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WHY IDENTIFY HIGHLY VALUED LANDSCAPES

This paper introduces a new collaborative enquiry, which aims to identify landscapes people regard as highly desirable and to determine what qualities make such landscapes specially valued. The project is one of two (the other deals with the perception of environmental hazards) undertaken by the International Geographical Union Working Group in Environmental Perception, under UNESCO MAB auspices.

What is the purpose of this project? Environmental satisfaction is often thought an important aspect of life, yet it is hard to identify the landscapes and places that elicit strong attachments. National and cultural differences in environmental taste are still less understood: Britain, France and the United States celebrate and protect unlike landscapes, yet little is known about their differences. An understanding of uniquely favored landscapes could enhance the benefits derived from scenic, historic, and other sites. But policy applications are premature. The goals at this stage are to increase knowledge about our affective links with landscape and places, and to compare the environmental attachments of different peoples and epochs.

To focus exclusively on highly valued landscapes and locales may occasion concern, lest concentration on the uniquely desirable adversely effect how we treat the everyday landscapes in which we pass most of our lives. Indeed, the "neglect of the general in favor of a single focus of merit" has obvious disadvantages in the
American landscape where, as I have noted, "the features most admired are set apart and deluged with attention; the rest of the country is consigned to the rubbish heap" (Lowenthal 1968, pp. 84-85). In the United States these perceptual habits tend to blind people to the ordinary and the familiar. But a greater awareness and understanding of what places and features most please us may eventually stimulate public interest in the everyday landscape too and thus help to enhance its fabric.

One precursor of this enquiry is Younghusband’s Royal Geographical Society presidential address of 1920. "Knowledge of beauty is the knowledge about the Earth which is most worth having," he declared. "The more natural beauty we see, the more there is to see... What men naturally do, and what I would suggest Geography should deliberately do, is to compare the beauty of one region with the beauty of another so that we may realize the beauty of each with a greater intensity and clearness" (Younghusband 1920, pp. 4, 7). Like Younghusband, I aim to discover and compare sources of landscape beauty throughout the world. But esthetic satisfaction is only one of many pleasures taken in landscape; our attachments have other roots as well, and these too must be identified and analyzed.

TYPES OF EVIDENCE AND VARIETIES OF TASTE

The identity of uniquely valued landscapes and locales is often taken for granted, but is in fact little known. History, folklore, gardens, parks, literature, painting, photography, all suggest the popularity of this or that generic landscape type, this or that country or city. But differing perspectives, changes of taste and fashion, varied explanations for preferred attachments seem to defy generalization. Can we say how far mountains or valleys, seashores or deserts, let alone their constituent parts, command the interest or affection of mankind, when mankind
includes Chinese and Caucasian, city-dweller and countryman, romantic and pragmatist, medieval and modern? Nor do particular localities elicit unswerving affection: places themselves change through time, as do the tastes of residents and visitors. Though Paris may be no less beloved now than a century ago, the reasons it is loved are in large measure different.

Attractions of landscape and attachments to localities have stimulated an abundant literature. Novels, paintings, travel guides, philosophical treatises, histories of art, planning reports, landscape architecture and the social sciences all offer explanations about preferred landscapes and places. But because the premises employed are so various, the conclusions are diverse and often contradictory. Some explanations depend on a priori judgments, others on professional expertise, others on attempts to take the public pulse. The reasons landscapes are thought to be preferred are equally various: some inquirers think the choice purely esthetic, others ecological, moral, economic, or dependent on mood and perspective.

A survey of the literature leaves one doubting the possibility of developing principles of landscape preferences, yet understanding why many feel impelled to find them. "The scenic quality of rural landscape has been seen as something to conserve. But agreed criteria are absent.... The demand from planners for answers, almost irrespective of their correctness has overtaken the researcher's ability to provide them" (Penning-Rowsell et al. 1977, p. 1).

VARIABLES THAT AFFECT ATTACHMENT TO LANDSCAPES

The diversity of criteria used to identify and explain landscape preferences reflect the fact that three clusters of variables — landscapes, people, interactions —
are involved (see Craik 1971). Landscapes and localities themselves are myriad, non-discrete, and constantly altering, both in their components and in their appearance. Exposure to an ever wider range of landscapes, in travel and in pictures, requires ever more elaborate classifications to encompass the whole experienced world (Greenlaw 1973, p. 10). Landscape observers -- residents, visitors, and armchair travelers -- are no less heterogeneous in what they experience and prefer. And the context of interaction between man and milieu depends on mood and circumstance, weather and light and time of day, views from on foot or in a vehicle, stationary or in motion, deliberately chosen or accidentally come upon. Finally, the viewer's purpose helps determine how well he likes what he sees; places may be highly regarded as the sites of enterprise, as homes, as localities for pleasure and recreation, or simply as beautiful scenes. These variables are discussed in detail in Part III.

WHY ESTHETIC PRINCIPLES CANNOT EXPLAIN LANDSCAPE TASTES

Many have tried to base landscape preferences on beauty alone, treating people as scenic observers whose interest is purely esthetic. Philosophers and planners alike have sought universal principles that would show why some scenes are esthetically superior to others. In classical, medieval, and Renaissance times these principles assumed that regularity, harmony, smoothness and symmetry were inherently pleasing. The supposed roundness of the primordial globe, the proportions exemplified in the human body, the symbolic perfection of certain geometric figures were exemplars of beauty in nature as well as art (Bosanquet 1932).

The search for universal standards of landscape esthetics is futile, however,
Judgments of landscape quality, even more than those of works of art, involve the beholder's active participation. Art and other objects of aesthetic appreciation are detached from the observer, framed in space and time, quite distinct from their milieus. But landscapes surround the observer, merging continuously with other landscapes to the horizon, and the absence of a set frame challenges the viewer to create his own perspectives. Wind and weather, light and shadow, clouds and sky, seasonal foliage, the disposition of birds, animals, and people make each glimpse of a landscape a new scene, even when seen repeatedly from the same spot (Hepburn 1963). "The frequency, order, timing and purpose of encounter with landscape alter its appearance for the individual" (Unwin 1975, p. 133). Moreover, landscapes change as we move through them: each step, each turn of the head, engages new vistas. The admiration of landscapes depends so much on our physical interaction with them that no aesthetic consensus could apply.

ATTACHMENTS TO LANDSCAPE AS SCENERY AND AS SOCIAL MILIEU

Esthetic preference, moreover, is only one of many sources of landscape attachment. A landscape judged beautiful may or may not be desirable to walk or drive through, to play golf or ride horses or hunt in, to spend a holiday or locate a second home, or to live in all year round. It may or may not be an ecologically fit landscape or one rich in economic resources. Even if we have "no direct evidence that observers can separate the appreciation" of beauty from other influences that cause them to value landscapes (University of Manchester 1978, p. 51), the judgments of resident and tourist, entrepreneur and conservationist, contemplative observer and active hedonist obviously differ.

The distinctions between aesthetic and other landscape values are by no means
clear cut. But non-esthetic attachments are the habitual province of residents, for whom physical features become the lineaments of socially charged landscapes. The distinction is one of both content and feeling, as shown by Norman Dennis's comparison of a planner's and a resident's response to a Sunderland "slum". The planner sees "a collection of shabby, mean and dreary houses, derelict back lanes, shoddy-fronted shops and broken pavements, the whole unsightly mess mercifully ill-lit!" The resident sees

the best butcher's shop in town; George McKeith's wet-fish shop and Peary's fried-fish shop... Maw's hot pies and peas prepared on the premises; the Willow Pond public house, in which her favourite nephew organises the darts and dominoes team;... the spacious cottage in which she was born and brought up... (but which has some damp patches which make it classifiable as a 'slum dwelling'); the short road to the cemetery where she cares for the graves of her mother, father and brother (Taylor 1973, p. 226).

The visitor ignorant of these social connections fails to see parallels with his own home area, which may likewise lack appeal to outsiders. Santymer (1962, p. 307) describes her childhood Ohio town as largely "shabby, worn, and unpicturesque... Yet that scene, so unconsciously accepted, had its values for us." In winter, with gray skies, soot-streaked pavements, and lumps of black snow in the gutters, one could hardly help "remarking how ugly the town was, and how drab and dull." Yet one went on storing away impressions of how the place felt;

the unfastidious heart makes up its magpie hoard, heedless of the protesting intelligence. Valentines in a drugstore window, the smell of roasting coffee, sawdust on the butcher's floor... these are as good to have known and remembered, associated as they are with friendliness between man and man,
between man and child, as fair streets and singing towers and classic
arcades (Santymer 1962, p. 50).

A shift of perspective can make a long familiar milieu scenic once more.
"The least change in our point of view, gives the whole world a pictorial air", wrote
Emerson (1836, p. 597). "A man who seldom rides, needs only to get into a coach
and traverse his own town, to turn the street into a puppet-show... wholly detached
from all relation to the observer."

The scenic perspective -- that of the observer with little functional interest in
the landscape (Lauric 1975, p. 117) -- most concerns us here. The term "landscape"
itself connotes scenery rather than utility (see page 36). And a landscape's scenic
classical character, notwithstanding divergences of taste, is its broadest appeal. Relatively
few prize a landscape for its recreational or other resources or as an ecological
reserve, but as a valued scene it may matter to millions.

To emphasize scenic appreciation is not to suggest that only the contemplative
observer enjoys scenery. The wilderness buff combines pride in confronting
elemental nature with sensate pleasure in the forests and mountains he walks through.
The canoeist negotiating rapids concentrates on avoiding submerged rocks but also
enjoys the shapes and colors of the stream and adjacent shores. The fisherman may
say, and even believe, that his sole motive is to catch fish, but he enjoys being in and
looking at the scene of his efforts, even sitting in a flooded gravel pit on a wet day.

While most outdoor recreation includes scenic appreciation, some pursuits
engender or permit more than others; the spectrum ranges from pure contemplation
to horseracing, tennis, and football, where the landscape is simply an artificial activity
space. The downhill skier, the power boatman, the hang-glider are hooked on physical
pleasures that highly constrain their locale. Differing ideas of landscape satisfaction occasion conflicts among users. The hiker complains that those on trail bikes or even horseback detract from his peaceful solitude; the paddling canoeist inveighs similarly against noisy motorboat operators (Lucas 1964).

But all enjoyment of landscape, even the most contemplative, is constrained by circumstance. The search for a picnic site calls not only for a likely view but for a spot out of the wind with a mixture of sun and shade, near but not too near the road, with a surface smooth enough to sit on and more or less devoid of noxious plants and insects. Indeed, most picnickers' preference for sites with tables, chairs, fireplaces, and dustbins suggests that scenic appreciation plays little part in their choice (Countryside Commission 1970, p. 21).

All appreciation of landscape thus involves other interests besides scenic. What can be said about landscapes seen solely for the resources they promise to yield? The mine-owner, the timber baron, the hydroelectric firm, even the farmer, like landscapes because they portend profitable use. While wholly economic man does not exist, a liking for landscape impelled only by the thought of extracting something from it cannot be considered a form of attachment.

Yet it is difficult to draw the line. Reasons for admiring landscapes and localities are infinitely varied and range from the sublime to the crass. The agricultural pioneer in 18th-century America enjoyed seeing wilderness landscapes because he envisaged their transformation into fruitful fields and pastures. Landscapes of arduous toil were beautiful to 18th-century British painters and their patrons. Magnitogorsk pleases Russian viewers because of the contribution it makes to their economy, just as the sooty facades of northern buildings signify to some Britons that "where there's muck there's money."
DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN LANDSCAPES AND PLACES

Landscape and locality are quite different kinds of geographical feature. Localities are specific places -- Boston, Cheshire, the Alps, England, Lake Windermere, the Eiffel Tower. Landscapes are generic types. To be sure, no two landscapes are entirely alike, but their evident resemblances make it usual to classify landscapes into categories -- mountains and plains, rivers and seashores, forests and deserts.

The distinction between landscapes and places is smudged at local scale by similarity among places and specificity within landscape types. Landscapes in southern Britain, for example, are apt to be considered both generic and specific -- Norfolk Broads, Weald, South Downs, all landscape types, but types of recognizable location. Nonetheless the distinction between the generic and the specific figures constantly in our awareness of environment. Our apprehension of the world is always divided between elements viewed as particulars and as types.

Appreciation of localities and landscapes requires different kinds of understanding. We are fond of various kinds of city—medieval, cathedral, picturesque — in a fashion unlike our attachment to particular cities -- York, Chester — even though the same elements may be prized in both cases. And our devotion to Lake Windermere, the Cuillins, Avebury, and Hackhurst Down is unlike our attachment to mountains, neolithic earthworks or chalk downs generally, just as our interest in a specific Yorkshire dale differs from our delight in the Dales in general. Attachment to a specific place is apt to reflect growing up in it or some other direct involvement; attachment to a landscape (or townscape) type is more apt to reflect esthetic or recreational preferences.
Particular experiences and images inspire attachment to York or Avebury or Box Hill; a shared, consensual taste explains why we like cathedral cities, megalithic landscapes, or steep wooded escarpments. Preferences for localities are more dispersed, because more disparate, than for landscape types. Associations or aspirations uniquely their own attach most people to specific localities the world over, but tastes for landscape in general tend to converge on a small number of types.

PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC LANDSCAPE PREFERENCES

Who are the appropriate judges of our landscape? Throughout history, a small minority -- those in power, those with special interest or knowledge -- have decided which landscapes were preferred and how they should be used. The areas set aside for special protection, like moorlands and mountains in Britain (Shoard 1978), reflect the tastes of a few, not those of the wider public. Until recently, ordinary folk were thought incapable of environmental appreciation; thus Santayana (1896, p. 133) maintained that "rude or vulgar people are indifferent to their natural surroundings. . . . The beautiful daily aspects of their environment escape them altogether." The professional's facility in verbalizing his feelings about landscape was mistaken as evidence of keener sensitivity.

The propriety and adequacy of elite judgments no longer go unchallenged, however. The general public shows increasing "reluctance to allow planners, with possibly a biased viewpoint, to put their private values on landscape seen as a public resource" (Penning-Rowsell et al 1977, p. 2). However closely a planner's view might conform with the public's, his preference is no longer acceptable if he has not consulted the public. Much research in environmental perception stems from the democratization of environmental decision-making. In particular, social scientists seek to ascertain public landscape and locality
preferences by means of questionnaires, interviews, and community participation programs (Whyte 1977).

The benefit of learning the public consensus on preferred locales is potentially great. "The Michelin Guides . . . list 4-star views, 3-star views, and 2-star views -- and almost everyone agrees . . . Surely, a few people decided, but . . . over a couple of hundred years that's been fairly well agreed upon." A "social science approach" to such preferences, suggests Daniel Tunstall, could gauge the actual popularity of locales, enabling planners to say that "we need to protect this view for this reason because so many people agree it is such an important view" (Craik and Zube 1976, p. 18).

Not all are convinced, however, that public preferences provide the best guide to landscape policy. "In other fields of aesthetics the most popular is seldom held to represent the peak of perfection," notes Turner (1975, p. 160). "Personally I am appalled at the prospect of planning landscape on the basis of public preference. . . . What makes up a landscape and why it is enjoyed is not popularly well understood," and one would moreover "be imposing the tastes and feelings of one generation on another."

Public landscape preferences, like expert opinions, emerge from varied types of evidence. Favored landscapes and localities are celebrated in literature and painting; popularity can partly be gauged by tourist visits; landscape tastes are volunteered in letters and in answers to explicit queries. Although none of these modes of ascertaining public opinion is wholly free from bias, some idea of popular consensus can be gleaned from each of them. The artist's background and his patron's tastes clearly affect his choice of scenes in paintings, but landscapes that gain public approbation are much reproduced. Paintings have created enduring popularity for certain scenes -- Cezanne's Provence, Claude's Campagna, Constable's Suffolk, the Hudson River landscapes immort-
alized by Durand, Cole and Church. Michelin stars grading famous views and scenes are assigned by a small group of "experts", but their choices acquire credibility through popular validation.

Other variables of landscape appreciation, other difficulties that hamper inquiry about favored locales, remain to be explored. This introduction has touched on only a few of the most salient -- the variety of source materials, the diversity of criteria for preference, the continuum comprising esthetic, recreational, and functional reasons for environmental attachment, the difference between scenic and utilitarian appreciation, the distinctive qualities of localities as against landscapes, the connections and differences between professional and public views, the difficulty of eliciting representative taste.
II. EXISTING EVIDENCE ABOUT VALUED LANDSCAPES

This section reviews some of the literature showing what kinds of landscapes are and have been highly valued. Both documentary and survey source materials are diverse and voluminous. I shall therefore aim to exemplify rather than to catalog.

Evidence about valued landscape will be classified under three headings. The first considers landscape attachments presumed, generally on intuitive grounds, to be innate. The second considers literary sources and artifactual evidence of landscape tastes specific to particular cultures and epochs. The third considers landscape preferences derived from landscape evaluation and other surveys that aim at objective, often quantitative, appraisal.

LANDSCAPE ATTACHMENTS THAT ARE PRESUMED TO BE INNATE

Modern scholars like past esthetic theorists often make ex cathedra statements about landscape preferences they consider so deeply rooted in human experience as to be well-nigh universal. Eric Newton (1962, p. 21) provides a characteristic instance: "Certain natural phenomena are fairly universally recognized as more pleasurable than others -- well-wooded country as opposed to moorland, mountains as opposed to plains, bright colours as opposed to dull ones . . . -- the list could be extended indefinitely." Newton does not tell us how he knows; he simply assumes that well-wooded country, mountains, and bright colors are such well-known favorites they need no explanation.

Four somewhat different "environments of persistent appeal" are specified by Yi-Fu Tuan (1974, p. 114-18): tropical forest, seashore, valley, and island. Tuan thinks that sense perception and early human experience help to account for these archetypal tastes.
The sylvan environment was mankind's "warm nurturing womb"; the seashore's "recession of beach and valley denote security" while the open horizon invites adventure; the valley is "a highly diversified ecological niche" symbolically identified with womb and shelter; the island "quarantined by the sea from the ills of the continent... symbolizes a state of prelapsarian innocence and bliss".

Tuan's archetypal favorites have much in common with Appleton's landscapes of prospect and refuge, environmental needs inherited from early man. "Places will vary in their capacity for stimulating aesthetic response, and those we think of as beautiful are favourably endowed in terms of the symbolism of prospect and refuge" (Appleton 1975a, p.238). Mountain peaks, tree tops, spires and pagodas are specially attractive because they afford prospects; leafy boughs, verandahs, and walled gardens are enjoyed because they promise refuge; waterfalls and natural arches embody both qualities at once.

Another common feature of scenic admiration is the water gap, where a stream cuts through a mountain or ridge. Noting the "widely held theory [of an unconscious identification between bodily image and geological form," Shepard (1961) suggests that water gaps provide an analogy between topographic and anatomical passages. Many mythic and literary journeys -- Siegfried's quest for the Grail, Tannhäuser's search for the Venusberg, Poe's Domain of Arnheim -- penetrate water gap barriers, emerging from fearsome confines into a rich, sweet paradise.

Optical and perceptual properties, rather than inherited biological traits, explain landscape attachments for Vaughan Cornish. Forest scenes are enhanced by the stereoscopic effect of trunks, boughs, and slender shoots, whose shadowing "maintains the third dimension of the objects in the wood" (Cornish 1943, p. 60-61). Ocean cliffs provide exhilarating contrasts of horizontal and vertical, fluid water with impregnable rock (Cornish 1935, pp. 9, 31; 1943, p. 38). Capes and headlands are exciting
because they join three scenic frontiers, land, water, and shoreline. The curved continuity of the chalk downs often conforms with the clouds above, "eternalizing the landscape and thus imparting an idea of Heaven" (Cornish 1943, pp. 36, 48, 102). Cornish's preferences for all these features assume the general desirability of a sense of distance, of magnitude, of contrast on a grand scale.

Several scholars thus agree that a few favored landscape types have a persistent or archetypal appeal, though each designates different favorites. These attachments are usually attributed to primordial experience, dispositions inherited from the environments of early man and his forebears. But "the obscure memory of pre-existence in the womb of the earth" (Eliade 1962) may lead to rejection, not attachment. As Shepard (1967 p. 23) notes, unconscious memory of landscape from the evolutionary past induces anxiety along with satisfaction; "a deep hereditary response to former habitats would necessarily be experienced with pleasure."

Moreover, mountains, valleys, and islands, cliffs and promontories, waterfalls, walled gardens and water gaps have other connotations too. Islands are the locus not only of romantic nostalgia for childhood security but also of isolation and imprisonment, poverty and degeneracy. Mountains, increasingly popular since the 18th century, were earlier horrid, misshapen places to be avoided at all costs.

Landscape attachments presumed to be archetypal require explanations in evolutionary biology and in the psychology of perception, whose mechanisms are common to all men. By contrast, history, literature, and art illumine landscape preferences that stem from religious belief, scientific conviction and esthetic principles which are specific to particular cultures and epochs. To this topic I now turn.
LITERARY AND HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR LANDSCAPE ATTACHMENTS

Evidence about highly valued landscapes from literature and painting is voluminous, and conclusions are as heterogeneous as the source materials and the cultures they illuminate. Material dealing with classical views, like Archibald Geikie's *Love of Nature among the Romans* (1912), is relatively scanty; early Oriental taste is still little understood (Sullivan 1962; Sickman and Soper 1968). Attitudes toward natural and manmade scenery in post-Renaissance Europe, however, and particularly in Britain, are detailed in several works that treat landscape tastes as an aspect of the history of ideas: Elizabeth Manwaring's *Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England* (1925), Christopher Hussey's *Picturesque* (1927), B. Sprague Allen's *Tides of English Taste* (1937), A. O. Lovejoy's essays on romanticism and nature (1948), the Ogdens' *English Taste in Landscape in the Seventeenth Century* (1955), Kenneth Clark's *Landscape into Art* (1956), Nikolaus Pevsner's *Englishness of English Art* (1956), Walter J. Hipple's *The Beautiful, the Sublime, and the Picturesque* (1957), Marjorie Hope Nicolson's *Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory* (1959), Samuel H. Monk's *Sublime* (1960), Edward Malin's *English Landscaping and Literature* (1966). These show how esthetic distinctions drawn by Addison, Burke, Knight, Price, Gilpin, Shenstone, Hogarth, Shaftesbury and others both reflected changing landscape tastes and helped to create them, notably in heightening appreciation of mountain scenery and rugged terrain, rough and irregular scenery as opposed to smooth, symmetrical, and tame.

Literary and art history trace the subsequent growth of landscape appreciation in Wordsworth, Ruskin, Morris and others. J. R. Watson's *Picturesque Landscape and English Romantic Poetry* (1970) and John Barrell's *Idea of Landscape and Sense of Place*
document changes in taste linked with new literary forms, with pastoral painting and poetry, and with alterations in the landscape itself. The enclosure of open fields and the building of roads enhanced facilities for travel and encouraged landscape comparisons, while at the same time diminishing the sense of community and belongingness in the English countryside. Meanwhile the making and remaking of landscape gardens and urban squares and terraces evinced new English tastes in the picturesque, the Palladian, and other scenic ideals. Indeed, the survival of these creations into present-day England is our best evidence of such Elysian tastes (Hyams 1971; Lees-Milne 1962; Hunt and Willis 1975).

Descriptions of visits to favored landscapes complement historical studies. "Gentlemen of taste" traveling in mid-18th century England were expected to show "approval of Gothic but dislike of Norman; . . . appreciation of a Palladian house but dismissal of a Baroque one; . . . pleasure in the work of Capability Brown but horror in the sight of a formal garden" (Moir 1964, p. xiv).

Travel guides reveal the sites tourists favored, what they hoped to see when they got there and the proper way to look. The tides of taste affected not just the popularity of mountains, ruins, lakes, and waterfalls, but also whether these were more admirable from a distance or close at hand, in motion or in repose, from ground level or at a height, with the unaided eye or through binoculars, alone or in company. Approved landscape attitudes have shifted from esthetic detachment to emotional involvement, moral reflection, scientific inquiry, physical exertion and risk taking. Favorable landscape types also reflect new forms of recreation and ease of access to remote spots.

AN EXAMPLE: MOUNTAIN SCENERY. The rise of appreciation for mountains
shows how literary sources account for landscape attachments (summarized from Nicolson 1959; Moir 1964; Zaring 1977). It was Ruskin (1886, IV, 317, 344) who contrasted ancient and modern attitudes as "mountain gloom" and "mountain glory." Classical, medieval, and early Renaissance painters and poets had neglected or expressed antipathy towards mountains. "The Greeks did not seem, as artists, to know that such things were in the world." In medieval paintings, mountains were no more than "some careless and jagged arrangements of blue spires and spikes on the horizon, and, here and there, an attempt at representing an overhanging rock with a hole through it, but merely in order to divide the light behind some human figure" (Ruskin 1886, III, 145).

By contrast, painters in Ruskin's day traversed "the wildest places of the globe in order to obtain subjects with craggy foregrounds and purple distances... The leading masters... reserve their highest powers to paint Alpine peaks or Italian promontories" (Ruskin 1886, III 250). In poems lauding mountain landscapes, Shelley, Byron, and Wordsworth celebrated "ideals of diversity, variety, irregularity,... indefiniteness and vastness." Formerly seen as "the rubbish of the world", mountains had become "an integral part of savage or solemn Nature whose majesty was enhanced rather than marred by their presence" (Nicolson 1959, p. 16).

Earlier poets, like Donne (1611), had reviled mountains as corruptions from nature's original globular perfection, "warts and pock-holes on the face of the earth":

But keepes the earth her round proportion still?

Does not a Tenarif, or higher Hill

Rise so high like a Rocke... confesse, in this

The worlds proportion disfigured is.
Seventeenth-century viewers saw a world little resembling the one God had made. "The Great Sculptor had not carved out hills and mountains, valleys and depths of ocean. He was rather a classical aesthetician" devoted to symmetry, proportion, and circularity. Human depravity - the sins of Adam and Eve and of later generations - had caused the warts and pockholes, fissured the smooth globe into mountains and valleys, condemned immortal nature to wear out and grow old (Nicolson 1959, pp. 77-78).

Men feared and detested the rugged lineaments of the earth. Thomas Burnet's Sacred Theory of the Earth (1684) was the standard tract against mountains. The Face of the Earth before the Deluge was smooth, regular, and uniform; without Mountains, and without a Sea ... This smooth Earth ... had the Beauty of Youth and blooming Nature, fresh and fruitful, and not a Wrinkle, Scar or Fracture in all its Body; no Rocks or Mountains, ... but even and uniform all over. In its place now were "wild, vast and undigested Heaps of Stone and Earth," spectacular "Ruins of a Broken World" (Burnet 1684, I, 71-72, 89, 137-38). Burnet responded emotionally to mountain scenes, but then current esthetic and theological principles made him condemn their disorder and asymmetry.

Burnet's theory of earth history in general and his animadversions against mountains in particular soon came under attack on several grounds, however. One argument was pragmatic: because mountains gave rise to commodious ports and harbors, bounteous rains and other resources, they were beneficial, indeed essential, to civilized life. Another argument was religious: a new theology saw the existing earth as God's creation; mountains reflected God's beneficence in seeking the fullest possible diversity.
A new esthetics also ennobled mountain landscapes. Admiring the "ruggedness" of the Isle of Wight and the Sussex Downs, John Ray (1691, pp. 207-7) thought the world "with all its Mountains and Hills, its Promontories and Rockes, so rude and deformed as they appear, was a natural beautiful and pleasant Object." The painting of mountains, noted Ray, reflected the new taste for them. "That the Mountains are pleasant Objects to behold, appears in that the very Images of them, their Draughts and Landskips, are so much esteemed." William Derham (1713) found "the grateful variety of Hills and Dales... more pleasing than the largest continued Planes."

Others admired mountains in rejecting classical esthetic standards. "The mountains are not out of shape, because they were not exact pyramids or cones," said Richard Bentley (1693, pp. 35-38); "nature seemed deformed only to men who mistook their own criteria of beauty for God's. Instead, God's creation "consists in assymetries and a wild variety" (Warren 1690), and those who failed to appreciate nature were remiss towards the deity too.

Geographical, astronomical, and microscopic discoveries, revealing worlds previously unknown, gave rise to the esthetics of the sublime.

Awe, compounded of mingled terror and exultation, once reserved for God, passed over in the seventeenth century first to an expanded cosmos, then... to the greatest objects in the geocosm -- mountain, ocean, desert... 'The Aesthetics of the Infinite' was laid down by Englishmen who found themselves astounded yet enthralled by infinite space (Nicolson 1959, p. 143).

Refuting Burnet on mountains, Joseph Addison borrowed Burnet's own terminology. The Alps near Geneva were "broken into so many steps and precipices, that they fill the mind with an agreeable kind of horror, and form one of the most irregular, mis-
shapen scenes in the world (Addison 1705, in Nicolson 1959, p. 305). Vastness, along with beauty and novelty, attached him to mountain scenery:

Our imagination loves... to grasp at any thing that is too big for its Capacity. We are flung into a pleasing astonishment... at such unbounded Views, and feel a delightful Stillness and Amazement... at the Apprehension of them... Huge heaps of mountains, high rocks and precipices... struck/us/ with that rude kind of magnificence (Addison 1712, in Monk 1960, p. 57).

Seventeenth-century writers described mountains in conventional or allegorical terms; those of the 18th and 19th took mountain imagery less from books, more from actual observation. The Grand Tour helped arouse landscape appreciation, and paintings of the Italian countryside stimulated their emulation in English landscape gardens. The new esthetics embraced tourism too; travelers self-consciously anticipated the sublime experience. "A stranger to mountain imagery," noted Wordsworth in his Guide to the Lakes(1835, p. 99), "naturally on his first arrival looks out for sublimity in every object that admits of it." Wordsworth himself considered mountains the world's supreme example "of the greatness which is the essence of sublimity" (Nicolson 1959, p. 380).

Yet safe, rapid, even comfortable travel to remote sites soon eroded sublimity that mountains became merely picturesque or beautiful. As more people journeyed far for recreation and health, the formerly secluded became commonplace; by the mid-19th century, tourists no longer found mountains passionately fulfilling, but "expected their money's worth of good honest scenery, thoroughly documented and without fantasy or extravagance" (Moir 1964, p. 156).

AN EXAMPLE: APPRECIATION OF WELSH LANDSCAPES. Before 1750 Wales was seldom noticed by outsiders, largely because it was so mountainous. Travelers
who fancied crag and chasm the "ruins of the world" and who considered mountains a hell where one died of cold had little use for Wales. Averse to mountains, Defoe in 1732 noted of Snowdonia only its "monstrous height" (Zaring 1977, p. 401). Even in 1768, "dreary" was the sole adjective one traveler applied to Snowdonia, which others thought bleak, barren, and disagreeable (Moir 1964, p. 129).

From the 1770s, however, Wales in general, the mountainous north in particular, rapidly gained favor. "Everywhere the rain-soaked uplands, sparsely populated and largely unploughed, were beautiful in the eyes of those who were reacting against their fathers' criteria for a beautiful landscape. By 1800 once 'barbarous Merionithshire', formerly the 'rudest and roughest district in all Wales', had replaced civilized Kent as Britain's scenic ideal (Zaring 1977, p. 403). Guides promised all the grand and stupendous scenery the traveler could desire; not even Switzerland or North America could match North Wales's extravagant wildness and angry grandeur (Moir 1964, p. 129). Wordsworth and Coleridge succumbed to Welsh charms; Peacock and Shelley spent a year in a Merioneth cottage. For artists, mountainous Wales was a land no less romantic than Italy; sketching trips to "our British Alps" became de rigueur for aspiring landscape painters in the 1780s.

Caernarvonshire tourists confronted savage, gloomy, awe-inspiring mountains. The approach to Snowdonia struck visitors as a supreme test of nerve. "With the sudden approach of mists a party would often find themselves surrounded on all sides by desperate precipices" (Moir 1964, p. 134). Some delighted in Snowdonia's loneliness and solitude, but most tourists found the ascent hazardous, especially when guides recounted the terrible accidents that had befallen earlier visitors. Also suitably horrific was Cader Idris, which Peacock in 1811 termed "the very sublimity of Nature's wildest magnificence" (Zaring 1977, p. 407).
Along with mountains, travelers in Wales enjoyed waterfalls. An 1816 North Wales itinerary listed sixteen cataracts not to be missed. In the Rhondda valley, where coal had been mined for a quarter of a century, tourists saw only mountain streams. Like mountain peaks, waterfalls appealed to the taste for the sublime, owing to the scenic impact of dark precipices, overhanging woods, broken and dramatically disposed rocks, the roar of the stream. "These terrible beauties," noted Newell at Mynach's giddy chasm, "have left a more vivid impression on my fancy than any I have seen before or since" (Moir 1964, pp. 137-38).

As the romantic mood waned, the taste for Welsh mountains also declined. After the 1830s "travelers to Wales saw fewer and fewer waterfalls and snowcapped Alps," and became more aware of poverty-stricken peasants forced off hillside farms into dismal mines and foundries. In 1854, when George Borrow proposed a tour of Wales, his horrified wife and daughter insisted on going somewhere more civilized and fashionable. Once again more depressing than exhilarating, mountains were increasingly seen as Wales's handicap rather than her glory (Zaring 1977, pp. 412-14).

Subsequent improvement in economy and transport have brought Welsh mountains into fashion once again. But 20th-century appreciation of Snowdonia stands in especial contrast with that of the 18th. The modern ascent is scenic, but scarcely sublime. The completion of the Snowdonia Mountain Railway in 1896 made it possible for anyone to reach the summit without effort. Irreversibly popularized, Snowdonia today serves a useful purpose by concentrating visitors, so relieving other mountain sites for those who may seek solitude (Manasseh and Partners 1975, pp. 6, 37).

Current attachment to mountains derives from 18th-century taste for the sublime, but our mountain tastes have changed.
Today when tours (by luxury train, private car, or auto bus) have become synonymous in thousands of minds with Mount Washington or Mount Hood, the Rockies, the High Sierras, Mont Blanc, the Jungfrau, the Alps or the Pyrenees, we assume that our feelings are the perennial ones of human beings. We do not ask ... to what extent they have been derived from poetry and novels we have read, landscape art we have seen, ways of thinking we have inherited (Nicolson 1969, p. 1).

Thus changing religious and esthetic views affected attitudes toward mountains, and vice versa: from loathed excrescences on the original smooth globe, mountains came to be inspiring locales, magnificently wild and irregular. Heavenly proximity, wilderness purity, hydrological utility, extensive panoramas, scenic configuration, architectural resemblances, stimuli to bravery and lessons for freedom are among the many motives since advanced for admiring mountains.

MODERN LANDSCAPE ATTACHMENTS AND TASTES. Present-day materials, by comparison with those on the past, yield disappointingly little about preferred landscapes. Literature on modern tourism focuses more on the attraction of specific sites than on landscape types. Michelin's starred views are specific, not generic; how many stars refer to buildings or townscapes, to general views, to mountains or moorlands, valleys or seashores, has not been counted. Without some such study, the actual tastes of travelers cannot be compared with expert opinions or with stated public preferences.

Some suggest that the places tourists visit are less and less real landscapes, more and more artifacts of tourism (Relph 1976; MacCannell 1976). As with Snowdonia, areas of greatest initial appeal have been so intensively exploited that artificial creations supersede the natural milieu. The olive trees of Majorca are so popular for salad bowls
and other souvenirs that Majorcans wonder whether "once they are all cut down we will have to erect plastic ones for the tourists to admire from their bus windows" (Graves and Hogarth 1965, p. 51). But this is no new trend; tourist popularity similarly altered the Lake District before Wordsworth's time (Nicolson 1955).

Our own survey of present day English landscape tastes (Lowenthal and Prince 1965), based on a review of published sources, categorized several prominent and well-loved aspects of the countryside. "Fondness for the old, the rustic, the picturesque, and the tidy, . . . which diffuse from elite to working class with little resistance, find tangible expression in landscape and townscape" (Lowenthal and Prince 1976, p. 127). We neglected attachments to mountains and moorland (page ). Still the preserve of a devoted minority, upland scenery has gained popularity with accessibility from the cities, with the taste for hiking, and with the increasing scarcity of lowland recreational sites owing to agricultural and other development.

A comparable study of American landscape tastes revealed attachments to outsized artifacts and landforms, to individual features as opposed to aggregate scenes, to evocations of the future and the past, and to the remote and spectacular in nature (Lowenthal 1968), the last most apparent in American national parks. But these popular traits do not help to identify widely preferred landscapes or landscape types. Scenes that come easily to mind -- Marlboro country with its great open spaces and lone cowboys, New England hills and valley with intimate villages and church spires - conform to no general American tastes. One emergent theme is a widespread preference for natural over manmade countryside, for wilderness devoid of human impact over landscapes altered by occupancy. Han Huth (1957), Leo Marx (1964), Roderick Nash (1967), J. B. Jackson (1970; Zube and Zube 1977), Annette Kolodny (1975), Linda H. Graber (1976) and others have explored these preferences.
A century and a half ago, Thomas Cole (1836) praised those hallmarks of American mountains, lakes, waterfalls, forests and skies -- densely wooded summits, transparent purity, natural majesty, associations with the future -- distinguishing them from European equivalents. The American landscape today is amply celebrated by poets and painters, visitors and residents; but shared elements of attachment transcending local and specific taste are not yet recognized.

What can be concluded from existing literature on landscape preferences and attachments? We seem better informed about our predecessors' tastes than our own. Each epoch, each people, ignores or shuns certain landscapes, adores and venerates others; the explanations bear on all aspects of culture, all relations with environment. The landscapes to which people are attached, and the reasons for those attachments, are as distinctive as the qualities of environment that give each country its unique personality.

LANDSCAPE PREFERENCES DERIVED FROM PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC INQUIRIES

I have reviewed efforts to collect and interpret existing evidence that bears on landscape attachments. Other evidence is created by tabulating professional preferences and by evoking those of the public.

Landscape judgments that are deliberately elicited take two radically different forms. (1) In landscape evaluation studies, planners use their own landscape values to justify planning recommendations. (2) Questionnaires and interviews, by contrast, aim to ascertain public landscape preferences. The two forms of inquiry are often
confused, because landscape evaluators claim that their surveys take account of popular judgments. But their claim is rarely valid; the line between landscape evaluation and public appraisal is usually clear and distinct.

LANDSCAPE EVALUATION SURVEYS. Studies neither ascertain landscape tastes nor assess public preferences, they tell us nothing about landscapes, the public values or why. Indeed, they are not a form of research but a planning tool to help determine how to use land, where to site motorways and reservoirs, when to spend money on development or protection. Landscape evaluation is not a way to learn about attachments to locales, but a practical means to a policy end.

Why bother to discuss a technique that adds so little to our understanding of valued landscapes? The reason is that landscape evaluation is sanctioned in scores of British local planning studies. Moreover, landscape evaluation is often supposed to concern landscape tastes, often claimed to yield data about preferences, often confused with assessments of public opinion. Not only do some practitioners wrongly make such claims, but many readers erroneously conclude that the voluminous technical apparatus of landscape evaluation connotes scholarly respectability.

Because landscape evaluation is now so influential in planning, it is important to show how such studies are made, what they claim to achieve, and what makes them wholly inappropriate in studying landscape preferences and attachments. The apparent utility of landscape evaluation in environmental decision-making may tempt some to use it in assessing landscape tastes. In my view, any such effort would be a waste of time.
Landscape evaluation helps planners to map landscape values much as they map economic costs and benefits. How is this done? The planner selects a set of criteria which in his view comprise, or at least represent, the sum of landscape amenity. These criteria commonly relate to landform, landscape components, land use, viewing perspectives, and the presence of special features the planner considers "good" or "bad". He then scales each criterion according to its presumed desirability, with mountains counting 5 points, for example, low hills 3 points, plains zero, or with open space, farmland, and industrial sites similarly scaled. The area to be rated is divided into a convenient number of segments, usually grid squares. The planner assigns each criterion a value and totals the values for each grid square. This yields scores enabling him to ascribe levels of value to the map of the whole area.*

This technique has several distinct advantages for planners. First, it is based on the local planner's own judgment about which criteria matter most, and is thus pertinent to the local area. Second, it bears on the area as it is today and is thus up to date. Third, results depend on criteria deployed in a mechanical and hence apparently objective fashion. Fourth, the method can be used for comparative purposes because the results are areally discrete and mappable. Fifth, because the conclusions are aggregated quantitatively, planners can specify precise arguments for environmental decisions, along the lines of cost-benefit analyses (Crofts and Cooke 1974, p. 1).

These presumed advantages are all fraught with drawbacks, however, which go far to invalidate landscape evaluation even for its intended purpose. First, the criteria to be evaluated -- such as slope, plant cover, water features, human impact, extent of view -- are arbitrarily and subjectively selected; the planner has little idea how far his choices reflect those of the public at large, or even those of other planners. In any

*There are in fact many types of landscape evaluation; the range is documented by Penning-Rossell (1973;1975) and Manchester University (1976).
case, no finite number of criteria can encompass all the gratifications we derive from landscapes (Dunn 1974). Second, the criteria are logically incompatible, and the more comprehensive they are the more ludicrous the exercise of combining them becomes. Adding together land form and land use, panoramic extent and historic features, is like summing apples, oranges, bacon, and peppercorns.

Third, no particular way of scaling landscape criteria can be justified (Manchester University 1976, pp. 116-19). Why 5 points for mountains rather than 10 or 15? Why assume, anyway, that mountains are always preferable to plains or open land to developed? Fourth, no rationale exists for weighting variables; who is to say how much land use, land form, historic features, trees of various species and groupings, or panoramic views should count in the total? Fifth, the grid squares for which scores are aggregated are not equivalent landscapes but diverse areas, some homogeneous, others highly differentiated. Sixth, numerical specificity can be a two-edged sword; as McEvoy (1971, p. 4) points out, "many resource managers would welcome . . . landscape rating scales since it will give them a number to point to if anyone asks 'did you consider the beauty of the region before flooding it?' "

Finally, the criteria that different landscape evaluation studies employ are too disparate to compare their results. In each county and borough survey, "techniques have tended either to be discarded or to be radically changed, so that they fit more closely to the particular concept of landscape held by each individual researcher. This . . . has effectively prevented the majority of techniques from being applied in more than a very few landscapes" (Blacksell and Gilg 1975, p. 135).

The subjective nature of landscape evaluation long went unnoticed. Evaluators themselves typically assumed that they were dealing with scientific facts about landscape esthetics, not just with their own scenic values. Recent studies have shown, however,
how subjective are many purportedly objective evaluations of landscape (Jones 1972; Crofts and Cooke 1974; University of Manchester 1976 pp. 91-96; Penning-Rowsell 1977). In response, landscape evaluators now contend that their criteria and methods of evaluation incorporate or mirror public consensus. Public ratings of landscape photographs guide some evaluators in choosing and scoring landscape criteria. Other planners claim that their views, based on long experience, reflect not merely personal taste but an informed assessment of public preferences. Others claim their conclusions parallel known tastes. Still others change their criteria or their weightings to yield results that conform with received opinion (Coventry-Solihull-Warwickshire 1971, pp. 136-39, Gilg 1975). These studies confirm what we have already surmised, not because they objectify perceptual preferences but rather because investigators alter their schemata to fit what is already known.

A handful of analysts have actually asked the public to indicate its landscape preferences (Penning-Rowsell 1977). But in most cases public consultation is illusory, and supposed public tastes mainly replicate the investigator's own. Surveys of public preferences, however empirically based, reflect professional criteria (Penning-Rowsell 1974, p. 9). The wording of questions, the choice of vocabulary, the derivation of landscape categories, the use of photographs or other surrogates for actual scenes, all display the investigator's biases. Instead of asking people what landscapes they liked, Zube and others (1975, pp. 165-66) and Shafer and others (1969) analyzed preferred photographs for such abstruse values as textural contrast and perimeter of intermediate vegetation - components of which the respondents themselves knew nothing and would have had trouble conceiving.

Planners also influence public responses by the way they pose their queries.
When people are asked how they think others would rate a set of landscapes, they supply judgments that are less diverse and hence more useful to planners than when they are asked for purely personal assessments. Many public evaluation surveys impose such a consensual perspective by requiring respondents to give not their own views but the conventional wisdom (Brush 1976, pp. 49–52; Elmes 1968; Shafer et al. 1969).

Preferences reported in landscape evaluation studies mainly reflect the tastes of the investigators. That Bedfordshire's highest quality landscapes include parks and the chalk escarpment is not unexpected, for woodlands and downs score high in the rating criteria (Cowley 1973). The most "idyllic" places in West Sussex feature ornamental woods, historic manor houses, and scenic slopes, qualities inherent in the classical landscape paintings the consultant used to validate the model (Tandy 1971, p. 4).

Academics as well as planners parade their own tastes as survey results. For Linton (1968), Scottish scenic attractiveness increases with relief, steepness of slope, abruptness, and wildness; not surprisingly, his preferred areas are rugged mountains (Appleton 1975a, p. 245, 1975b, p. 121). For Sargent (1966; 1967), "the greater the distance (and the broader the panorama) one can see . . . the more scenic the vista"; inevitably, Sargent's preferred Vermont landscapes are visible from afar. For Leopold (1969, p. 44), "the grandeur or majesty of a river is dependent upon a combination of its size and apparent speed"; naturally, his preferred streams are large and swift.

The information that landscape evaluation yields on favored landscapes is thus trivial and expectable: that people are especially fond of mountains, forests, and farmlands, natural as opposed to artificial scenes, bodies of water, scenic variety and diversity comes as no surprise. Landscape evaluation does not expand our understanding of why people are attached to any type of landscape.
SURVEYS OF PUBLIC PREFERENCE. Questionnaires and interviews that deliberately elicit public tastes, unlike landscape evaluation studies, can shed light on landscape attachments. But bias flaws such inquiries. The very act of response alters what we think: favored landscapes that come first to mind may differ from those we list and from others we would later choose. Some are reluctant to reveal what landscapes especially appeal to them. Kaplan (1977, p. 146) maintains that people 'actually like to express their environmental preference', but my own interviews sometimes meet with embarrassed reserve (Lowenthal 1966, p. 128).

The less sophisticated the respondent, the more constrained and impoverished the response is apt to be. Many lack appropriate words to articulate their tastes. People seldom describe landscapes in visual terms, even those they are looking at; instead they characterize scenes by value judgments (beautiful or ugly), by features they contain, or by their own experiences. Those who seem to enjoy a view because of its visual qualities often attribute their pleasure to associations—they like the scene because they see their car down below, spot the luncheon site, recognize roads and villages.

How far public preferences for landscapes coincide with those of experts is a matter of dispute. Zube and others (1975, p. 156) claim considerable concurrence and suggest that differences are partly due to time lag: landscapes that professionals appreciated twenty years ago may be those the public admires today. Trained observers and the general public exhibit marked disparity, however, in their capacity to express, if not to experience, visual delight.

Few surveys have yet been carried out that truly reflect public opinion, and their results are both meager and contradictory. Woodland and farmland, with long views of unspoiled countryside, held most appeal for Penning-Rowsell's (1977) Hertfordshire
respondents. Extensive and focused views, sweeping panoramas, and lots of
clouds characterized landscape slides Californians found most attractive (Craik 1972,
pp. 302-3). Rugged topography, heavy tree cover, bodies of water, the natural, the
primitive, and the colorful correlated with best-liked landscape photographs in
Massachusetts (Zube et al 1975, pp. 165-66; Zube 1973, p. 375) and among forest
visitors (Shafer et al 1969; Calvin et al 1972). Philadelphia residents, on the other
hand, evinced a decided preference for parklike over natural landscapes, with grass,
shade trees, and patterns reflecting man's occupancy and impact (Rabinowitz and
Coughlin 1970). Other urban dwellers yearned for wild, green, mountainous, and
sea-girt or lake-locked rural settings, while actually enjoying rich, lively, clean,
green and "natural" urban scenes (Lowenthal and Riel 1972; S. Kaplan 1975, p. 97;
Peterson 1967; Jackson and Johnston 1972).

These preliminary findings scarcely permit even tentative conclusions about
landscape preferences. Public responses to interviews and questionnaires lend credence,
however, to the known diversity of tastes. Because landscape attachments require
cultural and historical explanations, they are necessarily specific to particular peoples
and epochs.
III. PROSPECTIVE RESEARCH: UNDERSTANDING HOW LANDSCAPE ATTACHMENTS VARY

The preceding section reviewed the published evidence and the approaches thus far used to identify favored landscapes and localities and to explain the attachments they engender. Most of what is known comes from those inspired to create and improve such places, write about them, or paint them. While such materials make it possible to trace historical changes in landscape taste and to explore differences among cultures, the tastes they record are mainly those of a small and unrepresentative elite. Mass preferences can be deduced only in part from the popular appeal of surviving landscapes and of books and pictures that celebrate their charms.

Knowledge of tourist movements supplements this evidence. From the European Grand Tour to date, sightseers have voted their preferences with their feet; the popularity of famous beauty spots and pilgrimage sites partly reflects their presumed attractiveness. Guidebooks add further evidence, highlighting places most tourists choose to see. But it must be remembered that Baedeker and other guides have sought to educate public taste, not merely to follow it.

Visitor numbers signal some but not all preferred landscapes; they are biased in favor of accessible places and neglect others which people might enjoy but cannot easily reach. Before England's great country houses and landscaped grounds were opened to the public, few dreamed they would become so widely popular. A large part of every country is private property closed to outsiders, and landscapes and locales that are open to view are seldom representative of those that are not.
Statistical techniques of mental mapping and landscape evaluation add little of consequence to the written record and other known preferences. Numbers attached to landscape traits and formulae derived from preference ratings mainly validate the conventional wisdom and locate favored areas in expected places.

Straightforward surveys to determine what landscapes and localities people enjoy have yet to be undertaken. Asking people to consider their attachments to landscapes risks imposing bias, but could yield valuable insights. Plans for such a survey of landscape attitudes in Britain are now under consideration.

This section raises several issues which deserve consideration as variables in landscape attachment. Some problems touched upon in the introductory section are discussed here in a problem-solving context. Four topics especially require clarification and understanding: general concepts of landscape; types and attributes of favored landscapes; varieties of landscape experience; and differences among individual and group responses to landscapes.

WHAT "LANDSCAPE" MEANS

What is a landscape? As noted on page 5, a landscape is neither a work of art nor a specific object, nor does it remain constant; instead it is amorphous, continually altering, impossible to dissociate from neighbouring areas, and it surrounds observers who are in it. What distinguishes landscape from milieu, environment, locality? Are all landscapes out of doors; if not, how do we classify indoor landscapes? What landscape categories do people commonly employ, and how do they vary with culture?
One geographer (Meinig 1976) distinguished ten different landscape connotations -- as nature, habitat, artifact, system, problem, wealth, ideology, history, place, and esthetic. (The list could easily be extended; its purpose is heuristic.) Each connotative meaning evokes a different landscape image, and those attachments that specially concern us here -- esthetic, ideology, habitat, place -- carry quite different implications for the very nature of landscape.

LANDSCAPES SEEN AS PICTURES. Consider the esthetic connotation. The word "landscape" itself is an artifact of European art history, a consequence of post-Renaissance painting in which scenery, at first only a background to historical, religious, or mythic events, came to be admired for its own sake. Landscape paintings habituated viewers to look at the real world as a series of static, contrived views. Although we no longer use the Claude glass to make the landscape in front of us a picture, we still tend to consider scenery a detached object to be appreciated like a painting. The very notion of judging landscape stems from this pictorial inheritance. Landscapes are frequently appreciated less for their environmental attributes than as artistic compositions.

No wonder then that the public finds "landscape" a hard word. In many interviews questions about "landscape" draw a blank, while the alternative term "countryside" evokes a ready response. This word has a rural and natural bias, dismissing even the possibility of urban scenery. Yet nowadays the countryside is largely what "scenery" has come to represent; it is the rural landscape that urban outsiders view for pleasure. But public uneasiness with "landscape" is matched by experts' repugnance for "countryside." "He is a worthy man," writes Lees-Milne (1975, p. 54), "and earnestly loves the countryside. (I find myself writing this awful word, although
'country' is what I mean)." Such terms call to mind the post-holiday dialogue between two secretaries (New Yorker 1955):

"You get so tired with nothing but scenery all the time,"

"Yes, but you get even more tired and bored without any scenery."

"Well, I guess. But I like it better when there's mostly landscape and not so much scenery."

"Well, I guess. But then most of the scenery was gone when we were there. There were just mountains and things."

THE COMPLEX NATURE OF LANDSCAPES. Multiplicity of form and feature and lack of definite boundaries make landscapes extremely difficult to classify. It is easy to find categories of coins or chairs, conifers or mammals: each specimen is distinct and constant, differing from others according to explicit aspects of form, structure, genesis, decoration, iconography, scarcity, or whatever. But how can a landscape be classified? Their sizes, shapes, and components differ; they are observed from an infinity of standpoints and perspectives; they can change fundamentally over time -- what was once a forest may now be a field, a pasture may become a football ground or a building site. Finally, landscapes are not discrete objects but interleaved parts of a continuum, topologically indefinite components of geographical space that flow without a break into other landscapes, with no distinction between parts and wholes, components and aggregates. To call a stretch of land a "mountain" is arbitrary, for the mountain may also form part of a range and be an aggregate of spurs and furrows, cliffs and ravines.

Even if landscape components "tend to fall into recognizable visual groups," one team of planners concludes, "no two landscapes are ever likely to be exactly the same.
because of the infinite variation in the combinations of the controlling factors" (University of Manchester 1976, p. 45). Nor does perception provide an adequate basis for landscape categories. As Santayana (1896, p. 134) put it, "psychologically speaking, there is no such thing as a landscape; what we call such is an infinity of different scraps and glimpses given in succession." The public shares this uncertainty. One interviewer reports "widely different views" about what constitutes a landscape, and several respondents felt that so many factors affected landscape attractiveness they could not specify which places they liked best (Penning-Rowsell 1977, p. 20). As a forest recreation manager concluded apropos America's national parks, "to rate one more attractive than the others is like asking a person which is more valuable, your eyesight or hearing" (Catton 1966, pp. 185-86). Land-use consultants to the Scottish Countryside Commission similarly thought it "unrealistic to compare the quality of a mountain-top with the quality of a marsh; each may be good of its kind, but whether a mountain-top is 'better' than a marsh depends on personal preference . . . There can be no general comparison" (University of Manchester 1976, p. 48).

Nor are landscapes uniformly seen in terms of selected foci against a neutral background. "Designating landscape types as conspicuous and limited visual nodes," explains one landscape architect (Litton 1972, p. 278), necessarily omits from consideration "most of the undifferentiated continuum." This conforms with our general experience of landscape, which "does consist of an extensive fabric enlivened by concentrated points of visual interest." Some people perhaps do habitually see landscape as figure and ground, as Litton suggests; but to others it may be more like wallpaper hung with pictures, a collage, clusters of detail set against generalized forms, or commingled order and chaos. Each of these perceptual perspectives implies a different cognitive
PHYSICAL FEATURES AND ESTHETIC QUALITIES. What qualities then attach us to landscapes, endow them with special virtues, dispose us to value them? Touchstones have long been sought to reduce the untidy medley of our tastes to rational order. Some would replace landscape components with esthetic abstractions. In their view, landscape quality is to be found not in the objects themselves — landform and relief, vegetation and water — but only in their properties — rhythm, focal points, balance, scale, harmony of form and line and color, textural contrast and overall unity (Jones 1972, p. 14; Sircello 1975, p. 11). Such qualities do merit attention. But the presence and disposition of trees, rocks, water, sky, terrain are not reducible to proportion, balance, scale, harmony; they are freighted with meaning simply as physical objects. Sky, forest, and mountains compel our attention not only as ensembles, but individually: stars and constellations, trees and branches, peaks and passes all have particular associations for us.

Such elements may matter far more than their apparent magnitude suggests: Often what impresses us most will form but a very small portion of that visible beauty. That beauty may, for instance, be composed of lovely flowers and glittering streams, and blue sky, and white clouds; and yet the thing that impresses us most, and which we should be sorriest to lose, may be a thin grey film on the extreme horizon; but because . . . the grey film is known to mean a mountain ten thousand feet high, inhabited by a race of noble mountaineers, we are solemnly impressed by the aspect of it; and yet . . . we think we are only enjoying the visible scene (Ruskin 1886, III, 281).
Our appreciation of landscape elements depends on our evaluation of their functional role as well as of their appearance. Thus a century ago Hamerton (1885, p. 399) noted that the evil effect of railroads and engineering architecture operated "rather by its suggestion of hurry and business to the mind than by real offence to the eye"; if you imagine "that the embankment is an ancient military earthwork and the viaduct a Roman aqueduct, . . . they both immediately become much more easily harmonized with the landscape."

Traits and features, meanings and association, perspectives and ways of viewing all figure in our choice of cherished landscapes. We need a comprehensive taxonomy of landscapes that incorporates all these diverse components.

IDENTIFYING THE COMPONENTS OF FAVORED LANDSCAPES.

What kinds of landscape and locality command widespread attention and affection, and why? What terms come to mind that reflect our landscape experiences and preferences? Seashores, valleys, islands, mountains, moorlands, gardens, forests, cliffs, promontories, waterfalls, caverns, volcanoes, meadows, parks, heaths, farms, fields, pastures, deserts -- these are places that ordinary folk enjoy, not the categories of professional landscape designers. Each term covers a wide range of landscapes, yet each describes a distinctive, recognizable type, with its own unique history of attachment and devotion. I have noted the 16th to 18th century transition from mountain gloom to mountain glory, the change in garden taste from paradise to geometry to naturalistic. Heaths had similar appeal for 19th-century Danes
seeking solitude and romance (Olwig 1977), moorlands for 20th-century British wilderness lovers (Shoard 1978).

CLASSIFYING LANDSCAPE TYPES. These landscape terms likewise convey diverse images of scale and content. Some terms, like mountains and valleys, principally evoke terrain and landform. Some imply configuration and contrast: seashore, island, cliff, and promontory. Others are defined by vegetation: moors and heaths, parks and gardens, meadows and (by its absence) deserts. Waterfalls and volcanoes attract through their activity, actual or potential; seashores and rivers also beguile through movement. Some terms describe features rather than landscapes or aggregates: caverns, mountain peaks, waterfalls. Farms, pastures and fields are discerned, if not defined, in terms of use and function.

People do not normally deal in such categories, but experience each landscape as a melange of structure and cover, form and boundary, appearance and function, feature and aggregate. But they habitually value landscapes for their terrain, their vegetation, distinctive boundaries, variety and contrast, or uniqueness – qualities which can overshadow attachments to particular features. When and how such terms are used to praise landscapes needs to be better known.

Evaluative terms that denote interest, satisfaction, and attachment also deserve attention in studies of landscape taste. These range from admiration for such qualities as "smooth," "rich," "new," or "old" (Lowenthal and Riel 1972, No. 8) to terms like
prospect" and "refuge" (Appleton 1975a) or "variety," "unity," and "vividness" (Litton 1972, p. 284). Terms of admiration such as "beautiful," "pretty," "exciting," "cosy," "dreamy," "enthralling," "awe-inspiring" and "expressive" provide insight into changes in landscape taste since the demise of "sublime" and "picturesque" (Stolnitz 1961), and help us to distinguish esthetic from non-esthetic components in landscape enjoyment.

Contemporary inquiries are needed to supplement evidence of historical attachments to particular kinds of landscape. While Nicolson (1959) and others have examined earlier tastes for mountains, the tastes that animate folk today, from mountain climbers to collectors of Fujiyama postcards, are little understood.

AN EXAMPLE: THE LURE OF THE MOORS. The qualities moorland devotees find desirable exemplify the complex nature of landscape tastes. Through interviews with leaders of countryside causes, Shoard (1978) explores the reasons that persuade some Britons to admire landscapes other people regard as bleak, desolate, and dangerous. Though not numerous, lovers of moorland have powerfully influenced the British countryside movement; largely through their tastes and efforts moorland figures prominently in all but one of Britain's designated national parks.

Those fond of moorland combine a passion for wilderness, openness, and unrestricted access with a taste for a kind of terrain and vegetation -- a rough, undulating, irregular, largely undifferentiated upland, devoid of man and his work -- which satisfies their need to experience elemental nature alone, remote from others. Moors are enjoyed less for their beauty than for the sense of space and freedom and isolation they impart.

To subsume these preferences within a purely esthetic framework would omit or falsify essential elements of moorland attraction.
Another common element in moorland taste is a fondness for their ancient or primeval quality. The sense of antiquity may, as on Dartmoor, be associated with artifacts of ancient cultures, but moorland devotees generally prefer to feel that their favored landscapes antedate any human presence. Many of them are well aware that this is not the case, that man's removal of the original forest cover in fact created the moors, but this knowledge does not diminish their pleasure in the wild, primeval flavor of the moorland landscape.

PREFERENCES FOR WILD AND CULTIVATED LANDSCAPES. The preference for nature wild rather than improved is not yet widespread. Even after the Romantic movement had endowed mountains and chasms with sublimity, most people continued to prefer long-cultivated landscapes of park, garden and farm. Younghusband (1920, pp. 6-7) felt that man had improved on nature's handiwork: "we have in places made the Earth more beautiful than it was before we came." England's river valleys were lovely before human occupancy, "but not so beautiful as now. They must have been an unrelieved mass of forest and marsh. Now the marshes are drained and turned into golden meadows. The woods are cleared in part and well-kept parks take their place." London's St. James's Park, artificially planted and landscaped, with Westminster Abbey and the Houses of Parliament as backdrops, was "certainly more beautiful than the same piece of land was two thousand years ago in its natural condition," Stapleton (1942, p. 3) saw the trend toward wilderness adulation as a misguided attempt to atone for the rape of the earth. "It is only because we mistrust ourselves and have become ravagers and wantons that so very many of is have an almost morbid longing for scenery untouched by man" (see Kolodny 1975). The growth of concern over pollution and
environmental despoliation, the spread of ecological awareness, from Leopold's (1949) land ethic (Nash 1967, pp. 182-99) to McHarg's (1969) environmentalism, have contributed to the belief that truth and beauty lodge in wild landscapes.

These attitudes are voiced mainly in the United States, however, and even there only by an elite minority (Zube et al 1975, p. 155; Nash 1967; Lowenthal 1964, 1970; Graber 1976). Landscapes perceived as ancient and untouched principally attract well-educated city-dwellers (Hendee et al. 1968). Little is known about how far the public at large shares wilderness tastes (Lucas 1964) or of how preferences for "natural" and "manmade" landscapes vary from country to country.

The landscape's apparent rather than its actual origin is that matters, however. Just as Hamerton (1885) suggested beautifying a railroad viaduct by imagining it as a Roman aqueduct, so with moorlands can presumed naturalness endear a landscape (Shoard 1978). Landscape assemblages and details are most attractive when their origins, meaning, and function conform with the viewer's presuppositions. Such opinions underlie even the simplest, most straightforward environmental tastes and attachments.

LANDSCAPE QUALITIES SEEN AS INHERENTLY DESIRABLE. Favored qualities may indeed be wholly independent of the perceived landscape. Preconceptions about traits that ought to be associated with highly valued locales can overwhelm actual perception. Whether beach users preferred crowded, urban locales or empty, natural sites, they all characterized their favorite beaches as larger, cleaner, and with smoother sand than other beaches (Peterson and Neumann 1969). Observers regarded preferred locales in four American cities as smooth, rich, vivid, clean, ordered, fresh, and light,
notwithstanding actual differences among these locales (Lowenthal and Riel 1972, Nos. 1-5). Some environmental qualities seem so compellingly desirable in principle that they get attributed to almost any favored scene, however incongruous. A taxonomy of these qualities explaining their persuasive power should form part of a catalogue raisonné of well-liked localities and landscape characteristics.

HOW LANDSCAPE ATTACHMENTS VARY WITH EXPERIENCE AND PERSPECTIVE

Landscapes and locales elicit affection that is passionate or passive, enduring or evanescent. The way we happen to experience places may explain why we hold them especially dear. A glimpse of an unexpected paradise, a growing fondness for an initially humdrum street, a pattern of fields seen in an instant of ecstasy, a luminous landscape portrayed in a painting--such circumstances may endear a place for a moment or forever. Understanding these conditions of landscape experience and response illumines the nature of, and the reasons for, preference.

LANDSCAPE FEELINGS VARY IN INTENSITY. Exceptional occasions of ecstasy connected with particular places and particular times afford valuable clues to highly valued landscapes. "Peak experiences of topophilia" (love of place) notes Relph (1976, p. 123), "may give us a feeling of joy, ecstasy, of awe or despair, of unity with our surroundings, of perfection... -- a particular setting because of its form or our inclinations toward it enters our consciousness in a profound way." Such experiences "constitute a touchstone by which we can judge all our other experiences of landscapes." As Ansel Adams wrote of Yosemite (in Graber 1976, p. 41): 
My first impression of the Valley -- white water, azaleas, cool fir caverns, tall pines and solid oaks, cliffs rising to undreamed-of heights, the poignant sounds and smells of the Sierra ... was a culmination of experience so intense as to be almost painful. From that day in 1916 my life has been colored and modulated by the great earth-gesture of the Sierra.

Intense attachment to landscape of any kind is more characteristic of some epochs than others. During the Middle Ages, for example, landscapes were rarely of deep interest, and Renaissance taste was formalized and restrained. But 18th-century "sublimity" reflected a new taste for awesome greatness; travelers now thought it appropriate to swoon with joy when climbing a mountain or viewing a panorama. And 19th-century nature worship institutionalized environmental ecstasies that earlier generations would have found inconceivable.

Landscapes and viewpoints that once excited perfervid admiration have now, however, become expected, habitual sights.

Many of the people who, on their traditional trip to the Alps, ecstatically gaze at the snow of the mountain tops and at the azure of the transparent distance, do so now out of a sense of duty; ... they are simulating an emotion which they do not actually feel. ... To a few the landscape is still delightful. But hardly anybody feels the delight is so great, so overpowering, that he is moved to tears (van der Berg 1965, in Relph 1976, p. 128).

Similarly, the natural scenes that evoked divinity for Wordsworth's generation today seem indifferent, meaningless, even absurd (Hepburn 1963). So too with creative images. "We have many accounts of people at mid-century being moved to tears by a Thomas Cole landscape, so great were its religious and philosophical associations."
The same painting is viewed today with a dryer eye (Reiff 1972, p. 40).

If ecstatic experiences of landscape are nowadays unsuitable for public display, they still occur in other circumstances. Of growing import is the mystical contemplation of landscape based on Zen, Tao, and other Eastern lore and precept. Just as ancient Chinese and Japanese philosopher and poets sought intimate, intuitive contact with nature's sacred power, so their 20th-century followers find transcendence in communion with wilderness. The landscape photographs of Eliot Porter and Ansel Adams capture this numinous spirit, exemplified in the extraordinarily successful Sierra Club portfolios (Graber 1976, pp. 65-71).

The differences between such visionary landscapes and those that we admire more coolly and steadfastly are well delineated by Aldous Huxley (1954). As Shepard (1967, p. 40), suggests, "the visionary landscape is either distant and panoramic or intimately close and detailed -- seldom the middle ground of the human scale." These perceptual extremes also characterize well-loved landscapes seen from a great distance in time or space (pages 49-52).

Because ecstatic occasions usually take place under extreme conditions of light or weather, mood or circumstance, they are apt to involve landscapes that are unlike those we normally admire. An intensely joyous awareness of swirling mists on mountain summits, bright moonlight along tree-lined rural roads, or an aurora borealis above storm-tossed arctic waters need not imply permanent attachments to these locales.

A highly valued landscape may be the locus of one unique experience or of many accumulated over time. Attachment to any landscape derives from immediate perception, from a long history of associations, or from both. A typology of landscape awareness incorporating the rare but intensely felt, occasional enjoyment of novel scenes, and habitual
delight in familiar places could yield a fuller picture of locales that we specially cherish.

**NOVELTY AND FAMILIARITY ENHANCE LANDSCAPE ATTACHMENTS.** Landscape attraction increases sometimes with novelty, sometimes with familiarity. Familiarity is essential if landscapes are valued for their social and intimate qualities. Previously unknown places scarcely attract us if nothing about them can be recognized. Indeed, recognition sometimes seems reason enough for liking places; people enjoy being able to identify features of any scene. Familiarity bolsters fondness even after localities have deteriorated, enabling us to see the landscape as it was rather than as it is. "Successive visits perpetuate a preference for the familiar, though despoiled, landscape," Price (1976, p. 834) suggests.

Yet we also revel in landscape experiences that are novel. Tourists flock to the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, Pisa, and Venice because they are not merely spectacular but also unique, offering experience utterly out of the ordinary (Wohlwill 1974, p. 6). Novelty, as Ruskin (1886, III, 292-93) puts it, "quickens observation, sharpens sensation, and exalts sentiment." And pleasure decays with prolonged exposure to landscape. Ruskin's enjoyment of scenery when first seen always diminished with familiarity. "By keeping long away from hills, I can in part still restore the old childish feeling about them; and the more I live and work among them, the more it vanishes." Nor did finding new scenes restore the intense delight in landscape; if we "seek to recover the mental energy by more quickly repeated and brighter novelty, it is all over with our enjoyment; . . . if we try to obtain perpetual change, change itself will become monotonous." Delight does not always fade with familiarity -- residents, even regular visitors, may get increasing pleasure from a landscape with the passage of time, enjoying the return of
seasonal or daily scenes. But the keenest response comes when first revisiting a beloved locale.

Familiarity and novelty are both crucial to our enjoyment of landscapes and localities (Herzog et al 1976, pp. 628-29). When identifying those places to which people feel especially attached, we should also inquire how much the accustomed, how much the unusual, contribute to that attachment.

DISTANCE AND MEMORY ALTER IMAGES OF FAVORED LANDSCAPES. The lineaments of, and values inherent in, a landscape differ strikingly to the observer on the spot and to one who has not visited the area for a long time or is trying to discern it from afar. Yet temporal and physical distance are variables often overlooked when preferences are ascertained.

What do we recall of landscapes seen a hour ago, yesterday, last week, six months ago, a year, ten years, or more? The lapse of time affects the quantity and quality of remembered impression; each temporal remove highlights some features, deletes or distorts others, and alters our view of the whole. The frequency and duration of experience as well as its remoteness in time affect our recall. But landscapes not seen for a long time, like visionary scenes, are often valued most for general impressions or for features close at hand -- a memorable house, tree, street, or field. The passage of time also makes landscape images more pictorial, smoothing out the aberrant and eliminating the inconsequential.

Precious childhood landscapes especially combine dreamy impression with vivid and minute detail. They are also suffused with life and animation, full of forms and features used for venture and concealment:

In these special places he will always remember with peculiar reverence, the
child's play is... hiding, stalking, and capture. Pursuit, flight, scuffling, and organizing are woven through secret hides, cherished trees or thickets, rock piles or dumps, basements and alleys (Shepard 1967, p. 35).

These early impressions endure despite subsequent alterations both in ourselves and in the landscapes. We remain profoundly devoted to scenes which may no longer exist. Fancied resemblances of new to childhood landscapes may reawaken the sensate immediacy of our early years. Intensity of recall and openness to environmental experience both depend on childhood exposure to landscapes (Sonnenfeld 1966; Tuan 1977, pp. 19-23).

Physical distancing involves similar perceptual transitions (Cornish 1935, p. 73). The landscape close at hand is a mosaic of multiform detail; seen far off it becomes a more uniform whole. Distance does lend enchantment; markers at scenic viewpoints emphasize the remoteness of places on the horizon. Merely to recognize a city or a river from three miles up may be the airborne traveler's finest landscape experience. Like time, distance smooths and obliterates unwanted detail, erasing all but the grandest forms and features. Atmospheric moisture and reduced scale make distant scenes more composed and organized than those near by.

Distant landscapes seldom surround one as do those close at hand. The immediate scene is as palpable just behind and beside us as in front. But toward distant vistas we face forward as though the whole world were in front of us. The hill climber, the woodland walker, even the city stroller is conscious of the horizon ahead, seldom of what lies behind or far to the side. Only the sea, the moors, and the night sky leave us islanded in space, perhaps because the immediate landscape cannot be differentiated from the remote.
Some landscapes are never actually seen but only imagined from afar. These unvisited landscapes and localities for each of us comprise most of the world; the places we have seen or can ever hope to see are but a small fraction of the total. Our impressions of unseen places owe much to known locales, whose features and attributes we generalize and idealize to suit our desires (Porter and Lukermann 1976). Invisibility leaves the mind’s eye to furnish a substitute; thus “when the Casterbridge Ramblers set out from Kingston, thick fog enshrouded the Purbeck Hills. . . . They had to imagine the glorious views they would otherwise have enjoyed” (Dorset Evening Echo 1971).

How do imagined realms differ from favored localities we have actually experienced? Like locales distant in space or time, they are essentially physical scenes rather than social milieus, simpler and more uniform than those near at hand, yet concentrating delectable traits within a small compass. They include particular places: the Taj Mahal, the Pyramids, Ankor Wat, Machu Picchu, St. Marks, the Eiffel Tower, and similar marvels, most manmade. We also idealize certain landscape types, often derived from images in fiction or painting: Thomas Mann’s Swiss mountains, W.H. Hudson’s pampas and Orinoco rain forests, Lawrence Durrell’s Alexandrian street scenes and Cypriot citrus groves. In our mind’s eye these locales assume the luster of advertisements and fictional celebrations that make them larger than life. The very names of such places and landscape types can conjure up a delectable scene.

Highly prized landscapes thus fit into a spectrum of experience ranging from places we are in now to places we have never been to. In between are locales experienced at various removes of time and distance, recalled to mind and heart by memory and imagination. The configuration and components of our admired landscapes
depend in part on how well we know them through immediate experience, through recall, or through the eyes and ideas of others.

Immediately experienced landscapes surround us, involve us, and focus our attention on detail; landscapes distant in space and time are more selectively perceived and coherent in form and content; landscapes we have never visited commingle general impressions with featured highlights. But most experience combines all these types of perspective. We see familiar landscapes through the lenses of imagined ones, just as those we have never seen are shaped by the places we have experienced. When we identify highly favored locales and explain their appeal, we should attend to how they are principally experienced. Realms known mainly through sensate experience, through memory, and through fantasy may all attract us for quite different reasons.

**ACTUAL LANDSCAPES DIFFER FROM PICTURES OF THEM.** However familiar a landscape may be, our impressions of, and attachments to, it are partly based on surrogate images in pictures and written descriptions. Most surrogates are pictorial representations that approximate actual forms and features. Drawings and paintings, photographs and movies more or less faithfully reproduce landscapes and locales. Sometimes surrogate images are indelible; "we can scarcely visualize Provence except as a creation of Cezanne, the American desert other than through Hollywood and TV Westerns, or Dorset save as a scene in a novel by Thomas Hardy" (Lowenthal and Prince 1976, p. 125). Countless pictures of canyons and waterfalls influence our ideas of how the Grand Canyon and Niagara Falls ought to look. Even seeing snapshots of our own homes may give us a different insight into how they actually appear.

Each type of surrogate persuades us to examine and admire landscapes in a different way.
Books and paintings bring together their creators' own environmental experience, lend everyday vision a heightened luster, shed new light on familiar scenes. . . . Monet makes us aware that trees are not always green, and that shapes change with the intensity of light and the mood of the hour. A Wilson Harris jungle is not simply a rain forest but a universe where terrain and vegetation take on mythic dimensions. . . . The artist's strength of feeling enriches our excursions through places and past things with tension and passion (Lowenthal and Prince 1975, p. 125).

Paintings and drawings convey the essence of scenes by simplifying and exaggerating, focusing on some forms and features, ignoring or subordinating others, Our eyes usually do this with landscapes, too. But the picture transforms the scene by superimposing the artist's view; "a drawing of a tree shows, not a tree, but a tree-being-looked-at" (Berger 1977, p. 82). Landscape paintings and drawings, unlike the world we see, are directed and intentional. Painted scenes, real or archetypal, focus attention more than any actual landscape.

Landscape photography has reflected several ideals, emphasizing in turn prettiness, verisimilitude, contrasts of light and texture, collage and superimposition, movement and transience (Graber 1976, pp. 58-65). The camera achieves, as the painter cannot, a complexity of texture and a variety of form which approximate reality. But landscapes in photographs are flat, framed, bounded, static, solely visual, and optically distorted. Some of these defects they share with paintings -- scale, dimensionality, the absence of ambient surroundings. But paintings are less apt than photographs to be presented or perceived as substitutes for real landscapes. Most observers do not see landscape drawings, "even slightly, as mirror images of their real-world counterparts"
Because photographic representations are stable, fixed, cheap, easy to compare and to analyze in quantifiable fashion, they often replace real environments in landscape evaluation surveys. But the drawbacks of simulation and the defects of surrogates are manifold. Pictures never replicate reality; they collapse three dimensions into two, present landscapes at scales smaller than they normally appear, frame or edge boundaries artificially, distort background and side areas, abstract visual from other sensate experience, and exaggerate the picturesque perspective. Most photographs are meant to be pictorial, and scenes deliberately posed and framed are inevitably viewed more as pictures -- that is, works of art -- than in the myriad ways we regard landscapes (Rabinowitz and Coughlin 1970, pp. 35-41; Weinstein 1976, p. 622; Brush 1976, p. 51).

Landscape judgments based on surrogates may conform with choices made on site, but the concurrence does not remove the distinctions (Coughlin and Goldstein 1970, pp. 12-13).

Photographs, drawings, and paintings differ in the temporal depth of their delineated scenes. Photos are instantaneous impressions; only our own memories or the age of the photograph can lend the scene a sense of time. Drawings, and above all paintings, take time to create -- one or more sittings in various circumstances of daylight or season -- and involve the painter's own memory, not just what is now before his eyes (Berger 1977). Photographs abbreviate immediate experience, paintings lengthen involvements with landscape.

Just as we form attachments to unseen places, so may we feel attracted to landscapes because photos or paintings of them have impressed us. Familiarity with pictures helps to determine landscape choices. Scenic lookouts in American national parks seem unnatural, (Graber 1976, p. 51) suggests, because they were "selected for their resemblance to romantic landscape art" and for their
suitability as postcards and snapshots.

Landscapes well liked in their own right are likely, however, to be quite different from those admired in the first instance through surrogate images. A garden's reflections in an Impressionist painting, the desert dunes in Sierra Club photographs, portray landscapes that may seem less admirable when encountered in reality. "The brightly colored representations of Western scenes in the promotional pamphlets . . . were so different from what [tourists] were likely to see with mortal eyes"; they could not reconcile photographs of a profusion of desert blooms "with the alkali dust stretching along either side of a four-lane highway" (Pomeroy 1957, p. 217). As Priestley (1937, p. 92) put it, "what is this real world after those shiny folders?"

A SENSE OF CRISIS INTENSIFIES ATTACHMENT TO LANDSCAPES. People are seldom aware how much a place means to them until development threatens to alter or extinguish it, or they are forced to leave it. Attachment to a landscape waxes passionate only when the Central Electricity Generating Board, the Forestry Commission, or the Department of the Environment intrudes with a power line, a forest, or a highway; the virtues of locales become patent when we have to fight for them. The sense of crisis also transforms private sentiments into public causes; as people realize that others share their attachments, joint action magnifies common grounds and discourages idiosyncratic motives.

Local sentiment about the projected drainage of Amberley Wildbrooks, in Sussex, illustrates this point. Villagers --mostly commuters and retired people -- once took these wet meadows more or less for granted. But the prospect of drainage and associated works awakened many Amberley folk to the admirable qualities of the Wildbrooks -- silent spacious flatness, the lack of obtrusive evidence of man, sheets of water seasonally interspersed with green meadows, variegated texture and colors of its grasses, rich
plant and bird life, distant grazing cattle. Many Amberley residents might earlier have found it hard to say just why they liked the Wildbrooks. Now reasons come readily to the lips of those animated by a cause.

Landscape attachments gain strength, specificity, and self-consciousness when the status quo is threatened. Even natural, periodic change produces such reactions: we especially welcome foliage when leaves first come out. But change has its greatest impact where it seems permanent rather than seasonal, avoidable rather than inevitable, of human rather than natural agency.

Attachments to landscape and locales are often expressed, if not induced, when we face imminent loss. Memorable celebrations of localities, like Gray's "Elegy in a Country Churchyard" and John Clare's poems describing Helpston on the eve of the agricultural enclosures (Barrell 1972), stem from awareness of the final passing of a well-loved scene. A study tracing attachments to a locality before, during, and after a threatened change, perhaps along the lines of Boyd Gibbons' Wye Island (1977), might document how inchoate attachments become explicit only once again to recede from consciousness.

HOW PEOPLE DIFFER IN THEIR RESPONSE TO LANDSCAPES

How do people differ in their attachments to landscape? Not all variations are attributable to the landscape or to our modes of interaction with it; some responses are peculiar to individuals or to distinctive groups.

THE EFFECT OF PERSONAL SENSITIVITY. In all epochs and cultures, some people exhibit greater sensitivity than others to the world around them. The difference depends on experience, commitment, and personality. Nicholas Davenport (1974, p. 10), a
"Keynesian journalist, relates that he turned down a fellowship at Keble College because he could not bear living in esthetically abhorent surroundings."

Those specially sensitive to environment may have other distinctive traits. A century ago, Ruskin (1886, III, 285) speculated what these might be:

The intense love of nature is, in modern times, characteristic of persons not of the first order of intellect, but of brilliant imagination, quick sympathy, and undefined religious principle, suffering also usually under strong and ill-governed passions.

He went on to name Byron, Keats, Shelley, Burns, George Sand, Dumas, Shenstone, and Mrs. Radcliffe as creative exemplars of these qualities. What qualities would we now connect with landscape affection? Craik (1975, 1976) and McKechnie (1974; Craik and McKechnie 1977) suggest that strong landscape interests do correlate with certain personality traits. "Environmental preference may thus be both an enduring property of an individual and a clue to identifying classes of settings in which consistencies of behavior can be observed" (Kaplan 1977, p. 213).

THE EFFECT OF EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING. Environmental experience has long been thought conducive to landscape appreciation. As Younghusband (1920, p. 7) remarked in the Himalayas, Gilgit frontier folk "had never left their mountains, and were altogether ignorant of the special grandeur of their beauty. They thought all the world was just the same. But men who have seen many varieties of natural beauty and have taken pains to compare . . . become trained to see more beauty in each feature."

Those who travel widely may be able to compare landscapes but remain detached, viewing them all superficially. By contrast, stay-at-homes may form deep attachments which they cannot express in terms of landscape for want of comparative experience (Barr 1972, pp. 91-96, 184).
Training like experience promotes a comparative perspective. This may be why trained observers appear to agree more in their landscape preferences than do others. "The more thorough the education of the aesthetic sense the more closely will men agree about beauty," wrote Bonacina (1921), an opinion echoed by landscape evaluators today (page 31). As with works of art, so with landscapes, experts tend to agree, partly because they share long exposure to received canons of taste.

The untrained public exhibits preferences for exaggerated scenes that are both unique and perceptually undemanding. "The popular landscapes are those in which the lazy or uninterested eye is suddenly jerked into responsiveness by an unusually resonant contrast of tone or colour" (Clark, 1956, p. 98): a stretch of water lit by evening skies and set off by dark trees; the orange light of the evening sun on the hilltops; more specifically, "the crags of the Dolomites made 'too' pink by the sun, the water of the lagoon made 'too' silver by the moon; the blue skies of Greece or Sicily made too deep a blue by the arch in a white wall" (Dorfles 1969, pp. 154-55). Locales with mass appeal -- Niagara Falls, Yellowstone, the grottoes of Postumia, Mont St. Michel -- exhibit a jocular kitsch that both imitates nature and invents artifice. The sophisticate is offended by insignia of celebration -- markers, access roads, tourist kiosks, souvenir stands -- that strike most people as natural concomitants of pilgrimage sites. But the landscapes that now attract the many were once the haunt of the few; mass taste tends to follow elite (page 32) while the elite disdains past attachments.

Training and sophistication narrow as well as broaden perception; professional inclination makes artists and architects less alert to the whole scene than to its individual components. Ruskin conveys the distinction

Suppose that three or four persons come in sight of a group of pine-trees...

The engineer is struck by the manner in which their roots hold the ground,
and sets himself to examine their fibres, in a few minutes retaining little more consciousness of the beauty of the tree than if he were a rope-maker untwisting the strands of a cable; . . . the artist is struck by certain groupings of their colors . . . which he proceeds immediately to note mechanically for future use, with as little feeling as a cook setting down the constituents of a newly discovered dish. To the sentimentalist the sight of the trees calls up some happy association, and presently he forgets them, and pursues the memories they summoned; and an idealist, impressed by the wild coiling of boughs and roots, will begin to change them in his fancy into dragons and monsters (Ruskin 1886, III, 283-84).

But for the man who can contemplate the trees themselves "all these perceptions and trains of ideas are partially present, not distinctly, but in a mingled and perfect harmony . . . The power . . . of fully perceiving any natural object depends on our being able to group and fasten all our fancies about it as a centre." For most people, such holistic perception is rare and fleeting; they wander away from the thing seen to the business of life. "They see and love what is beautiful, but forget their admiration of it in following some train of thought . . . of more personal interest to them."

For any viewer of landscape, however, appreciation expands with practice (page 32). "The power most important to cultivate, and . . . hardest to acquire," as Marsh (1864, p. 10) advised, "is that of seeing what is before him. Sight is a faculty; seeing, an art." The choice of cherished locales and the qualities for which we admire them depend on our practice of that art as well as on our work, our upbringing, our personality traits, and our lifelong experience of landscape. Inquiries into valued landscapes must take account of all these personal variables.
UNIQUELY FAVORED NATIONAL LANDSCAPES. Like individuals, groups with shared experiences and expectations exhibit distinctive preferences for particular places. Every nation has landscapes felt to characterize the country or to symbolize its culture. Attachment to specific localities hallowed by history or folk memory evokes patriotic feeling and fosters national identity. Differences in environment heighten national individuality of taste. Just as the everyday experiences of, say, Finns and Greeks diverge, so do their definitions of, and attachments to, familiar and exotic landscapes.

Nationally favored locales include regions and places, landscapes and landscape types, as seen by two distinct kinds of observer, native and foreign. British residential choices revealed in mental maps show a "Southern Plateau of Desire" with "East Anglian and Welsh Border Prongs" and a "Lake District Dome" (Gould and White 1974, p. 83), and establish the attractiveness of cultural and historic towns and coastal resorts (Dicken and Robinson 1976). Irish school-leavers are attracted to the scenic and coastal west and southwest for both residence and vacation, to Dublin for residence only (Gillmor 1974). These aggregated preferences reflect tastes for landscape types as much as for localities and regions. The replacement of Kent by Merionethshire as the epitome of scenic beauty in late 18th century Britain (page 22) reflects a shift of esthetic interest from rich cultivated land to sublime mountains, not a judgment of county merits.

Differences between local and visitor preferences may indicate a lag in foreigners' awareness of local charms or native reluctance to frequent internationally popular locales, rather than any fundamental divergence of taste. The British avoid Stratford-on-Avon because Americans flock there, though both revere the Lake District. But English seaside resorts are essentially British rather than foreign haunts - most foreign visitors have "better" seasides at home.
The visitor's views condense and exaggerate those of the native. His preferences focus on the special and the unique, types of landscape felt to epitomize what is most remarkable in a particular country, especially when compared with his own. Thus Taine (1957, p. 188) noted that hills on the English horizon were "all drowned in that luminous vapour which melts colour into colour and gives the whole countryside an expression of tender happiness," implying the absence, in France, of such landscapes and of the associated pleasure.

WAYS OF ELICITING NATIONAL LANDSCAPE PREFERENCES. While the affections of visitors are illuminating, it is more important to ascertain the attachments of a country's natives. To assess the popular appeal and symbolic significance of locales in any country requires a wide range of evidence -- information about landscapes that have inspired poets and painters, about the places where citizens take their holidays or retire, about the areas specially protected by national or local government, about the foci of controversy over the use and preservation of landscapes and buildings.

These types of evidence can provide no definitive assessment of landscape tastes, however, but only clues which must be used with caution. Each clue is flawed, biased, incomplete. Places where people elect to visit or live are those they happen to know about and can easily reach or buy; other places, perhaps more attractive, are too inaccessible or expensive (Dunn 1974). "The finest scenery without accommodations," reported an American parks administrator, receives far fewer visitors than "an inferior character of scenery which has a better type of accommodation" (Pomeroy 1957, pp. 199-200). Areas specially protected by governments may be reserved for strategic, economic, ecological, or other motives unrelated to landscape values, even when landscape is the avowed reason. At the same time, many areas of greater appeal to the public rest in the hands of private
entrepreneurs. These cautions must be kept in mind when we seek to identify the most admired locales in any land.

To account for such attachments requires a thorough familiarity both with national landscapes and with their devotees. To ascertain what locales are specially favored and why calls for an understanding of a country's history and institutions that only a native is likely to have. A number of countries may share some elements of landscape perception and preferences, but national tastes and attachments always remain in some measure unique. These unique qualities make the task of comparison difficult but all the more rewarding.
IV. CONCLUSION

This introduction to the study of uniquely favored landscapes has had three distinct aims. I first tried to show why such an inquiry is desirable and discussed the variables that make it challenging. I then reviewed evidence for landscape and locality attachments exhibited by various people at various times in various places. Landscapes specifically created to give pleasure, tourists' and travelers' accounts of visits to favored localities, and written and painted delineations of scenery tell much about the nature of, and reasons for, landscape preference. Professional landscape evaluators have mapped the relative perceived desirability of various tracts of land, but neither these projects nor those that canvass public preferences add much substance to known landscape preferences.

Finally I have posed questions an inquiry into valued landscapes ought to consider. How landscapes are identified and thought about; which landscape components and attributes are discussed and admired; which physical properties and symbolic meanings are highlighted; how purpose, intensity, immediacy, duration, realism, novelty, and a sense of crisis affect landscape experience; how individuals and groups differ in their awareness toward, selection of, and attachment to favored landscapes -- these are themes that especially call for examination. In order to identify uniquely favored locales and account for landscape attachment, we must take all these circumstances into account, otherwise we fail to capture the essential variety of both landscape and life.
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