

PROBLEMY EKOROZWOJU – PROBLEMS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
2014, vol. 9, no 1, 81-88

Placing the idea of sustainable landscape in ecophilosophy

Miejsce idei zrównoważonego krajobrazu w ekofilozofii

Małgorzata Luc

*Institute of Geography and Spatial Management, Jagiellonian University,
ul. Gronostajowa 7, 30-387 Kraków, Poland
E-mail: mluc@gis.geo.uj.edu.pl*

Abstract

The preamble to the *European Landscape Convention* states, that the landscape is an important part of economic life, affecting culture, the environment and social issues. It is a basic component of the European natural and cultural heritage, building both national and local identities of society. The Convention also regards landscape as a key element of social well-being, meaning its protection and improvements to its quality and variety, yield economic value and depend on each of us. This conception of space provides a basis for building the sustainability in landscape, a challenging and multi-dimensional problem, whose foundations can be found in ecophilosophy. Therefore, this publication seeks to combine the world of philosophy and realistic spatial management in order to answer some fundamental questions about the nature of this relatively new idea. The author discusses the chances of this perspective gaining popularity and presents her understanding of the concepts of landscape and landscape sustainability.

Key words: sustainable landscape, ecophilosophy

Streszczenie

W preambule do *Europejskiej Konwencji Krajobrazowej* czytamy, że krajobraz stanowi istotny element życia gospodarczego, wiąże się z kulturą, ekologią i sprawami społecznymi. Stanowi on podstawowy komponent europejskiego dziedzictwa przyrodniczego i kulturowego, buduje tożsamość narodową i lokalną społeczeństwa. Zwraca się w niej także uwagę na to, że krajobraz stanowi kluczowy element dobrobytu społeczeństwa, a jego ochrona i planowanie to podnoszące jakość i różnorodność ważne elementy gospodarki i obowiązek każdego z nas. Takie podejście do przestrzeni daje podstawy budowania zrównoważenia w krajobrazie, problemu trudnego i wielowymiarowego, którego fundamenty można odnaleźć w ekofilozofii. Dlatego publikacja ta stara się połączyć świat filozofii i realistycznego zarządzania przestrzenią, by odpowiedzieć na podstawowe pytania o istotę tej stonkowo młodej idei, o to czy problem ten ma szansę na zaistnienie jako ważny element wizji przyszłości. Niezbędne było także przedstawienie swojego rozumienia pojęć krajobraz i krajobraz zrównoważony.

Słowa kluczowe: krajobraz zrównoważony, ekofilozofia

1. Introduction

Man is the measure of all things, of things that are, that they are, and of things that are not, that they are not, claimed Protagoras. This phrase can be applied to many aspects of the surrounding reality and understood in a variety of ways, and one possibility is to recognize the fact that every person has his or her own criterion of truth. This would, however, mean deep subjectivity, and thus the absence of an objective truth. Such relativism was believed for example

by the skeptics, and involved our view of the surrounding reality, including landscape. Is it then possible to find an absolute criterion of truth, to clarify which human behaviour towards the landscape is appropriate? Following Protagoras' thought, one can conclude that everything we undertake should be for the benefit of others. If there were no humans, neither the beauty nor the logic prevailing in nature would be recognized or appreciated at all, since *man as the only being in the world is 'someone', while all other beings are 'something'* (Wojtyła, 2001a).

Each argument can be countered, and reality is seen depending on the vantage point, thus every human being sees in a different way. It would seem, too, that all cognition and, in the longer term, activities undertaken by people make sense, when the entity constituting its essence is taken into account. If, therefore, landscape is such an entity, we should ask questions about what behaviour towards it is appropriate: (1) Is this assumption similar to that of H. Skolimowski, that the world is a sanctuary, which deserves respect, honour and reverence (Tyburski, 2008)? (2) Do we see the world from an economic perspective, which is one basis of human existence? (3) Or maybe we incline more towards the idea of anthropocentrism, or even utilitarianism, where the measure of all things is man, and his or her happiness is a value above all others?

H. Vontobel (2006) draws attention to people's ability to interpret the interdependence of the economy, culture, general human values and historical experience. Perhaps such an approach and developing ethos with regard to landscape gives hope for finding a new way to avoid errors repeated so far and, in doing so, allows us to sketch such a vision of landscape in which a certain era is over and a new one begins, characterized by civil courage and breaking the traditional thought patterns.

Issues concerning landscape research are multidimensional and their understanding requires a combination of a number of research trends in the field of humanities and sciences, including environmental science. However, rarely does the work of naturalists approximate the philosophical foundations of the concept of landscape, in particular the idea of its sustainability. This publication aims to fill this gap, since, according to A. Papuziński (2013, p. 7), it is *after all the works of philosophers that are the source of all of the ideas, world views, values and methodologies on which depend the picture of the world and the corresponding way of viewing and solving the problems of sustainable development*. In order to achieve this goal we need to look at existing philosophical beliefs regarding sustainable development in the context of landscape. In addition, we need to provide against this background a definition of landscape and sustainable landscape that renders the essence of the approach. Finally, we should consider whether sustainable landscape can be achieved, if it is at all necessary, or rather whether the state of balance of the geographical environment, which is reflected in landscape, is a utopia.

2. What do we mean by landscape?

I suggest exploring the concept of landscape by first reflecting on with the etymology of the word as discussed by Pietrzak (2002). In my opinion this well represents the discussion of the definition of landscape held for many generations. It is accepted, that this concept originated as far back as the *Book of*

Psalms (48), where, in a song celebrating the greatness of Zion, a mountain in Jerusalem, the Hebrew word *noff*, deriving from *yafe* or *beautiful*, appears. The term was probably first introduced in Polish by J. Lelewel in the sense of *the history of the country*, and W. Pol propagated it in physiognomic terms. In German, the word *Landschaft* may derive from *schaft*, used for things having common characteristics, or from the word *schaffen*, to shape. A. von Humboldt defined *Landschaft* as the comprehensive nature of an area. In English, however, the term *landscape* comes from the Latin *landscepi* and is connected to the word *shape*, shaping, forming.

As we can see, from the very beginning attention was paid to the visual aspect of surrounding areas, people's feelings and their conscious efforts to use the goods of nature. On this basis a number of definitions were adopted regarding either the paradigm of the discipline undertaking landscape studies, or treating a part of nature characterized by a specific structure and dynamics, as a system consisting of the subsystems assigned to it (Richling, 2004).

Perhaps the most common definition of landscape today was embodied in *the European Landscape Convention* (p. 2, 2000), signed in Florence on 20th October 2000, in which landscape is *an area as perceived by people, whose character is the result of action and interaction of natural and / or human factors*. P. Goodchild sees it in a different way (2007). He believes landscape is a concept, an idea, a real or imaginary look at an area in which natural and semi-natural elements can be significant, dominant or unique. Landscapes may include humans and anthropogenic objects. They are a combination of visual features, ways of using, perceiving and understanding places that are part of open space (Goodchild, 2007). Another approach is represented by A. Farina (p.17, 2010), who treats landscape as *an entity shared by different philosophers, different paradigms and different methods and scaling. It requires a common semantic basis and related principles*.

In the ordinary sense of the term *landscape*, however, we define the reality surrounding us, perceived in different ways, but whose most common form is *scenery* (Andrejczuk, 2010). This reality, i.e. the surroundings, is associated with a set of elements of the natural and social environment in which there are numerous links and its various components interact with each other and form a coherent system (Degórski, 2009). At the same time, it is worth stressing that the term *system* refers to a certain whole, order, ordered structure composed of different elements, but harmonizing with one another. In this understanding of landscape we can refer to the philosophical concept of the ecosystem and its surroundings, i.e. to ecophilosophy as a science of the systemic expression of philosophical issues of the natural and social environment (Dołęga, 2006). It should also be noted that a philosophical approach, contrary to common beliefs does not preclude a practical one and the use

of philosophical knowledge in spatial planning and management. J.M. Dołęga (2006) writes, in relation to landscape research, it seems this concept is best reflected in the systemic and informative approach to eco-development, which is justified and applied in forecasts of human development and assumptions of sustainable development.

Thus, given the numerous definitions, it can be assumed with some simplification, following P.L. Knox and S. Marston (2001 p.179; *vide* Pietrzak, 2010), the term *landscape is understood by everyone differently*. Therefore, in my approach I treat landscape holistically (after Richling and Solon, 1998), with emphasis on its physiognomy (after Schmithüsen, 1978). I assume landscape is what we call a part of space repeated in a similar form (after Forman and Godron, 1986), relating to the natural and cultural (geographical) environment (after Bogdanowski, 1994), which continues to be shaped under the influence of the natural, political, social and technological processes occurring in it (after Naveh, 2000). It is a system of natural and anthropogenic components reflected in land use and land cover, has an inherent structure and internal links (after Kondracki and Richling, 1983) and provides aesthetic feelings (after Szczęsny, 1971). This system reflects the social and economic needs of society at a given moment in time. A human being should blend into the landscape and not be its dominant form, should function in such a way as to take advantage of the benefits that landscape can offer, while acting in accordance with his or her knowledge and experience to mitigate the negative effects of his or her actions in the past, and above all, not treat landscape in a utilitarian way. Landscape deserves respect and reverence, because it provides for the needs of people who live and function within it.

It is also worthwhile noting the different definitions of the terms related to the environment depending on interest groups. This includes such words as landscape, nature, development, sustainability, protection, harmony and aesthetics.

3. What is the idea of a sustainable landscape?

Alarming changes are observed in the landscapes of many parts of the world. They are related to the over-exploitation of goods coupled with the lack of some sort of compensation, which would allow balance to be maintained. Another problem is the uneven distribution of attractive landscape resources which is associated with a greater concentration of people in those areas. Exploitative spatial management results in a lack of order in a space, lowers its cultural value and causes the degradation of landscapes. There are more and more such areas since the consumption of space increases along with the consumption of goods and services. Such a state of affairs cannot be overlooked, nor can it continue forever. It is therefore necessary to take measures to manage landscape

properly as soon as possible. Therefore, the idea of sustainable landscape is a response to the growing demand for relevant, planned, responsible, sensible, and sustainable spatial management.

Sustainable landscape, like sustainable development, is a multidimensional concept, combining natural, economic and social aspects of human behaviour in the environment, but also institutional, spatial, moral, and spiritual aspects connected to quality of life, although not necessarily considered in terms of material goods. This concept is commonly desirable, since its main objective is progress, and this provides an opportunity for correct, reasonable planning and spatial management. For it is important to find such areas of compromise (balance) between nature and human activities that do not disturb existing functioning mechanisms. The benefits of nature (landscape as space) can be enjoyed in accordance with the principle of balance, and simultaneously, care must be taken not to destroy existing values, including those of landscape. Assuming further development, we must begin to adapt the changes introduced to the capacity and capability of the environment. Evaluation, a tool for integrating the basic assumptions of this idea, ultimately leads to strategic decisions and plays a key role in this process (Langer and Schön, 2002).

Does the introduction of the concept of sustainable landscape within the context of consolidating the concept of sustainable development mean a multiplication of entities? It seems to me that it does not. Instead this narrows the assumptions made for analysis of the entire space to landscape, i.e. in accordance with the previously adopted definition, to the portion of space relating to the natural and cultural environment. Sustainable development and sustainable landscape are not equivalent terms but subordinate to each other. Sustainable landscape, just like the whole idea of sustainable development, aims to ensure a high standard of social life in a healthy and aesthetically pleasing environment, while respecting the environment and maintaining reasonable limits of consumption and use of natural resources. In order to make it possible to implement such an approach, market, educational and protective mechanisms which would promote efficient and proper management of landscape resources should be introduced.

In the discussion of the definition of the concept of *sustainable landscape* a group of supporters of the so-called dynamic approach has emerged, as opposed to the supporters of the evaluation of landscape structure in terms of the level of sustainability. For example, R. Haines-Young (2000) argues that sustainability should be measured and evaluated through the prism of the changes taking place in the landscape, and not through its condition at any time. Similarly, M. Antrop (2006) believes this issue should be discussed in its two aspects: (1) maintaining certain landscape values and absolute continuation of activities that maintain and organize this

space, and (2) keeping balance as the main principle of shaping landscapes in the future, i.e. potential landscapes strengthen the balance particularly in rural areas through proper planning and management. Also M. Kistowski (2008) represents a view saying the balance of landscape *lasts*, not *is*, and so just a single *snapshot* of landscape will not be enough to examine it, but a comparative analysis of its condition in at least two periods, or better in a longer sequence of time, should be made. On the other hand, J. Solon (2004) argues that *landscape can be sustainable regardless of the degree of its naturalness, and – what is more important – some activities related to the maintenance of landscape character lead to stopping or delaying the renaturalization processes*. Thus, for Solon, the capability of landscape to maintain a specific structure (including its functioning) at a given time is called landscape sustainability. Finally, we can define sustainable landscape as a landscape that has not been converted into another type of landscape, and it is characterized by structural stability under the conditions of unchanging land use. Nor has it degraded, i.e. it still functions and is shaped under the influence of natural and anthropogenic phenomena and processes, and has not been fully determined by anthropogenic processes (Degórski, 2009).

4. Does landscape research need ecophilosophy?

W. Tyburski (2008) believes ecology needs philosophy. I believe that this statement can be paraphrased as follows: applying similar justification, landscape research needs philosophy. As in ecology, in landscape research one should closely examine the need to *expand ethical judgement and carry out an assessment of the moral activity of man*. One should not miss the importance landscape education should have, shaping sensitivity to the importance of landscape to people, as well as the attitude to conscious planning and to the harnessing of social, environmental, economic and cultural qualities of the environment. All of these elements build the *ethical protection* of landscape and are bound by the need to *diagnose the causes of the ecological crisis that the contemporary world is experiencing, to develop the best concepts of resolving it and to construct such a philosophy of development which would take into account both human needs and the needs of nature* (Tyburski, 2006). In my opinion, this statement can provide the philosophical foundations of sustainable landscape. We can also find similar assumptions in H. Rolston III (1989). He suggests an analysis of people's interactions with the environment based on a formulation of rules that would provide political foundations for local and global, legislative and administrative decisions. Such a comprehensive approach to the environment can also be applied to landscape. The possibility of using economic and

business solutions (so-called holistic ecological philosophy), which in turn creates the foundations of sustainable landscape, is also analysed.

Landscape research falls within the scope of general philosophy as it relates to the substance, nature and condition of the natural and social (geographical) environment and the changes that occur in it. Moreover it is connected with both the sources of these changes and their impact on human life and health, as well as with seeking philosophical foundations to protect landscape as a timeless good. It also overlaps with the anthropological research of ecophilosophy, since it tackles the issues of demography, migration and cultural elements, including art and religion. Sustainable development is defined in terms of the quality of life, justice, rationality and progress, which clearly highlights their philosophical character. The same statement can be applied to the concept of sustainable landscape. However, for balance in landscape to stand a chance of developing, a radical change in social awareness is needed, as called for by representatives of the philosophy of *deep ecology*. They advocate the idea of protecting the diversity of life, self-restraint in consumption and a reduction in our needs. Life forms do not form a pyramid with our species at the top, but rather a circle, where everything is connected with everything (Tyburski, 2008), so it seems it is important not to make an evaluation of the importance of man and nature, nor to treat nature possessively, anthropocentrically, but also not to protect wildlife at all costs, not to build a kind of sanctuary. Such a direction of change should be proposed that would not deny the value of progress or science, and at the same time would be pragmatic in nature and constitute a different view of humans in the reality constructed by nature. Different does not mean better or worse; different in this sense is to be holistic and balanced, to reconcile the interests of different parties.

Ethics in the philosophy of nature is associated with the concept of the responsibility that people bear for their environment within the meaning of landscape as it exists, is changing or is created. A. Schweitzer (1974) and A. Pawłowski (2008), among others, draw attention to this. Responsibility is a constant concern for the space entrusted to us, not allowing the balance prevailing in it to be undermined and, thus, encouraging us to engage in lawful action for the sake of change, planned management and prevention of improper activities, which is not in opposition to economic development. People have a duty to make decisions concerning the creation of new parallel functions in the environment and, in exceptional cases, when necessary, even to destroy one value for the sake of the emergence of a new one, necessary for nature or people. In regard to landscape, this could mean a transition from one form of spatial exploitation to another; the problem is to keep a balance, but is such a balance possible? A. Schweitzer wrote that in order for right decisions to

be made, they should be based on a good understanding of the functioning of a given space: *Whenever I injure life of any sort, I must be quite clear whether it is necessary. Beyond the unavoidable, I must never go, not even with what seems insignificant* (Schweitzer, p. 52, 1974). He also draws attention to the need to determine the economic value of various elements of landscape, which would then be subject to change, in order to determine whether they allow us to speak about the sustainable management of space.

From the typological point of view, the relationship between philosophy and landscape can be related to ontological beliefs of the pragmatic philosophy of sustainable development. These beliefs are based on the assumption of the uniqueness of humans in the universe, which entitles us to treat landscape as an environment that meets our existential needs, realizes our desires and provides appropriate aesthetic impressions. Historiosophical beliefs, on the other hand, will turn our attention to the development and progress in people's attitude to the surrounding environment, which is directly reflected in the changes taking place in it. In the conservation philosophy of sustainable development, however, economic development is a priority before the comfort of human life and the quality of the environment (Papuziński, 2013). Also, ontological conditions dominate in this type of philosophy with regard to landscape. People assume here a subordination of the environment to their needs and comfort, but take into account the prohibition against destroying what could prolong the state of balance. However, I believe the essence of the philosophy of sustainable landscape is best described in the systemic philosophy of sustainable development. The ontological, anthropological, axiological or historiosophical assumptions adopted in it show the equalization of humans and nature, which leads to respecting all life and assumes the conducting of operations in accordance with rules that have always prevailed in nature. A similar approach can be found in ancient Chinese philosophy and in contemporary theology. K. Wojtyła (2001a) believed that *all the elements of the universe are mutually harmonized and any violation of ecological balance causes injury to a person. Thus, a scholar will not treat nature as a slave, but (...) he will approach it more as a sister having to work with him in order to open new avenues for the development of mankind*. Maintaining the dynamic balance of ecosystems is preferred in the systemic approach, and sustainable management is a function of the efficiency of ecosystems on which it is based.

M.R. Raupach (2012), however, saw the emergence of trends in the earth sciences to seek concrete solutions within eco-development, rather than to limit oneself to carrying out only observations or making descriptions of the processes involved. He draws attention to the complexity and multifaceted nature of sustainable development, which requires a multidimensional and multidisciplinary approach. He sees a

solution in conducting activities in a strategic manner so as to be able to transform values, principles, and aspirations into sustainable goods and introduce new mechanisms of interactive dialogue at different scales.

Seeking to answer the question of whether ecophilosophy is needed in landscape research, it should be noted that philosophy does not stand in contradiction to practice, it does not preclude the use of modern technology, but it takes into account both the needs of society and nature, and does not inhibit economic development. Rationalizing the philosophical approach to space in its broad sense, or to a narrower concept of landscape, and taking into account the values, ways of perceiving the world and attitudes existing in a given society, we can assume the development of skills building systemic, holistic models of reality should be carried out in parallel with the technological development of civilization. The philosophy of sustainable landscape could not function as a separate philosophical stream in science, but rather, in a more colloquial sense, as a way of showing the proper place of humans in the universe.

5. Are there any barriers to the prevalence of balance in landscape?

The development of civilization is both our blessing and a curse. The benefits of technological and scientific progress are compelling, but at the same time, paradoxically, raising our standard of living we have caused a decrease in its quality using the same mechanisms. W. Sztumski (2000), who argues that the contemporary social environment is characterized by, *inter alia*, the highest level of aggression and the worst ecological crisis in history, is of a similar opinion. All of these changes are very well reflected in landscape. The pursuit of profit is combined with a rejection of old ethical systems, and this affects landscape by treating it as nobody's property, and thus potentially able to be used according to one's own needs. Another attitude creates rivalry, especially for the most interesting location, which creates a sense of danger. These behaviours become evident in landscape especially in the absence of respect for cultural heritage. It manifests itself in an expansive development of the most attractive space, often lying on the border of protected areas, or in the modification of forms of so-called small architecture, consisting in the implementation of exotic elements, alien to the given region, (e.g. high fences around private homes, multi-storey detached houses, brightly-coloured façades of houses, clear-cut orchards and other trees, backfilled ditches, ponds, small streams, cutting down trees). These changes are chaotic in their nature. As a result, we face a degradation of landscape and its *dulling*, as it was originally put by Cz. Miłosz (Myga-Piątek, 2010).

A. Pawłowski (2008) notices a contradiction between the relatively simple principle of sustainable

development and the need to formulate complex strategies of action which take place in various areas of human activity. Many of these can also be applied to landscape. It has long been known that the changes taking place in landscape at the local level are a result of current ethical standards and the level of education of society, regional prosperity, and its tourist and recreational amenities. At the same time, they reflect the socio-cultural patterns prevailing in a given period and political preferences, particularly of local decision-makers. The environmental awareness of society usually also raises some anxiety. Both the low level of knowledge about the subject and the fact that little significance is attached to solving problems in the field of landscape ecology can be put down to poor schooling and local government education, and the lack of faith in the possibility of obtaining solutions satisfactory to all stakeholders. Therefore, the first step is to develop a sense of responsibility in the individual for the consequences of his or her impact on landscape. This aspect involves the protection of landscapes, but not at any price. Therefore, the idea of sustainability in this context appears to be the only reasonable solution.

One urgent question is whether we can use the geographical environment without adversely affecting landscape. An interesting possibility associated with the introduction of the concept of sustainable landscape is provided by the concept of industrial ecology. This can be used in the development of the system of functioning of the landscape in a way to compensate for the losses due to the technological development of an area. Today, new ideas of spatial development such as introducing wind turbines to landscape (Synowiec and Luc, 2013) raise many social controversies, but similar feelings arise in connection with the development of new, or the expansion of old, airfields, industrial sites (such as incinerators and landfills), quarries and many others. It is worth noting that, in terms of protection, legal instruments have been functioning in landscape research for a long time with great success. Issues related to landscape planning and management are treated with much less interest and rather as a niche concern. The adoption of systemic solutions would provide a chance to fill this gap, and thus to maintain economic and environmental balance. This would allow conditions to be created to compensate for losses caused either by mistakes made in the past, or by the introduction of new objects into a space which disturb harmony and cause inconvenience to society, or reduce the value of that space in its cultural and social aspects.

6. Is balance in landscape utopian, or a real vision of the future?

Landscape, which is dominated by people, reflects their social and economic needs and priorities, and is subject to constant change in a more or less haphaz-

ard manner (Antrop, 2006). In this sense, it is difficult to accept the view, that landscape can ever be sustainable, but it can definitely be part of the sustainable environment. M. Antrop admits that the concept of landscape is experiencing a transformation, so this idea stands a chance of becoming a viable vision of the future, provided the values of landscape are well defined and the context of change and its further functioning is established. Yet the author sees danger in a situation where the timeframe for landscape management is not defined accurately, and then noble ideas become fiction.

A. Papuziński (2013) expresses his clear opinion on this matter claiming that balance is utopian, yet it is not inconsistent with the rational nature of sustainability in the environment. However, Z. Hull (2008) shows two diametrically different attitudes of people in the modern world: one leading to sustainable development and the other one predicting an ecological disaster. Both are considered equally probable, both also have their *raison d'être*, probably in every culture on Earth. However, discussing the issue of balance in landscape from a global perspective, it seems doomed. Landscape solutions are usually implemented at the local or regional level, much less so on a nationwide scale, due to the excessive diversity of landscapes, and thus an unmanageable number of possible solutions. In addition, one needs to bear in mind the purely psychological aspect, i.e. people care most about the environment found in their immediate vicinity (Vail, 2006).

No single answer arises to the question posed at the beginning concerning an absolute criterion of truth, and human behaviour with respect to landscape. There is a range of geographical, cultural (local), political (at various levels of organization), social (including education), economic, ideological (e.g. religious) conditions which, in accordance with the principle of determinism, contribute to making choices and decisions. However, from an ethical point of view, there is nothing in the way of working to further define landscape, establish criteria for sustainability in landscape and ways of further functioning of landscape units of various importance. Such attempts must be made because the implementation of even just some of the principles of human functioning in the geographical environment can help to improve the quality of landscape, regardless of the degree of its naturalness.

7. What are the possible solutions?

Changes constantly occurring in landscape, often negative in their nature, force us to intensify the multi-faceted and integrated actions of science, administration and society, whose purpose would be to achieve sustainability. They should work towards the implementation of a variety of systemic solutions, taking into account local, cultural and social problems, certainly next to natural ones, as well as

sociological research on people's new relations with space and social education in the broad sense. It is important to create alternative solutions from the social point of view in order to meet people's economic aspirations while maintaining economic activity and protecting nature. The proposed directions cannot ignore the necessity of taking steps to prevent adverse developments or to repair devastated landscape. The key to success is not to maximize benefits, but rather efficiency, i.e. to implement such spatial management that space would be most effectively exploited without destroying the prevailing order associated with cultural and natural values. The development of sustainable landscape must be characterized by realism and pragmatism, and seek permanence in proposed solutions. It is therefore necessary to develop new strategies for land use that meet new challenges. One possibility is to build a relocation system of appealing landscape resources. Another possibility, provided by M. Lane (2010), is the concept of reducing population in some areas and redirecting people to areas that can absorb them.

In conclusion it should be noted that the concept of ethics is derived from habit and custom; it is a set of rules specific to a given community. However, one purpose of ethics is to seek philosophical premises on which to develop sets of imperatives in a rational way. Landscape and the balance prevailing in it fit these ideas perfectly. There is a need to create habits of carrying out any activity in the landscape, i.e. the standards on which decisions regarding landscaping will be made. However, *no ethical argument applies, if it is not related to the reasons inducing people to act* (Gray, 2001; Papuziński, 2013).

References

- ANDREJCZUK W., 2010, Krajobraz a turystyka: aspekt konceptualny, in: *Krajobraz a turystyka, Prace Komisji Krajobrazu Kulturowego PTG nr 14*, Sosnowiec, p. 15-24.
- ANTROP, M., 2006, Sustainable landscapes: contradiction, fiction or utopia?, in: *Landscape Urban Planning* 75 (3-4), p. 187-197.
- BOGDANOWSKI J., *Problemy percepcji i kształtowania krajobrazu*, Instytut Ekologii PAN, Dziekanów Leśny 1994.
- DEGÓRSKI M., 2009, Krajobraz jako odbicie przyrodniczych i antropogenicznych procesów zachodzących w megasystemie środowiska geograficznego, in: *Problemy ekologii krajobrazu*, T. XXIII, p. 53-60.
- DOŁĘGA J.M., 2006, Ekofilozofia – nauka na progu XXI wieku, in: *Studia Włocławskie*, t. 9.
- Europejska Konwencja Krajobrazowa, 2000*, Dziennik Ustaw 2006, nr 14, poz. 98.
- FARINA A., *Ecology, Cognition and Landscape, Linking Natural and Social Systems*, Springer 2010.
- FORMAN R.T.T., GODRON M., *Landscape Ecology*, Wiley and Sons, New York 1986.
- GOODCHILD P., 2007, Landscape—a suggested primary definition, in: *Czasopismo Techniczne. Architektura*, R. 104, z. 5A, p. 131-133.
- GRAY J., *Dwie twarze liberalizmu*, Fundacja ALETHEIA, Warszawa 2001.
- HAINES-YOUNG R., 2000, Sustainable development and sustainable landscapes: defining new paradigm for landscape ecology, in: *Fenia* 178 (1), p. 7-14.
- HULL Z., 2008, Sustainable Development: Promises, Understanding and Prospects, in: *Sustainable Development* vol. 16 no 2, p. 73-80.
- KISTOWSKI M., 2008, Koncepcja równowagi krajobrazu - mity i rzeczywistość, in: *Problemy Ekologii Krajobrazu*, XXI, p. 81-91.
- KNOX P.L., MARSTON S., *Humangeographie*, Spectrum Akademischer Verlag GmbH, Heidelberg, Berlin 2001.
- KONDRACKI J., RICHLING A., 1983, Próba uporządkowania terminologii w zakresie geografii fizycznej kompleksowej, in: *Przegląd Geograficzny*, 55, z. 1.
- LANE M., 2010, The carrying capacity imperative: Assessing regional carrying capacity methodologies for sustainable land-use planning, in: *Land Use Policy* 27, p. 1038-1045.
- LANGER M.E., SCHÖN A., An integrated referential framework for sustainable development, *EASY-ECO Evaluation of Sustainability EuroConference*, May 23-25, Vienna, Austria 2002.
- NAVEH Z., 2000, What is holistic landscape ecology? A conceptual introduction, in: *Landscape and Urban Planning* 50, p. 7-25.
- PAPUZIŃSKI A., 2013, The Axiology of Sustainable Development: An Attempt at Typologization, Editorial, in: *Problemy Ekorozwoju/Problems of Sustainable Development*, vol. 8, no 1, p. 5-25.
- PAWŁOWSKI A., 2008, How Many Dimensions Does Sustainable Development Have?, in: *Sustainable Development*, vol. 16 no 2, p. 81-90.
- PIETRZAK M., Ewolucja poglądów geograficznych na krajobraz, in: *Geografia jako nauka o przestrzeni środowisku i krajobrazie*, Zakład Geogr. Społ. i Turystyki UMK, Łódzkie Tow. Nauk., Łódź 2002.
- PIETRZAK M., *Podstawy i zastosowania ekologii krajobrazu, Teoria i metodologia*, Leszno 2010.
- RAUPACH M.R., 2012, Earth-system science at a crossroads, in: *IGBP's Global Change magazine*, Issue 79, October, <http://www.igbp.net/news/features/features/earthsystemsciencea-tacrosroads.5.19b40be31390c033ede80001358.html> (05.05.2013).

24. RICHLING A., Wstęp, in: *Geoekologia i ochrona krajobrazu, Leksykon*, ed. Malinowska E., Lewandowski W., Harasimiuk A., PWN, Warszawa 2004.
25. RICHLING A., SOLON J., *Ekologia krajobrazu*, PWN, Warszawa 1998.
26. ROLSTON H. III, *Philosophy Gone Wild, Environmental Ethics*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo, New York 1989.
27. SCHMITHÜSEN J., Pojęcie i określenie treści krajobrazu jako obiektu badań geograficznych i biologicznych, in: *Przegląd Zagranicznej Literatury Geograficznej, Ekologia krajobrazu*, Warszawa 1978.
28. SCHWEITZER A., *Życie*, PAX, Warszawa 1974.
29. SOLON J., Ocena zrównoważonego krajobrazu – w poszukiwaniu nowych wskaźników, in: *Studia ekologiczno-krajobrazowe w programowaniu rozwoju zrównoważonego, Przegląd polskich doświadczeń u progu integracji z Unią Europejską, The Problems of Landscape Ecology, vol. XIII*, ed. Kistowski M., Gdańsk 2004, p. 49-58.
30. SYNOWIEC W., LUC M., 2013, Wielokryterialna ocena przydatności terenu dla rozwoju energetyki wiatrowej na przykładzie gminy Rymanów, in: *Przegląd Geograficzny*, in printing.
31. SZCZĘSNY T., *Ochrona przyrody i krajobrazu*, PWN, Warszawa 1971.
32. SZTUMSKI W., Przejawy kryzysu ekologicznego w środowisku społecznym, in: *Polityka, ekologia, kultura, społeczne przesłanki kryzysu ekonomicznego*, ed. Papuziński A., Bydgoszcz 2000.
33. TYBURSKI W., 2008, Origin and Development of Ecological Philosophy and Environmental Ethics and Their Impact on The Idea of Sustainable Development, in: *Sustainable Development*, vol. 16 no 2, p. 100-108.
34. *Etyka i ekologia*, UMK, Toruń 2008/1995.
35. VAIL J., 2006, *Envisioning a Hamlet Economy: Topology of Sustainability and Fulfilled Ontogeny*, <http://www.jeffvail.net/2006/04/envisioning-hamlet-typology-of.html> (05.05.2013).
36. VONTOBEL H., *Człowiek miarą wszechrzeczy. Refleksje w dobie globalizacji*, MUZA SA, Warszawa 2006.
37. WOJTYŁA K., 2001a, *Miłość i Odpowiedzialność*, Lublin TN KUL, rozdz. 1.1, http://www.nonpossumus.pl/biblioteka/karol_wojtyla/milosc_i_odpowiedzialnosc/r1_1.php (05.05.2013).
38. WOJTYŁA K., *Elementarz Jana Pawła II, dla wierzącego, wątpiącego i szukającego*, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2001b.