Europ. Countrys. · 2· 2012 · p. 89-100
DOI: 10.2478/v10091-012-0016-5

INTRODUCTION FOR LIVING IN AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPES: PRACTICE, HERITAGE AND IDENTITY

Anu Printsmann[1], Alexandra Kruse[2], Michael Roth[3]

Received 27 August 2011; Accepted 23 March 2012

Abstract: This is an introduction into a compilation of selection of papers presented in a special session Living in Agricultural Landscapes: Practice and Heritage organised by EUCALAND-(European Culture expressed in Agricultural Landscapes)-Network at the 24th session of PECSRL (The Permanent European Conference for the Study of the Rural Landscape) Living in Landscapes: Knowledge, Practice, Imagination held in Riga and Liepāja, Latvia from 23-27 August 2010. Agricultural landscapes that form considerable share of European countryside witness similar problems from Russia to France, from Iceland and Ireland to Hungary yet the conceptualisations of heritage, development paths of its legal framework etc. are different, although the wish to maintain identities is similar. A proposal for a typological classification of European agricultural landscapes is introduced to enhance common planning approach.

Key words: agricultural landscape, practice, heritage, identity, classification, ELC, planning

Zusammenfassung: Der folgende Text ist die Einführung in eine Auswahl von Vorträgen, die auf der Speziellen Sektion „Leben in der Agrarlandschaft: Praxis und Erbe“, organisiert durch das EUCALAND-Netzwerk (Europäische Kultur im Spiegel der Agrarlandschaft) auf der 24. PECSRL-Konferenz (Ständige Europäische Konferenz für das Studium der Ländlichen Landschaft): „Leben in Landschaften: Wissen, Praxis, Vorstellung“ in Riga und Liepāja, Lettland vom 23.-27. August 2010 vorgetragen wurden. Agrarlandschaften stellen einen wichtigen Teil der Europäischen Landschaft und teilen die gleichen Probleme, von Russland bis Frankreich, von Island bis Irland und Ungarn. Die Konzepte für Erbe, Entwicklung sowie ihre rechtliche Verankerung sind zwar unterschiedlich, doch der Wunsch nach dem Erhalt der Identität ist der gleiche. Ein Vorschlag für eine typologische Klassifizierung der europäischen Agrarlandschaften als Grundlage für einen gemeinsamen Planungsansatz wird eingeführt.

[1] Anu Printsman, Centre for Landscape and Culture, Estonian Institute of Humanities, Tallinn University, Uus-Sadama 5, 10120 Tallinn, Estonia; e-mail: anu.printsmann@tlu.ee

[2] Alexandra Kruse, PhD., EUCALAND Network at Bureau for Landscape & Services, Fuchskaule 10, D-51491 Overath, Germany; e-mail: info@eucalandnetwork.eu

[3] ipl.-Ing. Michael Roth, Dortmund University of Technology, School of Spatial Planning, Chair of Landscape Ecology and Landscape Planning, August-Schmidt-Straße 10, 44227 Dortmund, Germany; e-mail: michael.roth@udo.edu

Schlüsselwörter: Agrarlandschaft, Praxis, Erbe, Identität, Klassifikation, Europäische Landschaftskonvention, Planung

1. Introduction

European countryside is synonymous with rural area, main part of which is (or has been) shaped by agriculture. Agricultural pre-urban past influences also most of European cities (Fairclough 2010a: 117). EUCALAND-Network is a new expert network that deals with the agricultural landscapes of Europe for promoting their consideration and use among their people and preserving their cultural heritage[4]. EUCALAND stands for EUropean Culture expressed in Agricultural LANDscapes.

The reason for choosing the term agricultural landscape above agrarian landscape, agri-landscape and agro-landscape is that it defines best the centuries long shaping of land for food cultivation – to include the word "cultural" and downplay stress on economics, technical business, industrial production and environmental issues so prominent in 20th as well as 21st century (Kruse et al. 2010: 100, 103, 106, 115). In Finno-Ugric languages (like Estonian – *põllumajandus* and Hungarian – *mezőgazdaság*) agriculture is literally field-economy or economy of fields (Centeri 2010: 3, Kruse et al. 2010: 100). And landscape itself as a word and concept has various backgrounds that can be understood in respective historic and linguistic contexts (Jones 1991, Palang et al. 2006).

Agricultural landscape (Kruse et al. 2010: 103, Velarde et al. 2010a: 49, 2010b: 11) is a landscape which is strongly related to past and present agricultural activity, which may contain some of these elements:

1. farmland, cultivated land, grasslands, meadows,
2. horticulture, viticulture, olive trees, fruit trees,
3. small infrastructure elements, roads, agricultural buildings, farmhouses, agrarian settlements,
4. ditches, stone walls, terraces,
5. vegetation structures, green corridors, hedges,
6. patches of forest and single trees within an agricultural context,
7. remains and relicts of past agricultural activity.

Agricultural landscape is a by-product of agricultural activities as nobody sets out to create it. Still, the result of unconscious intentionality of few causes appreciation and enjoyment for many. As agricultural landscapes have been rapidly changing because of political, economic, social and cultural alterations – transition into post-productivist societies – there is a need to raise awareness concerning heritage. Every innovation becomes once a heritage; what is not functional and purposeful any more will decay, with few exceptions. Landscape quality can contribute to human health (Ulrich 1984), well-being and quality of life in general (Council of Europe 2000: preamble).

On this background EUCALAND-Network set up a special session Living in Agricultural Landscapes: Practice and Heritage on 26th of August 2010 in Liepāja at the 24th session of The Permanent European Conference for the Study of the Rural Landscape (PECSRL) Living in Landscapes: Knowledge, Practice, Imagination held in Riga and Liepāja, Latvia from 23-27 August 2010. Following the successful special session in 2008 at PECSRL in Óbidos, Portugal on how European culture expresses in agricultural landscapes, we wanted to focus more on people living their everyday life in agricultural landscapes and dealing with heritage[5].

[4] http://www.eucalandnetwork.eu
[5] For more information on meetings, projects etc. please see the networks homepage: www.eucalandnetwork.eu.

2. The scope of the papers

In the call for papers of Living in Agricultural Landscapes: Practice and Heritage we aimed at understanding, e.g.:

1. How and why the people of Europe appreciate agricultural landscapes?
2. What is perceived as heritage in agricultural landscapes by different demographic and interest groups (local and lay people vs. experts (by no means uniform entities); local, regional, national and global policies)?
3. What people do to create, maintain and destroy heritage in agricultural landscapes?
4. How approaches towards heritage in agricultural landscapes have altered?
5. Do different support mechanisms create new heritage?
6. Possibility to sustain heritage in agricultural landscapes within nature conservation areas.
7. What happens to agricultural heritage in urban sprawl circumstances?

Overall, there were 10 presentations in the special session, five of which are included by editors Alexandra Kruse and Michael Roth to this special issue. The spatial scale ranges from Russia to France, from Iceland and Ireland to Hungary. Yet, the problems remain the same: rural population decline, aging, unemployment, poverty, abandonment, loss of traditions and biodiversity, lowering quality of life in terms of accessibility of services for the remaining, divergences of opinions for future management plans, lack of co-operation between local stakeholders and higher level administrative-institutional-legislative structures, pollution, soil degradation and erosion, commercialisation, changed way of life – some of which can be turned into opportunities.

As we asked for theoretically informed papers based on empirical research, preferably on comparative or European-wide context you do not find very specific case studies here but rather contemplations and some historiography on heritage in agricultural landscapes of respective countries.

In Russia's case, what is always overwhelming is the scale: 4 million square kilometres of agricultural lands, 38 million people in 150 000 rural settlements, within last 20 years the occupation of rural population in agriculture has dropped from 50 to 30% (see Semenova this issue). The specific problems of transition from centrally planned economy are familiar all over Eastern Europe (see e.g. Gelencsér et al. this issue about "heavy" heritage of cooperatives hindering development), most notably the lagging behind legal framework and inability of local co-operation and self-governance due to mistrust. Although, as Bailoni et al. (this issue) explain, the laws and wider understanding concerning heritage in France are also quite recent.

In Russian, like in many other Eastern European languages (see Palang et al. 2006), the newly adopted (from 1990s onward) Western concept of cultural landscape causes misunderstandings, as the notion of landscape is still deeply influenced by approaches of physical geography and complex territorial (regional) planning. It seems that German originated ландшафт (*landschaft*) in Russian is more spread than French пейзаж (*paysage*) that interestingly bares more of the connotation of picturesque quality. Fascinatingly, Semenova (this issue) brings forth that in the mid-19th century *Landschaft* was translated from German into Russian as земство[6] ('zemstvo') – the rural or provincial society with the authorised territorial self-management quite like the self-governing entities in Northern and Central Europe before the Renaissance (see Olwig's explanation on the double nature of landscape – social law and justice as opposed to scenery – from his seminal works of 1996, 2002a and b). Some TOSes – территориальное общественное самоуправление ('territorial'noe obschestvennoe

[6] Земство = земля ('zemlja') earth, land + suffix '-stvo'. Suffix -stvo is also appearing in words like (домашнее) хозяйство – (domestic) household (whereas хозяин – master (owner), host, (land)lord, governor of property), коллективное хозяйство or short колхоз – collective farm or short kolkhoz/kolhoz, советское хозяйство or short совхоз – soviet (state-owned) farm or short sovkhoz

samoupravlenie') – territorial public self-governments or territorial self-management bodies as 'community-based' organisations dealing also with landscape and heritage issues without comprehensive legislative, scientific and financial support – have been spontaneously emerged since 1990s; some of them have no legal statute, others are registered formal non-governmental organisations. Semenova (this issue) claims that legislative sphere still refers mainly to поселение ('poseleniya') settlements not to сообщество or община ('soobschestva' or 'obschiny') communities, which is an obvious legacy of the soviet period with the artificial separation of the management (top-down) and civic (bottom-up) culture (compare Gelencsér et al. this issue). Also Puolamäki (this issue) finds a clash between universalist expert science vs. relative local practices in Iceland and Finland, despite the fact that some experts do apply local practical knowledge.

All of the papers in this issue touch upon centre-periphery dichotomy (see also Renes 2010a: 78, 81, 2010b: 13) although from rather different angles. Puolamäki (this issue) writes on how the cultural landscape of Reykholtsdal in the western part of Iceland has sustained since middle ages, only "cottage fields" have emerged on outer rim at the northern hill zone. Bailoni et al. (this issue) try to define peri-urban in France finding the middle ground in thirdspace (*tiers-espace*) (see Meeus and Gulinck 2008, Soja 1996). Neo-rural population treasures heritage more nearby cities and towns where there can be found more finances for authenticity (see Fairclough 2010a: 117 on shallow past of the past two or three centuries in "traditional landscapes" , also Elerie and Spek 2010, Renes 2011). Gelencsér et al. (this issue) prove with the example of Koppány Valley, Hungary that in poorer areas agricultural enterprises are dominant and the access to public services is limited. In Russia (Semenova this issue) during the imperial society the centre was sacred, highly cultivated opposing the vast exploited but neglected periphery; during totalitarian regime marginal areas were seen as nature waiting to be conquered by a man, the "virgin" lands; the same applies to soviet rural and provincial areas – they were treated as obsolete, retarded "no-man" territories free for non-rational usage of natural resources in the way to the more "progressive" urban social space. This leads to a situation in which the living heritage of traditional communities in un- or under-developed regions needs preservation and development simultaneously. Abandonment and animal husbandry cessation in remote upland causes loss in biodiversity (Gelencsér et al. and O'Rourke and Kramm this issue). The well-being of a landscape comes down to social factors and state or European Union support. Many farmers continue to hold productivist values while taking advantage of incentives for post-productivist farming practices. Yet, as O'Rourke and Kramm (this issue) show, many farmers continue with agriculture against all odds (sense of belonging in Buchecker 2010).

Bailoni et al. and Puolamäki (this issue) show how heritage has its roots in hereditary affairs – inter-generational communication that we now understand more as sustainability – both of which are problematised in Hungarian case (see Gelencsér et al. this issue). Semenova (this issue) shows that oral regulations and traditions in the community via maintained cultural environment and transfer of knowledge from the older generation to young people is vanishing and the lack of operational documents for both spatial and cultural management at the local level is hindering heritage maintenance. Although the concept in the condition of "heritage frenzy" has widened to include little heritage (*petit patrimoine*) and even landscapes, Bailoni et al.'s (this issue) approach largely remains on tangible side of heritage controversially to Puolamäki (this issue) who shows how intangible heritage of natural objects guides planning in Iceland.

Thus, all of the papers stress the distinctive role of heritage whether in personal, family, local, regional, national or European level identity construction (see Stobbelaar and Pedroli 2011 on landscape identity). How can we promote the idea?

3. Identity and identification

Agricultural landscapes are a very important and obvious part of common European heritage and identity – manifold interwoven in history but nevertheless with national, regional and also local characteristics. Landscapes are never produced locally; they are always influenced by external ideas, technologies, policies, the fashion of travelling around the world, sometimes faster,

sometimes slower but the application of these “foreign” ideas into a local context with local know-hows etc. generates different landscapes (see e.g. Kizos and Koulouri 2010). Globalisation (see special issue on Reassessing Landscape Drivers and the Globalist Environmental Agenda in Landscape Research 36 (4) 2011, special issue on Landscape Change and Rural Development in Landscape Research 35 (6) 2010) in terms of climate change (Dockerty et al. 2005, 2006, Seabrook et al. 2011, Sheppard 2005, Tschakert et al. 2011, Wadsworth and Swetnam 1998) may be daunting but also offering positive solutions like renewable energy production (see special issue on Landscapes of Energies in Landscape Research 35 (2) 2010). It is believed by many that Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) tends to unify (not to say banalise) landscapes (figure 1), and that there is a need to balance it out with counter-policy to keep typicality/uniqueness and preserve identities (Blacksell 2010, Primdahl and Swaffield 2010). Now over decade old and much debated (see e.g. Jones 2007, Jones et al. 2007, Jones and Stenseke 2011, Olwig 2007) European Landscape Convention (ELC, Council of Europe 2000) is rather vague.

Fig 1. Some areas of Europe get more and more equalised/marginalised – due to production measures, trade pressures but also because of CAP regulations, which do often not consider the national, sometimes even regional characteristics. Galgahévíz, Hungary, showing intensive arable land with its effects: water, wind and tillage erosion (photo by C. Centeri, February 2008).

The Eucaland Project devised a pan-European agricultural landscape typological classification to safeguard heritage. We can (and will) protect only what we know! Therefore, the identification, what is there, is necessary.

There are enough top-down European maps based on some indicators on which individual countries do not recognise themselves. On the other hand, bottom-up approach has the disadvantages of too much detail, time and other resources consuming, landscapes rapidly changing, offering no generalisations. Joining national classifications would not create a European map. Comparative studies are complicated to conduct and meet difficulties in financing. A fifth way was needed for interpretative characterisation of agricultural landscape as a whole not land use, land cover or settlement pattern. Therefore a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches were used in landscape histories (Renes 2010b: 13) as well as in classification (Fairclough 2010a, b)[7].

[7] The following chapter is based on Fairclough (2010a) if not indicated otherwise

The term of agricultural landscape is here as a shorthand for “the contribution of agriculture to present perceptions of landscape”. Most synthesis of what is known about the history and time depth of landscape has been made only at the national or even local level (there are few notable exceptions like Emanuelsson (2009) and Grove and Rackham (2001)).

Another challenge of working at the European scale is taking account of national or regional names of landscape types. In various locations across Europe some landscape types are denoted with a term that is rather untranslatable (e.g. the French *bocage* (see Kruse et al. 2010: 108), the Spanish *dehesa* (see Kruse et al. 2010: 106-107), or the Portugese *montado* (see Kruse et al. 2010: 117) or the German *Waldhufenflur.* (The latter means a special, planned way of creating linear, very regular fields with or without settlement, out of forest.) This is one of the reasons alongside assurance that all the partners would understand the terms in the same way, why Eucaland Project started with a Glossary on Agricultural Landscapes (see Kruse et al. 2010). The meaning of names may have relict qualities, expressing the long-lasting human-environmental relationship and therefore have tremendous importance for heritage and identity. But when we describe these landscapes, we discover that processes behind creating these landscapes are not too different as Renes (2010a: 78-80) has lately explained, only dependent on local conditions such as material, soil, etc. and thus typological classification conjoining specific landscapes may become possible. Therefore, from a European perspective, it might become possible to compare and classify *dehesas*, *montados* (see Kruse et al. 2010: 106-107, 117) and wooded meadows together – finding unity in diversity.

The making of the classification was painstaking (see Fairclough 2010a, b) as it had to meet several principles:

1. focus on the human subjective (perception and interpretation) landscape values (emotional and amenity) as environmental structure (soil, altitude and climatic factors) is satisfactorily mapped already,
2. focus on cultural response and historical dimension as most of the economic perspective is covered by the CAP,
3. consider historic processes and dynamism of development, land use and management, social function and infrastructure,
4. find common aspects of holistic landscapes not single features, objects, elements, components or aspects,
5. detailed enough to express the variety of European agricultural landscapes,
6. coarse enough to be feasible on a pan-European scale,
7. enlargeable so that further countries can join and apply the classification,
8. use as much existing information material as possible and be hopefully mappable at several scales,
9. giving it a structure that allows further refinement, etc.

After long discussions, a practical set of seven attributes was formed as a basis for data-gathering (table 1) based on which a hierarchical classification of 10 classes and 50 types (with possible sub-types) was formed (Fairclough 2010a: 122-123, 2010b: 16).

Identity	**Pattern**	**Process**	**Change**	**Spatial Relationship**	**Social Organisation**	**Topography**
"A word, a name"	"An aspect"	"A farming system"	"A history"	"A connection"	"A human system"	"A basis, a background"
Tradition, value	Form, morphology	Function, practice, method	Time, maturity, change through time	Space, high level patterns	Social, people, settlement patterns, building types	Physical geography
What people call it	What it looks like	Why it looks like that	What has happened	What it is connected with	What society it reflects	Background scenery
Open field agriculture; Champagne	Large, lowland, intensively used open land Strip fields No boundary fences/ walls Cultivation mosaic	Arable/ ploughed land Rotations Fallow land	Long term agriculture Medieval origin	Grassland, meadows Manuring and soil sweetening	Nucleated villages Different forms of village types related to organisation of agricultural cultivation	Undulating lowlands
...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Tab 1. Data emerging attributes (first row) with explanation and resulting landscape types with characteristics (compiled by M. Roth after Fairclough 2010a: 123).

The 10 classes are (Fairclough 2010a: 126-128, 2010b: 16):

1. open fieldscapes,
2. enclosed landscapes,
3. modernised fieldscapes,
4. grazing,
5. wood pasture,
6. terraced landscapes,
7. drained land,
8. irrigated land,
9. arboriculture and viticulture,
10. non-agricultural.

The classification is emergent, provisional and tentative needing further refinement in including agricultural practices operating on inter-territorial or non-areal scales such as transhumance, droving or other long distance inter-relationships of even pre-industrial market economies (Fairclough 2010b: 16).

Classes and types (table 2) have been given brief descriptions (see Fairclough 2010a: 130-145) with the aim to capture both their overall essence or flavour and their heterogeneity. Landscapes are "profiled" with four questions (Fairclough 2010a: 129, 2010b: 16):

1. What does it look like, why is it distinctive (Pattern)?

2. Why does it look like that (Process)?
3. What is/was it connected with (Spatial Relationship)?
4. What has happened to it (Change)?

These questions highlight the shared characteristics of agricultural landscapes across Europe, with emphasis on the (material) presence of history and perception of lay people as well as experts.

Class	Type	Descriptive keywords	Naming keywords
1 Open fieldscapes	Open arable fields	Ploughed, rotation, fallow, medieval, recent	Open fields, Champagne, Champion
	Open mixed	Ploughed, rotation, fallow, grazing, orchard, woodland, medieval, recent, modern	Open fields, *coltura promiscua*
	Strip fields	Open, ploughed, fallow, rotation, strips, inter-mixed, medieval, recent	Common open fields
	Forest fields*	Open, forest, fields, medieval, recent, modern	Taiga, southern taiga
2 Enclosed fieldscapes	Enclosed grazing*	Enclosures, pasture, medieval, recent	*Bocage*, enclosures, ancient countryside
	Mixed enclosed fields	Enclosures, ploughed, pasture, orchard, woodland, medieval, recent, modern	*Bocage*, *coltura promiscua*, enclosures, ancient countryside
	Partly-enclosed fields	Some enclosures, ploughed, orchard, pasture, woodland, recent, modern	Semi-*bocage*, *coltura promiscua*
...	...	...	...

Tab 2. The example of the emerging European agricultural landscape typological classification. Types marked with an asterisk (*) fall into more than one class (Fairclough 2010a: 126).

"It is not claimed that this classification breaks a great deal of new ground [see e.g. Wascher 2005]. But the classification can be claimed to be the most historically, archaeologically and culturally sensitive classification at this scale that yet exists. It shows how landscape might be drawn away from its traditional focus on the natural and the topographic, on biodiversity and scenery, towards a more cultural, people-centred construction such as that promoted by the ELC" (Fairclough 2010a: 146).

It is hoped that this kind of classification would raise awareness of both the problem and the potential of landscape classification among lay people as well as trans-national researchers.

Maybe the most valuable outcome of the classification is not the typology but the grasping of variations in how landscape is understood in different countries. It also opens perspectives on what "landscape as common heritage" might mean in ELC for example.

Since the classification is partial and flawed EUCALAND-Network will continue its upgrading and elaboration as models of landscape at pan-European scale are essential tools if knowledge about the past is to influence spatial planning, agriculture, landscape policy and management practice in the 21st century.

4. Planning practice for future heritage

In order to keep the knowledge and to receive better results in planning and politics, but also in protecting heritage, the following is necessary:

1. a collection of best-practice examples, which are nationally and internationally transferrable and communicable to the wider public,
2. a Europe-wide awareness raising process through participation, information, dialogue and public workshops,
3. improvement of information and participation processes in order to attract the people and ensure acceptance of the concepts developed,
4. an integration of sectorial, institutional and administrational levels in scientific and planning activities,

5. a profound dissemination of knowledge on preservation, protection and integrative management of landscape resources,
6. campaigns for consciousness, especially in tourism and traditional crafts.

Cooperation between the different groups (landscape planners, scientists, politicians, administrative bodies and lay persons) that are already active in agricultural landscape domain is also essential. Cooperation is also a tool for better inter- and intra-ministerial and regional coordination and cooperation on different levels: national, EU, international. The initiation of (new) partnerships between agriculture and forestry, tourism and nature protection is necessary. The protection of natural and cultural landscapes together can secure and improve added value in rural areas and thus lead to sustainable rural development (Steiner 2010).

Typological classification of European agricultural landscapes enables common planning that might be lost within national and regional initiatives. We mean here a common approach (scenarios, goals, guidelines, measures, monitoring (see e.g. Roose and Sepp 2010)) that is sensitive to local peculiarities, to protect landscapes from merely top-down schematic planning, land despoliation and homogenisation thereby safeguarding sustainably heritage and identity; supporting CAP in adapting regional needs. There are basically two options to reach a common European landscape planning approach:

1. bottom-up: harmonisation of national planning laws, instruments and measures,
2. top-down: development of a (new) European planning framework – based on the ELC.

In both cases some common ground is necessary what this classification may offer.

Although the ELC states that landscape is everywhere, and planning should aim at a holistic view to landscape, due to the history/genesis, specific actors/stakeholders, specific policy and scientific domains and a more or less separate handling of land uses in many countries' law and planning, we foresee that similar classifications should be followed for forest, settlement (see e.g. Schwarz 2010), more pristine landscapes etc.

5. Conclusion

Reading the papers in this special issue we recognise similar problems everywhere concerning agricultural landscapes and their heritage. Until now, the handling of these struggles has been tried to solve on national levels, although the targets are also similar. Perhaps this proposed typological classification of European agricultural landscapes could be a mean to see unity in diversity. For a more efficient distribution of limited resources in common European planning approach a comprehensive classification is in place, which considers history, development, land use, land management and regional characteristics and which was developed and invented in a participative attempt being open-ended for further development. This means, that the countries have to work together in order to get the classification in right place.

The more detailed research has to find out about the "whys" and the "hows" behind the agricultural landscape development:

1. How are the countries in Europe interwoven – by which mechanisms?
2. What were and what are the driving forces behind the development, the change and the forming of the European agricultural landscape?

This special issue is one step along this road.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Csaba Centeri from Hungary (Szent István Egyetem, Gödöllö) for providing photos which significantly emphasises our words. And they would also like to thank Yves Michelin from France (VetAgro Sub, Clermont-Ferrand) for his tremendous input, ideas and discussion culture!

The research was supported by the European Commission within the Culture 2000-2013 program, by the European Union through the European Regional Development Fund (Centre of

Excellence in Cultural Theory) and by the Estonian Ministry of Education target-financed project no. SF0130033s07 “Landscape Practice and Heritage”.

References

[1] Bailoni, M., Edelblutte, S. & Tchékémian, A. (2012). Agricultural landscapes, heritage and identity in peri-urban areas in Western Europe, *European Countryside* 4(2), Doi: 10.2478/v10091-012-0020-9.

[2] Blacksell, M. (2010). Agriculture and landscape in 21st century Europe: the post-communist transition. *European Countryside* 2(1), 13-24. Doi: 10.2478/v10091-010-0002-8.

[3] Buchecker, M. (2010). Social functions and benefits of agricultural landscapes. In Pungetti G. & Kruse, A., eds., European Culture expressed in Agricultural Landscapes: Perspectives from the Eucaland Project (pp. 60-65). Rome: Palombi Editori.

[4] Centeri, C. (2010). Foreword. *Tájökológiai Lapok – Hungarian Journal of Landscape Ecology*, special issue on Eucaland Project: 3.

[5] Council of Europe (2000). European Landscape Convention. *European Treaty Series 176.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

[6] Dockerty, T., Lovett, A., Appleton, K., Bone, A. &. Sünnenberg, G. (2006). Developing scenarios and visualisations to illustrate potential policy and climatic influences on future agricultural landscapes. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 114(1), 103-120. Doi: 10.1016/j.agee.2005.11.008.

[7] Dockerty, T., Lovett, A., Sünnenberg, G., Appleton, K. & Parry, M. (2005). Visualising the potential impacts of climate change on rural landscapes. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 29(3): 297-320. Doi: 10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2004.05.004.

[8] Elerie, H. & Spek, T. (2010). The cultural biography of landscape as a tool for action research in the Drentsche Aa National Landscape (Northern Netherlands). In Bloemers, J.H.F., Kars, H., van der Valk, A. & Wijnen, M., eds. *The Cultural Landscape Heritage Paradox. Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological-historical Landscape and its European Dimension* (pp. 83-113). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

[9] Emanuelsson, U. (2009). *Rural Landscapes of Europe. How Man Has Shaped European Nature*. Stockholm: Research Council Formas.

[10] Fairclough, G., (2010a). Part III: Complexity and contingency: classifying the influence of agriculture on European landscapes. In Pungetti G. & Kruse, A., eds., *European Culture expressed in Agricultural Landscapes: Perspectives from the Eucaland Project* (pp. 115-148). Rome: Palombi Editori.

[11] Fairclough, G. (2010b). Summary of Eucaland Project WP 3. Classifying Europe: an outcome of the Eucaland Project. *Tájökológiai Lapok – Hungarian Journal of Landscape Ecology*, special issue on Eucaland Project: 15-16.

[12] Gelencsér, G., Vona, M. & Centeri, C.(2012). Loosing agricultural heritage in rural landscapes – a case study in Koppány Valley area, Hungary, *European Countryside 4(2),* Doi: 10.2478/v10091-012-0019-2.

[13] Grove, A. T. & Rackham, O. (2001). *The Nature of Mediterranean Europe: An Ecological History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

[14] Jones, M. (1991). The elusive reality of landscape. Concepts and approaches in landscape research. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift – Norwegian Journal of Geography* 45(4), 229-244. Doi: 10.1080/00291959108552277.

[15] Jones, M. (2007). The European landscape convention and the question of public participation. Landscape Research 32(5), 613-633. Doi: 10.1080/01426390701552753.

[16] Jones, M., Howard, P., Olwig, K. R., Primdahl, J. & Sarlöv Herlin, I. (2007). Multiple interfaces of the European Landscape Convention. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift – Norwegian Journal of Geography* 61(4), 207-216. Doi: 10.1080/00291950701709176.

[17] Jones, M. & Stenseke, M., eds., (2011). The European Landscape Convention: Challenges of Participation. Series: Décamps, H., Tress, B. & Tress, G., eds. *Landscape Series 13*. Dordrecht: Springer.

[18] Kizos, T. & Koulouri, M. (2010). Same land cover, same land use at the large scale, different landscapes at the small scale: landscape change in olive plantations on Lesvos Island, Greece. *Landscape Research* 35(4): 449-467. Doi: 10.1080/01426390802048297.

[19] Kruse, A., Centeri, C., Renes, H., Roth, M., Printsmann, A., Palang, H., Benito Jordá, L., Velarde, M. D. & Kruckenberg, H. (2010). Glossary on agricultural landscapes. *Tájökológiai Lapok – Hungarian Journal of Landscape Ecology*, special issue on Eucaland Project: 99-129.

[20] Landscape Research (2010). *Special issue on Landscapes of Energies* 35(2).

[21] Landscape Research (2010). *Special issue on Landscape Change and Rural Development* 35(6).

[22] Landscape Research (2011). *Special issue on Reassessing Landscape Drivers and the Globalist Environmental Agenda* 36(4).

[23] Meeus, S. J. & Gulinck, H. (2008). Semi-urban areas in landscape research: a review. *Living Reviews in Landscape Research* 2: 3.

[24] Olwig, K. R. (1996). Recovering the substantive nature of landscape. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 86(4). 630-653. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8306.1996.tb01770.x.

[25] Olwig, K. R. (2002a). *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic: From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

[26] Olwig, K. R. (2002b). The duplicity of space: Germanic 'Raum' and Swedish 'Rum' in English language geographical discourse. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 84(1): 1-17. Doi: 10.1111/j.0435-3684.2002.00109.x.

[27] Olwig, K. R. (2007). The practice of landscape 'Conventions' and the just landscape: the case of the European Landscape Convention. *Landscape Research* 32(5), 579-594. Doi: 10.1080/01426390701552738.

[28] O'Rourke, E. & Kramm, *N.* (2012). High Nature Value (HNV) farming and the management of upland biodiversity: a review, *Europoean Countryside* 4(2), Doi: 10.2478/v10091-012-0018-3.

[29] Palang, H., Printsmann, A., Konkoly-Gyuró, E., Urbanc, M., Skowronek E. & Woloszyn, W. (2006). The forgotten rural landscapes of Central and Eastern Europe. *Landscape Ecology* 21(3): 347-357. Doi: 10.1007/s10980-004-4313-x.

[30] Primdahl, J. & Swafield, S., eds. (2010). Globalisation and Agricultural Landscapes: Change Patterns and Policy Trends in Developed Countries. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[31] Puolamäki, L. (2012). Individual views and shared landscape of folklore in Reykholtsdal, Iceland, *European Countryside 4(2),* Doi: 10.2478/v10091-012-0021-8.

[32] Renes, H., ed. (2010a). Part II: European agricultural landscape history. In: Pungetti, G. & Kruse, A., eds.),) *European Culture expressed in Agricultural Landscapes: Perspectives from the Eucaland Project* (pp. 73-113). Rome: Palombi Editori.

[33] Renes, H. (2010b). Summary of Eucaland Project WP 2. Searching for system in the history of agricultural landscapes in Europe the historical part of the Eucaland Project. *Tájökológiai Lapok – Hungarian Journal of Landscape Ecology*, special issue on Eucaland Project: 13-14.

[34] Renes, J. (2011). European landscapes; continuity and change. In: Roca, Z., Claval, P. & Agnew, J., eds., *Landscapes, Identities and Development* (pp. 117-136). Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.

[35] Roose, A. & Sepp, K. (2010). Monitoring framework for assessing changes of the Estonian rural landscape in adopting European agricultural policies. *European Countryside* 2(1): 42-59. Doi: 10.2478/v10091-010-0004-6.

[36] Schwarz, N. (2010). Urban form revisited – selecting indicators for characterising European cities. Landscape and Urban Planning 96(1): 29-47. Doi: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2010.01.007.

[37] Seabrook, L., Mcalpine, C. A. & Bowen, M. E. (2011). Restore, repair or reinvent: options for sustainable landscapes in a changing climate. Landscape and Urban Planning 100(4): 407-410. Doi: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2011.02.015.

[38] Semenova, T. (2012). New strategies for rural development in the Russian North, *European Countryside 4(2),* Doi: 10.2478/v10091-012-0017-4.

[39] Sheppard, S. R. J. (2005). Landscape visualisation and climate change: the potential for influencing perceptions and behaviour. Environmental Science & Policy 8(6): 637-654. Doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2005.08.002.

[40] Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

[41] Steiner, C., ed. (2010). Part V: Planning the future of European agricultural landscapes considering their cultural value and heritage. In: Pungetti, G. & Kruse, A., eds. *European Culture expressed in Agricultural Landscapes: Perspectives from the Eucaland Project* (pp. 179-204). Rome: Palombi Editori.

[42] Stobbelaar, D. J. & Pedroli, B. (2011). Perspectives on landscape identity: a conceptual challenge. *Landscape Research* 36(3): 321-339. Doi: 10.1080/01426397.2011.564860.

[43] Tschakert, P., Tutu, R. & Alcaro, A. (2011). Embodied experiences of environmental and climatic changes in landscapes of everyday life in Ghana. Emotion, Space and Society, in press. Doi: 10.1016/j.emospa.2011.11.001.

[44] Ulrich, R. S. (1984). View through a window may influence recovery from surgery. *Science* 224(4647): 420-421. Doi: 10.1126/science.6143402.

[45] Velarde, M. D., Roth, M. & Buchecker, M. (2010a). Introduction. In Pungetti, G. & Kruse, A., eds. *European Culture expressed in Agricultural Landscapes: Perspectives from the Eucaland Project* (p. 49). Rome: Palombi Editori.

[46] Velarde, M. D., Roth, M. & Buchecker, M. (2010b). Summary of Eucaland Project WP 1. Description methods for European agricultural landscapes: definitions, cultural character and values. *Tájökológiai Lapok – Hungarian Journal of Landscape Ecology*, special issue on Eucaland Project: 11-12.

[47] Wadsworth, R. & Swetnam, R. (1998). Modelling the impact of climate warming at the landscape scale: will bench terraces become economically and ecologically viable structures under changed climates? *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 68(1-2), 27-39. Doi: 10.1016/S0167-8809(97)00133-3.

[48] Wascher, D., ed. (2005). *European Landscape Character Areas – Typology, Cartography and Indicators for the Assessment of Sustainable Landscapes*. Report no. 1254. Wageningen: Alterra.