

Part I Theory

Introduction

In this section five authors discuss topics that range from the significance of an interdisciplinary and international approach to researching cultural landscapes (McGovern), understanding the essence of cultural resources like archaeological sites (Mathews) and their meanings (Lozny and Rothschild), to discussions on the idea of place, space, and characteristics of cultural landscape (Lozny, Rothschild, Fairclough,).

Tom McGovern discusses the significance of international cooperation in regard to research and cultural heritage preservation. He points out that academic and applied archaeologists are being perceived as members of different social classes; elite vs commoners, so to speak. McGovern's point on bridging the gap is very timely and necessary. He outlines the agenda for a more integrated and interdisciplinary in its outlook approach to our common goal – research of the human past. Lozny focuses on the concept place and its multiple meanings. One of the principles followed in the applied approach is the idea of “significance” of a site. The historical ecology approach is used to investigate landscape's history, the human ecology approach stimulates questions, about how the landscape and its history is currently perceived. In our pursuit of the past we should not ignore the significance of local indigenous knowledge and its potential contribution to local policy-making regarding cultural heritage preservation. Nan Rothschild draws on the Native American and the Spaniards interactions during the 17th and 18th centuries to point out differences in the perception of landscape and space by people who occupy the same space. The case presented by Rothschild clearly illustrates the invaders' policy to adopt elements of the traditional landscape to their own political and economic agendas. Graham Fairclough reviews the use of the concept of landscape by archaeologists. He emphasizes the multidisciplinary nature of landscape studies and claims that the working with landscape requires new objectives. Landscape is not real in a sense that it is not material, it does exist as an idea, place filled with meanings. The key problem is not in identifying a site to be preserved but in identifying the context in which the site functioned. Only in such context of its cultural landscape is the site meaningful. Chris Matthews discusses the idea of archaeological site. There are several site characteristics that most

archaeologists take for granted, like that the site represents historic human activities that is complete and has been sealed from other destructions, etc. Matthews argues that archeological sites are in fact products of archaeological imagination and that many other processes despite human intervention might impact the site integrity and content. He relates the idea of a site to the concept of heritage – culturally defined social conscious about the past. Archaeological sites are localities where the past is linked to present; they became places of a discourse between archaeologist's interest and social interests.