

## Review

# Sustainable practices to limit soil erosion: a review and discussion

R. Evans\*

**Address:** Department of Geography, Anglia Ruskin University, East Road, Cambridge CB1 1PT, UK.

**\*Correspondence:** Email: r.evans@anglia.ac.uk

**Received:** 23 June 2006

**Accepted:** 25 July 2006

doi: 10.1079/PAVSNNR20061030

The electronic version of this article is the definitive one. It is located here: <http://www.cababstractsplus.org/cabreviews>

© CABI Publishing 2006 (Online ISSN 1749-8848)

## Abstract

How the review was carried out is briefly described. The review looks mainly at the literature published since year 2000, but does not exclude earlier publications. The sustainability of practices to limit erosion must be assessed not only in terms of the soil resource and the wider environment but must also take into account economical and socio-political factors. Soil degradation may be due to a number of causes and it may be that in places erosion is not the main factor. So how erosion is assessed and perceived may be an important factor if degradation is to be successfully tackled. Certainly, in many parts of the world farmers do not, or cannot, combat erosion. A brief history of soil conservation practices is given and then these techniques are examined in more detail in terms of their environmental, economical and socio-political sustainability. Many practices are environmentally sustainable, especially those used by small indigenous farmers, but few are sustainable in financial and socio-political terms. Although conservation tillage techniques are being vigorously promoted they may be more sustainable when carried out on small farms where no herbicide inputs are needed. It is the economical and socio-political factors that lead to erosion which need to be tackled if sustainable practices to limit soil erosion are to be successful.

**Keywords:** Erosion, Conservation, Sustainability, Economical and socio-political factors

**Review Methodology:** The abstracting service CAB DIRECT was interrogated and abstracts from those papers with titles indicating their relevance to the review were downloaded. I concentrated on land that grows crops and supports animals and I searched the database back to the beginning of year 2000 for titles or abstracts containing the words 'soil erosion'. I used a broad 'trawl' approach as a preliminary trial using other key words had identified very few relevant articles. The search produced over 1400 articles of which the first 1000 were scanned. I then interrogated the Agricultural Economics and Rural Studies database, again back to 1, January 2000, and again using the words 'soil erosion'. Over 400 articles were identified, a few duplicating the first search.

All together 153 abstracts of what appeared to be relevant articles were downloaded. Of these 85 were from journals, 15 were chapters from books, nine were from Bulletins, five were PhD theses and three were other papers and proceedings. The articles described relevant work on practices for limiting soil erosion from 47 countries, of which 18 articles described work in the USA, 17 referred to China, 11 to India, nine to Ethiopia, six to Kenya, and four each to Honduras, Nepal, Peru and Tanzania.

To write this review, I refer to the relevant articles and also to those I already knew about. I have not read all the articles, for not all are easily available from local sources, even though I have access to good libraries. For example, only 38 of the 85 journals in which the abstracted articles appear are easily accessible in the libraries of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin Universities. Interlibrary loans and access to articles over the internet are not free and it would have been costly to obtain all those articles that looked of interest. However, it seems likely that the abstracts and articles perused give such a widespread coverage of soil conservation practices in so many countries that they give an adequate sample to examine whether practices to conserve or limit soil erosion are sustainable.

## Introduction

The title of this review is carefully chosen. It accepts that erosion can only be limited, or curtailed, not stopped. It also accepts there is a tolerable level of erosion, this is arguable, especially if the view is taken, in my view rightly,

that soil is a finite resource [1]. 'Sustainable' implies that the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs [2]. However, the goals of economic and social development must be defined also in terms of sustainability [3]. Agriculture has an important role to play in encouraging

economic growth and poverty reduction in developing countries, but '*Sustainability is not an optional issue, it is fundamental to achieving future growth in agriculture. Agriculture is sustainable when it balances ecological, economic and socio-political trade-offs*' (para 84, page 23; [4]). This 'balance' is difficult to achieve.

This review is written from the perspective of a researcher who assesses erosion of agricultural land in the field, and those fields are in a country where climate and topography are not extreme, and where erosion extent and rates [5, 6] and sediment delivery to streams [7] are low. Nevertheless, such field assessment of erosion and its impacts have shown that even low levels of erosion, far lower than the generally accepted tolerable level of about 11 tons ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> [8], equivalent to a surface lowering of about 1 mm yr<sup>-1</sup>, can have serious impacts on water quality because of the pollutants (sediment, nutrients, pesticides) carried in runoff from the fields into water courses. Such pollutants have to be removed from the water before it can be drunk, a costly procedure [9–11] and the impacts of 'muddy floods' can be severe [12, 13]. Regulations in developed countries such as the USA and those in the European Union are bringing protection of soil and water quality to the fore, with important implications for agriculture.

Another way of defining what is a 'tolerable' level of erosion is that level which pertains prior to land being used for agriculture in an intensive manner. What may be called the 'background' level before intensification took place, in England and Wales this resulted in sediment yields in rivers of about 0.2 tons ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> [7], although this varied somewhat according to land use, rainfall and topography. Evidence suggests that over the last 50 years, as agriculture intensified – greater use of artificial fertilizers, larger fields, bigger machines, fewer people working the land, less grass in the crop rotation, growing of crops more vulnerable to erosion, continuous arable or more intensive stocking rates, decline in organic matter – soils have become more at risk of erosion. And sediment yields have probably doubled, or more (>0.4 tons ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>). It is likely that in many parts of the world, where rainfall is more intense and slopes steeper it may be difficult to attain 'background' sediment yields once much land is converted from forest or grassland to agriculture.

The lack of uptake by farmers of methods to limit erosion has resulted in many assessments as to why this has happened [14–26]. The poor uptake of schemes has many causes: schemes have often been 'top-down', erosion has not been perceived as a problem, co-operation between institutions has been poor, the schemes were not economic unless subsidised in some way, and socially and politically unpopular, especially in some African countries where such schemes were forced on indigenous populations by the then colonial power [27].

Other assessments, often involving many participating individuals and organizations, have been made to work out how to encourage farmers to manage their land in

a more sustainable way and to participate in schemes devised to curtail erosion [24, 28–33] but so far with few positive results unless projects addressed multiple goals, such as reducing soil loss and flooding, increasing dry season flows and improving the economic value of land and the livelihood of people [34–36]. Both the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technology (WOCAT) [37] and the World Association of Soil and Water Conservation (WASWC) [38] play important roles in trying to persuade farmers to use their land in a more sustainable way.

It is because the economic and socio-political factors have to take precedence over environmental ones – people have to eat if they are practising subsistence agriculture, as in many developing countries, or have to make a profit where farming is run as a business, as in the developed world – that practices to curtail erosion are not often taken up, for such practices are generally not economic.

Furthermore, many farmers are not aware that their actions in growing crops or grazing their animals have deleterious effects on the productivity of their land or have serious impacts on their downstream neighbours. Indeed, in developed countries it is likely the off-farm impacts are far greater than they are on-farm [9, 13]. It is important here to recognize therefore that what may not be financially viable for a farmer could well be economically viable for the community as a whole, or the nation, because of the off-site impacts and costs of erosion.

It is likely that in many parts of the world, it is loss of soil fertility, because nutrients taken up by the crop are not replaced by fertilisers, rather than erosion [39], that is the biggest problem for farmers. Compacted soils may also severely inhibit crop growth [40]. In other words, is erosion the problem or just a perception? It is becoming widely acknowledged that our knowledge of the extent and severity of erosion is poor [5, 41, 42] and, although there is better information than there used to be [43] and efforts are being made to improve the quality of information [1], we need better ways of assessing erosion [13, 44–47].

Also, if erosion is mainly by sheet wash rather than by rills and gullies, it is more difficult to discern, and often in such circumstances, the rates of erosion will be low and hence will be ignored. This observation leads to a fundamental point, how erosion is assessed is critical, thus the problem of erosion, as far as the 'expert' is concerned may appear severe, whereas it is not in the eyes of the farmer. Most ways of assessing erosion are done by using formulae based on plot experiments, and often overstate [48, 49] or mis-state [50] the problem of erosion. These differences in perception of erosion, between farmers and 'experts' may well explain why many soil conservation programmes have failed, especially in developing countries [51, 52].

When economical and socio-political factors control the decisions taken by farmers, the approach is almost of

necessity a short-term one, unless food or money surpluses are being generated rapidly to allow investment for the future. Long-term impacts such as the decline in soil depth and hence on the water holding capacity of the soil which controls crop yield, providing nutrient levels are satisfactory, are difficult to envisage. However, even in England and Wales, since the land has been settled and used for agriculture over a period of about 4000 years, soil thinning has resulted in yield reductions of at least 10% [13]. In countries where climate and topography are more severe, such impacts will occur far more quickly.

Hudson (page 16, [52]) has suggested that 'loss of productivity is a better measure of degradation than soil lost' but loss of productivity can be due to a number of factors – decline of soil fertility [39], soil erosion, soil compaction [40] – and unless the main contributing factor is known the problem of lost productivity cannot be remedied effectively.

There is a pressing need therefore to employ practices to limit soil erosion. I will describe briefly how conservation practices have developed, and then discuss in more detail some presently used practices and some of the problems associated with them which may explain their general lack of uptake, and then draw some conclusions about how a better uptake may be brought about.

### Practices to Limit Soil Erosion

It is appropriate to briefly describe the evolution of soil conservation techniques. Since the early 1900s when soil erosion came to be accepted as a problem [53, 54], especially of cultivated land, many practices have been designed to curtail erosion. Originally, many of these practices to combat water erosion were based on earth moving and the construction of terraces of various types, especially in the USA and Australia and former British colonies in Africa and the West Indies. Planting along the contour and strip cropping were also promulgated, as well as grassed waterways. Strip cropping and shelter belts of various kinds were also encouraged to stop wind erosion. These practices are dealt with in many text books [55–58].

As it was realized that a certain amount of crop or stubble cover (25–30%; [59]) was sufficient to disperse raindrop energy and greatly inhibit runoff and erosion, minimal or no tillage was encouraged so that seeds were drilled into a protective live or dead ground cover. In intensive agriculture, this relied on a herbicide to kill off the weeds which were likely to compete with the growing crop. Effective herbicides, used to defoliate the jungle in the USA/Vietnam war of the late 1960s/early 1970s, became widely available after the war ended. Minimal or no-till techniques allow large areas of land to be worked quickly using large machinery and with few workers and allows crops to be grown more cheaply [60]. It was for

those reasons that the practice became widely favoured and was later promoted as conservation tillage. Conservation tillage is now widely used in USA, Argentina, Brazil, Australia, Canada and China and is being widely promoted throughout the world by both commercial organisations and the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organisation [61–63].

With further technological advances other practices based on stabilizing the soil surface and soil aggregates have come to the fore, particularly in the 1990s, and are now being vigorously promoted [64–68].

The above comments relate to agriculture in those parts of the world where crops are grown as part of a business venture, often for export. Where crops are grown as part of a subsistence economy, it is often on a very small scale, and many different crops, shrubs and trees may be grown in close juxtaposition to each other on small plots. Such small-scale indigenous farming is considered sustainable [69, 70]. Erosion on small plots is often low or negligible compared to more intensively cultivated land [71–74]. In tropical forests, until population pressure becomes severe 'slash and burn' agriculture (=shifting cultivation (Jhum)) on a long cycle, say 10–12 years is the lowest cost source of growth [75], and does not lead to much erosion by water [76] or by mass movements. The system is resilient and once reforestation starts taking place, runoff and erosion levels soon revert to their previous low levels [77]. Poverty does not necessarily lead to degradation of the land [78].

Terrace agriculture is presently practised in many parts of the world, especially South East Asia, as it was in many parts of the Mediterranean basin [79], and parts of England, for example, in Medieval times. In many places the construction of terraces was, or is, more likely a response to the need for land which is level for cultivation and irrigation rather than to minimise erosion, although it does that too.

There is considerable evidence therefore that suggests that often, until population pressure becomes too severe, indigenous types of arable agriculture have negligible or low erosion rates. But even so, as shown above in England, the impacts on soil productivity can be large over the long term.

In many parts of the world too dry for growing crops without irrigation or too cold for cultivating crops animals are grazed. Often, before the boundaries of countries became fixed, the animals roamed unimpeded over vast areas and it seems likely erosion was not widespread, except perhaps around the Mediterranean Sea and parts of China [80], or at particular 'hotspots', at river crossings for example. Once the extent of grazings becomes limited or animal numbers are greatly increased, the chance of bare soil being exposed and eroded by water and wind is greatly increased [15, 46, 81]. Again, as for cultivated land, what evidence there is suggests that in many parts of the world indigenous grazing practices did not lead

to high erosion rates. In other words, such land uses were as near as possible sustainable.

### Sustainability of Practices to Limit Erosion

As noted above, except for conservation tillage in some form or other, and terracing in South East Asia (and the Mediterranean basin in the past), practices to limit erosion have not been widely taken up. In the following sections, I discuss the evidence for the sustainability of practices to limit erosion not only with regard to the conservation of the soil and its environment but also with regard to the economical and socio-political sustainability of agricultural communities.

#### Grazing Land

The most sustainable practice to limit erosion is to leave the land as forest or grassland with a low grazing intensity. Where erosion of grazed land is occurring in a developed country often, as I saw in New South Wales, Australia, in 1992, concrete spillways and pools had been constructed to prevent further gullying, but no effort was then being made to tackle the actual cause of the problem – too many animals grazing the land. Animals, mainly sheep, had not only created bare soil but had so tightly grazed the sward that runoff was almost instantaneous in winter when soils were saturated [82]. Much of the sediment transported down the gullies originated from the gullies themselves, due to headward retreat and widening, not from the heavily grazed paddocks. In many parts of the world, gullies created by runoff from overgrazed land have stabilizing structures or vegetation inserted within them [57], but little attempt seems to be made to address the underlying cause that too many animals are grazing the land. Unless the socio-political and economical factors leading to overgrazing are tackled erosion will continue. These factors need to be addressed not just in developing countries, such as Mongolia (R. Evans and K. Stafford, personal communication) but also in highly developed countries, such as Norway [83].

Overgrazed land may recover, at least it will often regain a permanent vegetation cover which inhibits erosion, if livestock are kept from the land [84, 85]. However, this is often not a financial proposition for the farmer. In England it has been found in some soil/vegetation landscapes that reducing by about 30% the grazing pressure that leads to erosion has led to recolonization of the bare soil by vegetation [86]. Under appropriate land management agreements, in this case between tenant and land owner and taking account of Government subsidies, the farm appears still to be an economically viable unit.

Research needs to be carried out to ascertain what the grazing intensity thresholds are that lead to the

creation of bare soil. This can only be done by monitoring grazing and its impacts in the field. Then, rules and regulations need to be devised with the graziers to make those stocking levels viable economically. Such grazing regimes may have to be based on a rotational stocking system with care taken to ensure that trampling along fence lines does not lead to the formation of bare soil and gullies.

#### Cultivated Land

The practices briefly described above and analysed below are, for the sake of brevity, and based on their similarities, classified and described under five headings: earth-moving; barriers to water flow and wind blow; ground protection; better land management; and surface stabilisers. The practices will not be described in great detail, but in terms of their sustainability.

##### *Earth-moving practices*

Terraces of some form or other, there are many kinds [57, 79], require soil to be moved and the 'steps' between the terraces protected from erosion by water or mass movements by vegetation or stonework. In terms of time and effort, they are expensive to construct and maintain. However, in many parts of the world, it has been only by constructing terraces that enough land was made available for cultivation to feed growing populations. When first built therefore they were sustainable both to the farmer and to the community in the economical and socio-political senses as well as protecting the soil from erosion. Terraces limit erosion [87–89], and hence are more sustainable in resource terms, and become more economical as population densities increase [75]. Presently, however, unless economical and socio-political factors are tackled to encourage people to build, farm and maintain terraced slopes, and that a food or crop surplus is produced to enable a satisfactory standard of living to be maintained, they will not appear to the farmer a financially attractive practice for sustainably limiting soil erosion [22, 87, 90].

In localities where water is scarce, it may be terracing will only be successful if water supplies are also ensured to improve crop yields so that conventional agricultural plots from which there is runoff are combined with conservation bench terraces [91].

Terraces which are not maintained may themselves trigger further erosion as mass movements or animals destroy the 'steps', or gullies can form at the 'steps', and in parts of the Mediterranean basin such erosion is occurring [79].

##### *Barriers to water flow and wind blow*

In many less developed countries of the world ways have been devised of holding up water flowing across the land so that it infiltrates into the soil rather than runs

off. If the barriers are spaced closely enough the runoff will not gain sufficient velocity to incise into the land, though particles may be transported by wash. Low terraces [32, 57], stone rows [92], soil [32, 90] and stone bunds [93], pits [69, 94], trenches [94], ridges and furrows [95], and ditches [89] can all limit erosion, but often their greatest advantage is that such structures can also improve crop yields by trapping rainfall. The soil particles which are trapped behind the barriers increase soil depth, and 'steps' or terraces may form, and crop yields in the vicinity of the barriers increase.

Strips of grass [57, 96], or shrubs and trees [57], and hedgerow intercropping along the contour also act as barriers to flow and cut down erosion [37, 71, 74, 92, 97–100].

However, uptake of such techniques is often low because farmers see little benefit [19] or are constrained by lack of money [20, 71]. Vetiver grass [101] has been widely promoted as material to form barriers to water flow in the warmer parts of the world, it is intolerant of frosts, but its uptake does not appear to be widely reported. Again, this is more likely to be related to financial and socio-political factors than it is to any perceived failing as a soil conservation technique. It may also be that such an approach is seen to be largely a top down one pushed by aid agencies and the World Bank, and does not take sufficient account of local social and economical factors.

Barriers to inhibit wind erosion, lines of shrubs or trees or strips of grass or stubble, have been widely researched and promoted [57] but may not always be used where appropriate. Again, this is not because the techniques do not work, but because they are considered not financially viable by farmers in the light of the agricultural economy prevailing at the time. An example can be given from the peat fenland of Cambridge and Norfolk, England where shelter belts were investigated and promoted [102, 103] and occasionally planted to prevent wind erosion but by the latter decades of the twentieth century had often been removed and worse, drainage ditches had been infilled to form larger fields which were more economic (for the farmer) to work but more vulnerable to wind erosion.

#### *Ground protection*

If the ground is protected by a vegetation cover, or is left rough by cultivation, rainfall infiltrates faster and runoff is impeded. However, if rainfall is intense enough and in sufficient quantity erosion can take place even of bare cultivated surfaces, a phenomenon I have seen not only in large chisel-ploughed fields in Wyoming, but in ploughed fields in England. Boardman [104] has described such erosion on chalk downland in Sussex, England. A vegetation cover of 25–30% [59] appears sufficient to severely limit erosion. However, until practices were devised in the 1960s and 1970s which allowed seeds to be drilled into a stubble or mulch large scale intensive agriculture

could not derive such soil conservation benefits. What came to be called conservation tillage sprang from a desire to reduce fuel costs by cutting out ploughing, harrowing and seed bed preparations and also to combat erosion in the mid-western states of the USA. Direct drilling was the ultimate aim, but often a cultivation to encourage weeds which could be sprayed off and then drilled was acceptable.

Conservation agriculture '*implies conformity with all three of the following general principles: no mechanical soil disturbance, direct seeding or planting; and permanent soil cover, making particular use of crop residues and cover crops; judicious choice of crop rotations*' (page v, [61]), but elsewhere in [61] it makes clear that herbicides are essential for successful conservation agriculture. The main aim of conservation tillage and of no-tillage seeding [105] is to disturb the soil as little as possible and to maintain protective vegetation, and to maintain (or increase) soil organic matter levels. Conservation agriculture and minimum tillage can be carried out on smallholder farms and without using herbicides [106, 107] and is probably the most sustainable practice known to limit erosion and also keeps people on the land rather than fleeing to cities [108]. However, a distinction needs to be made between the small scale conservation agriculture not using herbicides, which keeps people on the land, and the larger scale conservation agriculture dependant upon herbicides, which generally reduces the number of people working the land. The former is more sustainable than the latter both environmentally and socially.

In England, and in other countries too, it was the economic benefits of minimal tillage (later called conservation tillage) which were promoted rather than the protection of the soil. It is because conservation tillage appears to be of direct economic benefit to the farmer [60] that it has been taken up so widely, especially in those countries where agriculture is highly mechanised. In England, however, when such practices were first promoted in the 1970s although at first they were taken up widely, reduced yields and problems with pests led to a decline in the application of the techniques. The technique worked well on some soils, but not others, and in many rotations which included sugar beet or potatoes, for example, the plough was still needed, so needing two sets of machinery. As drills have improved, allowing a wider range of crops to be drilled followed by good germination rates, and farming has got less profitable in England so there has been wider promotion of conservation tillage. Going down this route can allow farm workers to be shed.

Conservation tillage is seen as a way to limit runoff and erosion that will enable farmers to comply with European Union and English regulations to keep their land in 'good agricultural and environmental condition'. Limiting runoff and erosion will also improve water quality. By 2015 river water quality in European nations has to be of 'good' quality, though 'good' is as yet undefined. The target year

is set by the European Union's Water Framework Directive. If farmers do not comply with keeping their land in good agricultural and environmental condition they will not get (all) their subsidies. It appears therefore that conservation tillage may be the major way forward to protect soils where the land is being used for large scale agriculture. It is being promoted widely (see above).

Erosion can be greatly reduced by conservation tillage [109–113], though runoff may not be reduced by the same proportion [112]. Research findings are not always clear however. At a site in England erosion from minimally tilled plots was about 60% that of the standard plots although there was no statistical difference between the results [114]. On the minimum tillage plots plant debris after harvest was incorporated into the top 10 cm of soil whereas on the standard plots plant remains were removed and the soil ploughed. However, another plot experiment at another site in England carried out to assess which tillage system cut down runoff and erosion most showed that ploughing in of straw was far superior to conservation tillage [115]. Conservation tillage will reduce pollution of water courses [116] but even small amounts of phosphate-enriched clay particles [117] may cause eutrophication of water bodies.

Poisonous pellets to control slugs which may damage crops, also kill other species and may impact on the biodiversity of the field and adjacent water courses. This may not matter in Chile (C. Crevetto, personal communication) but it does in the UK. Although conservation tillage is promoted as increasing the organic matter of the top few centimetres of soil and encouraging worms to inhabit that layer, a crop rotation which still necessitates the use of the plough mitigates those advantages. Fuglie [118] worries that the adoption of conservation tillage may lead to too great a reliance on agricultural chemicals. These and other problems that restrict the uptake of conservation tillage are outlined by Harrington [119] and Rockstrom *et al.* [120].

There are three major caveats with regard to conservation tillage. The first is that if herbicides are not applied under the right conditions they will be carried to water courses either in runoff or drain flow. This has serious implications for the water supply industries in developed countries such as the European Union and USA for they have to provide drinking water which by law must meet stringent requirements. It is costly to remove pesticides from water and the general public must bear that cost when it is passed on. Secondly, the production of pesticides relies on the continuing and economic supply of petroleum products. This may not be guaranteed far into the future [121]. The third caveat relates to weeds acquiring resistance to the herbicides used in conservation tillage, for example rye grass in Australia [122]. Alternative herbicides are probably less benign than those used now. If herbicides cannot be used is conservation tillage a viable agricultural practice on large farms? Only from a short-term financial viewpoint

therefore does conservation tillage appear to be a sustainable practice.

Organic and non-organic mulches, if available, cut down runoff and erosion world wide in cropped fields and plantations [123–128].

When arable land vulnerable to erosion is set-aside to grass the extent of erosion declines and the connectivity of flow down-valley is lessened, this change has been monitored in a catchment on the chalk Downlands of West Sussex, England [129]. In the USA government subsidies encouraged the take up of set-aside and will have had similar impacts. Off-farm impacts of flooding can be severe. In West Sussex, houses which had frequently been flooded prior to the land being set-aside were not flooded even in autumn 2000, when a sequence of storms happened estimated to be of a 1 in 350 year occurrence. Elsewhere on the Downs flooding of property was widespread [12]. The farmer could afford to set aside his land because he was paid an agricultural subsidy to do so [130]. However, the subsidy had not come about as a means to combat erosion, but as a means to stop overproduction of combinable crops, for the European Union had a surplus of cereals and it was expensive to store these or to subsidise their export.

#### *Better land management*

That set-aside reduced the extent of erosion and severity of flooding was not unexpected. When grass or legumes are included in the crop rotation soil erosion rates decline for the land is protected from erosion in those years. The soil's structure is also improved and when the land is ploughed up again, especially if the land has been under grass for 3 years or so, for a time the soil is more resistant to erosion. When there was an economic basis for a grass-based rotation, prior to the Second World War before cheap nitrogen fertilizers became widely available in the developed world, there was little evidence for runoff and erosion in England [13]. In the wetter west of the country the farm was dominantly under grass whereas in the drier east arable land was dominant. With the decline in area of short-term ley grassland and its replacement by continuous arable, as well as a change in cropping since the late 1960s, erosion has become much more evident [7]. In other countries too, rotations with more grass in them cut down erosion [131–134].

Growing trees or shrubs on vulnerable slopes or interspersing them between crops (agroforestry) will also cut down runoff and erosion [71, 135, 136] and connectivity [137]. Alternatively, grass cover crops [138, 139], or intercropped vegetables [110] or even weeds [140] can be grown between trees or shrubs, as on coffee or tea plantations. The incorporation of manure or compost into soils so improving soil structure also cuts down runoff and erosion [96, 141, 142] and phosphorus losses in water [116]. However, as Stocking (page 21, [33]) notes when discussing 'hillsides production systems', *"All projects, in varying ways, emphasize the factors*

that limit the adoption of available technologies” but “While financial, physical, and natural capital assets are extremely limited, social and human assets enable people to overcome the difficulties of their environment and secure their livelihoods.”

#### Surface stabilizers

Petroleum-based products can be used to stabilize the soil surface and to encourage soil particles and small aggregates to cohere to form larger aggregates [64–68] which are more resistant to transport by water and wind and can improve the infiltration capacity of the topsoil. Such products have been on the market for the last two decades and a particular product, PAM (polyacrylamide), has been vigorously promoted since the mid 1990s, especially for irrigated farmland [64, 143, 144]. As with other technologically driven techniques to alleviate erosion there are caveats. In this instance, the costs of the practice can only be covered by growing high value crops. To spray large areas of land to grow cereals, for example, is not a financial proposition. More importantly, petroleum products are themselves a finite resource and it is estimated that peak production has been, or shortly will be, attained [121]. Some doubts have been raised about the toxicity of the chemicals in the runoff which reaches water courses [145]. On resource, financial, economical and environmental grounds therefore such synthetic treatments of soils are probably not sustainable.

#### Conclusions

World wide, and in many agricultural systems, environmentally sustainable practices have been devised to limit erosion. But, world wide, except possibly where indigenous agriculture prevails and population pressure is low, these sustainable practices are not taken up because financial, social and political factors over-ride environmental needs.

Farmers need to be made (more) aware of (i) the long term impacts of erosion on crop yield, (ii) the impacts of runoff and erosion on their downstream neighbours and (iii) the impacts of runoff and erosion on the biodiversity of the rivers and oceans [41].

It is not difficult to devise strategies for protecting soil. What is difficult is persuading farmers to take actions to do that. Short-term actions must always over-ride actions that result in long-term benefits, for farmers have to eat and make enough money from selling their agricultural produce to buy food if they are not themselves self-sufficient and to buy other necessities, and to enable many people in developing countries to improve their standard of living. Hence, presently a practice that limits soil erosion and is sustainable in the resource sense, is rarely sustainable in the financial and socio-political contexts.

There are good economical and socio-political reasons for keeping people employed on the land, and stopping their flight to the cities [3]. But to retain those populations and to protect the soil all the three bases of sustainability – resource/ecological, financial (for the farmer)/economical (for society) and socio-political – need to be satisfied.

In my experience, if farmers accept there is a problem such as runoff and erosion, they are more than competent to solve it [130, 137], providing they will still be making a living. Very often farmers are not aware of the impacts on others of what they do. In some developed countries if farmers do not take heed of these warnings, litigation may ensue, to their disadvantage [146] but persuasion rather than coercion seems a better way. Indeed, co-operation and participation are essential if progress on limiting soil erosion is to be made.

The main difficulty therefore in devising sustainable practices to limit erosion is not the devising of the practices but is in designing the economical and socio-political schemes which will encourage farmers to take up the soil protecting practices, and which will overcome the financial, institutional and cultural barriers presently impeding uptake. Such schemes must produce a financial return to the farmer to not only make s/he want to protect the soil but to continue farming in such a way that they also improve their standard of living.

Prices of agricultural products must be such that they return a reasonable profit to the farmer, perhaps ‘fair trade’ shows the way here. Or, subsidies must be such that combined with prices they make it worthwhile for the farmer continuing to grow crops and animals. Hence it is likely a mix of market and government subsidy approaches is needed, tailored to the needs of individual countries and especially aimed to help the agricultural sector in the developing world. The World Trade Organisation must therefore look closely at how trade in agricultural products develops and is conducted in order to take into account not just the economical factors which largely seem to govern its attitudes to trade but, and more importantly, takes account of the resource and ecological aspects, as well as socio-political aspects, of sustainability. As noted elsewhere [147], taking such a path may have serious economical and socio-political impacts on urban dwellers.

In tackling these problems of resource sustainability, particularly as they affect soils, there is scope for using fertiliser, water and pesticides more efficiently, following an integrated or whole farm approach. Infrastructure off the farm – roads, improved communications – may also need to be greatly improved to allow agricultural produce to be moved easily and quickly to markets. Indeed, concentrating on improving the infrastructure and other socio-political factors, especially education, particularly for women, may greatly help in encouraging the uptake of sustainable practices to limit soil erosion.

## Acknowledgment

An anonymous referee made very helpful suggestions to improve the manuscript.

## References

- United Nations Environment Programme. UNEP's Strategy on Land Use Management and Soil Conservation. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi; 2004.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. Our Common Future. Oxford University Press, Oxford; 1987.
- Department for International Development. Growth and Poverty Reduction: The Role of Agriculture. London: Department for International Development; 2005.
- United Nations Sustainable Development Commission. Website [cited 2006 Jan 20]. Available from: URL: <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/>
- Evans R. An alternative way to assess water erosion of cultivated land – field-based measurements: and analysis of some results. *Applied Geography* 2002; 22:187–208.
- Evans R. Monitoring water erosion in lowland England and Wales – a personal view of its history and outcomes. *Catena* 2005; 64:142–61.
- Evans R. Land use, sediment delivery and sediment yield in England and Wales. In: Owens PN, Collins AJ, editors. *Soil Erosion and Sediment Redistribution in River Catchments*. CAB International, Wallingford; 2006. p. 70–83.
- McCormack DE, Young DD, Kimberlin LW. Current criteria for determining soil loss tolerance. In: *Determinants of Soil Loss Tolerance*. ASA Special Publication No 45. American Society of Agronomy/Soil Science Society of America, Madison; 1982. p. 95–111.
- Evans R. Soil erosion and land use: towards a sustainable policy. In: Evans B, editor. *Soil Erosion and Land Use: Towards a Sustainable Policy*. Proceedings of the Seventh Professional Environmental Seminar; 1995 Feb 25; Cambridge, England. The White Horse Press, Knapwell, Cambridge; 1995. p. 14–26.
- Pretty J, Brett C, Gee D, Hine R, Mason C, Morison J, *et al*. Policy challenges and priorities for internalising the externalities of modern agriculture. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 2001;44(2):263–83.
- Environment Agency. Agriculture and natural resources: benefits, costs and potential solutions. Environment Agency, Bristol; 2002.
- Boardman J. Soil erosion and flooding on the eastern South Downs, Southern England, 1976–2001. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers New Series* 2003;28:176–96.
- Evans R. *Soil Erosion and Its Impacts in England and Wales*. Friends of the Earth Trust, London; 1996.
- Chatterton L, Chatterton B. *Sustainable Dryland Farming*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; 1996.
- Aagesen D. Crisis and conservation at the end of the world: sheep ranching in Argentine Patagonia. *Environmental Conservation* 2000;27(2):208–15.
- Kerr J, Pangare G, Pangare VL, George PJ. An evaluation of dryland watershed development projects in India. EPTD Discussion Paper No 68. Environment and Production Technology Division, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington (DC); 2000.
- Hettiarachchi NDG, Gunatilake HM. Factors affecting the use of soil conservation measures by upland farmers in the Walawe river watershed. *Tropical Agricultural Research* 2000;12:255–64.
- Bewket W, Sterk G. Farmers' participation in soil and water conservation activities in the Chemoga watershed, Blue Nile Basin, Ethiopia. *Land Degradation & Development* 2002;13(3):189–200.
- Hellin J, Haigh MJ. Better land husbandry in Honduras: towards the new paradigm in conserving soil, water and productivity. *Land Degradation and Development* 2002;13(3):233–50.
- Hellin J, Schrader K. The case against direct incentives and the search for alternative approaches to better land management in Central America. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 2003;99(1/3):61–81.
- Warren A, Osbahr H, Batterbury S, Chappell A. Indigenous views of soil erosion at Fandou Beri, southwestern Niger. *Geoderma* 2003;111(3/4):439–56.
- Tenge AJ, Graaff J, de Hella JP. Social and economic factors affecting the adoption of soil and water conservation in West Usambara highlands, Tanzania. *Land Degradation & Development* 2004;15(2):99–114.
- Yang Hong. Land conservation campaign in China: integrated management, local participation and food supply option. *Geoforum* 2004;35(4):507–18.
- Arnalds A. Approaches to landcare – a century of soil conservation in Iceland. *Land Degradation & Development* 2005;16(2):113–25.
- Okoba BO, Graaff J de. Farmers' knowledge and perceptions of soil erosion and conservation measures in the Central Highlands, Kenya. *Land Degradation & Development* 2005;16(5):475–87.
- Shrestha P, McDonald M, Lawrence A, Sinclair F. Using local knowledge to develop soil and water management interventions for minimising soil and nutrient losses in the middle hills of Nepal. In: Stocking M, Helleman H, White R, editors. *Renewable Natural Resources Management for Mountain Communities*. University of East Anglia, Norwich; 2005. p. 47–72.
- Anderson DM. *Eroding the Commons: The Politics of Ecology in Baringo, Kenya, 1890–1963*. James Currey/EAEP/Ohio University Press, Oxford/Nairobi/Athens (Ohio); 2002.
- Hellin J, Larrea S. Uso de vegetacion para la conservacion de suelo y agua en laderas: consideraciones sociales y tecnicas. *CEIBA* 1999;40(1):35–9.
- Mbaga-Semgalawe Z, Folmer H. Household adoption behaviour of improved soil conservation: the case of the North Pare and East Usambara mountains of Tanzania. *Land Use Policy* 2000;17(4):321–36.
- Ekbom A, Knutsson P, Ovuka M. Is sustainable development based on agriculture attainable in Kenya? A multidisciplinary case study of Murang'a district. *Land Degradation and Development* 2001;12(5):435–47.
- Fagerstrom MHH, Messing I, Wen ZM. A participatory approach for integrated conservation planning in a small



- catchment in Loess Plateau, China: Part I. Approach and methods. *Catena* 2003;54(1/2):255–69.
32. Tadesse M, Belay K. Factors influencing adoption of soil conservation measures in southern Ethiopia: the case of Gununo area. *Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development in the Tropics and Subtropics* 2004;105(1):49–62.
  33. Stocking M. Living at the margin in hills – people building sustainable livelihoods based on renewable natural resources. In: Stocking M, Helleman H, White R, editors. *Renewable Natural Resources Management for Mountain Communities*. University of East Anglia, Norwich; 2005. p. 21–43.
  34. Abernethy CL, Wijayaratna CM. Evaluation of the impacts of projects to reduce human-induced soil losses in watersheds. In: Summer W, Klaghofer E, Zhang W, editors. *Modelling Soil Erosion, Sediment Transport and Closely Related Hydrological Processes*. Proceedings of an international symposium; 1998 July 13–17; Vienna, Austria. IAHS Publication No. 249; 1998. p. 287–95.
  35. Garrity DP, Amoroso VB, Koffa S, Catacutan D, Buenavista G, Fay P, *et al.* Landcare on the poverty-protection interface in an Asian watershed. *Conservation Ecology* 2002;6(1):12.
  36. Husain HJ, Raina AK. Adoption of agriculture technology before and after the introduction of watershed management project. *Indian Journal of Forestry* 2004;27(2):201–5.
  37. WOCAT. World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies. Website [cited 2006 July 24]. Available from: URL: <http://www.wocat.net>
  38. WASWC. World Association of Soil and Water Conservation. Website [cited 2006 July 24]. Available from: URL: [waswc.ait.cc.th](http://waswc.ait.cc.th)
  39. Evans R. Soil deterioration and loss of topsoil. In: Munn T, editor. *Encyclopedia of Global Environmental Change*. Douglas I, editor. Volume 3, Causes and Consequences of Global Environmental Change. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester; 2002. p. 587–94.
  40. McGary D. Tillage and soil compaction. In: Garcia-Torres L, Benites J, Martinez-Vilela A, Holgado-Cabrera A, editors. *Conservation Agriculture: Environment, Farmers Experiences, Innovations, Socio-economy, Policy*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht; 2003. p. 303–16.
  41. Millennium Assessment. *Ecosystems and Human Well-being. Synthesis*. Island Press, Washington, DC; 2005.
  42. Vidal J. UK ranked fifth best in world green list. *The Guardian*, 2006; Jan 24. p. 13 (col. 1).
  43. Oldeman LR, Hakkeling RTA, Sombroek WG. World map of the status of human-induced soil degradation. *Global assessment of soil degradation GLASOD*. 2nd ed. Wageningen/Nairobi: International Soil Reference and Information Centre/United Nations Environment Programme; 1991.
  44. Evans R. Assessing erosion in England and Wales. In: Haskins PG, Murphy BM, editors. *People protecting their land, Volume 1*. Proceedings of the 7th ISCO Conference; 1992 Sept 27–30; Sydney, Australia. Sydney: International Soil Conservation Organisation; 1992. p. 82–91.
  45. Herweg K. Field manual for assessment of current erosion damage. Berne (Switzerland)/Addis Abeba (Ethiopia): Centre for Development and Environment University of Berne/Soil Conservation Research Programme, Ethiopia; 1996.
  46. Arnalds O, Borarinsdottir EF, Metusalemsson S, Jonsson A, Gretarsson E, Arnason A. *Soil Erosion in Iceland*. Soil Conservation Service Agricultural Research Institute, Reykjavik; 2001.
  47. Stocking MA, Murnaghan N. *Field Assessment of Land Degradation*. Earthscan, London; 2001.
  48. Evans R. On assessing accelerated erosion of arable land by water. *Soil and Fertilizers* 1993;56(11):1285–93.
  49. Evans R. Some methods of directly assessing water erosion of cultivated land – a comparison of measurements made on plots and in fields. *Progress in Physical Geography* 1995;19(1):115–129.
  50. Evans R, Brazier R. Evaluation of modelled spatially distributed predictions of soil erosion by water versus field-based assessments. *Environmental Science & Policy* 2005;8:493–501.
  51. Hudson NW. A study of the reasons for success or failure of soil conservation projects. *FAO Soils Bulletin* 64. Food and Agriculture Organisation, Rome; 1991.
  52. Hudson N. *Land Husbandry*. BT Batsford, London; 1992.
  53. Fournier F. *Soil Conservation*. Council of Europe; 1972.
  54. Showers K. Soil erosion and conservation: an international history and a cautionary tale. In: Warkentin BP, editor. *Footprints in the Soil*. Elsevier, Amsterdam; 2006. p. 369–406.
  55. Troeh FR, Hobbs JA, Donahue RL. *Soil and Water Conservation: For Productivity and Environmental Protection*. Prentice-Hall, London; 1980.
  56. Schwab GO, Fangmeier DD, Elliot WJ, Frevert RK. *Soil and Water Conservation Engineering*. 4th ed. John Wiley & Sons, New York; 1993.
  57. Hudson N. *Soil Conservation*. 3rd ed. BT Batsford, London; 1995.
  58. Morgan RPC. *Soil Erosion and Conservation*. 3rd ed. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford; 2005.
  59. Elwell HA, Stocking MA. Vegetal cover to estimate soil erosion hazard in Rhodesia. *Geoderma* 1976;15:61–70.
  60. Pereira de Herrera A, Sain G. Adoption of maize conservation tillage in Azuero, Panama. Working Paper – CIMMYT Economics Programme 1999; No. 99-01.
  61. Garcia-Torres L, Benites J, Martinez-Vilela A, Holgado-Cabrera A, editors. *Conservation Agriculture: Environment, Farmers Experiences, Innovations, Socio-economy, Policy*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht; 2003.
  62. Bradley JF. Twenty-five year review of conservation tillage in the Southern US: perspective from industry. In: Santen E van, editor. *Making Conservation Tillage Conventional: Building a Future on 25 Years of Research*. Proceedings of 25th Southern Conservation Tillage Conference for Sustainable Agriculture; 2002 June 24–26; Auburn, AL, USA; 2002. p. 20–4.
  63. Benites JR, Ashburner JE. FAO's role in promoting conservation agriculture. In: Garcia-Torres L, Benites J, Martinez-Vilela A, Holgado-Cabrera A, editors. *Conservation Agriculture: Environment, Farmers Experiences, Innovations, Socio-economy, Policy*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht; 2003. p. 139–53.
  64. Bjorneborg DL, Santos FL, Castanheira NS, Martins OC, Reis JL, Aase JK, *et al.* Using polyacrylamide with sprinkler

## 10 Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science, Nutrition and Natural Resources

- irrigation to improve infiltration. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* (Ankeny) 2003;58(5):283–9.
65. Wallace A, Wallace GA. Organic gardening and farming vs polyacrylamide soil conditioners. In: Wallace A, Wallace GA, editors. *Polyacrylamide (PAM) and Micronized PAM Soil Conditioners: 50 Years of Progress*; 2003. p. 101–5.
66. Cochrane BHW, Reichert JM, Eitz FL, Norton LD. Controlling soil erosion and runoff with polyacrylamide and phosphogypsum on subtropical soil. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers* 2005;48(1):149–54.
67. Kornecki TS, Grigg BC, Fouss JL, Southwick LM. Polyacrylamide (PAM) application effectiveness in reducing soil erosion from sugarcane fields in southern Louisiana. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture* 2005;21(2):189–96.
68. Shekofteh H, Rafahi H, Gorji M. A study of the effects of polyacrylamide on soil erosion and runoff. *Iranian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 2005;36(1):177–86.
69. Rutatora DF. The matengo pit system of farming and its sustainability in the Matengo Highlands of Mbinga district, Tanzania. In: *Agrarian Economy: State and Society in Contemporary Tanzania*. 1999. p. 136–43.
70. Magcale-Macandog D, Ocampo LJM. Indigenous strategies of sustainable farming systems in the highlands of northern Philippines. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture* 2005;26(2):117–38.
71. Brodd P, Osanius M. Erosion and land use at plot and catchment levels – a case study in northern Vietnam. *Minor Field Studies – International Office, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences* 2002; No 192.
72. Pretty J. *Agri-Culture*. Earthscan, London; 2002.
73. Maiti RK, Lozada Ramirez ER, Singh VP, Wesche-Ebeling P. Comparative studies on the commercial and traditional production of peanut and sorghum in village Huaquechula, Puebla, Mexico. *Crop Research (Hisar)* 2003;26(3):432–42.
74. Maskey RB. Options for sustainable land management in the mid-hills of Nepal: experiences of testing and demonstration of contour hedgerow intercropping technology. *Mountain agriculture in the Hindu Kush-Himalayan region. Proceedings of an International Symposium, 2001 May 21–24, Kathmandu, Nepal*; 2003. p. 79–84.
75. Singh SB. Valuation of soil erosion effects in bench terrace, Puertorican terrace and shifting cultivation systems in Meghalaya State. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 2001;56(3):335–45.
76. Ali AMS. Technological change in agriculture and land degradation in Bangladesh: a case study. *Land Degradation & Development* 2004;15(3):283–98.
77. Abdul Gafur, Jensen JR, Borrgard OK, Petersen L. Runoff and losses of soil and nutrients from small watersheds under shifting cultivation (Jhum) in the Chittagong Hill Tracts of Bangladesh. *Journal of Hydrology (Amsterdam)* 2003;279(1/4):293–309.
78. Swinton SM, Quiroz R. Is poverty to blame for soil, pasture and forest degradation in Peru's Altiplano? *World Development* (Oxford) 2003;31(11):1903–19.
79. Grove AT, Rackham O. *The Nature of Mediterranean Europe. An Ecological History*. 2nd printing. Yale University Press, New Haven and London; 2003.
80. Dregne HE. Soil and water conservation: a global perspective. *Interiencia* 1986;11(4):166–72.
81. Evans R. The erosional impacts of grazing animals. *Progress in Physical Geography* 1998;22:251–68.
82. Armstrong J. Whiteheads Creek Goulburn NSW. ISCO Conference Southern Tour. 7th ISCO Conference; 24–26 September 1992, Sydney, Australia; International Soil Conservation Organisation, Sydney, Australia; 1992.
83. Evans R. Some impacts of overgrazing by reindeer in Finnmark, Norway. *Rangifer* 1996;16(1):3–19.
84. Bayne P, Harden R, Davies I. Feral goats (*Capra hircus* L.) in the Macleay River gorge system, north-eastern New South Wales, Australia. I. Impacts on soil erosion. *Wildlife Research* 2004;31(5):519–25.
85. Su YongZhong, Li YuLin, Cui JianYuan, Zhao WenZhi. Influences of continuous grazing and livestock exclusion on soil properties in a degraded sandy grassland, Inner Mongolia, northern China. *Catena* 2005;59(3):267–78.
86. Evans R. Curtailing grazing-induced erosion in a small catchment and its environs, the Peak District, Central England. *Applied Geography* 2005;25:81–95.
87. Turkelboom F, Trebil G. A multiscale approach for on-farm erosion research: application to northern Thailand highlands. In: Penning de Vries, Agus F, Kerr J, editors. *Soil Erosion at Multiple Scales: Principles and Methods for Assessing Causes and Impacts*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford; 1998. p. 51–71.
88. Hammad AHYA. Soil erosion and soil-moisture conservation under old terracing system in the Palestinian Central Mountains (thesis). *Agricultural University of Norway, As (Norway)*; 2004.
89. Cha ZhengZao, Lin ZhaoMu, Luo Wei, Li Shicong, Luo XueHua. Sustainable land management practices for rubber plantations in mountainous areas of Hainan. *Pedosphere* 2005;15(3):404–8.
90. Gebremedhin B, Swinton SM. Investment in soil conservation in northern Ethiopia: the role of land tenure security and public programs. Staff paper No. 2002-13. Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing; 2002.
91. Sharda VN, Dhyani BL. Economic analysis of conventional and conservation terrace systems in a sub-humid climate. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineering* 2004;47(3):711–20.
92. Zougmore RB. Integrated water and nutrient management for sorghum production in semi-arid Burkina Faso [thesis]. Wageningen University, Wageningen; 2003.
93. Gebremichael D, Nyssen J, Poesen J, Deckers J, Haile M, Govers G, *et al*. Effectiveness of stone bunds in controlling soil erosion on cropland in the Tigray Highlands, northern Ethiopia. *Soil Use and Management* 2005;21(3):287–97.
94. Dhanapal R, Mathew AC, Palaniswami C. Efficacy of soil and water conservation measures in coconut plantations of West Coast Region. *Indian Coconut Journal* 2005;35(9):3–6.
95. Patil JD, Pawar RB, Durgude AG, Takate AS, Patil VS. Relative efficacy of different cropping systems and land treatments on runoff, soil erosion and crop yields under dryland conditions. *Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural Universities* 2004;29(1):1–3.

96. Zougmore R, Ouattara K, Mando A, Outtara B. Role des nutriments dans le succes de techniques de conservation des eaux et des sols (cordons pierreux, bandes enherbees, zai et demi-lunes) au Burkina Faso. *Secheress* 2004;15(1):41–8.
97. Sims BG, Rodriguez VF. Impact of living barriers on hillside soils in the inter-Andean valleys of Bolivia. I: Effect on erosion. *CEIBA* 2000;41(1):1–9.
98. He Yonghua, Tang Ya, Sun Hui, Chen KeMing. Effects of contour hedgerows on runoff flow and soil erosion control in a dry valley of the Jinsha River. In: Ya T, Tulachan PM, editors. *Mountain agriculture in the Hindu Kush-Himalayan region. Proceedings of an International Symposium; 2001 May 21–24; 2003.* p. 91–5.
99. Pendke MS, Lote MH, Gitte AU. Vegetative barriers for soil and water conservation in rainfed area. *Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural Universities* 2004;29(2):202–4.
100. Costa WAJM de, Surentham P. Tree-crop interactions in hedgerow intercropping with different tree species and tea in Sri Lanka: I. Production and resource competition. *Agroforestry Systems* 2005;63(3):199–209.
101. National Research Council. *Vetiver grass. A thin green line against erosion.* National Academy Press, Washington DC; 1993.
102. Sneesby NJ. Wind Erosion and Shelter Belts. *Agriculture* 1953;60:263–71.
103. Sneesby NJ. Shelter against Soil Erosion. *Agriculture* 1968;75:550–1.
104. Boardman J. Land use, rainfall and erosion risk on the South Downs. *Soil Use and Management* 1991;7:34–8.
105. Baker CJ, Saxton KE, Ritchie KWR. *No-tillage seeding.* CAB International, Wallingford; 1996.
106. Astatke A, Mohammad Jabbar, Mohammed Saleem MA, Erkossa T. Development and testing of low-cost animal drawn minimum tillage implements: experience on Vertisols in Ethiopia. *AMA, Agricultural Mechanization in Asia* 2002;33(2):9–14.
107. Ribeiro MF. No-tillage equipment for small farms in Brazil. In: Garcia-Torres L, Benites J, Martinez-Vilela A, Holgado-Cabrera A, editors. *Conservation Agriculture: Environment, Farmers Experiences, Innovations, Socio-economy, Policy.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht; 2003. p. 263–70.
108. Bot AJ, Amada TJC, Mielniczak J, Benites J. Conservation agriculture as a tool to reduce emission of greenhouse gases. A case study from southern Brazil. In: Garcia-Torres L, Benites J, Martinez-Vilela A, Holgado-Cabrera A, editors. *Conservation Agriculture: Environment, Farmers Experiences, Innovations, Socio-economy, Policy.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht; 2003. p. 407–16.
109. Cogo NP, Levien R, Schwarz RA. Perdas de solo e agua por erosao hidrica influenciadas por metodos de preparo, classes de declive e nieis de fertilidade do solo. *Revista Brasileira de Ciencia do Solo* 2003;27(4):743–53.
110. Iijima M, Izumi Y, Yuliadi E, Afandi S, Utomo M. Erosion control on a steep slopes field in Indonesia with alley cropping, intercropped vegetables, and no-tillage. *Plant Production Science* 2003;6(3):224–9.
111. Shui JianGuo, Zhou QuanKang, Liao GenQing, Cha ZengXiang. Study on regulating and controlling loss by runoff on red soil hilly orchards by application of gramoxone and glyphosate. *Acta Agriculturae Zhejiangensis* 2003;15(1):23–7.
112. Dabney SM, Wilson GV, McGregor KC, Foster GR. History, residue, and tillage effects on erosion of a loessial soil. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers* 2004;47(3):767–75.
113. Mancilla GA, Chen S, McCool DK. Rill density prediction and flow velocity distributions on agricultural areas in the Pacific Northwest. *Soil & Tillage Research* 2005;84(1):54–66.
114. Quinton JN, Catt JA. The effects of minimal tillage and contour cultivation on surface runoff, soil loss and crop yield on the long-term Woburn Erosion Reference Experiment on sandy soil at Woburn, England. *Soil Use and Management* 2004;20(3):343–9.
115. Brown L, Donaldson G, Jordan VWL, Thornes JB. Effects and interactions of rotation, cultivation and agrochemical input levels on soil erosion and nutrient emissions. *Aspects of Applied Biology* 1996;47:409–12.
116. Andraski TW, Bundy LG, Kilian KC. Manure history and long-term tillage effects on soil properties and phosphorus losses in runoff. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 2003;32(5):1782–9.
117. Quinton J, Catt JA, Hess TM. The selective removal of phosphorus from soil: is event size important? *Journal of Environmental Quality* 2001;30:538–45.
118. Fuglie KO. Conservation tillage and pesticide use in the Cornbelt. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 1999;31(1):133–47.
119. Harrington LW. A world of conservation. In: Garcia-Torres L, Benites J, Martinez-Vilela A, Holgado-Cabrera A, editors. *Conservation Agriculture: Environment, Farmers Experiences, Innovations, Socio-economy, Policy.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht; 2003. p. 159–64.
120. Rockstrom J, Kaumbutho P, Mwaqley P, Temesgen M. Conservation among small-holder farmers in E Africa: Adapting and adopting innovative land management options. In: Garcia-Torres L, Benites J, Martinez-Vilela A, Holgado-Cabrera A, editors. *Conservation Agriculture: Environment, Farmers Experiences, Innovations, Socio-economy, Policy.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht; 2003. p. 459–70.
121. Leggett J. *Half Gone.* Portobello Books, London; 2005.
122. Young N. Western Australia no-tillage farmers' association. In: Garcia-Torres L, Benites J, Martinez-Vilela A, Holgado-Cabrera A, editors. *Conservation Agriculture: Environment, Farmers Experiences, Innovations, Socio-economy, Policy.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht; 2003. p. 155–8.
123. Odunze AC. Mulching practice in a semi-arid zone of Nigeria for soil erosion control and grain yield of maize. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture* 2002;20(2):31–40.
124. Semidey N, Orengo-Santiago E, Mas EG. Weed suppression and soil erosion control by live mulches on upland coffee plantations. *Journal of Agriculture of the University of Puerto Rico* 2002;86(3/4):155–7.
125. Khamsouk B, Roose E. Runoff and water erosion processes of a tropical volcanic soil cultivated under the main cropping systems in Martinique. *Tropical Agriculture* 2003;80(3):168–74.
126. Li XiaoYan. Gravel-sand mulch for soil and water conservation in the semiarid loess region of northwest China. *Catena* 52(2):105–27.

## 12 Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science, Nutrition and Natural Resources

127. Doring TF, Brandt M, Hess J, Finckh MR, Saucke H. Effects of straw mulch on soil nitrate dynamics, weeds, yield and soil erosion in organically grown potatoes. *Field Crops Research* 2005;94(2/3):238–49.
128. Scopel E, Douzet JM, Silva FAM da, Cardoso A, Moreira JAA, Findeling A, *et al.* Impact of direct-sowing mulch-based crop systems (DMC) on water, mineral nitrogen and soil carbon dynamics in the Brazilian cerrados. *Cahiers Agriculture* 2005;14(1):71–5.
129. Evans R, Boardman J. Curtailment of muddy floods in the Sompting catchment, South Downs, West Sussex, southern England. *Soil Use and Management* 2003;19:223–31.
130. Boardman J, Evans R, Ford J. Muddy floods on the South Downs, southern England: problem and responses. *Environmental Science & Policy* 2003;6:69–83.
131. Bennett HH. *Soil Conservation*. McGraw-Hill, New York; 1939.
132. Eltun R, Korsæth A, Nordheim O. A comparison of environmental, soil fertility, yield, and economical effects in six cropping systems based on an 8-year experiment in Norway. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 2002;90(2):155–68.
133. Jankauskas B, Jankauskiene G, Fullen MA. Erosion-preventive rotations and water erosion rates on undulating slopes in Lithuania. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science* 2004;84(2):177–86.
134. Ventura F, Pisa PR, Vicari A. Effect of land use on soil erosion in a small watershed of Emilia-Romagna Region. *Italian Journal of Agronomy* 2004;8(1):29–36.
135. Young A. *Agroforestry for Soil Management*. 2nd ed. CAB International, Wallingford; 1997.
136. Bui Dung The. Land use systems and erosion in the uplands of the Central Coast, Vietnam. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 2003;5(3/4):461–76.
137. Evans R. Curtailing water erosion of cultivated land: an example from north Norfolk, eastern England. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 2006;31:598–605.
138. Jiang GuangZao, Tan HePing, Huang Ping. Studies on weed ecological control in tea garden. *Southwest China Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 2003;16(3):57–60.
139. Hartemink AE. Plantation agriculture in the tropics – environmental issues. *Outlook on Agriculture* 2005;34(1):11–21.
140. Sarno Lumbanraja J, Afandi Adachi T, Oki Y, Senge M, Watanabe A. Effect of weed management in coffee plantation on soil chemical properties. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* 2004;69(1):1–4.
141. Arriaga FJ, Lowery B. Soil physical properties and crop productivity of an eroded soil amended with cattle manure. *Soil Science* 2003;168(12):888–99.
142. Williams JD. Effects of long-term winter wheat, summer fallow residue and nutrient management on field hydrology for a silt loam in north-central Oregon. *Soil & Tillage Research* 2004;75(2):109–119.
143. Yonts C. Polyacrylamide – a method to reduce soil erosion 1998 Aug [cited 2006 Jan 20]. Available from URL: [pubs@unl.edu](mailto:pubs@unl.edu)
144. Nishiharqa A, Shock C. Benefits and costs of applying polyacrylamide (PAM) in irrigated furrows 2001 [cited 2006 Jan 1]. Available from: URL: <http://www.cropinfo.net/bestpractices/bmppamreport.html>
145. Cummins J. Polyacrylamide is added to soil and pesticides, it may be a major problem? 2002 August [cited 2006 Jan 20]. Available from: URL: <http://www.mindfully.org/Pesticide/2002/Polyacrylamide-Soil-Pesticides-Cummins8aug02.htm>
146. Evans R. Outdoor pigs and flooding: an English case study. *Soil Use and Management* 2004;20:178–181.
147. Evans R. Reducing soil erosion and the loss of soil fertility for environmentally-sustainable agricultural cropping and livestock production systems. *Annals of Applied Biology* 2005;146:137–146.