

tural land have an obligation to assure that the purpose of the restrictions embodied therein is upheld. In exercising this responsibility, conservationists should take care not to impose restrictions on the land that could so limit the flexibility of the farm operator that as a practical business matter agriculture is no longer a possible use of the land. In actual practice, farm operators themselves will understand the nuances of this general proposition and will not be likely to agree to excessive restrictions if they themselves intend to remain on the land.

Perhaps more than anything else, the selection of a competent, conscientious farm operator—one who "comes with" the farm or who expresses an interest in acquiring land conserved by purchase—is the key to assuring sensitive, businesslike farm management. After all, if our goal is to conserve the nation's agricultural capacity and the vitality of the local agriculture industry, we must save farmers as well as the land.

Douglas P. Wheeler, President, American Farmland Trust, Washington, D. C.

PROTECTING RURAL CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Finding Value in the Countryside

Robert Z. Melnick

Introduction

The latest developments in natural and cultural resource preservation are heartening. We are witnessing a metamorphosis of the preservation "movement" from a single-issue concern to a multi-dimensional expression of caring for the world around us. This expression of caring, in the most human sense, is a reflection of both fear and hope for our natural and national treasures. To a certain extent increased activity in all facets of preservation is a response to new threats to these resources, as well as new understandings of the ways in which both natural and cultural resources are vital to our biological and human existence.

This has not always been true. Those concerned with natural resources and those concerned with cultural resources have often viewed themselves at odds with each other. There seemed to be an inherent conflict between caring for wilderness and caring for ancient artifacts. Natural resource conservation and cultural resource preservation seemed to stake out distinct territories, and guard those territories at all costs. Natural resource conservation adhered to a holistic view of the world; a view basic to an ecological understanding of our universe. Cultural resource preservation seemed to be mired in a piece-meal approach. Saving each artifact, whether archeological or architectural, became the goal. There appeared to be purposeful disregard for their interconnections.

One outgrowth of these changing attitudes has been an attempt to bridge some of these gaps through landscape preservation. In one sense, landscape preservation is a desire to understand the way people have purposefully manipulated the natural landscape, and then to save selections of those manipulations, where possible. The term "landscape preservation" is used to distinguish these activities from "wilderness preservation" or "natural resource conservation." It might equally be termed "historic preservation in the landscape." In a different light, these are places which Donald Meinig, the cultural geographer, refers to as "ordinary landscapes." "We specify ordinary landscapes," says Meinig, "to indicate our primary interest in that continuous surface which we can see all around us."¹

These ordinary landscapes, places which people have settled, lived in, manipulated, altered and developed, are reflections of the settlement of this country. These rural cultural landscapes have evolved over time; often through many generations. If we look at them carefully, they display the imprint of human occupation and the cultural response to natural forces and elements in the landscape.

This country is rich in both natural and cultural wealth. We are all familiar with the arguments concerning natural resource conservation, as well as the need to preserve great monuments of architectural wonders. Recent efforts have even been directed towards "industrial" and "commercial archeology." This concept may appear to contradict the very essence of sound archeological research. We may understand it, however, as a desire to save what is only recently old, before it disappears with other remnants of the American landscape. Preservation of relatively recent historical artifacts is a response to a panic situation; a situation in which people see so much destroyed that they attempt to save examples of everything around them. Henry Mercer's famous museum of late 19th and early 20th Century hardware and handtools is an early example of this attitude.

The rural landscape, the rural cultural landscape, can appropriately serve as a model and a study area for understanding the mixture of that natural and cultural wealth. Specific rural cultural landscapes may best be understood as complex human ecological systems existing within equally complex natural ecological frames. These frames are, in fact, the natural forces and elements we normally refer to as ecological systems themselves. However, these frames are but one aspect of this human ecological system; another significant aspect is the manipulation of those forces by people. This results in alteration of the landscape. These cultural landscapes have developed slowly and incrementally over time and through many generations. They are places that facilitate human activities. They are constantly and consistently altered due to changing needs and changing technologies, and they are characteristically in flux. Thus, their preservation, in the strictest sense, is almost impossible, and probably not even desirable.

Two other important characteristics of these landscapes: the

recognition, here on the land, that time has passed and continues to pass, through these places; and, a sense of history.

Recent Work

Much recent work has addressed a variety of issues in the rural landscape. Some of these efforts have focused on visual assessment, however it is not the purpose of this paper to review that material. Visual assessment, while appropriate in a variety of forums, has tended not to address significant, cultural issues of human use and alteration of the landscape. Other work, however, has attempted to understand the way various cultural and regional groups have significantly responded to natural settings, resulting in a dramatic and unique molding of the landscape.

These studies, principally conducted by cultural geographers, have again and again illuminated the differences and similarities of settlement patterns and spatial relationships in the landscape. This work is significant because it has forced us to appreciate and evaluate the common and ordinary places in the American landscape; by doing so we have marked the common as "special" and the ordinary as "unique."

In the past two years, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has embarked on a Rural Preservation project, attempting to join together those working on natural resources and those concerned with agricultural land preservation. These efforts are remarkable for their direction and stated goals, even if they have not always been successful. In 1978, The Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, an interdisciplinary group, was formed with the intent of bringing together a variety of people working in historic and cultural landscape preservation.

These activities, and others, have addressed the rural landscape from differing viewpoints. Historians, architects, geographers, archeologists and landscape architects all have their stake in that landscape. We are all, however, reading only a slice of that landscape and often fail to understand and appreciate the other viewpoints. In this failure, we are also denying the applicability of differing approaches and techniques to our own work.

Studies of cultural landscapes are new to the preservation movement. This is not because various scholars have failed to recognize their importance; it is because preservation, by definition, suggests activity, intervention and management. Simply stated, this increased concern with active intervention and management is new to the preservation community.

Cultural Landscapes in National Parks

While various efforts have been made to address specific issues related to understanding rural cultural landscapes, the management of these areas requires both particular circumstances and unusual opportunities. These circumstances and opportunities are uncommon in our society. Planning and management efforts

at such a scale are only possible, if at all, in the rarest of cases. An example of such a case is the current effort by the National Park Service to begin to explore the issues surrounding rural cultural landscapes within the Parks, and to suggest that the management of these landscapes may be an appropriate concern for the preservation community. The focus of this paper is a discussion of the work now being conducted for the National Park Service in that area.² Special reference will be made to the following three questions regarding these landscapes in the Parks:

1. What are the material components of a cultural landscape and how can they be identified?
2. Which aspects of the cultural landscape are significant and by what criteria can they be evaluated?
3. Which guidelines should be followed in managing a cultural landscape?

What are Cultural Landscapes?

Within the context of national parks, cultural landscape refers to any landscape or material component of a landscape that has been of human consequence for a period of time. A cultural landscape is an area having—or perceived as having—distinctive characteristics and composed of interrelated natural and human elements.

Cultural landscapes include farming areas, mining regions, ranching districts and coastal fishing villages. All of these, in their own way, are representative of patterns of land control, and they also reflect values, norms and attitudes of different cultural groups towards the landscape.

The term "historic landscape" refers to a type of cultural landscape. This term applies to a specific site having historical significance. These historic landscapes often are associated with a particular period, event, or person. A once-forested hillside cleared for cultivation has become a cultural landscape, while a virgin forest modified primarily by a hunters' trail would, by this definition, be considered a natural rather than a cultural landscape.

The National Park Service manages two broad categories of landscape types: natural and cultural. Natural landscapes include all of those areas which, although managed through human decisions, are basically in their natural state or maintained in a manner that replicates and supports natural ecological systems as closely as possible. These natural landscapes, important and valuable within their own right, are not considered as cultural landscapes in this paper. While cultural and natural landscapes generally overlap, it is valuable, operationally, to separate them in order to recognize and emphasize their unique characteristics.

It should be noted that a cultural landscape is made up of

material components that show the results of human occupancy. Thus, a cultural landscape may include a barn bearing a hex sign, or a strictly rectangular field pattern. These are tangible evidences of certain beliefs characteristic of the culture responsible for their construction. The beliefs themselves, however, are not part of the landscape. By definition, then, cultural landscapes are made up of material components only, although these components inevitably reflect non-material aspects of the culture involved.

Culture can exert its influence in terms of such things as method of procuring food, defense needs, inheritance laws, political boundaries, transport routes and personal preference in general. Inevitably, cultural landscapes also are influenced by natural features and reflect the complex relationships between human and natural forces. Among the natural features that may affect cultural landscape characteristics are landforms, vegetation and soils. Accessibility, suitability for protection against weather, predators and human enemies, fertility of soil and abundance of other resources, all are potential considerations in people's decisions to settle in particular places. In a rural setting natural features often dominate the cultural components.

Cultural landscape studies may vary considerably in scale. In one case, a study may focus in great detail on a single significant item, such as a specific structure and its immediate surroundings. In another instance, the study may consider as a unit an entire valley or prairie landscape. Perception at both scales is required when a cluster of valley farm buildings is considered as an individual landscape component, at the same time it is being perceived in the context of the entire cultivated floodplain. Usually, the preferred method of studying landscapes is, first, to examine the big picture in general terms and then to consider components in greater detail.

Incremental and Drastic Change

Landscapes within National Parks—like all other landscapes, whether natural or cultural—are continually changing. They have developed through natural processes over eons of geologic time. In addition, cultural landscapes reflect human impact which influences the rate of natural evolutionary change, as when a dam or a house is constructed, or when hillside erosion is hastened by removal of protective vegetation.

Incremental and drastic change are two types of change that occur. Incremental change implies a gradual modification of the landscape. Drastic change, by contrast, suggests a sudden alteration, either attributable to nature, as in the case of a volcanic eruption, or to culture, as in the case of a man-set forest fire.

To recognize what changes have occurred, an earlier landscape must be compared against a later one. Depending on human values, change may have had either a positive or negative affect on a landscape. In managing National Parks, consideration should be given to the fact that some changes are not necessarily

harmful to a landscape, and often should be encouraged or allowed to continue.

Social, Political and Economic Factors

The cultural landscape exists in relationship to, and is caused by, a complex set of social, political and economic factors. These include, but are not limited to, the following: ethnic group origin; religious and fraternal affiliations; local, state, and national political processes; attitudes and perceptions of the inhabitants toward frontier and wilderness landscapes; local, state and national economic forces; natural disasters and occurrences which have direct impact upon social, political, and economic 'facts of life'; and hopes, aspirations and dreams of the people who settled and inhabit the landscape.

These dimensions are critical factors in investigating the intricacies of the cultural landscape. They are the reasons, large and small, national and local, which brought people to different parts of the country and influenced their patterns and habits in settling the land. Understanding the non-material as well as the material aspects of the culture involved is essential.

Components of the Cultural Landscape

One purpose of this work for the National Park Service is to identify and evaluate cultural landscapes by looking at material components. Thirteen cultural landscape components have been identified as the essential parts of any cultural landscape. These 13 components of the cultural landscape are:

1. Overall cultural landscape organization
2. General land-use categories
3. Specific land-use activities
4. Relationship of built form to major natural elements
5. Circulation networks and patterns
6. Boundary-controlling elements
7. Site arrangements
8. Vegetation patterns related to human land-use
9. Building types and functions
10. Materials and construction techniques
11. Small-scale elements
12. Cemeteries
13. Views

1. Overall Cultural Landscape Organization

Overall cultural landscape organization is the large-scale relationship between and among major cultural elements, predominant landforms and natural features such as vegetation. This is the first, and perhaps most important, relationship to investigate, identify and evaluate when studying a cultural landscape. It is possible to see this landscape organization reflected in road systems, field patterns, distance between farmsteads, proximity to water sources, and orientation of structures to sun and wind.

Understanding landscape organization requires a recognition that each cultural landscape exhibits, at a large-scale, patterns of settlement. Furthermore, while the details of the large-scale patterns may change, the patterns themselves remain stable. For example, changes in technology may inspire a new dwelling to replace an old one. The location of the new dwelling, however, may be the same. This custom of housing-site selection is a crucial component in the overall landscape organization.

Across the road from that same house there are fields and fences, and even though fence material may change, the size, shape, and locations of the fields could remain the same.

In some parts of the country, residences tend to be located near the center of a large property, while in other areas homes are located near property lines. All of these, and many more, are components that define landscape organization.

2. General Land-use Categories

General land-use categories reflect human activities, such as farming, mining and ranching, which leave their imprint on the landscape. These land-uses, in the aggregate, are the major human forces that give form to the cultural landscape and shape its organization. The general land-use category may be determined through a variety of sources, and may vary within any given cultural landscape.

3. Specific Land-use Activities

Past and present land-uses are signs of human processes on the landscape. Land uses vary from traditional practices to innovating adaptations influenced by such factors as topographic variation, availability of materials and resources, ethnic traditions and fluctuating economy.

4. Relationship of Built Form to Major Natural Features

Major natural features such as mountains, grasslands, rivers and forests often influence location and organization of cultural features. The direct physical relationship among features may reveal traditions of land-use and lifestyle.

5. Circulation Networks and Patterns

Circulation networks differ in complexity and purpose, although all facilitate movement from one point to another. Maps reveal historical and current patterns. Intentional or unintentional circulation networks range in scale from livestock trails and footpaths to paved roads and major highways. Railways and waterways also are linear circulation routes.

6. Boundary Controlling Elements

Boundary controlling elements mark, define and delimit areas of use within a site or between sites of different ownership. These elements may take the form of barriers such as fences,

walls or planted tree lines. They may be either intentional (hedgerows) or unintentional (rivers).

7. Site Arrangement

Site arrangement refers to intentional placement of cultural elements within a landscape setting. These settings vary in scale from residential sites to industrial complexes or small towns.

8. Vegetation Patterns Related to Land-use

This component of the cultural landscape consists of vegetation that has been planted or maintained for some functional or aesthetic purpose. It includes native as well as introduced and naturalized plant species. Trees may have been removed for agricultural or other reasons, and they may have been planted to serve such purposes as windbreaks or boundary markers. These are functional uses of plant material.

Large trees growing near a house not only provide shade but contribute to a sense of place and identity. Other aesthetically valuable vegetation may include ornamental trees, annual and perennial flower beds, and mowed lawns.

9. Building Types and Functions

Buildings house or support people, animals, machines and produce. To investigate building types and functions it is necessary to understand vernacular architectural styles. Sometimes, as in the case of an early farmhouse, the building was enlarged or changed functionally as a family grew. Close examination of buildings may suggest family sizes, population densities, commercial activities and economic fluctuations.

10. Materials and Construction Techniques

The methods and materials used for building structures, both past and present, often are repeated throughout a cultural landscape. The use of native or imported building materials depends on availability and costs. Buildings usually reflect traditional construction techniques for a particular cultural group.

11. Detailed Elements

Although they are frequently overlooked, small-scale elements, such as a foot bridge or road sign, are important aspects of a cultural landscape. At times these elements serve a unique local purpose but they also may be commonly repeated throughout a cultural landscape. Bales of hay in a field, for example, may be considered a small-scale element of the cultural landscape.

12. Cemeteries

Valuable historical information is recorded on gravestones. Birth and death dates and ages of individuals will indicate, for example, such information as when the area was settled, and if there were coincidental deaths related to an epidemic or war.

Family relationships can be identified by marker placement. Also, family names may suggest ethnic backgrounds and thus help to explain settlement patterns or other cultural features.

Frequently cemeteries are planned and organized in a distinct natural or formal manner. They range in size from family plots to community sites. Locations vary from a central setting, usually found near a church, to a remote setting, perhaps on a hilltop outside the settlement area.

13. Views

Views represent significant visual linkages from one site to another, or between parts of an individual site. Views into, within and out of a site are all important to perceiving the entire cultural landscape. The important factor is to identify views which are now, or were, important to people living in the study area.

An Introduction to Evaluation

Cultural landscapes are composed of material objects and phenomena, and are constantly altered through human occupation and natural forces. They are special places but also common places, and reflect human decisions made one by one throughout the years. Cultural landscapes need to be evaluated for many reasons. The evaluation should focus on the entire landscape, its elements, components, resources, qualities and potentials. The primary concern in cultural landscape evaluation is to explain and understand the landscape as a whole, as an entity. The synergistic relationships among the components of the landscape make it what it is. These relationships, different from one landscape to the next, define and inform the total landscape. While any individual component may be critical to the whole landscape, it is the set of components within the larger natural setting that establishes the cultural landscape.

This cannot be stressed strongly enough. Any landscape, and especially any cultural landscape, can best be evaluated as a complete set of component parts. While it is also necessary and valuable to understand each part, it is the SET of parts and the relationships between them that establishes the character of that landscape.

The evaluation of a cultural landscape is similar to the evaluation of a historic structure:³ it begins with the selection of criteria, proceeds to the application of those criteria to the landscape, and concludes with a determination of relative significance. The major difference, however, is that the landscape is first evaluated in its entirety, and then each component of the landscape is evaluated for its contribution to the whole, as well as for its own significance.

Selecting Evaluation Criteria

The selection of evaluation criteria is the first and most

important activity in cultural landscape evaluation. The criteria are used to gauge the relative significance of, first, the landscape within its region and, second, the various components of that landscape. In some cases, one or more criteria will not be applicable to a given landscape or component.

The major categories of criteria for whole cultural landscapes are: significance, integrity, associative value, interpretive value, continuity and compatibility. Within each of these categories there are more detailed criteria which, when viewed as a set, allow for a summary under each category. Thus, an evaluator would not ask questions about "integrity," but would seek to answer questions about intrusions, encroachments, alterations, deletions and neglect. The summary of these answers would lead to a determination of relative "integrity."

The same is true for each component of the cultural landscape. The criteria categories for each component are: significance, integrity, associative value, interpretive value and contribution. Instead of attempting to evaluate "contribution," for example, the evaluator would first ask questions concerning various types of contribution of the component to the landscape, to predominant cultural patterns, to visual character, to unity and to cohesiveness. The summary of these, then, would lead to a determination of that component's overall contribution to the cultural landscape.

Following the evaluation of the landscape and its components, both material and non-material, it will be possible to develop a composite image of the overall significance of that landscape. While there is intentionally no final "grade" for either the landscape or its components, the evaluator will be able to make clarified management decisions based upon various aspects of the landscape. For example, if a certain landscape is understood to have overwhelming significance to the cultural group occupying it, a management policy that stresses continued use and occupancy may be developed. On the other hand, if a particular component is understood to have significance to that same group but lacks integrity due to neglect, a more interventive management policy for that component may be developed.

The Question of Significance

While each of the above criteria is a valuable and necessary way of viewing a cultural landscape, it is instructive to look at one of these--significance--in some detail. Significance is an issue that faces any manager of cultural resources, and consistently arises as a major problem when determining management priorities and strategies. Establishing and determining levels of significance within a cultural landscape comprise a difficult task. Significance may be based upon three different yet convergent levels: national, regional or local. A cultural landscape may have clear national significance as, for example, a farming or mining area with ties to national groups, events or periods. The National Park Service history themes outline those topics of

national importance which are and are not interpreted through one or more units within the National Parks.⁴ These national themes, while potentially valuable, are often not as applicable as regional or local considerations.

A cultural landscape, or any landscape, exists within a larger region. These regions may be defined by topography, ecosystems, biological life systems, plant communities or by the term "bio-region." Within that region, a cultural landscape may be indicative of the way people settled, used and manipulated the land over many years. This landscape, then, would be of significance at the regional level. It may additionally have associative value with a specific cultural group or even an important regional family.

Finally, a cultural landscape may be of significance at the local level only. There may be an important farm or mine which had substantial economic impact within the locale but did not affect the region or the nation.

The level of significance, either national, regional or local, does not reflect the absolute significance of the landscape. National significance is no more important or valuable than regional or local significance. In fact, local significance may be of greater importance because it is more closely tied to the people or cultural group that lives there.

While the level of significance is important, the determination of significance needs to be accomplished through viewing the landscape from a variety of perspectives. There are three basic ways to investigate the landscape and each will result in a different image of its significance. The first is to understand the landscape in the aggregate. As a set of parts, each interrelated, the cultural landscape may best be viewed as a "system," in which each component affects and is affected by each other component.

The ecological or natural concept of a system is equally applicable in a cultural landscape. The interrelationships of the natural elements with the settlement patterns, fields, fences, farmsteads, buildings and other components may be seen as the "cultural glue" that holds the landscape together. It is the determination of significance at this level which should have the greatest impact upon future management decisions.

The second way to understand the landscape is through each of its component parts. These components, be they field patterns, fence lines, barns or cemeteries each contribute to the cultural landscape. Within that landscape they may have varying degrees of significance, and will certainly vary in their contribution to the integrity and value of the whole landscape. Like the landscape as a whole, any given component may best be viewed as a contributor to the landscape "system."

The third way to view significance within the landscape is to understand the direct interrelationship between two or more components. For example, the evaluator may look at barns or

may look at fences. Equally important, however, is the relationship of the fence to the barn: how far away is it? What side of the barn is it on? Is it of the same material? Was it constructed at the same time? These are just a few of the questions which might be asked. The critical question here is whether the interrelationships of components form significant aspects of the cultural landscape. These aspects and qualities would be drastically different if those interrelationships were altered, changed or destroyed.

Other Landscape Evaluations

While this paper focuses on a procedure for evaluating the cultural landscape within National Parks, it should be noted briefly that there are other methods of landscape evaluation. Principally, these fall into two categories: evaluation from a strictly historical perspective, and evaluation from a perceptual or visual perspective. While both of these types of evaluation are valuable in their own ways, they are insufficient to evaluate the cultural landscape from a broad point of view. The historical perspective relies on known dates, significant people and established periods in history. While these are important facts to take into consideration when evaluating a cultural landscape, they are too restrictive. A cultural landscape represents many points in time and the contribution of known and unknown individuals, and it may reflect a variety of developmental periods for a region or location.

Landscape evaluation based upon perception or visual analysis frequently relies on a series of tests for visual or scenic preference. While this is valuable for planning new areas for the potential visitor, it has only limited applicability when one is attempting to evaluate a landscape from the standpoint of a long-established cultural group or groups. Visual preference may or may not be a factor in location or site selection for a cultural group, and may, in fact, have little bearing when trying to understand larger questions of ties to the land and cultural significance of various components. As used in this work, "view" or "scenic value" refers only to those views that historically were consistently experienced by the occupant or user of a place. The notion of individualized scenic values or preferences has purposely been omitted from this work for those reasons stated above.

"Rating" and Cultural Landscapes

The rating of cultural resources has become a popular tool, especially with regard to historic architecture. While the ultimate objective of an evaluation system is to determine priorities for future management decisions, rating of any cultural landscape is a dubious undertaking, at best. There are many reasons for this. First, a cultural landscape, by definition, will have greatest meaning to the people who settled it, lived there and cared for the land. Any attempt to place a "value" on this meaning, especially through comparison with other landscapes, negates the importance of the landscape to those people.

Second, since a cultural landscape is constantly changing, a rating today may not be the same rating tomorrow. This concept of continuous, desirable change in the landscape is important. It means that, unlike a building, the fact that the landscape changes may be a positive factor in any evaluation, rather than a negative one.

Third, a cultural landscape may be significant for any one of three reasons, or a combination of the three: the landscape as a whole; its individual material components; and the relationships among the components. Any potential rating system would, of necessity, place values on the synergistic qualities of that landscape. While this may not be impossible, the overwhelming subjectivity of such a system renders it fundamentally unsound.

Fourth, a rating system is inherently imbued with the values of the evaluator. While this may be applied in a variety of exercises, the intention of the cultural landscape's evaluation is to understand and explain the interaction of people with the landscape. The evaluator's values, therefore, have no place in this type of evaluation. Rating the landscape will, of necessity, cause an evaluator to draw upon his or her own values, thereby by-passing the fundamental purpose of the evaluation.

Finally, a cultural landscape is composed not only of material components, but of people's attitudes toward that landscape and impressions of it. The dangers of rating the complexities of the material landscapes and personal perceptions are so great that they have extremely limited value in any study of a cultural landscape.

Evaluation and Management Decisions

Cultural landscape evaluation must, by necessity, have an impact upon management decisions. It will be helpful here to offer a few thoughts about the relationship between evaluation and management.

While any evaluation of a cultural landscape is ideally conducted independently of management decisions, that is not always the case, nor should it be. The evaluation of that landscape, carried through to its logical conclusion, and dependent upon available resources, will have direct impact upon landscape management. It is therefore important that the evaluation neither preclude nor forecast limited options for management. Management decisions will not only be based on the findings of the cultural landscape evaluation but on the legal mandate of the Park Service unit in question, visitor needs, natural/ecological constraints, and other, yet unknown, factors.

The principal benefit that evaluation brings to management is the added ability to prioritize decisions and to understand the ramifications to the cultural landscape of those decisions. In management terms, the cultural landscape evaluation provides a basis for making those decisions, and an understanding of the impact they will have within the landscape.

Concluding Comment

The directed task of finding value in the rural cultural landscape challenges the preservation community. Future generations face the prospect of knowing little or nothing of the way in which the land was settled, used and sometimes even exploited by their forbearers. We have come to expect that drastic change in the landscape is uncontrollable and even the natural course of events.

Obviously, the landscape will continue to change and be altered. What we now revere for its age and quality was once new and innovative. It would be foolish to suggest that all change be halted, or that everything old is also good. In our haste to develop, however, we possess the technology and perhaps even the spirit to deny the past—or worse—to imitate it superficially.

Clearly, not all cultural landscapes deserve active intervention, just as only some historic structures or archeological sites are saved. We are at a point, however, where we are only now beginning to recognize the ordinary, everyday resources in our landscapes. These resources enrich the landscape around us. They provide extended opportunities to protect not only the specifically historic, but also the material components of a rich and diversified cultural wealth.

As we begin actively to protect this wealth, we need to learn from previous efforts in cultural resource management. It is necessary, however, to search for new techniques to understand and care for those landscapes which, by their quality and significance, serve to connect us to the past. While the past may, in fact, be "another country"⁵ where things are done differently, it is also a fundamentally familiar place in our minds. This familiarity makes us feel comfortable and welcomed in those cultural landscapes of today that also are remembrances of the past.

Notes

1. D. W. Meinig, "Introduction," in Meinig (ed.), *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*, Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1979, p. 6.
2. The author wishes to thank Daniel Spohn, Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Oregon, and Stephen L. Stover, Department of Geography, Kansas State University, for their contributions to an earlier version of this material.
3. The conceptual framework for this evaluation material is based in part on a methodology described by Harold Kalman in *The Evaluation of Historic Buildings*, Parks Canada, Ottawa, 1979.
4. See: *Part I of the National Park System Plan-History*, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., 1972.
5. My thanks to David Lowental for sharing the concept of "the past as another country."

Suggested Reading

- Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation. 1979. New Harmony Symposium on Landscape Preservation, June 9-12, 1978. Ottawa, Ontario.
- Appleton, Jay. 1975. *The Experience of Landscape*. John Wiley, New York.
- Austin, Richard L., Robert Z. Melnick, et al., eds. (in press.) *Yearbook of Landscape Architecture: Historic Preservation*. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.
- Billington, Ray A. 1949. *Western Expansion: A History of the American Frontier*. MacMillan, New York.
- Brown, Ralph H. 1948. *A Historical Geography of the United States*. Harcourt, Brace, New York.
- Carnes, W. G. 1951. Landscape Architecture in the National Park Service: Its Contribution to Preservation and Development. *Landscape Architecture* 41(July):145-150.
- Cerny, James W. 1974. Scenic Analysis Assessment. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Control* 4(2):221-250.
- Coben, Stanley and Lorman Ratner (eds.). 1970. *The Development of an American Culture*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Francaviglia, R. V. 1978. *The Mormon Landscape: Existence, Creation, and Perception of a Unique Image in the American West*. AMS Press, New York.
- Issac, Erich. 1959-60. Religion, Landscape and Space. *Landscape* 9:14-18.
- Jacobs, Steven W. 1979. *Wayne County: The Aesthetic Heritage of a Rural Area*. Wayne County Historical Society, New York.
- James, Preston E. 1959. *A Geography of Man* (2nd ed.). Ginn, Boston.
- Johnson, Hildegard Binder. 1979. The Framed Landscape. *Landscape* 23(2):27-32.
- Jordan, Terry. 1978. Perceptual Regions of Texas. *The Geographical Review* 68:293-307.
- Kalman, Harold. 1979. *The Evaluation of Historic Buildings*. Parks Canada. Ottawa.
- Leighly, John B. (ed.). 1963. *Land and Life: A Selection from the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Lewis, Pierce F. 1975. The Future of the Past: Our Clouded Vision of Historic Preservation. *Pioneer America* 7(July):1-20.
- Lowenthal, David. 1968. The American Scene. *The Geographical Review* 58:61-88.
- Lowenthal, David. 1978. Finding Valued Landscapes. *Progress in Human Geography* 2:374-418.
- Lowenthal, David and Marcus Binney (eds.). 1982. *Our Past Before Us: Why Do We Save It?* Temple Smith, London.
- Lynch, Kevin. 1976. *Managing the Sense of a Region*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Mather, Eugene C. and John Fraser Hart. 1954. Fences and Farms. *The Geographical Review* 44:201-223.
- Meinig, D. W. 1966. The Beholding Eye--Ten Versions of the Same Scene. *Landscape Architecture* 66(January):47-54.
- Meinig, D. W. 1971. Environmental Appreciation: Localities as a Humane Art. *Western Humanities* 25:1-11.
- Meinig, D. W. (ed.). 1979. *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*. Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford.
- Melnick, Robert Z. 1981. Capturing the Cultural Landscape. *Landscape Architecture* 71(January):56-60.
- Melnick, Robert Z. 1980. *Cultural and Historic Landscapes: A Selected Bibliography*. Vance Bibliographies, Monticello, Illinois.
- Melnick, Robert Z. 1980. Preserving Cultural and Historic Landscapes: Developing Standards. *CMR Bulletin, National Park Service* 3(March):1+.

- Paterson, J. H. 1975. North American: A geography of Canada and the United States (5th ed.). Oxford University Press, New York.
- Preservation Leaps the Garden Wall. 1981. Landscape Architecture 71(January):49-96 (entire issue).
- Salter, Christopher (compiler). 1971. The Cultural Landscape. Duxbury Press, Belmont, California.
- Shoard, Marion. 1980. Theft of the Countryside. Temple Smith, London.
- Strahler, Arthur N. and Alan H. Strahler. 1979. Modern Physical Geography. Wiley, New York.
- Tishler, W. H. 1979. The Landscape: An Emerging Historic Preservation Resource. The Association for Preservation Technology (APT) Bulletin 11(4):9-25.
- Trewartha, Glenn T. 1948. Some Regional Characteristics of American Farmsteads. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 38:169-225.
- Trewartha, Glenn T., A. H. Robinson and E. H. Hammond. 1967. Physical Elements of Geography (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill, New York. pp.16-19.
- United States Department of the Interior, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. 1978. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects. Washington, D. C.
- United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. 1978. Management Policies. Washington, D. C.
- United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. 1972. Part One of the National Park System Plan--History. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
- United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. 1978. Planning Process Guideline (NPS-2). Washington, D. C.
- Wagner, Philip. 1963. American Emerging. Landscape 13:22-26.
- Wagner, Philip. 1960. The Human Use of the Earth. The Free Press, New York.
- Wagner, P. L. and M. W. Mikesell (eds.). 1961. Readings in Cultural Geography. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Ward, David (ed.). 1979. Geographic Perspectives on America's Past: Readings on the Historical Geography of the United States. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Whose Time is This Place. (Landscape Preservation Issue). 1976. Landscape Architecture 66(May):217-280.
- Zelinsky, Wilbur. 1973. The Cultural Geography of the United States. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

ROBERT Z. MELNICK, Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Oregon, Eugene.