Europe's Cultural Landscape:
archaeologists and the management of change

Edited by Graham Fairclough and Stephen Rippon
Assistant Editor David Bull

Europae
Archaeologiae
Consilium

Managing
Europe's Archaeological heritage

COUNCIL CONSEIL
OF EUROPE DE L'EUROPE

ENGLISH HERITAGE

2002

Cover illustration: An early medieval stronghold at Moraczewo, in the Wielkopolska region of Poland, one of c. 7,000 entries on the Polish official register of scheduled sites and monuments. The stronghold is dated to between the 8th-11th century AD, and is associated with the power base of the Polanie tribe, one of the foundations of the future feudal Christian State. It sits within an agricultural landscape of much later date. Current agriculture activities on or near the site are monitored by the Service for the Protection of Monuments. The modern farm near the stronghold was built before the site was designated in 1972. Photo: W. Stêpieñ.

3: Archaeologists and the European Landscape Convention

Graham Fairclough

Abstract: *The European Landscape Convention offers a new, robust framework for bringing landscape and its archaeological aspects into the mainstream of European heritage and social policy. This paper offers an archaeologist's preliminary perspective on the Convention, and considers the character of the archaeological dimensions of the landscape as it is defined by the Convention. Finally, referring to seminars on cultural landscape organised at EAA conferences in 1999 and 2000, it summarises current debates amongst archaeologists about the landscape and its management, thus setting the scene for the main part of the volume.*

Introduction

The previous paper has provided an authoritative account of the genesis, philosophy and objectives of the Florence Convention. This paper now considers how archaeologists can engage with the Convention and with the concept of landscape that it enshrines in public policy. This engagement can operate both in terms of working with others to understand the landscape and of encouraging policies that ensure the long-term preservation of landscape's historic and archaeological character.

The Convention establishes the principle that all of Europe's landscape is a common cultural resource, and that an important aim of European policy is to maintain the landscape's diversity for reasons of local and regional identity, and for economic and social health. Underlying the philosophy and agenda of the Convention are two very powerful inter-related ideas (Priore forthcoming):

- landscape belongs to everyday life, as part of every citizen's culture, heritage and environment, and must be democratised both in terms of identifying why it is valuable and deciding how it is used and;
- landscape is a cultural construct composed of many different ways of understanding and appreciation. Not all of these ways are 'scientific', objective or material. Many are personal, individual and subjective, or reflect intangible aspects of the environment.

Both ideas present challenges to archaeologists.

In terms of the first idea, archaeology's history as a developing discipline has been one of increasing scientific rigour and specialisation, a trajectory that without care could take us away from close democratic engagement with the population. Furthermore, archaeologists have taught themselves to be concerned with detail and fact, whereas dealing with landscape often requires the opposite skills. Archaeologists often work at a landscape scale, but often their interest manifests itself as a concept of past landscapes, and with an environmental, positivist slant, whereas the Convention requires everyone to think in terms of the present landscape. What archaeologists bring to this debate is the ability to explain that landscape in archaeological *(sensu latto)* terms, is a very complicated artefact with a long history. Thus archaeology may need to adapt to some degree as it engages with the operationalisation of the Convention and this might not be easy.

On the other hand, archaeologists are already very well placed to work within the framework of the Convention. The definition of what constitutes archaeology's field of study has expanded so that it embraces all material culture of every date and type, and this breadth of interest finds some of its most natural expressions in the concept of landscape. Their discipline has already taught them the ability to work at a variety of scales, which is crucial when looking at landscape. Most importantly, it has taught the value of inter-disciplinary co-operation. Archaeologists readily recognise the interaction between different aspects of the environment, to understand for example the way that ecology has been shaped by human action even as humans have worked within natural constraints. Archaeologists are accustomed to working alongside other workers who have different values and methods, and to borrow theories, techniques and perspectives from other disciplines.

Most of all, archaeologists, by their own self-definition as a discipline of thought, are concerned with three of the most important aspects of landscape, dimensions that other disciplines cannot as readily contribute:

- understanding change through time, notably across long periods;

- recognising the role of human agency in landscape creation, acting through social processes at the collective rather than the individual level;
- spatial patterning and relationship: the total connection, often in unexpected ways, of everything within landscape, including the connection between the 'natural' and the cultural.

'Landscape' as envisaged by the Convention is, therefore, already a central field of study and understanding for archaeologists, whose discipline has prepared them very well in some ways and less so in others. The Convention clearly refers to the human made aspect of the European landscape. Archaeologists ought therefore to be major participants, in every country, in all the different approaches that the Convention will be put into practice.

At present, however, archaeologists are not well represented at discussions about the Convention. Out of the 14 of the 22 signatory countries present at the first Council of Europe's first Convention conference in November 2001, only one or two countries were represented by experts from the country's cultural heritage organisations, the remainder asking their Nature, Environmental or Countryside agencies and departments to take the lead. Without greater archaeological involvement, Europe's concept of cultural landscape, and the landscape of the future, may well be a rather shallow reflection of recent history, myth and assumed traditions. It is one of the intentions of this volume to underline the need for archaeologists to make positive contributions to the implementation of the Convention.

Archaeological perspectives on the European Landscape Convention

Archaeologists were instrumental in some of the Convention's early stages, such as the 1992 World Heritage definition of cultural landscapes and the 1995 Council of Europe Recommendation 95/9 on Cultural Landscape Areas (Council of Europe, 1995). There is also a great deal of groundbreaking work at national and local level, much of which is described in other papers in this volume. For this paper, England can stand as an example of some of this work: the English approach to countryside character that has influenced the drafting of the Convention (Countryside Commission 1996; 1998; Countryside Agency 1999; Fairclough *et al.* 1999) and the *Atlas of Rural Settlement* (Roberts & Wrathmell 2000).

For archaeological heritage management, the key point of the Convention is that it calls for coverage of all the landscape, irrespective of whether it is rural, peri-urban or urban, or regardless of any particular perceived quality. This moves decisively away from the aesthetic of special landscapes, and from the process of selecting and trying to preserve only special areas, to the exclusion and detriment of the remainder of the landscape (Priore forthcoming; Déjeant-Pons this volume).

In doing this, the Convention, published in 2000, had moved far from its original intentions. In the early stages of discussions about a convention, the objective was still the old-fashioned approach of choosing the best parts of the landscape on one set of criteria or the other (usually concerned with appearance or beauty), and creating a list or register. It is not very clear where a selective approach would have left the rest of the landscape, but it is likely that the majority of the cultural landscape, beyond the special areas, would have been neglected and undervalued, and subject to little protection or consideration. It can perhaps be predicted that the criteria would have privileged those areas closest to their supposed 'natural origin', or with relatively little obvious modern change. Time-depth and the contribution of long-term change to landscape would have been ignored, as perhaps would certain types of human change (industrial landscapes would perhaps have been largely excluded, for example).

Similar ideas and subsequent changing perspectives were evident in the early 1990s, in the first drafts of the document that became the 1995 Council of Europe Recommendation 95/9. The original aim was to define and list 'Heritage Landscape Sites' rather than to promote the whole landscape (Darvill 1993). The final version of the Recommendation (Council of Europe 2000) moved some way from this as far as the concept of 'cultural landscape areas', but still not quite as comprehensively as was needed, which the *European Landscape Convention* has remedied.

Recent history in the UK demonstrates why this broadening of view was necessary. The response of the conservation movement after 1945 to wholesale landscape and farming change was a withdrawal into relatively small protected areas such as National Parks or so-called Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This approach tried to preserve untouched reserves, but it failed because the reserves were too small, cut off from their contexts, they were no longer purely natural ecosystems and could not be managed properly in isolation from their surroundings.

Even successfully preserved resources lost their context as the rest of the world changed regardless, usually with too little control or care. The ecological reservoirs in the wider countryside from which reserves could be replenished were impoverished, common species of wildlife declined into rarity and the reserves lost the meaning that their surroundings once provided. The selective approach began to fail in popular consciousness as people began to demand that the landscapes on their doorsteps were also looked after, as well as the special areas that they might rarely or never visit. Archaeologists in Britain at least will recognise these failings from the way in which the wider archaeological resource has been eroded while attention and resources have been devoted to protecting a relatively small number of special monuments (Fairclough 1999).

Fig. 3.1: A modern 'landscape of leisure', taking advantage of natural features but created by, and for, specific human activities, Trentio, Italy. Photo: Graham Fairclough.

In contrast, the recent direction of archaeological heritage management (now supported by the Convention) has been to move away from only a concern for the individual monument. The move was, first, to an interest in the setting of monuments (and their 'archaeological landscape'), and then further to the wider landscape and its historical and archaeological dimension, whether site-based, monument oriented or not. This latter approach is closely aligned to the *European Landscape Convention's* position, with its emphasis on the concept of varying landscape character, formed from the sum of all its different attributes, including the cultural heritage.

This is a particularly noteworthy aspect of the Convention's view of landscape. Its very simple definition says that 'landscape' is:

an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors

It is particularly significant how this definition, through its use of words like 'action' and 'human factors', emphasises the historical and cultural dimension of landscape. The definition is a pointer to the vast literature of landscape archaeology that emphasises the role of human agencies, of people and of historic social and economic processes, in the past in creating today's landscape.

This simple definition is amplified by a reminder that cultural landscape exists everywhere. The Convention expects any country adopting it to agree that the cultural landscape covers the 'entire territory' of the country. The concept therefore relates not just to natural and rural areas (to which previous ecological or aesthetic perspectives tended to gravitate) but also to urban and peri-urban areas, and thus to areas more obviously (but not necessarily more extensively) altered by human activities. Cultural landscape includes not just land but water, whether inland or marine; most important, given the predilection for much past landscape conservation to focus on beautiful places, or supposed untouched 'wilderness', the Convention aims to include everyday or degraded landscapes, as well as any that might be considered outstanding.

The simplicity of the definition is one its strengths, allowing it to be fully inclusive and all embracing. It also means, however, that there is a risk that without dialogues between different disciplines (without sharing

understandings and appreciation) the simplicity could disguise very difference approaches. It would be possible for each discipline or interest group or country to implement the Convention while thinking of landscape only in natural or aesthetic terms without noticing how narrow that view might be. Most of the national delegates at the first Council of Europe Conference for Signatory States came from environmental and nature conservation agencies or government departments; there was very little representation of any historic or archaeological perspectives. Another role for EAC members is thus to ensure that the importance to landscape of archaeological heritage is made clear to decision-makers.

Reference to archaeology in the *European Landscape Convention* may not be explicit. The Convention deliberately abstains from singling out any one of the many disciplines that need to work together if landscape is to be comprehensively understood and valued. But archaeology can and should be read as being implicitly included in the Convention. The text shows that the preservation of landscapes also includes archaeology as one of many aspects of landscape. Not only visible archaeological remains are part of today's landscape, but also those which are buried in the sub-soil or in deposits of coastal and inland waters. These offer a great opportunity for preserving the archaeological heritage. Again, the Convention shows the fundamental need to approach the cultural landscape in a multi-disciplinary way.

It is of course today's landscape that is under scrutiny in the Convention, and the definition therefore points us towards the crucial issues of survival, visibility and protection. It asks us to identify which of the many aspects of the material culture of the past few thousand years still survive in the current landscape not just recognisably to experts but influentially to everyone's perception, thus creating landscape's *cultural* rather than *natural* dimension. It raises the question of how the past can be protected within today's landscape and passed on to future generations. This is why the Convention should form a major component of the EAC's concerns for archaeological heritage management. Protecting the landscape will of course also protect archaeological sites, but the main value of the Convention for archaeological heritage managers is that it gives opportunities to protect all aspects of the environment's material heritage.

Defining the archaeological significance of cultural landscape, and discovering and explaining long-term change, continuity and time-depth, is an archaeological task. Archaeologists understand the present landscape through longer-term narratives and explanations. Such a time-based understanding is essential for the sustainable protection, management and planning of cultural landscapes (see Castro *et al.* this volume) and the participation of archaeologists is necessary if the archaeology of cultural landscape is to be part of European

landscape policies. A discussion about the cultural landscape needs also to be a discussion about how new developments in landscape conservation could make a difference to the preservation and protection of the archaeological heritage itself. Indeed, archaeologists' use of a current landscape perspective might change aspects of the practice of archaeology itself. This volume demonstrates that the Convention's implementation will be flawed without the involvement of archaeologists.

Archaeologists of course are only some of the people who perceive landscapes. Almost everyone, consciously or not, creates a perception of their own landscape, from an infinite number of perspectives, not least the personal. This is an area again in which archaeologists have long had an interest, and the boundaries between archaeology and anthropology for example are fluid (Ucko & Layton 1999, with its suggestive subtitle 'Shaping your landscape'). It is, however, a difficult, contested, area to which archaeology has perhaps not fully adapted, and Gwyn, and Lee (this volume), describe two possible ways to approach this central aspect of cultural landscape.

A second significant aspect of the definition that needs to be recognised and acted upon lies in the phrase 'perceived by people'. This refers to a human, subjective response to landscape and to the archaeological heritage that it contains. 'Landscape' is not 'environment': it exists only when imagined, or interpreted - only when value, significance and meaning is attached to sites, deposits, buildings, hedges or any other built or human-modified aspect of the environment. This underlines the importance of an archaeological approach, because of archaeologists' familiarity with model-building and narrative-creation, and because of our long experience of using material remains to tell stories about the past, and through it, about the present. Therefore archaeologists can contribute to the Convention's desire to foster public awareness, interest and concern, and to establish and promote best practice through a European Landscape Prize awarded to local authorities.

Finally, the goal of this volume is to ensure that the archaeological heritage in the landscape is dealt with properly by sustainable planning and development. The clear policies and approaches to landscape protection and conservation that the Convention calls for, and the general principles that it promotes to secure the protection, sustainable management and sound landuse planning of landscape, need to be archaeologically sensitive. All of this will help to define and reinforce local identity, one of the Convention's starting points. The archaeological heritage should be at the centre of this endeavour as well.

The archaeology of cultural landscape
Landscape issues have been a concern of European and international policy for some time, but with a relatively low level of recognition of archaeological and historical

depth. Landscape's main champions to date have been nature conservationists, geographers and landscape architects (eg IUCN 1994; ICOMOS-Deutschland 1993; Ryszkowki *et al.* 1996; Bennett 1996; Hajós 1999). The European Environment Agency's guidance for collecting data for the agency's state of the environment report for the Environment Ministers' conference in Kiev in May 2003, for example, has nothing about archaeology in its chapter on Landscape or throughout the report (Wright & Russel2001).

The idea of landscape as being primarily natural has therefore dominated important documents such as the *Council of Europe's Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy* (Sofia October 1995). For example, the IUCN defines many categories of Protected Areas ranging from areas maintained as strict wilderness to managed resource areas (IUCN 1994). Almost all of the categories focus more or less exclusively on natural ecosystems, some of the principal exceptions being areas such as the very un-natural cultural landscapes of England's National Parks (fig.3.2). The IUCN's overall definition is of areas 'especially dedicated to the protection of biological diversity, and of natural and *associated* cultural resources': the italics are mine, to emphasise the secondary role that culture plays in the definition. None of the category definitions mention cultural or archaeological resources explicitly.

Some Protected Areas aim to preserve cultural as well as natural attributes, but most are focussed solely on natural value, sometimes to the extent of excluding modern human intrusion (eg biosphere reserves) and implicitly at least of excluding recognition of past human intrusion and landuse. The guiding principle of some Protected Areas philosophy and heritage management is to prevent further human change, and they often reject or overlook the impact of past human change.

For example, statements such as 'England was once a well forested country, but now only 7% of the land surface is covered by woodland and forest' (FNNP 1993) are not uncommon. Note particularly the use of the word 'once': more than a thousand years has passed in most of England (and over 3000 years in some regions) since there was extensive forest, and in that long period the landscape has been re-written and re-made several times (eg Roberts & Wrathmell 2000). Yet still there is a feeling among ecologists and landscape architects that woodland loss is a recent phenomenon that can easily be reversed (fig.3.3). It is as if the current distribution and extent of woodland is regarded as some sort of natural accident - the product of carelessness rather than the result of centuries conscious decisions, of human agency not environmental determinant (Fairclough 1999).

Thinking about cultural landscape needs to be much more sophisticated. Understanding will only really be enhanced when we persuade everyone to recognise that there is a longer and broader history of the landscape than that revealed by historical documents of the past few centuries. Additionally, the landscape may look natural but everywhere it has been crudely or subtly modified by people; whilst we could explain human action in the past purely in terms of environmental factors it is just as often the case that people have imposed cultural patterns on nature. Bio-diversity as we now value it in Europe is as much a cultural as a natural phenomenon, either by action or calculated passivity. Most of all, archaeology should try to persuade people that all of this culture in the landscape can often still be seen or appreciated and that it survives in many different ways as material culture, as heritage, the results of human environmental change to be enjoyed and learnt from.

Indeed, surely we need to celebrate change as perhaps the most dominant attribute and characteristic of the cultural landscape. In some ways, it can be argued that human change is more important in forming 'landscape' than geology or climate. Geology and climate determine the environment, but they do not determine 'landscape' because landscape is a social and cultural construct that uses things created in the past in physical terms but is created in the present in terms of ideas and perceptions. The concept of nature itself is of course a culturally constructed idea, existing only in opposition to (agri)culture. There have been many commendable attempts to bring together cultural (ie archaeological or historical) and natural (ie ecological and aesthetic) approaches to landscape, for example, in the discipline of landscape ecology, but they remain rare (eg Selman 1994).

In other words, it is crucial that the role of people in the past - that is, of people and the passage of time - is not under-valued during implementation of the European Landscape Convention. This is precisely what archaeologists can add to the concept of landscape.

Furthermore, landscape cannot only be viewed in terms of the tensions between nature and culture, as if the more natural a landscape was, the more important it is. Landscape is by definition a human, cultural creation. It is born of past human modification of the environment, and more importantly it only becomes landscape rather than environment when filtered through human perception and interpretation. Landscape is about viewpoints, in all senses of the word. Archaeology of the site-based kind tends to focus almost exclusively on the cultural, as does landscape archaeology. This rather misses an important point, that cultural landscape enshrines both culture and nature, not just in terms of understanding, but also in terms of valuing.

Nor should age really be seen as a pre-condition for a landscape to be considered significant, any more then 'natural-ness'. 'Natural' landscapes, undamaged and ancient landscapes, or 'wilderness' areas are not inherently

Fig. 3.2: An early 20th-century reservoir, Langdendale, Derbyshire, itself now valued for its landscape quality, has truncated earlier landscapes. Photo: Graham Fairclough.

more important than the recently changed or the new. It is perfectly feasible for very recent, highly modified and altered landscapes to be valuable and historically significant, such as, some of the large-scale prairies of post-1950 farming and other CAP-inspired agricultural intensification; even, perhaps, the landscape associated with collectivisation in Eastern Europe, 19th-century industrial landscapes and 20th-century military landscapes.

The creation of such landscapes cannot only be seen in terms of loss, although they do cause loss of course, particularly of archaeological remains and deposits (which is why landscape change needs to be monitored, managed and mitigated as does any other form of development). They can also be seen as gains: as the creation of new landscape types, as new layers in the archaeological cultural sequence. They will be studied by future archaeologists, but they can also be studied by archaeologists now: the social processes and anthropology of the later 20th century can be as legitimate a subject for archaeologists as the Bronze Age (and not necessarily more alien or opaque). All these are issues that lie at the heart of the landscape debate and that sit comfortably with the practice of archaeology and the interests of archaeologists - an acceptance and interest in change and its mechanisms; a reluctance to romanticise the past or to denigrate recent change, a wish to study and to learn (and then often to destroy through excavation) as well as to protect.

All of this should put archaeologists, who work daily with the concept of landscape change (usually in the past, but not necessarily only in a distant past, and perhaps even in the future, as Castro *et al.* paper, this volume, shows), firmly in the centre of the cultural landscape debate and moves to mange the landscape sustainably. More to the point, it promotes a mindset that regards cultural landscape management as being mainly about managing rather than preventing change (Fairclough forthcoming 2002). This volume considers variations on this theme.

Unfortunately, the word landscape is in danger of becoming devalued to the point of worthlessness. It is in almost constant use, both within archaeology and far-and-wide. We read in newspapers of the 'political landscape' within which politicians work, or we talk about the emotional landscape of a novel or a film. Without being distracted into a discussion about definition, we can recognise the fact that the word now carries a bewildering array of meanings even in archaeological circles, where it

is sometimes used merely to denote that an excavation or survey project covers a large area of ground. Use of the term nearly always involves a broadening of perspective, from a place or site to its wider context. 'Landscape archaeology' is usually related to settlement archaeology, to locate settlements in a broader economic, topographic and conceptual frame.

Broadly speaking, archaeologists approach landscape in two different ways, and both are represented in this volume. Both are necessary and appropriate to the interests of archaeologists, and on their own neither allow us to do our full job; the most successful archaeological landscape work combines both. It is important also to state that neither approach replaces any other archaeological approaches - we are looking here at extending the traditional sphere of archaeology, and complementing site-based work or the study of below ground deposits.

The first of the two approaches that archaeology takes at landscape scale is landscape history, which seeks to understand the countryside in some former state, for example by recreating the Bronze Age landscape, or (a more recent development of archaeology) through earlier peoples' eyes and minds, the cosmography of landscape. The second approach regards the landscape, that is today's countryside (or townscape) seen through people's perceptions, as being a single complex artefact with a long history of change and continuity. It uses archaeological methods and perceptions to understand it. It is this approach that is closest to the idea of cultural landscape, and which fits easily into a number of fields within which archaeologists are operating as the concept of *'applied archaeology'* (or socially-embedded' archaeology) finds wider acceptance. These include heritage conservation (archaeological or cultural resources management) and countryside and ecological management (each with their own analysis of the landscape). Community involvement in the local construction of what is significant (using the historic landscape to help build and sustain local community identity and sense of place) is also very important, and an area in which archaeologists would helpfully work more.

The increasing number of connections between these fields is one of the things that have brought cultural landscape onto the political and social agenda in the last 10 years or so.

The concept of cultural landscape brings together both natural and human factors and reflects the interactions between people and their natural environment over space and time. This includes the living component of the landscape, whether through biodiversity and semi-natural features, or whether through 'cultural' issues such as human life-styles, land-using processes, custom and tradition. Living features such as hedges forming part of historic field systems, or the distributions and pattern of ancient managed woodland, or even the patterns of land cover at regional scale, are all part of our evidence for landscape history, just as much as other archaeological resource, such as buried deposits or artefacts, or any other source of evidence such a historic maps. Understanding cultural landscape also needs an appreciation of the historic processes that have shaped the environment.

Fig. 3.3: An English rural landscape at Edlingham, Northumberland; the extent of woodland is largely the product of human factors such as the presence of hedgerows, settlements and railway embankments rather than environmentally determined. Photo: Graham Fairclough.

Cultural landscape is where archaeology, geography, history and anthropology can join together and build links to biodiversity, ecology and artistic/associative views of the world. One of the challenges is to bring together all these professions and the interests they represent, because land owners and managers see only a single landscape when they are planning their activities, and it is felt necessary to ensure that their monolithic view encompasses archaeology as an integral part of the cultural landscape. The *European Landscape Convention* offers one avenue for doing this, the views and practice of archaeologists offers another.

What archaeologists think about cultural landscape

There have been many recent conferences to explore both archaeological landscape and cultural landscape, and sessions on landscape have become *de rigeur* at most big archaeological conferences. Of particular relevance to the present volume, however, have been some recent sessions at The European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) conferences. In particular, two seminars have been organised by Jan-Kees Hagers and myself as part of the programme of EAA conferences in Bournemouth (1999) and Lisbon (2000). These had the specific aim of bringing together archaeologists in several different European countries to compare and contrast their approaches and experiences when dealing with the landscape as defined in the *European Landscape Convention.* Versions of some of the papers given then are included in the present volume.

A third session at the 2001 EAA conference in Esslingen organised by Dirk Meier and Charles Mount went on to present ongoing work. This included notably work within and related to the Culture 2000 programme 'European Pathways to the Cultural Landscape' (see Kraut, Nord Paullson, Darlington, and Ermischer this volume, www.pcl-eu.de) and InterReg EU projects such as LANCEWAD (Vollmer *et al.* 2001).

The Bournemouth and Lisbon conferences highlighted particularly the role of archaeologists in landscape work. Their efforts to preserve the cultural landscape exist with varying degrees of conviction and clarity in different parts of Europe. It is widely accepted that visible remains and even buried archaeological remains from the past give historical depth to the present landscape and thus contribute to its quality and identity. In some quarters, however, the most important concept that the whole landscape itself is an archaeological monument that needs to be treated as such, is only just starting to become widespread.

The two EAA conferences attempted to broaden debate. They were very well attended, with participants from about 20 different European countries, although with a northern European bias. There was lively discussion, which the EAC now hopes to take forward on a much broader front. In taking up the issues laid out in this volume, the EAC can realistically enlarge the debate about the archaeology of the landscape to the whole of Europe. Wider debate will encourage archaeology's integration into the heritage management of the landscape as a whole, the closer engagement of archaeology with cultural landscape issues, and the flowering of co-operation with workers in the field from other disciplines. EAC's decision to promote the issue of cultural landscape as a legitimate, indeed potentially central, aspect of archaeology and archaeological heritage management is particularly timely in the first year of the promotion of the *European Landscape Convention.*

Given that the modern landscape almost everywhere in Europe is humanly-created or has been greatly modified, archaeologists as stated earlier could play a fundamental role in the identification, characterisation and protection of the cultural landscape. The historic dimension of the landscape should motivate us to accept this role and to promote the appreciation, and management of the present landscape rather than only seeking to understand the past. To play this role it is necessary to broaden our view from the material and the physical to include the 'living' component.

Here lies a fundamental problem: the long-standing institutional separation between disciplines which exists in many European countries, perhaps symbolised in heritage management terms by the range of government departments and ministries across which responsibility for the landscape's use and management are spread. Whilst archaeology is usually the business of the culture ministry, the historic geographical elements of landscape, the 'living' components of the landscape mentioned earlier, are usually treated separately as part of the 'green environment' and are included in agriculture, nature conservation and landscape policies. These values are not claimed as part of the archaeological resource by archaeologists in every country, although the reasons for different perspectives are varied and sometimes country-specific.

It seems, therefore, necessary not only to broaden our view from the material to the living, but also to promote actively the integration of disciplines and the necessity for discipline-crossing, integrated approaches and policies. Recent work in the Netherlands (Hallewas and Beusekom this volume) is a perfect example of such an integrating process, which actually started at the beginning of the 1970s, but never found enough support to be implemented until very recently.

One of the main aims of this volume is to discuss, think and talk about what archaeologists can bring to the study, appreciation and protection of the cultural landscape particularly now that the Convention has placed it so strongly on the political and social agenda. Approaches differ considerably from country to country. This is partly

as a result of the different ways in which archaeology as a discipline has evolved across Europe. But it is often also a consequence of national policies, existing legislation and division of responsibilities.

Fundamental questions come to mind, such as whether archaeologists should approach the landscape holistically and integrally, regarding the whole landscape as an archaeological resource, keeping in mind that this could lead to conflicts of interests with other disciplines. Or, alternatively, whether archaeologists should define their responsibility as being restricted to conventionally archaeological aspects of the landscape heritage and to the process of studying, describing and assessing the landscape - to produce the best possible information and knowledge for others to use to take decisions about the landscape's future?

It can be claimed that because archaeologists are familiar with long-term change, and understand why the landscape has evolved as it has, they are among the best placed people to take a lead role in shaping the landscape of tomorrow. There is of course a further advantage for a growing and maturing profession in expanding its field of activity, especially into an area that will embed us more firmly into society.

Another basic aim of this volume is to establish a higher level of debate amongst archaeologists about cultural landscape. It is therefore perhaps useful to end this introductory paper by showing both the diversity and the unanimity of opinion among the profession, as an introduction to the present volume, which after all is designed to illuminate what Europe's archaeologists are already thinking and doing about the cultural landscape.

The following picture is drawn mainly from wide-ranging and lively discussions that took place during Cultural Landscapes sessions at the Bournemouth and Lisbon conferences of the European Association of Archaeologists in 1999 and 2000. It reflects some of the real and growing interest within the profession in landscape, building on, but travelling far beyond, traditional methods of landscape archaeology. It is organised in a simple set of headings; particularly noticeable is that much of the discussion took identification and understanding for granted and moved on to more difficult areas such as intangible character, and ways to achieve the sustainable management of something which is ever-changing and dynamic. It will be obvious how many of the issues raised are central concerns and aspirations of the *European Landscape Convention*.

Emotions and feelings: the intangible and the personal

There was a lot of agreement among archaeologists at the sessions that the idea of cultural landscape provides an opportunity, indeed a requirement, to take into account a range of intangible attributes. In particular, the strong personal element of the people living in the area should be central, even though this might be difficult to measure. Peoples' feelings about the landscape and its meaning, their emotional involvement in it, are as important in their way as the material aspects of a landscape. Such attitudes tend not to be part of the European archaeological landscape tradition in the same way as they are in indigenous contexts in Australia or Canada, for example, but they surely have a part to play.

It is widely felt by archaeologists that current landscape methodologies are largely 'top-down', if not bureaucratic, automatic or mechanistic, and concerned with scientific and expert views. There is a feeling that the appropriate archaeological methodologies for doing this have not yet been worked out. Visits to cultural landscapes (eg those put forward for World Heritage designation) can reveal the very strong, emotive and intuitive feelings that the people living in these places have for their landscape character. The term *lieu de memoire* perhaps encapsulates this, as does the word 'place': that an essential ingredient of a cultural landscape must be the strong *personal* element, something that cannot be measured.

Awareness and participation of the community

Arising from this is the need to involve people in defining the cultural aspects of landscape. This includes both those who live in an area and those who may visit or in some other way have a stake in its future. People should be given easy opportunities to contribute to information and understanding about an area of cultural landscape. Archaeologists should consider how their information could best be used to assist local communities in being aware of the character of their community's landscape, and to raise awareness of its history. This is the starting point to finding ways to look after it and to enhance it. Examples of how to do this include initiatives designed to identify local distinctiveness, for example through participation in spatial planning. Webpage-maps and free literature (for example, distributed house by house) could start discussion.

Discussions across the profession have begun to identify a few emerging examples of good - if immature - practice in these areas. Landscape character assessment work in Britain is beginning to involve local community consultation. This is in its infancy however, and still rather top-down, with experts defining character first and only then asking for local views. But it is starting to create a connection between what the 'experts' are trying to do and what communities are seeking for their own landscapes. In the Netherlands, where national government cannot implement spatial plans without consulting local people, inventorisation in Zuid-Holland was always checked locally in the community. This participation was mutual, and allowed everybody to come up with proposals.

Wider consultation and participation is starting to become more common, for example with World Heritage

management plans and nominations, as on Hadrian's Wall in England, where the process of participation brought a large number of farming, community and land-owning groups together constructively for almost the first time. Drawing up designations such as National Parks is also becoming more participatory, for example in Sciente, in Italy, where talking to everybody from the community was tremendously successful, and created real participation. Much progress is also being made in Wales, as David Gwyn's paper, in this volume, shows.

Participation is of course two-way. It can also help with informing local communities about the character of their landscapes, for example in relation to other areas. With initiatives like local distinctiveness, what sort of impressions are we getting back to communities, we should be raising awareness of the importance of the character of that community and in that way perhaps enhancing ways of looking after it.

In England, Historic Landscape Characterisation on GIS (Fairclough, Lambrick & Hopkins this volume) will shortly be available on local authority web-sites, linked to parish areas, and will be available to schools and libraries through this relatively new route. It is also hoped that another English project, in the Peak District, will experiment with creating a series of community areas with information about the character of each community published in a format that encourages local debate and re-writing. Lancashire HLC is finding a new audience through a European project (www.pcl-eu.de; see Darlington this volume).

The Ename project in Flanders every four months distributes 20,000 free copies of a journal to local houses, thus involving local people in the project. There is also a trend in the Netherlands to investigate what people are thinking about nature and cultural history. This adds questions on cultural issues to public opinion surveys, to allow people to indicate what they think is important. This is followed by multi-criteria analysis of how different experts valued different aspects of cultural history.

Archaeological sites in the landscape and their management

The ways in which the identification and management of the cultural landscape and of historic landscape character will help to protect individual sites and monuments (the conventional archaeological resource) needs further thought and research.

In Cornwall, in south-west England, the first historic landscape characterisation map produced is now used routinely in development control (Herring 1998). It is used for example to assess the routes of proposed pipelines, or the location of housing development. This helps to place such developments into areas of least potential or poor preservation, or to steer development into areas where landscape changes would have a less detrimental impact. It is also starting to be used as a predictive tool, explaining where archaeological sites are most likely to exist, and what their level of survival might be.

Part of environmental conservation and management
A landscape-scale approach will allow archaeological resource management to be more readily seen as an integral part of overall, mainstream environmental concerns. As a planning instrument, for example, it will make relations with other disciplines stronger. Ecologists, landscape architects and planners for example, will be given something that they find easier to understand than 'hard' archaeology and something that is more familiar territory to them. In England, historic landscape characterisation was consciously invented to use the same language as landscape architects.

What kind of instruments and methods should be developed? At present, a practical process of conservation has not yet been defined. We know how to analyse the landscape, but we are less sure of what to do with the results apart from using them in the spatial planning process. Modern Geographic Information Systems make generalised time depth analysis possible, but detailed information is sometimes still missing, and it is not clear how detailed information can be communicated to planners and others. It is also important that the limits of the information are understood by users, and that landscape assessments are kept up to date. The maps always contain a certain state of archaeological knowledge, for example, which must affect how they are used.

Evaluation

Understanding a cultural landscape archaeologically, and defining its historic landscape character, requires many approaches: deciding what makes up landscape character, understanding the history of an area, appreciating the full extent of its archaeology, plotting the distribution of its elements and defining the types of elements. Is this enough? Can such an understanding, constantly changing as it will, be fed directly into decisions about land management and landuse? Or is another stage needed, one of evaluation, to single out particular areas for special treatment, or to guide priorities for limited resources of expertise and funds?

There are deep differences of opinion among practitioners on this topic, within individual countries as well as across Europe. Some intentionally do not do evaluations and others do very explicitly. The timing and purpose of evaluation also varies. Practice in some countries, whether through political pressure or professional choice, requires explicit advance evaluation of areas of landscape (eg The Netherlands or Denmark); elsewhere (for example the character-based approach in England) there is more emphasis on differentiating value only when assessing the impact of specific proposed

change. A country's approach will inevitably reflect the nationally-specific character of its planning and conservation laws, and the stage that the development of ideas and resources has reached.

The European Landscape Convention is again relevant here. It clearly promotes the conservation of all areas of landscape, the everyday and ordinary as well as the special, on the democratic grounds that all landscape is the setting for someone's life, and on the environmental grounds that sustainable landuse is a necessary goal everywhere. This would argue against evaluating landscapes in order to pick out special areas for special treatment compared to the rest, yet of course there are still real issues of priorities and targets for conservation. From some perspectives certain areas can be seen to be more important archaeologically than others. Nevertheless, selective tools are primitive and the European Landscape Convention holds out the hope of more sophisticated, inclusive and wider-ranging approaches.

Characterisation work also defines types of landscape and their distribution. This needs to be able to help with pro-active planning. A first need here is to inform those working in planning departments who are not archaeologists. There is one strong school of thought that insists that planners should be given answers - told what is more valuable and what its quality's are and what can we do with it. Conversely, however, historic landscape character exists everywhere, differentiating one area from another. It is perhaps its total character that deserves protection, and an equally strong school of thought argues therefore that planners, for example, should merely be afforded access to better information about the whole resource, and given help in using it wisely as and when it is needed, rather than being 'spoon-fed' simplified selections of the 'best' bits.

In Britain, a distinction is now being drawn, notably in landscape assessment and elsewhere in general archaeological resource management, between characterisation and decision making. It is at the later stage that evaluation seems most useful, but this is evaluation against a whole range of attributes, using information from existing characterisation studies to measure character against impact everywhere not just in pre-selected areas. Such contributions by archaeologists to decision making needs to be not just at the development control stage but earlier, when strategic spatial plans are being drawn up for democratic acceptance by communities and government.

Using the historic landscape characterisation map in Cornwall has changed the way the planners think. Fewer of them now want selected areas defined by red lines as being important; instead they recognise that everything has some value and significance to a community or to individuals, and that it is that significance everywhere that needs consideration. The map opened planners' eyes to why local distinctiveness was of value, provided them with a framework to support more detailed local conservation work and provided a further level of explanation about the character of an area. It therefore has a role in raising awareness, among people as well as planners. Previously official-planning maps had shown small parts of the Cornish landscape as being culturally important, but had ignored the rest, including areas where most people lived. Changing this round really changes peoples' minds and ideas.

Living landscape

There is a particular difficulty with protecting or preserving landscape character where the activities that created it - notably traditional types of farming and landuse - no longer take place. Is it possible to find surrogate or proxy forms of land management to maintain aspects of character and appearance when a landscape cannot be managed 'naturally' ? When the economy of communities collapse, their landscape will change. Can we justify managing a landscape artificially, for example by European subsidy, to maintain it as it is?

More broadly, it is felt by most archaeologists that the idea of cultural landscape has the concept of change (in the future as well as in the past) at its very heart. The idea that there are any landscapes where time has stood still, and history has ended, is very strange. No landscape, whether urban or rural, has stopped its evolution, no landscape is relict: it is all continuing and ongoing; even if the environment (the physical part of 'landscape') is static, people's reactions to it will change (see the recent interest in preserving Cold War landscapes such as the Berlin Wall fragments or the cruise missile shelters at USAF Greenham Common). The decision that each generation, including archaeologists has to make, is what will happen next to the landscape, and how it will be managed or changed.

What archaeologists can bring to the debate about the future of landscapes is their understanding of what has happened in the past and why a landscape is as it is. This is a necessary prelude to thinking about how it should evolve in future. Issues such as long-term settlement location, or the complex sequence of successive landscape re-planning through time that are often still legible in the field, or the rate of change, are all accessible through the analysis of time-depth by landscape characterisation. This provides a first step towards looking at where change might be directed in the future. Many archaeologists suggest that this way of looking at landscape could help us with the move from a reactive to a proactive system of planning. It also makes it easier to bring together in debate all of the different groups who want to manage the landscape.

There was general agreement at the conferences that the most difficult challenge to protecting cultural landscape lie in the disappearance of the established

Fig.3.4: Alentejo, Portugal, this 'natural' landscape has in fact been a highly managed wood-pasture over many centuries. It may be changed entirely in character by the disappearance of traditional farming methods, or by flooding behind dams. Photo: Graham Fairclough.

management activities that created landscape character (eg Szpanowski this volume). Can 'traditional' activity be replaced by 'artificial' management, for example by putting sheep onto a hill to graze it, not for the economic value but to have nice pretty hills, or by continuing to coppice ancient woodland long after the commercial justification has gone. When do we accept that historic processes have stopped, and recognise that we need to create a new environment with new character? In some parts of Europe (including southern France, Spain and Portugal, the western Isles of Scotland, upland England and Wales) the problem of disappearing farming is, or threatens, to change the character of cultural landscape severely (fig3.4). One answer is for European farming subsidies to be targeted on environmental benefits not production (eg *Ty Gofal* in Wales, the Stewardship agri-environmental programmes in England, Foley this volume), but for how long and to what degree? Do farmers want that sort of job? How will culture, as opposed to landscape, alter? Perhaps we can keep abandoned landscapes but not the communities to protect them.

In short, why are we trying to preserve landscape? Is it for the biodiversity and ecology (if so, what happens to the most humanly changed areas such as industrial landscapes?), is it to keep those areas that are thought by the majority to be beautiful? Are we trying to protect and maintain the 'traditional' activities that made the current landscape what it is (in which case, what happens to earlier, older layers of the landscape)? Or are we concerned to protect the end product of those activities, in which case we can use artificial means to do this - grass cutting by hand not by sheep. What happens when agriculture and farming in a region stops? How do we use the understanding of the cultural landscape that we are starting to gain as archaeologists? What are we going to do next?

This volume does not of course answer any of these questions, but through case studies and accounts of experience it offers a few signposts for the first part of the journey, signposts to follow with the map *of the European Landscape Convention* in our hand.

References

Council of Europe 1995: *Recommendation R(95)9 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the integrated conservation of cultural landscape areas as part of landscape policies.* Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe 2000: *European Landscape Convention.* European Treaty Series No. 176. Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Countryside Agency 1999: *The Countryside Character of England,* volume 4 *East Midlands* (CA10), volume 5 *West Midlands* (CA11), volume 6 *The East* (CA12), volume 7 *South East* (CA13), vol 8 *South West* (CA14). Countryside Agency, Cheltenham.

Countryside Commission 1996: *Views From the Past - Historic Landscape Character in the English Countryside,* CCW4. Countryside Commission, Cheltenham.

Countryside Commission 1998: *The Countryside Character of England,* vol 1 *North East* (CCP535), vol 2 *North West* (CCP536), vol 3 *Yorkshire and the Humber* (CCP537). Countryside Commission, Cheltenham.

Darvill, T. 1993: Heritage Landscape Sites - an introduction to the work of the Group of Experts, in ICOMOS-Deutschland 1993, pp 27-29

Fairclough, G J, 1999b: Protecting the Cultural Landscape - national designations and local character in Grenville, J, 1999, 27-39

Fairclough, G. J., Lambrick, G. & McNab, A. 1999: *Yesterday's World, Tomorrow's Landscape - the English Heritage Historic Landscape Project 1992-94.* English Heritage, London.

Fairclough, G.J., forthcoming (2002): Cultural landscape, sustainability and living with change? in the proceedings of the US/ ICOMOS 4th International Symposium, *Managing Change: sustainable approaches to the conservation of the built environment,* April 5-8, 2001, Philadelphia.

FNNP (Federation of Nature and National Parks of Europe) 1993: *Loving them to death?: sustainable tourism in Europe's Nature and National Parks.* FNNP, Grafernau.

Grenville, J. (ed) 1999: *Managing the Historic Rural Environment.* Routledge and English Heritage, London.

Hajós, G. (ed.) 1999: *Denkmal- Ensemble - Kulturlandschaft am Beispiel Wachau.* Beiträge Internationales Symposon vom 12. bis 15. Oktober 1998 Dürnstein (Österreich), Wien.

Herring, P. 1998: *Cornwall's Historic Landscape. Presenting a method of historic landscape character assessment.* Cornwall Archaeology Unit and English Heritage, Cornwall County Council, Truro.

ICOMOS-Deutschland 1993: *Historische Kulturlandschaften,* Deutschen Nationalkommittee von ICOMOS, Hefte des Deutsches National Kommittee XI conference 10-17 May 1992 Cologne.

IUCN 1994: *Parks for Life: action for Protected Areas in Europe.* CNPPA (The IUCN Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas, IUCN (World Conservation Union), Gland.

Priore, R. forthcoming: *The European Landscape Convention, in proceedings of the International Conference "Europe, a Common Heritage - The Cultural Landscape"* held in Oxford on 3-5 May 2000, organised by ICOMOS-UK in co-operation with the University of Oxford, National Trust.

Roberts, BK & Wrathmell, S, 2000: *An Atlas of Rural Settlement in England.* English Heritage, London.

Ryszkowki, L, Pearson, G & Balazy, S (eds) 1996: *Landscape Diversity: a chance for the rural community to achieve a sustainable future* (second Pan European seminar on rural landscape, Poznan 25-30 September 1995) (Research Centre for Agricultural and Forest Environment and the Polish Academy of Science).

Selman, P. 1994: *The Ecology and Management of Cultural Landscapes* (proceedings of an IALE UK conference at Cheltenham 1993 published - Landscape Issues vol 11 No 1).

Ucko, P.J. & Layton, R. 1999: *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Shaping your landscape* (eds). One World Archaeology 30 (papers from the 1994 World Archaeology Congress, New Delhi). Routledge, London.

Wright, K., & Russel, C. 2001: Data collection guidelines for the Kiev Report, *Technical report no. 66.* European Environmental Agency, Copenhagen (http://reports.eea.eu.int/technical_report_2001_66/en).