

6.2 Look the other way – from a branch of archaeology to a root of landscape studies

Author

Graham Fairclough

formerly English Heritage, London, United Kingdom

Contact: graham.fairclough@newcastle.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This paper explores Landscape Archaeology's location within the broader interdisciplinary field of landscape research beyond archaeology. A variety of factors are already creating a widening field of landscape research, including the increasingly integrative role of the concept of landscape as promoted, for example, by the European Landscape Convention, a growing questioning (within more general trends in society towards holistic thinking) of the traditional divides between disciplines, and the scale of social and environmental problems perceived to be confronting the world which require comprehensive views such as landscape offers. There are similar trends in heritage management concerned with the social role and value of heritage (the Faro Convention), the distinction (or lack of) between the present and the past, and the social relevance of archaeological work.

It will be argued that, by presenting the continuum of (pre)history (as represented by past material culture) as a part of present-day landscape not merely as a pointer to understanding past environments or landscapes, Landscape Archaeology could become an important part of broader landscape research in addition to being a sub-discipline of archaeology. Landscape archaeology can bring special and unique expertise to landscape studies, and can in its turn benefit from exposure to the different horizons, theories and aims of other landscape disciplines. Working more closely with other landscape disciplines and practices studies would also help landscape archaeology to develop greater social relevance through the unifying framework of landscape.

KEYWORDS

interdisciplinary studies, perception, landscape research, social relevance, European Landscape Convention

INTRODUCTION

The organisation of a first international conference devoted exclusively to 'landscape archaeology' implied a coming of age for a discipline which (although its many sub-types vary in age, with some countries having longer traditions than others) is nevertheless mainly relatively young. The conference could not represent every part of Landscape Archaeology's broad scope, and there have been substantial sessions devoted to Landscape Archaeology at other international conferences, notably EAA and WAC. In its special focus, aspiration and consciousness, however, LAC2010 represented an important milestone and it is to be hoped that it will become as established in future years as, for instance, PECSRL, Ruralia, EAA or CAA already are. A continuing forum for Europe- (or world-) wide meditation on the character, theories, methods and aims of Landscape Archaeology is much-needed, not least because a well-defined understanding of one's own disciplinary position is the essential prelude to interdisciplinary fusion.

The closing session of LAC2010 was entitled 'How will landscape archaeology develop in future?', thus consciously encapsulating an increased sense of identity, mission and purpose. It was to this part of the conference that the present paper was originally addressed. Its aim was neither to applaud nor to challenge the growing sense that Landscape Archaeology is cohering as a single multidisciplinary sphere of research and practical activity, but to ask how a maturing Landscape Archaeology should work in a wider context than archaeology, and particularly how it should locate itself in relation to the very much larger realm of interdisciplinary landscape studies that extends far beyond archaeology, and even beyond historical studies more generally. The underlying question is whether Landscape Archaeology exists to use the idea of landscape only to study the past (which will mainly interest historical disciplines) or also (or mainly) to use archaeology to study the landscape of the present-day, in both its materiality and mentality, and thus to connect to all landscape disciplines and to a wider public.

There seems little doubt that Landscape Archaeology will grow further as an important sub-section of archaeology, and the case can be made that all types of archaeology should make a greater use of the idea of landscape. This paper will look in the other direction, however, outwards from archaeology, to suggest that if the discipline is to gain further momentum, social relevance and practical influence over the shaping of future landscapes, then it must play a more central part in the larger interdisciplinary field of landscape research as a whole. As will be discussed later, and as any archaeologist who has spent time in multidisciplinary gatherings of landscape researchers will have seen, many landscape disciplines do not always seem to notice or value the methods, insights and results of 'archaeologically-based' landscape research as much as we might hope, nor do they see a relevant use for them. Perhaps some of them do not consider that landscape archaeologists really work with the landscape idea, or we think they study the 'wrong sort' of landscape, but for whatever reason the constant restatement to other disciplines and policymakers of the relevance of archaeological views to landscape is often without success. Landscape Archaeology needs additional ways of seeing if it is to look in both directions, both back towards its parent discipline, and forwards towards the larger academic community beyond that is starting to form around

the landscape concept. At the risk of pushing the metaphor too far, 'coming of age' may mean leaving home.

LARGER COMMUNITIES AND THE UNIVERSALITY OF LANDSCAPE

Landscape research does not stop at the borders of archaeology. When we enter the landscape field we open our minds to other concepts. We find new ways of seeing and of interpretation and in a sense (and to an extent) we leave behind our interest in finding out about the past and look to the present as well. We also inevitably leave behind some of our scientific detachment and begin to engage more with perception and subjectivity. We are obliged to enter into different types of discussions about the future and about politics, governance and spatial planning or land management; conventional ideas that the aim of archaeological resource management is protection give way in the world of landscape to more nuanced ideas about managing change, preservation by development and future-oriented approaches (Bloemers 2002; Fairclough 2006a; Bloemers et al. 2010). In short, we find ourselves adapting to being part of a very large and differently-focused community of science and practice. We also find ourselves being drawn to engage in different ways with the public at large.

Landscape, although often casually characterised as being about and championing the local, is in fact global or universal. It is universal culturally, in that most nations have concepts of landscape, whether landscape/landschaft, paysage/paessaggio, krajina, maisema or tájatas. This appears at the very birth of nations, evidenced for example in the way that 'landscape' is very visible in the great national epics (from, for example, the Mabinogion and the Táin Bó Cúailnge, through the Icelandic sagas and the Arthurian cycle, to the Canterbury Tales, the Lusiads and Don Quixote, and including both tales of Ulysses). It is universal socially, chronologically and spatially. It is universal too as a subject of research, indeed it is almost the archetypical interdisciplinary theme, a subject for the physical sciences as much as the humanities, for social sciences as much as ecology, and it spans domains and disciplines. The same cannot be said of many of Archaeology's other sub-disciplines, because not all disciplines find it worthwhile to work in the past, or to study human action and agency, for example, or indeed to study material culture – the common ground is missing. Landscape however is quintessentially a common ground. All disciplines that deal with the physical world or with people and land will find landscape relevant because it integrates environment and society, history and culture. They will find in landscape a useful frame for their work and a valuable set of perspectives and tools.

The field of interdisciplinary landscape studies is in practice an emerging 'super-discipline' (although its creation may involve taking a post-disciplinary stance). Its growth is encouraged by interest in the European Landscape Convention at academic and policy level, not least in the forum that the Council of Europe's ELC conferences, workshops and publications (Council of Europe 2002-2010) has provided for interdisciplinary meeting and collaborations. It is also nurtured by the growing numbers of European-funded or coordinated networks and trans-frontier projects that have taken landscape as both subject and integrative framework (for example, Clark et al. 2003; Hernik 2008; Orejas et al. 2009; Pungetti et al. 2010). Many landscape disciplines are on the verge of a further coalescence under the aegis of strategies and policies currently forming within the European Science Foundation and the COST Programme.

The Science Policy Briefing published on the 10th anniversary of the European Landscape Conven-

tion – ‘*Landscape in a Changing World: Bridging Divides, Integrating Disciplines, Serving Society*’ (ESF-COST 2010) – places landscape research as a fully integrative and interdisciplinary field of research into the European Research Area. It bases its case that landscape research can claim a central place in the European Research Area on the high relevance of interdisciplinary landscape research to major social, economic and cultural challenges facing the pan-European region. The key word there is ‘interdisciplinary’. As LAC 2010 showed, Landscape Archaeology already crosses the boundaries of many disciplines (primarily in the historical sphere and its related geo-science fields), but landscape is a valid and existing field of research for almost disciplines in the arts and the humanities, the physical and natural sciences, and in social sciences. In such a large arena, Landscape Archaeology might appear to be a small player, but as will be seen below, it can make significant contributions, most notably by the study of long-term transformation, human agency through time and the human-nature interface that are at the heart of landscape.

It was suggested above that a number of different principles will need to be absorbed by landscape archaeologists if they are part of this wider more socially-embedded community. We cannot continue simply to learn more and more about ‘the past at landscape scale’. The most important change of mentality is to take to heart the aspects of landscape summed up in the Council of Europe’s definition (COE 2000). Landscape is an area ‘as perceived by people’. Landscape is not just a natural, physical space, but it is as much urban as rural, built as much as ‘natural’ – in short, always a cultural construct in which human perception is a prerequisite, and without which ‘landscape’ is merely the environment or the natural world. ‘Land’, ‘environment’, ‘territory’ or ‘region’ are not synonyms for landscape; they can contribute to the construction of landscape perceptions, but landscape is the bigger concept, because it encompasses perception as well as materiality, and because whilst spatial it is paradoxically free of spatial constraints. Not accepting some of these ideas alongside Landscape Archaeology’s currently main focus on the material dimensions of landscape is an obstacle to interaction and synergy with other landscape disciplines.

Secondly, the words ‘as perceived by’ inevitably and inherently mean ‘in the present day’. Landscape Archaeology however is traditionally occupied with understanding the past (including its focus on environmental history and time depth as simple chronological sequence rather than matrix). Such an approach can fail to engage with other landscape disciplines which firmly locate their landscape interest in the present or even (such as spatial planning and landscape architecture) the future. More importantly there can be a ‘disconnect’ with the needs and interests of policymakers and practitioners, those who change the present-day landscape and create tomorrow’s landscape. For such people, past-centred interpretations of landscape may inform heritage management or provide raw material for tourism but they are unlikely to be as helpful for positive spatial planning or environmental policy.

CURRENT POSITIONS

If a ‘coming of age’ is a good time to reflect on what comes next, we should begin with mapping our current situation, placing Landscape Archaeology in its wider world. An over-simplified diagram might place the main landscape disciplines on a spectrum between ‘environment’ at one end (those disciplines which study the landscape primarily in physical terms) and ‘perception’ or ‘representation’ at the other (those which focus on cultural and human issues).

Everything on that long spectrum must be considered to be part of landscape research. Towards the first end of the spectrum stand many of the natural sciences and the physical sciences such as geology and geomorphology, the earth sciences, some branches of ecology and, within landscape archaeology, palaeo-environmental and related subjects. Towards the other end might stand disciplines such as the social sciences, psychology, cultural and human geography, disciplines concerned with landscape as symbolism, meaning and representation, or the designing and creating disciplines, for example much landscape architecture and artistic disciplines such as performance, because landscape is first and foremost a lived, experienced thing, hence the value of using phenomenological approaches in landscape archaeology.

In the middle ground we might place those disciplines that offer to bridge the divide most effectively, some types of landscape ecology for instance with its recognition that the current natural world is the product and past and continuing human management (or as a landscape archaeologist might say, recognition that biodiversity is a culture construct), and the core aspects of landscape archaeology, able to stand in both natural and human camps, to deal with time as well as space, to be primarily concerned with the change and creation that lies deep at the heart of the human-natural relationship that is landscape.

Landscape Archaeology occupies other middle grounds too: between empirical practice and reflexive theory, between humanities and sciences, and between research and design, knowledge and action. Landscape is a 'bridge' between many disciplines, but landscape archaeology is naturally interdisciplinary, already well-versed in the difficulties and challenges of multidisciplinary work because it draws theory and methods from many different parts of archaeology together, from archaeological science to its more humanistic branches. Through landscape, it also possesses strong connections to other historical fields, notably historical geography but also urban morphology and anthropology. The range of interdisciplinary connections that Landscape Archaeology possesses as a branch of archaeology, and as part of the 'tree' of historical studies, becomes much narrower when we look the other way to see Landscape Archaeology not as a large part of archaeology but as a small part of landscape studies as a whole. Yet whilst we might think that Landscape Archaeology is a very small branch of that larger tree, there is reason to think that it might come to be seen as an important root of a future integrated super-discipline.

OPENING A DOOR - OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXPANSION, GROWTH AND CHANGE

Now is a good time to contemplate a future for Landscape Archaeology within this wider field. Landscape Archaeology has its own increasing maturity and identity, as these proceedings of LAC 2010 show. It is developing serious theoretical discourses, it now uses a plethora of techniques and methods, with new IT-led horizons notably in remote sensing and spatial computing, and it can show a critical mass of past results and models, which among other things offers a platform for constructing scenarios. This is a strong basis for interdisciplinary collaboration and for connecting with policy.

There are also landscape-related trends beyond archaeology that pull in this direction, notably the integrative influence of the European Landscape Convention's (ELC's) national and pan-European implementation. The ELC has created a new level of international and interdisciplinary discourse on landscape. Integrative pressure comes also from European-funded research programmes and networks, as part of the 2000 Lisbon Strategy, the Ljubljana Process, and within the Horizon2020 agenda for the European Research Area and the knowledge economy. Landscape studies need to make their case more strongly in

this latter arena, and the ESF/COST Science Policy Briefing on landscape research referred to above will only carry weight and win success if enacted on a truly interdisciplinary basis in which the humanities has an equally weight to the natural sciences. It offers a platform not a panacea. The Joint Programming Initiative on cultural heritage, also adopted at the end of 2010, will be highly relevant, offering landscape as a wider forum linked to social values.

Strengthening those trends is a deeper questioning of the traditional divides between disciplines; it is going too far to suggest that centuries of fragmentation of science and 'philosophy' into many separate, bounded and indeed defended sciences and disciplines will be rapidly reversed, but it is being questioned more frequently and its drawbacks in terms of helping to address major social or environmental challenges are becoming increasingly clear. The maxim 'Governments have problems; Universities have departments' seems to be heard more and more often. For an inherently integrative field like landscape, the benefits of specialisation are relatively quickly outweighed by the disbenefits of fragmentation, dissonance and conflict. These divides, especially between humanities and science, are becoming serious obstacles to progress in both landscape research and landscape policy. Climate change is obviously one issue that cannot be addressed through disciplinary reductionism, but neither can many social and demographic issues.

Another relevant consideration is the issue of sustainability. Sustainable development in relation to landscape might be perceived differently, as a primarily cultural aspiration and need, and only secondarily as a natural, environmental or 'green' one. The common emphasis of 'green' rhetoric on people's carbon footprints, on personal consumer choices, on individual recycling, car sharing and so on serves only to underline how sustainable development issues revolve first and foremost around human decisions, individual and collective choice and above all lifestyle. The strong connection between lifestyle and landscape perception means that ecological and environmental anxieties conceal questions of consumption, action and behaviour, and therefore lead to a need for an integrated understanding of landscape as a human perception of the human-nature interaction.

Sustainability is often described as a 'tripod' with environmental, economic and social legs, but traditionally it is the environmental leg, with its focus on the fundamentals of water, air and soil and its ethical and sentimental issues of biodiversity, that is given priority in policy and public perception. Landscape allows us to think in a slightly different way. All the practical concerns of sustainability collide in the nexus of human agency, production and consumption, demographics and identity, individual and collective aspiration that creates landscape and is summarised by the words 'as perceived by people'. Landscape offers an arena to debate all these issues, a common ground between science and humanities, between place and nature, and between place and globalism, short-term and long-term change, past and future, private and public. Asking landscape to help to address all these may be unrealistic, but it surely has a part to play, and Landscape Archaeology should be able to become more socially and politically relevant.

But why choose 'landscape' as a unifying frame for addressing these big issues when there are other concepts with equal or greater power? Part of the answer is that landscape has appeal to almost everyone, academic and lay, rich and poor, town dweller or farmer, resident or visitor, 'native' or 'migrant'. It also offers other advantages for integration: landscape is an interdisciplinary meeting place because so many disciplines use the idea of landscape, it is an integrative tool because there are many theories, problems, goals that cross disciplinary borders and allow landscape to be a common analytical starting point, a discourse, a frame or filter, a common language. As a way of seeing and therefore a way of acting and

performing, it combines materiality and mentality, and thereby connects place with people, science with humanities, past with present, real with virtual. It can provide a loaded rhetorical device; or it can be a blank screen onto which people can project many other social, ideological and environmental needs and ambitions. Finally, it is a shared territory, connecting readily to concepts of commons and collectivities, public realm in cities and access in the country; there is thus a politics of landscape.

Many disciplines use or study landscape and they inevitably find common ground in the concept. Take landscape architecture: the LE:NOTRE network (<http://www.le-notre.org/>) of landscape architecture schools examined over 20 'neighbouring disciplines' whose interests and expertise intersect with the practice of landscape architecture (Bell et al., 2011). These include fields such as agronomy (and agricultural history), cultural geography, environmental psychology, fine arts (and garden history), historical geography, landscape archaeology, landscape ecology, regional and spatial planning, urban design, urban (and other forms of) sociology, health and well-being. Landscape archaeology will possess an equally extensive set of neighbours.

VIEWS FROM OUTSIDE

But how do our disciplinary neighbours (and our audience or 'customers', those we wish to influence, for example politicians, research funders, planners, developers) regard Landscape Archaeology and its results? How relevant does the wider landscape community think Landscape Archaeology is to their work? It is not easy to know, because landscape archaeology, whether theory, methods or results, is mainly invisible in the published discourse of other disciplines (but then, it is noticeable that the bibliographies of any discipline's work on landscape tend not to look beyond its own literature). Recent overviews of the development of landscape studies rarely give much space to landscape archaeology. Wylie, on the evolution of the landscape branch of Geography (2008), for example, treats in detail only early historical geographical or topographical approaches or more recent phenomenological standpoints. Only 2 or 3 chapters out of 20 in *Landscape Interfaces* (Palang & Fry 2003) are from a historical or archaeological standpoint. Do other disciplines (and politicians and practitioners) think Landscape Archaeology is really about 'landscape'? Do they come to our conferences? Read our papers and books? Do our results find the right audiences? If not, why not? – does Landscape Archaeology use the wrong manner of presentation or do its results have too limited relevance to present and future landscape problems or too poor a resonance in popular mentality? Do we produce landscape stories, narratives, results to which ordinary people can connect? Is Landscape Archaeology too scientific, insufficiently attuned to stories and narratives? That landscape archaeology has much to contribute to interdisciplinary studies cannot be in doubt, as the Dutch BBO programme amply demonstrated (Bloemers et al. 2010), but the message seems not to be heard often enough.

A gentle critique of Landscape Archaeology that might be put into the mouths of other landscape researchers could include the complaint that Landscape Archaeology is not really about 'landscape' at all but is just a form of environmental history, concerned only with the past (what happened in the Iron Age) rather than with the past in the present (how the 'Iron Age' still happens in today's landscape; for an example of archaeologists doing this see Nord 2009). Or, that it is too little concerned with people and their experience of landscape, whether in the past or the present. Or, that it does not sufficiently balance perception with materiality, that archaeologists treat landscape as a thing, not an idea. Some landscape ar-

chaeologists even speak as if landscape has its own history, independent of society, let alone of individual people. There can also be criticism that Landscape Archaeology seeks to tell the story of land not of landscape, where the environment is the star of the film and humans are just passive extras.

Furthermore, there are landscape disciplines whose practitioners would accuse Landscape Archaeology of misusing the idea of landscape by treating it purely as a matter of scale or size: some landscape archaeology appears to be little more than conventional archaeology carried out over a large area. Archaeologists sometimes reach for the landscape-word ('Roman industrial landscape') whenever more than three or four sites are excavated in close proximity. Even the concept of 'landscape scale' often appealed to as a method by landscape archaeologists (and by some ecologists) can be seen as a basic misunderstanding of the idea of landscape. Scale is an important issue in landscape studies, but landscape is not itself a scale issue; landscape ways of seeing can be used at many scales. The scale problem lies behind the tendency of landscape archaeology (and landscape history) to work at regional level, to write regional history instead of landscape biography, to study cultural zones or settlement and label them as 'landscapes', as if landscape was only territory. Territories (whether townships, manors or political territories, transhumance zones, or modern territories of landscape character areas or pays, national or regional 'natural parks', or even tourism-branded regions) are important building blocks and tools of landscape understanding, but they are not the whole of landscape.

There is a lot of merit in the argument that understanding the past is a valid, fruitful and necessary goal in its own right and that curiosity-driven research leads to practical use and social benefit or relevance, but sometimes those arguments need to be tied more closely to questions of audience, strategy and applicability. There is perhaps another way forward.

RECONFIGURING LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY

The potential contribution of Landscape Archaeology to wider landscape studies is not to be underestimated. There are many aspects of interdisciplinary landscape research and policy to which Landscape Archaeology is very well-placed to contribute, which can be crudely (over)simplified as time, people and change. Foremost is the place of time in landscape (time depth, long-term processes, biography, narrative), a strong understanding and evidence of landscape's dynamism (change, continuities and discontinuities, adaptations), and the ability to offer a long-term and complex, multifactor explanation, merging human agency and environmental factors. In addition, its distinctive methods enable Landscape Archaeology to bring different ways of seeing to the interdisciplinary field: a vertical gaze on landscape, for example, from its use of remote sensing, sense of stratigraphy and map-based GIS work, producing a layered landscape that challenges the visual ideology of much landscape description.

Landscape archaeology's strong tradition of slow 'hands-on' fieldwork and visual analysis can provide simultaneously (and rarely) both internal (from a more subjective standpoint) embodied and external (objectified) analytical views of landscape. Finally, but not least, archaeology is a humanistic discipline as much as it is a scientific discipline: it can study the land, and environmental change through time, but ultimately its subject is human beings, their agency and their ways of thinking. Whilst perhaps the most difficult understanding to reach, it is cognition, which of course lies at the core of all landscape, that archaeology ultimately strives to capture.

At present, however, these contributions are mainly only potentialities. As suggested in the previous section, the ways in which Landscape Archaeology is currently framed or how it interprets and presents its findings, seems to restrict their relevance to other parts of landscape studies. Some of the characteristics of Landscape Archaeology stand in the way of interdisciplinary progress through a reluctance to appreciate how other disciplines theorise landscape. It is however possible to imagine that many characteristics that might seem to be 'flaws' to an observer from another landscape discipline – that is, that 'landscape' archaeology is too fixated on the past, is too environmentally-focused, takes too little account of the immaterial and of the place and role of people, their actions and perceptions, that it confuses 'land' with landscape and thus fails to see the meaning of 'scape', and that it has a naive view of scale – can be converted to strengths when reframed.

The traditional archaeologist's concern with the past not the present, for instance, can be redirected within a landscape frame to provide the understanding and appreciation of time depth and long-term explanation that many landscape disciplines seem to lack and that perhaps Landscape Archaeology can best provide. To do this however requires our past-oriented narratives to be accompanied by new present-focused and future-oriented narratives so that our understanding of the past landscape and of the historic dimension of the present landscape is linked to the contemporary landscape, not stranded in anachronistic 'periods' (Fairclough 2007). The very concept of 'periods', anachronistic in itself, is in terms of landscape an obstruction to the appreciation of the continuous flow of time, change and continuity. Landscape research should begin and not end with the present-day landscape. It can focus on character and biography, providing more synthesis and interpretation and less description. It can replace period-based studies with descriptions and analyses of sequence, defining time depth not as a sequence of layers but as a continuous flow; landscape is a way of seeing all surviving remains of the past, all periods of time, folded together into the present day. This is probably closer to how the lay public see the past, as being present, not passed.

The weakness of treating landscape simply as a scale issue is easily remedied by adopting more sophisticated theories of multiple scales; Landscape Archaeology's expertise in working at different scales will translate easily to interdisciplinary work (e.g. Fairclough 2006b). The regional scale for example can become a useful frame for landscape studies that seeks to identify long-term and large-scale transformation and continuity; it can provide laboratories for trans-frontier contrast and comparisons; it can also provide a way to capture public perceptions of place and landscape and add them to scientific insights.

The tendency of Landscape Archaeology to descend into being merely an environmental history (a story of land not landscape) can be counteracted by collaboration with those disciplines that have expertise in taking human perception into account, including other parts of archaeology and history that focus on human actions. Landscape Archaeology can thus provide the chronology and the stage for one half of the ELC's human/nature interaction. The criticism that landscape archaeologists do not sufficiently balance perception with materiality and that landscape is studied as a thing not an idea might not be turned into a positive contribution so easily, but it represents the reciprocal benefits of interdisciplinary research. This is one of the areas where archaeology can learn from other disciplines.

Changing Landscape Archaeology so that it fits its existing and well-developed practice and results into conceptual frames more accessible to other disciplines, will help to develop further the multidimensional Landscape Archaeology that already largely exists. Three broad types of landscape archaeology can be defined; they could all be used simultaneously in a single project but rarely are, it seems

- A first type of archaeological practice (the oldest) that uses landscape as a tool (notably merely a scale) for understanding the past, through (e.g.) long-term narratives and the ability to work at supra-site scales;
- A second type that studies the mentality of landscape in the past (lived, embodied, perceived landscape; mind not matter – how past people perceived landscape);
- A third type which seeks to identify, explain and describe the present-day historic character of landscape, how the past makes today's perceived landscapes.

In the first type it is the results, when properly framed and presented, that will provide the link to other disciplines; Landscape Archaeology can offer long-term explanatory models, and cross-time and cross-cultural comparisons.

The second type however offers more – not simply description and explanation but a conceptual common ground. It provides the chance to compare how and why people perceived landscape at different times, and the opportunity to explore in many cultural contexts the mechanisms of non-material landscape construction. From it we might work with social scientists or psychologists to form a better understanding of landscape social construction that would have significant contemporary relevance, not least in the sphere of landscape and social resilience to change.

The third of these types, however, has most to offer to an interdisciplinary landscape research because it fits relatively straightforwardly into the ELC-type view of landscape. By characterising historically the landscape that exists today it has the strongest potential for social relevance, and the greatest potential for integration with other disciplines' present-day appreciation and understanding of landscape. It gains interdisciplinary appeal simply through topical and contemporary relevance; this is archaeology studying where people live now (see, for example, in their different ways, Penrose et al. 2007; Blur & Santori-Frizell 2009). It also offers processes that can be shared with other disciplines to provide the main integrative force towards other landscape disciplines. What is required to inspire interdisciplinary work are common agendas, which are readily provided by practical issues such as climate change response or changes to lifestyle and society caused by new levels and types of mobility and lifestyle, or the issue of collective multiple identities, so often linked to land, territory and landscape.

CLOSING WORDS

This paper has tried to suggest that whilst applauding the recent growth and maturity of Landscape Archaeology we need also to be aware that it currently stands only at the edge, or too often outside, the larger field of interdisciplinary landscape research. Landscape Archaeology is qualified to contribute to and benefit from that larger community of practice. To do so, however, it needs to look away from, as well towards, archaeology and the past, and to develop a keener awareness of landscape debates and issues in other disciplines. New ways of thinking about and seeing landscape will be required, as will a willingness to redirect some of our aims and methods to different goals and achievements. Landscape Archaeology's theorisation of landscape remains relatively basic, and too single-mindedly focused on materiality, environmental change and the distant past. Ironically for a discipline which claims to study people and their work, when it comes to landscape, archaeologists often seriously understate the role of human beings in

making and perceiving landscape. We fail even to understand time except as a sequence of layers (and perhaps 'landscape' is telling us that archaeology as a whole is in the process of outgrowing its origin in geology and stratigraphy). We do not make enough connections between past and present and too often fail to help others understand the present-day world in a historically-informed landscape frame.

The growing trend for interdisciplinary collaboration, in landscape as other topics, is evidenced by initiatives such as the EC's joint programming initiatives designed to co-ordinate both disciplines and national funding streams; one of them concerns the cultural heritage and provides another connection. All of the ESF principal domain committees have emphasised in recent Position Papers the need to cross disciplinary boundaries and to reach out to other domains. This was the context for ESF/COST to commission a transnational and cross-discipline group of landscape specialists to prepare the Landscape Science Policy Briefing (ESF/COST 2010). The project was one of the first examples of such an attempt (although see now as RESCUE 2012, which delivers the same messages) 'Landscape in a Changing World', was published to coincide with the 10th anniversary of the Council of Europe's Landscape Convention – the ELC (the Florence Convention, COE 2000) as a strong statement of the need for more concerted efforts to be made to promote landscape research in concert with policy and action designed to address current social and environmental challenges.

Coinciding publication of the SPB with that anniversary is significant because the European Landscape Convention has been instrumental in forging the context for increased interdisciplinarity (and trans-disciplinarity) in landscape studies. It promotes landscape as a public good and a tool to be used in all sectors of policy and practice. It can be twinned with the Council's Faro Convention (2005) on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, which broadens definitions of cultural heritage to include intangible as well as the tangible, the perceptual as well as the physical, and action and performance, custom, behaviour, identity, and thus can provide another framework for this recalibration of landscape archaeology. Both conventions argue that landscape and heritage (which are inextricably entwined, each necessarily includes the other) are central not peripheral to 'real life', and through identity, community, place and belonging are cornerstones of society's very construction (Council of Europe 2009). Both Conventions therefore provide a framework and support for leading Landscape Archaeology into integrated landscape research and developing greater social relevance for it.

Some of the contributions that Landscape Archaeology should be able to make to integrated landscape research have been suggested above. The other side of the coin is the broader and more plural view of landscape and objectives and purpose that Landscape Archaeology would gain. A greater practical relevance for Landscape Archaeology would be developed in terms of contributions to the decision being taken about the shape of future landscapes, particularly in the face of global drivers for change and environmental change. Finally, a focus on integrated landscape studies, notably the connection between past and present and people and place, would give Landscape Archaeology a new level of social relevance.

All that is needed is for landscape archaeologists to recognise that landscape is a widely shared concept, an idea more than it is a thing, a tool more than a subject of study, and to cross a few boundaries toward other disciplines. Landscape Archaeology may be a branch of archaeology but it should be a root of landscape studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper benefitted from reviews by Henk Baas and Matthew Johnson.

REFERENCES

- Bloemers, J.H.F. 2002. Past- and Future-oriented archaeology: protecting and developing the archaeological-historical landscape of the Netherlands. In Fairclough, G.J. & Rippon, S.J. (eds.), *Europe's Cultural Landscape: archaeologists and the management of change*, EAC Occasional Paper no 2, 89-96. Europae Archaeologiae Consilium and English Heritage, Brussels/London.
- Bloemers, J.H.F., Kars, H. & van der Valk, A. (eds.) 2010. *The cultural landscape and heritage paradox: Protection and development of the Dutch archaeological-historical landscape and its European dimension*. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Blur, H. & Santori-Frizell, B. (eds.) 2009. *Via Tiburtina: Space, Movements and Artefacts*. Swedish Institute in Rome, Roma.
- Clark, J., Darlington, J. & Fairclough, G.J. (eds.) 2003. *Pathways to Europe's Landscape*. EPCL/EU: Heide.
- Council of Europe. 2000. *European Landscape Convention*, European Treaty Series 176: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm> accessed 5 November 2010.
- Council of Europe. 2002 – 2010. *Proceedings of the First to the Ninth ELC Workshops*, http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/culture-heritage/heritage/Landscape/Publications_en.asp (accessed 5 November 2010).
- Council of Europe. 2009. *Heritage and Beyond*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/beyond_en.asp (accessed 19 December 2009)
- ESF/COST. 2010. *Landscape in a Changing World - Bridging Divides, Integrating Disciplines, Serving Society*, Science Policy Briefing 41, ESF: Strasbourg / Brussels. <http://www.esf.org/publications/science-policy-briefings.html>; <http://www.cost.esf.org/library/newsroom/spb> (accessed 3 November 2010)
- Fairclough, G.J. 2006a. A new landscape for Cultural Heritage Management: characterisation as a management tool. In Lozny, L. (ed.), *Landscapes Under Pressure: Theory and Practice of Cultural Heritage Research and Preservation*, 55-74. Springer, New York.
- Fairclough, G.J. 2006b. Large Scale, long duration and broad perceptions: Scale issues in Historic Landscape Characterisation. In Lock, G. & Molyneaux, B. (eds.), *Confronting Scale in Archaeology: Issues of Theory and Practice*, 203-215. Springer, London.
- Fairclough, G.J. 2007. The contemporary and future landscape: change & creation in the later 20th century. In McAtackney, L., Palus, M. & Piccini, A. (eds.), *Contemporary and Historical Archaeology in Theory, Paper for the 2003 and 2004 CHAT conferences* (Studies in Contemporary and Historical Archaeology 4, BAR International Series 1677), 83-88. Archaeopress, Oxford.
- Hernik, J. (ed.) 2009. *Cultural Landscape – Across Disciplines*, Interreg IIIB/CadSES. Bydgoszcz, Krakow.
- Bell, S., Sarlov-Herlin, I and Stiles, R. (eds) 2011: *Exploring the Boundaries of Landscape Architecture*, Routledge, Abingdon, 83 -114
- Nord, J.M. 2009. *Changing Landscapes and Persistent Places*. Acta Archaeologica Lundensia, Series in Prima Quarto 29. Lund University, Lund.
- Orejas, A., Mattingley, D. & Clavel-Lévêque, M. 2009. COST A27 - *From Present to Past through Landscape*. CSIC, Madrid
- Palang, H. & Fry, G. (eds.) 2003. *Landscape Interfaces: Cultural Heritage in Changing Landscapes*, Landscape Series 1. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Pungetti, G., Kruse, A. & Rackham, O. (eds.) 2010. *European Culture Expressed in Agricultural Landscapes, The Eucaland Project*. Palombi Editori, Roma.
- Penrose, S. 2007. *Images of Change – an archaeology of England's contemporary landscape*. English Heritage, London.

RESCUE 2012: *Responses to Environmental and Societal Challenges for our Unstable Earth (RESCUE)*, ESF Forward Look – ESF-COST ‘Frontier of Science’ joint initiative. European Science Foundation and European Cooperation in Science and Technology, Strasbourg and Brussels. <http://www.esf.org/publications.html> (accessed 25 February 2012).

Wylie, J. 2008. *Landscape* (Key Ideas in Geography). Routledge, Abingdon.

