



Strasbourg, 18 February 2015

CEP-CDCPP (2015) 13E

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

LANDSCAPE AND DEMOCRACY

PROSPECTS

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

The Preamble of the European Landscape Convention states:

“The member States of the Council of Europe signatory hereto,

...

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

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 democracy

Mr Yves LUGINBÜHL, Emeritus Research Director at the National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS), France¹ and Expert of the Council of Europe for the drafting of the European Landscape Convention



“My later notions of leadership were profoundly influenced by observing the regent and his court. I watched and learned from the tribal meetings that were regularly held at the Great Place. ... Everyone who wanted to speak did so. It was democracy in its purest form. There may have been a hierarchy of importance among the speakers, but everyone was heard ... As a leader, I have always followed the principles I first saw demonstrated by the regent at the Great Place”. Nelson Mandela, 1995.

Introduction²

To a non-specialist, investigating the relationship between landscape and democracy³ might seem incongruous on the face of it. Until recently, landscape issues were governed by political decisions taken in the context of representative democracy, but usually backed by expert opinion. Democracy thus seemed self-evident. However, on reflection, many questions very soon arise, relating to methods of territorial governance, the place of academic knowledge relative to empirical know-how, the interest shown in landscape by the public, the relations between the politic world and civil society and the spread of experiments in participation in political decision-making. In truth this is a vast field, one drawing attention to whole swathes of European or even world political history. While it is crucial to address the political issue of the democratic process, as very many authors have done since Antiquity, it is clearly more complex to investigate the links that exist between the latter and landscape, even though they have been the subject of a number of studies and publications.

This report, written for the Council of Europe, is unlikely to be able to deal exhaustively with all the questions to be considered. However, it will attempt to open up lines of enquiry and set the terms of a debate which will inevitably arise at the regular meetings centring on the European Landscape Convention such as the conferences on the convention and the annual workshops.

¹ Chair of Scientific Committy - <http://www.ladyss.com/?lang=fr>

² The Great Place to which Nelson Mandela refers is the equivalent of the “palaver tree”.

³ Democracy, from the ancient Greek δημοκρατία/dēmokratía, meaning “sovereignty of the people”, a combination of the words δῆμος/demos, meaning “people” and κράτος/krátos, meaning “power” or “sovereignty”, from the verb kratein, “to command”, is the political system in which the people are sovereign.

The report is organised along the following lines:

- 1- The first part focuses on the role of landscape in European political history and in the methods of territorial governance which preceded the systems claiming to be democratic in the 18th century.
- 2- The second part examines the arrangements for exercising democracy and their capacity to reflect the opinions of all the populations concerned on the development of their living environment. This of course is the point at which the issue of levels of governance, ranging from the local to the national and the international, will be raised.
- 3- The third part of the report investigates the changes now occurring in this democratic process in the context of the globalisation of trade and the present crisis, and their impact on landscapes.
- 4- The fourth part is given over to contemporary forms of participatory democracy and the experiments in this area which are spreading throughout the world, and particularly in Europe.
- 5- In part five the focus is on the various factors which influence the success of these experiments and may either hamper them or ensure their full and successful realisation.
- 6- In the final part, which will serve as a conclusion, there is a summary, and certain subjects for further debate or investigation are put forward.

1. The lessons of the political history of territorial governance

We ought to look back at Sumerian, Indian and, above all, Greek antiquity and the Greek “polis”, a city-state in which the forum provided the setting for public debate. However, these first forms of democracy were highly inegalitarian, prohibiting the participation of women, slaves or metics, at least where Athenian “democracy” was concerned. So instead of going back to that era, let us start instead with the Italian “Quattrocento”, which provides a highly representative example of the questions raised by territorial governance and landscape management. This is a well-known example, which has been used to illustrate the European Landscape Convention so often that it has almost become a commonplace.

It is of course the famous fresco by Ambrogio Lorenzetti painted on the walls of a room in the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena in 1338 and presenting a lesson in local governance. This “Allegory of Good and Bad Government”, made up of four painted panels, was created at a remarkable political juncture⁴ which saw a transformation in the local governance and landscape management of a government which had originally consisted of a Council of 24 before being narrowed down to the Council of Nine, preserving the power of the great families of the municipal aristocracy.

As is stated by Chiara Frugoni, (1995), “rather than have themselves represented directly, the Nine preferred to establish the government of the 24, which lasted from 1236 to 1270 and was set up to counter the absolute power of the podestà and the influence of the great families through the constitution of the council known as the ‘elected consistory’, which marked the entry of the people into the government of the city. In a propaganda piece such as this fresco, a reminder of the past can offer the reassuring support of tradition and history and evoke, through its depiction of this past situation where the government was much more open to the lower social classes than the government of the Nine, the no doubt somewhat demagogical model from which the government claimed to draw its inspiration”⁵.

The fresco represents “an approach to territorial governance which can be transposed to landscape governance and is based on the theory that everyone, at his or her own temporal and spatial level,

⁴ The political system in Italy was one of autonomous cities – Italy was not unified until the 19th century – and the cities of Sienna and Florence were constantly at war, with the army of each city regularly pillaging the territory of the other.

⁵ (Translated from French) Frugoni C., 1995, Pietro and Ambrogio Lorenzetti, SCALA editions, 82 pages, p. 68.

governs a part of the landscape in which he or she lives – an approach which refers in turn to the dual notion of the rights and duties of each citizen. If we look closely at Lorenzetti's fresco, all of the persons depicted oversee a part of the society represented in the painting at their own level through the functions they perform or, in other words, control some of the components of the rural or urban landscape in the painting. The fact that the artist portrays good government next to the landscape it manages along with the subjects of its authority does not mean that that landscape depends for its political management solely on the prince and the figures surrounding him. Lorenzetti successfully makes the viewer feel that all the people are in their rightful place and fulfilling their function, even the 'bevy of dancing girls', as G. Duby so aptly describes them. The political meaning of the painting is one of order, peace and abundance and a feeling of serenity emanating from the landscape, even though we know full well that this political regime is not a democracy, but an authoritarian regime in which human rights still have little meaning."⁶

By contrast, the landscape of the bad government is one of pillage, war, crime and a lack of any productive activity. On this representation of bad government Lorenzetti has included writing, spelling out its vices such as greed, lust, pride and injustice.

D. Cosgrove⁷ talks of the question of the representation of political authority and points out that those who held such authority, such as the Duke of Siena, considered that allowing representatives of the neighbourhoods which made up the city to take part in decision making was a step too far. Subsequently the political elite radically restricted the role of these representatives, thus giving more power to the rich aristocrats and upper middle classes and favouring individualism over community life.

It should be said that during this period, the social elites, and sovereign power in particular, attempted to move against collective practices and the common lands these entailed. This was the case, for instance, in England where the Lords governing the counties began setting up enclosures (from the 13th century onwards) to establish private estates to replace the collective lands known as the commons used by poor peasants. The commons may be regarded as a form of shared governance of a territory – we will not go so far as to say that it was democratic – which gave those peasants access to a subsistence economy negotiated between themselves and the ruling nobility. This system evolved over time, particularly between 1750 and 1850 when parliamentary enclosures were introduced, establishing individual land ownership throughout the United Kingdom. This change in territorial and landscape governance, which changed the English landscape from an open field system to a landscape of fields surrounded by hedges (of hawthorn and oak), took place throughout the country and enabled the English monarchs to impose their sovereign law instead of the customary law which was one of the principles of the feudal system. At the same time there was an economic revolution, with the advent of liberalism, the agricultural revolution and the beginnings of industrial development, which were processes around which Adam Smith⁸ and then Ricardo⁹ devised their market-based economic theories, leading in turn to the theories of Karl Marx and his book "Das Kapital"¹⁰.

Another example deserves to be cited because it occurred in a European region where the first word equivalent to the term landscape emerged in the 15th century. In Dutch, German and Danish Friesland,

⁶ Luginbühl Y., 2012, *La mise en scène du monde, construction du paysage européen*, 2013 Edouard Bonnefous Prize of the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, CNRS Editions, Paris, 430 pages.

⁷ Cosgrove Denis E. (1998, first edition 1984), *Social formation and symbolic landscape*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 322 p., page 27.

⁸ Smith A., 1776, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, W. Strahan and T. Cadell, London.

⁹ Ricardo D., 1817, *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, John Murray, London.

¹⁰ Marx K., 1867, *Capital, A Critique of Political Economy* translated from the original German *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie*, Hamburg, Otto Meisner.

the peasantry who occupied the marshlands on the shores of the North Sea constructed “terpen”¹¹, which were artificial hillocks built up from earth taken from the surrounding area to provide ground that would be safe from the highest tides. On these “terpen” they set up their farms, where they lived in more or less complete isolation from the ruling nobility. In this way they managed their living environment almost entirely autonomously, untouched by the binding rules of feudalism. This was very widespread practice in the 10th and 11th centuries, so much so that researchers mapping these “terpen” have been able to identify at least 1,000. To claim that this form of land and landscape management was democratic would clearly be an exaggeration. However, it did amount to a form of shared governance involving a small number of individuals on a very local scale.

If we refer to this example, it is because it was in this area of the northern European coastline that the term *lantscap* appeared in 1462, representing the first known occurrence of the equivalent of the word landscape. The term combines *lant*, meaning country, and *scap*, which is the equivalent of the German word *Schaft*, meaning community, but it complements this with customary law in a form of territorial governance.

However, it was in fact the destiny of landscape to break with customary law and come under sovereign law, as is revealed by the changing meaning of the English word “landscape”, which derived from the Danish *landskab*. Kenneth Olwig provides a superb account of the changes in the meaning of this word, which was taken over directly from the Danish following the marriage of King James I of England to the Danish princess Anne, who brought the term to England with her. The royal couple saw it as a means of imposing sovereign law as opposed to the customary law favoured by the Lords and, following the attachment of Scotland to England, of establishing the United Kingdom¹². It should be reiterated that customary law was not the sign of a democratic form of territorial and landscape governance, but neither was sovereign law, which was more like a form of absolutism.

Other forms of government have, however, existed in the meantime, as in England, where the English Parliament emerged, restricting the powers of the monarch in accordance with the principles of the Magna Carta. The first elected parliament in England was de Montfort’s Parliament of 1265. Only a small minority had a vote, meaning that the parliament was elected by only a very small percentage of the population¹³. Parliaments only sat when the king or the queen saw fit to summon them (most often when he or she needed money). The power of parliament did grow over time, however, particularly on the occasion of the Glorious Revolution of 1688, in the wake of which a Bill of Rights was adopted in 1689, giving parliament more influence. The electorate grew slowly, and parliament gained more and more power until such time as the monarchy fulfilled only a figurehead role.

The period between the Renaissance and the 18th century saw despotic rulers prevail throughout Europe, and it was of course for this reason that the revolutions of the Age of Enlightenment occurred.

The first two modern democracies arose at this key moment in the world’s political history. The American democracy of 1788 preceded the French democracy, and these models were copied throughout the world. Although the American system was not viewed by its founding fathers as a democracy, it is considered by historians to be the first liberal democracy, because the Constitution of 1788 established the natural principles of freedom and equality before the law and rejected aristocratic regimes¹⁴.

¹¹ Lebecq S., 1980, “De la protohistoire au Haut Moyen Âge : le paysage des « Terpen », le long des côtes de la mer du nord, spécialement dans l’ancienne Frise”, in *Le paysage, réalités et représentations*, 10th Colloquy of Medieval Historians, *Revue du Nord*, Lille 1979, pages 125-148.

¹² Olwig K., 2002, *Landscape, Nature and the Body Politic, From Britain’s Renaissance to America’s New World*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 300 pages.

¹³ Less than 3% in 1780.

¹⁴ Wikipedia article on democracy.

However, there was no immediate link between these democracies and the landscape issue. Furthermore, democracies have changed and have not followed the same principles throughout history. In France universal suffrage was established in 1848, but votes for women were introduced in 1947. The examples already mentioned show at any rate that this form of political governance could be applied on differing scales, and there are countless highly diverse examples on all scales throughout the world, with varying degrees of openness to the participation of certain groups in society. The example from Africa of the “palaver tree” is certainly one instance of this, but can we talk about it in terms of democracy? Nelson Mandela clearly believed that the “palaver tree”, which he called the “Great Place”, was a democratic system for the exercise of power, enabling everyone to have a say, irrespective of the social hierarchies which inevitably existed¹⁵. While women only have a minor role to play and their participation should be increased, the “palaver tree” is a means of discussing the problems of the local community, the conflicts that divide it and any punishments that need to be imposed on individuals who have infringed the community’s rules. However, like the “terpen” of the North Sea coast and Lorenzetti’s fresco, these examples occur at local level and are not connected with the national scale which is, after all, where the world’s political democracies are put into practice.

2. Arrangements for the exercise of democracy and levels of governance

One of the prime concerns of the theoreticians on the exercise of democracy was to find the method of representation which would satisfy the greatest number of citizens. This question was a source of conflict between French revolutionaries, particularly between Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyes¹⁶, who contrasted the form of representative government he had helped to set up with the direct democracy advocated by Jean-Jacques Rousseau¹⁷, who had more confidence in the people. The system of government was still based on a limited right to vote determined by the wealth of individuals (namely census suffrage) and limited to men (women did not have the right to vote) and to an electorate which excluded people of other races or colonised people¹⁸. In addition, the United States and France practised slavery. It was abolished in the United States in 1865 (earlier in some states) and in France in 1848 (as well as between 1794 and 1802), but in practice discrimination continued in the political sphere for much longer. It was, however, only in the mid-19th century that the advocates of the representative system began calling it “democracy”, and the word lost its original meaning. These initial considerations prompt us to think that it would be wise to summarise the various forms of democracy so that the political context is properly delineated before we address the question of the relationship between democracy and landscape.

The question of the representativeness of citizens thus arises from the very beginning. The aim was to solve the problem which had given rise to the aforementioned debate between Sieyes and Rousseau, contrasting direct democracy with representative democracy. Direct democracy is a system which enables the people to adopt laws and important decisions themselves and to choose enforcers whom they can subsequently dismiss. Indirect, or representative, democracy is a system in which representatives are drawn by lots or elected by the citizens for a non-binding fixed-term mandate, during which they are not necessarily liable to dismissal by the citizens.

¹⁵ Mandela N., 1994, *Long Walk to Freedom*, The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela, Macdonald Purnell.

¹⁶ E J Sieyes: “Citizens who appoint representatives renounce – and must renounce – the possibility of making law themselves. They have no particular will to impose. If they were to dictate their will, France would no longer be a representative state; it would be a democratic state. In a country which is not a democracy (and France cannot be one), I repeat that the people can only speak and act through their representatives” (speech of 7 September 1789).

¹⁷ Jean-Jacques Rousseau considered that democracy could only be direct: “Sovereignty, for the same reason as it is inalienable, cannot be represented; it lies essentially in the general will, and that general will cannot be represented.”, *The Social Contract*, Book III, Chapter 15.

¹⁸ In the United States people were excluded on the basis of the colour of their skin while in France they were excluded if they were from the colonised peoples

However, there is also a form of semi-direct democracy in which the people are nonetheless required to rule themselves on certain laws by means of a referendum, which may actually be a vote on a popular initiative, either to oppose a bill through a veto or to table a bill. The latter scenario occurs for example in the Swiss Cantons and in Italy.

Representative democracy itself can be divided into several different types of system, namely parliamentary, presidential, semi-presidential, assembly-based and liberal democracy. The main feature of the parliamentary system is that the government is politically responsible to the parliament, from which it usually stems. The parliament may therefore dismiss the government through a vote of no confidence, the procedures for which vary from country to country. In exchange, the government, the holder of executive power, may dissolve the parliament, the holder of legislative authority. There is therefore a separation of powers within a parliamentary system, but it is regarded as “flexible” because of the reciprocal supervision between the executive and the legislature.

The presidential system is characterised by a stricter separation of powers. The executive has no political responsibility towards the legislature, which cannot dismiss it. On the other hand, the head of state, who is also the head of government and is elected by direct or indirect universal suffrage, has less power over parliament than in a parliamentary system, as he or she cannot dissolve it. In the United States, where the system is truly presidential, the President has the right to veto legislation.

The semi-presidential system combines the features of the parliamentary system and the presidential system, so is sometimes referred to as a mixed system. In the French Fifth Republic, the head of state is elected by direct universal suffrage and appoints and dismisses the members of the government. He or she may dissolve the Assembly, which, like the Senate, may only challenge the government through a vote of no confidence. If the President does not have a parliamentary majority, he or she is forced in principle into “cohabitation”, thus losing effective authority to the government and the head of government. When that happens, this system is more like a parliamentary system.

The assembly-based system is represented by a single assembly, elected by direct universal suffrage. It has exclusive political authority, as the executive and judiciary are subordinated to the legislature. The system was applied in France between 1792 and 1795, when the Convention was charged with drawing up a constitution. This type of system is not necessarily associated with a separation of powers.

In a liberal democracy, the capacity for elected representatives to exercise decision-making powers is subject to the rule of law and is generally delimited by a constitution which places the emphasis on protecting individual rights and freedoms, thus establishing a binding framework for leaders. This is not a particular type of representative system, so it may be parliamentary, presidential or mixed, as in France. Nor does it require a representative system in the strict sense, as it can also extend to a semi-direct system (like Switzerland’s) or a participatory one. Among its main principles, which are also found in most representative systems, we find individual rights and freedoms, but also freedom of expression, assembly, association and the press, property rights and the right to do business, in other words, the right to free trade.

No further comment will be made on these various forms of democracy, but an attempt will be made to investigate the links that are established between them and the question of landscape. In this connection, several introductory remarks need to be made:

- The first relates to the idea that societies form of the landscape. The situation differs according to whether the landscape is regarded as something outstanding or is equated with people’s everyday living environment.
- The second has to do with the applicable level of governance. The situation differs according to whether people think in terms of a national scale or an activity is carried out at local or regional level.

- Thirdly, the relationship between democracy and landscape varies according to the political and social status of the people involved. The process of drawing up laws or other measures or launching development, management or protection activities will differ according to whether it involves elected representatives, associations or just local residents.
- Lastly, the participatory process depends on what we mean by it. The role of citizens, experts, political leaders and institutions will differ according to whether the process is one of information, consultation, discussion or participation.

The definition of landscape

The definition of landscape has most certainly changed over time. Before the 1970s it was most frequently equated with outstanding landscapes and covered by the regulations introduced in most European countries to protect such landscapes because of their picturesqueness, role in legend or their scientific or artistic qualities. From the late 1960s onwards, the academic community began to pay attention to the landscape again, after it had fallen somewhat by the wayside following the great wave of interest that had stemmed from the work of geographers in several countries such as the UK, Italy, the Netherlands, France, Russia and Spain, who had regarded the landscape as the result of biophysical processes such as tectonics, hydrology, erosion or geomorphology, as a means of identifying countries' mining resources (this was the case with the Russian school, which added much to our knowledge about the formation of mountain ranges such as the Caucasus) or as a product of the interaction between nature and human activities (as was the case with the French school including Paul Vidal de la Blache). Historians had also produced a whole series of works on the history of the landscapes of certain countries, amongst them W.G. Hoskins in England, Emilio Sereni in Italy and Roger Dion in France. These works mostly date from the inter-war period, although some were published in the 1950s.

The emergence of environmental concerns changed the meaning attached to landscapes and prompted a revival in the research work on the subject, which had been declining generally in Europe – although not in all countries. The most important innovation, and one which was connected with the relationship between democracy and landscape, was undoubtedly the emergence of studies on the social perceptions or representations of landscapes. The effect of these was to turn the spotlight onto the diverse range of social views on the landscape and to reveal their major impact on political activities, in so far as the research showed that social players act according to their social perceptions or representations of landscapes, and not necessarily in response to the problems that actually arise in the field. In this way these academic studies, which were produced in many European countries and at the same time in North America, began altering the meaning that was attributed to the landscape by injecting the dimension of social perceptions and representations and by shifting the focus increasingly onto everyday landscapes and away from outstanding ones.

It was as a result of this that, when the European Landscape Convention was drafted, the discussion almost immediately showed an interest in those everyday landscapes – although outstanding landscapes were not forgotten. Everyday landscapes were therefore included within the scope of the Convention (under Article 5), and this prompted an upsurge in interest throughout Europe, the main argument being that the large majority of European people now lived in landscapes which were not outstanding, but above all urban or suburban, although of course sometimes rural, and that the main challenge was that of improving these people's living environments.

The other aspect of the semantics of the term landscape, which is connected with the above remarks, is the fairly widespread tendency among elected representatives to view the landscape as something that is linked with conservation and hence at odds with their desires for economic development. Here again the old idea of the landscape, equated with the protection of outstanding sites, comes up again and again, and it is relatively rare for elected representatives to accept the new definition, which is more alive to social concerns and aspirations, as assessed through social perceptions and representations. Further below we will discuss the position of elected representatives in relation to democratic

processes during landscape development operations, but it can already be said that they do not welcome trying to engage in discussions with their electorate.

It can be concluded therefore that the meaning that is assigned to the landscape determines the democratic quality of the debate between those concerned and of the political decisions taken. Fortunately, the meaning of the term has shifted to encompass greater participation by the people concerned, as is clearly indicated in the European Landscape Convention when it defines the landscape as an “area, as **perceived** by people”, hence alluding to the social representations and perceptions which act as a driving force for political action. Some evidence of the demand for democracy is provided by the appeal made by campaigners in South America for the example of the European Landscape Convention to be transposed into a world landscape convention or – probably more realistically – into a convention that would apply to the whole continent as the European Convention does in Europe. Also raised in this connection is the relevance of landscapes more connected with people’s everyday lives. Furthermore, there have been many experiments involving the participation of local residents in this region of America.

The question of level of governance

These new semantics also prompted the emergence of experiments with participation, which were sometimes spontaneous, and although they were not directly linked to the European Landscape Convention, they were incorporated into its principles to a degree, particularly in the articles on the identification and assessment of landscapes and landscape quality objective¹⁹ and those recommending that the public should be encouraged to take part in these activities. If these experiments are carried out in small areas, and not countrywide, the pursuance of policies for the benefit of landscape depends both on national institutions and on local and regional authorities. This is the meaning of the landscape as envisaged by the European Landscape Convention, which calls on the States Parties to implement landscape policies at this level. It can be accepted that this is a democratic process achieved through decisions taken by elected individuals representing the people. In this way they can have a law adopted which will be of benefit to the landscape.

The national level is also the one at which decisions are taken to promote policies for the protection of outstanding landscapes such as those that are candidates for inclusion on the World Heritage List. In this context, the democratic process is played out between the experts and the elected representatives of local and regional authorities or the nation. They need to have electoral representativeness and standing in expert circles in order to defend their case in the community and international institutions. To a certain extent, democracy steps aside in the face of diplomatic concerns and power politics between international experts and political figures, especially given that most applications for world heritage listing have not involved the populations concerned or been the subject of public consultation.

This is not always the case, as certain applications have succeeded thanks to appeals from the populations concerned, and UNESCO has fully realised that community action is a key strength where it comes to local partners having a sense of ownership of applications and any subsequent listings. In some respects, the World Heritage Convention was lagging behind communities’ demands for democracy and is now trying to catch up. This is a reflection of the discrepancy between the expert-based approach favoured by UNESCO and the demand by the public, which most opinion polls highlight, for their political representatives to pay more heed to them. These polls show that many people accuse their elected representatives of failing to listen to them. In the same way, the public rarely has any say in decisions on the protection of sites or landscapes at national level, which are regarded as matters for expert reports and technical opinions by the administrative departments

¹⁹ Article 6 C “Identification and assessment” and, in particular, b. to assess the landscapes thus identified, taking into account the particular values assigned to them by the interested parties and the population concerned. And Article 6 D “Landscape quality objectives”: Each Party undertakes to define landscape quality objectives for the landscapes identified and assessed, after public consultation in accordance with Article 5.c.

concerned and local and regional elected representatives. Public surveys may be conducted but they are not really a sign of any real democracy and are more like consultations, which are a very different matter.

The level of governance is therefore a key factor in the proper exercise of democracy with regard to landscape issues. We have already looked at some examples of this and they are on the increase throughout Europe, and even elsewhere in places such as North and South America, where campaigns for account to be taken of the aspirations of the populations of small territories are commonplace and try to combat developments deemed unsatisfactory. The case of Veneto is an interesting example, because it is one in which the committees (*comitati*) which were set up to oppose projects which took no account of the local population's desires are now attempting to devise development projects which are based on studies of the local landscape²⁰.

The local level is therefore the one at which the democratic process is most operational, although it raises countless questions which will be examined below. It is clear in particular that this is the level that most enables residents to regain control over the quality of their living environments, and it is indeed for this reason that more and more experiments are being carried out. It provides a form of resistance to all types of processes driven by the globalisation of commercial and financial transactions, which the citizens of Europe (and the world) cannot combat directly. In this way, the local level seems to serve as a kind of haven from globalisation. However, at this level there is of course also the question as to whether local residents are really capable, through the elected individuals who represent them in the political sphere, of having any influence on decisions which are taken at world level. For example, can they have any impact on the price of food, which is decided on the world markets and has a bearing on landscapes, because it means that certain crops are favoured over others, or on the price of oil, which affects transport infrastructure and methods?

Another issue that arises with regard to the level of governance is that, in some cases, spatial development decisions are taken by local authority bodies from which citizens are remote in administrative and political terms. This is the case for example with associations of municipalities or with nature parks, where procedures for landscape analysis and the preparation of development programmes are the sole responsibility of technical experts and elected representatives, and residents are never consulted or even informed about them. This is true of France's groupings of municipalities (*communautés de communes*), whose representatives are no longer elected by the people but chosen by other elected representatives in a process of political clashes and power brokering of which ordinary citizens are unaware, and which some might call "political jiggery-pokery". In such circumstances, democracy is a relatively distant notion, and decisions are taken by an elite circle of insiders in the interest of a limited number of political and economic pressure groups. These remarks bring us on to the issue of the status of the people involved.

The status of the people involved

The example above tells us much about the difficulties of exercising democracy at local level. However, the status of the people involved takes us even further. Local and regional governance and the landscape governance that goes with it depend on the interplay of power between social or pressure groups such as economic, political or trade union lobbies. The processes of global trade and financial transactions are carried out by economic or financial groupings which influence decisions and are the very opposite of democracy. The prices of cereals, animal products, and so on, which determine the fates of whole swathes of European landscapes, are fixed by global agreements (WTO) in which the major multinational food trading companies, which have not the slightest concern for

²⁰ Varotto M., 2000, "In difesa dei luoghi dell'abitare: il fenomeno dei comitati spontanei in Veneto", Quaderno 3 Osservatorio Veneto, Verona. And Varotto M., Visentin L.F., 2008, "Comitati locali e criticità ambientali in Veneto. L'evoluzione del fenomeno negli ultimi 10 anni", A.R.S. No. 116 January/March 2008.

local or regional development or landscapes, operate solely with the goal of making a short or medium-term profit.

These processes take place at international level but they are also present at national level, where it is the power brokering between political parties, trade unions or economic pressure groups which affect the political decisions in favour of one or another. The public interest often comes second to vested interests. Examples of this can be seen in policies on housing and infrastructure, which lie in the hands of major property or civil engineering companies, as in the case of motorways. The influence of lobbies is often greater than that of associations working to protect the environment or landscapes. The recent dramatic example of the Sivens dam project in France is a very telling one in this respect, and many other cases could be cited throughout Europe.

At local level also, even though citizens have more chance of taking part in negotiating procedures, some groups act in their own interests first, and the public interest comes second. At this level, the process is more balanced, but there is no doubt, as is proven by certain experiments with citizen participation, that some people have more of a capacity to intervene than others, if only because they are more used to speaking in public and are more skilled in imposing their views over those of other residents with less debating experience and less skill in argument. The democratic process can also be skewed when local issues are hidden because, if they were brought up in public, they would reignite underlying conflicts which some local groups do not want to be aired in front of the entire local population. This is especially the case with the question of the preservation of hedges in many regions, which also raises the issue of water quality. Environmental groups do not all agree with one another, and tensions can arise between those wishing to preserve biodiversity and those more attached to the quality of landscapes, with the two aims proving difficult to reconcile in a calm manner.

The people who promote such participation procedures may also belong to various spheres of society. Research workers, landscape practitioners, artists and environmental and landscape associations are all involved in various ways, and sometimes they work together, but problems arise in agreeing on the methods and tools to be used. Sometimes tensions also arise between these communities or even within one and the same group, such as the disagreement between ecologists and human sciences experts, who do not view the landscape in the same way. The involvement of artists can also pose problems, for although they draw the public's attention through the works and creations that they display in public spaces, they do not always carry a practical project through to its completion. We will see in part five below how these people from various backgrounds can offer solutions or prompt conflict within participation procedures.

Nonetheless, it is through public negotiation and by pitting different viewpoints against one another that problems can be solved. However, as we shall see, there are many obstacles to such debates, which are, as well, not necessarily appreciated by elected representatives, who sometimes see them as a waste of time when they themselves are bound by electoral timeframes and often wish to take a decision which may play a decisive part in their re-election.

Definitions of participation procedures

Definitions of participation procedures vary, ranging from the provision of information to true participation. In a technical document drawn up in connection with a research programme on landscape and sustainable development run by the French Ministry for Ecology and entitled "Participation and Landscape"²¹, the author, Yves Michelin, refers to Beuret et al, 2006, and, in

²¹ Technical document on "Participation and Landscape", 2013, Landscape and Sustainable Development Programme, 2005-2010, Yves Michelin, Ministry for Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy, Landscape Office, National Research Institute of Science and Technology for Environment and Agriculture (IRSTEA), 8 pages.

agreement with the members of the programme's Scientific Committee, identifies the following different types of procedure:

- Communication: this is a one-way process which attempts to gain the support of a target group.
- Information: this is also a one-way process, but it does provide access to a form of power in that it increases people's capacity to act.
- Consultation: while consultation does enable various opinions to be expressed, it does not allow decision-making powers to be shared and provides no guarantee as to whether the opinions expressed will be taken into account.
- Dialogue and exchange: the aim of dialogue and exchange is to help those involved to get to know one another better and to put them on an equal footing.
- Concerted action: the aim of concerted action is a collective effort to build up forward-looking approaches and goals, but it does not always allow people to play any part in the decision-making process.
- Negotiation: the aim of negotiation is to arrive at an agreement within a context of balances of power.

Before this second part of the report is concluded, it seems clear that these four parameters, namely the meaning assigned to landscape, the level of governance, the status of those involved and the forms of participation, are inextricably linked. It would be difficult to keep them apart when analysing and attempting to improve the democratic process as it relates to landscape.

Before drawing the lessons of this part of the report, it also seems essential to clarify the significance of the ways in which democracy has been and is exercised, as evidenced by the changes they have undergone in the last few decades. Between 2000 and 2010, the emphasis was placed on concerted action, which is not yet a fully-fledged form of participation. A report produced in 2007 by the French Ministry for Ecology and Sustainable Development attempted to take stock of the definitions of the terms and expressions used in the context of information, public participation, concerted action and engagement activities in the context of risk prevention plans²². It insists first and foremost on the challenges, aims and meaning of participation and concerted action, stating that:

“Concerted action is not an end in itself. The reasons why people get involved in a participatory process such as concerted action on a project or a policy or the establishment of specific bodies for concerted action can vary considerably. They may stem from a strong political desire, a regulatory obligation or a particular context, for instance. Consequently, although calls for participation and concerted action are increasingly frequent and urgent, and it seems to have become impossible to “do without” concerted action, concerted action should not just be conducted for its own sake. It only has any meaning in relationship to the goals set for it and which were the reason for it. Those goals are what will determine the procedures and tools used and the assessment of the action taken. These goals may fall into differing categories. A single process of concerted action may have several aims, of a highly diverse nature.”²³

²² Programme on “Information, public participation, concerted action and engagement in risk prevention plans”. This was carried out by the French Centre for Studies on Networks, Transport, Town Planning and Public Buildings (CERTU) (LydieBOSC), under the authority of the MEDAD/DPPR/SDPRM (Ministry for Ecology and Sustainable Development - Directorate for the Prevention of Pollution and Hazards, Sub-Directorate for the Prevention of Major Hazards) (Magali Pinon-Leconte), with the contribution of members of the programme's steering committee.

²³ Op. cit., page 5.

That report also describes the citizenship aspect of procedures, setting out what is expected of participation and concerted action: “It can be expected that a participatory approach will create renewed interest in public affairs and community matters and that it will restore confidence between (elected) representatives and those they represent (citizens), in a context which is often described as a ‘crisis of representative democracy’ or a ‘crisis of politics’, one of the main symptoms of which is the high abstention rate at elections”. So those expectations are highly diverse, and participation and concerted action also enable issues to be shared and public action to be changed, and may make a useful contribution to the preparation of projects (see Appendix 1).

The reason why extracts from the report referred to above are quoted in Appendix 1 is that it perfectly sums up, if brought up to date, the conditions in which so-called participatory democracy can be exercised. Although the report refers only to the subject of risk prevention, this does not make it any the less applicable to landscape, even if it does not cite the European Landscape Convention, which had already been adopted and ratified by France when the report was being prepared.

While the most conventional definition of democracy is that of a political system in which the people are sovereign, we prefer to proffer Paul Ricoeur’s definition: “A democratic society is one which is aware that it is divided, in other words shot through with conflicts of interest, and which decides to operate by involving every citizen in equal measure in the expression, analysis and consideration of those conflicts, with a view to finding a compromise”²⁴.

We will see below that this definition is more of an expression of democracy as applied to landscape development.

3. Trends of democratic practice in the context of globalisation as they relate to landscape

Emergence and development of participation

Citizens’ strong demand to be heard by political leaders could constitute a strength of democracy if only it were really fulfilled. Usually in fact, the residents of a place regret not being heard by their elected representatives, so it is understandable that the alternative movements springing up everywhere in Europe have developed and sometimes challenge or participate at local level. These are still not very common experiences, usually based on opposition to political decisions imperilling the landscape lived in by populations confronted with projects which they do not support. Sometimes changes that upset what the populations regard as equivoques prompt local elected representatives to venture into local debate. These experiences arise in connection with alteration of the living environment, tending towards the collective construction of new landscapes. But they do not yet constitute a dominant movement. While still marginal in relation to the customary institutional procedures, they reflect a resolve to broaden democracy, consistent with its evolution through history.

Pierre Rosanvallon²⁵ has thoroughly analysed this historical trend, and in particular the question of representativeness of the entire population in a system operating through elections favouring the majority party. In his view, the democratic regimes of the United States of America and France have followed a process of evolution which has broadened their societal base either by universal suffrage or by extension of the vote to women, or again by creating power-curbing bodies intended to avert the excesses which inevitably ensued from the election of representatives of a majority party.

²⁴ (Translated from the French of) Ricoeur P., 1997, *L’idéologie et l’utopie* (Lectures on Ideology and Utopia), Essais, Seuil, Paris, 413 pages. And Ricoeur P., 1997, *Amour et justice* (Love and Justice), PUF, Paris, 110 pages.

²⁵ Rosanvallon Pierre, 2008, *La légitimité démocratique, Impartialité, Réflexivité, proximité* (Democratic Legitimacy: Impartiality, Reflexivity, Proximity). Seuil Editions, Paris, 350 pages.

Societies themselves, and no longer states, have explored the avenue of mobilising certain groups which, by organising rallies of “citizens”, have tried to intervene in official decisions. This style of mobilisation took shape in the United States in the 1960s with the initiatives taken by the philosopher John Dewey. This form of contribution to political decision-making has found scope for expression in most European countries. Moreover, it resulted in the 1998 Aarhus Convention²⁶, to which the European Landscape Convention refers and which advocates public participation in the process of initiating landscape-specific action from the landscape identification and assessment stage onwards.

In the 1990s, the social sciences debated this question of consultation and participation and the forms which they take; many publications appeared and research programmes on this theme were undertaken. These publications often centred on the collective mechanisms which grow up around environmental issues and allow debate between opposing groups of a local society. These mechanisms have occasionally been constructed by scientists themselves or by institutions under a plan for development or management of an environmental problem.

In those early years of participation, a debate arose about the role of experts vis-à-vis politicians and civil society. Yves Le Bars²⁷, at a colloquy on modelling at the nature-society interface²⁸, describes three ages of an official decision: the first is that of the expert making decisions to satisfy basic needs, the second is the one where the decision-maker involves several experts in response to a challenge, and the third that of three-way dialogue involving the decision-maker, the experts and “others”. The term “expert” might also be considered rather vague since, in the landscape sphere, it may refer to landscaping practitioners or scientists, two very different things. In this period of incipient participation by civil society in official decision-making on landscape planning or on environmental issues, a colloquy took place with the title “Les experts sont formels” (The experts are categorical) adopting a critical stance towards the expert’s role. This corresponds to the first period described by Yves Le Bars, and it is true that a critical discourse with regard to experts did develop, sometimes rather caricaturing them.

Since that period the context has changed, and participatory democracy and its variants have developed, though without the expert’s role being made completely explicit. Is the expert to be the facilitator of the participation mechanism? Or a mediator? Or again, should he not be content to contribute his proficiencies and knowledge to the preparation of a common landscape project? The question of mediation is open to debate in the sphere of landscape: some researchers hold that the landscaper is primarily a new mediator; others consider that, while mediation is a tool at the service of participation, the main thing is to arrive at a landscape project which improves people’s living conditions, so the landscaper should not renounce the status of designer. These are questions which may enter into the lines of enquiry which we propose to develop at the Council of Europe.

Landscape and interactive democracy

Participatory projects of this kind require mobilisation of the participants over time, whereas research and study grants are only provided for limited terms, precluding the continued conduct and facilitation of participation over a period of time. Continuity raises the question of the time and the intervals between election periods – often leading to hiatuses in citizen participation experiments – and of the time frame of these experiments: elected representatives are not immutable, and their replacement on the occasion of an election may lead to changes in the priorities set for the activities initiated or in

²⁶ Op. cit.

²⁷ *General Council of Rural, Water and Forestry Engineering, chair of research group, adviser to the General Directorate of Cemagref (National centre for agricultural mechanisation of rural, water and forestry engineering), adviser to the Select Committee for Public Debate on Radioactive Waste, chair of the Technical Research and Exchange Group (2), former chair of the National Agency for Radioactive Waste in France.*

²⁸ “Modélisations à l’interface Natures et Sociétés”, NSS Cirad IRD Colloquy, Montpellier, December 2005.

their course, whereas the processes of debate which justify them and the exchanges of information are unfinished.

These two interactive processes in the work of justification and information exchange outline a far stronger and richer relationship for that purpose than the one established by a mandate. (...) Admittedly political power draws closer to society first of all under the constraint of justification and through the circulation of information. But citizens also feel stronger when they understand the world better, when they are better equipped to realise the issues of the moment, to assign a language and a meaning to what they experience. The sense of remoteness, of confiscation in fact also stems from ignorance. (...) When they feel more involved in this circulation of information and knowledge, citizens therefore actually establish a new relationship with the governing class. And so a new social economy of proximity concomitantly with social control – empowerment – is what is at work in interactive democracy²⁹.

The expression *interactive democracy* differs from the more commonly used *participatory democracy* and also from *deliberative democracy*, in the sense that it makes for ongoing reflection among all the players mobilised. This is why the landscape project viewed as an open process not limited in time is more relevant than the preparation of a completed plan resembling an architectural design. It enables the players not only to engage in a “*process of ongoing exchanges, not only between the political power and society but also within society itself. Thus it goes beyond the conventional distinction between participatory and deliberative democracy*”³⁰, but also to absorb the knowledge gained by analysing the effects of applying field-tested measures: “*It is an incessant task of inclusion, reaction and interpretation. Thus there is a certain de-materialisation of politics in no way implying loss of sociological relevance.*”³¹

Interactive democracy is consistent with the principle propounded to justify landscape’s meaning as the outcome of interaction between biophysical and social processes³². *Interaction* can be complemented by the idea of *adjustment*, signifying that in the actual course of the planning process, the players gradually adjust and possibly alter their positions with the help of new knowledge derived from experimental developments. History moreover provides appropriate lessons for understanding the concept of *adjustment* present in the work of geographers, historians and archaeologists where they analyse the reactions of societies to situations of environmental crisis³³. Exploitation of a resource may indeed bring about a critical situation because its extraction has been too intensive and its reserves are exhausted. During extraction, societies realise that the resource is beginning to run short for the continuation of an economic activity. Crisis breaks out and societies then enter a phase of down-sizing the exploitation of the resource, followed by another phase of *adjustment* of their technical, social as well as political capabilities. Adjustment is a moment of, and an opportunity for, reconstitution of social forces, political institutions, economic activities and technical systems allowing the commencement of a new growth phase on a new pattern of exploitation of the resource³⁴. It becomes a mode of governance presupposing transformations of the technology used but also of the social and political configurations. Technology, in which the political world often seeks refuge, does not suffice although systematic recourse is had to it for resolving an environmental crisis; the problem of climate change has brought into being technological speculation purportedly providing the answer

²⁹ Rosanvallon Pierre, op. cit., p. 330.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 337.

³¹ Ibid., p. 338.

³² As formulated by the European Landscape Convention in its definition of landscape, landscape “*is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors*”.

³³ See discussion of the concepts of interaction and adjustment in Luginbühl (Yves), 2009, Biodiversité, changement climatique et paysage, in “*Humanité et biodiversité, manifeste pour une nouvelle alliance*”, Ligne ROC, Descartes and Co., 314 pages, pp. 212-237.

³⁴ Beck Corinne, Luginbühl Yves, Muxart Tatiana, 2006, Temps et espaces des crises environnementales, collective work in the QUAE collection “*Indisciplines*”. See in particular contributions by Jean-Paul Métailié and Bernard Davasse concerning forestry resources in the Pyrenees.

to exhaustion of energy resources. Use of renewable resources is often identified as the way ahead, whereas the entire global social and political system is at stake and needs to be reconstituted. Technology is often merely an evasion of the necessities of radical change to the whole political and social system. Thus interactive democracy opens onto a permanent cognitive, informational and social interchange. As E. Morin puts it:

“As soon as an individual embarks on any action whatsoever, it begins to break free of his intentions. The action enters a universe of interactions, and it is finally the environment which takes hold of it in a way that may become opposite to the initial intention. The action will often rebound on us like a boomerang. This compels us to follow the action, to try and rectify it (...)”

³⁵

Following and trying to rectify the action is the aim of landscape projects conceived as continuous processes in which the action attempts to steer the current transformations in the direction which may emerge from debate. But do all citizens want debate? While governments need alternative forms of exercise of democracy to address controversial situations, it is not certain that everyone subscribes to the solution of interactive democracy, least of all the political world, as stated above. Participatory democracy is often criticised by elected representatives themselves, who regard it as a perversion of representative democracy or a muddled path liable to disrupt the political process and the place of the elected representatives of the people in political decision-making. At a colloquy organised in Venice in 2008, a member of the Italian Council of State asserted that participation by the population in political decisions was an open door to a Mafia takeover of local affairs!

It seems obvious that in the debates which coincide with these experiences, having a say depends on voluntary affiliation and raises the question of the participants' representativeness and of the pressure that may be exerted by class organisations on collective debate. Indeed, what does an action signify when its participants are not selected on lines representative of the local society concerned? This question poses many problems in the organisation of such actions and in their social and political relevance. Massimo Morisi, a jurist from Florence University, raised these various questions at the Biennale Toscana del Paesaggio³⁶. He distinguished various categories of policies, among which landscape projects may be placed as public policies arising from deliberative or argumentative democracy³⁷, alongside public policies originating from the political world, those born of technocracy and those resulting from a referendum. He also introduced other questions regarding the organisation of this form of participation.

Initiative was the first: the difference between an action of local democracy undertaken by a political institution and one undertaken by a residents' association arising from realisation of a conflict situation is not insignificant. It casts doubt on the social validity of participation; not all residents of a place where a conflict situation has emerged participate, but the representativeness of the participants can be presumed not to constitute an obstacle in itself to the circulation of information. The crux is that the action of participation should commence, provided that it is open enough; in a given locality, information circulates by word of mouth and the whole population is soon informed to a greater or lesser extent of the debates taking place, whose staging bears witness to a controversy. The debates may be enriched by the informal conversations occurring outside scheduled meetings.³⁸

³⁵ Morin Edgar, 2005, Introduction à la pensée complexe, Essays, Points, Seuil, Paris, 160 pages, p. 106.

³⁶ Massimo Morisi, 2008, Partecipazione e governo del territorio, Biennale Toscana del Paesaggio, 13-15 November 2008.

³⁷ The terms denoting non-representative democracy vary; interactive democracy is closer to the conception propounded here than deliberative, argumentative or participatory democracy.

³⁸ P. Rosanvallon mentions a study by the UK's Electoral Commission revealing that each day 15 million political conversations take place in England thanks to the new means of communication, and this he calls "diffuse citizenship involvement", in op. cit., p. 327.

Today citizens' alienation from politics is confirmed by a European survey which yields the following results:

- confidence in elected politicians: from 1.60% to 5.60% of respondents (21 countries + 2 Spanish regions);
- confidence in political parties: from 1.71% to 5.66%.

These results in fact indicate very low confidence in elected representatives and political parties, confirmed by elections in Europe generally, particularly European Parliament elections, where abstention is high, and by the rise of far right and far left parties. They make it easier to understand the success, albeit relative, of participation operations in respect of landscape. But as will be shown, they are not straightforward; they require particular conditions to ensure a certain effectiveness.

4. Contemporary forms of participatory democracy applied to landscape

Diverse and sometimes spontaneous experiments

Participatory experiments involving landscape emerged in the 1990s and developed thereafter. They accompanied social movements which appeared in Europe relating to problems of quality of the living environment threatened by infrastructure or alterations deemed contrary to the well-being of the populations concerned.

In France, studies in the Côtes d'Armor Department pinpointed one of these spontaneous experiments which took place in a small hydrographic basin. The MIR³⁹, a local association, organised a demonstration about damage to water quality from the spreading of slurries from enclosed livestock breeding; it invited the residents of the municipalities along the river in question to a festival on its banks. Afterwards the participants took a stroll along the stream and were asked to observe the existing hedges, the positions of former cut-down hedges and places where it would be important to replant; the farmers present discussed and broadly agreed with the observations made. After the festival, the association involved itself in hedge replanting proposals, persuading the farmers to participate. Its action took on the appearance of a festive event where debate proceeded in a convivial manner and resulted in collectively discussed replanting of hedges; subsequently the association provide the farmers with aerial photos of their farms showing the alignment of the hedgerows, enabling them to follow their development.

These movements are akin to the experiments that the social sciences tried in the same years, taking inspiration from the spontaneous actions which arose in contexts of opposition to political decisions. During works conducted in the Dordogne valley in 1993, landscape workshops were organised, along the same lines as had been followed by "Mairie-Conseils"⁴⁰. The workshops followed an extensive study of the Dordogne valley landscapes⁴¹ which had a dimension of scientific experimentation, surveying the 284 municipalities in the valley to locate the landscapes of local interest, the transformations as perceived locally, and the known individual and collective, public and private

³⁹ "Mission d'Initiative Rurale", referred to in a research programme on evaluation of the policy on reconstituting "bocage" landscape. "Evaluation des politiques publiques de paysagement du territoire", 2003, UMR LADYSS. Hughes Lamarche, director of the Research Programme on Public Policies and Landscapes; Analysis, evaluation, comparisons; Ministry for Ecology and Sustainable Development, France.

⁴⁰ Operational body of the Caisse des dépôts et consignations; Annie Blanchard and Yves Gorgeux in particular have conducted experiments in mobilisation and participation of local players and residents in several municipalities or groupings of municipalities in France.

⁴¹ Conducted for EPIDOR, the Dordogne valley inter-regional and inter-departmental management agency, by the STRATES laboratory and SEGESA, Society for Applied Economic, Geographical and Sociological Studies headed by Jean-Claude Bontron; STRATES, CNRS laboratory – Paris 1 University, became LADYSS in 1997. The survey response rate was 72%.

projects in each municipality⁴²; these details were mapped on a scale of 1:25,000, and on that basis the landscape workshops were held with the elected representatives, the technicians of the administrative authorities concerned and some residents. This experiment was described in the conclusions of the first European Landscape Convention workshops, held in Strasbourg. Only the essential inferences will be drawn from them here.

The workshops began with a group tour of the selected territory (5 municipalities representing approximately the area of one landscape unit) during which the participants were able to exchange on the spot knowledge about the transformations of the landscapes and comment on them. The tours were continued with indoor workshops which officialised the state of play shown on the maps produced beforehand by the survey: participants were invited to make their own additions to the maps. These were amended and validated at the subsequent meeting, an important stage setting the seal on recognition of a document which ranks as a body of shared knowledge.

The process of negotiation surrounding a collective development plan was founded on exchange and sharing of information, starting from a common concern, the quality of the river water causing alarm to the elected representatives because of a decision by the public health authority to close a camping ground with 2,000 places owing to the presence of bacteria dangerous to the health of bathers. Without going into the detail of the meetings, we shall highlight the importance of commencing the negotiation process on a definite fact that makes sense to the community, on which it is then possible to itemise the various urban planning, ecological and agricultural implications of the water quality issue, such as the domestic water supply system, whose cost is high if dwellings are spread out, for example. The upshot of this debate was thus to reconstitute step by step the landscape of the valley tract concerned, and the meeting acknowledged the need for control over the territory through planning instruments or specific measures, albeit with respect for the overall integrity of the territory. Each party contributed approaches for remedying the problems ascertained in common, and little by little a collective project that may be likened to a landscape project was built up.

The following lessons were learned from this experiment:

- collective reading of the landscape is an important phase, which has been replicated elsewhere and proven its effectiveness;
- the second point is mapping: it enables each participant to pinpoint the important local landscapes, the transformations and the projects, while sharing this knowledge through debate with the other residents;
- the third point is the process of devising the project on the basis of shared knowledge. It is constructed step by step through mutual input of solutions originating from the various players present, elected representatives included. But one of the problems besetting this process is its continuity. In the absence of funds allowing it to be taken further, the process halts and there is nothing to ensure that all the measures imagined during discussions will be carried through. This is a genuine problem, unresolved as long as the appropriations made for these experiments by the local and regional authorities are limited in time; moreover, the possibility of a change of elected representative is never to be ruled out, leaving the continuation of the operation in doubt.

At all events, this type of participatory approach is instructive regarding the public contribution to the collective experience of devising a landscape project in the framework of democracy.

⁴² Inspired by a similar project carried out in the Loire valley.

From opposition to project

In Italy, Mauro Varotto and Ludovico Visentin have analysed these movements as they appeared in Veneto⁴³: they mapped the *comitati* formed to oppose disputed new infrastructure developments; those committees, numbering 108 in the year 2000, fall into two categories:

- those whose approach is to contest new dumps, infrastructure, television or telephone relay masts, quarries and incinerators, in particular;
- the second category inclines more towards preparation of landscape development plans. The two Italian geographers remark that this second category has grown at the expense of the first. In a space of ten years or so, the committees moved from protest to proposal, and their number reached 253. Furthermore, they acquired a broader spatial basis, changing up to the supra-local level or organising at the regional level through mutual contacts via social networks, thereby forming more powerful unions in dealings with local and regional governments. By organising at a lower level, they also changed direction, tending to become organisations with a civic purpose or defending grassroots democracy:

“(...) their desire for the environmental quality, civic conscience and sustainable social justice of economic development processes constitutes the cultural challenge of the new respect for the civic environment.”⁴⁴

“In many cases, the protest of the committees is transformed into political proposal, structured within a wider scheme of alternative territorial development which operates in the committees to guide the administration of spatial planning.”⁴⁵

This trend is also noted by P. Rosanvallon: *“In the 1960s and 1970s, participatory democracy was typically invoked by social movements demanding a reapportionment of powers. (...) The stakes are no longer the same at the start of the 21st century.”⁴⁶* To his mind, governments need these alternative movements which perform a role of transmitting information or finding a way out of controversial situations. In asserting that they are *“nearly always set up by governments themselves”⁴⁷*, he overlooks the spontaneous movements originating from neither the political nor the scientific world, and particularly not the social sciences, but appearing when there is a conflict situation or a problem facing society at a given level, as in the case of the *comitati* in Veneto, thus bringing innovation to the relationship between landscape and democracy. They are part of a whole constituted by the alternative associations proliferating just about everywhere, as in Latin America. Their peculiarity is the use of landscape to convey civic demands for improvement of the living environment, associating wishes for greater social justice with calls for sustainable development and with recognition of the emotional and aesthetic values of the territory where they emerge.

Many further examples could be mentioned. Some will be examined in the next part. What can be borne in mind from these indications is no doubt the diversity of the democratic forms of participation which are linked with landscape. Also, the clear progression from opposition to project, which is increasingly taking on the appearance of a continuous process, although that is not always possible under the political and financial conditions of their implementation. We now propose to consider the factors in the success or failure of these experiments, whose procedures have evolved since their appearance in the social arena.

⁴³ Varotto Mauro, 2000, op. cit.

⁴⁴ Varotto Mauro, Visentin Ludovico Fabrizio, 2008, op. cit.

⁴⁵ Varotto Mauro, op. cit., p. 6.

⁴⁶ Rosanvallon Pierre, op. cit., p. 323.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

5. Factors in the success or failure of participatory democracy applied to landscape

The success or failure of landscape participation operations depends on multiple factors. These belong to very different worlds, and some have already been examined, such as the political moves of elected representatives who do not always look kindly on these experiments, because the requisite debating time impairs their capacity to take decisions ensuring their re-election, and also because they disturb their own conception of representative democracy and rely on a definition of landscape which does not correspond to their own conception, more akin to protection. Considering landscape as a project has not yet become a way of life for the political world, although certain experiments have had definite success, like the landscape project of Saint-Flour in France implemented in 1993 by landscaper Alain Marguerit, who continues to monitor it regularly, thus confirming the continuous nature of the landscape project through time.

In the Netherlands, Lifescape is an operation based on deployment of new practices favourable to landscape preservation and sustainable development. This type of operation supported by the European Union is widespread in several countries of Europe. Lifescape stems from an approach to landscape which sets out to influence processes of economic and social change favourable to the living environment and conditions of local populations:

“Change requires a response. Our landscapes, the people and the nature which are part of them, the economic exchanges which they sustain, all change rapidly. Lifescape – Your Landscape is a response to this change. To take up this challenge, the programme seeks to bring people together beyond national borders to stimulate innovation, establish the best practices and demonstrate an effective approach. Thus on the one hand Lifescape involves human nature and concentrates on the links which people have or might have with each other and with the landscapes around them. On the other hand, these links are to be used and applied to specific cases of sustainable management of rural landscapes.”⁴⁸

Negotiated landscape action thus no longer applies directly to landscape features but to processes of transformation of landscapes and to the way landscape is conceived. The “*Lifescape – Your landscape*” operation not only sets out to stop landscape developments deemed harmful to landscape quality and to the living conditions of the residents or nearby populations, but has also conducted many educational operations or cultural events capable of influencing conceptions of landscape as well. It innovates by introducing new practices to maintain economic activities favourable to quality landscapes:

“‘Lifescape – Your Landscape’ helps explore new ways to profit from the rural landscape while preserving its beauty and cultural and historical values. Fourteen partners in five European countries work together and share experiences to arrive at new approaches for long-term preservation of their landscapes.”⁴⁹

Context

The context in which participation operations are run also constitutes an essential question: the forms of participation may differ depending on whether the process takes place in a rural, urban or suburban landscape. Experiences of all three cases exist in numerous European countries; they differ in form, if only because the residents’ knowledge is not identically shared. The relative anonymity of urban residents is not necessarily conducive to the emergence of processes of spontaneous participation, yet some experience shows that mobilisation sometimes occurs at the prompting of neighbourhood

⁴⁸ “Lifescape – Your Landscape”, INTERREG IIIB programme of the European Union for North-West Europe. It is present in England, Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany with 14 institutional partners.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

community movements, as was the case in Paris with the example of the Jardins d'Eole project in which an association brought about a debate with Paris City Hall to arrive at the creation of an urban park on derelict railway land. In towns, neighbourhood committees to which residents are invited have also been created. But as the initiative came from elected representatives, misgivings appeared on the part of residents suspicious of action originating from the political world⁵⁰.

In the rural realm, residents' mutual acquaintance is often greater and may foster a situation of better participation; often however, it also carries antagonisms bequeathed by history or neighbourhood conflicts that result in cases of deadlock hardly conducive to public debate. Populations are often older and less inclined to participate in a debate, more wary than in town where there are more young people. The case of the urban periphery, where old-established and recent populations mingle is possibly different again. Generally though, in the absence of evaluation of current experience, it is still difficult to draw conclusions allowing of generalisation. In all situations, then, initiating a participation process is not so easy as might be believed, and should be carefully studied or else stem from an initiative by a voluntary movement, a community of artists, a local collective, etc. The development of participation has still not reached maturity: it may be necessary to wait for the current experiments to have their positive or negative effects before the new ones can absorb the lessons of the former.

To exemplify the multiplicity of experience with participation centred on landscape, information is appended concerning the work of the "Paysage et développement durable" (Landscape and sustainable development) programme of the French Ministry for Ecology which has allowed at least 6 teams to engage in research projects with a participatory dimension. Two of them made a kind of analytical inventory of this experimentation on a European scale, some details of which we shall give.

Input of knowledge

Input of knowledge into the participatory process is also an unresolved question: in which forms is this input to be effected? At which stage of the process should the knowledge of practitioners or scientists be contributed: at the start of the process, or as questions specific to a given theme crop up? The process itself generates new knowledge helping to fuel the debate and possibly influencing the decisions. Scientific knowledge is often hard for residents to understand, and this is often an argument of landscape practitioners for keeping researchers out of the participation process.

Between academic knowledge and empirical knowledge there are indeed gaps that may upset the workings of knowledge sharing between those involved in the participation process⁵¹. However,

⁵⁰ See in this connection the leaflet published by the Standing Conference for Territorial Development, Ministry for the Walloon Region: *La participation des citoyens à la vie communale: enjeux and pratiques*, 2003, 175 pages. See also: Barret Philippe (Geysler), *Guide pratique du dialogue territorial, Concertation et médiation pour l'environnement et le développement local*, Fondation de France, 2003; and Luginbühl Yves, 2009, *Rappresentazioni sociali del paesaggio ed evoluzione della domanda sociale*, in Castiglioni B., De Marchi M. (eds.), "Di chi è il paesaggio, la partecipazione degli attori nella individuazione, valutazione e pianificazione", CLEUP, Padua, pp. 59-67; or Luginbühl Yves, 2009, *Participer au paysage de demain*, in "Di chi è il paesaggio, La partecipazione degli attori nella individuazione, valutazione e pianificazione", edited by Benedetta Castiglioni and Massimo De Marchi, CLEUP, Padua.

⁵¹ See in this connection the definition of citizen knowledge proposed by Héloïse Nez, in "Nature et légitimités des savoirs citoyens dans l'urbanisme participatif", *Sociologie* [on line], No. 4, vol. 2, 2011, posted on line on 29 February 2012: "*Our initial definition of citizen knowledge is thus fairly broad: it includes all the learning, experiences and techniques, that is not only cognitive resources (knowledge in the strict sense) but also the practical skills (know-how) which can be deployed by a player holding neither elected status nor professional status when intervening in participatory mechanisms. Thus citizen knowledge is distinguished from the institutional knowledge carried by elected representatives (whose legitimacy is founded on universal suffrage) or professionals (regarded as experts, i.e. individuals endowed with a specific proficiency and holding a recognised position as specialists), even though individual careers show that the boundaries are not always so impermeable*

empirical knowledge is often used by scientists, for example to assess the animal or plant species in a territory, as ecologists do by making counts of birds or mammals in a given territory, and social scientists record residents' personal accounts so as to understand their social representations of the landscape or ascertain the hazard zones remembered by the older people, such as flood-prone areas or avalanche paths. In the urban landscape, sociologists, anthropologists or geographers question residents and gain insight into the clashes of usage or ethnic conflicts in a neighbourhood.

The research programmes conducted by the French Ministry for Ecology covered several experiments in participation in various settings; they reveal numerous factors of success or failure. A first finding from the analysis of these experiments conducted in various French regions and also studied in other countries shows that some of them, often in the hands of artists' or architects' collectives, aim to bring together residents of an urban district at festive events, but often those operations do not lead to a tangible project, merely organising conviviality and mutual acquaintance between residents without drawing them into the adventure of devising a collective project. In a way, these collectives have some success with elected representatives, precisely because they constitute operations without a real development goal and leave them free to prepare the development plan as they please under a cloak of participation.

Facilitating and arriving at the landscape project

In an operation conducted in a municipality beside the Loire⁵² those in charge also emphasised the process of participation, while presuming that process to be crucial and the achievement of a development plan to be secondary. But they finally acknowledged that the project was important, as it had mobilised part of the population, who had formed an association to make their municipality more beautiful.

This is in fact a pitfall which the writer regards as a hazard: while the process of participation is crucial, it must nevertheless reach a compromise on a plan which satisfies all players. The aim of these participation operations is indeed to carry through the approach in order to improve the living environment of the populations, and not to rally them for the sole purpose of creating social cohesion, even if this is essential. Facilitation of the participation process is a condition of success, and those in charge of the operations, most of them simultaneously landscape practitioners and mediators, must not abandon their mission as designers. This question of facilitation is essential, and facilitators' status must be accurately thought out: should they be a full stakeholder in the operation, for example a practitioner or a scientist? Should they be independent and have no responsibility in the measures envisaged, settling for the simple role of facilitation, as certain colloquy organisers do by calling on a journalist?

The Vall de Camprodon operation⁵³ staged in Spanish Catalonia resulted in the landscape charter negotiated by numerous private and public local partners and led to a programme of landscape actions signed by all the players who had participated collectively in its preparation. Modelled on the European Landscape Convention, the charter sets the landscape quality objectives shared by these various players. It innovates compared to the habitual process in this type of document which, starting from a diagnosis, ends in the preparation of a landscape project founded on an array of different operations designed to "restore meaning" to the landscape, to define a "new identity". While the programme of actions firstly involves definition of the landscape quality objectives, it has not yet

between the different types of players and branches of knowledge". She distinguishes between various types of knowledge: practical, professional and activist, as well as voluntary sector expertise.

⁵² The municipality of Villandry, on whose territory a common development project has been devised by the residents and a team of scientists and practitioners (see appendix).

⁵³ Carta del paisatge de la vall de Camprodon, pacte per a la protecció, ordenació, gestió i millora dels paisatges, pla de gestió, 2009, 34 pages, direcció tècnica: Josep Maria Mallarach, consultor ambiental.

entered fully into a permanent organised process of participation by residents, although many local associations participated in the meetings organised by the municipality of Camprodon.

Here the question of the meaning assigned to landscape recurs, although the question of identity is a matter for discussion. The meaning which the planning process gives landscape is fundamental, allowing detachment from the problems posed by the hard-to-negotiate aesthetic dimension. It is moreover one of the problems facing sites on the World Heritage List: in the natural heritage category, criterion vii referring to the exceptional natural beauty of a nature area is no doubt the most-discussed question in the world organisations linked with UNESCO, IUCN and ICOMOS. To avoid deferring to a definition of natural visual quality which is highly complex and often invokes academic canons, the IUCN in a joint study with ICOMOS in fact stresses the meaning given to the natural landscape⁵⁴.

Other questions arise such as validating the decisions, disseminating the content and conclusions of the debates, ways of rendering the decisions, interaction between the local forms of grassroots democracy and the debates at regional, national or international level, etc. These are avenues to explore which could fuel the discussions at Council of Europe meetings on matters relating to the implementation of the European Landscape Convention.

Evaluation of participatory projects

There remains the essential question of project evaluation; validation of the different stages of the participation process is part of it and is essential in that it enables participants to recognise the outcome of their commitment. But it is very surprising that large numbers of plans purporting to be landscape projects have never been subjected to an evaluation of their real effects on the landscape, even though the French ministry responsible for landscape issues has initiated a research programme on evaluation of official landscape policies⁵⁵. If we consider that a landscape project can be likened to a process nurtured by self-generated knowledge, its own progression also offers an evaluation phase. The lessons which come out of the planning process are a means of evaluating the project's effects: they continuously inform those involved in the project about the effects of the measures adopted and implemented and allow these to be altered or corrected as the project goes ahead. The planning process provides a loop of retroactivity: as presented by Jean-François Seguin⁵⁶, the landscape project constitutes a territorial process which begins with knowledge, progresses through definition of the landscape quality objectives, through the framing of the protection, management or development measures to the following stage of assessment, monitoring and evaluation, which retroactively provides input of knowledge and fresh impetus for the action influenced by what the process has yielded in the way of new knowledge.

6. Summary, proposals of subjects for debate

Thus the relationship between democracy and landscape is a complex area dependent on many factors within differing spheres of significance. While many different experiments exist throughout Europe and worldwide, they are not applied in the same way on the international, European, national, regional and local scales. It seems clear that the local scale is the one most in tune with the wishes of the people concerned, whereas the international scale is highly dependent on processes which it is difficult for peoples to control. Furthermore, the draft Constitutional Treaty of the European Union, proposed in 2004, when it distinguished participatory from representative democracy, regarded participatory democracy as a means of maintaining "an open, transparent and regular dialogue with representative

⁵⁴ IUCN, 2014, Study on the application of criterion (vii): considering superlative natural phenomena and exceptional natural beauty within the World Heritage Convention, Gland, 114 pages.

⁵⁵ Politiques publiques et évaluation: analyse, évaluation, comparaison, 1998-2005, French Ministry for Ecology.

⁵⁶ Seguin Jean-François, 2008, Le projet de paysage comme processus territorial, description presented to an inter-DIREN workshop in the context of implementation of the Information System on Nature and Landscape, 16 and 17 October, Vichy. Jean-François Seguin was head of the Landscapes Office, an agency of the French Ministry for Ecology and Chair of the Council of Europe Conference on the European Landscape Convention.

associations and civil society”. Although that treaty was not adopted because several countries voted against it, amongst them France, the Netherlands and Ireland, there is still a relatively keen desire for participation in European societies.

Amongst those factors, the very meaning of the word “landscape”, which does not always mean exactly the same thing in every country of Europe, but which was defined with the consent of the great majority of European countries through their ratification of the European Landscape Convention, interacts with the scales of action and the status of the stakeholders involved. Everywhere, in Europe as on other continents, there are manifestations of people’s wish to be listened to by the political world, which often seems to be out of its depth in terms of circumventing the major global processes of commercial and financial exchanges. The use of participation is becoming a kind of democratic practice called for by numerous social movements, such as the “Indignant” movement and the World Social Forum, which nevertheless find it difficult to get their views across.

Several lines of enquiry are already proving relevant in pursuing the commitment to putting into practice a democracy which makes it possible to tackle the issue of the environment and landscape in which people live their day-to-day lives, and we shall propose several of these, without claiming that the list is exhaustive.

- a) On the European scale, what path can be followed to promote implementation of a democracy which enables the everyday landscape, the environment in which people live, to be improved? Action on the European sectoral directives and the Common Agricultural Policy, on infrastructure programmes, on health and education standards? Opening up European Union research programmes, currently too marginal, to the landscape issue?
- b) On the national scale, encourage governments to include a landscape objective in sectoral policies, as already advocated by the European Landscape Convention, develop participatory urban planning documents which take account of the landscape dimension. Make systematic the use of landscape atlases, or inventories of the same type, such as the United Kingdom’s Landscape Character Assessment, with public participation in the landscape identification, assessment and classification phases and in landscape quality objectives. Interlink these atlases and similar with photographic landscape observatories and the databases relating to demography, housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and so on.
- c) On the regional scale, start participatory action programmes such as landscape plans, charters, contracts, and so on. Consolidate regional atlases and their participatory aspect through use of the Internet to consult and involve the public.
- d) On the local scale, encourage elected representatives to carry out participatory operations in landscape improvement through protection, management and enhancement, and to develop experimental activities with the assistance of the regions or central government.

Over and above these recommendations, however, it is essential to develop a discussion of interactive or deliberative democracy by promoting research in the social and ecological sciences, which have already turned attention to this subject, but receive insufficient support in terms of research funding, which has been sharply reduced in recent years because of the crisis and the need to cut public deficits. The issues below could be considered by a Council of Europe discussion group:

- a) Looking beyond the relevance of participation, the question of the relations between science and action which has arisen, but on which discussion is not at an end. Particularly because the media play a part in the dissemination of this knowledge and, as is well known, make changes and usually make it less complex:

“The New World of interactive democracy will only take shape if a newly renovated form of journalism emerges alongside it; one that is capable of leading public debate while at the same time maintaining an actively investigative presence in society, and endeavouring to intellectually decipher the complexities of the world.”⁵⁷ The author argues that a new foundation for this kind of journalism is itself indissociable from the capacity of social sciences to inform public debate and enrich its quality.

Here consideration needs to be given to the contribution of knowledge, whether academic or secular and empirical knowledge, and to its form and timing within the participatory arrangements made for landscape matters.

- b) The question of the facilitator’s role also seems crucial: while the facilitator of participatory operations is often a member of the community of landscape practitioners or architects, the problem arises of those facilitators’ position and status in those operations: mediators or designers? Which brings us back to the subject of their educational establishments’ training and syllabuses.
- c) Landscape projects: how should they be designed? They are often modelled on an architectural or garden project, but their scope and content differ according to the scale of the intervention. The landscape project as an ongoing and participatory process now seems to be relevant, but that continuity raises the question of the responsible authorities’ commitment to putting in place medium or long-term procedures and appropriate funding. What teams should be set up in such projects? Interdisciplinarity is a must, but it is not self-evident, and when research is combined with action, it is vital to consider the issue of the place of academics alongside landscape professionals and other stakeholders.
- d) The evaluation of democratic participation operations: not very often evaluated, there is nevertheless a need for consideration to be given to their actual effects on the day-to-day landscape and the well-being or ill-being which results for residents. If a participatory landscape project becomes an ongoing process, how can evaluation which is also ongoing be put in place?

The exercise of democracy cannot escape the complexity of the landscape production and transformation processes for which the involvement of society on a European scale came into being with the European Landscape Convention. The landscape itself is a “complex” of tangible and intangible meanings which science has separated and thereby reduced, to the point at which landscape action is difficult, although it offers potential commensurate with the high hopes of its advocates in this respect:

“(…) science has been blinded in its inability to control, to plan, even to conceive of its social role, in its inability to integrate, to articulate and to reflect on its own knowledge. If indeed the human mind is incapable of apprehending the huge mass of knowledge in every discipline, then either the human mind or the division of knowledge into different disciplines must be changed”⁵⁸.

⁵⁷ Rosanvallon Pierre, op. cit.

⁵⁸ (Translated from the French of) Morin Edgar, 2005, op. cit.

Bibliography

Barret Philippe (Geysler), 2003, Guide pratique du dialogue territorial, Concertation et médiation pour l'environnement et le développement local, Fondation de France.

Beck Corinne, Luginbühl Yves, Muxart Tatiana, 2006, Temps et espaces des crises environnementales, written collectively in QUAE's "Indisciplines" collection. Also see the contributions of Jean-Paul Métailié and Bernard Davasse concerning forestry resources in the Pyrenees.

Carta del paisatge de la vall de Camprodon, pacte per a la protecció, ordenació, gestió i millora dels paisatges, pla de gestió, 2009, 34 pages, direcció tècnica: Josep Maria Mallarach, consultor ambiental.

Conférence Permanente du Développement Territorial, ministère de la Région Wallonne : La participation des citoyens à la vie communale : enjeux et pratiques, 2003, 175 pages.

European Landscape Convention, Council of Europe
<http://www.coe.int/EuropeanLandscapeConvention>
<http://www.coe.int/Conventioneuropennedupaysage>

Cosgrove Denis E. (1998, first edition 1984), Social formation and symbolic landscape, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 322 p., page 27.

E J Sieyes (speech made on 7 September 1789).

Fiche technique « Participation et paysage », 2013, programme Paysage et développement durable, 2005-2010, Yves Michelin, MEDDE, Bureau des paysages, IRSTEA, 8 pages.

Frugoni Chiara, 1995, Pietro and Ambrogio Lorenzetti, SCALA editions, 82 pages, page 68.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1762, The social contract, book III, chapter 15.

Lebecq Stéphane, 1980, De la protohistoire au Haut Moyen Age : le paysage des « Terpen », le long des côtes de la mer du nord, spécialement dans l'ancienne Frise, in *Le paysage, réalités et représentations*, 10th Colloquy of Medieval Historians, *Revue du Nord*, Lille 1979, pages 125-148

Lifescape – Your Landscape, INTERREG IIIB programme of the European Union for North-West Europe.

Luginbühl Yves et al., 1995, Plan paysage de la vallée de la Dordogne, STRATES - SEGESA, for EPIDOR.

Luginbühl Yves, 2009, Rappresentazioni sociali del paesaggio ed evoluzione della domanda sociale, in Castiglioni B., De Marchi M. (eds.), "Di chi è il paesaggio, la partecipazione degli attori nella individuazione, valutazione e pianificazione", CLEUP, Padova, pp. 59-67.

Luginbühl Yves, 2009, Biodiversité, changement climatique et paysage, in "Humanité et biodiversité, manifeste pour une nouvelle alliance", Ligne ROC, Descartes et Cie, 314 pages, pages 212-237.

Luginbühl Yves, 2009, Participer au paysage de demain, in "Di chi è il paesaggio, La partecipazione degli attori nella individuazione, valutazione e pianificazione", edited by di Benedetta Castiglioni e Massimo De Marchi, CLEUP, Padova.

Luginbühl Yves, 2012, *La mise en scène du monde, construction du paysage européen*, Prix Edouard Bonnefous 2013 de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, CNRS Editions, Paris, 430 pages.

Mandela Nelson, 1994, *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*, Macdonald Purnell.

Marx Karl Heinrich, 1867, *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy* (original German title: *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie*, Hamburg, Otto Meisner).

Massimo Morisi, 2008, *Partecipazione e governo del territorio*, Biennale Toscana del Paesaggio, 13-15 November 2008.

Modélisations à l'interface Natures et Sociétés, Colloque NSS Cirad IRD, Montpellier, December 2005.

Morin Edgar, 2005, *Introduction à la pensée complexe (Introduction to complex thought)*, Essais, Points, Seuil, Paris, 160 pages, page 106.

Nez Héloïse, 2011, *Nature et légitimités des savoirs citoyens dans l'urbanisme participatif*, *Sociologie* [on line], N° 4, vol. 2, posted on line on 29 February 2012, <http://sociologie.revues.org/1127> and <http://sociologie.revues.org/1098>

Olwig Kenneth Robert, 2002, *Landscape, Nature and the Body Politic, From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 300 pages.

“Information, participation du public, concertation et association dans les plans de prévention des risques” programme conducted by CERTU (Lydie Bosc) under the supervision of MEDAD/DPPR/SDPRM (Magali Pinon-Leconte), with a contribution from members of the programme's steering committee.

Ricœur Paul, 1997, *L'idéologie et l'utopie (Lectures on Ideology and Utopia)*, Essais, Seuil, Paris, 413 pages. Also: Ricœur Paul, 1997, *Amour et justice*, PUF, Paris, 110 pages.

Seguin Jean-François, 2008, *Le projet de paysage comme processus territorial*, description presented to an inter-DIREN workshop in the context of implementation of the Information System on Nature and Landscape, 16 and 17 October, Vichy.

Smith Adam, 1776, *An inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 1776, W. Strahan and T. Cadell, London.

Bidima Jean-Godefroy, 1997, *La Palabre, une juridiction de la parole*, Paris, Michalon.

IUCN, 2013, *Study on the application of criterion (vii): considering superlative natural phenomena and exceptional natural beauty within the World Heritage Convention*, Gland, 105 pages.

Varotto Mauro, 2000, *In difesa dei luoghi dell'abitare: il fenomeno dei comitati spontanei in Veneto*, Quaderno 3 Osservatorio Veneto, Verona.

Varotto Mauro, Visentin Ludovico Fabrizio, 2008, *Comitati locali e criticità ambientali in Veneto. L'evoluzione del fenomeno negli ultimi 10 anni*, A.R.S. No. 116, January/March 2008.

Websites:

Website of the French national Landscape and Sustainable Development research programme: <http://paysage-developpement-durable.fr>

“Passeurs” collective: www.passeurs.eu

Glossary of French participation and consultation terminology: http://www.mementodumaire.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/glossaire_terme_participation.pdf

Ricardo David, 1817, *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, John Murray, London.

European Landscape Convention, Council of Europe
<http://www.coe.int/EuropeanLandscapeConvention>

Appendix 1: Programme report

The “*Information, public participation, consultation and involvement in risk prevention plans*” programme conducted by CERTU (Lydie Bosc) under the supervision of MEDAD/DPPR/SDPRM (Magali Pinon-Leconte), with a contribution from members of the programme’s steering committee (extracts).

Objectives of participation and consultation:

- 1) to meet the expectations of society, which increasingly asks to be informed and consulted about and involved in the policies which concern the environment and places where people live;
- 2) to promote citizenship, giving citizens a greater say, more power to make proposals, and a bigger role in their own environment, neighbourhood and town;
- 3) to raise citizens’ interest in public affairs by inviting them to have their say about collective issues concerning their cities and public areas and to take part in discussions in the political arena;
- 4) to restore social cohesion and combat exclusion, thanks to the introduction of public fora for discussion, expression and comparison of viewpoints and to the raising of awareness about collective issues;
- 5) to promote a new concept of the common interest, which, in sustainable development activities, is built up collectively on the basis of a variety of common interests (environmental, social, economic);
- 6) to bring elected representatives closer to the public. The introduction of participatory activities fosters proximity between representatives and those they represent, a proximity which is not only physical, through the holding of public meetings, but also more intellectual, through the sharing and exchanging of views about the implications of the projects and policies under discussion.

Participation and consultation also make it possible for issues to be shared:

- 1) Giving citizens responsibility, enabling them to take part in the preparation of public decisions;
- 2) Getting citizens involved in concerns and issues of common interest, particularly in the environmental field;
- 3) Keeping citizens informed. The educational dimension is crucial in consultations. Embarking on a process described as consultation without giving the people concerned a role to play in the discussion would be both ineffective and dishonest (in the sense that this is not consultation). Informing citizens also offers an opportunity to explain the implications and constraints of a project, which may make its acceptance easier thanks to a better understanding.
- 4) Raising awareness of how eco-citizens should behave, for example, is related to the two previous points.

This report also states that participation and consultation enable public action to be transformed:

- 1) Conducting consultations makes it possible to open the eyes of the public authorities’ technical departments to differing external viewpoints and methods of operation. Hearing about all these viewpoints and methods of operation (those of residents, traders, users, and so on) and taking them into account will give rise to a broader and more cross-cutting vision of the subjects dealt with. In order to engage in consultations, the language used will also have to be adapted to suit those taking part, and new knowledge will have to be brought into play. Thus consultation may help to:
 - 2) reorganise the administrative system, introducing a more cross-cutting approach and breaking down the barriers between departments and sectoral policies;
 - 3) improve public action by taking greater account of citizens’ needs and concerns (a more attentive administrative system, closer to those it serves) and making policies more consistent;
 - 4) modernise the public administrative system through the introduction to departments of new tools and new responsibilities (facilitation, mediation, communication).

Finally, participation and consultation may be useful during the preparation of projects:

Participation by the people concerned by a project, and particularly its beneficiaries, is a vital source of information and knowledge to:

- 1) improve the project through contributions of knowledge and various skills (residents' and users' day-to-day practices and usage of spaces) and by holding discussions of possible options;
- 2) adapt the project to users' expectations through better knowledge of the needs;
- 3) forestall, pay attention to and defuse any conflicts or disputes relating to the project by creating a forum for exchange at an early stage;
- 4) encourage appropriation of the project by the public, its users, by sharing information, explaining the implications, answering questions and replying to comments;
- 5) legitimise the project. In an increasingly complex environment in which the stakeholders are ever more numerous and varied, widespread participation ensures the legitimacy of the decision taken. The procedure itself whereby the decision is prepared (particularly when it is compulsory) becomes a source of legitimacy.

Appendix 2: Experiments in participation in landscape matters

For information, see the research projects of the French Ministry for Ecology: website PDD2. <http://paysage-developpement-durable.fr>

- 1) “L’appréhension du paysage urbain, une opportunité pour renouveler les conceptions urbaines environnementales et les démarches participatives” (Apprehending the urban landscape, an opportunity to renew urban environmental concepts and participatory action), *Emeline Bailly, CSTB, France, Rosemary Wakeman, Fordham University, New York*, a comparison of participatory activities in la Plaine St-Denis, northern Paris, and Melrose in the Bronx.
- 2) “Gestion participative des paysages : construction d’une ressource culturelle pour l’appropriation des enjeux de biodiversité ?” (Participatory landscape management: creation of a cultural resource for appropriating biodiversity issues?), *Aurélien Allouche, Alain Dervieux, François Mesléard, Alain Sandoz*. The researchers are developing participatory activity in the Camargue regional nature park, attempting to assess the capacities of such activity to manage flood risk and biodiversity or the restoration of nature.
- 3) “La participation et la médiation paysagère et le renouvellement des pratiques paysagistes” (Participation, mediation in landscape matters and the renewal of landscape practices), *David Montembault, Agrocampus Ouest, Serge Briffaud, Rémi Bercovitz, Ecole Nationale Supérieure d’Architecture et de Paysage de Bordeaux, Monique Toublanc, Ecole Nationale Supérieure de Paysage de Versailles, Antoine Luginbühl, Association Passeurs, et al.* Research-action covering two different geographical areas, one relating to the preparation of a landscape project in a municipality in the Loire area, the other to a historical approach in the Deux-Sèvres Department.
- 4) “Paysage et développement durable : à la recherche d’une participation créative” (Landscape and sustainable development: in search of creative participation), *Yvette Lazzeri, Hélène Balu - Anne Cadoret - Florent Chiappero - Michel Chiappero - Caroline Giran-Samat - Arinna Latz - Béatrice Mésini - Hélène Tudela - Martine Perron, Centre d’Études et de Recherches Internationales et Communautaires (CERIC), Aix-Marseille University, CNRS, University of Pau, University of Toulon*. Research into current participatory activities in Europe, especially in the architectural field.
- 5) “Dynamiques des modèles paysagers dans les villes nouvelles, cultiver des paysages durables” (Dynamics of landscape models in new towns, cultivating sustainable landscapes), *Marie-Jo Menozzi, independent ethno-sociologist, Etienne Bertrand, Gally design office, Julien Laborde, Mnémosis*. Research into participatory activity relating to Val Maubuée new town.
- 6) “Interface, Dynamiques paysagères et perceptions des interfaces arborées, Quels enjeux pour la mise en place de la Trame Verte et Bleue ?” (Interface, landscape dynamics and perceptions of interfaces featuring trees, implications for the introduction of the “Trame Verte et Bleue” network), *Sylvie Guillerme et al, GEODE, CNRS and University of Toulouse-le-Mirail*. Research relating to the participation of the those who deal with non-forest trees in south-western France.

Numerous participation experiments were identified and analysed during the research, but we shall mention only a few of them:

France:

Regional nature parks in Provence Côte d'Azur: Alpilles, Lubéron, Camargue, Verdon; programmed landscape reclassification operation "Ensemble, dessinons nos paysages" (Defining our landscapes together) comprising three phases: 1) Participatory analysis with the public and businesses, gathering of the perceptions of residents and institutional players of "landscape blackspots"; 2) Construction with residents of a landscape reclassification project; 3) Project reconstruction, round tables and workshops.

Calanques national park, Marseille: numerous participation problems referred to in the Lazzeri team's analysis covering the failure to take account of the nearby urban populations, uses by various marginalised social groups and the lack of a management plan. Study piloted by the state, with a public-interest grouping, associations, local authorities, local elected representatives, residents, various users and professionals. Lack of communication, risk of marginalisation of certain population groups, etc.

The Conservatoire des restanques, "Mediterranean orchard and garden", Marseille: a project led by an association called Colinéo, set up in 1973, which specialises in conservation and environmental education and awareness-raising for schools, particularly in educational priority zones (ZEPs), and which has "environmental protection" approval under the Code on Environment, Youth and Public Education and is also approved by the national education authorities. The Conservatoire des Restanques lies south of the Massif de l'Étoile, bordering the 13th and 14th districts of Marseille, in a relatively impoverished area of dense urbanisation. The project entails extracting from a process of increasing urbanisation a natural area of wasteland, an area rich in biodiversity, which the association will enhance. The stakeholders involved vary widely and include volunteer residents from the nearby municipalities, property owners from the ZAC Batarelle development area, academics, Aix-Marseille University (trainees, scientific research), the City of Marseille (financing, missions), the Departmental Council (financing of training workshops), the Regional Council (financial partnership), schools (environmental education), the national Mediterranean botanical conservation garden of Porquerolles (rare and ancient plants), the building industry federation (construction of a 250m² eco-building), Ademe (the environment and energy agency) and the Regional Council (financing of an architect). The participation procedure is based on the Natura 2000 network and the social policy of the Bouches du Rhône Departmental Council. Local residents object to building being allowed in the area. Various work sites have contributed to sustainable development: fruit tree planting with schools' help, educational trail, training workshops (brush clearance, plant maintenance, fruit tree pruning...), picking of communal olives, lectures by academics, scientific and nature research. The project resulted in the rehabilitation of a neglected area of former farmland (terraces, olive grove): embellishment, protection of flora, planting of Mediterranean fruit trees, highlighting of Mediterranean herbs, erection of an eco-building.

Redesign of a local public space in the Blosne neighbourhood of Rennes (June 2012), "Promenons-nous dans le bois" (Let's walk in the woods), a project in a disadvantaged urban district: temporary rearrangement of a little-used public space within a housing block in a district undergoing renovation by the ANRU agency. Intervention by the "Collectif Etc" collective to unite residents of that district and beyond. Subsidy from the city council (12,000 euros, excluding fees); stakeholders involved: various associations, the district's elected representatives, the consultation workshop, residents; effects of the project: the main users were children, who turned it into a play area for which the municipality took responsibility; good reception of the area and respect for it, consideration of the possibility of repeating the process in other spaces within housing blocks in the district, bringing back into use of this particular public space.

Public participation operation in Mont-de-Marsan: the Saint-Médard district, the main entrance to the Mont de Marsan conurbation, was the subject of numerous redesign proposals from its residents. Various problems are crystallised in this district, which nevertheless has strong landscape potential. The Mont-de-Marsan conurbation tasked the “Passeurs” collective with introducing a new public participation operation so as to plan an urban design project most appropriate to users’ views. On the basis of a shared consideration of the landscape, a dialogue began about the ways in which the area was changing and the developments in citizens’ lifestyles, representations, practices and expectations. The approach was built up jointly by residents, elected representatives, technicians and landscape specialists, from the “getting to know you” mobilisation and knowledge production phase right up to the landscape development design stage.

Sponsors: Mont-de-Marsan urban community, City of Mont-de-Marsan. Total research budget: 27,000 euros.

Work carried out by the “Passeurs” collective (www.passeurs.eu).

Estonia:

Preselection and designation of Natura 2000 sites: municipalities of Otepää and Konnumaa; stakeholders responsible: Ministry of the Environment, local administrative authority of the national park, the county’s environmental council; two phases: 1) Information: top-down process leaving little scope for local knowledge, information mainly ecological, little socio-economic information; 2) Consultation: the participation procedure excluded socio-economic concerns and was considered unilateral.

Sweden:

Regional Landscape Strategies and public participation: the Swedish Government decided to develop implementation of 16 environmental objectives and the European Landscape Convention, and the Regional Landscape Strategies were tested in seven counties in 2006 and 2007 through various pilot studies; the municipality of Vellinge in the county of Scania was a volunteer. In that county, hallmarked by a high degree of urbanisation, intensive agriculture and horse breeding, disputes emerged between horse riders and landowners because of the lack of appropriate bridle paths. The purpose of the research undertaken was to come up with a project for locating bridle paths in places agreed between riders and landowners; several meetings took place between them; the question of biodiversity arising because of the environmental objectives was not taken further; an association of riders and landowners was set up, and the top-down process was superseded by a bottom-up process enabling the land use dispute to be resolved.

United Kingdom:

Participatory action plan for the River Dart basin in Devon and its subsequent extension to other river basins started in 2003. This is run by the Devon Wildlife Trust, an association which works to protect landscapes in conjunction with other institutions and associations. The project comes under the EU Water Framework Directive and receive support from the European INTERREG programme. Its aim is to preserve water quality. The participants were selected on the basis of various criteria including the sharing of knowledge, the development of participants’ skills and the encouragement of small groups. Participatory drafting of the action plan, organisation of two festivals, active public participation. The plan received media coverage.

The other experiments are detailed in the research report: “*Paysage et développement durable: à la recherche d’une participation créative*” (Landscape and sustainable development: the search for creative participation), final report of the Landscape and sustainable development programme of the French Ministry for Ecology, scientific leader of the project Yvette Lazzeri, from the Sustainable Development and Mediterranean Territories Unit, International and Community Research Centre (CERIC), Aix-Marseille University, CNRS, University of Pau, University of Toulon, CERIC - DICE UMR 7318, 13628, Aix-en-Provence, France. <http://www.pole-developpementdurable.univ-cezanne.fr>

Experiments in participation in the landscape field analysed by the team of Agrocampus Ouest, Passeurs, ENSP:

Structure	Category	Project
Gruppe F, Berlin	Landscaper	Leisepark (2012): conversion of a former cemetery into a city park with children's play equipment.
Société Publique Locale Angers Rives Nouvelles, Angers	Urban planner	"Maine-rives nouvelles" project (2010-13): drawing up of the order and support for the project to redesign the banks of the river Maine.
Nomadisch Grün, Berlin	Film-maker	Prinzessinnengarten (2009): shared garden and place of sharing, developed on urban wasteland.
Collectif Etc, Lyon	Architects	"Au POIL", Project for the Ollière district and local ideas – municipality of Châteldon (Puy-de-Dôme)
Dubois Nathalie, Nantes	Landscaper and artist	"Le grand salon" in Béziers (2006): reclassification of the public space linking together two major ensembles.
Association l'Atelier d'Urbanisme, Perpignan	Landscape engineer	Project to restore the river Têt (2013): continuation of the project began in 2008 on the banks of the river Têt (low riverbanks, theatre) in Perpignan.
Die Baupiloten, Berlin	Architect	Alteration and extension of the school meals facility at Heinrich Nordhoff school in Wolfsburg.
Institut für Partizipatives Gestalten (IPG), Huntlosen, Germany	Landscaper	"Gut Sannum, Freiraum für alle" (2010-2012): design and development of the area around a centre for adults with disabilities.
Théâtre Foirail Camifolia, Chemillé (49)	Landscape engineer	Participatory "in bloom" project in the municipality of Saint-Georges-des-gardes (49)
Agence Itinéraire-bis, Lyon (69)	Landscaper	Residential area improvements in the district of Bel-air with its residents (Lyon)
Phytolab, Nantes	Landscaper/botanist	City-port 3 (2013-....): redevelopment of the seafront at St-Nazaire and "test actions" in the Petit Maroc district (participation by Respublica and urban scenography by Etc).
Agence Campo, Nantes	Landscaper	"Ecosphère" (2013): collective garden opened in a public area.
Vous êtes d'Ici, Aubière (63)	Geographer, consultant engineer	"Morne à l'eau" (2013): consultation workshop on the environmental issues and landscapes of the municipality of Morne à l'eau in Guadeloupe, under the DIVA research programme.
Les Robins des Villes (RDV), Lyon (69)	Architect/teacher	Participatory alterations to 10 school yards (Lyon)
Teichmann Landschaftsarchitekten, Berlin	Landscaper	Columbiadam (2012-2014): design and development of a collective park in the middle of a group of 220 flats, near the former Tempelhof airport.
Weidinger Landschaftsarchitekten, Berlin	Landscaper, lecturer at the Technische Universität	Nöldnerplatz (2006): design of a children's play area on part of the square (participation ensured by two artists).

Other experiments identified by the previous team:

* Joint readings

- “Subjective geography” by Catherine JOURDAN (Mapping cities such as Nantes and Rennes with primary school children);
- “Practical atlas of the landscapes of Auvergne” (Marie BARET, Victor MIRAMAND: mobile workshops);
- “Participatory photographic atlas of the landscapes of la Brenne”, by Claire Blouin-Gourbillière, La Brenne regional nature park (Doctoral thesis entitled “L’élaboration d’images « paysages » habitantes : un levier participatif d’aménagement du territoire. Le cas du Parc naturel régional de la Brenne”, written with financial support from CIFRE);
- “Stock rearing and landscape” walks – David MONTEMBAULT, Jean-Marc BESSE (CNIEL) (comparative interpretations of agricultural landscapes on the occasion of heritage open days to bring producers closer to consumers. Experimental in 2008, these walks now take place on about 20 farms every year.).

* Artistic projects: revelation/reappropriation of places

- “Public seats” project – “L’infüsoire” collective – Parc de la Moutonnerie, Nantes (Co-operative making and placing of public seats to enable people to reappropriate the park);
- “On the sentier des Lauzes trail” (Comparative views of landscapes: footpaths exploring arts-related themes in the Vercors, Monts d’Ardèche and Pilat regional nature parks) – Intervention by artists and participatory projects;
- “The Monplaisir neighbourhood, 100 views and comments” – Photographer Marc Legros, Angers (identification and explanation of the landscape qualities perceived of a “sensitive” neighbourhood by its residents).

* Spatial planning

- Plan to reshape landscapes in the upper valley of the river Bruche – Haute Bruche group of municipalities – Pierre Grandadam (2007 National Landscape Award);
- Drafting of the landscape charter of the Armorique regional nature park – Lise VAUVERT (Consultation with local stakeholders to classify those landscape units already identified and raise local issues) (Involvement of 20 Agrocampus students in this project);
- “The ‘Trame verte et bleue’ network: A participatory landscape-based approach” – Sylvain Guerveno, Loire Anjou Touraine regional nature park (Consultations about the introduction to the park of the “Trame verte et bleue” network).

* * *