

The European Landscape Convention and the Question of Public Participation

MICHAEL JONES

Department of Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

ABSTRACT *This paper explores some of the implications for policy-makers and administrators of introducing effective public participation in landscape protection, management and planning in accordance with the European Landscape Convention. The paper discusses justifications for public participation and what participation entails, and engages with the questions of who is entitled to participate and whether there are landscapes that participation does not apply to. The article then suggests different forms that participation may take. It presents two typologies of participation and what they imply for public participation in practice. Examples from Norway are taken as illustrations.*

KEY WORDS: European Landscape Convention, Norway, public participation, social justice

Preamble—The Red Caravan: A Norwegian Example of Public Participation

On 6 November 2006 a car towing a bright red caravan rolled into the car park of the Saupstad Centre in the 1970s' planned suburb of Kolstad on the southern side of the city of Trondheim in Central Norway. The morning was cold and frosty, but bystanders approached the red caravan with curiosity. Its pending arrival had been announced by the local newspaper, *Adresseavisen*. The caravan belonged to a young architect, Håkon Matre Aaserød, who had grown up locally and established an architectural practice in Oslo called Fantastic Norway. Sitting in the red caravan over coffee and ginger biscuits, the inhabitants of Kolstad were invited to suggest to the architect what they felt needed to be done to refurbish and revitalize the Saupstad Centre and its surroundings. By the end of the week, a broad cross-section of the inhabitants of Kolstad had stopped to talk at the caravan, and especially many young people and retired people. The architect had also visited the local secondary school and engaged the youngsters in a discussion about how the area around Saupstad Centre could be improved. Throughout the week the local newspaper as well as the local radio and television stations had assisted in providing a forum for debate over the ideas mooted. The debate continued on the Internet, and the architect received a series of follow-up e-mails and telephone calls.

Correspondence Address: Michael Jones, Department of Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Dragvoll, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway. Email: michael.jones@svt.ntnu.no

Kolstad is a typical example of a Norwegian *drabantby*, a planned suburb with low blocks of flats and rows of houses and its own service centre consisting of shops, social services, a library, doctors, schools, sports facilities and old people's homes. It was a product of the social-democratic planning ideology of the late 1960s. The housing is largely co-operative. The blocks of flats were not built in sterile rows but tastefully arranged around courtyards. There were green areas and playing fields, and one of the city's two swimming pools was located there. During the 1980s and 1990s, the area had become increasingly multicultural as a result of immigration. Many of the immigrants came as refugees—Chileans, Vietnamese, Kurds, Somalis and others. Kolstad has been from the beginning a predominantly working-class area, but there are also middle-class people living there. Immigrants have included university people like myself. However, despite the suburb's many assets, it gained a reputation in the 1990s as a socially disadvantaged area with a relatively high number dependent on social welfare. At the turn of the Millennium a programme of refurbishing the exteriors of the flats, with new balconies, was instituted, and the green areas were upgraded with benches and planted trees. The problem now was what to do with the service centre. The shops had originally been built around a small pedestrian square which had provided a popular meeting place. This was lost when the square was taken over and built on by a grocery store, one of a national chain. The diversity of shops became reduced over the years, leaving by the early 2000s three competing food shops, a chemist, a florist and a kiosk. The city authorities were talking of closing the swimming pool and local library, and moving the welfare office elsewhere. Next to the centre is a large expanse of asphalt providing a car park. Ownership of the centre building has recently changed hands, and the new owners want to use the car park for building development. Despite three schools and the old people's home in the immediate vicinity, many youngsters and old people expressed the feeling that the centre has become uninviting.

Fantastic Norway specializes in 'place development'. With the red caravan as its trademark, its architects travel around inviting dialogue with local communities, and inviting ordinary people to reflect over the values they think should form the basis for urban development. Even in areas with a tarnished reputation, local identity and pride are seen as a valuable planning tool. The aim of the Kolstad project was to encourage local engagement and constructive debate on the future of Saupstad Centre and its surroundings. By mobilizing local people's experiences, thoughts and ideas, a report was produced by mid-November proposing a series of concrete measures for revitalizing the centre which could be used as a basis for future planning. The report summed up ideas for improvement of both physical and social facilities.¹ The term 'landscape' is not found in the report, yet in my view this project is an example of a means of promoting participation by the public in a discussion concerning their surroundings that is entirely within the spirit and intentions of the European Landscape Convention.

The aim of this paper is to explore some of the challenges for policy-makers and administrators of introducing effective public participation in landscape protection, management and planning in accordance with the European Landscape Convention. The perspective is in the main a Nordic one, more specifically a view from Norway, which was the first country to ratify the European Landscape Convention. Although at the national level Norway has not yet fully thought through what public

participation might entail in practice, the examples given indicate a variety of more or less spontaneous attempts at public participation that might be instructive.

Public Participation According to the European Landscape Convention

The European Landscape Convention (Florence Convention) of the Council of Europe entered into force in 2004 (see Déjeant-Pons, 2006). By mid-February 2007, it had been ratified by 26 states and signed by a further eight states. Among the Nordic countries, it has so far been ratified by Denmark, Finland and Norway, and signed by Sweden.² The Convention defines landscape as “an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of action and interaction of natural and/or human factors”. The Convention places an obligation on signatory states to “recognize landscapes in law as an essential component of people’s surroundings, an expression of the diversity of their shared cultural and natural heritage, and a foundation of their identity”. The Convention recognizes that landscape is an important part of the quality of life of people in all areas and obliges signatories to make legal provision for landscape protection, management and planning. The Convention obliges signatory states to establish procedures for the participation of the general public, local and regional authorities and other interested parties in matters concerning landscape.

“As perceived by people” implies that the views of all groups should be included, not just the views of an academic or political elite. Landscape protection, management and planning are hence to be concerned with the characteristics of the landscape that the involved population wish to give recognition to in their surroundings. Specific Measures that the signatories are obliged to undertake include the identification of landscapes and analysis of “their characteristics and the forces and pressures transforming them”; and assessment of landscapes, “taking into account the particular values assigned to them by the interested parties and the population concerned”.

The European Landscape Convention refers in its preamble to the Council of Europe’s Aarhus Convention of 1998 (in force 2001) on access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters.³ Specifically, the Aarhus Convention applies “without discrimination as to citizenship, nationality or domicile...” (§9).

The Articles of the European Landscape Convention that provide for or are relevant for public participation are listed in Table 1. How participation is presented and discussed in the Explanatory Report to the European Landscape Convention is shown in Table 2.

What is Understood by Public Participation?

Discussing landscape and public participation, Michel Prieur and Sylvie Durosseau (2006, p. 165), experts to the Council of Europe, state: “... the term ‘public’ should be taken to mean civil society in the broad sense...”.

Public participation implies involving individuals and groups who are outside the formal decision-making process of the government and local authorities. However, participation is not the same as the complete delegation of powers to local

Table 1. Public participation according to the European Landscape Convention

Article 1—Definitions

Art. 1 a. “Landscape” means an area, as perceived by people . . .

Art. 1 c. “Landscape quality objective” means, for a specific landscape, the formulation by the competent public authorities of the aspirations of the public with regard to the landscape features of their surroundings.

Article 5—General measures

Art. 5 c. to establish procedures for the participation of the general public, local and regional authorities, and other parties with an interest in the definition and implementation of . . . landscape policies

Article 6—Specific measures

C Identification and assessment

Art. 6 C 1. With the active participation of the interested parties, as stipulated in Article 5.c, and with a view to improving knowledge of its landscapes, each Party undertakes:

- a
 - i to identify its own landscapes throughout its territory;
 - ii to analyse their characteristics and the forces and pressures transforming them;
 - iii to take note of changes;
- b to assess the landscapes thus identified, taking into account the particular values assigned to them by the interested parties and the population concerned.

D Landscape quality objectives

Art. 6 D. Each party undertakes to define landscape quality objectives for the landscapes identified and assessed, after public consultation in accordance with Article 5.c.

Note: Provisions of the European Landscape Convention relating to public participation are underlined.

Source: European Landscape Convention website (<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm>).

communities. It should not be seen as a substitute for official decision-making but as a complement to it. The objective is to draw into the decision-making process the views of all concerned groups or stakeholders, whether defined as local communities, residents, visitors, landholders, deprived groups, or specialists, alongside representative, democratically elected bodies. Public participation can be compared with co-management, defined as “the sharing of power and responsibility between government and local resource users” (Zachrisson, 2004, p. 12; see also Selman, 2004; Stenseke, 2006).

Justifications for Public Participation

The desirability of public participation can be justified under five headings, as follows:

1. Democratization

Michel Prieur argued at the Second Conference of the Contracting and Signatory States to the European Landscape Convention, Strasbourg, 10 October 2002 (quoted in Prieur & Dourousseau, 2006, pp. 166–167):

Table 2. Public participation according to the Explanatory Report of the European Landscape Convention

‘24. If people are given an active role in decision-making on landscape, they are more likely to identify with the areas and towns where they spend their working and leisure time. If they have more influence on their surroundings, they will be able to reinforce local and regional identity and distinctiveness and this will bring rewards in terms of individual, social and cultural fulfilment. This may in turn help promote the sustainable development of the area concerned, as the quality of landscape has an important bearing on the success of economic and social initiatives, whether public or private.’

Preamble

‘36. ... The landscape is important as a component of the environment and of people’s surroundings in both town and country and whether it is ordinary landscape or outstanding landscape. The public is accordingly encouraged to take an active part in landscape management and planning, and feel it has responsibility for what happens to the landscape.’

‘57. Sub-paragraph C 1 b requires Parties to assess the quality of the landscapes identified, taking into account the particular value of different kinds assigned to them by the general public and interested parties such as landowners and land users or land managers... This process must take account of the concerned people’s opinion and the interests linked to sectoral policies, and here views may well be highly subjective and differ considerably. It may well be worth *performing the evaluation according to objective criteria first, then comparing the findings with the various assessments of the landscape by people concerned and other interest groups. If necessary, this comparison could be carried out by public inquiry, with the interested parties having the right to express their opinion. Public participation in this type of procedure could be fostered by providing the public with information, consulting all representative bodies, using the media and conducting awareness-raising campaigns at all levels.*’

Note: Provisions of the Explanatory Report to European Landscape Convention relating to public participation are underlined. Italicised sections are discussed further in the main text. *Source:* European Landscape Convention website (<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm>).

A landscape policy which involved only experts and administrators, who themselves are often specialists, would result in landscapes that were imposed on the public, just as in the days when landscape was produced by and for an elite. Democratization of the landscape... is also reflected in this collective and individual appropriation of all landscapes, through the requirement that there be direct participation for all in all phases of decision-making regarding landscape alteration, supervision of landscape evolution and prevention of reckless landscape destruction.

The democratic system is enhanced when the public to an increased degree can participate in decision-making (Jonsson & Lundqvist, 2006).

2. *Legitimacy*

In relation to the co-management of natural resources, the Swedish researcher Anna Zachrisson (2004, p. 24) argues that: “When people are listened to, paid attention to,

treated politely and with respect, the legitimacy for the final decisions is increased.” Interaction can facilitate cooperation by creating trust. More flexible management is the expected result. Decentralized management regimes can make use of local people’s place-specific knowledge and social norms to design well-adapted rules and sanctions. Local institutions have the potential to respond to environmental and social feedbacks. However, coordination with higher levels may be difficult. Central organs can assist by providing such coordination and other forms of support such as economic incentives and technical assistance, according to Zachrisson (2004).

Decisions gain higher legitimacy if the public has participated in the formulation of visions, objectives and decision-making criteria. Decisions can hence become better anchored among interest groups (Jonsson & Lundqvist, 2006).

3. Information Exchange

Knowledge and awareness of landscape are enhanced when the authorities share relevant information with the general public. Conversely, public participation allows the incorporation of the public’s knowledge, values, viewpoints and behaviour in decision-making and gives the authorities a better overview of problems as perceived by the public, thus facilitating the finding of appropriate solutions (Jonsson & Lundqvist, 2006).

4. Tackling of Conflicts

Participation may assist the tackling of conflicts by giving the different parties and stakeholders a better idea of each other’s viewpoints. The objective is to reduce conflicts through actors meeting regularly to discuss problems (Jonsson & Lundqvist, 2006; Zachrisson, 2004).

5. Heterogeneity and Social Justice

The Convention’s definition of landscape as an area “as perceived by people” and the specific recognition of landscapes as an expression of the diversity of people’s shared cultural and natural heritage implies that landscape heterogeneity is regarded as a value. Sigurd Bergmann (2006) refers to Theodor Adorno’s work *Aesthetic Theory* (1997 [1970]), in which cultural diversity is linked to conceptions of justice that integrate the strange and the stranger. Bergmann suggests this can be applied to the field of human-environment interaction. He proposes a notion of environmental ethics that includes heterogeneity. Acceptance of heterogeneity implies social justice. This means recognizing the significance of landscapes to all inhabitants and implies public participation without discrimination.

Levels of Public Participation

Two levels of public participation in relation to landscape have been identified by Prieur and Durousseau (2006). The first is in the definition of landscape policy. The second is in the implementation of landscape policy. In countries where there are

legal procedures for public participation in planning (e.g. Norway, Sweden), these rarely specify landscape (Prieur & Dourousseau, 2006). Prieur, at the European Regional Planning seminar in Budapest 2003 (quoted in Prieur & Dourousseau, 2006, pp. 203–204), noted that “the public, as a rule, is more sensitive to visible operations than to plans”; the public takes most notice “during the actual implementation of projects in the field, . . . [when] decisions are made to build or carry out works, the often irreversible character of which will have an impact on the environment, whether on landscape, soil or biological diversity.”

Hence the challenge is to get the public involved early, before implementation has gone so far that public participation is too late to be effective.

Related to policy is the definition of landscape-quality objectives based on the identification and assessment of landscapes in accordance with Article 6 C & D of the Convention. While this is generally a task undertaken by professionals, it is clearly a matter of interest to the public, and the Convention provides for public consultation in accordance with the principle of participation. Assessments should specifically take into account “the particular values assigned to the landscapes in question by the interested parties and the population concerned” (Article 6 C 1).

Until now, many landscape analyses and assessments have been undertaken without consultation with or the participation of the population concerned. An earlier example of landscape identification without participation was a report making a regional division of the Nordic countries according to cultural landscapes, published by the Nordic Council of Ministers in 1987 (Nordisk ministerråd, 1987). This was developed from an earlier division of the Nordic countries into natural-geographical regions by adding information on land use, buildings and other cultural artefacts, and the landscape’s visual characteristics (Nordiska ministerrådet, 1977). This work has continued in Norway, where the Norwegian Forest and Landscape Institute (*Norsk institutt for skog og landskap*) has prepared a ‘National Reference System for Landscape’ dividing the country into 45 landscape regions and 444 sub-regions, based on landforms, water and watercourses, vegetation, agricultural land, and built-up areas and technical installations. The landscape character of each region is described, stating specific regional qualities, challenges and development trends (Puschmann, 2005). This was cited in Norway’s report at the end of 2006 to the Council of Europe on the status of landscape policies as an example of measures taken to carry out the identification of landscapes and the analysis of their characteristics in accordance with Article 6 C of the Convention. However, it is the work of professionals, without any direct input from the general public.

In my view, just as important as descriptions of nature, land use, buildings and the landscape’s visually distinctive features for landscape identification and assessment is the role of art and literature as well as people’s historical associations. These types of information need to be combined with investigations of people’s preferences and values.

However, there appears to be a similar mismatch between the Convention itself and the Convention’s own Explanatory Report regarding the relationship between experts and the public. Because of the inevitably subjective and varying public perceptions of landscape, the Explanatory Report recommends “performing the evaluation according to objective criteria first” (as if any criteria can be objective),

and then comparing the findings with the various assessments of the landscape by people concerned and other interest groups. The emphasis is on interested parties having the right to express their opinion at a public inquiry. Further, public participation is to be “fostered by providing the public with information, consulting all representative bodies, using the media and conducting awareness-raising campaigns at all levels.” Even though public participation is referred to, the procedure described is very top-down.

This has been pointed out by Kenneth Olwig (this issue), who states:

The kind of ‘public enquiry’ envisioned in the explanatory report treats landscape as something that is known to experts and inculcated into the populace through information campaigns before that population is then allowed to exercise the right bestowed upon them to express an opinion.

Who is Entitled to Participate?

The Convention states that participation is to include the general public, local and regional authorities, and other parties with an interest in the definition and implementation of landscape policies. According to Prieur and Durousseau (2006, p. 205), “the interpretation of ‘public’ ought to be extended to its meaning in the broadest sense, including individuals regardless of their place of residence”. In other words, participation is intended to be non-discriminatory, in accordance with the Aarhus Convention. This implies that everyone is entitled to a say: administrators, professionals and ordinary people; women, men, children; residents, visitors; citizens, immigrants; and different ethnic groups. This raises several important issues of principle:

1. Fairness for All

One of the principal challenges for the implementation of the European Landscape Convention is how to incorporate people’s perceptions of their landscapes into a form of participatory planning and management that takes into account differing perceptions of landscape. Procedures need to be developed that are perceived as fair not only by the majority but also by minority interests in the composite, multi-cultural society that makes up modern Europe.

2. Recognition of the Needs of Special Groups

There is a need to find appropriate ways of institutionalizing participation by all interested groups of stakeholders. One example of a group that has special needs in relation to landscape is the physically impaired. Blind people, for example, experience the landscape not through sight but through their other senses and are particularly vulnerable to their path being impeded by badly placed signs and street furniture. People in wheelchairs find their access impeded where paths and squares are surfaced with cobblestones or where there are stairways without accompanying ramps. Requests for better access by the physically impaired have in some cases met

opposition from city conservationists, afraid that the historic fabric of the city might be disturbed (Löfgren, 2006).

3. Local Communities

Another challenge is that of defining and safeguarding local community interests while recognizing the interests of other groups of stakeholders outside the local community and at different administrative levels. It must further be recognized that local communities are not homogenous but reflect local constellations of power and influence. A dilemma is that local communities, however defined, tend to be exclusive in their essence, while majority democratic rule on the other hand can often be discriminatory to minority interests. Participation requires developing a form of democracy that balances majority rule with sensitivity to minority interests (Jones, 2006).

4. Landholders

Certain measures may affect certain stakeholders, such as property owners and farmers, more than others. The question arises as to whether landowners or those possessing land rights should be privileged above others. A strong argument is made for public aid in the form of advice, landscape management agreements, agri-environmental subsidies, tax reductions or other means to facilitate landscape management in the public interest by those whose daily livelihoods are dependent on the land (Prieur & Dourousseau, 2006). There is a need to recognize the role of customary institutions and the complexity of land rights for maintaining the cherished diversity of landscapes (Jones, forthcoming). Yet the converse of recognizing the legal rights of the propertied is to listen to the grievances of the dispossessed—such as rooming-house tenants, squatters and the homeless, as Nick Blomley (1998) argues in the North American urban context with his case study of Vancouver.

5. Visitors

A commonly made distinction is between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, with the inference that the former by virtue of their ‘insidedness’ have a greater right to be heard on issues relating to ‘their’ landscapes. There is no doubt that individuals or groups who have stable and long-term attachments to particular places, sometimes over several generations, frequently have deep-rooted knowledge, often tacit knowledge, about the history and distinctive characteristics of the landscape. However, the distinction between insiders and outsiders is not in practice clear-cut. Visitors have differing degrees of involvement and interest in the landscapes they visit. New residents moving into an area may be regarded as ‘outsiders’ by long-established residents, yet can express strong attachments to the landscape of their adopted homes. Conversely, people who have moved out of an area may continue to visit it because of family connections, property or a continuing emotional attachment, and may express strong feelings about landscape changes. Other groups of visitors with varying degrees of attachment range from second-home owners who may be seasonal

visitors, holiday-makers who return on a regular basis to the same place, and tourists who visit a place once or only a few times on the basis of hearsay or advertising. Landscape specialists in academia or in government administration are often 'outsiders' who tend to have particularly strong views regarding landscape change based on their particular disciplinary training. The perceptions of all these groups are relevant in the terms of the European Landscape Convention, but finding ways of achieving a *modus vivendi* between their differing interests and value judgements is particularly challenging.

6. *Immigrants*

A more contentious matter concerns the rights of immigrants. Minorities include not only old-established regional minorities ('native' ethnic minorities) but also non-native minorities, who for the most part are recent, urban immigrants, often collecting together in particular areas of towns, and leaving their mark on the landscapes of these areas, in senses perceived both positively and negatively by the older-established majority. Legal immigrants have often become citizens of their adopted countries of residence, while those who have not done so have nonetheless in many cases gained the right to vote in local elections after a set number of years' residence. Despite this, the building of, for example, mosques and the development of ethnically distinctive urban districts are frequently matters of heated debate.

But what about other categories of immigrants, such as guest workers, temporary migrants, asylum seekers and refugees, who have restricted rights and entitlements? What about illegal immigrants (working often as labourers in construction or agriculture, as hotel workers or as domestic help) who are without formal rights? A radical, but undoubtedly controversial, interpretation of the Convention would mean that such groups should not be dealt with summarily but should be heard in matters concerning the physical environment in which they find themselves. As Don Mitchell (1996) has shown in the case of migrant labourers in California, landscapes may physically reflect social inequality and exploitation and thus raise questions of justice.

Are There Landscapes that Participation Does Not Apply to?

Article 2 makes it clear that the Convention covers all types of landscape: natural, rural, urban and peri-urban areas; inland waters and marine areas as well as land; and landscapes that might be considered outstanding as well as everyday or degraded landscapes.

Landscape is not simply a collection of material artefacts, but is concerned with the immaterial meanings and values people attach to their material surroundings. Nearly all landscapes are special in some way to someone, although not always consciously expressed. The Convention implies that account should be taken of people's attachments to their physical surroundings also in previously neglected areas, such as for example suburbs, industrial areas, working-class landscapes and even derelict landscapes.

Landscape hence includes towns and cities as well as rural areas, and not only beautiful historical cities but also ordinary city landscapes and even neglected areas.

The Convention moves on from administering landscapes solely with the aim of protection to a broader conception of landscape that is important to consider in all forms of planning and management of our surroundings. Even in 'boring' suburbs there are elements that people identify with and value, while slums and derelict areas are landscapes that need enhancement rather than protection. Some landscapes may have only transitory value and not be considered at all worth preserving for themselves over time, such as large-scale opencast mines, industrial corridors along motorways, or frontier installations.

Article 9 on trans-frontier landscapes encourages local and regional co-operation across national frontiers and provides for joint landscape programmes. However, it does not specifically address the question of whether and to what extent this applies to the external boundaries of the area covered by the member states of the Council of Europe. If Russia adheres at some future date to the Convention, it would apply as far east as the Bering Straits and the frontiers with China and North Korea.

Bergmann (2006) draws attention to the places and non-places and the landscapes emerging from '*Festung Europa*' and the selective immigration policies of the European Union. The treatment of temporary immigrants as either "enemies or slaves", as he puts it, is reflected in housing and territorial protection. "A whole new kind of architecture is growing up in Europe for and by an increasing number of people on the move" (Bergmann, 2006, p. 345). The outer frontiers of '*Festung Europa*' are characterized by walls and fences, military installations and watchtowers, shanty-towns, camps, ruins, abandoned vehicles, garbage heaps, tunnels, boat people, even dead bodies. Besides the distinctive landscapes of immigration control, hostile treatment at frontiers and fear of deportation also results in vulnerable migrants—men, women and children—choosing unsafe smuggler routes rather than safer routes that are heavily controlled by the authorities (see Sassen, 1999; Sharma, 2005).

A radical implication of the participatory democracy regarding the landscape and environment that the European Landscape Convention and its antecedent the Aarhus Convention provide for would be that such implacable problems as these would be addressed with the involvement of the people concerned.

Public Awareness, Training and Education

The next issue to be considered is how to create the preconditions for an informed public participation in landscape matters. Awareness-raising, training and education are among the Specific Measures of the Convention (Article 6 A and B), "designed to foster the emergence of a landscape culture among the authorities and the population" (Prieur & Dourousseau, 2006, p. 195). In accordance with Article 6 A, the signatory parties "undertake to increase awareness among the civil society, private organizations, and public authorities of the value of landscapes, their role and changes in them". Under Article 6 B, the parties undertake to promote training for landscape specialists, multidisciplinary training programmes for professionals in the public and private sectors, and school and university courses that "address the values attaching to landscapes and the issues raised by their protection, management and planning" (see also Sarlöv Herlin, 2004). Article 6 A and B does not mention the relationship between awareness-raising, education and public participation as such, but the focus on values, seen in the light of Article 6 C 1 b (see Table 2), would

indicate that it is the values assigned to landscapes by the interested parties and population concerned that is at issue here. Awareness-raising and education would thus involve communicating and discussing the diversity of differing and competing values attached to landscape among the public rather than simply arguing for particular values held by political or educated elites.

A number of different types of methods of awareness-raising and education can be envisaged. Norwegian examples include:

Public Awareness Campaigns. An early example from Norway was the Cultural Landscape Campaign of 1988–1989 under the auspices of the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of the Environment, designed to publicize features of the agricultural landscape considered valuable and threatened by change (Jones, 1991). Conversely, campaigns can be mounted by private interest groups concerned over planned building development that is seen as adversely affecting their landscapes.

Exhibitions. An example from the city of Trondheim was an exhibition mounted in 1978 as a co-operation between residents and professionals in the fields of conservation architecture, ethnology, geography, and history that resulted in the protection and conservation of Ilsvikøra, a small harbour-side community that the planning authorities had intended to demolish to make way for industrial and harbour development (Jones & Olsen, 1977).

Publicizing by Use of Media and Internet. Open access to information on plans involving landscape at an early stage in the planning process would allow the public to become more easily involved. Even better would be a process in which the public are invited to state their views and aspirations regarding their physical surroundings before planning gets under way.

Landscape Impact Analyses. A method of illustrated landscape scenarios presenting possible alternative futures for discussion, using a method developed in Sweden by Lars Emmelin (1982, 1996; Emmelin & Brusewitz, 1985), has been applied at two localities in south Norway as a means for presenting for discussion the landscape impacts of alternative agricultural policies (Emmelin *et al.*, 1990; Jones & Emmelin, 1995).

Landscape Awards. Norway has nominated candidates for UNESCO's cultural landscape prize (the Melina Mercouri International Prize for the Safeguarding and Management of Cultural Landscapes). The County of Hordaland has instituted its own Cultural Landscape Prize. In Sør-Trøndelag, the county branch of the Society for the Preservation of Norwegian Ancient Monuments (*Fortidsminneforeningen*) gives a prize each year for good maintenance or restoration of historic buildings or building complexes.

Signposted Landscape Trails. Nature trails and culture trails are found in many parts of Norway, with signposts giving information about features of interest from the perspectives of natural history, archaeology and history. They are frequently established and maintained by local museums and local history societies.

Photographic Documentation. A recent Norwegian example is a photographic exhibition comparing selected landscapes at places throughout Norway, where photographs had been taken at various points of time in the past (some as far back as 1880, others as late as the 1990s), with the same views today, focusing on how the landscape has changed (Puschmann *et al.*, 2006).

Local History Society or Natural History Society Walks. Organized walks may be led by specialists or teachers sharing their knowledge of the landscape, or led by local people sharing their experiences. Heimdal Local History Society in Trondheim arranges, for example, an annual walk during which older and long-established residents of the area tell their experiences of places, people and landscapes in the form of ‘history from below’.

Fieldwork by University Students. A master’s course in Landscape and Planning at the Department of Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, in Trondheim, involves each year an analysis of a planning case where landscape is an issue. By means of document analysis and qualitative interviews of planners, residents, owners and others, the landscape values of different interest groups and the way in which they are dealt with in the planning process are elucidated (Jones, 1999a).

School Field Trips. Some subjects, such as geography, biology and geology, have a long tradition of taking pupils out on field trips. These provide the opportunity for presenting and discussing the landscape in all its complexity outdoors rather than more abstractly in the classroom. Junior and even infant school children can be taken on outings ‘to show them the landscape’ and discussing the everyday terms used to describe, for example, different types of building or other landscape features.⁴

Forms of Public Participation

Public participation can take many forms, as indicated by the following list, including again some examples from Norway:

- Right of petition
- Public inquiries
- Local referenda
- Local consultation committees
- Citizens’ panels
- Focus groups
- E-democracy (websites and use of e-mails for mutual discussion and exchange of information)
- Children’s City Councils. A number of towns in Norway have set up Children’s City Councils (*Ungdommens bystyrer*), with representatives from secondary schools. For example, the Children’s City Council in Trondheim, constituted in 2005, is chosen among pupils aged between 13 and 19, and has discussed specific issues such as a controversial plan for building on

a play ground, as well as the interests of children in city planning more generally.

- Parliaments for minority groups. For example, the indigenous populations of Saami (Lapps) are represented in a Saami Parliament (*Sámedikkî*) in respectively Finland (from 1973), Norway (from 1989) and Sweden (from 1993). Among matters taken up by the Saami Parliaments are issues concerning customary rights to land and water.
- Participatory appraisal. An example is the monitoring of the first four Norwegian UNESCO World Heritage Sites (the mining town of Røros, the Hanseatic Wharves in Bergen, Urnes Stave Church, and the rock carvings in Alta), undertaken in the mid-1990s by international monitoring committees. The main objective of the work was to bring together representatives for the main management interests and collate their views on the most important problems and challenges related to world heritage status. These were then summarized in reports and related to the criteria and requirements for World Heritage Sites as laid down by international agreement, and recommendations were made on this basis. A weakness of the procedure was that time did not permit conversations with house-owners, landowners nor other local inhabitants (Austad *et al.*, 1996; Jones, 1999b; Larsen *et al.*, 1994a, 1994b; Myrvoll *et al.*, 1998).
- Open seminars with specialists and representatives of interest groups specially invited as speakers to discuss status, aims and means of landscape planning and management. An example from Trondheim was the Rotvoll Hearing, called to discuss the planning process around the contested establishment of the oil company Statoil's research centre at Rotvoll, an area of high landscape value in Trondheim (*Høring om kulturlandskap og Rotvoll*, 1991).
- Public meetings called by interest groups. An example, again from Trondheim, relates to plans to redevelop Nyhavna, part of the city's harbour area, where in February 2007 a meeting of representatives of the authorities and interested parties was called by the self-appointed Nyhavna 'government' (*Nyhavna-regjering*), consisting of academics, actors and artists. The objective was to bring about debate and discussion concerning the future use of the harbour area for housing and commercial enterprises, while maintaining its cultural heritage.
- Proactive consultation and mobilization on the basis of local people's perceptions, wishes and ideas (e.g. the architectural firm Fantastic Norway, introduced at the beginning of this paper).
- Delegated management or local community control. Sometimes local self-mobilization meets initial strong opposition from the authorities. A final example from Trondheim illustrating this concerns an area of late 19th century working-class houses, originally called Reina, which in accordance with a plan from 1947 was to become an area for industry. A few dwellings survived, however, although in poor condition. At the end of the 1980s a group of young activists moved into some of the houses that had become empty. They were students, artists, theatre people, musicians and some unemployed, who, wanting to establish an alternative lifestyle in cheap housing, contested the planned demolition of the remaining dwellings. Two nationally known artists supported the protesters by painting murals on the houses, and the inhabitants converted the adjoining open

area into a 'folk park' and children's playground. Despite strong opposition for a long time from the elected city council, tenacious protests and demonstrations resulted in the plans for demolition being reversed, and the area, now under the name of Svartlamoen, became in 2001 a self-managed experimental area of alternative housing based on ecological principles (Jones, 1999a).

Typologies of Participation

The effectiveness of public participation is dependent on the degree to which the authorities allow real involvement by the public and different interest groups. A typology of participation in development programmes and projects in third world countries, developed by Jules N. Pretty (1995), is instructive (Table 3). In the context of promoting sustainable agriculture, Pretty argues that new understandings and solutions are dependent on wide public and scientific participation. He identifies two overlapping schools of thought and practice regarding participation in agricultural development. The first views participation as a means of increasing efficiency—"if people are involved, they are more likely to agree with and support the new development . . .". The second regards participation as a fundamental right, the aim of which "is to initiate mobilization for collective action, empowerment and institution building" (Pretty, 1995, p. 1251). Studies have shown that participation is one of the critical components of success for development projects:

It has been associated with increased mobilization of stakeholder ownership of policies and projects; greater efficiency, understanding and social cohesion; more cost-effective services; greater transparency and accountability; increased empowering of the poor and disadvantaged; and strengthened capacity of people to learn and act. (Pretty, 1995, p. 1251)

However, there is a danger that lip-service is paid to participation in name rather than in reality:

The dilemma for many authorities is they both need and fear people's participation. They need people's agreement and support, but they fear that this wider involvement is less controllable, less precise and so likely to slow down planning processes. But if this fear permits only stage-managed forms of participation, then distrust and greater alienation are the most likely outcomes. This makes it all the more crucial that judgements can be made on the type of participation in use. (Pretty, 1995, pp. 1251–1252)

Pretty identifies seven types of participation (Table 3), ranging "from manipulative and passive participation, where people are told what is to happen and act out predetermined roles, to self-mobilization, where people take initiatives largely independent of external institutions" (1995, p. 1253). Some types of participation provide stakeholders with little or no real influence. The first four types of participation, he continues, are unlikely to have positive lasting effects on people's lives. Pretty emphasizes that great care must be taken over using and interpreting the term participation.

Table 3. A typology of participation in development programmes and projects according to Pretty (1995, p. 1252)

Type of participation	Characteristics
1. Manipulative participation	Participation is simply a pretence, with 'people's' representatives on official boards but who are unelected and have no power.
2. Passive participation	People participate by being told what has been decided or has already happened. It involves unilateral announcements by an administration or project management without any listening to people's responses. The information being shared belongs only to external professionals.
3. Participation by consultation	People participate by being consulted or by answering questions. External agents define problems and information-gathering processes, and so control analysis. Such a consultative process does not concede any share in decision-making, and professionals are under no obligation to take on board people's views.
4. Participation for material incentives	People participate by contributing resources, for example, labour, in return for food, cash or other material incentives. Farmers may provide the fields and labour, but are involved in neither experimentation nor the process of learning. It is very common to see this called participation, yet people have no stake in prolonging technologies or practices when the incentives end.
5. Functional participation	Participation is seen by external agencies as a means to achieve project goals, especially reduced costs. People may participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives related to the project. Such involvement may be interactive and involve shared decision making, but tends to arise only after major decisions have already been made by external agents. At worst, local people may still only be co-opted to serve external goals.
6. Interactive participation	People participate in joint analysis, development of action plans and formation or strengthening of local institutions. Participation is seen as a right, not just the means to achieve project goals. The process involves interdisciplinary methodologies that seek multiple perspectives and make use of systematic and structured learning processes. As groups take control over local decisions and determine how available resources are used, so they have a stake in maintaining structures or practices.
7. Self-mobilization	People participate by taking initiatives independently of external institutions to change systems. They develop contacts with external institutions for resources and technical advice they need, but retain control over how resources are used. Self-mobilization can spread if governments and NGOs provide an enabling framework of support. Such self-initiated mobilization may or may not challenge existing distributions of wealth and power.

A typology of citizen participation in connection with the co-management of natural resources has been developed by Anna Zachrisson (2004) (Table 4). She describes levels 1–3 in Table 4 as tokenism—the government sets the agenda and retains all the decision-making power, while getting input from the local level. Levels 4–7 are labelled co-management, with varying roles for the local community: levels

Table 4. A typology of citizen participation in relation to co-management of natural resources according to Zachrisson (2004, p. 13)

Type of participation	Characteristics
1. Informing	The community is informed about decisions already made, one-way communication between government and the community.
2. Consultation	Start of face-to-face contact, community input is heard but not necessarily heeded (usually involved late in the decision-making process); limitation of involvement continues to be set by the government agency.
3. Co-operation	The community starts to have input into management, and local knowledge is solicited; community members are involved at a low level as assistants or guides, still limited by the management agency's agenda.
4. Communication	Start of two-way information exchange; local concerns begin to enter management plans; joint management actions may take place without joint jurisdiction over the resource.
5. Advisory committees	Partnership in decision-making starts; joint action on common objectives, local communities have advisory powers only; decisions are non-binding.
6. Management boards	The community is given the opportunity to participate in developing and implementing plans; local input plays more than just an advisory role.
7. Partnership	Partnership of equals, joint decision-making is institutionalized and formally recognized; control is delegated to the community where feasible.
8. Community control	The community can make decisions independent of government or with very limited government involvement; most or all of the management power is delegated to the community for local resources.

4–5 are called placation, as the role of local communities is only advisory; level 6 is partnership in management, allowing negotiations between the parties; while level 7 is partnership of equals, with a degree of delegated power. At level 8, termed community control, most or all the power of management is delegated to the local community.

Levels 1–3 correspond largely to Pretty's passive participation, participation by consultation and functional participation respectively, while level 8 corresponds to Pretty's self-mobilization. However, Zachrisson's typology is more detailed on different types of interactive participation. It is especially at levels 6 and 7 that models can be seen for participation in accordance with the European Landscape Convention.

In Conclusion

The European Landscape Convention places an obligation on signatory states to establish procedures for the participation of the general public, local and regional authorities and other interested parties in matters concerning landscape. This implies broad consultation with all interested individuals, organizations and administrative

bodies at various levels. The intention of a participatory, dialogue-based approach is undoubtedly a step in the right direction. It means that the values and meanings attached to landscapes by different groups will need to be the subject of negotiation between competing views and interests. Conflicts concerning landscape values are often symptomatic of deeper-lying social conflicts (Jones, 1999a). The challenge to law-makers is to create appropriate procedures and institutions for solving conflicts between different interest groups. While not without pitfalls (Howard, 2004), public participation in accordance with the European Landscape Convention can provide a means whereby different values and ideologies expressed in attachments to the physical surroundings can be brought to the fore with the objective of negotiating a solution. Negotiations and arbitration procedures with the help of brokers and mediators would complement the prevailing form of representative democracy based on the rule of the majority.

There is a need to recognize and accept that participatory approaches requiring dialogue and negotiation are frequently and necessarily time-consuming. This may not accord with the wishes of administrative bureaucracies, who in many cases favour quick and measurable results, nor of economic interests, who demand clear and unambiguous decisions allowing development. Long, drawn-out procedures may be inconvenient for result-orientated administrations and test the patience of businesspeople. They may also place demands on public funding. Apathy on the part of the general public is another problem that may have to be faced. On the other hand, if the public becomes engaged, their enthusiasm may generate a resource in the form of voluntary work.

The approach of communicative rationality and will to dialogue (Habermas, 1990 [1983]) often requires time and patience—sometimes over many years—to be successful. This notwithstanding, the contestation of power through various forms of direct action cannot be excluded as a strategy that may be adopted by dissatisfied groups (Foucault, 1987). Successful participation requires that people are involved in a mutual interaction between the authorities and all interested parties at an early stage, with all parties presenting their ideas, concerns and arguments as a basis for landscape planning and management rather than powerful groups presenting their plans as virtual *faits accomplis*.

Postscript

In May 2007 the firm of architects charged with preparing the new detailed plan for the Saupstad Centre and surroundings presented its proposal.⁵ The firm had been assigned the task by the principal landowners: the City of Trondheim, the Trondheim and Region Cooperative Society (Trondos, which has its own shop there), and the new owner of the centre building and main car park. It was this architectural firm that had in turn sub-contracted out the exercise in public participation through the red caravan. The majority of the ideas that came up as a result of this have been incorporated into the proposed plan. The objective of the plan is to develop a more attractive centre that will serve as a meeting place for all groups regardless of age, ethnicity or interest. National guidelines for considering the interests of children and young people in planning had been satisfied by the visits made to the local secondary school. The proposed plan involves replacing the car

park by underground parking facilities, and turning part of the former car park into a car-free public square, combined with a children's playground. The centre building itself is to be made more open and inviting by the use of glass covering. A new element is to be an indoor activities centre. In order to provide better contact with the open landscape on the outside of the centre, physical obstructions are to be removed between buildings to give improved access. The surrounding green areas are to be upgraded and given park treatment. Easy access to the centre for physically impaired people is to be secured.

Revitalization of the centre is dependent on a combination of public and private investment. The interests of the owners of the centre lie in improved profitability through development. This is to be achieved by densification. Blocks of flats are to be built on part of the former car park, as well as on a nearby open area and above the shops, providing office space as well as more than 200 new dwelling units. The new centre is envisaged on two levels, with rooftop gardens and bridges between the buildings on the second level. It is argued that the provision of more dwellings will enhance safety as it will mean the centre will not be deserted at night. A more densely built landscape was not, however, one of the wishes of the general public. The plan thus represents a compromise between the desire of the general public for improved facilities, which was strongly expressed through the participation exercise, and the stipulation of the owners for a return on their investment. At the time of writing, the plan still has to be officially announced and made available for public comment and objections before it is laid before the city council for final approval.

Acknowledgements

The article is based on a paper presented at a seminar on the European Landscape Convention, 'Rethinking Landscape in Practice—Participation and Perception', arranged by the Swedish Cultural Heritage Board at the Swedish Institute in Rome, 15–17 March 2007. Thanks are due to the organizers and participants for valuable discussions before and during the seminar, as well as to Don Mitchell and an anonymous referee for their comments on the draft of the paper. I would also like to thank Marie Stenseke for drawing my attention to the work of Anna Zachrisson (2004). Most of the Norwegian examples in the article are taken from my personal involvement, either directly as a participant or indirectly through university teaching.

Notes

- 1 Håkon Matre Aaserød, *Fantastic Kolstad*, 18 November 2006, available at http://rapidshare.com/files/5450538/Rapport_Fantastic_Kolstad.pdf.html.
- 2 By 14 February 2007 the European Landscape Convention had been ratified by 26 states and signed by a further eight states. Among the Nordic countries, it has been ratified by Norway (23 October 2001), Denmark (20 March 2003), and Finland (16 December 2005); it has been signed by Sweden (22 February 2001), but not signed by Iceland. Among the Baltic countries, it has been ratified by Lithuania (13 November 2002) and signed by Latvia (29 November 2006), but not signed by Estonia. Among other major countries, it has been ratified by Turkey (13 October 2003), France (17 March 2006), Italy (4 May 2006), and the UK (21 November 2006); it has been signed by Spain (20 October 2000) and Switzerland (20 October 2000), but not signed by Germany or Russia (source: European Landscape Convention website at <http://conventions.coe.int/>).

- 3 The Aarhus Convention had 46 Parties by the end of 2005, of which five had signed but not yet ratified it. Among the Nordic countries, it has been ratified by Norway (2 May 2003) and Sweden (20 May 2005), accepted by Finland (1 September 2004), approved by Denmark (29 September 2000), and signed by Iceland (25 June 1998) but not ratified. Among the Baltic countries, it has been ratified by Estonia (2 August 2001), Lithuania (28 January 2002), and Latvia (14 June 2002). Among other major member states of the Council of Europe, it has been ratified by Italy (13 June 2001), Spain (29 December 2004), UK (23 February 2005), and Germany (15 January 2007); approved by France (8 July 2002); signed by Switzerland (25 June 1998) but not ratified; while Russia and Turkey are not listed (source: http://www.unece.org/env/pp/ctreaty_files/ctreaty_2007_03_27.htm).
- 4 An outing for infant school children can be illustrated by an experience I had, not in Norway, but in England, in my home town of Southampton. As a visiting uncle, I accompanied along with volunteering parents and other close relatives (under teacher supervision) a group of five-year-olds on a field trip in the immediate vicinity of their school, examining, discussing and photographing different types of house, so that they learned the difference between detached houses, semi-detached houses, bungalows, terrace houses and blocks of flats. I would like to thank the teachers at Bitterne Church of England Infant School for making me aware of the potentiality that such studies have for creating landscape awareness at an early age.
- 5 The plan proposal ('*Reguleringsbestemmelsene for Saupstad senter*' and '*Reguleringsplan for Saupstad senter område*') has been made available by Bente Rødahl, of Selberg Arkitektkontor AS/Bente Rødahl AS, the consultant architectural firm commissioned to prepare the draft plan.

References

- Adorno, T. W. (1997 [1970]) *Aesthetic Theory*, G. Adorno & R. Tiedemann (Eds), trans. R. Hullot-Kentor (London: Athlone Press).
- Austad, I., Jokilehto, J., Jones, M., Larsen, K. E., Mitchell, N. J., Nilsen, D., Soheil, M. A. & Stove, H. (1996) Assessment of Urnes Stave Church, World Heritage Convention, *ICOMOS Nytt* 2/96, pp. 5–14.
- Bergmann, S. (2006) Atmospheres of synergy: towards an eco-theological aesth/ethics of space, *Ecotheology*, 11(3), pp. 326–356.
- Blomley, N. (1998) Landscapes of property, *Law & Society Review*, 32(3), pp. 567–612.
- Déjeant-Pons, M. (2006) The European Landscape Convention, *Landscape Research*, 31(4), pp. 363–384.
- Emmelin, L. (1982) *Painting the Future—Visual Impact Analysis of Changes in the Swedish Landscape*, Forskningsrådsnämndens Rapport 1982:15 (Stockholm: Forskningsrådsnämnden).
- Emmelin, L. (1996) Landscape Impact Analysis: a systematic approach to landscape impacts of policy, *Landscape Research*, 21(1), pp. 13–35.
- Emmelin, L. & Brusewitz, G. (1985) *Det föränderliga landskapet—utveckling och framtidsbilder* (Stockholm: LTs förlag).
- Emmelin, L., Jones, M., Ree, H. & Forshed, N. (1990) Landskap på Jæren og Romerike: Utvikling og framtidsbilder, in: D. P. Sødal, A. Vatn, L. Emmelin, M. Jones & N. Forshed (Eds) *Jordbrukspolitikk og miljø, del II Kulturlandskapet*, 32 p. (Oslo: Landbruksforlaget).
- Foucault, M. (1987) The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom, in: J. Bernauer & D. Rasmussen (Eds) *The Final Foucault*, pp. 1–20 (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Habermas, J. (1990 [1983]) *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. C. Lenhardt & S.W. Nicholson (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Høring om kulturlandskap og Rotvoll* (1991) (Trondheim: Folkeaksjonen Bevar Rotvoll/Naturvernforbund i Sør-Trøndelag).
- Howard, P. (2004) Spatial planning for landscape: mapping the pitfalls, *Landscape Research*, 29(4), pp. 423–434.
- Jones, M. (1991) The elusive reality of landscape, *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift*, 45(3), pp. 229–244.
- Jones, M. (1999a) Landscapsverdier som konfliktpunkt i planlegging. Eksempler fra Trondheim, in: M. Eggen, A. K. Geelmuyden & K. Jørgensen (Eds) *Landskapet vi lever i. Festskrift til Magne Bruun*, pp. 178–203 (Oslo: Norsk arkitekturforlag).

- Jones, M. (1999b) Røros as a World Heritage Site, in: G. Setten, T. Semb & R. Torvik (Eds) *Shaping the Land. Vol. 1: The Relevance of Research for Landscape Management: Tool or Critique?* Proceedings of the Permanent European Conference for the Study of the Rural Landscape, 18th Session in Røros and Trondheim, Norway, 7–11 September 1998, Papers from the Department of Geography, University of Trondheim, New series A 27, pp. 33–50 (Trondheim: Geografisk institutt, Universitetet i Trondheim).
- Jones, M. (2006) Landscape, law and justice—concepts and issues, *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift/Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 60(1), pp. 1–14.
- Jones, M. (forthcoming) Multiple interfaces of the European Landscape Convention: the interface with law, *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift/Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 61.
- Jones, M. & Emmelin, L. (1995) Scenarios for the visual impact of agricultural policies in two Norway landscapes, in: J. F. T. Schoute, P. A. Finke, F. A. Veeneklaas & H. P. Wolfert (Eds) *Scenario Studies for the Rural Environment. Selected and Edited Proceedings of the Symposium*, Scenario Studies for the Rural Environment, Wageningen, The Netherlands, 12–15 September 1994, Environment & Policy, vol. 5, pp. 405–413 & Plates 5a–11b (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic).
- Jones, M. & Olsen, V. (Eds) (1977) *Ilsvikøra—Footdee. To samfunn—samme debatt*. Artikkelsamling til utstillingen “Ilsvikøra—fortid og framtid” i Galleri Hornemann, Trondheim, 19 February to 6 March 1977 (Trondheim).
- Jonsson, A. & Lundqvist, L. J. (2006) Engagera sig i vattenfrågor—varför, hur mycket och var?, in: A. Jöborn, I. Danielsson & H. Oscarsson (Eds) *På tal om vatten. Om vägen mot en hållbar vattenförvaltning*, Vastra rapport 6, pp. 93–122 (Göteborg: Vastra).
- Larsen, K. E., Ahlberg, N., Jokilehto, J., Jones, M. & Nilsen, D. (1994a) Evaluation of Røros Bergstad in Norway, World Heritage Convention, *ICOMOS Nytt* 3/94, pp. 8–13.
- Larsen, K. E., Ahlberg, N., Jokilehto, J., Jones, M. & Nilsen, D. (1994b) Evaluation of Bryggen in Bergen, Norway, World Heritage Convention, *ICOMOS Nytt* 3/94, pp. 14–19.
- Löfgren, A. (2006) Your little doorstep is my wall: a personal experience of living in a disabling society, *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift/Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 60(3), pp. 267–271.
- Mitchell, D. (1996) *The Lie of the Land: Migrant Workers and the Californian Landscape* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Myrvoll, S., Pound, C. & Bertilsson, U. (1998) Alta Petroglyphs. Periodic World Heritage State of Conservation Report, *ICOMOS Nytt* 1/98, pp. 9–10.
- Nordiska ministerrådet (1977) *Naturgeografisk regionalindelning av Norden*, NU B 1977:34 (Stockholm: Nordiska ministerrådet).
- Nordisk ministerråd (1987) *Natur- og kulturlandskapet i arealplanlegging, 1. Regioninndeling av landskap*, Miljørapport 1987:3 (Moss: Nordisk Ministerråd).
- Pretty, J. N. (1995) Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture, *World Development*, 23(8), pp. 1247–1263.
- Prieur, M. & Durosseau, S. (2006) Landscape and public participation, in: *Landscape and Sustainable Development. Challenges of the European Landscape Convention*, pp. 165–207 (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing).
- Puschmann, O. (2005) *Nasjonalt referansesystem for landskap – beskrivelse av Norges 45 landskapsregioner*, NIJOS rapport 10/2005 (Ås: Norsk institutt for jord- og skogkartlegging).
- Puschmann, O., Dramstad, W. & Hoel, R. (2006) *Tilbakeblikk – norske landskap i endring* [Norwegian Landscapes in Retrospect] (Oslo: Tun Forlag).
- Sarlöv Herlin, I. (2004) New challenges in the field of spatial planning, *Landscape Research*, 29(4), pp. 399–411.
- Sassen, S. (1999) *Guests and Aliens* (New York: New Press).
- Selman, P. (2004) Community participation in the planning and management of cultural landscape, *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 47(3), pp. 365–392.
- Sharma, N. (2005) *Home Economics: Nationalism and the Making of ‘Migrant Workers’ in Canada* (Toronto: Toronto University Press).
- Stenseke, M. (2006) *Lokalt inflytande i landskapsvården. En forskningsöversikt med bäring på skötsel av naturbetesmarker*, Occasional Papers 2006:1 (Göteborg: Kulturgeografiska institutionen, Handelshögskolan vid Göteborgs Universitet).
- Zachrisson, A. (2004) *Co-management of Natural Resources. Paradigm Shifts, Key Concepts and Cases*, Mountain Mistra Programme report, Report no. 1 (Umeå: Mountain Mistra Programme).