until recently. Initiatives such as Rewilding Europe (<http://www.rewildingeurope.com>, and see Chap. 9) and the PAN Parks Network (<http://www.panparks.org>) are now bringing rewilding to the forefront of the discussion of European conservation policies. Rewilding poses many challenges, but those are inherent to the implementation of any restoration plan. In a world wounded by biodiversity loss, farmland abandonment is an opportunity to improve biodiversity in Europe, to study the regeneration of vegetation, and even to test ecological theories (Hobbs and Cramer 2007). In the end, the question is not whether we prefer a domesticated or a wild European landscape but rather which management options (Fig. 1.1) at each place will be more achievable and sustainable.

Acknowledgments We thank P. Verburg for sharing data from the CLUE model and commenting on the manuscript. We also thank V. Proença, R. Beilin, J. Bullock and S. Ceaușu for comments. This research was funded by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT)-ABAFBIO (PTDC/AMB/73901/2006) and by FORMAS-Project LUPA. L.N. was supported by a grant from FCT (SFRH/BD/62547/2009).

Open Access This chapter is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License, which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

References

- Antrop, M. (2005). Why landscapes of the past are important for the future. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 70, 21–34.
- Arbelo, C. D., Rodríguez-Rodríguez, A., Guerra, J. A., Mora, J. L., Notario, J. S., & Fuentes, F. (2006). Soil degradation processes and plant colonization in abandoned terraced fields overlying pumice tuffs. *Land Degradation and Development*, 17, 571–588.
- Balmford, A., Green, R. E., & Scharlemann, J. P. W. (2005). Sparing land for nature: Exploring the potential impact of changes in agricultural yield on the area needed for crop production. *Global Change Biology*, 11, 1594–1605.
- Batáry, P., Holzschuh, A., Orci, K. M., Samu, F., & Tschardtke, T. (2012). Responses of plant, insect and spider biodiversity to local and landscape scale management intensity in cereal crops and grasslands. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 146(1), 130–136.
- Bauer, N., Wallner, A., & Hunziker, M. (2009). The change of European landscapes: Human-nature relationships, public attitudes towards rewilding, and the implications for landscape management in Switzerland. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90, 2910–2920.
- Bell, S., Montarzino, A., Aspinall, P., Penēze, Z., & Nikodemus, O. (2009). Rural society, social inclusion and landscape change in Central and Eastern Europe: A case study of Latvia. *European Society for Rural Sociology*, 49, 295–326.
- Blondel, J. (2006). The “design” of mediterranean landscapes: A millennial story of humans and ecological systems during the historic period. *Human Ecology*, 34, 713–729.
- Boitani, L. (2000). *Action plan for the conservation of the wolves (Canis lupus) in Europe. nature and environment, no. 113* (p. 84). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Brauman, K. A., Daily, G. C., Duarte, T. K., & Mooney, H. A. (2007). The nature and value of ecosystem services: An overview highlighting hydrologic services. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 32, 67–98.

- Breitenmoser, U. (1998). Large predators in the Alps: The fall and rise of man's competitors. *Biological Conservation*, 83, 279–289.
- Bugalho, M. N., Caldeira, M. C., Pereira, J. S., Aronson, J., & Pausas, J. G. (2011). Mediterranean Cork Oak Savannas require human use to sustain biodiversity and ecosystem services. *Frontiers in Ecology and Environment*, 9(5), 278–286.
- Bullock, D. J. (2009). What larger mammals did Britain have and what did they do? *British Wildlife*, 20(5), 16–20.
- Burton, A. (2011). Where the wisents roam. *Frontiers in Ecology and Environment*, 9, 140.
- Caro, T. (2007). The Pleistocene re-wilding gambit. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution (Personal edition)*, 22, 281–283.
- Chauchard, S., Carcaillet, C., & Guibal, F. (2007). Patterns of land-use abandonment control tree-recruitment and forest dynamics in Mediterranean mountains. *Ecosystems*, 10, 936–948.
- Conti, G., & Fagarazzi, L. (2005). Forest expansion in mountain ecosystems: “environmentalist’s dream” or societal nightmare? *Planum*, 11, 1–20.
- Cooper, T., Baldock, D., Rayment, M., Kuhmonen, T., Terluin, I., Swales, V., Poux, X., Zakeossian, D., & Farmer, M. (2006). *An evaluation of the less favoured area measure in the 25 member states of the European Union* (p. 262). London: Institute for European Environmental Policy.
- Cramer, V. A., Hobbs, R. J., & Standish, R. J. (2008). What’s new about old fields? Land abandonment and ecosystem assembly. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution (Personal edition)*, 23, 104–112.
- Daugstad, K., Ronningen, K., & Skar, B. (2006). Agriculture as an upholder of cultural heritage? Conceptualizations and value judgements—a Norwegian perspective in international context. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 67–81.
- Dax, T. (2005). The redefinition of Europe’s less favoured areas. In Rural development in Europe—3rd annual conference—Funding European Rural Development in 2007–2013. MPRA paper no. 711.
- Decker, S. E., Bath, A. J., Simms, A., Lindner, U., & Reisinger, E. (2010). The return of the king or bringing snails to the garden? The human dimensions of a proposed restoration of European Bison (*Bison bonasus*) in Germany. *Restoration Ecology*, 18, 41–51.
- Delibes-Mateos, M., Delibes, M., Ferreras, P., & Villafuerte, R. (2008). Key role of European rabbits in the conservation of the Western Mediterranean basin hotspot. *Conservation Biology: The Journal of the Society for Conservation Biology*, 22(5), 1106–1117.
- Devy-Vareta, N., & Alves, A. A. M. (2007). Os avanc,os e os recuos da floresta em Portugal-da Idade Média ao Liberalismo. In J. S. Silva (Ed.), *Floresta e sociedade, uma historia em comum* (pp 55–75). Lisboa: Público SA e Fundação Luso-Americana.
- Agriculture, D. G. (2011). Rural development in the European Union. Statistical and economic information report (p. 257).
- Donlan, C. J., Berger, J., Bock, C. E., Bock, J. H., Burney, D. A., Estes, J. A., Foreman, D., Martin, P. S., Roemer, G. W., Smith, F. A., Soulé, M. E., & Greene, H. W. (2006). Pleistocene rewilding: An optimistic agenda for twenty-first century conservation. *The American Naturalist*, 168(5), 660–681.
- EEA (2004). *High nature value farmland: Characteristics, trends and policy challenges* (p. 31). Copenhagen: European Environmental Agency.
- EC—European Commission. (2008a). *Poverty and social exclusion in rural areas* (p. 187). Brussels: DG Employment Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities.
- EC—European Commission. (2008b). *Overview of the less favoured areas farms in the EU-25 (2004–2005)* (p. 99). Brussels: DG Agriculture and Rural Development.
- EC—European Commission. (2009). *New insights into mountain farming in the European Union* (p. 35). Brussels: DG Agriculture and Rural Development.
- Eickhout, B., Van Meijl H., Tabeau, A., & Van Rheenen, T. (2007). Economic and ecological consequences of four European land use scenarios. *Land Use Policy*, 24, 562–575.
- Enserink, M., & Vogel, G. (2006). The carnivore comeback. *Science*, 314, 746–749.
- Farrell, E. P., Führer, E., Ryan, D., Andersson, F., Hüttl, R., & Piussi, P. (2000). European forest ecosystems: Building the future on the legacy of the past. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 132, 5–20.

- FAO. (2011). *State of the world's forests* (p. 179). Rome: FAO.
- FAOSTAT. (2010). <http://faostat.fao.org>. Accessed: 1. March 2011.
- Figueiredo, J., & Pereira, H. M. (2011). Regime shifts in a socio-ecological model of farmland abandonment. *Landscape Ecology*, 26(5), 737–749.
- Fourli, M. (1999). Compensation for damage caused by bears and wolves in the European Union. LIFE-Nature projects, European Commission-DG XI-Environment, Nuclear Safety and Civil Protection. 72p. Brussels.
- Gellrich, M., Baur, P., Koch, B., & Zimmermann, N. E. (2007). Agricultural land abandonment and natural forest re-growth in the Swiss mountains: A spatially explicit economic analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 118, 93–108.
- Gillson, L., Ladle, R. J., & Araújo, M. B. (2011). Baselines, patterns and process. In R. J. Ladle, R. J. Whittaker (Eds.), *Conservation biogeography* (pp. 31–44). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gobster, P. H., Nassauer, J. I., Daniel, T. C., & Fry, G. (2007). The shared landscape: What does aesthetics have to do with ecology? *Landscape Ecology*, 22, 959–972.
- Gortázar, C., Herrero, J., Villafuerte, R., & Marco, J. (2000). Historical examination of the status of large mammals in Aragon, Spain. *Mammalia*, 64, 411–422.
- Goulding, M. J., & Roper, T. J. (2002). Press responses to the presence of free-living wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) in southern England. *Mammal Reviews*, 32, 272–282.
- Halada, L., Evans, D., Romão, C., & Petersen, J.-E. (2011). Which habitats of European importance depend on agricultural practices? *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 20(11), 2365–2378.
- Hobbs, R. J., & Cramer, V. A. (2007). Why old fields? Socioeconomic and ecological causes and consequences of land abandonment. In V. A. Cramer, R. J. Hobbs (Eds.), *Old fields: Dynamic and restoration of abandoned farmland* (pp. 1–14). Washington: Island Press.
- Hobbs, R. J., Higgs, E., & Harris, J. A. (2009). Novel ecosystems: Implications for conservation and restoration. *Trends in ecology & evolution (Personal edition)*, 24, 599–605.
- Höchtel, F., Lehninger, S., & Konold, W. (2005). “Wilderness”: What it means when it becomes a reality—a case study from the southwestern Alps. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 70, 85–95.
- Hodder, K. H., & Bullock, J. M. (2009). Really wild? Naturalistic grazing in modern landscapes. *British Wildlife*, 20, 37–43.
- Hodder, K. H., Buckland, P. C., Kirby, K. K., & Bullock, J. M. (2009). Can the pre-neolithic provide suitable models for re-wilding the landscape in Britain? *British Wildlife*, 20(5), 4–15.
- Hölzel, N., Haub, C., Ingelfinger, M. P., Otte, A., & Pilipenko, V. N. (2002). The return of the steppe—large-scale restoration of degraded land in southern Russia during the post-Soviet era. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 10, 75–85.
- Honda, T., Miyagawa, Y., Ueda, H., & Inoue, M. (2009). Effectiveness of newly-designed electric fences in reducing crop damage by medium and large mammals. *Mammal Study*, 34, 13–17.
- Johnson, C. N. (2009). Ecological consequences of late quaternary extinctions of megafauna. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 276, 2509–2519.
- Kaczensky, P., Blazic, M., Gossow, H. (2004). Public attitudes towards brown bears (*Ursus arctos*) in Slovenia. *Biological Conservation*, 118, 661–674.
- Kamler, J., Homolka, M., Barancėková, M., & Krojerová-Prokesová, J. (2010). Reduction of herbivore density as a tool for reduction of herbivore browsing on palatable tree species. *European Journal of Forest Research*, 129, 155–162.
- Kaplan, J. O., Krumhardt, K. M., & Zimmermann, N. (2009). The prehistoric and preindustrial deforestation of Europe. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 28, 3016–3034.
- Keenleyside, C., & Tucker, G. 2010. *Farmland Abandonment in the EU: An assessment of trends and prospects* (p. 97) London: WWF and IEEP.
- Körner, C., Spehn, E., & Baron, J. (2005). *Mountain systems. Millenium ecosystem assessment. Ecosystems and human well-being: Current state and trends* (pp. 681–716). Washington: Island Press.
- Kuemmerle, T., Hostert, P., Radeloff, V. C., Linden, S., Perzanowski, K., & Kruhlov, I. (2008). Cross-border comparison of post-socialist farmland abandonment in the Carpathians. *Ecosystems*, 11, 614–628.

- Kuiters, A. T., & Slim, P. A. (2003). Tree colonisation of abandoned arable land after 27 years of horse-grazing: The role of bramble as a facilitator of oak wood regeneration. *Forest Ecology Management, 181*, 239–251.
- Kull, T., Pencheva, V., Petrovic, F., Elias, P., Henle, K., Balciuskas, L., Kopacz, M., Zajickova, Z., & Stoianovici, V. (2004). Agricultural landscapes. In J Young, L Halada, T Kull, A Kuzniar, U Tartes, Y Uzunov, & A Watt (Eds.), *Conflicts between human activities and the conservation of biodiversity in agricultural landscapes, grasslands, forests, wetlands and uplands in the acceding and candidate countries* (pp. 10–20) Wallingford: Centre for Ecology and Hydrology.
- Laiolo, P., Dondero, F., Ciliento, E., & Rolando, A. (2004). Consequences of pastoral abandonment for the structure and diversity of the alpine avifauna. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 41*, 294–304.
- Lindborg, R., Bengtsson, J., Berg, A., Cousins, S. A. O., Eriksson, O., Gustafsson, T., Hasund, K. P., Lenoir, L., Pihlgren, A., Sjödin, E., & Stenseke, M. (2008). A landscape perspective on conservation of semi-natural grasslands. *Agricultural and Ecosystem Environment, 125*(1), 213–222.
- Linnell, J. D. C., Swenson, J. E., & Andersen, R. (2000). Conservation of biodiversity in Scandinavian boreal forests: Large carnivores as flagships, umbrellas, indicators, or keystones? *Biodiversity and Conservation, 9*, 857–868.
- MA—Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. (2005). *Ecosystems and human well-being: Scenarios*. (p. 560). Washington: Island Press.
- MacDonald, D., Crabtree, J. R., Wiesinger, G., Dax, T., Stamou, N., Fleury, P., Gutierrez Lazpita, J., & Gibon, A. (2000). Agricultural abandonment in mountain areas of Europe: Environmental consequences and policy response. *Journal of Environmental Management, 59*, 47–69.
- McNeely, J. A. (1994). Lessons from the past: Forests and biodiversity. *Biodiversity and Conservation, 3*, 3–20.
- Meijaard, E., & Sheil, D. (2011). A modest proposal for wealthy countries to reforest their land for the common good. *Biotropica, 43*(5), 524–528.
- Moreira, F., & Russo, D. (2007). Modelling the impact of agricultural abandonment and wildfires on vertebrate diversity in Mediterranean Europe. *Landscape Ecology, 22*, 1461–1476.
- Nabuurs, G. J., Schelhaas, M. J., Mohren, G. M. J., & Field, C. B. (2003). Temporal evolution of the European forest sector carbon sink from 1950 to 1999. *Global Change Biology, 9*, 152–160.
- Nowicki, P., Weeger, C., Van Meijl H., Banse, M., Helming, J., Terluin, I., Verhoog, D., Overmars, K. P., & Westhoek, H. 2006. *SCENAR 2020: Scenario study on agriculture and the rural world* (p. 236). Brussels: European Commission-DG Agriculture and Rural Development.
- Pausas, J. G., Llovet, J., Rodrigo, A., & Vallejo, R. (2008). Are wildfires a disaster in the Mediterranean basin—a review. *International Journal of Wildland Fire, 17*, 713–723.
- Pereira, E., Queiroz, C., Pereira, H. M., & Vicente, L. (2005). Ecosystem services and human well-being: A participatory study in a mountain community in Portugal. *Ecology and Society, 10*(2), 14.
- Pereira, H. M., Leadley, P. W., Proença, V., Alkemade, R., Scharlemann, J. P. W., Fernandez-Manjarrés, J. F., Araújo, M. B., Balvanera, P., Biggs, R., Cheung, W. W. L., Chini, L., Cooper, H. D., Gilman, E. L., Guénette, S., Hurtt, G. C., Huntington, H. P., Mace, G. M., Oberdorff, T., Revenga, C., Rodrigues, P., Scholes, R. J., Sumaila, U. R., & Walpole, M. (2010). Scenarios for global biodiversity in the 21st century. *Science, 330*, 1496–1501.
- Pereira, H. M., Navarro, L. M., & Martins, I. S. 2012. Global biodiversity change: The good, the bad and the unknown. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 37*, 25–50.
- Phalan, B., Onial, M., Balmford, A., & Green, R. E. (2011). Reconciling food production and biodiversity conservation: Land sharing and land sparing compared. *Science, 333*(6047), 1289–1291.
- Pinto-Correia, T., & Mascarenhas, J. (1999). Contribution to the extensification/intensification debate: New trends in the Portuguese Montado. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 46*, 125–131.
- Pointereau, P., Coulon, F., Lambotte, M., Stuczynski, T., Sanchez Ortega, V., & Del Rio, A. (2008). *Analysis of farmland abandonment and the extent and location of agricultural areas that are actually abandoned or are in risk to be abandoned* (p. 204). Ispra: European Commission-JRC-Institute for Environment and Sustainability.

- Proença, V., & Pereira, H. M. (2010a). Appendix 2: Mediterranean forest (pp. 60–67). In Leadley, P., Pereira, H.M., Alkemade, R., Fernandez-Manjarrés, J.F., Proença, V., Scharlemann, J.P.W., Walpole, M.J. (Eds.) *Biodiversity Scenarios: Projections of 21st century change in biodiversity and associated ecosystem services*. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal. Technical Series no. 50, 132 pages.
- Proença, V., & Pereira, H. M. (2010b). Ecosystem changes, biodiversity loss and human well-being. In J. O. Nriagu (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of environmental health* (pp. 215–224). Burlington: Elsevier.
- Proença, V., Pereira, H. M., & Vicente, L. (2008). Organismal complexity is an indicator of species existence value. *Frontiers in Ecology Environment*, 6, 298–299.
- Rasker, R., & Hackman, A. (1996). Economic development and the conservation of large carnivores. *Conservation Biology: The Journal of the Society for Conservation Biology*, 10, 991–1002.
- Rey Benayas, J., & Bullock, J. (2012). Restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services on agricultural land. *Ecosystems*, 15, 883–899.
- Rey Benayas, J. M., Martins, A., Nicolau, J. M., & Schulz, J. J. (2007). Abandonment of agricultural land: An overview of drivers and consequences. *CAB Reviews*, 2, 1–14.
- Rey Benayas, J. M., Bullock, J. M., & Newton, A. C. (2008). Creating woodland islets to reconcile ecological restoration, conservation, and agricultural land use. *Frontiers in Ecology Environment*, 6, 329–336.
- Rounsevell, M. D. A., Reginster, I., Araújo, M. B., Carter, T. R., Dendoncker, N., Ewert, F., House, J. I., Kankaanpaa, S., Leemans, R., Metzger, M. J., Schmit, C., Smith, P., & Tuck, G. (2006). A coherent set of future land use change scenarios for Europe. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 114, 57–68.
- Ruben, R., & Pender, J. (2004). Rural diversity and heterogeneity in less-favoured areas: The quest for policy targeting. *Food Policy*, 29, 303–320.
- Russo, D. (2006). Effects of land abandonment on animal species in Europe: Conservation and management implications. Integrated assessment of vulnerable ecosystems under global change in the EU (p. 52). Project report.
- Schley, L., & Roper, T. J. (2003). Diet of wild boar *Sus scrofa* in Western Europe, with particular reference to consumption of agricultural crops. *Mammal Review*, 33, 43–56.
- Schröter, D., Cramer, W., Leemans, R., Prentice, I. C., Araújo, M. B., Arnell, N. W., Bondeau, A., Bugmann, H., Carter, T. R., & Gracia, C. A. (2005). Ecosystem service supply and vulnerability to global change in Europe. *Science*, 310, 1333–1337.
- Sirami, C., Brotons, L., Burfield, I., Fonderflick, J., & Martin, J. L. (2008). Is land abandonment having an impact on biodiversity? A metaanalytical approach to bird distribution changes in the northwestern Mediterranean. *Biological Conservation*, 141, 450–459.
- Stoate, C., Báldi, A., Beja, P., Boatman, N. D., Herzog, I., Van Doorn A., De Snoo, G. R., Rakosy, L., & Ramwell, C. (2009). Ecological impacts of early 21st century agricultural change in Europe—a review. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 91, 22–46.
- Strijker, D. (2005). Marginal lands in Europe—causes of decline. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 6, 99–106.
- Sutherland, W. J. (2002). Openness in management. *Nature*, 418, 834–835.
- Svenning, J. C. (2002). A review of natural vegetation openness in North-western Europe. *Biological Conservation*, 104(2), 133–148.
- TEEB. (2010). The economics of ecosystems and biodiversity: Mainstreaming the economics of nature: A synthesis of the approach, conclusions and recommendations of TEEB, 39p.
- Tschamtker, T., Klein, A. M., Krüess, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., & Thies, C. (2005). Landscape perspectives on agricultural intensification and biodiversity—ecosystem service management. *Ecology Letters*, 8(8), 857–874.
- Van den Berg, A. E., & Koole, S. L. (2006). New wilderness in the Netherlands: An investigation of visual preferences for nature development landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 78, 362–372.
- Van Vuuren, D. P., Sala, O. E., & Pereira, H. M. (2006). The future of vascular plant diversity under four global scenarios. *Ecology and Society*, 11(2), 25.
- Vera, F. W. M. (2000). *Grazing ecology and forest history* (p. 527). New York: CABI.

- Vera, F. W. M. (2009). Large-scale nature development—the Oostvaardersplassen. *British Wildlife*, 20(5), 28–36.
- Verburg, P. H., & Overmars, K. P. (2009). Combining top-down and bottom-up dynamics in land use modeling: Exploring the future of abandoned farmlands in Europe with the Dyna-CLUE model. *Landscape Ecology*, 24, 1167–1181.
- Williams, M. (2000). Dark ages and dark areas: Global deforestation in the deep past. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 26, 28–46.
- Wilkinson, D. M. (1999). The disturbing history of intermediate disturbance. *Oikos*, 84, 145–147.
- Wilson, C. J. (2004). Could we live with reintroduced large carnivores in the UK? *Mammal Review*, 34, 211–232.
- Young, J., Watt, A., Nowicki, P., Alard, D., Clitherow, J., Henle, K., Johnson, R., Laczko, E., McCracken, D., Matouch, S., Niemela, J., & Richards, C. (2005). Towards sustainable land use: Identifying and managing the conflicts between human activities and biodiversity conservation in Europe. *Biodiversity Conservation*, 14, 1641–1661.