

2

Place, Historical Ecology and Cultural Landscape: New Directions for Culture Resource Management

LUDOMIR R. LOZNY

Department of Anthropology, Hunter College, New York, NY, Ludomir.Lozny@hunter.cuny.edu

*We come and go
but the land is always here.
And the people who love it
and understand it are the people
who own it—for a little while*

Willa Cather, O Pioneers!

Introduction

The two themes discussed in this paper are: historical ecology (landscape history) presented as a guiding scheme for studying past cultural landscapes, and the concept of place examined as a time-space identification of human activities. Historical ecology is the study of past relationships between groups of people and their environments. Its multidimensional orientation combines the knowledge of various aspects of human activity with the theory and methodology of ecology. The historical ecology approach explains human decisions in terms of deterministically understood relationship between adaptational constraints invoked by a variety of environmental stresses throughout time. On occasion, however, people make decisions that may not necessarily contribute the best solutions to solve a problem at hand (cf. the fate of the Easter Island population or the Norse occupation of Greenland). As archaeologists, we should expect to recognize evidence of various decisions (good and bad) made to solve problems at hand. Consequences of some of those decisions will be preserved in form of archaeological data like artifacts, features, landscape modifications, etc. Obviously, with environmental stresses increasing, also human responses will diversify and intensify. Therefore, with complexity of decisions rising, a greater diversity of archaeological facts is expected. Archaeologists argue that all kinds of evidence of human past behavior are significant and might contribute a new knowledge to better understanding of human history. In principle, this is correct. My point discussed in this paper, however, is that not all evidence of the human past can be researched and/or preserved. A plea to preserve all of them seems practically inconceivable. If, for obvious

reasons, we cannot preserve all evidence of human past behavior than what evidence can we preserve? Escalating infrastructure changes introduced to a variety of landscapes force our thoughts to be oriented towards identifying a sustainable past. The selective approach might not be the best solution, but it seems inevitable. It makes more sense to investigate an archaeological site comprehensively following the ecological approach than to investigate several sites in order to retrieve artifacts that will increase the existing collection. The comprehensive approach also involves recognition of multivocality of the site, hence the idea of place propagated in this paper.

The practice of heritage preservation is driven by policies designed to preserve selected evidence of human activities in the past. Such an approach usually contributes a limited knowledge about the past set up on seemingly blurred data compiled through the application of imprecise archaeological methods. And there is another, more serious matter usually phrased in the following question: What should be preserved, and why? And additionally: Who decides what will be preserved and why? This is an obvious dilemma. For instance, can a representative of an industrialized nation understand the symbolism of native lands? Archaeologists who are not trained anthropologists might not be able to recognize all symbolic meanings that might be associated with a site/place. This problem is identified and phrased in the following questions: Whose past do we preserve? Because the problem is political in nature, perhaps it should be discussed separately for a specific cultural context. Similar questions have been discussed on different occasions (Layton 1989) and in reference to locally significant culture. I would like to introduce a proposition which goes beyond the politically charged concept of culture. As we move away from ethnically bounded polities, the concept of place rather than culture becomes the critical focus of decision-making that stipulates the pragmatics of local cultural heritage preservation policies. I identify a cultural heritage domain as “cultural landscape” composed of places filled symbolically with diverse meanings and encompassing all details of human past activities within an ecosystem. The concept of place delineated here concerns, therefore, not just material objects, but also other, not so tangible things like certain memories, feelings, sense of belonging, etc. Because the same place is identified by and is meaningful to a variety of people in this sense place does not replace culture. Its meaning is composed of two distinct realms: cultural (recognized/meaningful) and natural and both could be experienced simultaneously. Therefore, the full potential of place is in its multiple symbolic meanings but its significance in specific cultural designation.

Cultural Heritage Preservation, Historical Ecology and Place

In 1999 I contributed a paper in a session organized for the 4th World Archaeology Congress in Cape Town, South Africa. The symposium was devoted to answering several key problems that escalated from the frustration felt by many archaeologists

and cultural resource management (CRM)¹ practitioners about the malaises pertaining to the practice of CRM, especially in relation to archaeological research and its methodology. The frustration is deeply rooted in an illusory, in my opinion, dichotomy that is often used to separate the CRM's sphere from the academic world. Simply put, the critics of CRM say that the sort of archaeological pragmatics employed in cultural heritage preservation strategies are not "scientific," whereas academic archaeology, by definition, remains within the realm of science. Therefore, the main focus of this session oscillated around debating the future of CRM and its role in heritage preservation strategies. Although we all have agreed that the current status quo of CRM will change, we could not reach a consensus about what direction the change will take. Knowing the practice and pragmatics of CRM in the United States and elsewhere, I share some of these fears and doubts. Thus, I have provocatively offered a hypothesis that current or future, cultural resource management is not just about perfecting archaeological theory and methods. It encompasses a far broader, ecological in its nature outlook, for it deals with various aspects that concern diversity of human interactions from past to present.

Those who degrade CRM archaeology today usually emphasize its mediocre theoretical and methodological background. Often than not it is a legitimate claim. CRM archaeologists also known as professional archaeologists are not always fully aware of what theoretical persuasion concerning their archeological activities do they follow at the moment. Having seen an assortment of CRM type archaeology in several countries, I concur with these allegations. But I also think that CRM archaeology suffers from the same ills that academic archaeology does. I do not see a far greater utilization of diverse theoretical approaches among academic archaeologists either. Such a situation concerns most European countries (cf. Cleere 1989; Ostojă-Zagórski 1997), but it is also present in the United States and elsewhere (Luz and Politis 2001; Politis and Peretti 2004; Podgorny 2000, Benavides, personal communication).

In this paper I favor the ecological approach, and argue that CRM archaeology in its general outlook (cf. King 1998; Hodder 1999;) delineates an integrative approach, deeply rooted in ecological models. The ecological approach is primarily concerned in addressing the two major issues: what are the consequences of a mutual relationship between environment and organisms? And, what are the consequences of interactions between organisms within the same environment?

In the most classic terms, ecology is "the study of the relations between organisms and the totality of the physical and biological factors affecting them or influenced by them" (Pianka 1974:3). Human ecology differs from the above in only one aspect; it is exclusively interested in humans and their actions, present or

¹ I will continue using the acronym CRM in reference to the American version of a set of methods and legislature employed to manage cultural resources through heritage preservation policies. British colleagues have labeled a similar approach as Archaeological Resource Management, but I believe the difference remains in semantics rather than the philosophy of the approach.

past, and not other organisms. The main questions remain the same. Thus, ecologists who study interactions between humans and nature usually examine a variety of sometimes overlapping aspects, like adaptive patterns and their changes, decision-making processes and their consequences, and biological/evolutionary diversities.

The diachronic use of the concept of human ecology has been coined into the idea of historical ecology (Crumley 1994; 1998), or landscape history approach (Tilley 1994; Ashmore and Knapp 1999). The historical ecology approach offers diverse methodology, which allows for a very comprehensive insight into the human conditions in the past. Its multidimensional, mutiscalar approach (Crumley 1994a) links various disciplines including: anthropology, biology, geography, demography, economics, etc. Historical ecology combines the knowledge of all aspects of human beings with the theory and methodology of ecology. As Carole Crumley indicated (1994), historical ecology encompasses “evidence of the human past with evidence about the environment by studying the evolution of landscapes.” Archaeologists who use ecological models are forced to accept interdisciplinary approach, which combines physical and natural sciences with the humanities.

Implicit in various ecological models is the connection between ecology and evolutionary theory, for the crucial factor in the evolutionary process is an ecological factor—the fit between organisms (humans) and their environment, manifested in a created (cultural) landscape. Ecological models have to be approached carefully, however, for as Bates (1996) suggested, they may not always be adequate to study the complexity of human-made cultural landscapes, as our “unique attributes pose problems for modeling local interactions.” The difficulty relies in the fact that although our actions are always caused by ecological conditions, some are forced deterministically, while other may derive from the randomness of decision-making process (Lozny 2000). Nonetheless, I feel especially obliged to strongly emphasize the need to study diverse ecological conditions driving our decisions as the knowledge concerning environmental changes becomes critical particularly now, after the first case of extinction among the primate order has been recorded (Oates et al. 2000). Clearly, certain enduring ecological relations begin to tremble.

It seems obvious to me that the aim of CRM is to identify and preserve all the evidence of interactions between humans and their environments, using diverse methodologies. I argue therefore that historical ecology approach fits the task well. The practice of historical ecology encompasses several relevant subdisciplines such as archaeology, ethnography, ethnohistory, history, geography, and environmental sciences. This approach allows for making a comprehensive record of the ongoing dialectical relations between humans and nature, and concerns diverse evidence of all human activities physical or intellectual, which are manifested in the landscape. The application of the historical ecology approach requires a rigorous methodological design, however. Regardless the fact that a landscape might testify about who, what, when, and how, the problem remains in the ability to read the landscape and identify its significant elements. The real challenge, then, rests in the ability to read, decipher the landscape, and furthermore in the ability to manipulate and use landscape histories to fit local, regional, or global agendas.

Through the application of historical ecology to examine specific human populations, we can address the following two major questions: 1. What is the population's place in its particular ecological system? and 2. How are particular behaviors characteristic of this population relate to its place in the ecosystem? I feel that any attempt to answer either one of these questions coherently requires the employment of the idea of place rather than the elusive concept of an archaeological site or another culture-specific signifier. As we move away from ethnically bounded polities into another, multiethnic level of political complexity, the concept of place rather than culture will, in my view, become the critical focus theoretical advancement within the archaeological practice, CRM included.

The two major qualities of place (regardless its location) will play a significant role in this progression: 1) humans occupy a remarkable diversity of ecosystems (diversity of places), and 2) we are the dominant species of our ecosystem (therefore, we will change it; we may turn any place into "our place," even for a while). Humans create both qualities through their unique way of adaptation that is distinctively flexible, for adaptation is at once the solution to a particular problem and the source of unanticipated changes and new problems.

A Sense of Place in Cultural Landscape

A few years ago (Lozny 1997), I have observed large-scale infrastructure alterations taking place in Eastern Europe. Due to systemic, political and economic changes introduced in the beginning of the 1990s, this part of Europe became an ideal place to conduct fieldwork on culture change of industrial people (cf. Burawoy and Verdery 1999). Watching all these changes triggered by either political agendas or practical reasons, I tried to analyze the spectrum of attitudes towards modifications of the cultural landscape expressed through actions such as removals of certain elements of the landscape or additions of new ones. Primarily, I was wondering how all these changes would be perceived on local, regional, or national levels. My main interest was to find out how members of a society create a meaning of "their" place. What kind of symbols and meanings matter to whom? I have thought that if I discover what matters to a group of people presently, I may eventually generalize on what does matter to all of us now, at this time, and perhaps what did matter to people in the past. I was after creating a specific methodology that would allow for identification and examination of various cultural changes and their meanings introduced by people to the same place, but at different times. For instance, I observed how eager people of this region were to eliminate all emblems of the communist past. Most of tangible evidence were removed and today this not so distant past remains mostly in people memories, feelings, and sentiments. I know it existed, because I lived through it. But what will remain for a random observer to see? Although not very distant, this past will have to be studied throughout the use of various methods, archaeological included. What is certain to me in this regard is that we cannot pretend it never happened. While pursuing my inquiries, I tried (Lozny 1997) to design feasible trajectories for identification procedures and

preservation policies in culturally diverse and sensitive regions which are going to be heavily impacted during the next few decades. My first conclusion was: people create multiple meanings of place; people with power will favor their meaning and understanding of place and will force others to accept it. What follows should be regarded as my introductory exploration of the concept of place and specific strategies for its management. I probably should have titled this section of my paper: “The politics of cultural landscape,” because that is precisely what cultural heritage preservation practices are presently all about. If anyone wonders what a sense of place might be, I argue that place is multivocal for it bears the meanings that researchers and preservationists create in addition to whatever meanings other people might have attached to it and accept. Place contains multiple senses, and even if we can read all of them through the application of diverse methodologies, not all of these meanings might be preserved.

Place As An Ecosystem

First, let us consider place as an ecosystem, a very dynamic and constantly changing cycle of matter and energy and their links. The concept applies to any environment, but more important, it describes organisms (humans) in a very dynamic interplay with other elements of the system (including other humans). Thus the ecosystem concept gives us a way of describing how human populations influence and are influenced by their surroundings (Moran 1990). Yet, each ecosystem, although kept in equilibrium or near equilibrium, can be described as relations among the component populations. These relations are constantly changing (Holling 1973).²

Ecosystems are filled with places, elements of cultural landscapes. In order to better understand how place is perceived by people, I make a distinction between *place* and *space* as two units of a cultural landscape. From a phenomenological point of view such distinction makes a lot of sense. Understandably, as Casey (1996) pointed out, for anthropologists *space* comes first, because anthropologists are interested to find out how human behavior articulates in nature. For the native people, however, *place* becomes most significant, because they symbolically fill it with specific meanings often unrecognizable to the researchers of *space*, especially after certain cultural elements of the space have been removed. Anthropologists and archaeologists are primarily interested how “being-in-place” articulates. This is why we use the concept of culture and relate this idea to a concept of space rather than a concept of place. From a philosophical point of view, it is place that is most significant to people. There is no knowing or sensing place but by being in that place, meaning, being able to perceive it. Therefore, knowledge of

² Two ideas describe continuity and change within ecosystems: resilience, a measure of change a system can undergo while still maintaining its basic elements or relationships, and stability, a measure of the speed with which a system returns to equilibrium after absorbing disturbances.

place is a consequence of experience (practice), constituted by cultural and social structure. As humans, we are place-bounded creatures and; place is universal. Still, historians, ethnographers, anthropologists are mostly interested in space and time relations. Philosophers could retrieve a sense of place (see for instance Casey 1996), but can anthropologists do the same? Anthropological approach to place is to identify and map it out within a space. In doing so, we are not very different from geographers, historians, sociologists, or political thinkers. Recognizing the crucial interactions between people, place, and motion could identify a place. Concluding from the above, we may say that people are never placeless; places belong to them, and depend on them. We always create our own place in form of a matrix of symbols we identify with at the time (Lozny 1998). Because the approach followed by CRM practitioners to investigate and preserve traces of human adaptation (cultural landscape) continues to be both: diachronic (through time), and synchronic (concerned with the present political, economic, social status quo), the above conclusion is worth taking into consideration.

Place, Cultural Geography and Other Humanistic Studies

There are valuable contributions by cultural geographers to the concept of place, and some refer to aspects known to anthropologists (Buttimer 1993; Entrikin 1991; J. Jackson 1994). Cultural geographers seem to incorporate modern philosophical thought, guided by the idea of “dwelling” as described by Martin Heidegger (1971). Feld and Basso (1996) point out that all these ideas are blended with social theory and produce two types of syntheses: 1) closely related to the sociological notion of “placeways” developed in the work of E. V. Walter (1988), and 2) critical and deconstructive analyzes for application in the fields of environmental design, urban planning, and architecture (Mugerauer 1994; Seamon 1992).

Another trend in cultural geography is concerned with the neo-Marxist cultural critique and with global postmodern theory (Harvey 1989; P. Jackson 1989; Soja 1989). These works are oriented towards discussing various aspects of geographies of struggle and resistance, like issues of representation, gender, political action (Duncan and Ley 1993; Keith and Pile 1993; Massey 1994), and most are based on Foucault’s discussions of spatial analyzes of repression, institutional power, and social control.

The cultural geography approach is linked somehow with other humanistic studies of place including perspectives from anthropology and archaeology in works exploring relationship between landscape and authority (Bender 1993), or issues concerning indigenous people and preservationist (for instance sacred places—Carmichael et al. 1994; Kelly and Francis 1994). Recent cultural anthropology approach has been directed towards theorizing social identities (essays presented in published in 1984 *Place: Experience and Symbols*). Most of these essays focused on the social well being attached to the sense of rootedness in place. Other cultural anthropology directions studied place largely from its contestation

and its linkage to local and global power relations (issues like exile, diaspora, displacement, struggles by indigenous people and cultural minorities for ancestral homelands, land rights, and retention of sacred places. These days, narratives of place once presented under such headlines as “national integration” and “political evolution” are being framed in much harsher terms: as economic development by state invasion and occupation, or as the extraction of transnational wealth at escalating cost in human suffering, cultural degradation, and environmental degradation (Bodley 1988; Burger 1990; Cultural Survival 1993). Place, in other words, is a site of power struggles, and therefore ethnographies of place are stories about contestations, in which previously absent “others” are now portrayed as fully present, no longer presumed as “them” removed from “us”.

Place and Social Memory

Places consist of specific elements beyond the human component. Casey (1996) says that “places gather.” Among these “gathered” elements are specific histories, memories, thoughts, cultural traits, like symbolic meanings, linguistic features, etc. There is also specific experience attached to it. We have this experience every time we go back to places we have been, places that are full of memories, individual and social. Place becomes a powerful form of identification. Being in place also means being in a configuration of complex things (material, symbolic objects that define the form of a place).

Memories of place could be attached to personal experience or social experience. We can return to “our” place we keep in our memory; it is always the same place. Our place does not change, only people who occupy it. Place is not something simply physical (this is how we, anthropologists or archaeologists see it). Place is something for which we continually have to discover or invent new forms of understanding, new ideas (see Casey 1996 for phenomenological analysis of place).

As archaeologists, we do not recover one place but diverse and dynamic time and space relations. What we find is constantly changing qualifications of different places, qualified by their contents and contents articulations in various cultures. We designate these places to specific cultures. Place is composed of physical things but also memories and thoughts. The physical attributes include artifacts and the environmental surroundings. In this sense place is inseparable from the region it occurs. A cave containing the Upper Paleolithic assemblage will be a cave existing not only in the Upper Paleolithic; this makes the cave to be a regional (spatial) feature and not just temporal (Upper Paleolithic). In such a context place contains a variety of meanings: historical, physical, and also emotional (assumed). Despite its nature, it somehow contributes to the character of the entire region. Places constitute the regions content historical and social of diverse people. The essence of place is to be regional, and the essence of a region is to be composed of places.

Conclusions

My intention was to examine how people encounter places, perceive them, and grant them with significance within specific ecosystem (cultural landscape). I tried to move beyond generalizations about place being culturally constructed by describing specific ways in which places contain different words of sense. Others present more detailed discussion of the topic. Margaret Rodman (1992) "Empowering Place: Multilocality and Multivocality" provides an excellent review of power positions and assumptions underlying comparability of "place" and "location." Rodman advocates studies of place that take discontinuities and multiplicities into greater account. Such studies must reject "boundedness" models of culture and the ways they privilege the authority of persons in positions of power. Also, Gupta and Ferguson (1992) "Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference" see the need for reevaluation of the "assumed isomorphism of space, place, and culture." They imagine this space as one "beyond culture," where hybrid and fluid zones replace stabilized territories such as borderlands, characterized by place indeterminacy (the notions of "ethnospace" as a response to the bounded culture syndrome Appadurai 1992; see also Clifford's critique of anthropological approach promoting the idea of dwelling over travel).

British social anthropology produced an anthology titled *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space* (Hirsch and O'Hanlon 1995). From this book we can get an insight that anthropology can, in fact, provide a theorization of landscape as cultural process that is dynamic, and constantly fluctuating between "place" (everyday lived locale) and "space" (social potential; see also Tilley 1994). The meaning of place is therefore recognized as a discursive entity—the floating signifier. Feld and Basso (1996) point out to a very specific behavioral quality: "that as people fashion places, so, too, do they fashion themselves." Filling places with meanings exemplifies maintaining order of how things should be. And those meanings help us to answer the question: why do we hold on to what we like? From the above I conclude that we always identify place within a certain cultural pattern. It is embedded in culture, and expressed through behavior or symbols. Place needs to be classified. But how? Using what signifiers? Place has its own specific connotation in time and space, because people always attach specific meanings to it. Such unique articulation of place is manifested through the meanings given to place by people. Culture is found in place, and it gives place its meaning. Yet people carry culture into place, and therefore place is known by means set by the people who occupy it at the time. Culture, therefore, assigns the way in which place is perceived. There is usually something left aside, the unknown or unrecognized ("wild" in Casey's 1996 terminology). Why should place be identified and classified as one? Why so? No doubt place is a reality, but what kind? Place, therefore, will be composed of two distinct realms: cultural (recognized) and natural; but people will experience both simultaneously. To be fully in place means to know both dichotomic aspects of a place, to experience both, cultural and natural. In this sense, we could assume that the time/space

dichotomy will also arise from the experience of place. Place provides a common matrix for time and space. The matrix is filled with events, time-space units. The full potential of place is in its multivocal symbolism and significance of cultural designation. Place can only be identified in a context. Time and history cannot be separated from place, although place will be known by its most manifested event (culture). Therefore the meaning of place is discursive because it depends on how we make sense of it within a specific cultural/political context. Place is a part of our discursive explanation of reality. Place that cannot be recognized and identified within our discursive way of explanation will not be noticed or given any meaning.

References

- Appadurai, Arjun 1992 Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for Transnational Anthropology, In *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, Richard Fox, ed., pp. 191–210. Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press.
- Ashmore, Wendy and A. Bernard Knapp (eds) 1999 *Archaeologies of Landscape. Contemporary Perspectives*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Bates, Daniel G., 1996 *Cultural Anthropology*, Allyn and Bacon.
- Benavides, O. Hugo, personal communication.
- Bender, Barbara, (ed.) 1993 *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg.
- Bodley, John, H. (Ed.) 1988 *Tribal Peoples and Development Issues: A Global Overview*. Mountain View, California: Mayfield.
- Michael Burawoy and Katherine Verdery, (Eds) 1999 *Uncertain Transition. Ethnographies of Change in the Postsocialist World*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford.
- Burger, Julian 1990 *The Gaia Atlas of First Peoples: A Future for the Indigenous World*. London: Gaia Books.
- Buttimer, Anne 1993 *Geography and the Human Spirit*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Casey, Edward, S., 1996 How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena. In Steven Feld and Keith Basso (eds.) *Senses of Place*, pp. 13–52. School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series, School of American Research Press, Santa Fe: New Mexico.
- Cleere, Henry, F., (ed.) 1989 *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Cultural Survival 1993 *State of the Peoples: A Global Human Rights Report on Societies in Danger*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Crumley, Carole, L. 1994 Preface. In Carole L. Crumley, ed. *Historical Ecology. Cultural Knowledge and Changing Landscapes*, pp. I–XIV. School of American Research Press Santa Fe, New Mexico.
- . 1994a *Historical Ecology. A Multidimensional Ecological Orientation*. In Carole L. Crumley, ed. *Historical Ecology. Cultural Knowledge and Changing Landscapes*, pp. 1–16. School of American Research Press Santa Fe, New Mexico.
- . 1998 *Introduction to the Practice of Historical Ecology*. Paper presented at *Landscapes in Transition: Recent Approaches to Cultural Heritage Research and Preservation*. NABO Workshop, Hunter College, CUNY. December 8–9, 1998.

- Duncan, James, and David Ley (eds.) 1993 *Place/Culture/Representation*. London: Routledge.
- Entrikin, J. Nicholas 1991 *The Betweenness of Place: Toward a Geography of Modernity*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Feld, Steven and Keith Basso 1996 Introduction. In Steven Feld and Keith Basso (Eds.), *Senses of Place*, pp. 3–11. School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series, School of American Research Press, Santa Fe: New Mexico.
- Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson 1992 Beyond “Culture”: Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 6–23.
- Harvey, David 1989 *The Condition of Postmodernity*. New York: Blackwell.
- Heidegger, Martin 1971 *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York, Harper and Row.
- Hirsch, Eric, and Michael O’Hanlon 1995 *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Space and Place*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hodder, Ian 1999 *The Archaeological Process. An Introduction*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Holling, C. S., 1973 Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4:1–23.
- Jackson, John B., 1994 *A Sense of Place, a Sense of Time*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Jackson, Michael 1989 *Paths toward a Clearing*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Keith, Michael and Steve Pile (eds.) 1993 *Place and the Politics of Identity*. London: Routledge.
- King, Thomas, F. 1998 *Cultural Resource Laws and Practice. An Introductory Guide*. Walnut Creek, London, New Dehli: Altamira Press.
- Layton, Robert (ed.) 1989 *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous values and archaeology*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Lozny, Ludomir R. 1997 *Archaeology in Transitional Societies. Socioeconomics of Archaeology in Central Europe*. Guest lecture for the faculty and students of the City University of New York, Archaeological Seminar 1997.
- . 1998 *A Sense of Place: Landscape and Social Memory (Rethinking Central European Cultural Heritage)*, paper presented at the conference: *Landscapes in Transition: Recent approaches to cultural heritage research and preservation*, Hunter College, December 7–8, 1998.
- Luz Endere, Marfa and Gustavo Politis 2001 *Cultural Resource Protection and Archaeological Research in Argentina: Between Bureaucracy and Inefficiency*. In: *Archaeological Research and Heritage Preservation in the Americas*. R. Drennan S. Mora (eds.), 69–75. The Society of American Archaeology. Washington.
- Massey, Doreen 1994 *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Moran, E. F., 1990 *Ecosystem ecology in biology and anthropology: A critical assessment*. In E. F. Moran (ed.), *The ecosystem approach in anthropology: From concept to practice*, pp. 3–40. Ann-Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mugerauer, Robert 1994 *Interpretations on Behalf of Place: Environmental Displacement and Alternative Responses*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Oates, J., Abedi-Lartey, M., McGraw, S., Struhsaker, T. and G. Whitesides 2000. Extinction of a West African colobus monkey. *Conservation Biology*, vol. 14, no. 5, November 2000.
- Ostoja-Zagórski, Janusz (ed.) 1997 *Jakiej archeologii potrzebuje współczesna humanistyka?* Instytut Historii UAM. Poznań.
- Pianka, E. R., 1974 *Evolutionary biology*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Politis, Gustavo and Roberto Peretti (eds) 2004 *Teoría Arqueológica en América del Sur*. Serie Teórica No. 3, Ediciones INCUAPA, Olavarría.
- Podgorny, Irina 2000 Archaeology and Education in Argentina. *Antiquity*, 70:283, 151–155.
- Rodman, Margaret 1992 Empowering Place: Multilocality and Multivocality. *American Anthropologist* 94(3):640–56.
- Seamon David (ed.) 1992 *Dwelling, Seeing, and Building: Toward a Phenomenological Ecology*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Slobodkin, L. B., 1968 Toward a predictive theory of evolution. In R. C. Lewontin (ed.), *Population biology and evolution*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Soja, Edward W. 1989 *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. New York: Verso.
- Tilley, Christopher 1994 *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*. Oxford: Berg.
- Walter, E. V., 1988 *Placeways: A Theory of the Human Environment*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Landscapes under Pressure

Theory and Practice of Cultural Heritage Research and
Preservation

Lozny, L.R. (Ed.)

2006, XX, 259 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-0-387-28460-6