



Strasbourg, 18 February 2015

CEP-CDCPP (2015) 19E

# EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE CONVENTION

## *CEP-CDCPP*

## 8th COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONFERENCE ON

## THE EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE CONVENTION

***Conference organised under the auspices of the Belgian Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe***

## PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT ON

## "LANDSCAPE AND ECONOMY, AN APPROACH FROM THE EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE CONVENTION"

Council of Europe
Palais de l'Europe, Strasbourg
18-20 March 2015

*Document of the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe*
*Directorate of Democratic Governance*

*Summary*

*Considering that the Preamble of the European Landscape Convention states:*

*"The member States of the Council of Europe signatory hereto,*
*...*

*Noting that* ***the landscape*** *has an important public interest role in the cultural, ecological, environmental and social fields, and* ***constitutes a resource favourable to economic activity*** *and whose protection, management and planning can* ***contribute to job creation****;*

*Aware that the landscape contributes to the formation of local cultures and that it is a basic component of the European natural and cultural heritage, contributing to* ***human well-being*** *and consolidation of the European identity;*

*Acknowledging that the landscape is an important part of the* ***quality of life for people everywhere****: in urban areas and in the countryside, in degraded areas as well as in areas of high quality, in areas recognised as being of outstanding beauty as well as everyday areas;*

*Noting that developments in agriculture, forestry, industrial and mineral production techniques and in regional planning, town planning, transport, infrastructure, tourism and* ***recreation*** *and, at a more general level, changes in the world economy are in many cases accelerating the transformation of landscapes;*

*Wishing to respond to the* ***public's wish to enjoy high quality landscape****s and to play an active part in the development of landscapes;*

*Believing that the landscape is a key element of* ***individual and social well-being*** *and that its protection, management and planning entail rights and responsibilities for everyone;"*

*The Conference is invited to:*

- examine the report prepared in the framework of the Council of Europe Work Programme of the European Landscape Convention and in particular its conclusions, and to decide on possible follow-up to be given.

# Landscape and the economy,

# an approach from the European Landscape Convention

*Joaquín ROMANO*
*Expert Consultant for the Council of Europe*
*Chaired Professor of economy at the Faculty of Economic Sciences of the University of Valladolid (Spain)*

*Contents*

*Presentation*



## Presentation

The landscape and the economy as social representations have been the subject of many studies. Each mainly follow their own theories but are united in practice since, though it is simple to capture the reality of social representations, capturing the concept is not so easy. Both are certainly linked as they are part of the framework of daily life. In a metaphorical sense, this can be compared to the molecular structure of water, which favours the interactions that create the links or 'hydrogen bonds'[1], upon which the existence of this essential resource for all kinds of life depends.

We shall examine the links that the landscape, as conceived in the European Landscape Convention, establishes with the main objectives of the economy: social well-being, the creation of employment, public assets and interventions, all of which connect with the real worries of European societies; we also wish to learn more about the risks inherent in a lack of any connection between economics and the landscape, as well as the opportunities offered by such links.

The first part considers the different viewpoints and methodologies that can be applied in the analysis of the landscape's economic dimension, given that it will be from such viewpoints and methodologies that the perceivable forces of attraction between the economy and the landscape depend. These forces

[1] Second says Goold, S.E. (2011): "*Water is everywhere on our planet. In the air, in our bodies, in our food and in our breath. Without it life as we know it would not be possible. Water is vital for the survival of all living things, yet as a molecule it has some pretty odd behavior. Water molecules stick to each other, forming the 'skin' on ponds and droplets. The solid form floats on the liquid form. At room temperature water is a liquid, when most of the molecules closely related to it are gasses. Why does water have so many strange and wonderful properties? What is it about this rather tiny and innocuous molecule that makes it so important for life? To answer that you have to look at the actual structure of the molecule, exploring a world far, far smaller than microbiology usually goes. The properties of water are determined by the forces that hold it together"*. The 'hydrogen bond' is really a special case of dipole forces. A hydrogen bond is the attractive force between the hydrogen attached to an electronegative atom of one molecule and an electronegative atom of a different molecule. Usually the electronegative atom is oxygen, nitrogen, or fluorine, which has a partial negative charge. The hydrogen then has the partial positive charge.

both determine and are determined by the capacity to implement public participation, which reveals the essential common factor in the economic processes or dynamics and the landscape.

The second part then considers an economics subject that has become fundamental in its development: social well-being. This can maintain a generic link to the landscape, as is pointed out in detail in the Convention. The contributions of the landscape to social well-being, in both theory and practice, offer economics the possibility of an argued renovation of the subjective aspects of welfare as revealed by the landscape.

The third part deals with one of the central pillars of social well-being as reflected in economic policies, social worries and academic research: employment. The perspective of the landscape allows us to widen the recognition of work beyond just a monetary salary, interpreting it as the wider set of human activities linked to the very dynamics and management of the landscape. If employment is seen as something more than just the labour market, it can be considered as a form of public participation and social construction par excellence.

Finally, the fourth part introduces the existing connections between the economy and the landscape through the debate on the private versus public sphere of the economy. If the selection criteria are relaxed, the landscape can help to uncover the double condition of public versus private, and this allows the landscape to be stressed as an essential factor in harmonising and linking these different areas.

Each part has meaning within the reflection as a whole on the forces of attraction that the landscape exerts upon the economy, thus establishing bridges and links which are essential to coexistence and democracy. This is something that even competition, essentially from the markets, must know how to serve, since such means cannot be the end, and exclusion cannot be the basis of social welfare; because another economy is possible, one that can make this world a better place. As Europeans, we hold the historical responsibility for driving such a change, and we should recognise this vital opportunity that the landscape gives us.

## 1. The economic dimension of landscape: the nexus

The landscape and the economy are acquiring growing importance and stronger links in the complex cultural configuration process that both determines and is determined by human behaviour. Understanding the complexity of this process is the starting point in the analysis of the economic dimension of the landscape[2].

Knowledge of the existing relationship between economics and the landscape is determined by the way in which such an approach to its complexity (i.e., to the methodology adopted) is interpreted. At one extreme we have approaches that take on this complexity with the intention of resolving it through the simplification of the cultural system; first the decomposition, fragmentation and dispersion of its parts, to then proceed with a specialised and independent study of each one, the so-called disciplinary focus. Close to that, there is also the interdisciplinary focus, which groups together a set of works from different disciplines. The desired result is objective and detailed knowledge from each sphere of reality. At the other extreme, other currents of opinion[3]interpret this approach to complexity from the

[2]Complexity supposes the understanding that reality is dynamic, modelled in space and time by an infinite number of elements, natural species, persons, organisations, cultures, technologies… which are in a continual interrelationship and which are materialised through the landscape and the economy, among other spheres.

[3] These currents are developed in both the public sphere of the social or collective organisations and the private business organisations. In the latter case, it has stood out for its “effectiveness in converting intangible knowledge into tangible business assets, creating an organisation based on processes, teams and communities” (Nonaka, I. 1995).

point of view of the "fusion between the unit and the multiplicity"[4], the so-called transdisciplinary focus, which is based on and takes into consideration the complexity itself. The desired result is meaningful knowledge.

Meaningful knowledge is not guided by facts, but by scenarios; it is relational and emotional. It is based on dealing with a single reality as if it were multiple realities. This means that, in the matter of landscape and economics, each decision is based on a relationship and interconnectivity with a multitude of questions which each decision can bring about in both local and global affairs, bringing both sense and logic to the processes from tradition, acquired knowledge, experience, real or everyday situations, creativity and social dialogue.

This methodological distinction is crucial. Firstly, because it enables us to look at the divergent results that can come from the analysis of the landscape's economic dimension. Secondly, because of the different possibilities for public participation[5] through the level of debate that arises. Collective knowledge processes are thus established, limited in one case by the disciplinary nature, and in the other, opened up by the transdisciplinary nature, in the preoccupation with the problems being characterised.

When applying a disciplinary approach, the analysis of the economic dimension of the landscape will give us a very different result from the one we will get if the landscape dimension of the economy is analysed. This is because the recognised theoretical orthodoxies of the science of economics on the one hand, and the academic orthodoxies of the landscape on the other, differ substantially in their aims and research methods. Specialisation brings with it, among other things, a problem when we wish to take the debate beyond the specialisations. Such reductionism represents a serious limitation to our knowledge of reality and its key challenges in spite of the notable academic results in each of the disciplines[6]. This is what some authors have called the social syndrome of the Tower of Babel, whose conflicts involve effects that are critical to the understanding of the process of the construction of the landscape.

Adopting a transdisciplinary approach as an alternative facilitates the simultaneous approach to both the landscape and the economy. This also assumes some recognition of the complexity, but without the possibility, nor the intention, of resolving the said complexity. We simply introduce holistic analysis, which stresses the importance of everything considered globally, and in which economics and landscape both participate, creating the synergies of their interdependence. With the introduction in the economy of the landscape approach, we are looking for the synthesis that will enable the exchange of and mutual respect for ideas, beliefs or different cultures, either individual or collective. It also opposes any kind of reductionism of reality that would limit the field of study, concentrating on the traditional part, and thus encouraging indoctrination and single thought[7].

---

[4]An expression of Edgar Morin (1990), who, in opposition to the traditional way of thinking, which classifies the field of knowledge into disciplines, formulates the idea of complex thought as a kind of relinking. It is, therefore, opposed to the isolation of pieces of knowledge, restores them to their context and, whenever possible, reinserts them into the global picture to which they belong.

[5]Public participation has been defined by Rowe, G. and Frewer, L. (2004) *"at a general level as the practice of consulting and involving members of the public in the agenda-setting, decision-making, and policy-forming activities of organisations or institutions responsible for policy development"*.

[6] According to Popper (1963): *"We are not students of some subject matter but students of problems. And problems may cut right across the borders of any subject matter or discipline"*. Also Becher (1991) warns that the specialisations are real "academic disciplinary tribes", more concerned with studying issues that trouble.

[7] The concept of single thought, first described by the German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer in 1819 as that thought which "*sustains itself, without having to make reference to other components of a system of thought", has been questioned by different authors. Edgar Morin, well-known critic of single thought, points out: "'Single thought' was thus named by its detractors, given its desire to hold the truth and to represent reality. It is thus a question of the illusion of realism, which hopes to know the truth, to see it and control it. Obviously, it is a reality constructed for a made-to-measure rationalizing of its reductionist concepts. Reality, however, cannot be*

The European Landscape Convention recognises the adoption of a transdisciplinary approach, wherein the notion of landscape is established as: *"an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors*". Equally appreciable is the notion of landscape management it introduces: *"Landscape management means action, from a perspective of sustainable development, to ensure the regular upkeep of a landscape, so as to guide and harmonise changes which are brought about by social, economic and environmental processes"*.

The Convention's application becomes effective upon the recognition of the transdisciplinary nature of the notion of landscape, as is pointed out in the Recommendation CM/Rec(2008)3 of the Committee of Ministers of member States on the Guidelines for setting up the European Landscape Convention: *"The concept of landscape in the convention differs from the one that may be found in certain documents, which sees in landscape an 'asset' (heritage concept of landscape) and assesses it (as 'cultural', 'natural' etc. landscape) by considering it as a part of physical space. This new concept expresses, on the contrary, the desire to confront, head-on and in a comprehensive way, the theme of the quality of the surroundings where people live; this is recognised as a precondition for individual and social well-being (understood in the physical, physiological, psychological and intellectual sense) and for sustainable development, as well as a resource conducive to economic activity"*.

The Convention, in the way it has been conceived and developed, offers not only the purpose but also the opportunity to encourage a community of interests that will allow a certain common sense to be used in the management of that reality which, as European citizens, we all share and which is, at the same time, an economic, social and ecological, unique yet diverse, space and time upon which all those needs, desires or perceptions of us Europeans, necessary for the collective building of a better world, can be given expression.

The objectives of this universal desire have been shown to be a sizeable challenge. In spite of the unquestionable advances of European society over the last half century, the changes in the lifestyles of Europeans have also supposed new and growing risks that threaten all social, ecological and economic levels, to an extent which, historically, has never before occurred. As Europeans, we enjoy a comfortable life, but where is it leading us?

Every European country has recognised these risks and their incipient materialisation in the form of environmental and cultural damage which, in some cases, may well be irreversible. Every country has also recognised the need for a change in policies towards sustainable development, and different national and collective strategies have been elaborated in this sense[8].

These policies and strategies towards a sustainable development are beginning to bear fruit in the form of some very important results, especially in terms of the integration of public interventions. However, they also demonstrate that many of them are being limited by the resistance of various interest groups, especially economic ones, many of which exercise their power on a global level, but always with a short-term perspective. This makes the development of the institutional framework, from which to carry out the diagnosis and adequate treatment of the problems, more difficult. The effect is clear, the level of the quality of life and the sustainability of development on the medium to long term are ever

---

*rationalized, because it is so wide, indivisible and mysterious. Thus, the desire for single thought to be a forced adaptation of current realities is not very realistic, prior to all the transformation processes currently underway. If single thought were to become aware that it is itself subject to these transformation processes of the current world, it would no longer be so single, but more multidimensional. It would be a complex thought*". Vallejo-Gomez, N. (2008, pp. 249-262).

[8] The European Union contemplates, in its strategy for sustainable development, the following seven fundamental challenges: Climate change and clean energy; Sustainable transport; Sustainable production and consumption; Conservation and management of natural resources; Public health; Social inclusion, demography and migration; World poverty.

more uncertain.[9]

The groups of economic power and the social changes give impetus to, and are contributing to the increasing distrust of European citizens towards politics, political parties and politicians, in spite of the fact that the majority still support democratic institutions and values. The landscape reflects this conflict between what is and what should be, distancing the representatives from the people they are supposed to represent, threatening some of the most important social structures of the past century, while the social sciences cannot offer effective answers.

The transdisciplinary notion of landscape offered by the Convention represents a bridge to unite disciplines; in particular, those such as the economy that currently plays a key role in both the development and processes of social and ecological degradation. It is a bridge that, on the one hand, facilitates communication and the establishment of links capable of rediscovering relationships, favours the exchange of knowledge and gives impetus to social networks which are all essential to strengthening democracy.

On the other hand, however, it allows the differences of opinion between the recognised landscape and economic specialists to be taken on board. With their work, each one has contributed to an extraordinary disciplinary development, as well as to a dangerous scientific independence of these fields of knowledge in contemporary culture, typical of the western world over the last two centuries, but whose theories, whenever they have been put into practice, have frequently led to worse situations than those initially envisaged because of a lack of vision grounded in reality.

European society has historically championed the world's cultural and academic progress in the sense that they make it possible, i.e., through exploring the possibilities and taking better advantage of the available resources in order to achieve collective goals. However, at the start of the 21st century, this may be changing towards an economic determinism in which human behaviour, our way of thinking and everything that happens in the environment, are permanently being determined by a supposedly optimistic economic cause and effect; something which will necessarily affect future social possibilities.

In its preamble, the European Landscape Convention stresses the relationship that the landscape has with economic activity and social welfare, and this is widely accepted as a general idea. In practice, however, the economic agents and authorities seem to show a total lack of concern for, or ignorance of, its application[10]. In addition, the Convention urges us to *"integrate landscape into its regional and town planning policies and in its cultural, environmental, agricultural, social and economic policies, as well as in any other policies with possible direct or indirect impact on landscape"*.

The key of making this integration of landscape into policies effectively lies in developing this transdisciplinary approach as proposed by the Convention, and thus establishing the framework for connecting to reality, facilitating a participative analysis of the problems and opportunities, and recognising citizens' right to participate. Such a right is fundamental to the construction of alternatives and the development of decision-making processes capable of recognising and dealing with the other great conflict associated with these processes, one which sets individual interests against collective ones, in understanding the meaning of wealth, as can be inferred from the most original and elementary notion of economics.[11]

[9] As recognised in The Final Evaluation Report of the IV Environmental Programme of the European Commission.

[10] The national economic policies, or those of the European Union, continue to concentrate on economic growth as the main aim. On observing the current instability and the European economic crisis, we must take note of a certain loss of interest in sustainable development, as opposed to growth, in spite of the fact that without sustainable development any solution to the crisis must be questioned.

[11] In the emerging notion of economics introduced by Aristotle (ca. 384-322 a.C) in his Politics (Book I) and Nicomachean Ethics (Book V), on dealing with themes related to wealth, money or commerce, two parts can be

The Convention's economic reflection offers economics itself the opportunity to overcome the determinism with which orthodox economic theory is developed. The orthodox theory is linked to the analysis of individual motives, reduced to the principles, causes or forces that operate in the markets, and which are isolated from the forces of nature or the physical environment, as well as from the complex and delicate social building processes. The landscape gives economic science the possibility to relate to and become enriched by other sciences, but mainly it provides the opportunity to go beyond disciplines and theoretical debates, to serve, in practice, the aims of sustainable development and social well-being, as well as to form an institutional framework based on firm collective values which enable democracy to function effectively.

## 2. Landscape and welfare economics: can the landscape renew welfare economics?

The term welfare (or well-being) is commonly used in the most diverse fields and, to some extent, has received feedback from this situation until it has acquired an infinite number of meanings that go far beyond the simple fact of feeling well. The identifiable meanings have both physical and psychic dimensions, which can be either objective or subjective and even include emotional or perceptual aspects, both personal and collective. One general explanation for its successful diffusion can be found in the fact that it provides a reason for living; it gives life sense and an elementary orientation. To be or not to be, is only the necessary part of the question, but it does not seem to be enough; human beings aspire to being able to enjoy a decent quality of life[12].

In the sphere of the economy, generically dedicated to the administration of resources for the satisfaction of the needs of humanity, attention to well-being has become so important that it has come to characterise one of the most outstanding economic currents: welfare economics, which has transcended the economy to the spheres of social and political organisation, as well as to ecological processes, and the landscape has to be part of it, as it facilitates the integrated understanding of this transcendence.

Welfare economics has undergone an essentially disciplinary evolution, driven by the need to demonstrate the objectivity of its propositions. Paradoxically, however, the very subjective nature of the term has marked its partiality, its limitations and its failures. The transcendental history of welfare economics has largely been written in the light of such pessimism and failures,[13] linked to the lack of interest in, or interest in ignoring, value judgements in a wide sense of the term. That is to say, ignoring a whole set of factors, contexts and subjective aspects which are notably present in the

---

distinguished in the khrèmatistikè: *"commerce oriented towards satisfying the natural needs of the home and commerce oriented towards obtaining money"*. Concerning the latter part, he offers an essential evaluation of wealth: *"Wealth is good and desirable. However, wealth obtained through usury or interest is not. This is so because money was made to facilitate exchange and not to obtain more money. Of all businesses, this is the most antinatural. As with King Midas, converting everything you touch into gold prevents the natural tendency for living beings to be fed"*.

Although much has been written since these contributions of Aristotle to explain the content and methodologies of economics, even to the extent of elevating it to the category of an independent science, this original distinction between economics and business has to some extent become one of the gravitational axes of economic notions, as pointed out by Naredo (1987). It also connects with the differentiation between "formal" and "substantive" economics, taken from the rationality typologies described by Weber (1922:64), which takes up the duality between a private economics, maximizing individual profits, and a collective, public or social.

[12]Dignity is derived from the Latin adjective 'digno' and can be translated as "valuable". It refers to the human being's inherent value in that we are rational and gifted with freedom and the power to create. People can thus model and improve their lives through decision-making and the exercise of their free will.

[13]Stressed by Baujard (2011), for whom, according to an ancient theory, several authors compete to be more pessimistic concerning the outcome of welfare economics.

landscape and which, in practice, are shown to be much more relevant, economically speaking, than some of the most outstanding economists have thought in their theories and models.

In its origins, in the 18th and 19th centuries, the pioneering worked through a classical economic thought. It introduced the identification of welfare with that of wealth, recognising the force in economic man's egoism that drove the economic well-being of society, offering an aggregate view of social welfare with no references to the landscape.

Later, marginalist thought brought with it a rather different conception of social welfare, identifying it with the efficient assignation of resources through the free market[14]. In this neoclassical current, landscape is not identified as a resource linked to a specific market; in the cases where it is mentioned, it is associated with some of the market faults that this current identifies[15]. An extensive literature has been developed concerning such faults and the conditions of public intervention to resolve them, paying special attention to the objective of efficiency and, to a lesser extent, to that of equity.

These neoliberal currents are questioned by Keynesianism, given the limitations of public interventions during economic crises. As John Maynard Keynes pointed out in his celebrated work 'The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money': *"Whilst, therefore, the enlargement of the functions of government, involved in the task of adjusting to one another the propensity to consume and the inducement to invest, would seem to a nineteenth-century publicist or to a contemporary American financier to be a terrific encroachment on individualism. I defend it, on the contrary, both as the only practicable means of avoiding the destruction of existing economic forms in their entirety and as the condition of the successful functioning of individual initiative… The authoritarian state systems of today seem to solve the problem of unemployment at the expense of efficiency and of freedom. It is certain that the world will not much longer tolerate the unemployment which, apart from brief intervals of excitement, is associated and in my opinion, inevitably associated with present-day capitalistic individualism. But it may be possible by a right analysis of the problem to cure the disease whilst preserving efficiency and freedom"*.

The remedy to capitalism's illness proposed by Keynes is known as the Welfare State, which justifies public intervention to bring access to certain essential goods and services to the citizens as a whole, as well as the institutionalisation of the so-called social rights, guaranteeing a series of benefits linked to employment. The Welfare State has managed to reduce social conflict by making the State the referee of the interests in dispute, and it has been recognised as one of the major achievements of the 20th century.

Nevertheless, the Welfare State opens up another debate between authors. On the one hand, there are those who represent an alternative to neoliberalism, giving the State a primordial role in the economy as the guarantor of social security against the recognised market risks. On the other hand, there are those who go beyond the dualism of Keynesians and marginalists in the definition of the role to be played by the public sector in the economy, as they consider it to be simply a change that can give continuity to welfare economics as opposed to the social and ecological failures.

Recognising the predominance of welfare economics in public policies, alternating between the Keynesian and the neoliberal tendencies[16], a profound reflection must be undertaken to promote its

[14]For authors such as Bentham, Menguer, Walras, Jevons, or Marshall among others, the economy is conceived *"as a fully separate sphere with its own laws"*. Their ideas introduce a rupture with the value-work tradition, and their analyses associate the value of things to man's relation with these assets, displacing the nucleus of the economy with the individual assignations which, following utilitarian criteria, obey the law of marginalisation, according to which "*each new unit gradually acquires a lower valuation*".

[15]Price C. (2012) said: *"For economists, the essence of landscape as an 'economic problem' is the absence of conventional markets"*:

[16] For the Nobel prize winner Krugman: *"It's important to understand that Keynes did much more than make bold assertions. 'The General Theory' is a work of profound, deep analysis – analysis that persuaded the best*

renewal. It can effectively be made useful for decision-making with an effective and substantive social projection, capable of recognising basic ways to integrate economic activity, other than those of the market and of exchange – such as reciprocity, redistribution or self-production; all of which have been instrumental in forming the landscape, and without which landscape interpretation lacks any content whatsoever.

In this sense, when the contribution of the landscape to social well-being is analysed following the orthodox economic methodologies, which is equivalent to interpreting the landscape as an asset with an associated market whose management responds to the objectives of efficiency and equity, numerous questions appear which show up not so much the imperfections of that market, but the limitations of this mercantile interpretation in the management of landscapes to recognise them as part of our well-being:

– How can we define the landscape's right to ownership?
– What mechanisms of exclusion can be used to decide who can and cannot enjoy the landscape?
– Under what conditions are the preferences of the consumers of the landscape revealed?
– Who should be recognised as a producer of the landscape?
– How does the consumption of the landscape affect its conservation?
– What level of information in the market is necessary?
– Do we promote ecologically adapted human behaviour that can guarantee the conservation of the natural processes that support the lives of all the species on the planet?
– Are we capable of appreciating the social welfare in our own landscape?

The list of questions, which are not unconnected to the economy itself and its evolution, is endless.

Faced with the lack of satisfactory answers to these questions from welfare economics, at least from ethical, moral and ecological points of view, the idea of linking the notion of welfare to other notions as universal as that of the quality of life has been suggested, which, in all its aspects[17], facilitates the incorporation of subjective information to the analysis, such as the information provided through the individual's own perception of his/her life, and whose value is estimated through the relationships and social ties it promotes.

When our aspirations are to preserve a landscape we consider to be our own, we should understand that we are perceiving well-being and quality of life in a very different way from what the welfare economy proposes. This is because the latter is based on the belief that our wellbeing and quality of life is lacking – something which happens as soon as we start to consider ourselves as individuals, leading to an individual search to find what is lacking. On the other hand, in the landscape economy, we appreciate all those characteristics of our collective identity that make us aware of what we have and of how we are part of our surroundings and our culture, encouraging us to cooperate in order to conserve it.

To really advance the quality of life, in the interpretation of social well-being, it should be understood as a concept that cannot be separated from the "landscape quality objective" as defined in the Convention, which "*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*

---

*young economists of the day. Yet the story of economics over the past half century is, to a large degree, the story of a retreat from Keynesianism and a return to neoclassicism*".

[17] According to Cummins (1998): "The quality of life is both objective and subjective and each dimension proceeds from the aggregation of the domains: material well-being, health, productivity, privacy, community and emotional well-being. The objective domains are made up by the objective measurements of well-being. The subjective domains are made up by the satisfaction weighted by the individual's importance".

*surroundings"*. Among the public's aspirations we should note the conservation of the material and abstract cultural heritage that identifies communities and gains respect for other cultures and different ways of thinking, which are inherent to the diversity and wealth of the landscapes, as well as the integral care of nature.

It is within this analysis framework that the landscape shows its economic relevance, emerging as a key element in the renovation of the economic theories at the service of this social welfare proposal. This is because it facilitates its understanding on a multiple space and time scale, recuperating the value of the local vernacular economies as an essential part of the culture, as opposed to the tendencies that lead to its dilution within that global sphere dominated by the megamarkets. In the global markets, the citizens' role is reduced to that of producers or consumers, and they lose their sense of responsibility for the negative impacts and externalities they cause, making an unequal and inefficient behaviour widespread; one that inhibits social well-being, even in the most economistic sense: for someone to win, many must lose.

The landscape helps us to produce and consume immaterial values, developing the subject-oriented economy, as a guarantee of social welfare, as against the dominant object-oriented economy, in which we are condemned to being dissatisfied, as we base our well-being on material possessions.

It is also essential that economics should include qualitative means of evaluation in its methodologies and its practical applications, something which is widespread in the sphere of landscape and which offers meaningful knowledge concerning reality as well as being adequate for measuring social well-being and quality of life. It also facilitates the exchange of experiences and methodologies. On incorporating such means of evaluation, those methodological difficulties derived from the subjectivity they introduce should be accepted completely. Attempts to eliminate them generally lead to a cardinal ordering of individuals' preferences resulting from value judgements being converted into utility evaluations, something extremely difficult to measure, given that the satisfaction produced by the consumption of a good depends on multiple personal and collective factors. Thus, the supposed rigour will bring with it a loss of realism and a loss of confidence in the results[18].

There are many cases which can be used as examples of how far objectivity can or cannot be used. Thus, it can objectively be recognised that the village of Ushguli, in the Caucasus, at about 2,200m, is the highest habitation in Europe. However, to compare the level of welfare and quality of life they enjoy is not only extremely risky, but also imprudent, as it supposes the validity of the same value judgements for very diverse cultures. Even within the same culture, such aspects as gender, age, and many more, can lead to very different evaluations which cannot be aggregated to obtain a single result, since the policies that are developed in accordance with it necessarily have high risk factors which are socially inadmissible.

In European regions, when indices of wealth – which reflect levels of productive profit – are compared with indicators of the quality of life – which better reflect the levels of utility –, the heterogeneous nature of these objectives becomes apparent. According to Eurostat data, the wealthiest region in the EU in per capita income is Inner London, with more than triple the average, while also having one of the highest indices of urbanisation. However, this primacy is not reflected in terms of the quality of life, and the inhabitants themselves are demanding such things as support for the creation of new

[18] In a first attempt to measure the quality of life, the OECD considered it necessary to introduce perception indicators. Thus, such indicators were included in its 1973 work, but they were later removed due to the methodological difficulties they entailed. In its 1976 report, it was stated that no satisfactory means had been found for including subjective indicators. It was only in the work of 1982 that subjective preoccupations were suppressed, allowing a cardinal ordering of the quality of life by country, but this was still far from being credible or resolving the debates; in fact, it only made the debates more heated.

urban allotments for cultivation[19]. It is an attempt to recuperate traditional activities to provide them with good quality food and restore the land degraded by urban pressure. There is a growing awareness of the rural vocation in these areas[20].

Based on the economic form of own production, the allotments had no associated mercantile pofit and conventional economics did not be able to recognise a direct utility from them, i.e., a contribution to social welfare. Furthermore, when it does so through indirect methods, extremely absurd results can appear, such as estimating that the utility provided by the autoconsumption of a vegetable cultivated on expensive urban soil is much higher than that obtained from the same vegetable cultivated on cheap agricultural land.

Without a landscape dimension, economics have difficulties to recognise the individual and collective utility of activities carried out with no lucrative end, but which provide recognised external benefits. It is, therefore, worth noting in the case of Inner London, when degraded urban land is converted to traditional allotments, there is a recognised social utility that those who brought about the change like to share it with others who feel pleasure on admiring it, uniting their usefulness with no material profit, typical of a system of reciprocity.

An example of the real recognition of the economic system of reciprocity is the importance of the social economics sector[21] in Europe, which has begun to be formally considered over the last few decades, even though the concept and its field of action is still somewhat imprecise. In Europe, the percentage of the adult population who work as volunteers in this sector continues to grow. A comparative analysis of the EU countries shows the correlation between this percentage, the country's level of development, its capacity to resist the crisis and the preoccupation for the landscape in its multiple manifestations.

A good example of this is the Netherlands, the country with the highest percentage of the population participating as volunteers, with 57%. Founded on a model of economic and social consensus known as the Polder model, this country can boast one of the highest per capita incomes of Europe, great social homogeneity and low unemployment since the 1980s. The beginnings of the Polder model are closely linked to the singular nature of the Dutch territory which, since the middle ages, has required a highly efficient management of the water levels. To achieve this, an economy of consensus was developed between the water boards, the farmers and the ecologists, among other groups with very different interests. This mutual understanding, underlined by volunteering, has characterised the Dutch landscape. It has also become vital in maintaining some parts of the country above water. The attention paid to the landscape in Holland has recently given a boost to the integration of territorial policies and strengthened the coalitions between the social agents that enable these policies to be successful[22].

[19] Worthy of note among the promoted activities is the London 2012 Capital Growth campaign, whose aim was the creation of 2,012 new urban allotments, on either public or private land, in London by the year 2012.

[20] In the United Kingdom, this sentiment had the support of such illustrious defenders as Beatrix Potter, from whose pen came such characters as Peter Rabbit, Jemina Puddle-Duck or Squirrel Nutkin. At the end of the 19th century, Potter championed the collective need to defend the rural tradition in the Lake District against the growing touristic speculation of the Victorian 'jet set', who wanted to build bungalows where there were farms, thus destroying the landscape and the areas social fabric.

[21] The social economy in Europe is extremely important, in both economic and human terms, since it provides remunerated employment for more than 14.5 million people, or 6.5% of the active population of the EU-27. These figures demonstrate that it is a reality which cannot be ignored either by society or institutions. The Report *"The Social Economy in the European Union"* (CIRIEC,2007) says: *The new SE is taking shape as an emerging sector which is increasingly indispensable if an adequate response to the new challenges of the global economy and society is to be provided. These challenges lie at the root of the increasing interest in the role that the new SE can play in the welfare society"*.

[22] According to Roetemeijer (2005): *"In the first place, there are coalitions between various governmental levels, for example between the provincial and municipalities in area-specific policies. In most cases the national government has most direct relations with the provinces, and seldom directly with the Municipalities, although this is different for large cities. Provinces in turn are 'the spider in the web' having to do with all levels*

Numerous European experiences show the capacity of the landscape to incorporate the contribution of non-lucrative social welfare activities into welfare economics. Such activities include not only those that satisfy vital needs, but also those which define the cultural links that give communities their identity. They are the result of cooperation, not competition, and they demonstrate humanity's capacity to relate economically on the basis of other values than those of individual egoism.

It is through the landscape that we can learn respect for the fact that private, non-lucrative economic agents are not part of the property rights to be shown off, and that their value do not lie in their levels of income but in the recognition of their contribution to our intangible heritage, and to the sense of belonging to a place and to an active community, situated upon a physical space, a part of the territory, but which is a global creator of that culture, open to other universal values which manifest themselves through the perception of the landscape.

The awareness raising promoted by the Convention among "civil society, private organisations, and public authorities of the value of landscapes, their role and changes to them", constitute the seed of this welfare culture, based on other collective values such as solidarity, social responsibility, altruism, social justice, respect for differences and social, economic and ecological diversity - biodiversity-; thus setting social, ecological and economic cooperation against competition.

These values also represent the basis for social cohesion[23], defined as a society's capacity to ensure the welfare of all its members, reduce inequalities and avoid marginalisation. This has been recognised by the Council of Europe as one of its priorities, and their experience in defining policies and indicators of social cohesion is currently an international benchmark. In spite of these advances in social cohesion, many of the objectives in this matter are still considered to be unattained challenges.

The five main challenges that the Task Force on social cohesion in the 21st century (2007) has identified are: globalisation, demographic changes, the development of immigration and cultural diversity, political, economic and social changes, as well as the recognition of social cohesion and the struggle to conserve it. These challenges are more pertinent than ever and reveal that social cohesion problems persist, and that they are even on the increase in the current economic crisis in the Europe of today

The New Strategy and Plan of Action of the Council of Europe concerning social cohesion justifies a social cohesion strategy for the 21st century, pointing out that: "*Social cohesion is a dynamic process and an essential condition for social justice, democratic security and sustainable development. Divided and unequal societies are not only unjust; they also cannot guarantee stability in the long term*". This argument gains greater strength from the landscape and should be adequately reflected in the economic activities.

This has a marked effect in rural areas as well, where the process of destructuration, begun by the mechanisation and industrialisation of agriculture, still continues. Yet it also has an effect on urban areas, where the forms of reorganisation into social classes and ethnic groups are more easily visible, and these contribute to an increase in social differences as well as creating important problems of coexistence.

---

*of government. Consequently the Municipality is most connected to the Province. Also coalitions exist between the government and NGO's, and Government with citizens and market parties".*

[23] The Strategy of Social Cohesion of the Council of Europe defines the following principles: equal access to rights and resources, with attention also to vulnerable groups, and dignity/recognition for individuals, as expressed through human rights; sharing of responsibilities; an activating approach (participation and reconciliation); managing the balance across interests, generations and domains of action. Economic development and social development are viewed by the Task Force as inalienably related and sustainability is seen to hinge on the effective management of both with a particular eye to balance among different sectors of the population, different generations and different policy domains. Council of Europe (2007).

Some activities such as tourism, and in particular rural tourism, stand out for their contribution to protecting landscapes, as they contribute both to the well-being of the visitors who enjoy the traditional countryside, and to the development of new economic activities in the said countryside. It also favours the conservation of other activities that were in danger of disappearing, such as crafts and local food production, thus creating both employment and permanent resident population.

However, these economic strategies based on the tourist market include a very small part of the landscape. It is evident that the rural culture needs public investment and the public in general to survive. Yet its future cannot depend on the ephemeral postcard charm of tourist attractions, often confused with the landscape. Something as transcendental as the future cannot be left to luck, whereby tourism is attracted by the ephemeral charm created by an uncertain market. If it did so, it would drag with it the entire profound culture that the rural areas represent, as an expression of the popular, the ancestral heritage (vernacular), the legacy of centuries, and the essence of a landscape living through its daily activities; but also in the memory, looks, feelings, thoughts, spirits and sentiments of each countryman's soul, things which have made this collective identity grow and which converts each territory into a key reference point.

Within the transdisciplinary dimension assumed by the Convention, guiding economic activities in expansion (as is the case of tourism) through the landscape, allows for the inclusion of an ethnographic, anthropological and ecological meaning to the interpretation for the visitor. It is one which differs from and substantially widens the mere fact of presenting heritage "as such". The interpretation can be understood as "the art of giving meaning and sense to a place or territory, for its recognition, use and enjoyment, and which permits its conservation as a legacy for future generations".[24] On the basis of this approach, tourism leads to ecotourism in its most authentic dimension.[25]

This enriching effect of the landscape is not exclusive to tourism, but is widely understood in economic activities as a whole, many of which, in fact, have much closer links to the process of the landscape's social construction, in both its physical or material and immaterial aspects. Daily activities acquire meaning and sense when there is a firm, collective will for relationships that build and

[24]This interpretative approach can be seen in Santamarina Campos, B. (2008).

[25] A particular kind of tourism has come to the fore because of its links to the landscape; it has been called ecotourism. The International Ecotourism Society (TIES, 1990) defined Ecotourism as: "*Responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people… Ecotourism is about uniting conservation, communities, and sustainable travel. This means that those who implement and participate in ecotourism activities should follow the following ecotourism principles: minimise impact; build environmental and cultural awareness and respect; provide positive experiences for both visitors and hosts provide direct financial benefits for conservation; provide financial benefits and empowerment for local people; raise sensitivity to host countries' political, environmental, and social climate"*.
However, the most prominent ecotourism programmes, such as those offered to Europeans that take place on other continents, should raise an elementary question: Can an activity with such high transport costs have a minimal environmental impact? Landscape management recognizes the elementary answer to that question, linking ecotourism more to tourism close to home, due to its simple accessibility, using scarce mechanical means of transport, if at all. Such nearby places, in general, do not possess monumental or spectacular characteristics, but those that they do possess are essential for discovering the natural capacities and the cultural and economic aptitudes which should guide citizens' behavior, since, to conserve these places, it is first necessary for those who live there to learn to appreciate them. In this dimension, landscape enriches the visitor and, inversely, the visitor enriches the landscape. The well-being associated with this mutual enrichment is not limited, nor can it be measured, by monetary exchange, but by the cultural exchange. This exchange requires time and the necessary reiteration for the formation of ties to these places and their culture, and this supposes the incorporation to the economic strategies of a vision not only of the space, in which well-being is both local and global, individual and collective, but also of the time, in which well-being is evaluated simultaneously in the short, medium and long term, as well as in the present, past and future.

conserve our values through exchange, self-production, redistribution and reciprocity.

Without such collective values, we can still maintain the landscapes formally, yet we will be changing the content since we strip them of their original meanings, introducing new ones in which the people no longer count. The traditions are replaced by "cultural spectacles" which can be seen anywhere in the world. That is, we find that the landscape is solely a product of the market, it is denaturalised, and will end up as just another element of merchandising.

With the landscape, the desire for well-being is considered a necessity which must transcend the individual and lucrative without becoming the imposition of an order, neither of the markets nor the authorities, but the understanding that the personal and collective perceptions, that define the landscape enclose all the values that enable communication and interpersonal relationships, as well as with the natural environment, essential for the sustainable development.

## 3. Landscape and employment: beyond the labour market

We have stressed that the quality of landscape, in any of its interpretations, maintains a close correlation with social well-being. It is also universally recognised that if people do not have employment, then well-being is not possible. It is also well-known that well-being is a function of quality of the employment generated in a society. It should not be difficult to comprehend that these two determining factors for social welfare, employment and landscape, have inseparable ties. Employment creates the landscapes which, in turn, create the jobs.

The problem we have in understanding these inseparable ties is one of the consequences of excessive specialisation and disciplinary division discussed above. Far from helping to conserve the landscape and create employment, they make it more difficult for today's societies to pay simultaneous attention to these two objectives. In fact, this characteristic has in the past been one of Europe's most deeply rooted cultural capacities, as can be seen throughout history.

If we take a look at the rural landscape of the French region of Poitou-Charentes, to be precise, the area around the town of Cognac, which has given its name to the internationally known alcoholic spirit, the predominance of vineyards is easily appreciable[26]. This crop has been a part of the landscape here for a long time but, during the 19th century, the vines were almost completely wiped out by phylloxera, as well as about half the vines of Europe. The perception of the landscape for the inhabitants of this region, linked as it is to their work and their need to feed their families, determined their decision to replace most of the vines with cereal crops. This change was as drastic a transformation in their way of life and work as the change of colour to their fields from green to yellow during the summer.

The citizens accepted this change in the landscape by the force of nature, but the fact that the original landscape of vineyards should stay in their collective memory made it possible, years later, to gradually reintroduce the vineyards around the town of Cognac, where the production of the famous spirit has ever since been on the increase. The Poitou-Charentes region has an unemployment rate below the French average, which is due not only to this sector, but also to others that have close ties to it, such as tourism. The quality of employment is also determined by these activities that dominate the landscape of the region, as there is a strong seasonality to the work, in both tourism and the times when the vineyards require the most work, which makes the region attractive to people from different places, and the population continues to grow.

[26]The commercial denomination "cognac" is reserved solely for this area by means of a decree dating from 1909. The region of Cognac has over 15,000 vineyards within a total surface area of 900km2, producing more than 190 million bottles of this prestigious spirit per year, of which 90% is exported.

The case of the above mentioned territory is one of many examples around Europe, demonstrating the existence of a symbiotic relationship between landscape and employment. In the same sense, the European Union encourages the appreciation of the diversity of the landscape through the existing gastronomic varieties within territories, so as to promote and protect the richness of agricultural and food products, while fully respecting the citizens' right to an informed choice and to enjoy good quality products. To do so, evaluation and protection systems have been developed for some products that have added value in the socioeconomic plane, as they are produced in a particular region or following a certain method[27].

The European Landscape Convention contains many references, both explicit and implicit, to this relationship. In its Preamble, the Convention says: *"the landscape has an important public interest role in the cultural, ecological, environmental and social fields, and constitutes a resource favourable to economic activity and whose protection, management and planning can contribute to job creation"*. In addition, it recognises that *"the landscape contributes to the formation of local cultures"*, and that its economic activities and associated employment is an indivisible part of it, endorsing the idea that the protection, management and distribution of the landscape must go hand in hand with that of employment.

This relationship also has been recognized in the projects presented for the Council of Europe's Landscape Award. The winning project of 2013: Preserving ecological value in the landscape of the Szprotawa river valley, presented by the Lower Silesian Association of Landscape Parks, from Poland, stressed: "*The goals of this long-term project were achieved from 1999 to 2009. An original, innovative and long-term program was implemented to actively conserve the natural assets of the site while allowing sustainable development...The project relies on the cooperation of the local population, especially farmers and landowners, to carry out the eco-agricultural programs that have a direct effect on the preservation of landscape value in the Przemkowski Landscape Park*".

Lamentably, this relationship is also perceptible through the recent processes of landscape degradation in Europe and the connection with the transformations in labour markets, production processes, institutional labour negotiation frameworks, or resizing and relocation of companies, as well as other factors which influence the level and stability of employment.

The growing size of European companies in an ever more globalised economy has generally been linked to the need to increase work productivity, recognised in liberal doctrine as the motor of progress in modern economies. Yet such progress, based on the increased capacity to generate more production with fewer workers, risks falling into a dangerous vicious circle, since there are only two alternatives from the point of view of employment: condemning many people to unemployment or encouraging an unsustainable process of growth based on supply and demand of ever more goods and services. This means giving ourselves up to the cornucopia of material wealth which is only self-supporting if there is a continuous increase in the consumption of raw materials and natural resources.

Adopting a landscape approach to the economy is vital to recognising these vicious circles[28] and finding a rational solution to the paradoxical economic, social and ecological problem posed around employment. All this should lead us to formulate the following question, among others: Can a decent

[27] In 1992, The EU created the following systems: Protected Designation of Origin (PDO), Protected Geographical Indication (PGI), Traditional Specialties Guaranteed (TSG) and Organic Farming. The PDO and PGI systems can be consulted in the EC Regulation nº 510/2006 of the Council of March 20th 2006 on the protection of the geographical indication and designation of origin of agricultural products and foodstuffs.

[28] Work productivity means that if our economies do not grow, we run the risk of making people unemployed, even with zero population growth. The increase in unemployment generates an increase in social expenditure. More public spending leads to unmanageable levels of sovereign debt. Higher debts can only be revised through an increase in the fiscal tax on future income, and this supposes entering into a spiral whereby disincentives to work are created accompanied by the foreseeable fall in public employment in order to correct the fiscal imbalance, leaving a desolate labour panorama.

job for each person, in many cases the heritage of traditional know-how, be a problem for society?

An elementary contribution of the landscape to employment is the recognition that there are different interpretations to work. Work can be appreciated in the landscape in both its generic condition of actions carried out by a person in order to achieve a series of tasks or activities, either physical or intellectual, and in a more specific way, in what we shall call formal or declared work, which includes remunerated activities that are legal with respect to their nature and are declared to the public authorities.

A wide-ranging definition of work, linked to that of a person as a citizen of a particular territory, allows us to appreciate all the manifestations of human activity and its complexity, since, in addition to economic functions, we can also include positive psychosocial functions such as the following: giving structure to people's and communities' lives; creating opportunities to develop skills and acquire knowledge; transmitting values, rules, beliefs and expectations; contributing to personal and work identity; providing status and prestige, as well as the capacity and power to create social integration that represents the main manifestation of participation in society. Yet there are also some negative functions, such as dissatisfaction, frustration, stress, and a series of widely studied physical and mental illnesses that become more severe when work is reduced to a monetary wage and its productive condition.

The time spent working must not only be valued as time for earning money. It is essential to acquire the sense that one is participating in a collective work, with the will to build a model of society that has firm social values in which we collectively believe, and to recognise the opportunities of having the time to dedicate to private and social projects that can be developed outside the market, to no lucrative end.

In this sense, John Maynard Keynes, in an essay entitled "Our grandchildren's economic possibilities", published in 1932, foresaw a time in which we could all work less and spend more time with our families, friends and community. It is, without doubt, a strategy which is worth thinking about. The landscape tells us that indefinite growth is difficult to achieve and, in many cases, is not even desirable, given the ecological and social imbalance introduced by an economic model that, in order to grow, needs to extract base resources. The question that Keynes considered over 80 years ago is now worth thinking about much more closely.

The landscape provides a substantial knowledge of the concept of work, integrator of its economic, social, cultural and environmental dimensions. In a moment in which the market economy reduces it's lucrative condition, the landscape allows us to recognise other values and other ways of working which are linked to the above-mentioned systems of economic activity: reciprocity, redistribution and self-production.

The development of the so-called tertiary sector, or social economy sector, offers a good model for the orientation of employment in the private sector. The cooperative solutions to employment, those of labour reinsertion enterprises, and many other ways of organising that incorporate other values to work which are not strictly speaking economic, are viewed as one of the most innovative in the strengthening of the organisations.

This change would require a strong political will and the conviction that if the landscape is a manifestation of democracy, in which everyone participates through their daily activities, then employment, should be recognised as an inherent right to the condition of being an active member of society.

Economics can formally differentiate between producers and consumers with respect to the activities that those performing the acts carry out in a territory, and associate the notion of work to the activities in the production sphere. Nevertheless, there is a cultural differentiation, which is the opposite of the

ecological notion of producers and consumers in the ecosystems, and which situates our species and the set of human activities at the level of consumers, since, even for the production of the simplest goods, we need to use raw materials whose production takes place solely in nature itself.

The result of considering both senses, in a meaningful knowledge approach, is to recognise that you have to perform a job to consume and also have to consume in order to produce, so the classic functions of supply and demand upon which the decisions are made in the markets and by the economic authorities are revealed as academic constructions that respond to technical criteria loaded with strong value judgements, which determine the quantities to be produced and the prices to be paid as a mechanism of assignation of these products.

A second dimension of employment that landscape helps to perceive is the difference between declared and undeclared work[29], which has close ties to such phenomena as immigration and labour exploitation[30]. The sectors of activity, the size of the companies and the extension of the geographic sphere of their activities are aspects that are linked to the landscape that affect the level of legalised work. Yet the question is not so much to identify these illegal situations to impose the observance of fiscal obligations and social security matters, but more to guarantee the protection of workers' conditions, as proposed by the International Labour Organisation (ILO).[31]

The transformation in the landscape linked to the progress contributes so many difficulties as solutions, with a marked impact in the employment, because when the landscape degenerates, or it gets lost, stops working to share a community of destination.

The landscape invites the labour environment to be conceived as the result of a shared perception by the members of an organisation. This shared perception comes from the interaction between an objective reality, linked to tasks, responsibilities, power hierarchy, or work rules, with a subjective reality linked to sensations, emotions, prior knowledge, competence and expectations. The style of leadership is determinant for the work environment, and it is generally accepted that a better work environment is achieved in those organisations that adopt a participative model of leadership.

In addition, consumers should recognise their fundamental role in controlling the spread of undeclared work, since there is a responsibility behind their decision to buy in favouring certain practices of social and ecological behaviour. When the landscape does not form part of the consumers' culture, their faithfulness to the goods and services produced in decent labour conditions and better adapted to the environment is lost.

Considering the relationship between the landscape and employment in the case of such a basic sector

[29] The European Commission (2007), in its Communication on undeclared work, provides the following definition: *"any paid activities that are lawful as regards their nature but not declared to public authorities, taking into account differences in the regulatory system of Member States"*. The focus of the ILO (OIT,2010) with respect to undeclared work is part of the wider concept known as the informal economy, defined as *"any economic activity carried out by the worker and an economic unit which – by law or in practice – is not covered, or is insufficiently covered by a formal arrangement"*. This definition includes the concept of undeclared work as understood by the EC, as well as "the worker who is sometimes outside the sphere of application of labour legislation (for instance, the domestic or agricultural worker)". ILO (2010): Labour inspection in Europe: undeclared work, migration and traffic in workers. Work Notebook 7. Geneva. Commission of the European Communities (2007): Stepping up the fight against undeclared work. Communication from the Commission to the Council, The European Parliament, The European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of the Regions. COM(2007) 628.

[30] This can be seen in the EU Report (2007)

[31] The ILO (2010) has pointed out that *"Workers in the informal economy, clandestine workers, or subject to working in a situation of non-declaration, frequently face a series of disadvantages. They generally earn less and work more hours than a formal worker. They can be deprived of their right to social security and they can suffer unstable living conditions. Formal employers are affected by this unfair competition on the part of employers who use clandestine workers and pay wages below the legal or market minimum"*.

as the textile industry, in which Europe has become a net importer, mainly from the two Asiatic giants: China and India, it can be seen that something of the sense of local identity, transmitted by the typical dress of each area, has been lost. In Belgium, a country which has traditionally had one of the best-known textile industries in Europe, the loss of its production capacity is notable. All the textile producers have suffered a loss of business; with clear consequences as far as employment is concerned.[32.]

The wardrobe culture of each territory must be conserved, in both production and consumption, as part of a human landscape whose personal and collective identity responds to the cultural adaptation and the natural and climatic conditions. The wardrobe as a representation of local know-how and a desire to belong to a community is in opposition to the destructive desire to identify oneself with a way of dressing of an exclusive social class.

Furthermore, the landscape shows the intersectorial, social and ecological influence of these effects on employment. These values, which introduce the landscape into the textile sector, are common to other sectors that attend to essential necessities and must, therefore, be part of the collective employment negotiation strategy between the different social agents, business organisations, trade unions, public authorities and civil society.

Awareness of this landscape transformation process, which has gone from developing without growing to growing without developing, based on the use of non-renewable resources, should bring about a change in the orientation of employment, more towards quality of work and encouragement of inclusive policies involving all the citizens in the conservation of both the material and immaterial heritage, which are part and parcel of the landscape, and a guarantee of the quality of life.

This orientation should mainly be translated into a demand, in the case of public employment, at the service of the collectively perceived landscape, and based on the work of a social vocation that will require cooperative selection and work methods, as opposed to competitive ones.

Concerning employment, the integration of the young must be recognized as a priority, since they represent the new sap that will feed the landscape's vitality. As the Commission to the European Parliament has indicated [33]: *"Youth unemployment has a profound impact on individuals as well as on society and the economy. Unless current trends are reversed quickly, today's levels of youth unemployment risk damaging the longer-term employment prospects for young people, with serious implications for future growth and social cohesion. Within Europe's broader strategy to create growth and jobs, helping young people to enter and remain in the labour market and to acquire and develop the skills that will pave the way for future employment is therefore a top priority for the European Union"*.

If the difficulties young people experience while entering the labour market are not satisfactorily resolved, there are extremely serious consequences for the landscape, as can be seen, in particular, in rural areas over the last few decades. The rural industrialisation that produced an impressive increase in labour productivity is the origin of the unceasing exodus of youth from the rural areas to the cities;

[32] The sales figures in the Belgian textile industry fell by 6.3% in the first quarter of 2012, and by 9.8% in the second quarter. The fall in the third and fourth quarters was similar, 4.2% and 3.2 %, respectively, and no particular change could be appreciated. The sluggishness of the market in 2012 has had an effect on employment. Between mid-2011 and mid-2012, around 1,500 jobs (6.4%) have been lost, which would currently have given employment to around 22,000 people.

[33] See: - Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions (2013): Working together for Europe's young people. A call to action on Youth unemployment, Brussels.

- Resolution of the Council and of the Representatives of the Government of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the participation of young people with fewer opportunities, adopted by the Council on 30 April 2008.

in particular that of women who, although being traditionally more active in the rural areas, carrying out work both within and outside the home, suffer a lack of recognition and opportunities, thus favouring their silent exodus from the rural landscape.

However, youth without a future condemns these places to a future without youth. They are not the anti-rural-system, the rural system is 'anti-them' and 'anti-itself' since, when the cultural dynamics of the rural landscape stops the generational feedback, then it is lost. Perhaps these places do not change much physically, but their landscapes, the individual and collective perceptions they transmit, will have been profoundly and easily transformed in a way that is irreversible.[34]

Knowledge of the parallelisms and the synergies between the Leader initiative and the landscape approach promoted by the Convention would allow these limitations to be overcome through the development of a work culture, based on the labour tradition of each territory, but which could be renewed to develop the strengths that would allow them to face the threats and pressures of the global economy.[35]

The European Landscape Convention anticipates these scenarios by considering the importance of formation in the landscape. In accordance with Recommendation CM/Rec(2008)3 of the Committee of Ministers to the Member States concerning the directives for setting up the European Landscape Convention, we would like to express the importance of this through the following logical conditional sentence:

*If* landscape constitutes a teaching resource because, when reading it, pupils are brought face to face with visible signs of their surroundings that relate to spatial-planning issues, landscape reading also makes it possible to understand current and historical approaches to landscape production as an expression of a community's identity, *then* school curricula at various levels should foster an awareness of landscape themes through learning to read landscapes and through sensitisation to relations between cadre de vie and landscape, to relations between ecology and landscape problems and to social and economic questions.

In effect, the European Landscape Convention offers ways to face the threats to employment and working created by an economic system based on growth and profit, generating social inequality and environmental degradation. The Convention is a strong impetus through participation, sensitisation, formation and education in the landscape, upon which our capacity to recognise all these offers of work around us depends. It also offers ways to respond to its renewal and conservation, as Europe's

[34] This problem directly affects over half the population of the European Union living in rural areas and represents 90% of the European Union's territory. The most innovative initiative of the rural development policies developed by the European Union to deal with this problem is the Leader programme. Since it was set up in 1991, it has been working to offer a way to allow local actors in rural areas to participate in the management of the future development of their areas. Its interest is widely acknowledged, not only in the European Union but also outside it, as is its influence on the administrations and the national, regional and local policies, due to its capacity to deal with development problems using new forms of association and activities to strengthen the traditional local cultures. Taking a very positive point of view, in the balance of this initiative for rural development, its scope and depth have not been enough to overturn the processes of economic, social and ecological decay in the rural areas, and in so doing create the strength that would allow the current stages of economic and ecological crises to be faced. Many factors have determined the limited effect of the Leader initiative in many rural areas, of which we should note the need to go more profoundly into that holistic, endogenous, objective and subjective vision of the territories which would be propitiated by the introduction of the landscape dimension.

[35] In case of the rural employment, the incorporation of the instruments proposed for the practical setting up of the European Landscape Convention within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), of which the rural development policy is an increasingly important component, would allow the development in these territories of their strengths, recognizing that fact that they are essentially natural and sociocultural, and that they need special attention in order to encourage and direct job offers in these areas. Yet the demand for labour should be prepared to satisfy it from a different work culture, based on traditional forms of work.

landscape is the result of a social and ecological metabolism in continuous change which requires an ever wider and more inclusive vision of employment.

## 4. Landscape and public economics: a holistic view

It is widely recognised that the economic analysis of the landscape is generally inspired by public economics, that landscape transformations are adhering to the sphere of non-mercantile phenomena, and that they are regulated by the public authorities.[36] However, in so far as public economics includes doctrines with diverse, and sometimes contradictory, interpretations of the role that the public sector should play in the economy, these controversies are also transmitted to the landscape.

We have stressed the controversies in such aspects as social welfare and employment. The implementation of the European Landscape Convention provides therefore an opportunity to debate and to establish an institutional framework that allows bringing together proposals from projects or other landscape policies.

The European Landscape Convention recognises a principle of coherence[37] which offers a necessary complement to the explicit recognition of integration, from which the principle of cohesion is derived. This coherence is approached on both a theoretical level, in which the landscape's economic nature is debated in order to determine the legitimate public intervention, and on a more operative level, promoting a basic harmonisation and joint effort among the different public authorities involved in landscape policies in order to avoid unnecessary duplications and contradictions in their actions; contradictions which may well create confusion among the citizens, thus, in some cases, discouraging them from participating, and in others creating confrontations or divisions that can distort the personal and collective perceptions which define landscape.

One of the Convention's notable achievements in the theoretical plane has been to make some propositions to help to overcome the spiral into which the longstanding academic debate, stemming from a certain part of the economic literature concerning the nature of the landscape's public or private good, has been drawn. It does so from a belief that the landscape is the heritage of all, that it contributes to both individual and social well-being, and that its protection, management and distribution involve both rights and responsibilities on everyone's part. It does so also from the integrated understanding of the economic, social and ecological aspects. These aspects are not identified in the landscape as three independent pillars that hold up a common development, but as inseparable components that determine such individual and collective perceptions through which the landscape acquires its form and content.

The transdisciplinary nature of the landscape, as described in the Convention, breaks with the dualisms: the public as opposed to the private; as well as with the gradualisms, more or less efficient, more or less equitable, more or less well-being. Economic theory, which insists on classifying the natural landscape as a public or private good, supposedly to be coherent, in order to promote a particular intervention of the public sector, thus claiming to be objective, falls into an intrinsic contradiction that prevents any objectivity or real coherence.

The Convention, having recognised the landscape as a reality that is both objective and subjective, transfers the concern for precision in the classification and measurement of the landscape's components to the process of establishing relationships in order to ensure sustainable development. People aspire enjoying high quality landscapes and to actively participate in their development, as encouraged by the Convention; the public is recognised as being inherent to the private, and personal perceptions are determined by value judgements and collective rules.

[36] See Oueslati, W. Ed. (2011).
[37] The principle of coherence is implicitly recognised in the text of the Convention, as explained in Prieur (2006).

In this sense, it should be pointed out that the contributions of the new institutionalism, encouraging individual agents and groups to pursue their respective interests in a context of collective forces, should acquire the form of institutions[38]. These forces have historical roots and strong contextual links that mould the desires, preferences and actions of the groups and individuals through whom social action takes place.

There should be the right balance between the object and its environment in the design of the institutions[39]. The social, political and economic institutions are the most important raw material of collective life. In recent years, they have increased in size and have become considerably more complex and ingenious.

The landscape, as it is conceived by the Convention, is intrinsic to human beings in their personal and social condition, whose activities are both the cause and effect of the landscape. The landscape continues indeed its production process, which is that of both consumption and enjoyment. Economic and landscape theorists should assist in interpreting this process, while also respecting the dynamics of the inherited rural and urban landscapes.

The attention paid to the "anthropological places" that have the essential identity of being, relational and historical characteristics in common, is a response to the risk of producing a creative economic system "non-places" ephemeral and enigmatic areas which grow and multiply through the modern world, as described Augé (1992).

This extraordinary complexity of the landscape is also its wealth. The Convention recognises that this depends on "*the quality of life for people everywhere: in urban areas and in the countryside, in degraded areas as well as in areas of high quality, in areas recognised as being of outstanding beauty as well as everyday areas"*. Such a responsibility, on both a collective and a personal level, brings with it the implication that the public authorities should take the lead in the question of the protection of the landscape from both an operative and a strategic point of view. Before discussing what to do, with whom and for whom, the decision of "why" should first be resolved, that is to say, the landscape's common objectives, so they can acquire real meaning on being defined in a participative manner.

The collective decision-making processes on this strategic level are affected by numerous difficulties, and these difficulties demand special care to be taken in the development of the participative processes which transcend the formal authorities, the representative democracies and, obviously, the markets. While not considering the markets and authorities as dispensable, they are simply considered as a means and not an end to which such a society as the European one should aspire. We should remember that democracies are not founded on institutional permanence, as this has a price to be paid in rigidity, which is precisely one of the main threats to democracy, as it limits freedom of expression and public participation.

Landscapes are always the result of widespread direct participation of the population, which is why the decision-making processes are resolved through both formal institutional logic, through which the rules are made, and informal, through which the personal and collective spirit is developed. It is this spirit which finally determines the success of any territorial system. When the formal rules do not correspond with this spirit and social will, the action that brings about the landscape is not developed under the auspices of the institutions, but above and beyond the institutions, with the consequent effect of social dislocation.

[38] See Ostrom, E. (1990).

[39] In the basic theory of institutional design, Robert Goodin (1996) stresses the political intentionality. He considers *"the creation of a way to encourage valuable results in a particular context which can serve as the basis for action to be fundamental"*.

The institutional standards must respond to the behaviour of the cultural and natural actors present in the landscape, whose conservation is determined by appreciating the stability and recurrence of its dynamics. Such an appreciation requires coherence in the definition, distribution and coordination of the competences of the different public administrations and civil society.

The landscape is the perception of both time and space; a chronological and historical time that essentially exists in a human dimension. A space, which is unique on a planetary level, has been moulded in each territory through a slow cultural process in which the institutions have historically been a response to that cultural perception. The institutions should, therefore, be the main interested part in taking care that the social connection will not be broken, as in such a case the perception of both people and communities, would lose all sense. In this case, any action that contributed to their creation would, sooner or later, turn against them, more or less pacifically, as has happened throughout Europe's history, episodes which have marked world history.

Landscape's economic dimension achieves the double condition of being public and private precisely through the participation of the public. It is the participation procedures that the public administrations can formally develop that determine the public's level of commitment to putting that responsibility into practice. The European Landscape Convention, which in general promotes voluntary involvement, makes the public's participation an obligation of the State and its main theme, even though it leaves States the flexibility to select the means of the public's participation.

The organisation of public administrations into international, national, regional or local levels of government should take into account their common interest in conserving the landscape, since every citizen on this planet simultaneously belongs to a town, region, nation and continent. When conflicts or alliances occur between the different levels of authority which do not concur with the perceptions of the citizens in essential aspects, then there are inevitable reactions that may have very diverse and uncontrolled manifestations, even violent ones, when the institutions demonstrate a lack of sensitivity towards social preoccupations.

The Convention stresses the special role played by local and regional authorities and the opportunities offered them by the landscape, recognising the principle of subsidiarity, defined in the Recommendation CM/Rec(2008)3 of the Committee of Ministers to the Member States concerning the guidelines for the setting up of the European Landscape Convention, according to which *"the actions should be carried out on the closest institutional level to the citizens"*.

The public authorities' responsibilities in matters concerning the landscape are also recognised, as well as the importance of European cooperation. The Convention understands that the voluntary assumption of commitments to the landscape will strengthen the institutions through closer ties to the citizens by means of awareness-raising actions, formation, education and proactive public participation. European cooperation, promoting the exchange of information and experiences between public administrations, has been stressed as the means to support administrations in the process of applying the Convention.

The Council of Europe's Landscape Award, as well as those that each State can adopt with its own specifications, as mentioned by the Convention, is part of that cooperation and exchange of information; in particular, recognising the awareness-raising promoted by the *"exemplary actions carried out by public collectives and governmental organisations"*.

In conclusion, the interpretation of the landscape, within the approach proposed by the Convention, builds bridges with the economy in order to boost a context for activities adapted to the ecological scenarios and to the culture of each territory. Such safeguards should mould private and public actions, individual and collective actions, from and concerning the markets and the powers they represent. As this renovation is carried out in the economy, encouraged by the landscape, we Europeans will take on a culture of cultures, in which the appreciation of the perceptual diversity of our territories will come

face to face with the inequalities that bore holes in our social cohesion, conferring a humanism on our economics that will be capable of valuing and storing up the most of each individual, becoming the driving force that can redirect the welfare, employment and social life of Europeans, thus strengthening democracy.

## Reference documents


Augé, M. (1992) : *Non-Lieux. Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité*, Paris, Seuil, coll. « La librairie du XXIe siècle ».

Baujard, A. (2011) : *L'économie du bien-être est morte. Vive l'économie du bien-être.* WP.02. Université de Rennes et Université de Caen

Becher, T. (1991): Academic Tribes and Territories. Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press

CIRIEC (2007): *L'économie sociale dans l'Union européenne*. Comité économique et social européen

Commission des Communautés européennes (2007) : Intensifier la lutte contre le travail non déclaré. Communication de la Commission au Conseil, au Parlement européen, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions. COM(2007) 628 Final.

Conseil de l'Europe (2013) : Projet de recommandation sur le paysage et l'éducation à l'école primaire et secondaire. CDCPP(2103)27. Conseil de l'Europe

Conseil de l'Europe (2010) : Nouvelle stratégie et Plan d'action du Conseil de l'Europe pour la cohésion sociale approuvés par le Comité des Ministres du Conseil de l'Europe le 7 juillet 2010
http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/socialpolicies/socialcohesiondev/source/2010Strategie_PlanAction_CohesionSociale.pdf.

Conseil de l'Europe (2007): *Towards an active, fair and socially cohesive Europe*. Report of high-level Task Force on social cohesion.

Cummins, R. A., (Ed.). (1998). *Quality of Life Definition and Terminology: A Discussion Document from the International Society for Quality of Life Studies*. Blacksburg, VA, The International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies, 43 p.

Gould, S.E. (2011): "Hydrogen bonds: why life needs water". *Scientific American Review.*

Goodin R.E.Ed. (1996): *The Theory of Institutional Design*. Cambridge University Press

ILO (2011): Regulating for Decent Work. New directions in labour market regulation

ILO (2013): Labour inspection and undeclared work in the EU. Working Paper

Jackson T (2012). Prosperity without growth. In F Hinterberger, E Freytag, E Pirgmaier and M Schuster (Eds): *Growth in transition*, p. 62-65. Abington/New York: Earthscan/Routledge

Keynes J.M. (1930): Economic Possibilities for our Grandchildren. * Scanned from John Maynard Keynes, Essays in Persuasion, New York: W.W.Norton & Co., 1963, pp. 358-373. http://www.econ.yale.edu/smith/econ116a/keynes1.pdf

Keynes, J.M (1936): The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money. Macmillan Cambridge University Press, for Royal Economic Society
http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/economics/keynes/general-theory/ch24.htm

Kurgman, P. (2009): How Did Economists Get It So Wrong? *The new York times*

Morin E. (1990) : *Introduction à la pensée complexe*, Le Seuil

Moscovici, S. (1979) : *El psicoanálisis, su imagen y su público*. Huemul S.A.Buenos Aires

Naredo, J.M. (1987): *La economía en evolución: historia y perspectivas de las categorías básicas del pensamiento económico.* Siglo XXI.

Nonaka, I. (1995): *The knowledge creating company*. Oxford: Oxford Press

OIT (2010) : L'inspection du travail en Europe: Travail non déclaré, migration et la traite des êtres humains. Document de travail, 7. Genève. http://travail-emploi.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/wcms_120319.pdf

Ostrom E. (1990): Governing the commons. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Oueslati, W. Ed. (2011): Analyses économiques du paysage. Editions Quae. Versailles

Popper, K.R. (1963): Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific. Knowledge, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Price, C. (2012): *The European Landscape Convention: viewpoint of an economist.* Council of Europe, Landscape and Territories Series

Prieur M. (2006) : Paysage et approches sociale, économique, culturelle et écologique, in Conseil de l'Europe : *Paysage et développement durable: les enjeux de la Convention européenne du paysage*. Conseil de l'Europe

Roetemeijer, W. (2005): *The European Landscape Convention and the Netherlands, a perfect match?* Wageningen University and Research Center (WUR)

Rowe, G. and Frewer, L. (2000). "*Public participation methods: a framework for evaluation*". In: *Science, technology & Human values*, v.25, n.1, pp.3-29.

Rowe, G. and Frewer, L. (2004). "Evaluating public participation exercises: a research agenda". In: *Science, technology, & Human values*, v.29, n.4, pp.512-55.

Santamarina Campos, B. (2008) : De la educación a la interpretación patrimonial: patrimonio, interpretación y antropología, in Pereiro,X, S. Prado y H.Takenaka:.P*atrimonios culturales: educación e interpretación. cruzando límites y produciendo alternativas.* Donostia, Ankulegi Antropologia Elkartea, pp. 40-56.

Union européenne (2001) : Communication de la Commission du 15 mai 2001 développement durable en Europe pour un monde meilleur: stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable (Proposition de la Commission en vue du Conseil européen de Göteborg) [COM(2001) 264 final.
http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/environment/sustainable_development/

Union européenne (2006) : Nouvelle stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable.

Union européenne (2007) : *Le travail non déclaré au sein de l'Union européenne*. Eurobaromètre. Rapport 206.

Vallejo-Gomez, N. (2008), « La pensée complexe : antidote pour les pensées uniques. Entretien avec E. Morin ». *Synergies Monde* n° 4, pp. 249-262.

* * *