

A Discussion of A. Buttimer's Paper on Sustainable Development : Issues of Scale and Appropriateness

Hong-key Yoon*

Professor Buttimer, your well illustrated paper with slides is a welcome contribution to this conference. Your analytical methodology based on three criteria, landscape transformation, ways of life (*genre-de-vie*) and scales of discretionary reach will be especially useful for Korean geographers who want to examine on a micro scale study of regions for framing appropriate criteria and scale for sustainable development.

Your paper has developed from a network research project under the European Community which you led. It must have been a difficult research project requiring good coordination and cooperation of the international colleagues with a cross-cultural research design. Your study in a way reminds me of Clarence J. Glacken's study of 3 Okinawan villages in his book, *Great Loochoo*, although it was carried out by a single researcher in one cultural region.

I found that you have presented discussions in a clear and concise manner. I will attempt to comment on your paper and ask some questions following the order of your discussion.

You have carried out a very complicated research project covering four regions in Europe, each with different backgrounds. You said that the site selection was designed to demonstrate the differential impacts of the mid-twentieth century

development on a bio-geographically and culturally diverse Europe. However, it is not clearly stated in your paper why you have chosen these four regions. If you wanted to choose two original EU member states, the rationale behind your choice of both the Netherlands and West Germany is not clear. I would have thought that choosing two distant regions out of Germany, France and Italy would have been more suitable to achieve your site selection criteria of demonstrating the differential impact of development on a biogeographically and culturally diverse regions in Europe. However, your choice of Ireland and Sweden is readily understandable.

On your varying analytical foci in scope, it is not clear whether your research team deliberately adopted a micro-scale study for the Irish, Dutch and Swedish cases and a local to transnational scale (a micro to macro-scale study) in the case of Germany. Readers of your paper might wonder why different scales were adopted by your research team. Was 'adopting varying scales' your research team's deliberate choice, or imposed upon your team by external factors which you were forced to accept. Adopting a varying analytical scale for different regions in a cross-cultural studies is expected to produce problems, when those four regions are compared and contrasted.

* Professor, University of Auckland (Auckland 대학교 교수)

Your research focussed on agricultural changes in the first three cases, while in the German case you focussed on the impact of energy policies. In your research, the German case was qualitatively different from the three other regions, and without the German region, your research project would have been tackling a more coherent set of research regions with a focus on a common scale (micro-scale) and common criterion (changes in agriculture). Considering these factors, it is not clear why the German region is included in your research project.

On landscape transformations.

In your definition of landscape being literally understood as visible artefactual surfaces, you have been concerned mainly with the form of landscape. In terms of the changes in the landscape form, there seem to have been little changes between 1950 and 1990. Nevertheless, I feel that in your paper, you have touched upon a very important aspect of landscape, namely the study of relationships between form and function of cultural landscape. You said that the case of Flevoland, an artificially constructed landscape reveals the planning objectives of the period for the rationalization of land uses toward maximum productivity and later for justification. This example may suggest that while the form of landscape stays static, its function can change.

In Skane, the agrarian landscape forms had been rationalized (changed) in 1950, but there are efforts to conserve traditional forms, implying little changes in landscape forms since 1950. This region seemed to suggest that since 1950, both the form and function of landscape stays static.

In Tipperary, it seems that the long lasting relative stability of landscape form and function has been maintained, due to cultural attachment to land and the resilience of kinship structure.

In Saarland, the traditional landscape forms have been maintained, but the new patterns of living

have been inserted into them. This case suggests that while the form of landscape remains static, its function has changed. Classifying the dynamic relationships between the form and function of landscape and a systematic investigation of the causes and processes of those relationships would have been an exciting contribution to cultural geography.

I feel that the weakness in the studies of cultural landscapes have been caused by geographers concerned mainly with landscape forms and not with functions. In his article, the Morphology of Landscape, Carl Sauer categorically excluded function from the study of landscape. He said that the study of cultural landscape was mainly concerned with forms, namely morphology. This tradition has more or less continued without critical examination of the traditional stance in the study of cultural landscape (H. Yoon, *Maori Mind, Maori Land*, 1986, p.93). I think that we need to review this traditional stance on landscape studies, and to examine form & function and the relationship between the two. The form and function of a landscape are like the two sides of a coin. The study of the function of landscape is necessary to understand the form of landscape more meaningfully. "Without understanding both sides of the landscape, it may not be possible to gain a comprehensive understanding of the changes in a cultural landscape (H. Yoon, 1986, p.95)." A systematic study of the relationships between form and function of cultural landscape is imperative.

You have elegantly portrayed the three phase trend, each one emphasizing different scales for development that go through all four regions.

First phase, an economic phase with postwar reconstruction and modernization schemes in the 1950s.

Second phase, articulated ecological concerns in the late 1960s and 1970s

Third phase, the sustainability era from the mid-eighties.

It was good to learn about the European phases as it gave me an opportunity to reflect on our Korean situation. I feel that Korea has been in the economic phase until now, and we are entering the second phase, and the sustainability era is yet to come.

Tensions between area-based and sector-based genre-de-vie

It was most interesting to learn about the different attitudes toward the environment in the four European regions.

- a) Dutch farmers - land as a mere commodity or factor of production
- b) Irish farmers- emotional ties with land (symbolic meaning of land)
- c) Swedish - varies from the sense of stewardship of inherited property to exploitation for maximum productivity.
- d) German (energy production) - identity and perceptual reach associated with institutional role and status. Unaware of the consequences of their decision on native populations in remote areas.

I thought that the first three were concerned directly with the land and have common ground for comparison, while the German case was qualitatively different.

You have commented that farmers who followed the EU policy for high productivity are having serious difficulty in adapting to policies emphasizing environmental considerations. It is interesting to note that similar cases are found among the Korean farmers who followed the policy of high productivity.

Functional reach

Market driven food and fuel processing have increased pectorally based enterprise and curtailed the functional reach of area based occupations; Trans-national networks have produced social inequalities; rationalization of community services

have undermined much of the traditional infrastructure of social life - a result of the capitalistic free market economy, we have witnessed some similar cases in New Zealand while restructuring the country with the spirit of so called " Rogernomics".

Professor Buttimer suggested that the criteria of appropriate scale for environmental policy should involve:

- a) sensitivity to bio-geographical setting and socio-cultural traditions.
- b) assessments of external costs involved in the production and distribution of products and consequences for recirculation.
- c) administrative capacity to accommodate initiatives.
- d) information arriving via existing educational and media channels.

In addition to these four, we may need to add a fifth criteria along the lines of "a change in the people's methods and purposes of using the local environment induces a change in their genre-de-vie."

III Implications(points for potential dialogue in Korea)

1. You had stated that the primary cause of environmentally unsustainable development is a global economic system (with multi-national enterprises). I assume, your statement implies that the capitalistic free market economy is to be blamed for this situation.

2. You had also stated that underlying the currently unsustainable course of developments is sectoral specialization in the production of scientific knowledge and policy expertise. The conventional economic theory set criteria for the minimal size of an enterprise, but not for maximal thresholds of scale in the production and circulation of products; Social and ecological consequences were regarded as ancillary. You had stated that a serious approach to these problems must identify and critically

Hong-key Yoon

assess complete paths of production-consumption-recycling or dumping of products. I agree wholeheartedly with your call for new frameworks (new development theories) to set criteria for maximal thresholds of scale in the production and circulation of products.

In concluding my discussion, I wish to thank you for presenting your paper providing useful insights for geographers on what scale and what criteria of appropriateness are needed for sustainable development which attempts to harmonies ecological, economical and social values.