



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Changing landscapes of archaeology and heritage

Fairclough, G.; van Londen, H.

Publication date

2010

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

The cultural landscape & heritage paradox: protection and development of the Dutch archaeological-historical landscape and its European dimension

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Fairclough, G., & van Londen, H. (2010). Changing landscapes of archaeology and heritage. In T. Bloemers, H. Kars, A. van der Valk, & M. Wijnen (Eds.), *The cultural landscape & heritage paradox: protection and development of the Dutch archaeological-historical landscape and its European dimension* (pp. 653-669). (Landscape & heritage series). Amsterdam University Press.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

The Cultural Landscape & Heritage Paradox

Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape and its European Dimension

Editors:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Tom (J.H.F.) Bloemers | Emeritus Professor of archaeological heritage and landscape, University of Amsterdam |
| Henk Kars | Professor of geo- and bioarchaeology, VU University Amsterdam |
| Arnold van der Valk | Professor in land use planning, Wageningen University |
| Mies Wijnen | Former secretary of the NWO PDL/BBO-programme |

This publication is one of the results stemming from the NWO-programme 'Bodemarchief in Behoud en Ontwikkeling (BBO), a research programme organized by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

3. Changing landscapes of archaeology and heritage

Graham Fairclough¹ & Heleen van Londen²

ABSTRACT

Florence and Faro (the European Landscape Convention and the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society) offer new lines of vision into archaeological heritage management. Unlike the Valletta Convention, neither of these two young conventions is specifically focused on archaeology and in fact the differences are much more fundamental. In conjunction with a more long-standing but recently maturing landscape dimension within heritage management and archaeologically/historically informed spatial planning, they offer a new context for archaeology and related disciplines. They open new channels into other landscape disciplines and into the integrated practice of landscape management. They suggest different approaches to understanding and responding to the past within the present. They expand the scale of theory and practice to the wider and more fluid concept of landscape itself, with a considerable impact therefore on conceptual frames. In three sections that look backwards, at current trends and at the future, and through the mirror of the PDL/BBO programme, this chapter explores the many faces that the ELC and the Faro Convention offer to archaeological practice, leading towards the introduction of a new European research agenda for ESF/COST focusing on landscape studies balanced between the humanities, the social sciences and the physical sciences.

KEY WORDS

Archaeology, heritage practice, landscape; ELC, social relevance, Faro; future

1. LANDSCAPES OF THOUGHT AND ACTION

1.1 *Metaphorical landscapes: disciplinary contexts and changing situations.*

Landscape can be object and subject, material as well as perceptual, metaphor as well as reality. Rather than dividing the field of research and practice, however, this diversity and multiplicity helps to provide a broad field of common ground. Landscape is above all a shared idea and creates an unparalleled nexus for debate, dialectic and difference within humanities and sciences. It is a place for researchers and practitioners from many varied fields to meet and discuss, using the idea of landscape as a virtual *agora*, *thing* or *parlement*, within which landscape meanings and significances can be contested as well as agreed. Landscape is an integrative force. It offers a way to dissolve some of the many divisions which have arisen in science, research, policy and practice over the past couple of centuries. This allows archaeological-historical knowledge and policy to be set within wider social contexts through which they will reach new levels of relevance. It might be said that landscape concerns everyday life whereas heritage is for holidays.

Metaphorical landscapes also change and this book clearly shows how the landscape of archaeological and historical research has changed in recent years, creating new ways for research and practice. This might be traced back to New Archaeology's discovery of 'landscape' or 'total archaeology' in the later

1960s or to older paradigms in historical geography and in 'field archaeology' from the 1920s at least. But since about 1990 a tidal wave of major literature, the vast majority, revealingly, being collaborative and often interdisciplinary, has greatly expanded the subject.³ Not all these books use the word landscape, in Britain for example 'archaeology', 'environment' and 'countryside' were frequent proxies, e.g. Macinnes/Wickham-Jones 1992, but they nonetheless contributed to the emergent new paradigm that we see coming of age in the pages of this book. This reflects not only the PDL/BBO programme, but initiatives in other parts of Europe as well, in many cases facilitated by pan-European EC-funded projects and networks and even beyond.⁴

Archaeology's intellectual, social and organizational landscapes also change, as exemplified by the European Landscape Convention (ELC; Florence 2000). The ELC is 'a genuine innovation compared with other international documents on cultural and natural heritage' (Council of Europe 2008) that seeks to strengthen the democratic social role for landscapes and that is already stimulating new levels of interdisciplinary research and action (Landscape Research Group 2006). The ELC's definition of landscape, that it is "an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factor", is all-encompassing in its brevity, making room for the interests and concerns of all landscape disciplines and thus bringing archaeological and historical disciplines into synergetic debate and collaborations with other disciplines. The ELC also promotes a wider concept of landscape for archaeology than has been traditional and opens a way to re-visualize the practice of heritage in general.

The landscape of heritage is also changing. Like the ELC, it is responding to a sense of challenge and change at global scale and to broader ideas such as memory and belonging, and identity and community (e.g. Council of Europe 2009, Fairclough *et al.* 2008; Graham/Howard 2008; Sassitelli 2009). Another large recent bibliography, again often collaborative and interdisciplinary, testifies to the wide-ranging and widespread development of landscape ideas within heritage and beyond.⁵

1.2 Interdisciplinary landscapes

There is thus a wide and growing context for landscape-based historical and archaeological research and heritage action. The widespread adoption of landscape as a tool in practical spheres such as spatial planning (e.g. Sarlöv Herlin 2004; Selman 2006) has contributed to this, as has the adoption of landscape as a fundamental subject, in scalar or conceptual terms, in a large number of academic disciplines across all domains from humanities and arts to social and physical sciences, as evidenced by recent Position Papers of ESF standing committees and other networks. There is increasing recognition in the context of the European Research Area that in intrinsically interdisciplinary subjects like landscape the benefits of specialization can be outweighed by fragmentation, dissonance and needless tensions between disciplines. Merely multidisciplinary approaches are an insufficient answer, and explorations so far of inter- and transdisciplinary work have taken us little further. In terms of landscape we probably need to seek to be 'postdisciplinary'.

Disciplinary fragmentation has placed significant obstacles in the way of using landscape research to answer major social, economic and environmental challenges. A false distinction can arise between so-called curiosity driven and applied research. This, unfortunately, is especially the case in subjects such as landscape which have everyday practical relevance at all levels from the individual to the collective and in social, economic and environmental fields.

Effective interdisciplinary work is not easy to achieve. No discipline has a monopoly of landscape, but it is easy for a single discipline to see the ELC's definition of landscape as endorsing 'their' approach without noticing the full scope of its potential inclusivity. There will be conflicts between disciplines, of course, because the perspective of 'landscape' does not guarantee the same views and there are fundamental differences between scientific and humanities approaches (e.g. on the nature of data or the role of perception) and there can be conflicts or at least contradictions between cultural and natural heritage viewpoints. On the other hand, these differences could be used as a platform for *constructive* tensions, whilst interdisciplinary work offers reflexive advantages that help disciplines better understand themselves.

In the narrower, but interdisciplinary because of archaeology's theoretical and methodological reach, sphere of this book, landscape offers a new context for heritage management:

- The Belvedere Memorandum (Belvedere 1999) marked the rise of new policy and practice over the past ten years or more in the Netherlands. Alongside the more traditional heritage goals of preservation and awareness-raising, Belvedere stimulated the integration of historical landmarks into planning in order to create lasting improvement and a more socially sustainable and liveable environment.
- The research programme PDL/BBO (*Protecting and Developing the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape*) had a time frame parallel to the Belvedere policy programme. As explained elsewhere in this volume, it aimed to study archaeological values in relation to historical-geographical and development values (see also Bloemers/Wijnen 2002, 4). Whereas Belvedere was about landmarks and planning in general, the BBO programme placed the archaeological-historical disciplines and practices in the planning context as its central focus.

After ten years of experience and self-evaluation, Belvedere openly questions the success of the policy for buried archaeological sites (Linszen/Witsen 2009, 249). On the other hand, Belvedere projects seem mostly to deal with sites or objects, not with landscape, so it is clear that more steps are needed down this road. Integrative strategies on a landscape level need to be further developed, as was done for instance by PDL/BBO. More strategic research is needed.

1.3 Belonging and ownership: landscape and social archaeology

'Landscape' in its ELC manifestation is a powerful concept which partly returns to an earlier manifestation of the concept of landscape before it was taken over by elite art and aesthetics since the Renaissance. This older 'everyman's' landscape is landscape as customary territory, polity and community, a view of landscape focused on shared use of land, community and fellowship - land to which a community or collective group belongs, rather than land owned by someone. Land can be owned, but landscape is always common; landscape can be kept with you in memory and thought, whereas land must be left behind, where it sits.

Although often referred to as a Nordic concept of landscape, because it is most recognized through the work of scholars in Scandinavia, notably of course Kenneth Olwig (e.g. Olwig 2002), it is tempting to assume that it also existed elsewhere in Europe. Britain, for example, has its 1000+-year old territories known as 'townships', farmed and exploited as a unit, and it is difficult not to start to search for its traces or survival further afield. It is a view of landscape with which the underlying mindset and objectives of archaeological research sit easily.

Recent approaches to archaeologically-informed understandings of landscape could be interpreted as reaching back to this sort of landscape. The idea of landscape as biography (Hidding/Kolen/Spek 2001; Van Londen 2006) showcased within the PDL/BBO programme connects with this older idea of landscape. It makes an explicit link between long time spans of environmental history and the individually short, but intergenerationally long, time spans of human lives and human biographies, lived between birth and death in many different ways. On the other hand, the more distanced 'vertical' perspectives of other types of landscape archaeology such as landscape characterisation give a second perspective. This is one that accepts our separation from the past but supports it with the basic notion of stratigraphy and historic processes through time afforded by the maps, aerial and satellite photographs used to understand landscape, either filtered interpretatively through characterisation or unmediated through *Google Earth* and *Bing Maps* (Fairclough 2003). A third approach is offered by more conventional empirical field survey approaches to landscape archaeology. This can go as far as treating landscape as a social place, embedding the researcher in the landscape itself, a form of lived, embodied landscape, bringing this approach closer than its practitioners often acknowledge to phenomenological approaches.

All these techniques illuminate ordinary lives lived and landscapes experienced in the past in a genuinely *longue durée* well beyond written history. They are also beyond written records in other ways because they capture things and events that historic documents never mention, the ahistoric as well as pre-historic aspects of landscape become of critical importance. They can also begin to guess at the cognitive, sensual and mental landscapes as well as the environments, a much simpler task, of our predecessors through the footprints they left on the land. They encourage archaeology and other historical disciplines to look beyond land as property, to go beyond landscape as image and to take up landscape's offer of a social context for understanding the past.

1.4 "The play's the thing...": landscape as context

This social context for archaeology fits well with the ELC's redefinition of landscape in terms of people. In the twenty-first century, most people living in Europe have lives and landscapes that are largely urban or urbanized, but conversely an individual's landscape is often more diverse than ever before, being multiple, polyvalent, mobile, virtual as well as real, multi-locational and global as well as local. Landscape research, even when its main focus is in the past, needs to relate to these altered relationships between people and land. The ELC relocates the idea of landscape in the realm of common current, present-day and everyday experience, or of embodiment and living; this is not very far removed from emerging new ideas of heritage either.

Whilst frequently equated with the 'local', indeed seen by many for policy purposes as the embodiment of local values, landscape can however also be seen as an instrument of global understanding and action and as a universal concept. A hundred and fifty years ago or so it was enlisted as a champion of nationalistic definitions, just as heritage was, but three hundred years ago it was adopted to symbolize the social and educational superiority of the landowning aristocracies. In this trajectory we perhaps see a gradual broadening out of the concept to a more democratic and universal level.

The ELC also reinforces landscape's characteristic dynamism and continuous change, summarized by the ELC as the 'action and interaction of humans and nature'; landscape is not a static depiction. Landscape changes all the time, whether we choose to define it as the world we see and sense around us or as what exists in memories and imaginations. Being dynamic, living, fluid and unfix(ed)(able) is actu-

ally central to landscape's very character. Its continuous transformations are not merely a change in the scenery, once a popular synonym for landscape in Britain (e.g. Stamp 1946), but are more far-reaching changes in screenplay, stage directions, cast, audience and performance; new stories are started as the old one ends. Some quality or character of landscape always endures through these transformations, however, and whilst it is always changing and changeable, malleable and vulnerable, with a dynamism that is embedded and immanent, landscape is also resilient. It will survive in one form or another as long as there are people to perceive it, whether or not they call it landscape, and of course in many parts of Europe they use other terms, such as *paysage*, *krajina*, *maisema* and various proxies such as countryside.

The ELC's is a view of landscape immediately recognizable to archaeological research, with people at its centre. But it asks archaeology to change. For example, it leaves little or no room for artificially constructed 'periods' or 'sites'. Working with landscape emphasizes like nothing else does both the temporal and the spatial seamlessness from past to future and across whole territories. In today's perceived landscape all periods of the past will co-exist whenever there is enough knowledge and understanding. Landscape archaeology needs to focus much less on trying to find 'Bronze Age', 'Roman' or 'Medieval' landscapes.

The ELC's definition of landscape encapsulates the interactions and relationships, not the 'balance', between humanity and the rest of the natural world, but understanding landscape historically reinforces its humanity. This is landscape as the opposite of environment - not merely a passive backdrop or stage on which human actors walk, but the play itself, the thing we imagine, write, design, choreograph and construct.

1.5 Frame, canvas, brush - landscape as tool

Landscape is not simply a larger type of archaeological site or historical monument, any more than it is simply a collection of habitats. Landscape is categorically different. It is a tool, a way of seeing, a lens, a filter, a scale, an explanatory model, a descriptive style, an agenda, that can be applied to many fields of research in humanities or sciences, as it often has been to archaeology. It simultaneously provides a frame, canvas and brush for research, for the communication of results to a wide range of audiences and users and for policy. It can help to solve significant current issues such as demographic change, new types of mobility, migration and social belonging, responses and results of climate change, recession and development. It is possible to manage change using landscape, through landscape, as well to manage changes to landscape.

The ELC reminds us that landscape is to be looked after, not simply for its own sake or for its own internalized values, but for wider public interests. Although the Convention refers to the threat of physical and environmental change in its preamble, its main concern can be seen to be more important social concerns, landscape as life, as part of identity and memory, sustainability as first and foremost a social aspiration within which the environmental fits. Some of these are spelt out in the Convention's Preamble, for example "(landscape, in) cultural, ecological, environmental and social fields constitutes a resource favourable to economic activity, contributes to the formation of local cultures and ... is a basic component of... natural and cultural heritage, contributing to human well-being and ... the European identity; (and) for the quality of life for people everywhere".

A second, even more recent, Convention approaches all the same issues, democracy, rights and responsibilities, social relations, the link between past and future, the balancing of change and preservation, social equity and environmental care, but from a different perspective, using 'cultural heritage'

rather than landscape as its medium. The Faro Convention, a Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro 2005), assesses heritage in terms of social, economic and environmental gains and in doing so it broadly redefines heritage not as something given to people by experts but something already existing, like landscape, in their world view and in their mentality. Experts can help in its understanding and construction but cannot define it. Faro, like Florence, should have a direct and significant bearing on the debates and ideas about archaeological and historical landscape research and practice contained within this book.

2. STEPS ON THE WAY

2.1 Adjusting research

The current conceptualization of landscape means that material aspects of landscape whilst not disregarded are filtered through perception in varying combinations dependent on the observer. Landscape is no longer only seen as an external object but as an idea and way of seeing. Landscape archaeology is adjusting to these newer ideas in many ways:

- Greater recognition that landscape and 'environment' are not the same, that landscape is not natural; tautological undertones of the term 'cultural landscape' are revealed, which 'landscapes' are not cultural?
- Landscape, viewed as culture, reflects its place within human intellect and emotion (perception) as well as in human actions of the past few thousand years.
- This 'culturalness' of landscape is linked to its embodied character. As well as being studied, represented and characterized, landscape is also lived. Distinctions between objectivity and subjectivity dissolve in landscape.
- It is now seen as axiomatic that landscape exists everywhere, not just in a few well-known places with good survival. The ordinary and the typical are seen as fundamental and the marginal can become central.
- In historical-archaeological terms, a landscape-centred research requires the abandonment of the traditional fragmentation of the past into constructs called 'site' and 'period'; the idea of bounded sites is irrelevant.
- Landscape is not always beautiful or green; 'ugly' landscapes-abandoned, post-industrial landscapes - and urban landscapes, the full extent of cities and towns, are seen as having their own values, notably evidential ones, an important open door for archaeology.
- There is no need to see landscape only as scenery. There are other important attributes such as context, biography, character, interest or familiarity that are more suited to historical research.
- A now commonplace recognition across many landscape disciplines that landscape components do not need to be visible. This broadens the link between archaeology and landscape to the seabed component of seascapes, for example, and the 'hidden-scapes' of buried archaeological and palaeo-environmental remains.

Other assumptions need reappraisal, such as that landscape is necessarily old. Landscape is also modern, expressed in concrete and tarmac as well as in trees and grass, by streets as well as by heathland. The recent or contemporary past is a fit subject and a necessary one for landscape and archaeological study. It is also a useful laboratory for addressing other heritage issues relating to the deeper past (Fairclough 2007; Penrose *et al.* 2007).

An ELC-type understanding of landscape makes it impossible to treat it as a field of study for any single discipline. Landscape has long been seen as a field which can bring together related sub-disciplines, for example in archaeology and history, but now it is becoming widely recognized as one of the key interdisciplinary fields that spans wider divisions, including the fundamental but obstructive divide between the humanities and the sciences, as well of course as the smaller divides between, for example, geography and history. The desirability of disciplines, indeed higher level domains, to reach out to each other is a current thread in the strategies of European Research Area bodies, and because of its interdisciplinary strength or at least its potential, landscape was chosen by two of them, the European Science Foundation and the COST Programme, to explore ways of bringing them together.

The ESF-COST Synergy Initiative: "A Network of Networks, New Perspectives on Landscapes" that was set up in 2008 to pursue this agenda took as a starting point the need to map out the interconnections between disciplines and domains, seek doorways through the walls between disciplines and identify social, environmental and economic policy challenges at European scale that the integrative landscape research could help to address. The 'network of networks' set up to achieve this new overview and to define ways forward produced a short "Science Policy Briefing" with 'Landscape in a Changing World - Bridging Divides, Integrating Disciplines, Serving Society' as its working title (Synergy Initiative 2010). It analyses the current strengths (e.g. a recent history of very robust theoretical and methodological development in many disciplines) and weaknesses, e.g. fragmentation, lack of inter-domain collaboration, of landscape research as an integrative discipline, and identifies key threats, notably a failure to capitalize on landscape research's great potential to help address major European policy challenges.

Landscape as concept offers much, its multiplicity and plurality, the way it absorbs and thrives on change, the humanity of landscape but also the environmental evolution and the lessons that we can draw from the past for the future. However, all these strengths are failing to be exploited in facing major social and environmental challenges such as demographic change, increased mobility and changes in how identities are being re-forged, urbanization and climate change responses. The Policy Briefing therefore identifies some of the ways that landscape engages with major policy issues, for instance its ability to contain multiple viewpoints, to link the past with the present through long term narratives and both materiality and mentality and to address change over the very long term. All these viewpoints, especially when integrated, give landscape research an unusual degree of purchase on twenty-first-century socio-environmental and even demographic concerns. Major social and political issues, such as landscape as common good, the balance between private gain and public benefit, the effects of increased mobility and transience in the population and other demographic changes and the longterm transformations that are at the heart of the human-environment relationship, reside within and can be illuminated by landscape research.

As a result, *Landscape in a Changing World*, hopefully to be published at the same time as this book on the 10th anniversary of the ELC's publication, makes a strong statement of the need for more concerted efforts to be made at structural and institutional as well as academic levels to promote landscape research and its multiple social and environmental uses as a major interdisciplinary field. First steps would be to establish a forum for landscape studies in Europe, forge a vision of the way ahead and start to establish appropriately funded European wide programmes and networks of research.

A strengthened more integrative landscape research will become more fully and constructively interdisciplinary, enabling it to exploit the potential of landscape research to help address big human and po-

litical issues. In those spheres, too, a new revitalized idea of landscape is provoking adjustments, which the next section considers briefly.

2.2 Adjusting policy and practice

Like landscape research, landscape policy and practice is also evolving. The ELC includes many significant ideas which have the potential to change practice, but in our view the most significant are the democratic nature of landscape as common heritage, the plurality of perceptions and the overriding need for public awareness to be encouraged and used and for public involvement to be easily enabled. The Faro Convention with its notions of ownership and shared heritage is very relevant when read alongside the Landscape Convention. The issue of landscape is now less about land-use and more about concepts such as place (and placemaking), Quality of Life and *cadre de vie* and personal and collective identity; the ELC defines Landscape Quality Objectives as the aspirations of the public for the places where they live.

The idea, as mentioned above, that spatial planning or heritage management for example can work through landscape not simply for landscape (e.g. Selman 2006) is highly relevant. In other words, landscape can be used as a framework for shaping how we live in the world, one of the founding principles of Belvedere. This change of perspective can already be tracked in a number of ways:

- The growing influence of the ELC emphasis on landscape being everywhere, not just the special places, which places traditional heritage management (monumentalizing, authoritative and top-down, national, 'looking after the best') into a different context, calling for more widespread, localizing, contextualizing approaches.
- In terms of the ELC, Landscape Management, the management of change, and Planning, the enhancement and contextual creation of future landscapes, are more significant than Protection, which only works at the level of landscape component.
- The ELC has opened the question of agenda and aims. There exist few, if any, agendas specifically designed for landscape management or planning. Most are borrowed or recycled from other spheres, assuming for example that meeting biodiversity goals will necessarily also fulfil landscape objectives, or trying to adapt conservation approaches from building protection when many key issues (authenticity of fabric for example) do not translate into landscape.
- Faro insists that all individuals (alone but also collectively, in 'heritage communities') have both a right to their own cultural heritage and a responsibility to respect and look after other people's. This creates a multiplicity and diversity that challenges traditional heritage practice and indeed points policy further, beyond heritage (Council of Europe 2009).

The character and style of the Florence (Florence 2000) and Faro (Faro 2005) conventions reflects their content. The two conventions are different from the other Council of Europe conventions (Grenada, Valletta, Berne) because they neither prescribe nor prohibit. They recommend making no list of the special but instead to keep sight of the whole. They offer no particular protective measures but instead recommend more fluid ways of thinking whilst leaving detailed implementation to be tailored to national or local contexts. In some ways they even suggest a pulling back from control (although that is safer and easier at this moment in time in some European countries than in others), offering instead the idea that both landscape and heritage need to become issues for all strands of policy from environmental to economic, from social such as housing and placemaking to infrastructural.

They ask for changes in mentality, and offer new paradigms. In particular, unlike the Grenada, Valletta and Berne conventions, they begin with people not with things, fabric or wildlife. Their key is behaviour and human values. They see heritage as a resource and landscape as a way of relating to the world or adapting to changing environments and they are concerned first and foremost with people, being about mentality, discourse and values more than about things. They are socially embedded conventions, which makes them powerful and potentially radical.

2.3 Reflecting on future objectives

Future landscape and present-day and future changes are the key to the future of landscape studies, even for historically-focused disciplines. More work is needed on the strongest current drivers of change as they impact on landscape at the European scale, such as globalization, urbanization, transport policies, changing climates, the Common Agricultural Policy, and migration and mobility. Policy responses, e.g. to climate change, are major drivers for change in their own right.

Landscape can hold a mirror to assumptions about how archaeology or history is practised. Whereas traditionally archaeology and history aim to create ('recover') increasingly accurate knowledge about the past, Florence and Faro suggest that the past needs to be researched as part of the present, 'the present past'. The assumption that archaeology must protect its resource at all costs might therefore require further discussion. Where does the social relevance of archaeology sit?

We protect the authentic fabric of a historic building because its fabric is seen as central to its value. If we decide that change and dynamism and the subjectivity of people's perceptions are central to landscape's value, then we might need to reconsider what exactly we wish to protect and how. It might be argued that the way we have been looking after monuments and sites would be the wrong way to look after landscape and that conventional heritage principles and assumptions might not be transferable to landscape.

Archaeologically and historically informed goals for landscape as opposed to site management have rarely been defined, what agenda or ideologies might guide them? There is a habit of borrowing environmental (or 'natural') agendas, but if the crucial distinction between landscape and environment is not maintained then the value of landscape as a useful 'new' policy tool for heritage will be lost.

It is surely possible to devise distinctively archaeological or wider cultural agendas. These might be 'green' in the widest sense but they need not be identical to the aims of the biodiversity movement, which through rewilding or habitat recreation can cause as much damaging change to inherited landscapes as conventional 'development' such as forestry or housing. Where are the cultural, people-centred landscape policies to set alongside environmentally-based green objectives?

In article 1 the ELC identifies three complementary instruments, landscape protection, of course, and of greater relevance, landscape management (regular upkeep of a landscape) and landscape planning (forward-looking action to enhance, restore or create landscape). Whereas protection is focused on 'features' within the landscape, management and planning engage with the whole landscape. Whereas protection concerns the conservation of fabric, management and planning are concerned with managing change and perception and with shaping new landscapes in which the past also needs to be legible. The aims of Belvedere can be seen to be reflected in these formulations.

2.4 PDL/BBO themes revisited: learning through landscape

The insights from PDL/BBO programme have a strong resonance with the ELC. The three themes structuring the results and experiences of the BBO programme as presented in this volume focus on the actors and users that embody the knowledge supply-demand relationship and that represent this relationship within research and between research, policy, practice and public (Ch.VI).

The PDL/BBO programme and the related Belvedere policy are a fascinating illustration of the adjusting of research, policy and practice over a decade to the challenges and opportunities being presented to the historical landscape disciplines and sector by Dutch society. Although the PDL/BBO programme has adopted the central motto of Belvedere, 'conservation through development', it defined its own focus by linking research with action as expressed by the methodological concept of action research. In this way the participants in the programme, researchers and partners, have practised 'learning through landscape' by making use of the following three themes.

Linking knowledge and action

It is commonplace that knowledge of the past can, some would say should, underpin actions in the present (Rigney 2000, 7-9). For landscape, the knowledge we need is about the past *within* the present (the 'present past'), rather than about the past *per se*. Landscape-led research in the archaeological and historical disciplines needs to be drawn towards a greater concern for the present and future. This will create more social and cultural relevance. Archaeologists (and historians) are not usually well-embedded in landscape policy and decision-making at a European level (or, often, at national levels), either in the academy or in the 'real' world, and neither in research nor practice. In most countries, for example, leadership in implementing the ELC is given to Nature or Environment ministries. Archaeologists and historians need to talk their way deeper into the landscape mainstream if the potential of landscape for archaeological heritage management is to be realized.

This should not be so difficult. There is a research role in all the stages outlined in the ELC implementation guidelines and there is potential for input from archaeological landscape research in all of them, from creating knowledge of the landscape, through defining and starting to achieve landscape quality objectives, to monitoring landscape change (Council of Europe 2008). But archaeological ideas and preoccupations need to be embedded more deeply into spatial planning at all scales and stages, and this means focusing on the present day as well as the past and on making archaeological data relevant to others. One of the implications of the ELC is that research disciplines should try to become more involved with public perception and awareness-raising and with the design and planning of new landscape.

Imagination: facts and constructions

Progress with this theme requires interdisciplinary work and additionally the combination of scientific knowledge of landscape with public understanding. This is problematic. The ELC definition of landscape contains a tension between materiality and perception and this does not necessarily privilege scientific ways of seeing. It is clear that the scientific and academic community cannot have a monopoly of knowledge about landscape and it is not possible to dictate which 'facts' people use in constructing their landscapes, but information can be offered that might modify or enrich how people know, see or understand the world around them. The Dutch policy to present and promote the 'canon' concept is an example of this and of the diverse reception it has received (Adams/Hendriks 2007; Van Oostrom 2007). It is clear

from the spin-off of the canon policy and from the PDL/BBO experience, and in particular with activities related to historic narration and landscape biography, that imagination is a rich resource for mobilizing engagement and stimulating creativity from policy, practitioners and public. However, it has also become manifest that these activities have to be embedded in rules of engagement between the actors giving them scientific and democratic legitimation. Landscape can thus be shaped by changing perceptions as well as by changing the environment itself.

Sharing knowledge: stories, maps and designs

Archaeologists and historians or geographers might also ask themselves whether the ways they present their knowledge is best suited to help people construct their mental 'imagined' landscapes. We have learnt to 'read' landscape but are we yet adept at 'writing' it? Many new ways are being developed. Aside from the biography approach basic to the BBO, three books published in three separate countries in the space of less than two years have offered three other distinctive novel approaches (Le Du-Blayo 2007; Nord 2009; Blur/Santillo Frizell 2009). The process of sharing knowledge is two-way, it requires capturing other people's knowledge or perceptions, which as noted above might also mean allowing 'non-scientific' stories to reside next to scientific 'truths'. Landscape can contain both, just as it can contain competing and conflicting perceptions of the same area of land and as it challenges the dominance of expert, specialist or national criteria. Not every person sees or reads an area of land as landscape in the same way.

3. AGENDA FOR THE FUTURE AND THE ESF/COST NETWORK OF NETWORKS

3.1 Needs and gaps, opportunities and challenges

This book offers a series of challenges for landscape archaeology and related historical disciplines in terms of policy such as the Florence and Faro Conventions which challenge many heritage assumptions, and of new academic approaches, such as the various experiments being made using contemporary archaeology as a laboratory which fits well with the landscape paradigm. There are signs that a new more landscape-oriented heritage practice is emerging (Fairclough *et al.* 2008; Holtorf 2009), and the concept of social relevance is becoming a common debating point. What will replace the current essentially early twentieth century 'conservation' ethos?

In relation to archaeological practice, to start at the 'narrow' end, new challenges include:

- The increasing invalidity of constructs such as 'sites' and 'periods'; Grenada and Valletta are in particular focused on sites and monuments that are to a greater or lesser extent de-contextualized;
- The difficulty (undesirability) of maintaining emphasis on top-down measurements of significance, at least as traditionally defined (Grenada and Valletta both presuppose an established national canon), because both the ELC and Faro offer more democratic alternatives;
- The purely pragmatic impracticality of extending the traditional protectionist approaches, common to most European nation states and designed to deal with a limited number of special monuments, to a larger heritage defined, like landscape, as being widespread and everywhere and both universal and local.
- As the notion of heritage is broadened, the desirability of finding a more creative response than 'Save!' or 'Rescue!' becomes ever more critical. Heritage needs to be seen as something to be enjoyed, celebrated and used but not necessarily kept. This is the distinction between a heritage asset and a social resource and applies *par excellence* to landscape.

Archaeological research and heritage management also have their own challenges. The recent expansion of archaeological work in Europe since the 1980s, accelerated by the Valletta Convention in 1992 (Valletta 1992), shows us that there are archaeological remains everywhere. We are collecting more data than we can handle, with an ever greater need for research to be rigorously question-led. We have a different perspective now than in the 1970s and 1980s when protection and rescue seemed crucial tasks. Now understanding is most important, knowledge is seen as more than just data and as something that gains in value when transmitted beyond the discipline.

There is well-trodden ground here on the question of the identification (as the ELC calls it) of landscape, indeed there is a plethora of landscape survey and analysis techniques. More comparative work is needed on these methods of understanding, characterisation and assessment (see Fairclough/Rippon 2002; Fairclough/Grau Møller 2008), to be followed by more exchanges of expertise between countries and disciplines: "there is an acute awareness of the inadequacies of the most frequently used theoretical and methodological instruments for operational needs. Too often, they belong to *compartmentalized disciplinary universes*, while the landscape demands adequate responses within cross-disciplinary time and space constraints....." (Council of Europe 2008 with added emphasis).

The ELC also offers a framework to use understanding of landscape and perception for social and therefore economic and environmental goals, and Faro offers a similar framework for heritage. Old-fashioned archaeological data need to be converted into landscape synthesis in order to fit into these changing intellectual frameworks and paradigms. This is not landscape archaeology in its traditional sense, but archaeology using landscape as the PDL/BBO did to connect with current socio-political issues rather than merely heritage protection, and using landscape as Belvedere did for wider planning goals.

Even greater challenges were illuminated in 2008-2009 during the process of preparing the Landscape Science Policy Briefing for the European Science Foundation and the COST programmes mentioned above (Synergy Initiative 2010). Carried out through a multidisciplinary network of networks, with the contribution of 120 landscape researchers attending one or more of the network's five workshops, and through debates at other conferences and arenas, the Briefing was conceived as a collaborative exploration between a number of landscape disciplines within the Humanities to explore the scope for further interdisciplinary work.

There is already a strong drive within the European Research Area towards the lowering of boundaries between discipline and domains, and landscape was seen by the ESF Humanities committee, for example, as one of the primary spheres in which the humanities and the sciences might reach out to the physical, earth and social sciences where there are equally flourishing landscape disciplines. The network drawing up the Briefing located this drive for collaboration in the light of major social, economic, demographic and environmental challenges. It was felt that fully interdisciplinary approaches to landscape research, underpinned by the social and cultural aspirations of Florence and Faro, could begin to help address those big issues facing European and indeed global society.

3.2 Thinking bigger

The abiding message of Belvedere, the PDL/BBO programme and its results, the Landscape Convention and the papers within this book is that landscape archaeology and historical landscape studies need to "think bigger". The greatest general threat to landscape research was identified by the synthesis in the

preceding chapter as being a potential failure to miss opportunities afforded by the current debate on major socio-environmental challenges. Rising to the opportunities those challenges offer to landscape research will need more ambitious agendas. The sites that landscape archaeology studies need to become regions. Fences need to be torn down to allow partnership with other landscape disciplines. Heritage should be seen as socially relevant, looking forward to tomorrow as well as back to yesterday. The contemporary relevance of studying the past needs to be stated ever more loudly and the history, achievements and mistakes of our predecessors over thousands of years need to be understood both for their own sake and for the lessons they have for life today and tomorrow.

Knowing the past prompts thought about the future, especially through the filter of landscape, which as archaeologists know is only one moment in a continuing transformation. What is the best way to make decisions about a landscape's future? Where do we put new motorways or runways, where do we build new houses as our populations grow, how do we fit new essentials such as wind turbines or nuclear reactors into inherited landscapes, how will we react to pressure from population growth, inward migration and loss of land to the sea?

Cherished ideals of 'saving' the special, the significant and the highly valued, especially in the most densely populated and pressurized of countries like the Netherlands, will be much less useful when the whole territory, as the ELC expresses it, must be looked after in some way. The Council of Europe's Faro Convention (Faro 2005) on the value of heritage for society with its notions of ownership and shared heritage becomes very relevant when read alongside the Landscape Convention (Florence 2000). Is it democratic to have less interest, less careful planning (at worst, unregulated development), in an 'undesigned' majority of each country that is usually where the bulk of the population lives?

New approaches would seem to be needed. One of these, as an example, might be to use the idea of sensitivity instead of significance, based on understanding the capacity of any landscape to absorb or benefit from change. Sensitivity, or its opposite, resilience, is perhaps a better tool for managing change in the landscape than significance or value. Unlike significance, sensitivity is usable in terms of all landscapes and is directly related to change and threats.

Florence and Faro whisper to us of the innate conservatism of heritage in its traditional and conventional paradigms. It is possible through the eye of landscape to question whether researching the past necessarily needs to be tied to preserving its remains. In the past few decades, 'rescue' and conservation were efficient platforms for the growth of archaeology as both discipline and practice, but being tied to preservationist goals might not necessarily be justified for landscape research or management.

Landscape often seems to be actually defined by being at risk, threatened or under pressure (Lozny 2006), rather than by its true intrinsic characteristics, one of which is change. Change is what archaeologists and historians study and find interesting, especially in landscape studies, and this is where archaeologists and historians can get most readily engaged with interdisciplinary landscape studies and policy. Evidence of change tells at least as much about the past as evidence of continuity does, and both can explain present landscape character and future landscape directions (Fairclough 2007). The ELC is also about change, encouraging us to look forward to new landscapes. One archaeological heritage agenda should be to explore how those new landscapes will in their turn be capable of future archaeological analysis, to determine how legible the past, our past and our future, will be within them in the future.

3.3 The biggest step – outside the academy?

More fundamentally, we might usefully ask how much is actually known about what landscape actually means to the wider population. There seem to be few well tested methods for securing community and civil society participation in creating landscape understanding or for capturing (or harvesting?) public views. There may be even fewer for *understanding* public views (what do people mean when they speak of beauty in the landscape?) or using them sensitively (how to align the non-scientific with the scientific, the myths and stories with the results of excavations or archival research, see e.g. Clark/Darlington/Fairclough 2004).

How precisely do people construct their mental landscape, in what way does the world around them, or heritage for that matter, help to create identities and belongings? What is most valued and why, and by whom? How does landscape differ in relation to family background, socio-economic status, degree of marginalization or alienation, position in relation to 'mainstream' society; what are the landscapes of migrant, displaced, mobile liminal communities? Where does landscape meet issues of equity, justice, property and governance? Seeing landscape simply as land or environment cannot address any of these socio-cultural questions, but landscape in its perceptual, people-centred guise can. Archaeological and historical researchers, if working in broad interdisciplinary and interdomain frames, can potentially offer insights to all these questions.

Such viewpoints suggest new roles for archaeologists and historians other than only using landscape as an archive to learn about the past and to be preserved as a scientific resource. They could for example learn to be a 'designing discipline', or to work in other ways to help shape the future. It might be said that such work belongs to other disciplines, but leaving it entirely to others risks marginalizing archaeological and historical perspectives. The ELC defines landscape quality objectives as "the formulation by the competent public authorities of the aspirations of the public with regard to the landscape features of their surroundings". Competent public authorities should include archaeological agencies, some members of the public are archaeologists or have archaeological interests and there are many two-way conversations that archaeologists need to have with the rest of society.

The new approaches and directions that landscape policy might take requires us to look at a bigger picture, to engage with the causes not the effects, for example, to focus on management and planning more than on protection, and to use landscape as a means to broader goals as well as being an end in itself. It requires research to start with people rather than with nature. Landscape primarily offers cultural services rather than ecological services, although these might follow as by-products, consequences or delivery mechanisms. There is perhaps an argument that it would more honestly reflect the state of the world to develop a cultural services approach with ecological benefits rather than an eco-systems approach. As mentioned above, it is necessary to be much more clear-sighted about the aims of historically/archaeologically informed landscape policy. Biodiversity for example is a product of human use of the land over many centuries, but that does not mean that its preservation or enhancement is automatically a landscape policy objective.

Landscape is first and foremost a cultural issue and it should be contributing to cultural ends, to mainstream socio-economic and socio-environmental aims. Landscape is an important concept. It raises and meets big challenges which we are only part way to meeting, we need to step further outside conventional ideas of what archaeology is, what it is for, and what it means to be an archaeologist. We need to 'think big'.

NOTES

- 1 English Heritage, London, England.
- 2 Amsterdam University, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- 3 Examples of recent major literature on landscape archaeology and heritage in the first author's country include, for example, *Archaeologies of Landscape* (Ashmore/Knapp 1999), *Making English Landscapes* (Barker/Darvill (eds.) 1997), *Landscape: politics and perspectives* (Bender 1993), *Unravelling the Landscape* (Bowden 1999), *The Archaeology of Landscape* (Everson/Williamson (eds.) 1998), *Yesterday's World, Tomorrow's Landscape* (Fairclough/Lambrick/McNab (eds.) 1999), *Ideas of Landscape* (Johnson 2007), *All Natural Things: Archaeology and the Green Debate* (Macinnes/Wickham-Jones (eds.) 1992), *Approaches to Landscape* (Muir 1999). In the the second author's country they include *Landschap in meervoud: perspectieven op het Nederlandse landschap* (Kolen/Lemaire (eds.) 1999), *De Biografie van het Landschap* (Hidding/Kolen/Spek 2001 in Bloemers *et al.* 2001), *Bodemarchief in Behoud en Ontwikkeling, De conceptuele grondslagen* (Bloemers *et al.* 2001), *Sacred landscapes. Cultural Biographies of persons, objects and 'natural' places in the Bronze Age of the southern Netherlands* (Fontijn 2002), *Landscaping the Powers of Darkness and Light. 600 BC – 350 AD settlement concerns of Noord-Holland in wider perspective* (Therkorn 2004), *De biografie van het landschap, drie essays over landschap, geschiedenis en erfgoed* (Kolen 2005), *Midden-Delfland. The Roman Native Landscape Past and Present* (Van Londen 2006), *The homecoming of religious practice: an analysis of offering sites in the wet low-lying parts of the landscape in the Oer-IJ area (2500 BC-AD 450)* (Kok 2008), *Living Landscape: Bronze Age settlement sites in the Dutch river area (c.2000-800 BC)* (Arnoldussen 2008).
- 4 Examples of pan-European landscape-based research include *Pathways to Europe's Landscape* (Clark/Darlington/Fairclough (eds.) 2003), *One Land, Many Landscapes* (Darvill/Godja (eds.) 2001), *Landscape as heritage COST A27* (Fairclough/Grau Møller 2008), *Europe's Cultural Landscape: archaeologists and the management of change* (Fairclough/Rippon (eds.) 2002), *Envisioning Landscape Archaeology* (Hicks/McAtackney/Fairclough 2007), *Frühe Kulturlandschaften in Europa* (Kelm (ed.) 2005), *People and Nature in Historical Perspective* (Laszlovszky/Szabo (eds.) 2003), *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Shaping your landscape* (Ucko/Layton (eds.) 1999). Examples from other landscape disciplines such as geography, planning or ecology include *Paysage: de la connaissance à l'action (Landscapes: from knowledge to action)* (Berlan-Darque/Terrasson/Luginbuhl (eds.) 2007), *Perception and Evaluation of Cultural Landscapes* (Doukellis/Mendoni (eds.) 2004), *Nordic Landscapes* (Jones/Olwig (eds.) 2008), *Multiple Landscape. Merging Past and Present* (Van der Knaap/Van der Valk (eds.)), *Landscape Interfaces: Cultural Heritage in Changing Landscapes* (Palang/Fry (eds.) 2003), *Leggere il paesaggio. Confronti internazionali* (Scazzoni (ed.) 2002) and *Landscape* (Wylie, 2008)
- 5 A few examples of landscape research in practice in spatial planning and heritage include: *A Heritage Reader* (Fairclough/Harrison/Jameson/Schofield (eds.) 2008), *Cultural Landscape - across disciplines* (Hernik (ed.) 2009): *Stretching Beyond the Horizon: A Multiplanar Theory of Spatial Planning and Governance* (Hillier 2007), *Landscapes Under Pressure* (Lozny (ed.) 2006), *Landscape Ideologies* (Meier (ed.) 2006), *Planning at Landscape Scale* (Selman 2006).

- 6 Far too many to cite, some examples include Landscape Archaeology – An Introduction to Fieldwork Techniques (Aston/Rowley 1974), Unravelling the Landscape, an Inquisitive Approach to Archaeology (Bowden 1999), The Future of Surface Artefact Survey in Europe (Bintliff/Kuna/Venclová (eds.) 2000).

REFERENCES

- Adams, T./M. Hendriks, 2007: *Culturele canonvorming. Een eerste inventarisatie*, Amsterdam.
- Belvedere, 1999: *The Belvedere Memorandum. A policy document examining the relationship between cultural history and spatial planning*, The Hague.
- Bloemers, J.H.F./M.-H. Wijnen, 2002: *Protecting and Developing the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape*, The Hague.
- Blur, H./B. Santillo Frizell (eds.), 2009: *Via Tiburtina: Space, Movement and Artefacts in the Urban Landscape*, Rome.
- Clark, J./J. Darlington/G. Fairclough, 2004. *Using Historic Landscape Characterisation*, London.
- Council of Europe, 2008: CM/Rec. (2008) 3: *Guidelines for the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention*. (<https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1246005>).
- Council of Europe, 2009: *Heritage and Beyond*, Strasbourg. (Accessed 19 December, 2009 at http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/beyond_en.asp).
- Fairclough, G.J., 2003: The long chain: archaeology, historical landscape characterisation and time depth in the landscape, in H. Palang/G. Fry(eds.), *Landscape Interfaces: Cultural Heritage in Changing Landscapes*, Dordrecht, 295-317 (reprinted with revisions in Fairclough et al. (eds.) 2008, 408-424).
- Fairclough, G.J., 2007: The contemporary and future landscape: change & creation in the later 20th century, in L. McAtackney/M. Palus/A. Piccini (eds.), *Contemporary and Historical Archaeology in Theory*, Oxford (Studies in Contemporary and Historical Archaeology 4, BAR International Series 1677), 83-88.
- Fairclough, G./P. Grau Møller (eds.), 2008: *Landscape as Heritage. The Management and Protection of Landscape in Europe, a summary by the Cost A 27 project 'LANDMARKS*, Bern (Geographica Bernensia 79).
- Fairclough, G.J./R.Harrison/J. Jameson Jr./J. Schofield (eds.), 2008: *A Heritage Reader*, London.
- Fairclough, G./S. Rippon (eds.), 2002: *Europe's Cultural Landscape: archaeologists and the management of change*, Brussels.
- Faro, 2005: *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, Strasbourg (Council of Europe).
- Florence, 2000: *European Landscape Convention. Florence, 20 October 2000*, Strasbourg (Council of Europe).
- Graham, B./P. Howard, 2008: *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, Aldershot.
- Hidding, M./J. Kolen/T. Spek, 2001: De biografie van het landschap. Ontwerp voor een inter- en multidisciplinaire benadering van de landschapsgeschiedenis en het culturele erfgoed, in J.H.F. Bloemers, R. During/J.N.H. Elerie/H.A. Groenendijk/M. Hidding/J. Kolen/Th. Spek/M.-H. Wijnen, 2001: *Bodemarchief in Behoud en Ontwikkeling. De conceptuele grondslagen*, Den Haag, 7-109.
- Holtorf, C., 2009: World Heritage in Perspective [in Comments on Terje Brattli, 'Managing the Archaeological World Cultural Heritage: consensus or rhetoric' in NAJ 42(1)2009]], *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 42, 196-200.
- Landscape Research Group, 2006: Cultural Landscapes in the 21st Century, *Landscape Research*, 31(4) (themed issue on the ELC).
- Le Du-Blay, L. (with contributors), 2007: *Le Paysage en Bretagne: enjeux et défis*. Rennes.
- Linssen, M./P.P. Witsen, 2009: <Belvedere.nu>. *Praktijkboek cultuurhistorie en ruimtelijke ontwikkeling*, Utrecht.
- Londen, H. van, 2006: Cultural biography and the power of image, in W. van der Knaap/A. van der Valk (eds.), *Multiple Landscape. Merging Past and Present. Selected Papers from the fifth International Workshop on Sustainable Land Use Planning 7-9 June 2004*, Wageningen, 171-181.
- Lozny, L. (ed.), 2006: *Landscapes Under Pressure: Theory and Practice of Cultural Heritage Research and Preservation*, New York.
- Macinnes, L./C.R. Wickham-Jones, 1992: Time-depth in the countryside: archaeology and the environment. in L. Macinnes/C.R. Wickham-Jones (eds.), *All Natural Things: Archaeology and the Green Debate*, Oxford (Oxbow Monograph 21), 1-13.
- Nord, J.M, 2009: Changing Landscapes and Persistent Places, *Acta Archaeologica Lundensia*, Lund (Series in Prima Quarto, No 29).
- Olwig, K.R., 2002: *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic. From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World*, Madison.
- Oostrom, F. van, 2007: *A Key to Dutch History. Report by the Committee for the Development of the Dutch Canon*, Amsterdam.
- Penrose, S. (with contributors), 2007: *Images of Change – an archaeology of England's contemporary landscape*, London.
- Rigney, A., 2000: Introduction: Values, Responsibilities, History, in: J. Leerssen/A. Rigney (eds.), *Historians and Social Values*, Amsterdam, 7-15.
- Sarlöv Herlin, I., 2004: New challenges in the field of spatial planning: landscapes. *Landscape Research* 29, 399-411.
- Sassitelli, M., 2009: *Becoming Europeans: Cultural Identity and Cultural Policies*, London.
- Selman, P., 2006: *Planning at Landscape Scale*, London.
- Stamp, L.D., 1946: *Britain's Structure and Scenery*, London.
- Synergy Initiative 2010: *Landscape in a Changing World. Bridging Divides, Integrating Disciplines, Serving Society*, Strasbourg/Brussels (Science Policy Briefing by the ESF-COST Synergy Initiative 'A European Network of Networks: New Perspectives on Landscapes').
- Valetta 1992: *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised)* Valetta, 16.I.1992, Strasbourg (Council of Europe).

WEBSITES: FINDING FLORENCE AND FARO

- Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, European Treaty Series 1999: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/default_en.asp. (Accessed 19 December, 2009).
- European Landscape Convention, European Treaty Series 176: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Landscape/default_en.asp. (Accessed 21 December, 2009).