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ABSTRACT
Landscape Justice, we argue, is one of the preconditions for social sustainability underlined by an ethos of equality. While there are several social groups who experience discrimination, in this paper we focus on landscape and migration in the context of Europe’s gravest refugee crisis since the Second World War. Refugees, and migrants in general, are one of the most vulnerable groups of people in society. In most Western countries they face economic hardship and difficult living conditions and frequently have to face a social climate of prejudices and hostility. Such adversities, affected by spatial conditions and access to spatial resources, as well as affecting potential positive associations with landscape, are at the core of landscape justice. Building on the premise that landscape is the essential infrastructure for wellbeing and that research on landscape justice is instrumental to achieving the goals of the European Landscape Convention, this article offers a review of existing literature on landscape and migration. The goal is to identify new potential research directions and strategies that would contribute to landscape justice and wellbeing.

1. Introduction

Landscape Justice has been identified as a field not receiving much attention in landscape studies. Related spatial study areas such as political geography and planning have had a longer tradition of engagement with a social equality ethos (Jorgensen, 2016; Mels, 2016; Olwig & Mitchell, 2009). In landscape studies and landscape architecture in particular, the prominent ethos of the past two decades has been that of sustainability assumed as the overlap between environmental, economic and social sustainability. Social sustainability is viable only within an ethos of equality and justice (Bauman, 2007). It is in this context that we define landscape justice aligned with the concept of The Right to Landscape based on the propositions that landscape is a common good and the infrastructure for wellbeing (Egoz, 2016).

As such, several areas of landscape studies in effect deal with landscape justice by relating landscape with inequalities, whether gender or race, marginalised, deprived, politically oppressed or underprivileged populations, and their access to landscape resources. Universal design for the disabled and the role of public green areas in supporting physical and mental health are other examples of landscape justice that embody an ethos of equality and inclusion.

We chose to address one topical study field which we argue represents a relevant sub-field of landscape justice: migration.
2. Landscape and migration

Migration has always been part of the human experience. During the recent decades of globalisation, people's growing mobility and conflict-driven forced migrations have changed contemporary societies. Nowadays, much more than in the past, the 'other' and the 'elsewhere' do not constitute distant and abstract entities, located beyond the borders of 'home', but are present in everyday life.

The influx of refugees into Europe is unprecedented, and said to be the worst refugee crisis since the Second World War, amounting to an acute societal challenge of our times. Clashes related to migration are being exacerbated in Europe as well as in the United States. The June 2016 British referendum's outcome—to exit the European Union—brought to the fore related complex challenges, and represents but one sign of the ill feelings among the public towards foreigners in their societies. Increasing support for right-wing anti-immigration political values in other European countries, as well as in the United States, is another indicator of the gravity of the subject (BBC, 2016). Climate change impact on populations, which is bound to drive further mass migrations and social unrest, is a further burning issue.

Migrants, and refugees in particular, are one of the most vulnerable groups of people in society. Often forced to abandon their familiar landscapes and cultural comfort zones, deprived and feeling out of place both physically and socially, their relocation may become a traumatic experience. At the same time, migrant individuals and communities are increasingly marginalised by their host societies. In most Western countries migrants face economic hardship and difficult living conditions: they dwell in degraded neighbourhoods, might be obliged to accept dangerous and underpaid jobs, and frequently have to face a social climate of prejudices and hostility (Mountz, 2011). These hardships, affected by spatial conditions and access to spatial resources, as well as affecting potential positive associations with landscape, are at the core of landscape justice. Migration studies as described by geographer Russel King are ‘the description, analysis, and theorisation of the movement of people from one place or country to another’ (King, 2012, p. 136). The emphasis on place implies that one central component of the experience of migration is the role of the physical environment or landscape. This article offers a review of existing literature on landscape and migration. Ample work has been done on this topic in the past few decades, but in light of the present crisis there is a need to identify further research questions and strategies.

Keeping in mind the interface between landscape justice and migration, the review is structured according to the following headings: landscape as common ground; the everyday landscape and creating meaningful places; and resettlement in the landscape.

2.1. Landscape as common ground

This topic has been developed with special reference to green spaces, where landscape is addressed as a public and shared setting that supports processes of inclusion or connotes exclusion of migrants and minority ethnic groups. It focuses on the way in which countryside, urban forests and urban public parks constitute contexts in which the relationships between autochthonous and migrant populations are negotiated and shaped.

Landscape as the arena for promoting national identity and exclusion has been well established (see Egoz & Merhav, 2009). Some examples are discussions about 'Britishness' and 'Englishness' (Matless, 1998), the English seaside (Burdsey, 2016) and on how the southern English countryside has become an expression of England's identity—often defined through opposition to the 'Other' (Rose, 2001) and through the exclusion of minorities from an idealised landscape considered essentially 'white' (Agyeman, 1990 and Agyeman & Neal, 2006; Agyeman & Spooner, 1997; Askins, 2006, 2009; Bressey, 2009; Chakrabarti & Garland, 2004; Cloke, 2006; Hubbard, 2005). Hubbard (2005), for example, demonstrated that racial tensions are prevalent within English rural communities, noting that the inhabitants' protests against construction of centres for the accommodation of asylum seekers are an expression of rural racism. Xenophobic sentiments are rooted in a long-lasting ideal of countryside as a symbol of the local and white community's identity and, as such, something that needs to be protected from foreigners.
Both ethnic diversity and rural racism are present in the English countryside, yet these attitudes have only partially been recognised by policy-makers and stakeholders (Chakraborti, 2010; Neal, 2002).

Byrne and Wolch (2009), reviewing studies on ethnic groups’ recreational behaviour, which mainly took place in North American parks and green spaces, highlighted the inequalities experienced by migrants in these territorial contexts. They reported that ‘leisure theorists have advanced four interconnected explanations for ethno-racially differentiated park use: (1) marginality; (2) race/ethnicity; (3) assimilation and acculturation; and (4) discrimination’ (2009, p. 749). Marginality refers to socio-economic barriers that could prevent migrants from visiting parks, such as low incomes and dependence on public transport. Race/ethnicity highlights differences in cultural backgrounds, asserting that behaviours and preferences are culturally determined. Acculturation/assimilation refers to the different levels of adaptation to the host society that migrants might achieve, so that scholars expect that over time minority groups will adopt behaviours closer to the dominant group’s habits. Finally, discrimination theory addresses the climate of hostility and prejudice experienced by migrants in public parks, causing them to avoid visiting parks.

As the authors emphasised, these theories overlook some other factors. For example, often migrants live in neighbourhoods where parks and recreational facilities are poorly provided for, or they experience practical obstacles such as lack of multilingual signs, or parking problems, and social barriers such as discrimination, fear and perceptions of unsafety. All these aspects constitute issues of landscape justice, since they prevent or discourage ethnic minorities from attending parks and other recreational green spaces, and enjoying the health benefits they provide (Bruton & Floyd, 2014; Byrne, 2012; Byrne, Wolch, & Zhang, 2009; Floyd, 2014; Höglhammer, Muhar, & Schauppenlehner, 2015; Jay et al., 2012).

Byrne et al. (2009) studied visitors to an urban national park in Los Angeles, identifying spatial factors of location and distances as well as access to facilities, as possible influences on park use that should be explored. They also noted that more research is needed regarding ‘the thoughts, feelings, beliefs, values and attitudes of those people who do not use the national park’ (2009, p. 384). Byrne (2012), looking at Latino migrants’ (non) use patterns in some urban parks in Los Angeles, underlined the importance of taking into account the ‘cultural politics of nature’ (2012, p. 597)—that is, the intertwining of policies, ideologies and various interpretations of nature—in order to understand the different ethnic attitudes towards parks. Floyd (2014) explicitly acknowledged the need to study leisure experiences through a social justice perspective, and to actively work in order to ‘alleviate leisure constraints related to race, ethnicity, and other markers of social and economic inequality’ (2014, p. 381).

Gobster (1998) observed that in Warren Park in Chicago, despite evidence of spatial segregation, there are also several areas in the park that a mix of ethnic groups visit, hence it could be considered as a ‘green magnet’. Gobster maintained that there is a need for more research on the frequency and actual nature of the interactions between different ethnic groups.

In line with Alport’s Contact Theory, (in Shinew, Glover, & Parry, 2004) that argues that increased contact will support tolerance to differences, further scholars have focused on the potential of green spaces and other public spaces as sites for fostering intercultural dialogue and inter-ethnic social cohesion (Gobster, 1998; Jay & Schraml, 2009, 2014; Peters, Elands, & Buijs, 2010; Ravenscroft & Markwell, 2000; Seeland, Dübendorfer, & Hansmann, 2009). Gentin (2011), however, highlighted that some of these studies display contrasting results, and Valentine and Sadgrove (2012) pointed to a gap and contradictions between individual values and actual behaviour in public spaces.

Jay and Schraml (2009) investigated the potential of urban forests for the facilitation of integration of three different groups of migrants, Turkish, Balkan, and Russia-Germans (the term used for late repatriates from the former Soviet Union) living in Freiburg, Germany. The authors studied migrants’ perceptions and uses of these spaces, finding that some of them were determined by culture. For example, Turkish migrants did not visit forests as frequently as the others did. At the same time, individuals’ experiences, such as childhood encounters with forests in countries of origin, influenced use patterns more than cultural background. Forests are found to provide a link between host and home countries through memories of past life stages, and are able to foster a sense of belonging, since natural elements are more ‘universal’ than other features in the landscape. The authors noted that in general, social contacts
remained on a ‘small-talk’ level, since people didn’t wish to engage in conversations with strangers, and only Turkish migrants found forests to be places suited for social interactions.

Similarly, in their study of the relationships of Dutch people and non-Western migrants with some urban parks in the Netherlands, Peters et al. (2010) found that both groups considered parks as places for social interactions, but that they mostly had contact with people they knew. In this study as well, Turkish migrants were more interested in having conversations than ethnic Dutch people, but they didn’t make the first step and chats remained cursory. The authors nonetheless concluded that the use of green spaces as places for relaxation is common to all ethnic groups, the attachment of those who use them is not related to ethnicity and that urban parks can be considered inclusive spaces.

The studies cited above highlighted the different dynamics of people’s relationships with green spaces. While some factors, such as frequency of visits, or whether visits are solitary or in a group, are mainly ‘culturally determined’, others are ‘experientially determined’, for example evoking childhood memories and sentiments related to these.

In a more recent contribution, Jay and Schraml (2014) highlighted that some recreational patterns are independent from the migration background, being shaped by personal experience, gender, and lifestyle. Kloek, Buijs, Boersema, and Schouten (2016), in a study of recreational patterns of migrant and autochthonous people in the Netherlands, reported that the heterogeneity of different ethnic groups is instrumental to use-patterns. They found for example that both intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic similarities and differences in behaviour were more influenced by gender than culture.

At the same time, Seeland et al. (2009), exploring the role of urban forests and parks in increasing social inclusion of youths from different cultures living in Zurich, found that despite the high presence of foreign inhabitants cross-cultural friendships are less frequent in the poorest neighbourhood they investigated.

Peters and de Haan (2011) studied Lombok, a multicultural neighbourhood in the Dutch city of Utrecht and reported that though Lombok residents claimed to enjoy cultural diversity nonetheless, they admitted that in everyday life, actual interactions with people from other ethnicities are restricted to small talk in stores and that development of personal relationships and networks were monocultural.

In a different territorial context—the city of Padua, in northeastern Italy—Cancellieri and Ostanel described a ‘struggle’ for public space. Focusing in particular on the multi-ethnic space around the railway station of the city, the authors found that ‘the level of visibility acquired by difference becomes a sort of ‘hypervisibility’ and migrants are [generally perceived by the locals as] a threat to the appropriate use of urban space. The railway station epitomises a struggle between migrants for the physical and symbolic production, occupation and appropriation of (public) space’ (Cancellieri & Ostanel, 2015, p. 507).

Yu (2016), studying the mobility patterns of the inhabitants of Flushing, where the largest Chinese community of New York lives, reported that even though the place was characterised by high accessibility and by a variety of available transportation resources, Chinese migrants tended not to leave, experiencing a condition of physical and social immobility, impacted by racial discrimination.

Several researchers have studied social and cultural processes through which landscape had become an arena for exclusion (Durrheim & Dixon, 2001; Peake & Ray, 2001; Pulido, 2000; Schein, 2009; Van Hooreweghe, 2015), or a context for inclusion (Gobster, 2002; Rishbeth, 2001; Viola, 2012; Wolch, Byrne, & Newell, 2014), being aware that ‘the construction of everyday multiculturalisms is in the end the task of inhabitants as well as planners’ (Fincher, Iveson, Leitner, & Preston, 2014, p. 47).

Ravenscroft and Markwell (2000) described this knotty issue as ‘an apparent contradiction, in which parks and public spaces are determined to be of value to those who use them, despite a lack of evidence about their contribution to integrative or community experiences’ (2000, p. 136).

Nonetheless, participatory events that draw people together and increase their opportunities to be involved in intercultural relationships, are a potential avenue to increased integration. One example is the possibility of street music to facilitate intercultural encounters and ‘moments of egalitarian togetherness’ (Doughty & Lagerqvist, 2016, p. 65).
2.2. The everyday landscape and creating meaningful places

The second body of work on migration and landscape relates mainly to the everyday landscape. This scholarly occupation lines up with the values of the European Landscape Convention’s definition of Landscape as ‘an area as perceived by people’ (CoE, 2000) and as such reflects landscape justice values embedded in the ELC (Egoz et al., 2011). This field of study is concerned with how migrants build a relationship with their everyday places, and the processes through which they build new territorial ties and maintain transnational bonds. It often focuses on how migrants develop place-attachment and a sense of belonging to places, through active involvement in shaping the landscape and embodied and emotional experiences of it.

The notion of *Place Attachment* has been largely addressed by environmental psychologists and human geographers along with other related concepts such as ‘sense of place,’ ‘place identity,’ ‘sense of belonging,’ and ‘place-belongingness.’ (Altman & Low, 1992; Antonsich, 2010; Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001; Manzo, 2005; Manzo & Devine-Wright, 2014; Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977, 1980, 1990; Twigger-ross & Uzzell, 1996). These terms convey the subjective, emotional, experiential, and affective dimensions of humans’ relationships with places and landscapes, as well as the connection between such relationships and social interactions. Such studies can thus be useful in order to better understand migrants’ relationships with places: how migrants build new territorial ties; how they maintain bonds with their country of origin; which factors mostly contribute to such processes, and to the psychological and emotional wellbeing and equilibrium sought-after in the progression towards a re-rooting in place.

Most of the studies on these topics, focused on both green and urban landscapes, aim at exploring how the processes of displacement and placement connected to the experience of migrants affect their relationships with places. For example, Byrne and Goodall (2013) studied the ‘placemaking’ practices of Arab and Vietnamese migrants in a national park in Sydney. They found that for their interviewees, picnics were mainly social events, but also the opportunity to encounter Australia’s natural environment. Rishbeth and Finney, in a study of a group of asylum seekers and refugees on the ‘experiential knowledges’ of urban green spaces, affirmed that such landscapes provided a psychological link between countries of origin and adopted countries, even when the compared places presented very different landscape characteristics (2006).

One prevalent practice of place-making that has been increasing in the past two decades, as the sustainability paradigm reaches into mainstream society, is community food gardening. Among migrants it is becoming another way of connecting with landscape.

2.2.1. Community gardening

Studies on community gardens highlight how such settings contribute to an improvement of both environmental quality and social ties. Community gardens can thus become contexts in which environmental sustainability and social justice coalesce (Anguelovski, 2013, 2014; Bassett, 2014; Milbourne, 2012; Gottlieb, 2010; Baker, 2004). Milbourne (2012) examined 18 community gardening projects in disadvantaged urban neighbourhoods in the UK, underlining that the environmental actions occurring in community gardens may work as a ‘medium’ to reach social and cultural tolerance.

Scholars show that in multicultural contexts, community gardens facilitate social cohesion and intercultural dialogue. Gardens also contribute to refugees’ and migrants’ wellbeing, health, social and cultural empowerment, and inclusive ideas of citizenship (Crossan, Cumbers, McMaster, & Shaw, 2016; Cummings, Rowe, Harris, & Somerset, 2008; Eggert, Blood-Siegfried, Champagne, Al-Jumaily, & Biederman, 2015; Gerber, 2015; Grubesic, 2013; Harris, Rowe-Minniss, & Somerset, 2014; Hartwig & Mason, 2016; Lee, 2001; Mares & Peña, 2011; Neilsen, 2015). Similarly Eggert et al. (2015) noted that growing plants from both one’s home and host country, positively affects refugees’ nutrition, finances, and social networking. Hartwig and Mason (2016) reported that community gardens also provide emotional and mental benefits, especially for women, who are more likely to suffer from social isolation and depression than men.
Furthermore, the activity of shaping the landscape helps migrants build a positive relationship with their host country, as well as fostering their affective connection with their homeland. In this regard, community gardens and other forms of urban agriculture build a bridge between different places and life stages, supporting migrants’ sense of continuity and identity (Agustina & Beilin, 2012; Brook, 2003; Gerodetti & Foster, 2016; Graham & Connell, 2006; Hinton, 2016; Hondagneu-Sotelo & Ruiz, 2014; Kelly, 2012; Kenny, 2014; Mazumdar & Mazumdar, 2012; Shinew et al., 2004; Thompson, Corkery, & Judd, 2007; Ward-Lambert, 2014). For example, Gerodetti and Foster (2016) found that migrants shape ‘hybrid’ landscapes: through gardening, they maintain their bond to their past place of life, but also make efforts to adapt to the new one. Similar benefits are experienced by older migrants (Beckie & Bogdan, 2010; Li, Hodgetts, & Ho, 2010).

Researchers also identified some challenges. Agustina and Beilin (2012), who in their study of community gardens in Australia reported that most gardeners develop social networks through their activity, also highlighted that the language barrier was to some degree an obstacle to intercultural dialogue. Hinton (2016) studied the community garden experience of a group of Bhutanese refugees living in Halifax, Canada, and found few intercultural interactions, and difficulties in understanding others’ agricultural practices. Ward-Lambert (2014) reported unequal power dynamics and conflicts related to planting techniques and control over resources.

Another sub-topic that frames meaning-creation is the role of landscape as a reference for identity and as a link between different places and stages of life.

### 2.2.2. Identity and belonging

Belonging is a basic human need considered instrumental to the human experience to ensure wellbeing. The following studies are thus underpinned by the notion of landscape justice.

Rishbeth and Finney (2006) and Rishbeth and Powell (2013) explored the relationship between migrants and their neighbourhood in Sheffield. They found that identifying familiar plants aroused nostalgic feelings for home, but was also an active agent in building positive connections to the new place of life. It has long been established that familiarity is a factor that influences landscape preferences (Kaplan & Kaplan, 1989) and the duration of residence in a place is central to developing a sense of attachment. At the same time, responses to landscape and feelings of belonging are also highly influenced by personal meanings, as well as daily lived experiences that provide continuity.

Similar findings are highlighted by Main (2013), who studied migrants’ relationship with an urban park in California. Main found that a strong sense of belonging can also be developed by people who have recently settled, determined by meanings attributed to the place. Main thus suggested considering the complexity of these dynamics, which include a wide range of meanings, both positive, such as sense of inclusion and restoration, and negative, such as concern for personal safety and loneliness.

Several scholars have argued that relationships with everyday places, including feelings of place-attachment and belonging, are mainly built by attributing symbolic meanings to landscape, through a dialectical relationship between past memories, present experiences, and expectations for the future, in which life events, people and places become deeply intertwined (Armstrong, 2004; Benson, 2011; Buffel & Phillipson, 2011; Castiglioni, De Nardi, & Dalla Zuanna, 2015; Darling, Healey, & Healey, 2012; De Nardi, 2013, 2017; Ehrkamp, 2005; O’Neill & Hubbard, 2010; Pascual-de-Sans, 2004; Peters, Stodolska, & Horolets, 2016; Raffaetà & Duff, 2013; Richter, 2011; Tolia-Kelly, 2004, 2010)). In these dynamics a central role is played by habits, daily movements, imagination, and emotional/psychological conditions such as significant memories, hopes, and social relationships, as well as quality of life and legal status in the new country.

Benson, in her study of British migrants to rural France, concluded that migrants’ ‘multi-layered understandings of the landscape emerge out of the negotiation between imagination and experience’ (2011, p. 74). Richter, studying the attachment to places of Spanish migrants in Switzerland, identified two types of places on which migrants build their relationship with the place they live in. The first is ‘identification’—‘symbolic and emblematic sites that link migrants to specific emotional moments’ and
that are deeply connected to their past. The second type are places ‘of daily actions’, which are ‘imbued with meaning derived from concrete practices performed daily’ (2011, p. 225).

Darling et al. (2012) reported that, in particular in the case of asylum seekers, sense of belonging is related to one’s emotions and significant experiences, but also to the possibility of being recognised as an actual part of a state and of a community. Raffaetà and Duff, studying sense of belonging among a group of Ecuadorian people in an Italian Alpine valley, pointed out the significance of social interactions and quality of life. They underlined that migrants particularly expressed ‘a desire for communal space in the village, places with benches and tables for the community to come together’ (2013, p. 334) and that the modern facilities and infrastructural amenities affected the positive sentiments for the new place.

De Nardi (2013, 2017) examined first- and second-generation migrants’ territorial ties in the Italian Veneto region and found that the relationship with the place of life is characterised by two dimensions: a ‘practical’ dimension and an ‘emotional’ dimension. The former is built on everyday routines, as well as on services and places deemed ‘useful’ by migrants, such as shops, frequently used streets, banks, and public offices. The ‘emotional’ dimension implies instead that the subjects develop an affective involvement towards the place, mainly through three factors: memory, social relationships, and quality of life. To this end, particular memories, experiences, events, and life stages connected with places and landscape elements are relevant. Such elements include, for example, the house inhabited during the first period in the host country, or a physical feature, a particular plant or statue which migrants associate with their home country. The author also highlighted how the place is a source of attachment when it allows migrants to live close to relatives and compatriots and to cultivate relationships with them, and when it offers quality of life. For example, De Nardi (2017) showed that kindergartens and schools are particularly important to first-generation migrant women as a symbol of the awareness that the actual place offered opportunities for a better life than the home country. She also maintained that sense of belonging to place is determined more by the symbolic meanings attributed to the landscape, than by its aesthetic quality. Length of residence is not enough to generate place attachment—a place must become a significant context for one’s life, with reference to present purposes, past events, and aspirations for the future.

Scholars studying these topics often conceptualise migrants’ territorial ties using the idea of belonging to multiple places. Personal emotions and meanings, pragmatic attitudes, and social and collective dynamics of inclusion/exclusion may involve several ‘homes’ at the same time. Sometimes migrants appeared suspended between the home country and the host one. O’Neill and Hubbard (2010) termed this split ‘double consciousness’, describing the condition of migrants who reported a sense of belonging to two countries, but at the same time feeling they belong to nowhere. Koefoed and Simonsen (2012) argued that migrants can feel like ‘strangers’ in both their home country and the host one. Buffel and Philipson (2011) and Becker (2003) reported that ambivalent feelings towards one’s country of origin also persist in older migrants.

Liu cited Ahmed’s observation that migrations ‘involve a splitting of home as a place of origin and home as the sensory world of everyday experience’ and that ‘migrants employ the word “home” to refer both to their immigration destination and to their place of birth or origin’ (2014, p. 19).

Some of these studies do not directly refer to the local context, but discuss in general the country of arrival/settlement, as well as the country of origin. They do, however, highlight open, complex, and ambiguous notions of belonging and attachment, with regard to multiple homes (Blunt, 2007; Moskal, 2015; Ralph & Staeheli, 2011). These further highlight the many aspects that contribute to shape migrants’ spatial experiences. For example: how feelings, judgements, and sense of place may vary according to age (Hay, 1998; Shamai & Ilatov, 2005), to the stage of the migratory process (Derrien & Stokowski, 2014), and to whether the person is a first- or second-generation migrant (Waite & Cook, 2011). At the same time sentiments are also influenced by several other factors such as social and political processes (Marcu, 2014), others’ recognition (Christensen & Jensen, 2011; Koefoed & Simonsen, 2012), the multi-scalar nature of home (Lewicka, 2010), and the interdependence between the physical and the symbolic dimension of places which are considered home (Liu, 2014; Wiles, 2008). Disappointment experienced by those who come back to a home country which they find different from the ‘idealised’
one (Christou, 2011), and the ‘emotional dimension’ of citizenship (Ho, 2009) are further components that add to the complexity of the migration experience.

In this variegated framework, landscape often appears as a powerful trigger of emotions and memories. Marcu found that some of her interviewees, Romanian migrants who established in Spain, missed their families but also felt nostalgia about their country of origin, longing for ‘the river, leaves, mud in the streets and doors that squeak’ (2014, p. 11). Christou, in a study of Greek immigrants living in Denmark, reported a nostalgic narrative of Greek ‘warm, inviting, welcoming air, that particular air is not to be found anywhere else in the world’ (2011, p. 255), which makes ‘the place’ as the main motivation to come back home. Liu, discussing the ‘clear differentiation between a strong sense of cultural identity and a more flexible and often ambiguous sense of home’ (2014, p. 23), found that ‘home’ is interpreted by her migrant respondents in many different ways, with reference to one’s family, to values such as freedom, but also to ‘migrants’ physical presence and daily engagement in the country they reside in’ (Liu, 2014, p. 24).

Peters et al. framed an ‘analytical distinction of place attachment and sense of belonging’ relating these notions to ‘the complex interrelation between place, identity, culture and society’ (2016, p. 64). Identity, however, is not a straightforward concept (Egoz, 2013). Koefoed and Simonsen (2012), in a study of Pakistani migrants living in Copenhagen, found that migrants feel Danish, but are often not recognised as such by the host community. Similarly, Christensen and Jensen (2011), in another study on migrants in Denmark, reported feelings of attachment towards the neighbourhood and not towards the nation, since at the national level migrants are considered as ‘unwanted guests’.

### 2.3. Resettlement in the landscape

This section includes studies that have addressed how various landscape settings (both urban and rural) influence the wellbeing of those resettled, also exploring the therapeutic potential of landscape in supporting migrants and refugees’ adaptation to their new conditions of life. Here too, the topic of equal opportunities to enjoy landscape should be seen as a parameter for landscape justice.

As stated above, the experience of migration is a heterogeneous phenomenon—it affects people in different ways, depending on many variables such as one’s expectations, previous experience of migration, reasons for moving, distance and degree of diversity between home and host place. Several scholars have acknowledged that migration involves physical and psychological stress (Bhugra, 2004; El-Bialy & Mulay, 2015; Hordyk, Hanley, & Richard, 2015; Ng, 1998). In a study among migrants in Montreal, Hordyk et al. (2015) reported some of the difficulties experienced during the settlement adaptation process, namely ‘social isolation; language difficulties; underemployment or unemployment; inadequate housing conditions; noise pollution; transportation difficulties; and systemic barriers in health, education and government institutions’ (2015, p. 76). In exploring the connection between migration and mental health, Bhugra (2004) highlighted some resilience factors that may help people to face the psychological challenges of adapting to the new context of life. These include high motivation to migrate and social and emotional support. At the same time Bhugra noted that there are differences between forced and voluntary migrations that ought to be considered when trying to understand the impact of migration (2004, p. 244). The condition of refugees and asylum seekers is particularly acute, often embedding traumatic experiences from their home country, and facing difficult living conditions also in the country of asylum and/or resettlement (Hiruy, 2009). Taking into account this complex context, researchers have explored how landscape and place can contribute to mitigating migrants’ stress, and to improving their settlement process in an often completely unknown territorial, social and cultural reality. In this respect the well-established concept of ‘therapeutic landscape’ is relevant and is another dimension of landscape justice. Therapeutic landscapes are ‘natural and built physical landscapes, social and symbolic environments, and landscapes of the mind, that is, largely or entirely imagined landscapes’ (Rose, 2012, p. 1381).

Scholars who have studied the therapeutic potential of landscape with reference to the migrant experience, highlighted the health effect of specific types of place, for example green spaces (Hordyk et al., 2015), leisure spaces in general such as parks, but also sport facilities and shopping centres
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(Hasmi, Gross, & Scott-Young, 2014), and places of worship (Agyekum & Newbold, 2016). Cattell, Dines, Gesler, and Curtis (2008) cited Conradson (2005) arguing that places are not intrinsically therapeutic, since their positive effects on human wellbeing largely depend on how people experience them. The authors explored this topic in a multi-ethnic area of East London, reporting that wellbeing is associated with a variety of different places such as parks, streets, and ethnic market areas. Furthermore, wellbeing is affected by environmental and aesthetic qualities of places, the symbolic link between places and particular activities, memories, regular and unexpected encounters, and the need to be around people as well as alone, fostering a sense of community and social inclusion.

Sampson and Gifford (2010) analysed the place-making activities of young refugees during their first year in Melbourne. They reported different types of ‘therapeutic landscapes of settlement’, corresponding with the refugees’ needs for restoration and renewal. These include ‘places of opportunity’, such as schools and sport facilities, where meaningful activities are carried out and providing people with purpose in life. The second type are defined as ‘places of restoration’, which are characterised by beauty, greenness, and cleanliness, and promote a sense of calmness and peace. These sites are completely different from the places previously known to these young people in their home countries. The third category is ‘places of sociality’, where social and family relationships are restored and new friendships are established, fostering a sense of social inclusion. The fourth type are ‘places of safety’, which embody a sense of security.

Other scholars have demonstrated that the new place may have positive effects on migrants’ wellbeing, if it supports them in facing the challenges of the first stages of settlement. Landscape became ‘therapeutic’ or ‘healthy’ through both its symbolic features—for example when it is perceived through the lens of meaningful relationships, social networks, and activities—and its physical ones (Chakrabarti, 2010; Darling et al., 2012; Dyck & Dossa, 2007; El-Bialy & Mulay, 2015).

Darling et al. (2012) studied place experiences of asylum seekers in the county of Greater Manchester, UK. They found that migrants’ relationship with place is shaped by the different symbolic meanings attributed to the landscape and connected to people’s experiences. Frustrations due to rejections of asylum requests, a sense of political exclusion, and the sense of belonging to the city, all developed through social interactions. Yet, they also found that the characteristics of the natural and built landscape, a waterfront environment for example, recalled positive memories of holidays, evoking pleasant feelings and providing relaxation and mental comfort.

El-Bialy and Mulay (2015), studying the ‘place-related’ factors which influence the wellbeing of a group of refugees resettled in a small urban centre in Canada, reported that ‘the small size of the city, which shocked and distressed several participants upon their arrival, was later portrayed as a positive attribute—the small size of the city made it feel more familiar and safe as the participants settled into it’ (2015, p. 54). Moreover, participants considered the natural environment a source of ‘emotional healing’ and a reason to keep on living there, although it offered less social and economic possibilities than cities.

Studies on the therapeutic potential of landscape also include what Gastaldo et al. called ‘therapeutic landscapes of the mind’, that is, landscapes made of physical elements, but also of ‘social, political and economic relations’ and personal desires and tastes (Gastaldo, Andrews, & Khanlou, 2004, p. 160). These authors described their own experiences as ‘middle-class’ migrants living in Toronto, to highlight that such landscapes are strictly connected to one’s subjectivity and experiences, shaping one’s identity through both real places and imagined ones.

Migrants, and especially refugees, often suffer from physical and psychological wounds: they ‘are looking for a place to stop and settle down’ (King, 2012, p. 136), but even when they find it, resettlement may be difficult. In his research on former African refugees in Hobart, Tasmania, Hiruy reported that in camps and cities refugees lived in sub-standard conditions, also enduring traumatic treatment and harassment. Such experiences lead refugees to ‘create an alternative imaginary reality, at least in their daydreams, in order to get away from these confronting realities’ (2009, p. 64). Their relationship with place is shaped by both their dreams of resettlement in a third country, and the pain for the loss of their country and previous life; it is a condition of ‘suspension’ that can bring subjects to demoralisation and mental disorders (Hiruy, 2009).
3. Discussion and conclusion

With our proposition that landscape justice is a measure for social sustainability, we have focused on migrants as one of several marginalised groups in society closely associated with landscape and place. We found a considerable body of work underlined by values of justice and equality, addressing issues of inclusion and exclusion in public spaces. All this resonates with ethical stances voiced by figures such as scholar Ash Amin (2002) and political philosopher Michael Sandel (2009). At the beginning of this century Amin argued that ‘diversity is thought to be negotiated in the city’s public spaces’ (2002, p. 967) and Sandel advocated for ‘the new politics of common good’ for spaces where, in his words, ‘people from different walks of life encounter one another and so acquire enough of a sense of a shared life that we can meaningfully think of one another as citizens in a common venture’ (BBC Reith Lectures).

At the same time several studies, especially in urban contexts, demonstrated that coexistence between autochthonous and migrant people challenges the idea of public space as an arena for fostering intercultural dialogue and comprehension. Landscape itself is not a panacea for social injustices. The European Landscape Convention, as a document of the Council of Europe, is underpinned by the universal declaration of human rights’ (UDHR) values of democratic governing and an aspiration for justice. This, along with a sustainability ethos, hold opportunities to employ landscape as a tool to address the acute challenges related to migration facing Europe (and the rest of the world) today.

Landscape scholars, spatial planners, and landscape architects hold the expertise to address these challenges (Bauman, 2007). One avenue is facilitating democratic participation in design of places, engaging both local and newly arrived residents. Action research too, is a way of educating about landscape, as outlined by the ELC, and a social–environmental interface for getting to know the other, share a common goal, and overcome xenophobic sentiments.

Another path is to involve landscape experts and planners in policy decision-making regarding resettlement. Such experts have the scientific skills to identify and analyse the capacities of the landscape to serve as a sustainable infrastructure for refugee resettlement. Landscape architect Denis Hoffman Brandt (2011), arguing that often refugee encampment is long-term and perpetuates social unrest and environmental degradation, developed the concept of ‘relief organism (emphasis in original): a refugee settlement framed as an emergent urban system engaged in locally specific landscape-based production to sustain asylum seekers’ human rights and create opportunities for sustainable agro-economic practices in the host country’ (2011, p. 246).

Some scholars have alluded to the complexity attached to the subject of landscape and migration. It is clear that aesthetic landscape preferences and sentiments of place attachment cannot be understood in isolation from other human experiences and social behaviours. Studies need to address the nuances and complexities of the emotional structure of humans and societies, and at the same time to recognise contextual drivers such as political frameworks, economic interests, and nationalist ideologies that contribute to inclusion or exclusion from landscapes.

We also note that often the landscape migration experience involves multiple locations, rather than just the country of origin and a new host country. Refugees might stay in several locations, and experience a variety of landscapes en route before reaching their resettlement destination. Development studies is one area where researchers working with forced migration in interim refugee camps could contribute to the field. More so, the overlap between development studies, political ecology and landscape studies will help to define landscape justice and extend the knowledge beyond existing North American, Australian and European research into the developing countries.

One further possible direction is an anthropological path of life stories and personal histories. The potential richness of such data is consistent with the idea of landscape as the infrastructure for both physical and emotional wellbeing. A relationship with landscape is an expression of the human condition, a concept employed across disciplines and ‘indispensable to the probing of human nature and human wellbeing’ as noted by Yi-Fu Tuan (in Egoz et al., 2011).

In conclusion, we are witnessing challenging days both socially and environmentally—it is clear that these two are not separate. While many landscape scholars have engaged with studies regarding
migration and social justice that we define as ‘Landscape Justice’, landscape research still has a decent amount of prospective work.

**Note**

1. This review focuses mainly on migration to Europe, North America and Australia due to a limit of the scope (word count) permitted in this journal. Another topic which merits investigation is the relationship between landscape and forced migrations in developing countries.
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