



Dalglish, C., Leslie, A., Brophy, K. and MacGregor, G. (2017) Justice, development and the land: the social context of Scotland's energy transition. *Landscape Research*, 65(6): 39-74: 0
(doi:[10.1080/01426397.2017.1315386](https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2017.1315386))

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/142708/>

Deposited on: 09 February 2018

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

JUSTICE, DEVELOPMENT AND THE LAND: THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF SCOTLAND'S ENERGY TRANSITION

CHRIS DALGLISH*, ALAN LESLIE*, KENNY BROPHY** & GAVIN MACGREGOR†

* Inherit: the Institute for Heritage & Sustainable Human Development, Glasgow, United Kingdom

** Archaeology, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom

† Northlight Heritage, Glasgow, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Scotland, like many other countries, is undergoing a transition to renewable energy. This paper discusses the social context within which this transition is taking place and which is conditioning the possibilities for energy development and its effects on people. In particular, the paper explores historically-rooted conflicts relating to land rights and wild land protection, considering these issues and their relationship to energy development in terms of landscape justice (i.e. the principle of fairness in the ways people relate to the landscape and to each other through the landscape). Pursuing a more just settlement between people and landscape is often a matter of understanding problematic pasts and working to overcome their harmful legacies. It is argued that there is an important role for heritage practice in helping to deliver energy development which takes the historical, social and cultural context more fully into account and thereby helps to bring about a more just settlement between people and the landscape.

KEY WORDS

Scotland, renewable energy, landscape justice, land reform, wild land

Introduction

In common with other countries, Scotland is undergoing a transition to renewable energy. Energy policy is reserved to the United Kingdom Government and the UK's *Climate Change Act* (2008) sets targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 34% by 2020 and 80% by 2050, relative to the 1990 level. However, because planning is a devolved matter, the Scottish Government shapes the future energy landscape through its planning policy and the planning system. The *Climate Change (Scotland) Act* (2009) promotes a target of 42% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 and Scottish Government policy is for 30% of all energy demand to come from renewables by that year (Scottish Government, 2011). This includes generating an equivalent of 100% demand for electricity from renewables; currently, around 50% of Scotland's gross electricity consumption comes from such sources (Scottish Government, 2015a, p. 4). It is also Scottish Government policy to phase out existing nuclear power stations as they reach the end of their operating lives, placing even greater emphasis on renewables as a means of reducing carbon emissions.

Renewable energy development is changing the landscape and this is most evident in Scotland's extensive upland and coastal areas. Onshore wind is the most significant technology with a generating capacity which had reached 5,015MW by 2014 (Scottish Government, 2015a, p. 13), approximately 70% of Scotland's total renewables capacity. Onshore wind also accounts for the largest proportion of consented and planned renewable developments, with over 250 projects (totalling c. 8,500MW) under construction, consented or in the planning system (Scottish Government, 2015a, p. 6). Hydro-electric makes up around 20% of the total, with a generating capacity of around 1.5GW (Scottish Government, 2015a, p. 21), and offshore wind, wave and tidal

energy are all potentially significant (Scottish Government, 2011, pp. 62, 73). Added to these are other options which are currently being promoted, including biomass and various microgeneration technologies (see Scottish Government, 2011).

Our interest is in the relationship between renewable energy development, landscape change and questions of power and justice. Energy development is shaping the landscape, while the landscape is shaping energy policy and its implementation. Renewable energy has become part of the process and practice of making landscape, as a physical, cultural and as a socio-political reality (Nadaï & Van der Horst, 2010, pp. 143-149). In this paper, we take a social and cultural perspective on the Scottish energy transition and on related issues of landscape governance. In particular, we are concerned with the deeply-embedded historical inequities which condition people's capacity to benefit from or be harmed by change and by the potential for energy development to perpetuate or disrupt social relationships which are enacted through and in relation to the landscape. As Murphy and Smith (2013) have explained, energy transitions need to be understood not just in technological terms, but in social terms too. Dynamic and complex relationships between people and particular ways of perceiving change create "powerful path dependencies" which exert pressure on development, often in diverse and contradictory ways (Murphy & Smith, 2013, pp. 693, 701). In other words, the possibilities and constraints for new energy development, the form that development takes and its effects on society are all conditioned by the cultural and social character of the particular country or region. At the local level, landscape "introduces heterogeneity and uncertainty in the deployment of renewable energies", testing established norms and general assumptions about the path of change "because the processes and practices of producing landscapes are embedded into the materiality, the local culture, the local history" (Nadaï & Van der Horst, 2010, p. 148, 149). Because the enactment of the renewable energy transition is dispersed across heterogeneous landscapes, the particularities of landscape influence the way energy and related policies translate into reality (Nadaï & Van der Horst, 2010, p.150).

Below, we define key concepts – sustainable development, landscape justice and historical justice – which frame the subsequent discussion. We introduce a cluster of social and cultural concerns which are particularly significant in the Scottish context, namely: historical processes of rural depopulation and the monopolisation of control over the land by a landowning minority; ongoing debate and conflict over questions of who controls and benefits from development of the land; and tensions arising from a drive to protect wild land. The issues of land rights and wild(er)ness preservation are not unique to Scotland, but the Scottish case has its own specificities and understanding these is an important step in seeking to understand the nature and effects of decisions regarding energy development in Scotland. We explore how deeply-embedded historical injustices relating to the land are being perpetuated and challenged, with implications for renewable energy development and for people's capacity to benefit from or be harmed by such development. Our argument is that pursuing a more just settlement between people and landscape involves understanding problematic pasts and working to overcome their harmful legacies. We contend that current approaches to the governance of landscape change, of which renewable energy development is a key driver, are failing adequately to recognise and respond to this negative heritage of embedded injustice. Our conclusion is that there is an important role for cultural heritage practice in helping to deliver energy development which takes such historical, social and cultural concerns more fully into account and thereby helps to bring about a more just settlement between people and landscape. In the present context, we are primarily concerned with two areas of heritage practice: 1) the assessment of impacts on heritage concerns in relation to particular development proposals (e.g. through Environmental Impact Assessment), and; 2) the provision of strategic information regarding the heritage aspects of landscape character.

Framing concepts: sustainable development, landscape justice, historical justice

Considering Scotland's energy transition from a social and cultural point of view is essential in seeking to determine whether or not this transition accords with the principles of sustainable development and landscape justice. Following established definitions, we see the purpose of sustainable development as one of satisfying human need and improving quality of life in socially and environmentally sustainable ways (Dalglish & Leslie, 2016). It is important to distinguish between *development* ("a qualitative improvement or unfolding of potentialities") and *growth* ("quantitative increase in physical scale"), and sustainable development should not be confused with 'sustainable growth' (Daly 1990, pp. 1-2). For development to be sustainable, it must be integrated and both long- and short-term in its focus; it must use renewable resources no faster than they can regenerate, emit wastes no faster than they can be assimilated and limit the use of finite resources (Daly 1990); and it must promote redistribution and sharing to tackle poverty and inequality (Daly 1990) and the participation of those who might benefit from or be harmed by development (Dalglish & Leslie 2016). Current landscape policy – as expressed in the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000), which has been ratified by the UK – has the purpose of embedding the principle of sustainable development in landscape governance and translating it into action in particular localities.

Landscape justice is a concept closely linked to the questions of human need and quality of life raised by sustainability discourse. It is the principle of fair distribution of the benefits of landscape; of equitable entitlement to a life characterised by good relationships with the landscape; and of meaningful participation – for all those with a sufficient interest – in plans, decisions and actions relating to a landscape (Dalglish, 2012, pp. 328, 333). Landscape justice has received increasing attention as a concept and a vision over the past decade or so (Jorgensen, 2016, pp. 2-3), in conjunction with the emergence of landscape ethics as a distinct field which seeks to bridge the gap between social and environmental ethics (Dalglish, 2012, pp. 331-2). There are various points of view within this field and our sympathy lies most with relational approaches, i.e. those which centre on the character of relationships between people and the landscape and between different people as mediated by the landscape (e.g. Cortina, 2011). Like Jorgensen, we admit to an anthropocentric bias, in that our primary interest is in "addressing unequal (human) access to landscape goods and resources, including cultural resources or unequal exposure to environmental degradation or risk" (Jorgensen, 2016, p. 2). Following Aitken *et al.* (2016, p. 234) on climate justice, we find it analytically and operationally useful to define landscape Justice in terms of: distribution (of harms and benefits relating to the landscape); procedure (the fairness or lack thereof of the processes and practices of landscape governance); recognition (the legitimacy or lack thereof accorded to different voices, perspectives and needs); and capabilities (people's capacity or lack thereof to achieve the outcomes they desire with regard to the landscape).

Consideration of questions of landscape justice needs always, we believe, to go hand-in-hand with a consideration of heritage. Present-day issues of landscape justice are often issues of historical justice. The notion of historical justice stems from the understanding that many of today's problems are legacies of injustices perpetrated in the past and which continue, in one way or another, to be active in the present. Seeking historical justice is a matter of fostering understanding of problematic pasts as part of the process of overcoming their harmful legacies. This is a restorative justice which is exemplified by the 'truth and reconciliation' commissions instigated in various countries to address the legacies of apartheid, sectarianism and other past-yet-present problems, but which is more widely relevant, including in relation to the ways we relate to our landscapes: "political, economic, social and cultural inequalities become enshrined in landscape itself, creating unequal access not only to natural goods and resources, but also to the embedded processes that determine how landscape is shaped and represented" (Jorgensen, 2016, p. 2). Mitchell (2003) has challenged geographers to contribute to a more just future by using the tools at their disposal to

understand the processes and actions whereby people have been alienated from their landscapes. We enjoin heritage practitioners – those who specialise in dealing with the legacies of the past in the present – to do the same. A historical approach to present-day problems is needed if we are to identify, understand and overcome inequalities which are embedded in the landscape, yet all too often these inequities are not recognised as legitimate concerns in our established assessment and decision-making processes. Recognising this provides heritage practitioners with the objective of assessing how injustices have been created in the past and sustained into the present in landscape contexts (Landscape Research Group, 2015). This includes analysing whether or not embedded injustices are being sustained – or challenged – by current paths of energy development.

Power, land and energy in Scotland

To illustrate and ground our general argument, we will consider selected aspects of the context of the Scottish energy transition, namely the ways in which historical injustices relating to the land are being simultaneously challenged (e.g. through land reform) and perpetuated (e.g. through measures to protect wild land).

Scotland's land question: a brief history

Over the past 500 years, Scotland has seen a fundamental narrowing and individualisation of its land ownership (Whyte, 2005, p. 355; Wightman, 2011). Private property rights have been privileged over collective rights, and control of the land has been concentrated in the hands of a small minority. This trend of land privatisation is common enough in Europe and beyond but, in Scotland, it has taken particularly extreme form. Approximately 11% of the land area of Scotland is publicly owned and a few percent more are owned by landowning NGOs, especially nature conservation charities (Land Reform Review Group [LRRG], 2014, p. 52; Wightman, 2000, pp. 146–147, 157). Most of the rest is in private hands and the pattern, while varied, is dominated by large estates and a high concentration of ownership. It is estimated that 432 private landowners (c. 0.00008% of the population) own 50% of rural land and has been argued that this can be considered the most “concentrated pattern of largescale private land ownership in the world” (LRRG, 2014, pp. 159–160). Very little common land remains beyond certain publicly-owned ‘common good lands’ (e.g. public buildings, parks and other public spaces), the common grazing rights attached to specific types of rural tenancy in the north and west of the country (LRRG, 2014, pp. 41-42, 74-76) and lands which have recently come under community ownership (see below).

Throughout the period when land was being privatised and monopolised, its use was also changing. In this, territories subject to multiple private and common rights and uses came to be seen as private resources to be exploited in order to generate a financial return for the owner and to support their political and social standing. Scotland's recent rural history is a lesson in the local effects of global entanglement – from the 16th century onwards, people's lives were transformed with increasing market dependency and with the increasing dominance of the countryside by commercially-orientated private estates (Dalglish, in press). During the agricultural improvements of the 18th century and the boom years of agricultural production in the Napoleonic era, for instance, estates aimed to keep a high population on the land to provide labour. However, in the decades after the Napoleonic Wars, many estates instigated programmes of depopulation, evicting large numbers of tenants in order to turn the land over to other forms of production such as extensive sheep farms. During the late-nineteenth-century agricultural depression, when cheap food imports undermined the domestic farming economy, many estates – especially in the uplands – were repurposed as hunting and fishing reserves for the enjoyment of their wealthy owners. Further change occurred after the First World War and through the 20th century, with widespread afforestation and more highly capitalised, mechanised and intense agricultural production further

changing the face of the landscape and reducing the size of the rural population in many parts of the country.

As a result of these events, actions and processes, the majority of the population became divorced from the land, disempowered in relation to its management and governance and excluded from all but a few of the benefits it can provide. The significance of this history of depopulation and land monopolisation stems from its still-active nature. The past is alive in the conditions it has set for the present and, in relation to energy development, there are two main aspects of this heritage which we wish to consider. First, there is Scotland's ongoing process of land reform – a struggle over how the land is governed, owned, used and accessed. Second, there is a recent and ongoing drive to identify and protect wild land in Scotland. On the face of it, these might seem like unrelated issues, but each has a genealogy we can trace back to the same history of depopulation and land monopolisation. Both land reform and wild land protection are connected in the present by the same questions: should large parts of the country remain empty of people or not? Should they be developed actively or not? If they are to be developed, in what manner and for whose benefit?

Land reform

In 1997, the Scottish population voted in a referendum to re-establish the Scottish Parliament, which had been dissolved 290 years earlier when the Westminster Parliament in London was created the centre of government for the whole United Kingdom. The subsequent devolution of substantial powers from London to Edinburgh, in 1999, brought about a sea change in both Scottish and UK politics. In 2014 there was a referendum on the question of Scottish independence from the UK. In the vote, the Scottish electorate stopped just short of demanding full independence for Scotland. However, the desire to pursue a distinctly Scottish approach to social justice – a desire which has been at the heart of Scottish politics since devolution and which was central to the 2014 independence campaign, both for those who voted 'yes' for independence and many who voted 'no' – has continued unabated. A core element of this vibrant public discourse concerning social justice is the land question.

Land reform has been on the political agenda on-and-off since the 19th century, but it has rarely been addressed in such a sustained way as it is being addressed now. The devolution of powers to Scotland created a new political environment: before, it had been difficult to address the land question because of limited opportunities for bringing Scottish legislation before the UK Parliament and because of the potential influence on such legislation of vested interests within the House of Lords, the UK's second chamber (LRRG, 2014, p. 24).

Driving Scottish land reform is the widely-held perception that Scotland's highly concentrated pattern of private land ownership is unjust. Land reform advocates argue that minority control of a common resource is stopping the majority of the population from exercising their rights in relation to the land and enjoying the opportunities and benefits which potentially arise from it (e.g. Wightman, 2000, pp. 1, 196). The problem lies with the local land monopolies which have become embedded in the fabric of our society, which have been protected by our legal system and which exercise undue influence over people's life chances (Land Reform Policy Group [LRPG], 1998, pp. 3–5, 22). The modern land reform movement has the aim of re-balancing power over the land in line with the principles of democracy, justice, community benefit and active citizenship (LRPG, 1998, pp. 22–23).

Since 1999, a series of land reform Acts have been passed. This includes the *Land Reform (Scotland) Act* (2003) which grants the public a general right of 'responsible access' to privately-owned land and establishes new community rights in relation to land ownership. For some

communities these rights include a right-to-buy land when it is voluntarily put up for sale by its owner; for others, there is now a pre-emptive right-to-buy, allowing certain lands, mineral and other rights to be forcibly transferred to the community with or without the private owner's consent.

However, despite such changes to the law, the total amount of land owned by community controlled organisations has only risen modestly, currently standing at a little over 2% of the total (LRRG, 2014, p. 87; Scottish Government Social Research 2012, 6). Given this, many see Scotland as still "on a journey delivering land reform and changes to land use" (LRRG, 2014, pp. 7, 16–17), and the Scottish Government has set a target of doubling the amount of land in community ownership by 2020 (LRRG, 2014, pp. 81, 87). Recently agreed measures include extending community acquisition rights, allowing local government pre-emptively to acquire private land in the public interest, involving communities more actively in the management of Common Good land and in decisions relating to land more generally, establishing a Scottish Land Commission and making provision for a Government 'land rights and responsibilities statement' focused on human rights, justice and sustainable development concerns (*Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015*; *Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2016*; LRRG, 2014).

Protecting Wild Land

Moving beyond the land question *sensu stricto*, consideration also needs to be given to the question of wild land protection which, as noted above, has a common ancestry with land reform in the sense that it stems from the same historical process of rural depopulation and land monopolisation. Prior to the publication of *National Planning Policy Guideline NPPG 14* on natural heritage (Scottish Office, 1999), there had been no specific policy for the protection of 'wildness' and 'wild land' (SNH, 2002, para. 1), but these concerns have attained some prominence since that time. This increasing interest has been explained as resulting from the "progressive attrition [of wild land] due to various types of development", a growth in outdoor recreation and public awareness, and the emergence of active voluntary organisations championing wild land (Carver & Wrightman, 2007, p. 357).

Wildness in Scotland's Countryside: A Policy Statement (SNH, 2002), produced by the government agency Scottish Natural Heritage, distinguishes between wildness (a quality people perceive) and wild land (places "where wildness is best expressed"; SNH 2002, paras 2-3). It notes that wild land is normally "identified in the uninhabited and remoter areas in the north and west", while wildness can be found more extensively in the countryside (SNH, 2002, paras 2, 6). A contrast is drawn between 'wildness' and 'wilderness', the latter considered inappropriate in Scotland "where most wild land shows some effects from past human use" and still has an economic purpose of some kind (SNH, 2002, para. 5). The term 'wild land', then, is "best reserved for those now limited core areas of mountain and moorland and remote coast, which mostly lie beyond contemporary human artefacts such as roads or other development" (SNH, 2002, para. 5). While there is acknowledgement here that wild land areas often show signs of past human inhabitation and still have value for people in cultural, social and economic terms, these characteristics are seen as minor or diminished ones – wild land is to be perceived and valued as "the still undeveloped parts of our countryside" (SNH, 2002, para. 8).

In order to support the protection of wild land, Scottish Natural Heritage has mapped 42 Wild Land Areas (see Carver & Wrightman, 2007; SNH, n.d.), the overwhelming majority of which lie in the Highland & Island zone in the north and west of the country. The policy aim here is that "there are parts of Scotland where the wild character of the landscape, its related recreational value and potential for nature are such that these areas should be safeguarded against inappropriate development or land-use change"; the "only uses of these areas should be of a low key and sensitive nature, which do not detract from their wild qualities" (SNH, 2002, para. 34). Specific policy

objectives include safeguarding wildness and wild land (including through a “strong presumption against development”); protecting and enhancing nature; promoting responsible recreational use; promoting action for the recovery of past damage, wildness and wild land having “suffered adverse change through varied human activities in the past”; and promoting awareness (SNH, 2002, para. 34). Scotland’s current *National Planning Framework* promotes strong protection of the country’s wildest landscapes (Scottish Government, 2014a) and *Scottish Planning Policy* (Scottish Government, 2014b) includes provisions to safeguard the 42 mapped areas of wild land.

The impact of ideas of ‘wildness’ extends beyond the planning context. Private landowners actively promote themselves as stewards of the natural landscape, not least when justifying their position in the context of land reform (Stewart, Bechhofer, McCrone & Kelly, 2001). Parts of the Scottish landscape are also controlled by public bodies and conservation charities who actively promote wild land protection (e.g. John Muir Trust, 2015; National Trust for Scotland, 2002). Some areas – such as Scotland’s two national parks – are often cast as quintessentially wild in tourist, literary and popular media, and tourism and other businesses trade on this currency of wildness (Brown, 2015, p. 40). Market research has identified significant public support for the conservation of wild land (Market Research Partners, 2008; MVA Consultancy, 2012). In all these cases, perceptions of the ‘wild’ interact with structures of ownership, control and authority over the land – whether that control is exercised by the private estate owner, a landowning NGO or a public body – with the effect that particular perceptions of what the landscape *is* and particular visions of what it *ought to be* are put into practice.

Part of the power of the ‘wildness’ concept is its widely-perceived status as a fact of nature – an inherent characteristic of the land, rather than a culturally-constructed perception of it held by some, but not all, people. In present-day Scotland, we see a particular manifestation of a longer-lived and geographically widespread phenomenon: the wild(er)ness ideal has lain at the heart of a significant proportion of environmental thinking and action over the past few centuries and it is a core part of environmental discourse to see the world through the lens of a pristine nature lost through, or threatened by, culpable human acts (e.g. Cronon (ed.), 1996). Our point here is not to deny that human actions have had negative environmental consequences, but to question the idea that humans and nature stand in simple separation from each other as opposing and irreconcilable forces, and to question the moral imperative which drives and justifies the pursuit of wild landscapes from which humans are all but excluded.

The hyper-separation of humans and ‘nature’ has been much critiqued in recent decades, and there is now a wealth of evidence and analysis showing the historical origins and development of this particular cultural understanding of the world and charting its ideological application to the metaphorical and literal clearance of (some) people (by others) from the land; there has also been a substantial critique of the related process whereby ‘nature’ has been perceptually erased from landscapes which are now perceived as entirely ‘built’, ‘cultural’ and human-generated (e.g. Cronon, 1996; Davison, 2009; Gazin-Schwartz, 2008; King, 2000; Light, 2001; Plumwood, 2006). Landscapes – as products of interactions and relationships between people, non-human agencies and our shared environments – are more complex than such culture-nature dualisms allow.

If Scotland’s ‘wild land’ seems to be empty of people and to bear only limited traces of recent human inhabitation, then this is not a fact of nature but a result of history. It is true that much of the landscape lies open and unsettled – 73% of Scotland is categorised as moorland and rough grazing, for example, which is a strikingly high figure when compared with 28% in Wales and 11% in England (RCAHMS, 2002, p. 47; Cameron, 2005, p. 187) – but, while this is partly a function of the upland topography of large parts of the country, it is also the result of historical depopulation and of settlement and land use change associated with the replacement of mixed farming communities by

intensive market-orientated livestock farms, hunting estates and forestry plantations (Dodgshon & Amered Olsson, 2006; Dalgligh, forthcoming). Seemingly 'wild' landscapes are, in fact, co-produced, being neither simply cultural nor simply natural in origin.

Implications for Scotland's energy transition

The dynamic processes of land reform and wild land protection are important aspects of the complex social and cultural conditions for energy development in Scotland, both enabling and constraining such development and shaping its effects on society.

A reading of government policy makes clear the direct impact which notions of wildness are having on the potential for renewable energy development. *Wildness in Scotland's Countryside* states that "at heart, the issues of debate here are to determine the extent to which society wants to keep these near-natural areas free from development or intrusive uses; how much of this resource should be safeguarded; how these areas can be protected and enhanced; and how this can best be done" (SNH, 2002, para. 8; emphasis added). Current *Scottish Planning Policy* and the current *National Planning Framework* state that wind farms will not be acceptable in National Parks and National Scenic Areas and that, elsewhere, wind farm and energy infrastructure developments will be significantly controlled where they may affect wild land as identified on the 2014 Wild Land Areas map (Scottish Government, 2014a, p. 34; 2014b, pp. 39-40).

It is not just government policy which matters here. Significant power still lies in the hands of Scotland's minority of large landowners. As noted above, natural heritage stewardship is something which is promoted by private landed estates – whether out of genuine nature conservation concern or because this provides an ideological gloss which helps to justify the continued exclusion of people from extensive tracts of land which have been set aside for hunting or other private uses. The exclusion of people from the land, or at least the placing of significant limits on the extent to which people can interact with the land, is also a policy aim of landowning conservation charities such as the John Muir Trust and the National Trust for Scotland.

As evidenced by several recent surveys (Market Research Partners, 2008; MVA Consultancy, 2012), there is some public support for wild land protection, although the level and nature of the support varies between the population at large, members of special interest organisations (i.e. outdoor, environmental and conservation charities) and residents of particular localities (e.g. Scotland's two national parks). These surveys found that the general population perceives the Highlands and the islands off Scotland's west and north coasts (i.e. those areas perhaps most affected by historical depopulation) as especially wild. The surveys also found that commonly-perceived threats to wild land include wind turbines and electricity pylons and that such infrastructure is seen as a particularly inappropriate kind of development for 'wild' areas. The most frequently requested actions to preserve wild areas included more stringent planning control on such developments. Opinions on the level of the threat to wild land and the need for action vary, though. For example, members of special interest organisations are much more likely to perceive wild areas as under threat than either the general population or residents of Scotland's two national parks, and organisation members and the general population are more in favour of the designation of wild land than are national park residents (MVA Consultancy, 2012, sections 6.2, 6.3).

These surveys provide evidence of a significant strand of public opinion opposed to renewable energy development in areas of perceived wildness, particularly in the Scottish Highlands – a strand of opinion which has, numerous times now, been mobilised in campaigns to stop particular development proposals. This – together with the emphasis placed on wild land protection in planning policy and in the policies of landowning NGOs – raises questions of who benefits from

efforts to protect land perceived as wild from development and who loses out. More generally, it raises the concern that, in grounding debate and decision-making in a dualistic and exclusive understanding of how people ought to relate to the environment, we “leave ourselves little hope of discovering what an ethical, sustainable, *honourable* human place in nature might actually look like” (Cronon, 1996, p. 81; emphasis in original).

Scotland’s land question is also a significant factor in understanding the manner in which renewable energy development has been proceeding. In cases, people have raised their historical and cultural attachment to specific portions of land – land which they do not own in a legal sense, but over which they exercise a form of cultural ownership – in objecting to particular energy developments. An example here is a proposal for a 234 turbine wind farm on the island of Lewis, which met objections on the grounds of its potential impact on the cultural heritage of the peat moorland site it would be built upon and of its lack of benefits for the community, rather than the private landowning and corporate interests promoting it (Murphy & Smith, 2013, pp. 698-699). However, local communities are not simply opposed to renewable energy development and actively promote it where there is a significant benefit to them and their future wellbeing. In the Lewis case, for example, the initial wind farm proposal prompted a community buy-out of a private estate upon which part of the development would have been sited; a community wind farm proposal was brought forward for this newly community-owned land (Murphy & Smith, 2013, pp. 699-700). In cases such as this, we hear an echo of the social and economic development mission which lay behind a previous, state-driven campaign of renewables development: from the 1940s, Scotland saw significant hydroelectric development and this was designed in accordance with an “almost socialist vision” of contributing to the common good by catalysing regeneration of the Scottish Highlands and by requiring developments to provide power to communities in their catchment area (Historic Scotland, 2010, pp. 11-13). Hydroelectric power development was a political response to the recognised depression and ongoing depopulation of the Highlands (Hunter, 2007, p. 4).

There is no simple relationship here between renewable energy development and the politics of land. Two points are clear, though: just as with hydroelectric development in the past, Scotland’s current renewable energy transition has the potential to support communities across large parts of the country and to enable them to develop in sustainable ways; but this potential is denied by the exclusion, by-and-large, of the majority of people from decisions relating to the land and from the benefits it can provide. This is a result of a historical process of land monopolisation, the exclusionary effects of which are being perpetuated by those with an interest in the preservation of minority control of the land and, albeit unwittingly, by those promoting wild land protection measures. However, as the Lewis case cited above shows, the situation is dynamic.

Conclusion: landscape justice and heritage practice

Our starting point in this paper has been that, in order to arrive at a just and sustainable approach to landscape governance in the context of energy development, it is necessary to pay attention to the social and cultural landscape which is both conditioning development and being re-shaped by it. The past matters in this context. Renewable energy technologies are being introduced into contexts where legal and social institutions and cultural understandings of the world have been laid down over centuries, creating an embedded, though dynamic, set of conditions. Energy development has the potential to reproduce or transform the social and cultural environment into which it is being introduced (Murphy & Smith, 2013, p. 703).

The situation is admittedly complex – in Scotland, renewable energy development can act both to perpetuate injustice in relation to the land and to challenge it – and we do not wish to present an over-simplified analysis. Rather, in concluding, we wish to make the general point that

understanding the possibilities for and potential impacts of energy development requires a more serious engagement with the historically-rooted social and cultural conditions within which that development takes place. There is a need to engage more fully with the genealogy of a landscape in order to appreciate its present character. History, here, is a means of developing the understanding necessary to arrive at more informed decisions and to ensure that energy development contributes to overcoming embedded landscape injustices, rather than to their perpetuation or exacerbation. Developing this historical understanding will require moving beyond the confines of any narrow technical process or single discourse in order to engage fully with the range of values which the landscape has for people (Dalglish & Leslie, 2016).

Developing a critical understanding of the contingent and historical nature of our present relationships with and perceptions of the land is a valuable and necessary act in working to implement sustainable development. This “means never imagining that we can . . . escape history and the obligation to take responsibility for our own actions that history inescapably entails” and that we need always “to recollect the nature, the culture, and the history that have come together to make the world as we know it” (Cronon, 1996, pp. 89-90). If energy development policies, proposals and projects proceed without full cognisance of the historically-rooted social and cultural conditions within which they are situated, then there will always be the potential for energy development to perpetuate injustice; if energy development proceeds by taking this context fully into account, then it has the potential to act as one means through which injustice can be addressed. It is the complex interplay between social, cultural, economic and environmental factors which create landscape character and it is only by engaging with this complexity – in public and democratic ways – that we deliver sustainability. We contend that, at present, this isn’t happening sufficiently and the questions of historical and landscape justice which we have raised in this paper are not being addressed adequately in the context of Scotland’s renewable energy transition. Referring back to our earlier point that landscape justice can be considered in terms of distribution, procedure, recognition and capabilities we contend that: the harms and benefits of energy-related landscape change are not being fairly distributed; and that this is partly (though not wholly) due to the failure of our current decision-making procedures to recognise sufficiently the (historically-generated) social and cultural circumstances within which energy development takes place and to afford people the opportunity to shape development in such a way that it addresses historical injustices associated with the land.

Heritage practitioners have an important role to play in addressing the above concerns, as a contribution to the wider effort to secure more just and sustainable outcomes with regard to renewable energy development. For this contribution to be realised, there will need to be changes to the processes and practices of heritage assessment at both the project and strategic levels.

At the project level, current approaches to the assessment of the impacts of particular renewable energy development proposals fail fully to take into account the complex nature of social, cultural, economic and ecological interactions (Smith *et al.*, 2016, p. 4, 26). In contexts such as Environmental Impact Assessment, cultural heritage professionals tend to focus on relatively narrow concerns relating to the objective assessment of impacts upon a material heritage of buildings, sites, monuments and (physical) landscapes (see Dalglish, 2012; Dalglish & Leslie, 2016). Those who deal with the assessment of impacts upon people as well as upon things, such as landscape architects, tend to deal insufficiently with the historical aspects of the landscape under assessment (Dalglish & Leslie, 2016). We advocate that issues of historical justice be introduced to the assessment process, requiring the analysis not just of the material heritage of a landscape but the historical processes which, over time, have created people’s current relationships and interactions with their surroundings or frustrated those relationships and interactions.

Looking beyond the specific circumstances of individual development proposals, we advocate the provision of strategic qualitative information on the kind of historical justice concerns we have raised in this paper. As discussed above, public money has been invested in the national-level mapping of 'wild land', because the protection of such land has been made a policy priority. We also have national programmes of Landscape Character Assessment and Historic Landuse Assessment (see Dalglish & Leslie, 2016, for a discussion). Characterisation and mapping programmes such as these help to establish recognition for certain matters as legitimate concerns in decision-making contexts. However, matters which are not captured by such assessments often fail to be recognised or to be accorded legitimacy (Stephenson, 2008, p. 129). Because "political, economic, social and cultural inequalities become enshrined in landscape" (Jorgensen, 2016, p. 2), they are part of its character and, we believe, much more effort needs to be put into identifying and understanding these historical characteristics, providing publicly-accessible information regarding them and embedding them as material and routinely-considered concerns in the decision-making process. The generation and promotion of such information and insight can support a more enlightened debate regarding the manner of renewable energy development, which in turn can underpin the generation of more just outcomes from such development (see Mason & Milbourne, 2014, p.114).

References

Aitken, M., Christman, B., Bonaventura, M., Van der Horst, D. & Holbrook, J. (2016). Climate justice begins at home: conceptual, pragmatic and transformative approaches to climate justice in Scotland. *Scottish Affairs*, 25(2), 225-252. doi: 10.3366/scot.2016.0128

Brown, K.M. (2015). The role of landscape in regulating (ir)responsible conduct: moral geographies of the 'proper control' of dogs. *Landscape Research*, 40(1), 39-56. doi: 10.1080/01426397.2013.829811

Cameron E.A. (2005). The modernisation of Scottish agriculture. In T.M. Devine, C.H. Lee & G.C. Peden (Eds), *The transformation of Scotland* (pp. 184–207). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Carver, S. & Wrightman, M. (2007). Shrinking wild lands: assessing human intrusion in the Highlands of Scotland, 1870 to 2004, using Geographical Information Systems. *USDA Forest Service Proceedings*, RMRS-P-49, 357-365. Retrieved from: http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_p049/rmrs_p049_357_366.pdf

Climate Change Act, Public General Acts – Elizabeth II chapter 27 (2008).

Climate Change (Scotland) Act, 2009 asp 12 (2009).

Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act, 2015 asp 6 (2015).

Cortina, A. (2011). Landscape ethics: a moral commitment to responsible regional management, *Ramon Llull Journal of Applied Ethics*, 1(2), 163-178.

Council of Europe. (2000). *European landscape convention*. Retrieved from: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm>

Cronon, W. (1996). The trouble with wilderness; or, getting back to the wrong nature. In W. Cronon (Ed.) (pp. 69-90).

Cronon, W. (Ed.). (1996). *Uncommon ground: Rethinking the human place in nature* (paperback ed.). New York/London: Norton.

Dalglish, C. (2012). Archaeology and landscape ethics. *World Archaeology*, 44(3), 327-341. doi: 10.1080/00438243.2012.723320

Dalglish, C. (in press). Enclosure: a living historical process. In E. Casella & M. Nevell (Eds), *The Oxford handbook of industrial archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dalglish, C. & Leslie, A. (2016). A question of what matters: landscape characterisation as a process of situated, problem-orientated public discourse. *Landscape Research*, 41(2), 212-226. doi: 10.1080/01426397.2015.1135319

Daly, H. (1990). Toward some operational principles of sustainable development. *Ecological Economics*, 2, 1-6. doi: 10.1016/0921-8009(90)90010-R

Davison, A. (2009). Living between nature and technology: the suburban constitution of environmentalism in Australia. In D.F. White & C. Wilbert (Eds), *Technonatures: Environments, technologies, spaces, and places in the twenty-first century* (pp. 167-189). Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Dodgshon, R.A. & Amered Olsson, G. (2006). Heather moorland in the Scottish Highlands: the history of a cultural landscape, 1600-1880. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 32(1), 21-37. doi: 10.1016/j.jhg.2005.01.002

Gazin-Schwartz, A. (2008). Abandoned, avoided, expelled: the creation of "empty" landscapes. In A. Smith & A. Gazin-Schwartz (Eds), *Landscapes of clearance: Archaeological and anthropological perspectives* (pp. 25-45). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Historic Scotland. (2010). *Power to the people: the built heritage of Scotland's hydroelectric power*. Edinburgh: Historic Scotland.

Hunter, J. (2007). History: its key place in the future of the Highlands and Islands. *Northern Scotland*, 27, 1-14.

John Muir Trust. (2015). *Wild land policy*. Pitlochry: John Muir Trust.

Jorgensen, A. (2016). Editorial: 2016: Landscape justice in an anniversary year. *Landscape Research*, 41(1), 1-6. doi: 10.1080/01426397.2016.1115187

King, R. J. H. (2000). Environmental ethics and the built environment. *Environmental Ethics*, 22(2), 115-131. doi: 10.5840/enviroethics200022230

Land Reform (Scotland) Act, 2003 asp 2 (2003).

Land Reform (Scotland) Act, 2016 asp 18 (2016).

Land Reform Policy Group (LRPG). (1998). *Identifying the problems*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office.

Land Reform Review Group (LRRG). (2014). *The land of Scotland and the common good: Report of the Land Reform Review Group*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Landscape Research Group. (2015). *Our research strategy*. Oxford: Landscape Research Group.

Light, A. (2001). The urban blind spot in environmental ethics. *Environmental Politics*, 10(1), 7-35. doi: 10.1080/714000511

Market Research Partners. (2008). *Public perceptions of wild places and landscapes in Scotland* (Commissioned Report No.291; ROAME No. F06NC03). Inverness: Scottish Natural Heritage.

Mason, K. & Milbourne, P. (2014). Constructing a 'landscape justice' for windfarm development: the case of Nant Y Moch, Wales'. *Geoforum*, 53, 104-115. doi: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.02.012

Mitchell, D. (2003). Cultural landscapes: just landscapes or landscapes of justice? *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(6), 787-796. doi: 10.1191/0309132503ph464pr

Murphy, J. & Smith, R. (2013). Understanding transition-periphery dynamics: renewable energy in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. *Environment and Planning A*, 45, 691-709. doi: 10.1068/a45190

MVA Consultancy. (2012). *Public perception survey of wildness in Scotland: Report for Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park Authority*. Cairngorms National Park Authority and Scottish Natural Heritage in association with Research Now. Retrieved from: http://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/images/stories/Looking%20After/PDF/publication%20pdfs/Wildness_survey_report.pdf

Nadaï, A. & Van der Horst, D. (2010). Introduction: landscapes of energies. *Landscape Research*, 35(2), 143-155. doi: 10.1080/01426390903557543

National Trust for Scotland. (2002). *Wild land policy*. Edinburgh: National Trust for Scotland.

Plumwood, V. (2006). The concept of a cultural landscape: nature, culture and agency in the land. *Ethics & the Environment*, 11(2), 115-150. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40339126>

RCAHMS. (2002). *But the walls remained: A survey of unroofed rural settlement depicted on the first edition of the Ordnance Survey 6-inch Map of Scotland*. Edinburgh: RCAHMS/Historic Scotland.

Scottish Government. (2011). *2020 Routemap for renewable energy in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government. (2014a). *Ambition. Opportunity. Place. Scotland's third national planning framework*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government. (2014b). *Scottish planning policy*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government. (2015). *2020 Routemap for renewable energy in Scotland – Update, 17 September 2015*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government

Scottish Government Social Research. (2012). *Overview of evidence on land reform in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH). (2002). *Wildness in Scotland's countryside: A policy statement*. Perth: Scottish Natural Heritage.

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH). (n.d.). <http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/looking-after-landscapes/landscape-policy-and-guidance/wild-land/mapping/>

Scottish Office. (1999). *National planning policy guideline NPPG 14*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office.

Smith, D., Convery, I., Bold, V. & Sinclair, B. (2016). *The Solway Estuary: A socio-cultural evaluation of a coastal energy landscape*. Dumfries: University of Glasgow, the Solway Centre. Retrieved from: <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/120905/8/120905.pdf>

Stephenson, J. 2008. 'The Cultural Values Model: An Integrated Approach to Values in Landscapes', *Landscape and Urban Planning* 84(2), 127-139. doi: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.07.003

Stewart, R., Bechhofer, F., McCrone, D. & Kelly, R. (2001). Keepers of the land: ideology and identities in the Scottish rural elite. *Identities*, 8(3), 381–409. doi: 10.1080/1070289X.2001.9962697

Whyte, I.D. (2005). Landlord-tenant relationships in Scotland from the sixteenth century to modern times. In J. Beech, O. Hand, M.A. Mulhern & J. Weston (Eds), *Scottish life and society: A compendium of Scottish ethnology* (pp. 343-357). Edinburgh: John Donald.

Wightman, A. (2000). *Who owns Scotland*. Edinburgh: Canongate.

Wightman, A. (2011). *The poor had no lawyers: Who owns Scotland (and how they got it)*. Edinburgh: Birlinn.