

Inhalt

Landschaft und Gerechtigkeit

*Ludger Gailing, Markus Leibenath, Luisa Geldbach, Julia Zscherneck und
Henk Wiechers* 9

Konzeptionelle Zugänge zu Landschaftsgerechtigkeit

**Räume für mehr Gerechtigkeit: Zur Bedeutung von Beziehungsgerechtigkeit für
die sozialökologische Transformation bei Avantgardist*innen der Landnutzung**
Christine Katz und Daniela Gottschlich 37

**Beteiligungsgerechtigkeit in landschaftsbezogenen Planungsprozessen
praxeologisch und ethnografisch erforschen**
Markus Leibenath 61

Lebenschancengerechtigkeit als Landschaftsgerechtigkeit
Karsten Berr und Olaf Kühne 81

Landschaftsgerechtigkeit in Stoffströmen und Ressourcenkonflikten

Landscape and justice in extractivist times?
Tom Mels 99

**Telecoupling in der Urbanisierung neu denken: Landschaftsgerechtigkeit
von der Mine bis zur Stadt**
Alejandro de Castro Mazarra, Miriam Prys-Hansen, Bruno Milanez und Hendrik Herold .. 117

Neuland: Singapurs Landgewinnung unter dem Brennglas der Landschaftsgerechtigkeit	
<i>Hans Hortic</i>	129

Das Recht auf Landschaft in ländlichen Räumen

Das Recht auf Zentralität in ländlichen Räumen	
<i>Jannis Pfendtner-Heise</i>	147

<i>These rights are made by walking:</i> Die Inszenierung landschaftlicher Teilhabe im ländlichen Südspanien	
<i>Maïke Melles</i>	165

Eine Wohnung auf dem Lande: Perspektiven für mehrgeschossige DDR-Neubauten im südlichen Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	
<i>Richard Pantzier</i>	183

Landschaftsgerechtigkeit in der Transformation: das Beispiel der Lausitz

Herausforderungen bei der Transformation der Lausitzer Tagebaufolgelandschaft im Kontext von Landschaft und Kulturerbe	
<i>Ana Maria Bergholz</i>	201

<i>Shadow Places</i> von Wasserstoffregionen – Globale Verflechtungen zwischen regionalen Energielandschaften	
<i>Henk Wiechers</i>	219

Strukturwandel in der Lausitz: Auf dem Weg zu mehr Umweltgerechtigkeit und gerechteren Landschaften?	
<i>Luisa Geldbach</i>	239

Landscape and justice in extractivist times?

Tom Mels

1 Attention to landscape

Landscape has never been an altogether straightforward academic concept. Plenty of work has insisted on the polysemy of the word – easily confirmed when consulting dictionaries – indicating the troubled translatability of the concept across languages. Dictionary definitions of landscape may guide attention in different directions: to physical surrounding; to the sensorial experience roused by that surrounding; to the place of a polity; to the subjective perception of a scenic object; to the outdoors as rendered in graphic representation. With attention shifting in multiple directions, additional layers of theoretical meaning have been supplied by archaeologists, landscape architects, geographers, semioticians, art historians and others. Traffic across disciplinary boundaries has continued to fashion the shape of different schools of thought on landscape. This is obvious in my own discipline, human geography, where debate over the concept's polysemy or referential ambiguity, and a shifting engagement with various academic communities, has been seminal to the articulation of different methodological and philosophical positions.

From a heightened awareness of a broadly understood politics of landscape throughout the 1980s and 1990s – notably concerning the problem of cultural representation as an expression of social power – geographical research has increasingly acknowledged the importance of justice (Mels 2016). This provided a specific substance to landscape's referential duplicity, with justice issues tied at once to the material and representational. However, bringing justice to an understanding of the meaning and workings of landscape was a substantive solution with a twist. For if landscape remains caught in polysemy, this is perhaps even more so the case with justice. Combining the two is no mean task.

While quite some scholarly work has been dedicated to advance the landscape and justice connection since the 1990s (Olwig/Mitchell 2008), I think it is worthwhile to trace the engagement itself within the wider realm of geographical landscape research. This arguably helps to understand the specific shape that landscape and justice research took in its original form, that is to say, primarily as a reaction to postmodern tendencies within landscape research. However, the way this reaction was framed initially entailed a *limited* theorization of justice, with notions of place and community, polity and power inequalities looming large. The result was the development of historically grounded, but also quite generalized empirical notions of landscape as expressions of (in)justice.

I view the engagement with justice as part of a much longer trajectory of thinking politically about landscape, informed by both a shifting yet incessant ›disciplinary‹ politics of shaping research agendas, and an implicitly or explicitly voiced ›epistemic‹ politics of landscape, attending to the role of power in rendering landscape in particular ways. As I will demonstrate, both developed against the backdrop of a ›material‹ politics of landscape, as produced from the interactions of physical (non-human) processes and human activities and often tied to existing concerns with social inequalities and experiences of environmental destruction.

In the opening sections of this paper, I offer a historical background to the use of landscape and justice, looking particularly into how they combined in human geographical landscape studies. The first section turns to the rise of landscape in modern, early twentieth-century geography, arguing that attention to landscape as historically modified material form did not mean it was innocent of politics. In the second section, the politics of landscape re-emerges in a different form under the influence of postmodern conceptual controversies at the closure of the century. The association of landscape with epistemic and disciplinary politics, I argue, is of great importance to the way justice entered the debate. Early on, this was more concerned with reshaping the conceptual discourse over landscape, than with an explicit theorization of justice. I will subsequently address what I see as a recent shift to more overt theorizations of the content of landscape justice in terms of participation, recognition, and distribution. Any such theorization, as I argue in the final section, is not just an academic exercise. Considering the current surge for resources ravaging landscapes everywhere and rampant environmental injustice, it is nothing but a global concern.

2 Politics and landscape I: Modern controversies

Only recently, justice has entered the field of landscape research. It did so at a time when landscape research increasingly distanced itself from the study of changes on the land to engage more immediately with the way landscapes were represented in text and image. Part of the turn to justice was a rereading of the earlier tradition, and it demanded a new way of approaching representation.

Much of earlier theoretical debate on landscape focused on the scientific usefulness and rigor of landscape as a geographical keyword. As part of the ›disciplinary‹ politics of geography, defining the task of landscape studies was a central concern. Using the landscape as a concept for serious research demanded strict delineation of what could be included and excluded as objects of study. In practice, its polysemy needed to be curbed and adapted to what was seen as the business of geography. At least, that was what some of the leading scholars implied. Some even went so far as to suggest that landscape could hardly gain academic status, because a serious academic concept could not be both the »real superficial form« (physical surrounding), the »total sensual-perception« of that surrounding (the land as it was perceived) *and* the »visual impression« (Hartshorne 1939: 168). Other, avowedly more stable concepts such as region seemed to be more suitable for the task, as Richard Hartshorne famously claimed. Yet such conceptual disagreement between the champions of ›landscape‹ and ›region‹ may overshadow important commonalities. For one thing, both Carl Ortwin Sauer (1925) and Hartshorne in America shared enthusiasm for geography as chorology. They were also steeped selectively in German geography, with Sauer building mainly on approaches from *Landschaftskunde* (notably the morphological method) and Hartshorne on *Raumwissenschaft* or regional science.

Closely related to Hartshorne's critique of landscape and following the *Raumwissenschaft* approach, was his position on history (Hartshorne 1939: 175ff.). The argument was not that historical explanation was useless, but that geographers should refrain from doing history, which should remain the domain of historians. This disciplinary politics can be traced back to Alfred Hettner, the philosophically inclined German geographer who was influenced by viewpoints on the academic division of labor that had earlier been formulated by Immanuel Kant and Alexander von Humboldt (Hartshorne 1958). In this division of labor, Hettner thought of geography primarily as *Raumwissenschaft*, studying spatial arrangements. Geography would thereby secure itself a clearly defined unique subject that would ensure its academic

legitimacy, distinguishing it from more immediately historical or systematic sciences. To put it briefly, the geographical perspective entailed the study of causal relationships between spatial phenomena occurring in a particular region (*Räume*), not their long historical evolution (Hettner 1927: 123).

The chorological orthodoxy, at least in Hartshorne's vision, thus entailed an argument not only against using landscape as a scientific concept but also against the view of history that had become so central to its users in both *Landschaftskunde* and the closely related *Länderkunde*. Otto Schlüter's *Landschaftskunde*, fundamental to the development of German landscape geography, was from its inception wary of any such presentist tendencies. Cultural landscape studies, he argued, were at once inherently *morphological*, searching for the sensually perceptible features (*sinnlich wahrnehmbar*) of human presence, and necessarily *historical*, in a constant state of becoming (Schlüter 1906: 24; Kaasch/Kaasch 2011). His was very much an effort to sharpen acuity of what human geographers should add to the scientific community, modeled upon physical geography's (*physische Geographie*) study of »the earth surface in the physically extended sense« (*die Erdoberfläche im körperlich erweiterten Sinn*) (Schlüter 1906: 7). Against ideas to think of human geography as defined by »causal nature-society relations« (*ursächlicher Zusammenhang mit der Landesnatur*) or the method of »spatial juxtaposition« (*räumliches Nebeneinander der Dinge*), Schlüter argued that geography had in fact a specific object of study, i.e., »the concrete earth surface« (*Erdoberfläche im konkreten Sinne*) (Schlüter 1906: 10, 12, and 18). Paralleling the field of physical geography, focus would be on the »traces of human activity in the landscape« (*Spuren, welche die menschliche Tätigkeit in der Landschaft hinterlässt*) (Schlüter 1906: 28).

The morphological convention thus originated in a critique of environmental determinism (wherein nature's causal force was seen as profoundly shaping human affairs) and engaged in contemporary »disciplinary politics« (philosophical arguments about the division of academic labor). Yet, at the same time it could never free itself entirely from ideological context and politics. Francis Harvey and Ute Wardenga claim that »many German geographers rejected empirical chorography in favor of anti-modern thought, holistic concepts, and mythical concepts centered on the term *Landschaft*« (Harvey/Wardenga 2006: 242). Thus, in a polemic attack on Hettner, Hans Spethmann's book on *Dynamische Länderkunde* insisted on the importance of historical change as apparent in the landscape, against what he saw as static approaches within geography (Spethmann 1928). Spethmann's work on the Ruhr valley demonstrated the importance of shifting forces of technology,

politics, and economy in the landscape. But while bestowing upon landscape morphological features (studying perceptible features of human presence) and its historical implications, the publication also carried an ideological burden, reflecting the general conservatism of the academic bourgeoisie in the Weimar Republic (Fahlbusch/Rössler/Siegrist 1989). In other words, *Landschaft* got partly embellished in a deeply problematic *völkisch* geography, reviving ideas of *Lebensraum* and *Geopolitik* (Troll 1947). Spethmann's embracement of *destiny* in the landscape, substituting ideological mystifications for proper causal explanation, fits into the frame of mind of this new geography (Spethmann 1932). Critical response (Blume 1933; Hettner 1935) could not prevent scholars like Ewald Banse, Siegfried Passarge and Hans Schrepfer to reinvent *Landschaft* as an ideological tool for the Third Reich. Pointing at the role of censorship and what became a deeply politicized academic world, Carl Troll – who coined the term landscape ecology in the 1930s – concluded that the uninitiated looking at this period would have difficulties in distinguishing deceitful rhetoric from proper scholarly efforts at causal explanation (*Ursächlichkeit*); free and objective research from biased research; and scientific statements dictated by the NSDAP from those opposing it (Troll 1947: 7). He remarked that the environmental concern that informed official *Landschaftsschutz*, *Landschaftsgestaltung* and *Landschaftspflege* of the era was tainted by an authoritarian combination of technocracy and ideological delusions, including racial theory. It was also backed up institutionally by introducing »engineering biology« (*Ingenieurbiologie*) at universities, in an attempt at turning the matter of landscaping (*Landschaftspflege*) into a more technical matter.

But landscape was also simultaneously associated with the earlier landscape sensitivity (*Landschaftsgefühl*) of German humanism, surviving, as Troll put it, as »a healthy psychological reaction« (*eine gesunde Regung der Verantwortung*) to the totalitarian state's overwhelming »mechanization of life as a whole« (*der Technisierung des gesamten Lebens*) and its »idolatry of technology« (*Vergötterung der Technik*). In other words, landscape got structurally entangled in a confused, but clearly ideologically charged »epistemic« and »disciplinary« politics. It produced a devastating »material« politics of landscape too: »The German landscape«, Troll added with wry understatement, »has not become »healthier« during this time«: *Die deutsche Landschaft ist in dieser Zeit nicht »gesünder« geworden* (Troll 1947: 8).

I particularly highlight these developments in Germany because of its prominence in geographical landscape work, and also because it demonstrated

the importance of a heightened awareness of the disciplinary, epistemic *and* material politics of landscape. Perhaps as a result of the early mindfulness to the perils of politics, the basic focus of research in the postwar period largely concerned landscape as a material form, a physical piece of space, arranged and produced as the expression of a changing society. The landscape was fields and meadows, villages and land-use patterns, hedges and walls, land reforms and ownership, traffic and infrastructure, farming practices and culturally determined ways of life. It was also deeply historical as it materialized the changing human relationship to the natural world. For those trained in the German academic tradition, thinking of landscape as a heuristic for holistic forms of geographical knowledge will be familiar (Pfaffen 1973). Only much later, under the influence of a reemerging humanistic surge, postmodern discourse and cultural constructivism, the politics of landscape transmogrified into a scrutiny of graphic and textual representation, frequently interpreted as forms of power. Contrasting technocratic totalitarianism and humanistic landscape feelings would thus reemerge in multiple forms and contexts of urban sociology, architecture and geography throughout the 1960s and 1970s.

3 Politics and landscape II: Postmodern controversies

From the 1970s onwards, there was a parallel development, not least in the discipline of human geography, of trying to understand human experience: a fascination loosely rooted in existential philosophy and phenomenological approaches (Meinig 1979). Much of this humanistic path of inquiry sought to understand the world of places, that is spaces imbued with meaning. Yet the humanistic approach was more than a mapping effort trying to make sense of the way people relate to their perceived environment, reminiscent of what I think Troll gestured at with his *Landschaftsgefühl* (in an attempt to rescue landscape from totalitarian politics), albeit not primarily rooted in the romantic tradition. Parts of it was also deeply committed to a long tradition of critical thinking, simply because it questioned enlightenment ideals of progress, modernity and rationality and their expression in modern planning. It also practiced a ›material‹ politics of landscape, looking at landscapes as material environments, constructed in particular historical contexts and offering multiple meanings and experiences. Landscapes of modernity, as many studies argued, augmented alienation, not only between humans and their fellow human beings, but also in the human relationship to its immediate environment

(Cosgrove 1984; Relph 1981). Again, landscape was a handy conceptual tool in the effort to make sense of this.

When I entered graduate school in the early 1990s, I was drawn to landscape studies because it seemed to be the suitable vehicle to study not only the material world from a societal and humanistic point of view, but perhaps more specifically to further explore dimensions of environmental concern and the human destruction of wild habitats unfolding before my eyes. But the 1990s were also the time, inherited from the 1980s, of a rather heated debate amongst geographers quarreling about the correct way to understand what landscape really was and how it should be studied properly. In British geography, there seemed to be a rather strong belief that landscape was first and foremost a social construct or a form of representation: going beyond the notion of landscape as a material space, it was a »way of seeing«, a discourse, seen from a particular social perspective on the world that could be traced and analyzed by textual and other visual collections of signs (Daniels/Cosgrove 1988). Inspiration was taken from methods developed in literary studies, art history and other sources within the humanities. It led to a »disciplinary« and »epistemic« politics wherein landscape was duplicitous in the sense that we could never be sure about what is true or false about the landscape (Daniels 1989). It thereby deeply questioned our abilities as researchers. Your perspective on the landscape was inescapably that: a perspective. This prospect attracted me as much as it was a source of apprehension.

Early on, my apprehension concerned the lingering influence of postmodern thinking and its fascination with epistemic relativism, while underplaying materiality, explanation and causality. More recently, and adding to more classical historical materialist notions, I have found resources in justice theory to rethink the at once narrow and totalizing ways in which »representation« was interpreted at the time, as if it was all about graphic and textual expression. What seemed to be lost in the earlier discussions was an ability to extend the politics of representation into an engagement with the stuff of democracy: political representation, and the question of being represented and having or being denied voice (Mels 2016). As it turned out, earlier concerns with representation thereby remained largely blind to justice.

4 Politics and landscape III: The justice turn

Frustration over postmodern ›disciplinary‹ and ›epistemic‹ politics was no doubt widespread. To me, it was too generalizing in its claims about visual representation and textuality. I found its version of the making of landscapes of capitalist modernity to be limited and to an extent also narrowly tied to a British context. It was surely also too much stuck in philosophical idealism. It even seemed to overstate the failures of earlier humanistic efforts and to disregard the value of their work on place and human experience. It seemed devoid of a ›material‹ politics of landscape, equipped to take on the material challenges facing the realities of environmental destruction. I hence also thought that it did too little for the development of a progressive politics of landscape.

As I mentioned, one of the problems was that it was vigorously deconstructing the ›epistemic‹ politics, seeing the landscape as a graphic and textual form of expression. But it was not very good at unearthing ›political representation‹ as a core dimension of landscape: the landscape as a bunch of material struggles over resources, as the stuff of normative claim-making and ingrained forms of inequality – in short, landscape as contested place and polity of sorts, where environment and justice were core issues (Mels 2016). This argument was at the heart of Kenneth Olwig's notion of the substantive landscape, insisting on the historical and contemporary importance of a *political* landscape tied to particular conceptions of lawfulness and social and bodily practice (Olwig 1996). Thought of it as returning to landscape as »a blend of land and life, of physical and social morphologies« and not just settling for the ambition to »describe extended, pictorial views« or an »idea« perhaps this seemed like a quite undramatic call (Cosgrove 2006: 50). In my view, however this was the defining moment when *justice* firmly entered the realm of landscape studies and it importantly inspired some of my own work. In light of diverse interpretations of landscape, Olwig claimed it is vital to »recover the contradictions between them and their conflicting meaning for past and present-day practices of landscape justice and geographical discourse« (Olwig 2021: 441). More concretely, the substantive landscape could be found in the old German *Landschaften*, the Scandinavian *Landskap* and many contemporary equivalents worldwide, associated with their particular political organization as places. These were places structured around various notions of justice and customary practices.

My conclusion is that the substantive landscape vision reemphasized justice concerns in studying landscape as polity and place. It reconstituted scholarly interest for the history and contemporaneity of landscape as deeply implicated in normative (moral, political) questions of law and justice (place-oriented customary law, expressed through practices). However, Olwig's version of the substantive landscape primary focuses on contrasting customary law and its modern equivalents to statutory law. He connects these legal and justice traditions with the contrasting notions of place and space, historically imbuing struggles over landscape. While this is important, I found a more wide-ranging empirical application of justice thinking in environmental justice research and a more complete theorization of justice (beyond concerns with legal history) in the work of Nancy Fraser. I see it as an additional advantage of Fraser's approach that she forefronts a critical scrutiny of capitalism (Fraser 2009, 2021).

5 Environmental justice

Whereas environmental justice has been of great importance to align environmental issues with social justice, it also for a very long time focused on justice as primarily a question of *distribution*. Articulating a ›material‹ politics of landscape of sorts, it analyzed »who gets what where and when« and tried to map and explain patterns of uneven environmental pollution and amenities in the landscape (Mohai/Pellow/Roberts 2009). Distribution has been a core notion of justice, and I am convinced that uneven distribution and the call for redistribution remain crucial. Yet as Fraser and others have noted, this is not enough. Justice also means being recognized as human beings, as subjects having rights, and it also means having a voice in decision making. In the justice literature, these dimensions of justice are *recognition* and *participatory justice* (Mels 2016, 2020, 2023).

Importantly, Fraser is critical of scholars who reduce justice to questions of recognition. Not that she questions the importance of being recognized. As scholars like Axel Honneth and Charles Taylor have shown, we all need recognition to develop our identities, self-worth, self-confidence, to partake in the spheres of social interaction and all the rest of it (Fraser/Honneth 2003). But a full notion of justice cannot trust that a heightened attention to recognition will solve injustices. Fraser argues that a lack of recognition is the sign of a status-injury and that such a status injury can only be resolved by paying special attention to the way we organize participation in society. Participatory

justice is necessary if we want to do something about uneven power relationships, brought about and maintained through institutionalized practices and procedures. Participatory parity cannot be attained simply by recognition but requires the elimination of institutionalized patterns that impede people from contributing to decision making and public speech. Arguably, Fraser's special attention to participation reverberates a well-known theme from the literature on landscape and urban planning since the 1980s in what is known as communicative planning theory. Clearly, the latter immediately relates to landscape transformations.

Fraser thus proposes that redistribution, recognition, and representation (i.e., participation) are equally vital fields of struggle over justice. I think that this is important, but not enough because, by contrast to environmental justice researchers, she also does little to move this theory closer to the ground as it were. Notably, one might wonder where geography comes in and how this could connect justice to landscape, especially when new terrain of commodification is constantly being opened up (Fraser 2014; Fälton/Mels 2024). One thing that is abundantly clear from current developments in the far north of Sweden, as I will argue in the penultimate section of this paper, is that pushing the boundaries of capitalist exploitation remakes the landscape and hence fundamentally affects the social and material conditions of justice at its core.

6 Extractivist times

I spent quite some space on conceptual issues, because they are important to frame some of the most pressing and complex crisis of our time. In my view, the development of a stronger interest for justice within academic research is both a result of experiences of environmental crisis *and* a necessary reminder of the importance of landscape studies in our days. It may also help to highlight the urgency of designing landscape work, that in a meaningful way relates to that crisis.

In my own recent research projects, I have been engaged in analyzing the natural resource conflicts as they are developing in the far north of Sweden, and how they entail different justice issues. Working with an interdisciplinary group of researchers versed in geology, political science, ethnology, law, and ecology, my interest has primarily focused on exploring how the current intensified exploitation of forests, minerals and energy resources affect indigenous Sámi reindeer herding communities and their claims to justice. Under-

lying developments in the north of Sweden and elsewhere, are political developments emanating from the European Union (EU), the national government, and local planning efforts. Many of these rest on the internationally familiar notion of a green transition, including the European Green Deal (European Commission 2019), and ultimately deriving from the Global Goals for sustainable development (United Nations 2015). In response to European policy and legal developments concerning forestry, mining, and increased electricity production, northern Sweden has taken on a significant role in national development goals (European Commission 2008, 2019, 2020, 2021; Regeringskansliet 2013, 2018a, 2018b, 2022). The development of this novel ›material‹ politics of landscape puts new pressures on large swaths of land that are in many cases already heavily exploited. It is therefore to be anticipated that questions of public acceptance and resentment will increase in the hotspots of resource mobilization (EESC 2021; European Commission 2020).

For Sámi herding communities in Sweden, the encroachment of green industrial projects, decarbonization and fossil-free futures is particularly problematic, because reindeer typically cover vast stretches of land, following the seasons and availability of lichen and other grazing resources. These communities enjoy use rights to herd reindeer on public and private land in their traditional territories, throughout Sápmi (the land of the Sámi) often stretching from the Baltic Sea to the mountain region bordering on Norway. Although the Sámi are recognized as a national minority, the Swedish state has done little to address indigenous rights issues. As critical assessments by the UN, the Council of Europe, and human rights bodies have suggested, the Sámi therefore continue to experience a lack of right to consultation, recognition of land rights, while legal aid also remains inadequate (Allard/Brännström 2021; Brännström 2017; Cambou 2020; Larsen/Raitio 2019; Tarras-Wahlberg/Southalan 2021).

One defining feature of indigenous peoples is their attachment to land and other natural resources. Reindeer herding more specifically, requires access to the land and involves the recognition of landscape as a use value. It is well-known that the physical impact of wind parks, power lines, mines, quarries, highways and railroads, large-scale forestry, and the establishment of industries lead to an increasing fragmentation of the landscape, which in its turn amounts to an incessant geographical displacement of reindeer herding resources: by limiting resource availability in one place, pressures on others increase.

The result is a landscape in which claims to what is right and wrong often move in opposite directions. On the one hand, there is a strong policy and plan-

ning trend toward a green transition – or green industrialization as it is also called – backed by Swedish laws and regulations as well as by global climate discourse. On the other hand, there is the subaltern surge of Sámi communities claiming use rights that are increasingly violated and raising questions central to indigenous rights discourses, biodiversity loss, and other environmental concerns. Those use rights thus not only encompass access to land in a quantitative sense, but also demands for the integrity of ecosystems, undisturbed grazing and safeguarding the ancient, natural migration routes of reindeer.

Through interviews and workshops with Sámi communities, and building on my colleagues' longstanding research efforts, at least three central issues constantly recur in land use planning initiated by private sector actors (forestry, mining, energy, tourism companies) and public authorities. Firstly, the Sámi experience an ignorance of their practical, field-based experience in deliberation, policy making and planning. Instead of situated knowledge on reindeer behavior, needs and resources, reliance on generalized notions about reindeer herding and quantitative measurements and economic rationality prevail. Related to this is a more general ignorance of indigenous identities, everyday life, and culture. Secondly, there is widespread dissatisfaction with deliberation and consultation, rooted in a fundamental lack of trust between parties. Dialogues often ensue as a formality after major decisions already seem to have been taken. Consultation is experienced as extremely time-consuming and putting one-sided demands on Sámi representatives' expertise on mining, forestry, energy provision, policies and legal matters. Thirdly, the combined impact of encroachments in an increasingly fragmented landscape is lost to view due to an equally fragmented, narrow focus on the geographically limited scale of individual projects. These cumulative effects and the way they limit resource availability for reindeer herding over vast areas cannot be ignored in favor of naive but powerful rhetorical notions of coexistence. While reality on the ground is constantly shifting, planning decisions and projects rely all too often on obsolete maps and management plans that were deficient from their inception. From these experiences, it is possible to tacitly formulate several justice claims, including:

- a) *Demands for recognition.* Demand interpretative prerogative on Sámi reindeer herding. Acknowledge Sámi connection to the land as central and how circumstances vary between communities throughout Sápmi.
- b) *Demands for participation.* Legal regulation of consultation needs a revision. Expert support in consultation is central to parity of participation. Corpo-

rate participants must be informed and knowledgeable. Sámi representatives need full compensation for consultation.

- c) *Demands for distribution.* Use rights of land and vital resources must be protected and restored whenever harmed. Reindeer routes and undisturbed grazing must be cared for. Plans and maps must reflect current and changing distribution of resources.

In our research, we explore how such claims to justice also need further work on the content, status and use of knowledge, institutional arrangements and on novel forms of legal regulation. But even the very limited insights from Sápmi offered here, arguably alerts us to the importance of understanding landscape as more than a general question of how we represent the world to each other or how that world is physically transformed. Distribution and control over resources, recognition of rights and duties, and participation in decision-making and planning, all embody claims to justice that in various ways, but nonetheless on a global scale, unfold ›epistemic‹ as well as ›material‹ politics of landscape. These claims are too important to be left to the privileged force of forestry, mining, energy corporations or any of those who think that there is no alternative but to infinitely expand the boundaries of commodification.

7 Conclusion: landscape as an encounter with justice

The expanded interpretation of the politics of landscape, as conceptualized in this paper, takes us beyond traditional notions of cultural representation to highlight the importance of justice. It historicized the former – the traditional ›epistemic‹ politics of landscape – within a ›disciplinary‹ politics of shaping research agendas, looking at the various national and international ramifications of German *Landschaftskunde*, as well as developments under the influence of humanistic and postmodern scholarship. Tracing these developments suggests that justice would enter academic discourse by selectively accepting and rejecting earlier disciplinary trends regarding representation and politics.

The latter – landscape as a matter of justice – can thus partly be traced to discontent with some developments in the ›disciplinary‹ politics of the 1980s, notably its occupation with particular forms of cultural representation. The turn to justice not only provided novel conceptual ways of thinking about landscape (in terms of material practice, rights, values, planning, law and

polity) in academic work. Like other fields of current justice thinking, it linked to past and present real-world events, including everyday experiences with forms of oppression and environmental destruction, as my vignette from Sápmi showed. In that sense, looking at landscape as an encounter with multiple forms of (in)justice – explicitly theorized in terms of distribution, recognition and participation – may also offer resources for the design of a ›material‹ politics of landscape robust enough to challenge harmful policies and practices of contemporary capitalism in extractivist times.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by Formas grants 2021–01382 and 2021–00044

Bibliography

- Allard, Christina/Brännström, Malin (2021): Girjas reindeer herding community v. Sweden. Analysing the merits of the Girjas case«, in: *Arctic Review on Law and Politics* 11, S. 56–79.
- Blume, Karl (1933): »Metaphysik in der Geographie?«, in: *Geographische Zeitschrift* 39/3, S. 144–155.
- Brännström, Malin (2017): Skogsbruk och renskötsel på samma mark. En rättsvetenskaplig studie av äganderätten och renskötselrätten. Dissertation. Umeå: Umeå University.
- Cambou, Dorothee (2020): »Uncovering injustices in the Green Transition«, in: *Arctic Review on Law and Politics* 11, S. 310–333.
- Cosgrove, Denis (1984): *Social formation and symbolic landscape*. Madison, Wis.: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.
- Cosgrove, Denis (2006): »Modernity, community and the landscape idea«, in: *Journal of Material Culture* 11/1-2, S. 49–66.
- Daniels, Stephen (1989): »Marxism, culture, and the duplicity of landscape«, in: Richard Peet/Nigel Thrift (Hg.), *New models in geography* (Vol. 2). London: Unwin Hyman, S. 196–220.
- Daniels, Stephen/Cosgrove, Denis (1988): »Introduction. Iconography and landscape«, in: Denis Cosgrove/Stephen Daniels (Hg.), *The iconography of landscape*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, S. 1–10.

- EESC (2021): Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on ›Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions – Critical Raw Materials Resilience: Charting a Path towards greater Security and Sustainability‹ (COM (2020) 474 final) OJ C220/118.
- European Commission (2008): The raw materials initiative. Meeting our critical needs for growth and jobs in Europe (Communication) COM (699).
- European Commission (2019): The European green deal (Communication) COM (640).
- European Commission (2020): Critical raw materials resilience. Charting a path towards greater security and sustainability (Communication) COM (474).
- European Commission (2021): New EU forest strategy for 2030 (Communication) COM (572).
- Fahlbusch, Michael/Rössler, Mechtild/Siegrist, Dominik (1989): »Conservatism, ideology and geography in Germany 1920–1950«, in: *Political Geography Quarterly* 8, S. 353–367.
- Fälton, Emelie/Mels, Tom (2024): »Historical boundary struggles in the construction of the non-human world. nature conservation and tourism in Swedish national parks«, in: *Journal of Historical Geography* 86, S. 70–86.
- Fraser, Nancy (2009): *Scales of justice*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fraser, Nancy (2014): »Behind Marx's hidden abode. For an expanded conception of capitalism«, in: *New Left Review* 86/4, S. 55–72.
- Fraser, Nancy (2021): »Climates of capital«, in: *New Left Review* 127, S. 94–127.
- Fraser, Nancy/Honneth, Axel (2003): *Redistribution or recognition? A political-philosophical exchange*. London: Verso.
- Hartshorne, Richard (1939): *The nature of geography. A critical survey of current thought in the light of the past*. Lancaster, Penn.: Association of American Geographers.
- Hartshorne, Richard (1958): »The concept of geography as a science of space. From Kant and Humboldt to Hettner«, in: *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 48/2, S. 97–108.
- Harvey, Francis/Wardenga, Ute (2006): »Richard Hartshorne's adaptation of Alfred Hettner's system of geography«, in: *Journal of Historical Geography* 32/2, S. 422–440.
- Hettner, Alfred (1927): *Die Geographie. Ihre Geschichte, ihr Wesen und ihre Methoden*. Breslau: Hirt.

- Hettner, Alfred (1935): »Gesetzmässigkeit und Zufall in der Geographie«, in: *Geographische Zeitschrift* 41/1, S. 2–15.
- Kaasch, Michael/Kaasch, Joachim (Hg.) (2011): *Otto Schlüter (1872–1959). Sein Wirken für die Geographie und die Leopoldina*. Nova Acta Leopoldina NF 112/383.
- Larsen, Rasmus K./Raitio, Kajsa (2019): »Implementing the state duty to consult in land and resource decisions«, in: *Arctic Review on Law and Politics* 10, S. 4–23.
- Meinig, Donald W. (Hg.) (1979): *The interpretation of ordinary landscapes. Geographical essays*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Mels, Tom (2016): »The trouble with representation: landscape and environmental justice«, in: *Landscape Research* 41/4, 417–424.
- Mels, Tom (2020): »The deep historical geography of environmental justice«, in: *Annales de Géographie* 736/3, 31–54.
- Mels, Tom (2023): »Mainstreaming environmental justice? Right to the landscape in northern Sweden«, in: Corine Wood-Donnelly/Johanna Ohlsson (Hg.), *Arctic justice. Environment, society and governance*. Bristol: Bristol University Press, S. 81–95.
- Mohai, Paul/Pellow, David/Roberts, J. Timmons (2009): »Environmental justice«, in: *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 34, S. 405–430.
- Olwig, Kenneth R. (1996): »Recovering the substantive nature of landscape«, in: *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86, S. 630–653.
- Olwig, Kenneth R. (2021): »Author response to the commentaries. The meanings of landscape: Essays on place, space, environment and justice«, in: *Progress in Human Geography*, 45/2, S. 410–412.
- Olwig, Kenneth R./Mitchell, Don (Hg.) (2008): *Justice, power and the political landscape*. London: Routledge.
- Pfaffen, Karlheinz (1973): *Das Wesen der Landschaft*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Regeringskansliet (2013): *Sveriges mineralstrategi. För ett hållbart nyttjande av Sveriges mineraltillgångar som skapar tillväxt i hela landet (N2013.02)*. Stockholm: Näringsdepartementet.
- Regeringskansliet (2018a): *Handlingsplan för Sveriges nationella skogsprogram 2018 (N2018.29)*. Stockholm: Näringsdepartementet.
- Regeringskansliet (2018b): *Strategidokument. Sveriges nationella skogsprogram (N2018.15)*. Stockholm: Näringsdepartementet.
- Regeringskansliet (2022): *Nationell strategi för elektrifiering*. Stockholm: Regeringskansliet.

- Relph, Edward (1981): *Rational landscapes and humanistic geography*. London: Croom Helm.
- Sauer, Carl O. (1925): *The morphology of landscape*. Berkeley: University of California publications in geography 2.
- Schlüter, Otto (1906): *Die Ziele der Geographie des Menschen*. Berlin.
- Spethmann, Hans (1928). *Dynamische Länderkunde*. Breslau: Ferdinand Hirt.
- Spethmann, Hans (1932): *Das Schicksal in der Landschaft*. Berlin: R. Hobbing.
- Tarras-Wahlberg, Håkan/Southalan, John (2021): Mining and indigenous rights in Sweden: what is at stake and the role for legislation«, in: *Mineral Economics* 35, S. 239–252.
- Troll, C. (1947): »Die geographische Wissenschaft in Deutschland in den Jahren 1933 bis 1945«, in: *Erdkunde* 1/1-3, S. 3–48.
- United Nations (2015): *Transforming our world. The 2030 Agenda for sustainable development*, UN general assembly resolution A/RES/70/1 (21 October). New York: United Nations.

Autor*innen

Ana María Bergholz (geb. Parra Oliva) (M.A.), geb. 1982, ist Ph.D. Kandidatin des Programms Heritage Studies an der Brandenburgischen Technischen Universität Cottbus-Senftenberg. Ihre Forschungsschwerpunkte umfassen Kulturlandschaften und Transformationsprozesse. Gegenstand ihrer Dissertation ist die Transformation der Landschaft am Beispiel des Lausitzer Seenlandes mit Schwerpunkt in Brandenburg.

Karsten Berr (Dr. phil.), geb. 1960, ist wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter und Projektleiter am Lehrstuhl Stadt- und Regionalentwicklung an der Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen. Arbeitsschwerpunkte betreffen unter anderem die transdisziplinäre Landschaftsforschung, Landschaftsarchitekturtheorie, Planungsethik und Landschaftskonflikte.

Alejandro de Castro Mazarro (PhD), geb. 1979, ist Senior Researcher am Leibniz-Institut für ökologische Stadt- und Regionalentwicklung in Dresden (Deutschland). Sein Forschungsschwerpunkt liegt auf der Telekopplung von städtischen Gebieten und den Landschaften, die globale Baumaterialien liefern.

Ludger Gailing (Prof. Dr. rer. pol.), geb. 1976, leitet das Fachgebiet Regionalplanung an der Brandenburgischen Technischen Universität Cottbus-Senftenberg. Er ist einer der Sprecher des Arbeitskreises Landschaftsforschung. Seine Forschungsschwerpunkte betreffen u.a. regionale Raumentwicklung, Räume der Energiewende und des Klimaschutzes sowie Fragen von Gemeinwohl und Gerechtigkeit in der Planung.

Luisa Geldbach (M.Sc.), geb. 1992, ist wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Fachgebiet Regionalplanung an der Brandenburgischen Technischen Universität Cottbus-Senftenberg. Sie forscht zu umweltbezogener Gerechtigkeit in ländlichen Räumen.

Daniela Gottschlich (Prof. Dr. rer. pol.), geb. 1972, leitet den Studiengang Ökonomie – Nachhaltigkeit – Gesellschaftsgestaltung an der Hochschule für Gesellschaftsgestaltung in Koblenz. Ihre Forschungsschwerpunkte betreffen u. a. Nachhaltigkeit als mehrdimensionales Gerechtigkeitskonzept, neue Ökonomien, Demokratisierung gesellschaftlicher Naturverhältnisse, Care als sozial-ökologisches Transformationsprinzip sowie Ökologie und Rechtsextremismus.

Hendrik Herold (Dr. rer. nat.), geb. 1977, ist wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter und Projektleiter am Leibniz-Institut für ökologische Raumentwicklung in Dresden. Er forscht zu Fragen der raumzeitlichen Analyse und Modellierung der Landnutzung und damit verbundener Umweltaspekte.

Hans Hortig (Dipl. Ing.), geb. 1984, ist Doktorand am Lehrstuhl für Architektur und Territorialplanung des Departments Architektur der ETH Zürich, Forschungsassistent am Singapore-ETH Centre und freischaffender Landschaftsarchitekt. Seine Forschungsschwerpunkte umfassen die räumlich-sozialen Auswirkungen urbaner Stoffwechselprozesse und die Transformation industrieller Landwirtschaft.

Christine Katz (Dr. rer. nat.), geb. 1960, ist geschäftsführende Vorsitzende des Instituts für Diversity, Natur, Gender und Nachhaltigkeit (diversu e.V.) in Lüneburg. Ihre Forschungsschwerpunkte liegen in der solidarischen gemeinwohlorientierten Gestaltung von Landnutzung, Caring with Nature(s), Unterdrückungszusammenhänge gesellschaftlicher Naturverhältnisse. Sie ist zusätzlich involviert in die Realisierung von zivilgesellschaftlicher Teilhabe und Mitbestimmungsmacht an sozial-ökologischen Veränderungsprozessen im ländlichen Raum.

Olaf Kühne (Prof. Dr. phil. habil. Dr. rer. soc.), geb. 1973, ist Professor für Stadt- und Regionalentwicklung an der Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen. Er befasst sich unter anderem mit sozialkonstruktivistischer Landschaftsforschung, der sozialen Akzeptanz von Landschaftsveränderungen, insbesonde-

re im Kontext der Energiewende, Stadtlandhybriden und neopragmatischen Perspektiven in der Geographie.

Markus Leibenath (Prof. Dr.-Ing.; Habilitation an der TU Berlin), geb. 1966, leitet das Fachgebiet ›Landschaftsplanung und Kommunikation‹ an der Universität Kassel und ist einer der Sprecher des Arbeitskreises Landschaftsforschung. Er forscht zu planerischen Beteiligungs- und Kommunikationsprozessen, etwa im Hinblick auf Stadterweiterungsprojekte und Landschaftsentwicklung am Rand von Großstädten, sowie zu sozial-ökologischen Transformationen und Gerechtigkeit, beispielsweise im Kontext von Großschutzgebieten.

Maike Melles (Dr. phil.), geb. 1990, ist wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Institut für Ethnologie der Tschechischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Prag. Ihre Forschungsschwerpunkte umfassen Landschaften, Kulturerbe, Ressourcen und Nachhaltigkeit in Süd- und Mitteleuropa.

Tom Mels (PhD), born in 1969, is an associate professor at the Department of Human Geography, Uppsala University. Based at Campus Gotland, his research and teaching seeks to understand how planning processes and landscape changes in Sweden raise questions of environmental justice. Empirical contexts include the draining of wetlands, indigenous land rights, and nature conservation.

Bruno Milanez (PhD), geb. 1975, ist außerordentlicher Professor am Fachbereich für Wirtschaftsingenieurwesen und am Graduiertenprogramm für Geografie an der Bundesuniversität Juiz de Fora (Brasilien). Er koordiniert die Forschungsgruppe für Politik, Wirtschaft, Bergbau, Umwelt und Gesellschaft (PoEMAS). Sein Forschungsschwerpunkt liegt auf der Bergbaupolitik und den institutionellen Strategien von Rohstoffkonzernen.

Richard Pantzier (M.Sc.), geb. 1995, ist akademischer Mitarbeiter am Fachgebiet Regionalplanung an der Brandenburgischen Technischen Universität Cottbus-Senftenberg. Er forscht zu Lebensbedingungen in dünn besiedelten ländlichen Räumen, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die Lebenswirklichkeit älterer Menschen.

Jannis Pfendtner-Heise (M.Sc.), geb. 1992, ist wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter im Bereich Nachhaltigkeit der Leuphana Universität Lüneburg. Er forscht zu

nachhaltiger und gerechter Entwicklung in städtischen und ländlichen Räumen.

Miriam Prys-Hansen (Prof. Dr.), geb. 1978, leitet den Forschungsschwerpunkt Globale Ordnungen und Außenpolitiken am German Institute for Global and Area Studies, Hamburg. Ihre Forschungsschwerpunkte sind regionale und globale Umwelt- und Klimapolitik, sowie Machtverschiebungen in der globalen Ordnung.

Henk Wiechers (M.A.), geb. 1992, arbeitet als wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter am Fachgebiet Regionalplanung an der Brandenburgischen Technischen Universität Cottbus-Senftenberg. Seine Arbeitsschwerpunkte liegen im Bereich der sozialwissenschaftlichen Energieforschung, qualitativer Methoden der Sozialforschung und der Politischen Ökologie.

Julia Zscherneck (M.Sc.), geb. 1993, ist wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin und Doktorandin im Fachgebiet Regionalplanung an der Brandenburgischen Technischen Universität Cottbus-Senftenberg im Fachgebiet Regionalplanung. Sie ist studierte Geographin und forscht und lehrt zu den Themen ländliche Regionalentwicklung, Sicherung der Daseinsvorsorge sowie Digitalisierung in ländlichen Räumen.