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The past lives on, in art and memory, but it is not static: it shifts and changes as the present throws its shadow backwards. The landscape also changes, but far more slowly: it is a living link between what we were and what we have become. This is one of the reasons why we feel such profound and apparently disproportionate anguish when a loved landscape is altered out of recognition; we lose not only a place, but a part of ourselves, a continuity between the shifting phases of our life.
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LANDSCAPE, CULTURE AND HERITAGE. CHANGING PERSPECTIVES IN AN ASIAN CONTEXT

ABSTRACT

‘All at once heritage is everywhere ... One can hardly move without bumping into a heritage site. Every legacy is cherished.’ (Lowenthal 1998:xi)

A decisive social advance of the post-World War II era has been concern for the world’s cultural heritage with associated efforts to mobilise professional global and national agencies and initiatives to protect it. Initially with the advent in 1964 of The Venice Charter heritage was seen to reside predominantly and physically in great monuments and sites — and substantively monuments and sites of the Classical (Old) World — as works of art. The promulgation of UNESCO World Heritage Convention of 1972 firmly placed cultural heritage (and natural heritage) conservation on the world stage, coinciding as it did with the winds of social, political and economic changes heralded by the opening phases of post-modernity and globalisation of which it was a part.

As the management of cultural heritage resources developed professionally and philosophically through scholarly critique a challenge emerged in the late 1980s/early 1990s to the 1960s and 1970s concept of heritage focusing on noble monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles, or historic sites with connections to the rich and famous. Here was the inception of an enlarged value system embracing such issues as cultural landscapes and settings, living history and heritage, intangible heritage, vernacular heritage, and community involvement.

Critical to the expanded view of cultural heritage was and remains an appreciation of the inter-relationships through time between people, events, and places involving not merely — and certainly not predominantly — tangible aspects of heritage, but associated intangible cultural heritage associations. Co-incidental was the view of heritage as cultural process, not a product. Inevitably heritage has become inextricably linked to notions of identity and continuity, to private and public memories, and to sense of place. As a result, notions of intangible cultural heritage have increasingly suffused the thinking of scholars, organisations and agencies as shifting global approaches to cultural heritage protection have evolved. Such a line of thinking is a welcome development. It links clearly to notions of cultural sustainability, not least towards rethinking approaches to urban conservation which has become a timely focus of attention as global urban populations grow at remarkable speed, and not least in Asia. The emergence of the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) paradigm reflects the shifting interest in urban conservation.

Following the introductory background Chapter 1, Chapter 2 ‘Situating the thesis: research and professional context’ is a dialogical overview tracking approaches to the theoretical and professional changes that have influenced the cultural heritage management process internationally since 1972. Given that my particular locus of interest lies in Southeast and East Asia, case examples throughout focus on this region. The chapter also serves to establish a link between the forces and outcomes of change and the thirteen previously published papers

---

included in Chapter 3 (‘Prior publications’). How the forces and outcomes of change influenced my thinking and writing in the papers are outlined in Chapter 3 (‘Discussion’).

The thesis inquiry and research context are grounded in a series of questions that critically address what has happened since 1972, why have things happened, who has been involved, and what are the implications of changing global perceptions. The conclusions to be drawn from the inquiry reflect on a number of topics. These include the future of heritage studies as an academic discipline and its dialogue with professional practice; the increasing focus on people in relation to things where heritage is a social process as well as a physical one; the advisability of not separating the intangible from the tangible but rather understanding the dialogue between people, their values and things; need for a balanced approach between critical heritage studies and materiality.

*Key Words:* cultural landscape, intangible cultural heritage, values, identity, communities, cultural sustainability, historic urban landscape (HUL).
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND PRESENTATION OF THESIS

Background

This thesis is in the format of PhD by Prior Publication as prescribed by Deakin University’s Higher Degree Procedure in which the thesis is based on a series of publications produced prior to candidature. Following is a list of the thirteen (13) published papers (7 international refereed journal papers and 6 recent refereed book chapters) that are set out in Chapter 4. They reflect critical analysis and experience from my academic and professional inquiry into the shifts that were taking place post-2000 in cultural heritage scholarship and practice. Particular attention throughout is given to Southeast and East Asian examples in that this region has been my particular locus of interest.

Refereed Articles:


Refereed book chapters:


No part of any publication has been submitted for any other degree. The research and inquiry leading to the publications was conducted in a way consistent with university research integrity requirements and no Human Research Ethics approvals were required. It has focused on literature search and application of ideas on how and why change was taking place balanced by my experience gained from attendance at meetings, conferences and study visits in Asia, Europe and North America. These activities have led to exchange of ideas with academic and professional colleagues internationally but particularly in Southeast and East Asian countries including in particular Thailand, Vietnam, Philippines, China, and Japan. Examples used throughout the thesis, particularly Chapter 2 address Southeast and East Asian examples and modes of thinking, often in contrast to Western modes.

Terms of reference: Doctorate by Prior Publication

Deakin University’s Higher Doctorates Procedure (2014) enables a doctorate to be awarded subject to

(15) The candidate must in accordance with the conditions of candidature and any other requirements specified by the University present for examination an electronic copy of their submission for assessment for a Higher Doctorate award by the University consisting of:

a. a copy of the published works that are to be assessed as the basis for seeking the award;

b. an exposition on the significance, impact and standing of the published works that have been included;

c. a signed statement describing the contribution of the candidate to works with more than one author (https://policy.deakin.edu.au/view.current.php?id=00131; accessed 1 January 2017).

Thus, “it is possible to submit a thesis based on publications produced prior to candidature. The publications, which need to be specified at the time of admission, must form a coherent body of work that demonstrates a substantial original contribution to knowledge on the part of the applicant (http://www.deakin.edu.au/students/research/your-thesis-and-examinations/thesis-structure-options ; accessed 1 January 2017)

Under this route, Deakin University’s academic expectations include the need for the candidate to produce a ‘frame’ for the work. One part of the thesis is a unified document that includes an Introduction that lays out the theory and the body of previously published work, explaining how the body coheres and what is being tested or expounded within the body of previously published work. A second chapter should comprise a discursive chapter which brings together the collective major findings of the prior published work and connects it back to the theory assertions that are advanced in the Introduction chapter.
Intent and Aim

The intent of this thesis is to reflect on my work as an academic and practitioner with the aim of outlining what I hope is a modest contribution to the advancement of the body of knowledge in the field of cultural heritage conservation.

Research context and organisation

The research context for the body of work rests on the existence of a number of questions that underpin inquiry into the cultural heritage ascendant phenomenon. Addressed in Chapter 2, these include:

- What has happened in the fifty plus years since 1972 in the cultural heritage arena;
- Why have things happened the way they did;
- Who has been involved; and,
- How do we address changing global perceptions.

Body of the thesis

Following this introduction and presentation commentary, the body of Chapter 2 is essentially a narrative that delves into the remarkable and far-reaching changes in philosophy, theory and practice of defining heritage that have taken place post-1972 (date of the World Heritage Convention) and how do we, or should we, care for it under the umbrella of heritage management. The enthusiasm for heritage is now global and has grown exponentially since the 1950s/1960s when it remained the preserve of a few cognoscenti, as for example the National Trust groups in Australia. This is not an actual or implied criticism of such groups for they paved the way for the current popularity of heritage, a concern for ‘things that you keep.’

The period post-1972 is significant in world social history: Chapter 2 therefore gives a critical overview of the global phenomenon of the heritagisation movement, with some focus – because of my particular research interest – in the cultural landscape concept and how it has increasingly suffused global perspectives in heritage thinking. Chapter 3 ‘Discussion’ reviews and concludes how the forces and outcomes of change influenced the why of my thinking and writing in the published papers which are included at Chapter 4.

Terminology

One word on terminology, particularly use of the two words ‘conservation’ and ‘preservation’, and more precisely their sometimes confusion internationally. Throughout the text I use the word ‘conservation’ in the sense of Article 1.4 of the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2013:2) ‘for all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance’. Preservation is seen in the sense that it may be part of the conservation process as defined in Article 1.6 of the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2013:2): ‘Preservation means maintaining a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration’. Such use stands in contrast to the North American (USA and Canada, but particularly the USA) general use of the term ‘preservation’ as in ‘historic preservation’ when what is meant is conservation. Further ‘conservation’ is the accepted recognised term in international practice. Where

---

1 Term coined by Eric Reece, Premier of Tasmania
‘preservation’ is used in my text it has the meaning of the Burra Charter definition, except where I quote directly from United States authors. The confusion between ‘conservation and ‘preservation’ has seemingly been exacerbated by the proliferation into Asia of USA literature and thus its use by Asian students. When Asian graduate and postgraduate students study in Australia they may often first default to ‘preservation’ literature rather than ‘conservation’ literature.
CHAPTER 2

SITUATING THE THESIS: RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT

Reflections

Framing a narrative that informs and explains a research and professional rationale for the published papers submitted for PhD by Prior Publication perforce reflects back to the late 1980s and 1990s. These were particularly fruitful years for the heritage conservation discipline internationally. It was the period that heralded the opening of a broadening critical debate and understanding of the concept of cultural heritage to that which had prevailed earlier in the 1960s and 1970s which was typified by a focus predominantly on the technical and material conservation of monuments and sites (and substantially the sites of the Old World). It was also the time in which a comprehensive definition of, and operational framework for recognising heritage values of cultural landscapes, was elaborated building on the innovative thinking and writings particularly of geographers (Taylor 2012). The inception of the three World Heritage categories of cultural landscapes adopted by UNESCO in 1992 extended existing emerging concepts and international cultural heritage conservation thinking and practice which embraced associative values rather than a sole focus on tangible, physical fabric. It was an initiative that proved to be of significance also as a driver to re-think other heritage categories and their conservation principles previously established. Underscoring these changes was also the appreciation of the significance of intangible aspects and role of memory and identify in heritage thinking.

My interest in the cultural landscape concept was re-awakened in the late 1970s when asked to direct a study of the historic landscape of the Lanyon-Lambrigg area of the ACT\(^1\) and the subsequent publication of *The Murrumbidgee River Valley Study* (The National Trust of Australia [ACT] 1980). I say ‘reawakened’ because it tapped my foundation UK university undergraduate education in cultural geography (or human geography as it was then called), followed by graduate studies in town planning and then landscape architecture. Such a learning experience, coupled with an introduction to the fascination of reading the landscape, led to my view that understanding human environments offered a rich field of study best understood under the cultural landscape umbrella. In turn I was spurred on to start writing papers and conference presentations in the late 1980s early 1990s. As a result I was fortunate to be invited by Herb Stovel to speak in May 1993 at the Montreal *ICOMOS Cultural Landscape Colloquium* and from this to the UNESCO October 1993 *International Expert Meeting on Cultural Landscapes of Outstanding Universal Value*” in Templin, Germany.

Serendipitously these experiences coincided with the continuation of the work of such pioneers as WG Hoskins, J B Jackson and David Lowenthal in the rich field of reading the landscape. Hoskins (1955:14) was the academic historian who exhorted teachers and students to get out of the archives and into the field to study history in the landscape with his proposition that:

> The … landscape itself, to those who know how to read it aright is the richest historical record we possess.

\(^1\) Australian Capital Territory
J B Jackson (1951:5) expressed his interest in the landscape with the pithy comment that:

A rich and beautiful book is always open before us. We have but to learn how to read it.

David Lowenthal (1975:12) avowed that:

It is the landscape as a whole – that largely manmade tapestry, in which all other artefacts are embedded … which gives them their sense of place.

Further work on the historic Lanyon landscape in the mid-1980s leading to the preparation of the 1987 Study of the conservation, preparation and interpretation of the rural heritage landscape of the Lanyon-Lambrigg area indulged my interest and prodded a view that such landscapes were a rich source of social history with attendant heritage values reflecting the teachings of Hoskins, Jackson and Lowenthal. Noteworthy in the Lanyon exercises, aiming to demonstrate the conservation worth of an historic rural landscape, was the attention paid not just to the landowners but to the ordinary everyday people who worked the property and were central to the landscape making process. The significance of the role of ordinary people in history and associated heritage values, a democratic view of history and heritage, was well understood and a seminal strand of Australian heritage practice by 1987. It was elucidated in the Australia ICOMOS 1988 Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance as social value. Donald Meinig (1979:v) in the Preface to his book of geographical essays on interpreting ordinary landscapes referred to the topic from an international perspective as ‘a lively and expanding realm of interest.’ In one of the essays Marwyn Samuels (1979:52) suggests this interest stems from the fact that ‘there is something unreasonable about a human landscape lacking in inhabitants; something strangely absurd about a geography of man devoid of men.’ It is for this reason that in undertaking study of a cultural landscape it is helpful to address the following specific research questions:

- WHAT has occurred,
- WHEN did it occur,
- WHERE,
- WHO has been involved in shaping the landscape over time,
- WHY did they do what they did to shape the landscape and continue to do so?

The first three items address tangible data, whilst the latter two address aspects of intangible values involving deciphering the ideologies and cultural traditions that have been critical to the process of landscape making.

Additionally and with changes taking place in the 1980s was the increasing awareness that an understanding of heritage itself demanded multi-disciplinarity in approaches to research and professional practice (praxis). Uzzell (2009: 343) validates the multidisciplinary approach as ‘one of the reasons why we undertake [it] is to communicate and engage with others in order to develop and employ methodologies in an informed way to understand the heritage.’

---

2 Taylor K, Winston-Gregson J & Johnson K for the Department of Territories, ACT
3 The Lanyon Bowl area flanking both sides of the Murrumbidgee River was entered in the then Register of the National Estate in 1987
4 ‘Social value embraces the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a majority or minority group.’
The human side of landscape and heritagisation process

Over the last thirty-five years or so there has emerged the idea of historic cultural landscapes being worthy of heritage conservation action. It is a movement that embraces an extraordinary array of landscapes from everyday landscapes – vernacular landscapes reflecting the human side of landscape – to the international level of World Heritage landscapes (Taylor 2015a). It must be acknowledged that even at the World Heritage List level many listed landscapes are everyday landscapes representative of ways of living, for example, in the Philippines Cordilleran Rice Terraces inscribed in the World Heritage List is 1995.

Coincidental has been a broadening critical scholarly discourse on heritage and what it means, leading to what has essentially been a rethink of the process of heritagisation grounded in an understanding of the link between culture and heritage. ‘The process of “heritagisation” – insofar as it is a cultural phenomenon – takes place in the same dynamic and dialectic environment which is the base of the construction of culture itself’ (Fontal and Gómez-Redondo 2016:66). Parallel with interest in cultural landscape as process concept has been critical inquiry into the concept of heritage as process, not a product (Harvey 2001, Howard 2003). Covering far more than simply buildings, structures and sites, such processes embrace concepts of living history and living heritage to encompass the full spectrum of people’s sense of place, traditional knowledge and its transmission, cultural production including equity and access, creativity and innovation, and the safeguarding of natural resources and cultural traditions that provide the foundations of local livelihoods. Further, the concept of living heritage as a resource for local community-based sustainable development offers a foundation for an association of cultural sustainability with heritage management action (see below discussion on Cultural sustainability).

In addition to recognizing the profundity of the concepts of living history and living heritage as a prime resource for local community-based sustainable development, they have become a lens through which cultural heritage management is increasingly perceived. The significance of these concepts is grounded in the 1980s/1990s academic and serious professional debates in public history and folklore studies as seen, for example, in the emergence of a two journals: The Public Historian, in the USA in 1978 (National Council on Public History) and the Australian journal Public History Review (University of Technology Sydney, editor Paul Ashton) with its first edition in August 1992. In the first edition of Public History Review the idea of landscapes as public historical resource was explored (Taylor and Winston-Gregson 1992:81):

The term cultural landscape is now commonly used by a range of professionals involved in historical research, heritage conservation and heritage interpretation. Interest in cultural landscapes follows from a growth in understanding of the role of landscape as a statement of the history of people …

The development of Australian interest is timely. It is part of an increasing awareness of the historic significance and social significance, with resultant heritage values, of cultural landscapes. Sharon Sullivan commented in 1985 on the growth of the popular heritage movement leading to history becoming more accessible to the public because “People are asking themselves What happened in our history” [see Sullivan 1985:15]. As part of presenting answers Sullivan points to the importance

---

5 ‘Process’ throughout the chapter is taken to mean a series of actions or steps taken in order to achieve a particular end, ie methodical/systematic (OED).
of cultural landscapes as the total setting for public history. She suggests that these landscapes are part of our “intellectual and cultural background of which they are a product.”

Scholarly commentary on the link that was being forged between public history and popular interest in heritage is apparent in the work of the Marxist historian Raphael Samuel. In his *Theatres of Memory* (1994) Samuel explores ‘the social role of heritage’ (Harrison 2010:241) and its expanding horizons from the rich and famous and the elite country house and park image of history and heritage to ideas of people’s history or ‘history from below’ (West & McKellar 2010:196; see also Harrison 2010:241). The tension here is where does history from ‘below the stairs’ imagery – cosily reassuring film and television images of servants in their quarters and their relationships with masters and mistresses – change to real history from below?” Harrison (2013:100) suggests that Samuel saw the answer to this in regarding heritage as a social process that had ‘served to make the past more democratic through an emphasis on “ordinary” people.’ Popular interest in genealogy may be seen as another reflection of the democratizing of heritage.

Changing ideas on living history and living heritage and history/heritage from below are also reflected in various international heritage initiatives – milestones – such as ICCROM 2000 *Promoting People Centre Approaches to Conservation: Living Heritage* (http://www.iccrom.org/priority-areas/living-heritage/); ICOMOS 2005 *Filling the Gaps*; UNESCO 2007 *World Heritage Challenges for the Millennium*; UNESCO 2007; ‘Community’ added as fourth ‘C’ to Credibility, Capacity Building, Communication in the 2002 Budapest Declaration on World Heritage; UNESCO World Heritage Papers: 26 2009 on Cultural Landscapes; Papers 31 2012 on Community Development and World Heritage; Papers 41 2014 on Engaging Communities in Stewardship of World Heritage. These initiatives are included in Table 2.1 along with other notable milestones showing the chronology of, and actions in, development of the heritage process in the late modern/post-modern period since World War II and the directions being taken in the post-modern era.

The shift that has occurred in thinking on living history/living heritage is part of the re-orientation of the ‘conventional’ (Wijesuriya et al 2013) cultural heritage management approach from solely caring for the physical fabric of heritage structures, towards recognising the significance of intangible cultural heritage and associated values of living communities and the needs and wishes of living communities who are the custodians of this heritage. Putting them centre-stage, the thinking goes, ensures a more engaged, better informed and locally rooted conservation management process, which is more culturally sustainable. Poulios (2014:28) expresses this in his three key principles that determine a ‘living heritage approach’:

1. Recognizing local communities as the true long-term custodians of their heritage sites;
2. Empowering communities in the conservation and management process, and benefiting from their traditional knowledge, management systems and maintenance practices; and
3. Linking conservation to the sustainable development of the communities, by developing a process to manage change and by making heritage relevant to the needs of the contemporary communities.

In regard to local community values and practice the stated position of UNESCO should be noted as Logan (2012:219) reflects:

> UNESCO now argues that it is imperative that the values and practices of the local communities,
Table 2.1 Chronology of steps and actions in development of the heritage process

- **1945** the United Nations was formed.
- Creation of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO], November 1945. The Constitution of UNESCO [November 1946] mandates the Organisation to ensure the conservation and protection of the world’s inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science (UNESCO 2007). Here was established the firming of globalised thinking on cultural heritage protection in the modernist tradition of ‘ideas and practices that could be applied around the world regardless of differences in local cultures’ (Logan 2001).

In the early UNESCO years, various missions were organised to advise Member States on the conservation of heritage sites. Later these developed into international campaigns, of which the first was launched in **1959** on the Temples of Abu Simbel, Egypt, threatened by the construction of the Aswan Dam.

UNESCO also collaborated in the organisation of meetings of experts in the preservation of heritage resources. These included a conference on the preservation of monuments held in Venice in **1964**, which adopted the ICOMOS International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, (*the Venice Charter*).

- **1972** at a UN conference on the human environment in Stockholm, it was recommended that a UNESCO convention on World Heritage should be adopted, resulting in *The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (16 November 1972). Generally known as *The World Heritage Convention*, it has achieved a great deal during its existence. ‘Today, it is among the foremost international tools of conservation, and certainly among the best known’ (Bandarin 2007:18).

- UNESCO was instrumental in setting up key international organisations—ICOMOS, ICCROM, and IUCN—that have become official advisory bodies to the World Heritage Centre.

**ICOMOS** (International Council on Monuments and Sites), a non-governmental organisation with headquarters in Paris, was established in 1965. It is dedicated to the conservation of the world’s historic monuments and sites, and provides a forum for professional dialogue and a vehicle for the collection, evaluation and dissemination of information on conservation principles, techniques and policies. It also advises UNESCO on World Heritage cultural matters.

**ICCROM** (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property) based in Rome was established in 1956 by UNESCO. It has a worldwide mandate to promote the conservation of all types of cultural heritage, movable and immovable, with the aim of improving the quality of conservation practices and raising awareness about the importance of preserving cultural heritage through training, cooperation, research, information and awareness.


- **1992** the World Heritage Centre was established and is the focal point and coordinator within UNESCO for all matters related to World Heritage including: management of the Convention; organising annual World Heritage Committee meetings; providing advice to States Parties in the
preparation of nominations; coordinating the reporting on the condition of sites and the emergency action undertaken when a site is threatened. The Centre also organises technical seminars and workshops; updates the World Heritage List and database; develops teaching materials to raise awareness among young people of the need for heritage preservation; and keeps the public informed of World Heritage issues.

- **1992 UNESCO Experts Meeting** La Petite Pierre proposes categories for World Heritage recognition and revisions to WH Operational Guidelines

- **1992 UNESCO World Heritage Centre** recommends three categories of Cultural Landscapes for World Heritage recognition by WH Committee.

- **1993 Cultural Landscape Colloquium** Montreal
  1993 UNESCO Experts Meeting, Templin, Germany.

- **1994 ICOMOS, The Nara Document on Authenticity.**

- **1994** the World Heritage Committee (WHC) launched the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List (http://whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy). With the aim ensuring that the List reflects the world's cultural and natural diversity of outstanding universal value. The WHC wanted to broaden the definition of World Heritage to reflect better the full spectrum of the world’s cultural and natural treasures and to provide a comprehensive framework and operational methodology for implementing the World Heritage Convention. It resulted from a global study carried out by ICOMOS from 1987 to 1993 revealed that Europe, historic towns and religious monuments, Christianity, historical periods and 'elitist' architecture (in relation to vernacular) were all over-represented on the World Heritage List; whereas, all living cultures, and especially 'traditional cultures', were underrepresented.


- Early 2000s to present: mounting critical heritage studies debate on what is heritage and importance of ‘culture’ in cultural heritage; questioning of universality of heritage values particularly in the WH Convention; intangible cultural heritage; criticism of a primary locus of attention on famous monuments and sites.

- **2002 UNESCO Budapest Declaration on World Heritage addressing intangible cultural heritage**

- **2002 ICOMOS China Principles for Conservation of Heritage Sites in China.**

- **2003 UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.**

- **2003 ICOMOS The Hoi An Declaration on Conservation of Historic Districts of Asia**

  The plan was intended as a contribution to the further development of the Global Strategy for a credible, representative and balanced World Heritage List.

2005a, UNESCO, *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*

WH Committee decision (Decision 31 COM 13B) at its meeting in 2007 in Christchurch to include ‘Community’ with the four Cs (Credibility, Conservation, Capacity Building and Communication) of the *Budapest Declaration on World Heritage* (UNESCO 2002). Also at this meeting the Committee requested that ICOMOS and IUCN submit commentary on inclusion of local people in World Heritage nominations.

*World Heritage Challenges for the Millennium 2007* (UNESCO World Heritage Centre)

2007 *ICOMOS Declaration on Heritage and Metropolis Asia and the Pacific.*


2013 UNESCO *New Life for Historic Cities: the historic urban landscape approach explained.*

UNESCO 2013 Publication: *Managing World Cultural Heritage.*

together with traditional management systems, are fully understood, respected, encouraged and accommodated in management plans if the heritage resources are to be sustained into the future (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2004, p. 9). This is a major advance towards establishing a human rights-based approach to World Heritage site management and would seem to give hope to further progress in this direction.

A significant aspect of the heritagisation process critical discourse and changes in attitudes to what is heritage was the emergence of deepening interest in the concept of **intangible cultural heritage** (ICH). ICH thinking recognises that value does not reside solely or primarily in tangible/physical expressions of culture. In the context of the focus of my study an understanding of the nuances of ICH is critically applicable in Southeast & East Asia, where, in my view, some of the most outstanding examples of the world’s living history and heritage reside. In the past communities have evolved traditional management systems and there is a need to recognise these and encourage their continuity so that heritage resources can be sustained as change takes place and impacts such as mass domestic and international tourism gather pace. ICH ‘comprises the living expressions and traditions that communities, groups and individuals … receive from their ancestors and pass on to their descendants. ‘Constantly recreated and providing its bearers with a sense of identity and continuity, this heritage is particularly vulnerable’ (UNESCO 2007a). **Identity** is a key word, crucial to a sense of place where the tangible (physical features and functions) and intangible (meaning or symbols) coalesce.

The places we inhabit are marked by distinctive characteristics. These are tangible, as in the physical patterns and components of our surrounds, and intangible as in the symbolic meanings and values we attach to places, and also to objects and to traditional ways of expression as in language, art, song, dance and so on. In this way physical spaces, sites and objects become places in the wider cultural landscape setting. They offer a past, are part of the present and suggest future continuity. It is these places with their association of meanings which give rise to local identity and sense of place of communities (Figure 2.1).

![Figure 2.1 Place identity and its components](K. Taylor adapted from Relph 1976).

At this point in my discussion I offer the suggestion that the two emergent ideas – cultural landscapes as process and heritage as process – are coincidental and mutually dependent. This link does not infer haphazard coincidence. Rather that both movements and thought processes were closely interwoven and mutually dependent. They crystallised from growing concern for what exactly is heritage and scholarly critique of heritage practice globally from the mid-
1980s onwards with a perceived focus on monuments and sites. In addressing this topic Harrison (2013:115) reflects that the post-1980s period:

has seen the concept of heritage broaden to accommodate an increasingly large number of objects, places and perhaps most importantly, practices, and the landscapes in which these occur. It has also seen increasingly heritage shift away from a concern with ‘things’ to a concern with cultures, traditions and the ‘intangible’ … While this broadening agenda has been driven partially by economic interests and the need to appeal to increasingly diverse audiences, this has paralleled a movement in academic heritage studies away from a concern with materiality of heritage to a concern with heritage as a discourse and a system of values.

The critique – emerging a decade or so after the World Heritage Convention of 1972 established the idea of universal heritage based on a European and North American milieu of heritage – questioned universality of application in different cultural contexts. Therefore, ‘Inevitably in looking at international standards, often based on Western conservation canons, the fundamental question arises: “Whose values are we addressing and whose heritage is it?” While acknowledging the importance of establishing professional standards of practice for protection of the world’s cultural heritage, it is imperative that universality of practice and adoption of standards do not overwhelm local values’ (Taylor 2010:1340). Contrary to some academic criticism, UNESCO as I indicate above had also recognised the imperative of addressing local values in 2004.

The term coined to embrace the broadening process is heritagis(z)ion. Effectively the concept inherent in cultural landscape thinking complements the heritagisation process with its suggestions of alternative ways of thinking about heritage. Djament-Tran (2016) typifies this process as:

… characterised by a multiple expansion (typological, chronological, spatial) of heritage and of heritage producers (local actors, inhabitants, social groups, national states, international players), [it] nourishes also the production of alternative heritage. By this expression, we wish to focus on non-institutional, dissonant, under-recognized heritage, located on the “pioneer front” of contemporary heritage production. Alter-heritage represents, therefore, an alternative to the heritage institutional ‘production chain’, controlled by the national state (Heinich 2009), by metropolitan leaders or corporate private groups. It also represents an alternative to the hyper-spectacular heritage sites encompassing the capital resources, the global attention and the international tourist flows (Gravari-Barbas 2012 and 2014).

In the context of statements on heritage and intangibility Smith provocatively proposes that all heritage is intangible (Smith 2011). This is a topic to which I return (see below section Authenticity) and pose the view that physical (materiality) fabric can have inherent hidden values. Byrne (2009:229) succinctly encapsulates thinking on intangibility, although I subscribe to the view that it is possible to take criticism of focus on things and materiality too far:

Those of us who have pushed for recognition of ‘the intangible’ in heritage work are also those who tend to stress the ‘cultural’ in cultural heritage. We try to resist the tendency of heritage discourse to reduce culture to things, we try to counter its privileging of physical fabric over social life.

There is a connection in Smith’s and Byrne’s positions with Harrison’s (2013:115) not altogether uncritical comment on the movement in heritage studies away from a concern with materiality to a concern with heritage as a discourse and a system of values. The move to a value based understanding of heritage is linked intellectually and professionally to the post mid-1980s questioning of an international heritage focus on monuments and famous sites. It has seen a shift away from what Richard Engelhardt\textsuperscript{7} pithily refers to as concentrating wholly on the three ‘Ps’ of Princes, Priests, and Politicians to include PEOPLE. Linked to this has been the question of whose values are we addressing in heritage conservation (Taylor 2014), particularly those of communities – the fourth P – who inhabit the places in which we are interested. My point though is that we must ensure the questioning process does not cause an imbalance on what is heritage: a balance between the tangible and the intangible is needed.

**Culture**

Parallel with the heritagisation and cultural landscape movements, and central to them, has been the emergence of the idea of values and meanings linked to the concept of cultural heritage, prompting the question of what is meant by the conjunction of the two words ‘cultural heritage’? The word ‘cultural’ derives from ‘culture’ in the way that Horne (1986) nicely phrased as:

> the repertoire of collective habits of thinking and acting that give particular meanings to existence.

Similar is the definition of culture and cultural heritage in the 2000 *ASEAN Declaration on Cultural Heritage* (p.3):

> “Culture” means the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, intellectual, emotional and material features that characterize a society or social group. It includes the arts and letters as well as human modes of life, value systems, creativity, knowledge systems, traditions and beliefs.

> “Cultural heritage” means:

- (a) significant cultural values and concepts;
- (b) structures and artifacts: dwellings, buildings for worship, utility structures, works of visual arts, tools and implements, that are of a historical, aesthetic, or scientific significance;
- (c) sites and human habitats: human creations or combined human creations and nature, archaeological sites and sites of living human communities that are of outstanding value from a historical, aesthetic, anthropological or ecological viewpoint, or, because of its natural features, of considerable importance as habitat for the cultural survival and identity of particular living traditions;
- (d) oral or folk heritage: folkways, folklore, languages and literature, traditional arts and crafts, architecture, and the performing arts, games, indigenous knowledge systems and practices, myths, customs and beliefs, rituals and other living traditions;
- (e) the written heritage;

\textsuperscript{7}Comment in his keynote presentation (unpublished) to *Heritage and Development*, 12th International Conference of National Trust, INTACH, New Delhi 3-5 December 2007.
(f) popular cultural heritage: popular creativity in mass cultures (i.e. industrial or commercial cultures), popular forms of expression of outstanding aesthetic, anthropological and sociological values, including the music, dance, graphic arts, fashion, games and sports, industrial design, cinema, television, music video, video arts and cyber art in technologically oriented urbanized communities.

Cultural sustainability

In the section above on the human side of landscape and heritagisation it was suggested that the concept of living heritage as a resource for local community-based sustainable development offers a foundation for an association of cultural sustainability with heritage management action. Increasingly over the last three decades the focus on whose values and questions of community identity and sense of place have invigorated and suffused thinking and practice in cultural heritage management. I discuss the rise of value laden approaches to cultural heritage management in a following section (The dilemma and paradox of universality and cultural heritage: ubiquity of heritage). But at this point in my discussion I propose to explore links between heritagisation and concepts cultural sustainability.

It is now over forty years ago that the seminal text, *The limits to growth: a report for the Club of Rome’s project on the predicament of mankind* (Meadows et al 1972), challenged the notion that the earth’s resources were infinite and laid the foundations for the concept of sustainable development. The book came as a jolt to the wave of optimism in unparalleled world economic growth that burgeoned in the later 1950s and 1960s. Some fifteen years later (1987) the Brundtland Commission report, *Our Common Future*, took up the challenge and preached the moral imperative of environmentally sustainable development which became characterised by concepts of ecological (environmental), economic, and social sustainability. To these Rannikko (1999) added cultural sustainability, although he regarded cultural sustainability as a sub-set of social sustainability. In fact it is not, it is separate as shown in Figure 2.2. In effect Rannikko (1999) effectively acknowledges this with the observation that ‘Cultural sustainability requires that the development be in harmony with the cultures and values of the individuals involved. The key word being ‘values’ in that it denotes human values and meanings: people’s behaviours, beliefs, and symbols in the Boasian tradition (see below *Defining Cultural Landscapes* for full reference to Boas). Some years earlier, Norgaard (1988), as Lélé (1991:615) posits, ‘argued for cultural sustainability, which includes value and belief systems.’ Whilst Norgaard did not use the term ‘cultural sustainability’ he did articulate that sustainability applies to belief systems, ways of thinking and entails fostering of diversity *per se* and thereby can reduce likelihood of valuable traits disappearing prematurely.

By the late 1990s acknowledgement of a fourth separate pillar of sustainability – cultural sustainability – had evolved and was added to the three pillars of environmental, economic and social frameworks of sustainability in an overall approach to Sustainable Development (SD). The rationale for this shift in thinking is lucidly set out by Hawks (2001:25) as seen in Figure 2.2.

Inherent in the ideas expressed above in relation to thinking on sustainability, the following are critical considerations:

- concepts of culture and what is meant by this word;
- reality of change through time;
- human values; and
identity, ie who we are or sense of place.

Without a foundation that expressly includes culture, the [new] frameworks are bereft of the means of comprehending, let alone implementing, the changes they promote. Culture has to be a separate and ‘distinct’ reference point. Which is to say that the four pillars of sustainability are:

-------- **Cultural** vitality: wellbeing, creativity, diversity and innovation.
-------- **Social** equity: justice, engagement, cohesion, welfare.
-------- **Environmental** responsibility: ecological balance.
-------- **Economic** viability: material prosperity.

**Figure 2.2 Pillars of sustainability** (K. Taylor after Hawks 2001)

Scammon (2012:3) nicely encapsulates this thinking with the observation that:

Cultural sustainability examines ways to enhance our cultural identity and sense of place through heritage, shared spaces, public art, social capital, educational opportunities, and public policies in ways that promote environmental, economic, and social sustainability.

Some three years after the UNESCO (2005a) *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression* (Table 2.1), Throsby (2008) reflected in a paper for UNESCO on the manner in which a broadening had occurred in thinking about economics of development to address broader notions of development as a human-centred process. Throsby drew attention to how the particular role of culture in this evolving scenario was brought into focus by the World Commission on Culture and Development (“the Perez de Cuellar Commission”), with its 1995 report *Our Creative Diversity*. The Commission pointed to the essential cultural dimensions of a human-centred development paradigm, and proposed bringing culture in from the periphery of development thinking and placing it in centre stage. Whilst all these ideas were bubbling away, Throsby cautioned that, notwithstanding there was widespread acceptance of the ideas, the incorporation of culture into development processes remained unclear. In this regard I suggest we need to be cautious in heritage discourse of the extent to which advocacy for alter-heritage representing an alternative to the heritage institutional ‘production chain’ controlled by the national state, by metropolitan leaders or corporate private groups (see reference to Heinich 2016 above) drowns out materiality aspects of heritage. It is a challenge explored by Staiff (2016) in a paper ‘Is Cultural Sustainability Diminishing the Heritage Enterprise?’ Staiff (2016:21) suggests ‘There is growing evidence of a gathering disconnect between practices oriented to the conservation of material heritage and those that would focus on the sustainability of local cultures.’ Framing Staiff’s words, I suggest we need to ask therefore does championing of cultures, traditions, the intangible and so on threaten to relegate the heritage enterprise to the sidelines? In this regard it is important that academic heritage studies/research and heritage praxis do not become separate enterprises. Each needs to work to inform the other, not least because of the political economic and social interconnections of heritage, and keep at the front of our thinking ‘the very raison d’être of the heritage enterprise: the protection and conservation of parts of our planet for the future.’ (Staiff 2016:34)

On the politics of heritage Throsby (2008:4/5) offers a checklist against which policy measures can be judged to ensure their cultural sustainability (2008:4/5):
• **intergenerational equity**: development must take a long-term view and not be such as to compromise the capacities of future generations to access cultural resources and meet their cultural needs; this requires particular concern for protecting and enhancing a nation’s tangible and intangible cultural capital.

• **intrigenerational equity**: development must provide equity in access to cultural production, participation and enjoyment to all members of the community on a fair and non-discriminatory basis; in particular, attention must be paid to the poorest members of society to ensure that development is consistent with the objectives of poverty alleviation.

• **importance of diversity**: just as sustainable development requires the protection of biodiversity, so also should account be taken of the value of cultural diversity to the processes of economic, social and cultural development.

• **precautionary principle**: when facing decisions with irreversible consequences such as the destruction of cultural heritage or the extinction of valued cultural practices, a risk averse position must be adopted.

• **interconnectedness**: economic, social, cultural and environmental systems should not be seen in isolation; rather, a holistic approach is required, i.e. one that recognises interconnectedness, particularly between economic and cultural development.

### Defining cultural landscape

‘Any landscape is a condition of the spirit’ Henri Frédéric Amiel

At this point we may ask where does the concept of cultural landscapes slot into thinking on changing perspectives in heritage. In addressing this question I suggest that inextricably linked to a cultural concept of landscape is the understanding that one of our deepest needs is for a sense of identity and belonging. In this connection I argue that a common denominator in this is human attachment to landscape and how we find identity in landscape and place and that such a phenomenon is cross cultural. Cultural landscape study has also been coincidental with a widening interest in the public history movement and everyday landscapes. It underpins the notion that landscapes reflecting everyday ways of life, the ideologies that compel people to create places, and the sequence or rhythm of life over time tell the story of people, events and places through time, offering a sense of continuity: a sense of the stream of time. They also offer the context for broader concepts and understandings of cultural heritage than monuments and sites (Taylor 2015a). Here there is a correlation with Cosgrove’s dictum that landscape is not what we see, but a way of seeing (Cosgrove 1984). In this sense landscape is not simply or overwhelmingly a product. It is a process in which humans create landscapes – cultural landscapes – where ‘our human landscape is our unwitting biography, reflecting our tastes, our values, our aspirations, and even our fears in tangible visible form’ (Lewis 1979:12).

The cultural landscape concept is therefore intended to increase awareness that heritage places are not isolated islands and that there is interdependence between people, their social structures and ecosystems and landscape conservation. Additionally increasing attention is now being focused on urban cultural landscapes particularly under the Historic Landscape Paradigm (HUL) paradigm, a topic which I discuss later. At this stage suffice to say that HUL is an approach to historic urban conservation which sees towns and cities as consisting of layers as in the cultural landscape concept. It marks a shift away from the preoccupation with the historic city as visual object with a focus on famous buildings or groups of building divorced from their cultural setting to an interest in the historic environment as a space for ritual and human experience.

---

8 Swiss philosopher and poet, 1821-1881
If, as the above discussion suggests, there is an immutable link between cultural landscapes and modern thinking on cultural heritage, it is useful at this stage to look at a definition of cultural landscape. Here I refer to a paper by Peter Fowler ‘Cultural landscape: dreadful phrase, great concept’ in which Fowler (2001) includes a number of definitions. The definition I quote below, and why it is quoted, is because it is succinct. Like Fowler I find it theoretically and professionally workable: the last sentence expressing the very essence of what we mean by ‘cultural landscapes’ with ‘a brevity beguiling its profundity’ (Fowler 2001:67):

Cultural landscapes reflect the interactions between people and their natural environment over space and time. Nature, in this context, is the counterpart to human society; both are dynamic forces, shaping the landscapes … A cultural landscape is a complex phenomenon with a tangible and intangible identity. The intangible component arises from ideas and interactions which have an impact on the perceptions and shaping of a landscape, such as sacred beliefs closely linked to the landscape and the way it has been perceived over time. Cultural landscapes mirror the cultures which created them [my bold italics] (Plachter and Rössler in von Droste et al. 1995:15).

This definition evolved from discussions at a UNESCO international expert meeting held at Templin in Germany in 1993. The Templin meeting followed the 1992 expert meeting at La Petite Pierre which directly led to UNESCO’s 1992 initiative of recognising three categories of cultural landscapes for World Heritage listing purposes. Notably the expert meeting eschewed expressions of beauty and harmony or landscape aesthetics in their deliberations on the cultural significance of landscape, but did recognise associative values of landscape for indigenous peoples (see also Layton and Titchener 1995, and McBryde 1990 in Layton and Titchener). Here was literally a pivotal moment in the broadening of the concept of heritage confirming that landscape is not what we see but a way of seeing. Further it opened the way for renomination of Tongariro National Park in New Zealand (1993) and Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park Australia (1994) [see Appendix 2.1] as cultural landscapes.

Hence, the three categories below evolved out of increasing interest in the cultural landscape concept during the 1980s and early 1990s so that, as it gathered momentum, it permeated cultural heritage management theory and practice:

• **Clearly defined landscapes designed and intentionally created by man**;

• **Organically evolved landscapes in two categories**:
  - A relict or fossil landscape in which an evolutionary process has come to an end but where its distinguishing features are still visible;
  - Continuing landscape which retains an active social role in contemporary society associated with a traditional way of life and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress and where it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time;

• **Associative cultural landscapes**: the inclusion of such landscapes is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element rather than the material cultural evidence.

Critical to the 1990s movement were the 1960s and 1970s scholarly writings of cultural geographers like David Lowenthal, Peirce Lewis, Donald Meinig, J.B. Jackson with his inimitable essays on the everyday American scene, Dennis Cosgrove in Britain, or Dennis Jeans in Australia. They built on the late nineteenth century German tradition of Otto Schlüter’s ‘Kulturlandschaft’ with landscape morphology seen as a cultural outcome and Franz Boas who championed the idea that different cultures adjusted to similar environments.

---

9 The author attended as an Australian representative.
and taught the historicist mode of conceptualising environment. Boas argued that it was important to understand cultural traits of societies – their behaviours, beliefs, and symbols – and the necessity of examining them in their local context. He also understood that as people migrate from one place to another, and as the cultural context changes over time, the elements of a culture, and their meanings, will change, which led him to emphasise the importance of local histories for an analysis of cultures (Livingstone 1992; see also http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Franz_Boas). His teachings and ideas in social anthropology and geography remain central to present-day interest in the cultural landscape idea where landscape is a clue to culture.

Tracing the development of the concept of cultural landscapes inevitable involves reference to Carl Sauer. Sauer established the Berkeley School of cultural geography in the 1920s. He continued the kulturlandschaft tradition and elaborated an empirical cultural and historical geography tradition by championing the idea of reading the landscape based on clear observation and recording in the field. Sauer’s view that ‘The cultural landscape is fashioned out of the natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result’ (Sauer 1925:46) is still quoted, and all too often uncritically in relation to cultural landscape and heritage conservation concerns for it remains a too positivist view of landscape as product rather than as process. Sauer’s approach to landscape morphology narrowly kept within the bounds of scientific method and he concentrated on material aspects of cultural diversity in what Robertson and Richards (2003:2) regard as ‘unnecessarily deterministic.’ He did not emphasise the visual and affective aspects of landscapes or what Peter Jackson (1989:19 quoted in Wylie 2007) refers to as its ‘social dimensions.’ Jackson proposes more consideration be given to the non-material or symbolic qualities of culture that cannot be ‘read off’ directly from the landscape.

As I discuss in two published papers included in Chapter 4 of this PhD (Taylor 2009 and 2012) landscape is a ubiquitous word in English and other European languages with origins in Anglo-German language dating back to c500AD in Europe. The words – landskiye or landscaef – and the notions implied were taken to Britain by Anglo-Saxon settlers (Jackson, 1984:5). The meaning was a clearing in the forest with animals, huts, fields, fences. It was essentially a peasant landscape carved out of the original forest or weald, i.e. out of the wilderness with interconnections to patterns of occupation and associated customs and ways of doing things. Stilgoe (2015:2) relates the word to the Old Frisian landschop which was introduced by seamen to England in the sixteenth century where it morphed into landskep Landscape from its beginnings, therefore, has meant a ‘man-made’ artefact with associated cultural process values. Here is an holistic view of landscape as a way of seeing – its morphology resulting from the interplay between cultural values, customs and land-use practices – critically explored by Wylie (2007) in his book Landscape; Olwig (2007) nicely summarises what we mean by landscape as ‘an active scene of practice.’

J B Jackson (1984) further indicates there is an equivalent meaning in Latin based languages derived from the Latin pagus, meaning a defined rural district. He notes that this gives the French words pays and paysage, but that there are other French words for landscape including campagne deriving from champagne meaning a countryside of fields; the English equivalent once being ‘champion’.

At this point in the discussion it is germane to acknowledge that a dilemma facing any critical examination of cultural landscape is whether the term ‘cultural’ is in reality redundant. As Greffe (2010: 1) clearly articulates ‘we may wonder if there are really any landscapes that are
not cultural.’ Why use it if discourse on ‘landscape’ is inextricably linked to aspects of culture, nature, diversity and human identity leading to the idea that all landscape is culturally defined? Is ‘cultural landscape’ a tautology?: in an Asian context and with particular reference to China, the Chinese scholar and landscape architect, Feng Han (2006 and 2012) suggested that it was. She argued for example that in China the term had been problematic. She posits that people are part of the landscape experience and that landscape in the context of nature has its specific meanings which, she argues, contrast with Western notions, including inter alia that it is humanistic rather than religious; it is aesthetic rather than scientific; travelling in nature aims to be enjoyable, instead of solitude oriented; artistic rebuilt nature is more beautiful than the original.

Many regional Asian languages generally have no direct equivalent of the word ‘landscape’ in the Germanic/English sense or in Latin derived languages. Nevertheless, South-eastern and Eastern Asian languages have words that convey various ideas of landscape similar to the way in which landscape and scenery have been interchangeable in English. Taking the example of China, the word ‘fengjing’ is a general word for (abundant) scenery, the landscape you comprehend at a glance. Other words relating to landscape are helpfully included in the glossary of the China ICOMOS (2002) Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China. Whilst ‘cultural landscape’ is used as a synonym for the Pinyin (Standard Mandarin romanisation) terms ‘renwen jingguan’ and ‘renwen huanjing’, their literal translation to English is ‘humanistic landscape’. ‘Ren’= people and ‘wen’= heritage, ‘jing’= scenery and ‘guan’= see. In ‘renwen huangjing’, huangjing = environment, surroundings (viewed as scenery), and the full term has a literal translation to humanistic + setting. Translation to cultural rather than humanistic landscape recognises the universality of the term ‘cultural landscape’ (Taylor, 2009).

Nevertheless the term ‘cultural landscape’ has become increasingly accepted, not least with the inscription of various Southeast and East Asian cultural landscapes on the World Heritage list. To date (February 2016) there are seventeen (17) such landscapes in Southeast and East Asia included on the World Heritage List as cultural landscapes (see Appendix 2.1) out of a global total of eighty-eight (88). The number of Asian examples is likely to increase by at least one in 2017 with nomination of places such as Sambor Prei Kuk Archaeological Site Representing the Cultural Landscape of Ancient Ishanapura, Cambodia near Angkor Wat. Importantly cultural landscapes that have evolved in Southeast and East Asia reflect beautifully the interaction between people and their environment not simply as a tangible cultural product but as a result of cultural process with associated intangible values (Taylor 2009).

Critical discourse on heritage places, including cultural landscapes, inevitably confronts the challenge of gauging the globalising and homogenising influence of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention (see below discussion on World Heritage and Outstanding Universal Value). In particular questions are raised by many scholars on the extent to which nominations to the World Heritage List can or may distort local and regional values as nation states seize

---

10 For example SACH (State Administration for Cultural Heritage, the national agency responsible for management of cultural heritage management sites and policy and museums in China) indicated that the subject of cultural landscapes was to be addressed when the Director of SACH at a May 2008 ICOMOS Asia Pacific conference referring to the international significance of cultural landscapes declared they will be a focus of attention for China over the next few years (personal communication, Dr Feng Han). He also mandated the use of the term ‘cultural landscape.’

on political and economic considerations as drivers of nominations to the List. Nevertheless in the case of cultural landscapes a number of authors have reflected on how the 1992 UNESCO World Heritage categories opened up debate in two critical areas (see Wallace and Buckley 2015:45/46 for a list):

(i) how the three categories transferred readily to all cultural landscapes whether of international, national, regional or local significance;

(ii) fusing efforts to bring considerations of culture and nature, intangible aspects and community considerations into the heritage process, ie a widening of perspectives and narratives nicely summarised by Wallace and Buckley (2015:45/46) as creating ‘new spaces for representation and visibility, and they have allowed newer and more complex places to be considered as heritage.’ Bandarin (2009) reflects most of the World Heritage listed cultural landscapes are living cultural landscapes and that over time cultural landscape categories (including relict and associative) provide an opening of the World Heritage Convention for cultures not [represented] or under-represented prior to 1992. He quotes as examples the inscription of the Kaya Forest Systems in Kenya or the Chief Roi Mata’s Domain in Vanuatu, the Kuk Early Agricultural site in Papua New Guinea or the Tobacco production of Vinales Valley in Cuba, reflecting that none of these sites would have had a chance prior to 1992 of being recognized. The same observation applies to many of the landscapes listed in Appendix 2.1.

In the light of shifts to questioning what are universal values as expressed in the World Heritage Convention (which I discuss below) and the opening up of debate on whose values, the freeing of the World Heritage List in the context of Bandarin’s comment was not haphazard or accidental. It was an outcome of serious thinking and debate on the opportunities offered by the cultural landscape concept for opening the World Heritage process and list parallel with developing ideas on embracing the values based approach to heritage.

Landscape is ...

Examination above of the word ‘landscape’ inevitably prompts two questions: what is landscape and what are its connections with human memory? On the first question I refer back to the three mid-twentieth century pioneering teachers of landscape study, J B Jackson, W G Hoskins and D Lowenthal quoted above. What they were contending forms the modern foundation for landscape study. This is where landscape is not looked on as simply a pretty picture or as a static text: rather it is the expression of landscape as cultural process. The connections, therefore, between landscape and identity and hence memory, thought, and comprehension are fundamental to understanding of landscape and human sense of place.

People see and make landscapes as a result of their shared system of beliefs and ideologies (Biger 2006). In this way landscape is a cultural construct, a mirror of our memories and myths encoded with meanings which can be read and interpreted. Such a construct sits well with the idea of landscape as process where landscape is not simply a product of human endeavour, ‘not as object to be seen or a text to be read, but as a process by which identities are formed’ (Mitchell 1994: 1). Nearly forty years ago Meinig (1979:1/3) proposed that ‘Landscape is an attractive, important, and ambiguous term (Meinig’s emphasis) [that] encompasses an ensemble of ordinary features which constitute an extraordinarily rich exhibit of the course and character of any society’ and that ‘Landscape is defined by our vision and interpreted by our minds.’ In other words, to understand ourselves we need to look searchingly at ‘landscapes as a clue to culture’ (Lewis 1979:15), and our ordinary everyday landscapes at that, not just the national icons. Such ordinary landscapes are what Lynda Sexson (1982) nicely encapsulates as ‘the ordinarily sacred’ where people find a sense of the sacred in ordinarily
everyday places. Looking searchingly at landscapes is what geographers refer to as reading the landscape. Linked to deliberations in cultural landscape study there is, I contend, a number of key issues:

1. **Landscapes are a clue to culture** (see also Lewis 1979): they tell a story that can be read, interpreted and experienced.
2. **Existence of continuity in the landscape**: they present a composite image (montage) rather than a separate dots on a map approach to heritage, i.e., everything is connected.
3. **They represent inter-relationships between places, events, people and setting over time**.
4. **Existence of layers of change over time**.
5. **They are significant reminders of the past and present**: they contain elements that are part of our collective and private memories.
6. **They reveal social history and can arouse associative values** (related to knowledge of past and current events, people and places) and **interpretative values**.

Notably there have been, and remain, tensions in various schools of thought on how we see landscape and study it. Wylie (2007: 1/2) posits that the tension is ‘between proximity and distance, body and mind, sensuous immersion and detached observation. Is landscape the world we are living in, or a scene we are looking at, from afar ... a set of visual strategies and devices for distancing and observing?’ Here is the tension between our lived-in world concept and landscape as an artistic and historical genre – the landscape we are looking at – where both have relevance to the human experience of landscape.

The *European Landscape Convention* (2000:2) (ELC), a document clearly influenced by cultural landscape thinking, is instructive in deliberations on landscape as a construct and process. It presents a simple but decisive definition: ‘Landscape means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors’, i.e., a cultural landscape. In the modern idiom, landscape is viewed as humanistic where culture/nature are not divided. The indivisibility of culture and nature is a view held by Indigenous peoples worldwide, and not least by Australian Aboriginal people. This culture-nature link is also a fundamental principle in the World Heritage cultural landscape categories as expressed by Rössler (2006:4) with cultural landscape being

at the interface between nature and culture, tangible and intangible heritage, biological and cultural diversity – they represent a closely woven net of relationships, the essence of culture and people’s identity … they are a symbol of the growing recognition of the fundamental links between local communities and their heritage, humankind and its natural environment.

The old Germanic/English *landscaef* connotation has therefore in effect been revitalised in the ELC in that it ‘recognises the potential value of all landscapes to communities’ (Taylor et al., 2015: 4) including the ordinary, everyday or vernacular landscape. In the ELC it can be seen (Roe and Taylor, 2014: 8) that:

In particular, the ordinary landscapes where most people live are seen as having potential value to someone, even though the quality may be low in terms of many of the commonly identified indicators, such as scenic beauty, biodiversity rating, range of use and accessibility. The emphasis here is very much on the value to ‘someone’ (communities, cultures and individuals).
The dilemma and paradox of universality and cultural heritage: ubiquity of heritage

David Lowenthal (1998:xi), not uncritically, advises ‘All at once heritage is everywhere … One can hardly move without bumping into a heritage site. Every legacy is cherished.’ The point he makes is that there is a false sense of heritage as inherently a good thing as in ‘goodly heritage’ (Psalm 16:6). Anyone who has visited places like the Khmer Rouge Tuol Sleng genocide museum in Phnom Penh or Auschwitz-Birkenhau memorial museum is all too aware that heritage here is not goodly, and does not necessarily resonate with the physical fabric of such places. Rather it harrowingly tells the story of people who suffered atrocities of incarceration, brutality and murder and the story, however unsavoury, of the perpetrators.

Valorising places regarded as having cultural heritage significance is not solely a twentieth century phenomenon. Although human interest in antiquities dates back centuries, contemporary heritage thinking and practice are generally regarded as an outcome of the Enlightenment with its focus on reason and scientific methods: for example, classifying objects into an order as in botanical classification and cataloguing. The classification and cataloguing approach has infiltrated heritage practice in the form of lists of classified heritage sites/places/objects that are central to public government and NGOs (such as National Trusts) practice and to international practice as in the World Heritage List. Allied to interest in antiquities, Enlightenment thinking notably saw development of concern for preservation of the natural and cultural environment in an ordered way that was presumed to be scientifically sound and logical. For the cultural environment it did, not unsurprisingly, focus on what were regarded as high art/high aesthetic sites and objects: the antiquarian approach with its interest in artefacts from past civilisations representing the rich and famous and which presumed the antiquarian was well educated and appreciated fine things.

In proposing an overall chronological timeframe for development of heritage consciousness, Harrison (2013) marks the Enlightenment as the first phase; the second as the development of state control during the twentieth century extending to international focus with the concept World Heritage; the third as post World Heritage Convention 1972 with foundation of an international modus operandi, the rise of the popular heritage boom and move towards interest in the ordinary, vernacular places and people. The latter period also has seen a widening of critical heritage discourse on what is heritage; intangible heritage; role of memory and identity; cultural values and how these are not universally held; and, linking many of these, criticism of a primary locus of attention on famous monuments and sites.

A pivotal social advance of the post-World War II era has been concern for the world’s cultural heritage with associated efforts to mobilise professional global agencies and initiatives to protect it which gathered pace in the 1950s. Following this The Venice Charter of 1964 (ICOMOS 1964) offered an orthodox canon of heritage residing predominantly in the physical fabric of great monuments and sites – and substantively monuments and sites of the Classical (Old) World – as works of art. The UNESCO World Heritage Convention of 1972 firmly placed cultural heritage (and natural heritage) conservation on the world stage, and certainly early inscriptions on the World Heritage List focused on famous monuments and sites, sometimes referred to as the separate dots on a map syndrome. As the management of cultural heritage resources developed professionally and philosophically there emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s the challenge to the 1960s and 1970s concept of heritage focusing on great monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles, or historic sites with connections to the rich and famous. Here was the birth of a different value system.
with attention focused on such issues as cultural landscapes, living history and heritage, intangible values, and community involvement.

At this point, therefore, I propose to examine particular events and movements from Harrison’s (2013) second and third phases – post World War II years – to assist in gauging effects and changes that have occurred in heritage thinking and practice. Milestones that seem to me to be noteworthy in these phases are listed in Table 2.1.

In 1946 with the creation of UNESCO its Constitution mandated the Organisation ensure the conservation and protection of the world’s inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science (UNESCO 2007b). In the early UNESCO years, various missions were organised to advise Member States on the conservation of heritage sites. Later these developed into international campaigns, of which the first was launched in 1959 on the Temples of Abu Simbel, Egypt, threatened by the construction of the Aswan Dam. The growth of global thinking and practice in cultural heritage management emerged from the twentieth century modernist movement – modernism – originating as a Western cultural phenomenon. Modernism started in the late nineteenth century in various arts such as poetry, architecture, painting and continued to influence twentieth century ideas (Bullock and Stallybrass, eds., 1977). It invoked a break with tradition to create new forms as, for example, in architecture and planning. It was a rationalist view of an ideal world that could be applied universally. It informed the cultural globalisation movement paralleling economic globalisation (Logan 2001).

Laying down global frameworks for protecting cultural heritage underpinned by methodical approaches to identification and assessment of heritage resources, analysis of significance, and evaluation of proposals has led to an internationally accepted modus operandi. It represents a modern bureaucratic system where heritage resources are itemised through categories and entered in registers and lists. Whilst we need to apply such tools anchored in a systematic and demonstrable way of working, they, and associated charters and declarations, demonstrate their Western cultural origins (Byrne 1991), and, one may add, Western values, although these may well be cross cultural in aspiration and extent. Nevertheless, the question is how far such universal approaches based on Western methodologies and thinking adequately address regional cultural values and differences across the world? In other words, whose values and whose heritage are we addressing and where do we draw a line on cultural imperialism? (Taylor 2010).

The concept of cultural imperialism – imposition of a foreign viewpoint or culture over another country – emerged in the 1960s. Terms such as first world (developed) and third world (developing) may be seen by some observers as representative of an imperial attitude. Edward Said in discussing the way British writers have historically seen “abroad” or the exotic other out there as strange, “ours” to control, posits that this imperial manner of thinking became “a main element in the consolidated vision, or departmental cultural view, of the globe” (Said 1994:74). Said proposes the notion of a social and political ‘centre and a series of overseas territories connected to it at the periphery’ (Said 1994:74). Such critiques gel with the alternative notion of cultural relativism acknowledging cultural diversity and attempts to understand and judge the behaviour of another culture in terms of its standards rather than one’s own. (Eller, 2009). Can the globalised tenets of cultural heritage management processes of the twentieth century be seen as a reflection of a culturally imperial view? Or alternatively are they part of a systematic approach to guide protection processes capable of being
sensitively adjusted to reflect differing cultural contexts? Critical discourse on this topic has continued unabated in academe and professionally in the period since 2004.

Among its early tasks, UNESCO collaborated in the organisation of meetings of experts in the preservation of heritage resources. These included a conference on the preservation of monuments held in Venice in 1964, which adopted the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, (the Venice Charter) (ICOMOS 1964). Its focus is ancient monuments and buildings reflecting the somewhat narrow scope of conservation in the 1960s; although it must be acknowledged the Charter recognises that such buildings and monuments reflect age-old traditions and human values. It consists of a series of 16 Articles which define ancient monuments and set out guidelines for their treatment. Notably it does acknowledge that the concept of such structures embraces the setting - urban or rural - of architectural works as evidence of a particular civilisation, significant development or cultural event. Hence there is an attempt to acknowledge cultural context and there is reference to more modest works of the past as well as works of art. There are guidelines on restoration and the extent to which conservation works may extend. Emphasis is on physical fabric rather than social meanings, with the intention of preserving and revealing aesthetic and historic value of the monuments. Whilst the Venice Charter is the forerunner of subsequent documents and marks an increasing concern about conserving the past for the present and future, its application now is, in my view, dubious and certainly so in the context of Asian values. It is very much a heritage from above approach relying predominantly on experts and the physical conservation of structures. This is not to deny the role and importance of experts, materiality and physical conservation, but the Charter’s tenets sit uncomfortably with a world outside Europe and North America and concentration on maintaining and repairing existing physical fabric. In present day practice its reference to conserving and restoring monuments to safeguard them no less as works of art than as historical evidence (Article 3) poses the response: for whom are we conserving and restoring? Articles 9 and 12 are also questionable with their respective commentary that the aim of ‘The process of restoration … is to preserve and reveal the aesthetic and historic value of the monument …’ (9) and ‘Replacement of missing parts must integrate harmoniously with the whole, but at the same time must be distinguishable from the original so that restoration does not falsify the artistic or historic evidence’ (12). They pose the questions of what is meant by aesthetic (and historic) value and where does the suggestion that replacement parts must be distinguishable sit with the practices in Asia where structures and place are constantly rebuilt/replaced?

**World Heritage Convention and Outstanding Universal Value**

The World Heritage Convention (WHC) with the promulgation of the World Heritage List of 1972 and the concept of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) extended the focus on heritage universally to the world stage beyond existing national practices in place to protect heritage. Implementation of the WHC is facilitated by the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (OG) which, inter alia, give a list of criteria on which States Parties (countries that are signatories to the WHC) can evaluate and propose sites that they deem to be significant expressed as OUV (see para 54 OG):

---

12 International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments in Venice in May 1964
13 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage
14 The OGs have been and continue to be regularly edited and revised, not least in relation to the wording of the evaluation criteria to reflect changes in thinking
Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity.

Coincidental with the WHC was the evolution of ‘a new cultural heritage bureaucracy at the international level,’ (Logan 2001:51) as part of the globalising shift in heritage. The globalising practice tendency of international organisations such as UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICOM, and ICCROM is compelling. Whilst they lay ‘down international standards for professional practice – “world best practice” – in the cultural heritage field as well as influencing thinking in those fields in less direct ways’ they can be said ‘to be imposing a common stamp on culture across the world and their policies creating a logic of global cultural uniformity [by seeking] to impose standards of “good behaviour” onto Member States and other states’ (Logan 2001:52). Logan himself does not unwaveringly subscribe to this criticism. Rather he lists a series of actions where UNESCO has had a positive and beneficial effect on international conservation practice (See Logan 2001:52/53).

A cogent alternative view to ‘the dead hand’ image of UNESCO and organisations such as ICOMOS is acknowledgement of the fact that they have established a shared way of working that is apparent and understandable, is replicable so that its validity is testable, and one that allows comparative evaluation of findings and management recommendations. One may also add that these methods must then be applied in ways that are appropriate to the country and culture in which you are working, i.e. adapting them to be sympathetic to specific cultural contexts. Contrary to the view of some academics and professionals critical of what they see as a one ‘a one size fits all’ globalising approach of UNESCO and ICOMOS, I have commented above in relation to Table 2.1 the various international heritage initiatives – milestones – that are indicative of ‘UNESCO’s progressive accommodation of heritage diversity’ (Askew 2010:28) and demands to expand its thinking and practice.

Supporters and detractors of UNESCO at least agree on one thing: that UNESCO ‘is today the indisputable global-level instrument which mobilises resources, reproduces dominant arguments and rationales, establishes program agendas and policies, and dispenses status surrounding the conservation and preservation of the thing called “heritage.” ’ (Askew 2010:19). Within the moral high-ground debate inevitably the word ‘globalisation’ comes into play and whether all globalising influences are negative. Clearly they are not, or at least the underlying rationale and intentions of some globally involved agencies and NGOs are not (eg UNICEF, Médecins Sans Frontières, WWF) and in which category I include UNESCO as Askew (2010:19/20) cogently observes:

For at least a decade UNESCO's leadership, assemblies and associated organisations have pronounced that its expanding cultural programs aim towards mitigating the destructive effects of 'globalisation', particularly the cultural globalisation represented by the commodifying and homogenising culture industries of capitalism. The rhetoric of UNESCO's key texts (its conventions and declarations) position the organisation outside the threatening globalising processes of the world ('bad' globalisation), but UNESCO itself is a prime expression of a countervailing form of beneficent (or 'good') globalisation, as expressed in its advocacy of world-wide protection of cultures and their valued tangible and 'intangible' past by means of protocols, declarations of universal principles and, most crucially, the compilation of inventories. Moreover, 'World Heritage', which UNESCO promotes and numerous cultural and tourism industries rely on, has emerged from the process of globalisation
The WHC has been variously criticised as being hegemonic and culturally inappropriate by forcing Western notions on countries with different value systems. Such criticisms eschew the role of agencies such as UNESCO and ICOMOS as imposing their standards and ideas on cultures outside the Western (read European) world. They ignore the fact that instruments such as the World Heritage Convention are routinely used by national governments around the world, not least in Southeast and East Asia, to further nationalistic agendas. In a trenchant critique Askew (2010: 21/22) argues that

the Eurocentric and crypto-imperialist [claim] is both redundant and a conceptual red herring: it misrecognises the real locus of power and exploitation in the global heritage game, which is the nation-state and not any dominant global institutional structure or discourse of heritage classification.

In agreeing with this criticism I add the observation that States Parties worldwide – Western and non-Western – have politically used the system for their own nation state agendas nationally and internationally, and not least in the lucrative economic field of tourism. Additionally negative criticism levelled at UNESCO and ICOMOS on World Heritage nomination and listing outcomes that deserve criticism are, from personal experience, invariably due to the politicisation of the process by States Parties and the increasing tendency for political figures representing States Parties at World Heritage Committee meetings when decisions on nominations are made. There have been notable examples in the past where recommendations by ICOMOS assessors through UNESCO World Heritage Centre that nominations be held back or referred have not been upheld by the Committee. Allied to such criticisms the role or usurping of human rights is raised. Reflecting on this Logan (2012:214) acknowledges that ‘cases can be drawn on to demonstrate that some kind of problem exists in the management of heritage places at the world, state, provincial and local levels and that human rights are implicated.’ He does this in response to a criticism by Scholze (2008: 227-228) that agencies such as UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICCROM, IUCN ‘are not, or only rarely, aware of the cultural, political or economic implications of their interventions’ and ‘do not comprehend the delicate relationships between local and national actors and the conflicts that divide them.’ For me this simply does not wash. From my experience the agencies have increasingly comprehended these factors, and have since the early 2000s. Their powers, particularly in the case of UNESCO, however, are limited. My experience again is that these agencies have and do voice concerns, not least at the assessment stage of World Heritage nominations, concerns that can be and are swept aside once matters reach the World Heritage Committee. Logan (2012:219 in Ekern et al, 2012) summarises this process in relation to UNESCO, ‘being an IGO, the problem arises that States Parties tend to use the World Heritage system for their own nationalistic, political purposes, even to the extent of boosting jingoism and facilitating aggression against neighbouring countries.’

---

15 An egregious example was the World Heritage inscription of the Cambodian part of Preah Vihear in 2008 when the World Heritage Committee swept advice aside thereby ignoring inclusion of the significant and inalienable part of the temple complex in Thailand. Another was the refusal by the Committee to support establishment of a World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Committee of Experts as an Advisory body. This was in spite of a World Heritage Committee request to ICOMOS and IUCN at its meeting In New Zealand in 2007 to report on progress in involvement of minorities, indigenous and/or local people in World Heritage nominations (UNESCO (2007), Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, World Heritage Committee Thirty-first Session, Christchurch, New Zealand 23 June-2 July 2007: WHC-07/31.COM/9. Paris, UNESCO World Heritage Centre; p.3.
The centrality of universality in the World Heritage Convention has been criticised particularly since the 1990s. In 2001 Henry Cleere (2001:24) expressed this criticism:

The concept of universality as used in the text of the Convention and its preamble is not easy to define. There appears to be an implicit assumption that there are values that transcend regional and chronological distinctions, a notion that is deeply rooted in the European cultural tradition, combining historical and aesthetic parameters that derive from the classical philosophy. This approach is one that is at odds with anthropological and archaeological theory, which sees universality in human achievement and mastery of the natural environment in its multifarious forms. In these terms diversity in itself is a manifestation of universality and the wealth of that diversity should be given full and equal recognition. The two should go hand in hand, but the World Heritage Convention as it has been implemented until very recently has signally failed to realize this imperative.

Similar to Cleere’s critique are those of Byrne (1991) and Smith (2006). Notwithstanding these critiques, Harrison (2013:115) interestingly and thought provokingly argues that:

major transformations were driven by the World Heritage Convention’s self-definition as a ‘universal’ principle – that these crises many of which forced UNESCO and its States Parties to adopt broader and more inclusive definitions of heritage were (perhaps counterintuitively) actually a result of UNESCO’s own hegemony. In attempting to apply a model of heritage that had developed in Euro-American contexts … globally, to countries with radically different conceptions of heritage, the foundations and assumptions on which the Convention and its particular model of heritage rested would be challenged and ultimately transformed.

On a positive note regarding this topic Harrison (2013:116) interestingly reflects that:

It was this very claim to universality that allowed the possibility for Indigenous, minority, postcolonial and non-Western critique, that has ultimately been responsible for the transformations in heritage practice that have come about in the later twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

It is within this transformation of heritage practice that I locate the thinking on cultural landscapes and the inclusion of 3 categories within the ambit of the World Heritage Convention in 1992: the rise of cultural landscapes (Jacques 1995). Contrary to the scepticism of some scholars that the international bureaucracies and agencies were immune to changes in thinking and broadening of cultural heritage theory and methods – paradigm – such a view is not supported by evidence of shifts that have occurred (Table 2.1) in the forty-five years since 1972. Broadening of the thinking and practice has seen a shift ‘to accommodate an increasingly large number of objects, places, and perhaps most importantly, practices, and the landscapes in which these occur’ (Harrison 2013:115). Coincidental has been the broadening of concern with culture and the intangible rather than focusing primarily on things. In the shift away from a concentration on monuments and sites heritage now embraces (Logan 2010:38):

precincts, historic urban centres, whole towns and villages, cultural landscapes, and historic urban landscapes, associative values and intangible heritage – the talents embodied in people, such as artistic skills in dance, music and painting, or skills in language, or craft and construction skills.

Following the Venice Charter (1964) and The World Heritage Convention (1972) and criticism of the notion of heritage residing in famous monuments and sites and universality of heritage, there are two particular instruments reflecting changing attitudes in critical heritage discourse:
• the landmark decision in 1992 to recognize three categories of cultural landscapes for World Heritage listing purposes which I have already addressed; and

• The Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS 1994) which challenged conventional thinking in the conservation field. In its preparation recognition was paid to the framework provided by the World Heritage Committee’s desire to apply the test of authenticity in ways which accord full respect to the social and cultural values of all societies. The Nara Document is a tacit acknowledgement of the plurality of approaches to the issue of authenticity and that it does not reside primarily in Western notions of intact fabric. It acknowledges the need to respect cultural diversity and all aspects of belief systems and was ‘a powerful voice from the periphery, a veritable watershed’ (Logan 2001:55). It proposes that authenticity judgements may be linked to a variety of information sources and may include form and design; materials and substance; use and function; traditions and techniques; location and setting; spirit and feeling. The Document points out that use of these sources permits elaboration of specific artistic, historic, social, and scientific dimensions of a cultural heritage place and underlines the point that authenticity is as much about intangible aspects of heritage as it is about fabric; indeed some would say more so.

Indication that international bureaucracies and agencies became increasingly conscious from the 1990s onwards of the imperatives to embrace a broadening of cultural heritage thinking and practice can be seen through the promulgation of a number of instruments listed in Table 1. I draw attention to three of these as indicative of change in thinking: UNESCO (2003) Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage; The World Heritage List. Filling the Gaps: An Action Plan for the Future (ICOMOS 2005); and World Heritage Challenges for the Millennium (UNESCO 2007 World Heritage Centre). Not surprisingly, Henry Cleere (see above under World Heritage and universality) was a key figure in the ICOMOS report.

The ICOMOS (2005) and UNESCO (2007) reports were aimed at identifying regional imbalance in World Heritage listings and in types of cultural heritage places listed. In the ICOMOS (2005:14) report it was made clear that the idea of ‘balance’ in relation to the World Heritage List should not be seen to refer to a balance between countries, or types of properties, but rather to how well a particular type of heritage of outstanding universal value is represented on the List. There will probably always remain a certain ‘imbalance’ between various regions and countries of the world, considering the incredible diversity of cultural heritage, the way it is distributed and how it is now represented around the world. As a consequence, the aim of the present study is to help States Parties in their efforts to identify possible gaps on the List.

In the Filling the Gaps I (ICOMOS 2005) report it came as no surprise that it was found that the majority of places on the World Heritage List or Tentative Lists were archaeological, architectural monuments and religious properties, with a preponderance in the Europe/North America region. In relation to Asia it was clear that there was a paucity of such ensembles as cultural landscapes, vernacular architecture, technological and agricultural sites, all within the cultural landscape spectrum – that, I contend (Taylor 2009) – represented a missed opportunity taking into account the spirit of places in the region. Behind the report was the intention to aim for a more balanced World Heritage list geographically and typologically. States Parties whose heritage is well represented on the List were encouraged to space new nominations and to assist the under-represented States Parties requiring technical co-operation to enhance conditions for the preparation and updating of Tentative Lists and the nomination of their
cultural and natural heritage. Examining cultural landscapes and World Heritage recognition statistics suggest that there have been shifts in regional representation. In 2002 there were 30 World Heritage cultural landscapes listed (21 States Parties with a total of 577 listed cultural World Heritage properties): 21 were listed from Europe/North America and 4 from Asia Pacific\(^\text{16}\) (ICOMOS 2005:56). By 2016 the numbers were 88 World Heritage cultural landscapes listed (61 States Parties and a total of 815 listed cultural World Heritage properties): 36 listed from Europe/North America and 17 from Southeast/East Asia and Pacific\(^\text{17}\) (Appendix 2.1).

In the 1990s the reasoning that the World Heritage Convention emphasised material aspects of conservation and ‘offered no means of documenting intangible practices’ (West & Ansell 2010:41) increasingly prevailed. Following the *Nara Document on Authenticity* (1994) The UNESCO (2003) *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (ICH) intended to address this imbalance by drawing attention internationally to an extended understanding of heritage, its meanings and values. Article 1 defines ICH as ‘the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups … and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity …’ It consists of, *inter alia*, (a) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage; (b) performing arts; (c) social practices, rituals and festive events; (d) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; (e) traditional craftsmanship’, on the condition that they are ‘compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development’.

The use of the word ‘safeguarding’ rather than ‘conservation’ is notable. It is taken to mean ‘measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage (Article 2)’. The *Convention* was seen as ‘a bold attempt to extend the official categories of what heritage is and to see it as living cultural process’ (West & Ansell:41).

The understanding of the significance of ICH has been underscored in no small way by the rising interest in anthropologically based study of culture and the concept that places with their tangible and intangible connections – cultural landscapes – and people are not part of a static text, but are part of a dynamic ‘process by which […] identities are formed’ (Mitchell 1994:1). A coherent part of these changes in attitude is the understanding that people’s heritage consists of ‘various, complex and interdependent [cultural] expressions, revealed through social customs as well as physical heritage’ (Bouchenaki 2003:106). This is in line with the UNESCO (2002) *Istanbul Declaration on World Heritage* (Table 2.1) which, *inter alia*, refers to ICH as addressing cultural identity, living and recreated practices, and where

\(^{16}\) NB: here I am not using full list of countries in the official UNESCO Asia/Pacific region having omitted 8 listed cultural landscapes in Afghanistan, India, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey as my focus is Southeast and East Asia. Adding the 8 to the other 17 there are 25 listed cultural landscapes in the full Asia Pacific UNESCO region.

safeguarding intangible heritage must involve democratic participation of actors involved in heritage (in Taylor 2013). Critical to this dimension is appreciating that associated intangible aspects are an inseparable part of the remarkable diversity of our cultural expressions and their meanings. The quest for meaning in the global plurality of cultural expressions has underpinned a deepening appreciation of the significance of social customs and systems of beliefs, including myths, thereby giving us a better appreciation of people’s identity, creativity, and diversity (Bouchenaki 2003).

At this juncture I suggest that ICH must be seen within a broad framework of ideas and practices that give shape and significance to heritage places. I make this point because for me the ICHC can be seen as a double edged sword in that it has for some commentators seemingly disengaged ICH from heritage sites and places: ie separation of intangible from tangible and vice versa and its eschewing of the concept of authenticity residing in intangible heritage (see below). The reasons for the separation of tangible and intangible may be seen substantively to lie with the 1972 World Heritage Convention which separates the two, ‘a separation of objects, buildings and places from the practices and traditions associated with them.’ (Harrison 2013:137). Rather than separation the two need to be integrated. In this vein Khalaf (2017:266) remarks that ‘The integration of tangible and intangible aspects – including emotions and feelings – is closer to the meaning of heritage than their separation (the World Heritage Convention + the ICH Convention makes more sense than the World Heritage Convention vs the ICH Convention).’ Harrison (2013:137) aptly summarises why the separation of intangible – emotions and feelings – from tangible – material – does not make sense:

In recognizing intangible heritage as a specific category that stands in opposition to ‘tangible’ heritage, the Convention continues a separation of objects, buildings and places from the practices and traditions associated with them. This maintains the Cartesian dualism of matter and mind.

**Authenticity**

A key concept in the discussion on tangible and intangible aspects of heritage is ‘authenticity’. A working definition ‘used during the Nara Document discussions [was that] authenticity [is] a measure of the degree to which the values of a heritage property may be understood to be truthfully, genuinely and credibly, expressed by the attributes carrying the values’ (Stovel 2007:23). The Nara Document sets out (Articles 9 and 10) that Authenticity is a manifestation of how

conservation of cultural heritage in all its forms and historical periods is rooted in the values attributed to the heritage [where] ability to understand these values depends, in part, on the degree to which information sources about these values may be understood as credible or truthful. Knowledge and understanding of these sources of information, in relation to original and subsequent characteristics of the cultural heritage, and their meaning, is a requisite basis for assessing all aspects of authenticity … The understanding of authenticity plays a fundamental role in all scientific studies of the cultural heritage, in conservation and restoration planning, as well as within the inscription procedures used for the World Heritage Convention and other cultural heritage inventories.

Is the Nara Document having a bet each way? Is authenticity to do with original aspects and/or acceptable changes to physical fabric through conservation and restoration planning or does it also include intangible aspects of meanings and values which change through time? In connection with meanings and values, Article 11 does give guidance:
All judgements about values attributed to cultural properties as well as the credibility of related information sources may differ from culture to culture, and even within the same culture. It is thus not possible to base judgements of values and authenticity within fixed criteria. On the contrary, the respect due to all cultures requires that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong.

Assuming that the concept of authenticity is grounded in having credible and truthful information about cultural heritage in all its forms the question I pose is whether authenticity is concerned with the ‘real’ as in the Western-centric idea of authentic physical fabric or is it concerned with diversity: diversity of cultural beliefs and systems? In effect it concerns both aspects. Nevertheless, whilst ‘authenticity… is an important quality attached to cultural heritage … [it] remains perplexing and slippery … there is no definite description of authenticity: it depends entirely on the situation and the context’ (Karlström 2015:29). What we can see is that it is concerned with specific values held by diverse groups in different cultural contexts as established in the Nara Document. This holds for whether it is tied to the idea of material, form and fabric or under the umbrella of according full respect to the social and cultural values of all societies. Both embody the notion of values. For the material, form and fabric conceptions Karlström (2015:30) argues that these are embedded in ‘the ideas that heritage values are universal, that heritage belongs to all humankind, and that heritage should be preserved for the future.’

In the same vein, is a focus on the real, ‘the “really real” ’ (Harrison 2013:88) at odds with the focus on intangibility? I think not. It is my contention that some places/objects because of strong political and historical connotations can and do have inherent/intrinsic qualities (values?) that make people recognise them as heritage without any instruction from experts or learned arguments on whether values are universal. For example, tourists visiting Angkor know the archaeological remains are significant universally and inherently recognise them as such. They may have read in a tourist guide or coffee table magazine that this is the case without giving it much thought. Here Berliner’s (nd:2) commentary is instructive:

what about the object, the site and the ritual per se? Are there any inherent, intrinsic qualities to sites, objects or gestures that make them catchy enough to become patrimoine? Something about their size, surfaces, colours, texture, localisation, rhythm, sound, taste; something sensual that makes them more likely to be noticed by a human observer, to trigger specific emotional reactions and to produce long-lasting memories about them? In other words, do buildings, practices and objects hold inner iconic properties and how may these (or not) influence the heritagization process?

Whilst the World Heritage Convention seemingly separates intangible cultural heritage and tangible heritage by not referring to ICH, the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention have, since 2005, linked notions of intangible heritage with tangible through the application of the conditions of Authenticity for nominated cultural properties. Paragraph 82 (2005) guidelines (same for 2016 version) states that depending on the type of cultural heritage, and its cultural context, properties may be understood to meet the conditions of authenticity if their cultural value (as recognized in the nomination criteria proposed) are truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes including:

• form and design;
• materials and substance;
• use and function;
• traditions, techniques and management systems;
• location and setting;
• language, and other forms of intangible heritage;
• spirit and feeling; and
• other internal and external factors.

Specifically there is reference to language and other forms of intangible heritage; but also intangible aspects are, I contend, integral with factors such as use, setting, spirit and feeling. In this connection there is parallel association with the judgement sources in the Nara Document on Authenticity.

Before 2005 the attributes only included tangible aspects in the spirit of the Venice Charter with its direction that ‘It is our duty to hand them on (ie historic monuments) in the full richness of their authenticity’, meaning essentially their physical authenticity. This focuses attention on the vexed question of what is meant by ‘authenticity’. Certainly we understand authenticity relating to buildings and structures as incorporating repairs and renovations through time as long as they are based on verifiable evidence and where ‘conservation judgements (how to repair and what materials to use) [do not] detract from the monument’s historic and aesthetic qualities’ (Otero-Paios et al 2010: 58). The conundrum here is what is really meant by historic and aesthetic qualities, particularly the latter. The terms were used in the Venice Charter without any definition. Presumably if one was educated and had an appreciation of fine things and the monuments as works of art, one would intrinsically know what was meant.

One major reason for the comment I made above about the ICHC being a double edged sword is that it does not refer to or use the concept of authenticity. Indeed authenticity is not seen to be an inhering quality of intangible heritage in the Convention (2003). I profoundly disagree with this line of thought in that many intangibles are connected with lived-in places and landscapes where authenticity is a defining factor. Here I do not mean authenticity in building form and fabric, but in human associations with place and meaning of places. The Convention itself seemingly acknowledges this fact with reference to spaces and places as in ‘places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing the intangible cultural heritage’ (Article 14c), and cultural spaces associated with the intangible cultural heritage (Article 1). I would argue that the idea of separating intangible from places (real and imaginary) and objects is artificial and obfuscates the tangible/intangible relationship, and indeed what authenticity is about. Music, poetry, art and so on cannot be divorced from places and objects (their cultural landscape in effect with which they have an intellectual relationship). Here is a view of authenticity as a dynamic concept where change takes place over time. It accords with what Herb Stovel (2007:28) refers to as ‘progressive authenticity’. He further points out in relation to the persistent notion that authenticity is fixed on original fabric conservation: ‘From the beginning however, most of those involved argued that authenticity analysis was a relative concept and must be used in relation to the historical context of the messages being expressed.’ Perhaps it is with the passage of time and critical discourse that the concept of authenticity has moved beyond the physical aspect of heritage to embrace ‘social and intellectual structures’ (Nezhad et al 2015:95), so that ‘the concept of authenticity is of course socially constructed’ (Kidd 2011: 25). To further this point Skounti (2009:77) posits:

… there is no one intangible cultural heritage, there is a wide spectrum, ranging from the non-material dimension of a material heritage element (site, monument, object) to the most tangible aspect (tale, poem, song, musical note, prayer scent, perfume etc). Furthermore, pure immateriality
is a fiction: can something intangible exist? There is obviously a material dimension to every element of intangible heritage.

The association of authenticity with ICH is cogently discussed from an international law and human rights perspective through the concept of it being representative of the living culture of peoples (Lenzerini 2011). Lenzerini (2011:113) argues that ‘in fact, it is essential that ICH retain its authenticity in light of its strong connection with the cultural identity of its creators and bearers. Therefore, loss of authenticity can lead to the creation of an artificial ICH which is no longer connected to the cultural idiosyncrasy of the communities, groups, and/or individuals to which it culturally belongs … When this takes place the heritage concerned can no longer be considered “intangible cultural heritage” according to the meaning of this expression as representing a value to be safeguarded.’ Lenzerini (2011:113) further offers the significant point that:

Therefore, safeguarding the authenticity of ICH means allowing such heritage to be constantly tailored to the cultural identity of communities, groups, and/or persons concerned, through automatically recreating itself so as to reflect the cultural and social evolution of such communities, groups, and/or persons.

Values and meanings: Burra Charter

Article 9 of the Nara Document establishes that ‘Conservation of cultural heritage in all its forms and historical periods is rooted in the values attributed to the heritage’ (ICOMOS, 1994). Well before 1994 Australia ICOMOS adopted its own set of conservation principles in the internationally influential The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter). First promulgated in 1979, fifteen years after the Venice Charter, it was the first such charter issued by a single country in an attempt to tailor thinking and practice to specific regional conditions. It has gone through various iterations: 1984, 1988, 1999 and 2013 (Australia ICOMOS 2013). ‘It created an international impact on how heritage professionals make decisions about the meaning of heritage places. It did so by renaming the heritage category, “sites and monuments” as “places of cultural significance.” This shifted the emphasis from “stones and bones”, material culture, towards the meaning of places, the significance that humans attribute to material; culture.’ (West & Ansell 2010:38/39). The term ‘place’ encompasses elements, objects, spaces and views and may have tangible and intangible dimensions.

Practice Note 1 in the Charter refers to aesthetic, historic, scientific, social and spiritual values and how these inform the notion of significance expressed in a statement of significance where the concept of significance with all its human ramifications was an innovation of the Burra Charter:

Cultural significance is the sum of the qualities or values that a place has, including the five values—esthetic, historic, scientific, social and spiritual—that are listed in Article 1.2 of the Burra Charter. Through the processes of investigating the place and assessing each of these values, we can clearly describe why a place is important. This is the first step towards ensuring that our decisions and actions do not diminish its significance.

There are internationally available typologies of heritage values. ‘By use of such a typology - a framework that breaks down significance into constituent kinds of heritage value - the views of experts, citizens, communities, governments, and other stakeholders can be voiced and
compared more effectively’ (Mason, 2002:9). It should be noted that the Nara Document itself noted that ‘the respect due to all cultures requires that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong’ (ICOMOS, 1994: 11). A sample of values is shown in Figure 2.3 (see also Mason, 2002).

In relation to the Burra Charter, aesthetic, historic and scientific values were not new. It was the introduction of social value that was innovative in 1988 (see endnote 3). It refers (2013 version) to the associations that a place has for a particular community or cultural group and the social or cultural meanings that it holds for them. Reference to spiritual value was in the 1999 version of the Burra Charter without defining its meaning. This was rectified in the 2013 version so that spiritual value has been added to aesthetic, historic, scientific and social.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter 1977/2013</th>
<th>Aesthetic, Historic, Scientific, Social, Spiritual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China ICOMOS Principles 2000</td>
<td>Artistic, Historical, Scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage 1977</td>
<td>Aesthetic Cultural Educational &amp; Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Resource Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines</td>
<td>Criteria i-ii for Outstanding Universal Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3 Examples of heritage value typologies (K. Taylor; see also Mason 2002).

Spiritual value refers to the intangible values and meanings embodied in or evoked by a place which give it importance in the spiritual identity, or the traditional knowledge, art and practices of a cultural group. Spiritual value may also be reflected in the intensity of aesthetic and emotional responses or community associations, and be expressed through cultural practices and related places. The qualities of the place may inspire a strong and/or spontaneous emotional or metaphysical response in people, expanding their understanding of their place, purpose and obligations in the world, particularly in relation to the spiritual realm. ‘The impact of the Burra Charter’s use of values to determine a more holistic approach to significance has gone far beyond Australia as it has been picked up by other official agencies’ (West & Ansell 2010:39). An example of this is China ICOMOS (2000) Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China, the drafting of which was undertaken by China ICOMOS with collaborative input from Australian Heritage Commission and Getty Institute.

In practice values are normally assessed and analysed so that a statement of significance can be prepared for the heritage resource under study and its management. For World Heritage
properties significance is set out in the statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). It is therefore critical that the process of research and also that of documentation used in practice, aiming to unravel values and significance of landscapes, follows a framework:

- That is apparent and understandable by other researchers, clients, community, and other stakeholders;
- Includes methods that are replicable so that their application may be tested elsewhere and modified where appropriate; archival and on-site research will be vital components (see next section on Reading the Landscape) in the context of informing rigorous practice;
- Allows evaluation of proposed decisions or recommendations and be appropriate to the country and culture in which you are working.

Representativeness

Validity of criticism of universality in the concept of OUV in the World Heritage Convention needs to be viewed through the concepts of significance and of representativeness. As quoted above in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (OG) (para 54) Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. The concept of representativeness parallels significance in intent in that both engage with the idea of comparability between places. In the first place there is no doubt that the inception of the Convention was intended to deal with an exclusive and restricted list of the ‘best’ there is. Such a view became tempered by the concept of representativeness and linking it with significance which itself was linked to application of values that are not absolute, but relative. By 1977 the OG introduced the word ‘representative’ in para 7: ‘Opinions may vary from one culture or period to another and the term “universal” must therefore be interpreted as referring to a property which is highly representative of the culture of which it forms part.’ Jokilehto (1999:296) suggested that within the context of representativeness:

… it may be possible to identify groups or classes of products with similar characteristics, out of which to select the most representative or outstanding … universal value implies that the single item be not only seen for its individual merits but always also as a representation of the common heritage of humanity.

The concept of cultural heritage places at the international level being representative rather than the best of the best was given currency in 1994 when World Heritage Committee (WHC) launched the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List (http://whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy). Therefore the acceptance of representativeness as referring to particularly outstanding example(s) of a kind of cultural heritage place(s) related to it (their) values judged within a given culture or cultures has become normal practice. The process involves comparison between places and understanding whose values are to be addressed and that these are change between cultures. At the World Heritage level this has meant a broader and more diverse list of places.

Heritage revisited

A distinctive aspect of heritage discourse in the third period, particularly since the early 2000s, has been the increasing alignment of heritage with notions of memory and identity articulating around the notion of culture as “ways of life” and involving conjoined issues of practice,
policy and politics (Isar et al 2011:2). Consequently concern for heritage has accelerated beyond acting mainly at local and national scales to become part of a globalised endeavour where heritage, memory and identity can be seen as ‘global scripts’ (Kong 2010 in Isar et al 2011:2/3).

At this point we may legitimately pose the question: what is heritage and indeed is there such a thing as heritage? All too often heritage is seen as a physical entity that can be photographed, measured and recorded. The hangover of 1960s/1970s heritage practice has certainly encouraged this view with its Eurocentric focus solely on famous monuments and sites, grand houses and palaces: a movement that was transported around the world partnering heritage somehow with the accolade of good taste. In this sense heritage can be seen to be exclusive and exclusionary, something which lionises the grand: what in Australia used to be dubbed the great white house syndrome. Inevitably such a myopic view has been rigorously challenged and revised. This takes us to the proposition by Smith (2006:11) that ‘There is, really, no such thing as heritage.’ What Smith means here is that heritage is not a thing but ‘a multilayered performance … that embodies acts of remembrance and commemoration while … constructing a sense of place, belonging and understanding in the present’ (Smith 2006:3). In this connection she also proposes that whilst heritage as process passes on established values and meanings it creates new meanings and values. Hence heritage is dynamic so that ‘what constitutes heritage is not fixed … it evolves with society and reflects its changing values over time. It is therefore incumbent upon contemporary societies to redefine the role, meaning and purpose of heritage’ (Bandarin and van Oers 2012:178).

**Change sustaining cultures**

What has also become clear is the strengthening of the view that heritage is not a fixed immutable thing residing solely in famous architectural and archaeological monuments and sites lionising commemorations of the rich and famous in history. Additionally we have come to recognise (Uzzell, 2009: 326/327) that:

> The meaning of heritage will vary over time and for different groups of people. It serves social, cultural and political functions. But the heritage during this process does not remain static and unchanged … We use the heritage in the creation of our own individual, group and national identities.

In the vein of Uzzell’s (2009) comments, a notable aspect of culture is that cultures and cultural values change over time in response to cultural context changes as Franz Boas recognised. This paradoxically mirrors the French adage, *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose* (the more things change, the more they stay the same). The fact of change is recognised in UNESCO (2003) *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (2003) Article 1:

> The “intangible cultural heritage” means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.

Therefore, with change, culture does not vanish nor do the range of potential values that inform culture. This was recently succinctly expressed to me by a PhD student with the apt comment that ‘culture will not disappear as long as humans are around, so what exactly do we want to happen?’\textsuperscript{18} The answer to this question in many ways underscores, or should underscore, academic and professional aspects of cultural heritage management studies with a focus on culture and people alongside the materiality of physical fabric and objects.

To illustrate my point on change and the tenacity and sustainability of culture I offer by way of example a commentary by Stevan Harrell (2013). Harrell recounts an incident on a field visit to Bimo Cultural Park associated with The Fourth International Conference on Yi Studies, Meigu County, Liangshan Yi Autonomous Prefecture, China, concurrent with a Conference on Tourism and Development and the Yi Cultural Festival. Inside the Park were bimo, Nuosu Yi priests, working part-time performing rituals for visitors and otherwise continuing what their patrilineal ancestors had done for tens of generations, doing rituals for the health of the living and the peace of the dead. The bimo demonstrated in various outdoor ritual spaces and in newly built traditional houses. Harrell reports that one visitor, a white foreigner, became quite agitated and in approaching a group of visitors declared this was horrible; the end of Yi culture; pitifully inauthentic in a commercialised place with no connection to real, continuing culture. A Yi scholar who overheard lectured her in perfect English that these men (bimo) came here today specifically to do a ritual for your health and good fortune. Is this how you show your gratitude? The point Harrell makes is that underlying ancient values of such ceremonies continue even though the context changes and that change is an inherent part of culture. And that anything labelled as ‘heritage’ mistakenly gets signalled as needing preservation\textsuperscript{19}, because it’s done for.

Harrell (2013:286) makes the following incisive observation in relation to culture as process and the inevitability of change:

Insofar as we try to preserve anything, to stop the process of cultural change in its tracks, we are using a kind of cultural formaldehyde that is only suitable for preserving dead things. This is what bothered the visitor … she was not witnessing bimo in their organic setting, but rather in a setting created by the process of cultural preservation, which indicated that they needed help in surviving, but could not survive in a meaningful form because they needed help.

In another sense, however, preserved cultural heritages continue to exist, even in changed form, and we can just as easily see the preservation, too, is part of the process of cultural change, and that the forms that emerge in the intentional process of preservation are just as much links in the chain of cultural continuity as are the forms that emerge out of less self-conscious and more organic processes. If the bimo rituals were still effective, it did not matter that they took place in a cultural park, to benefit visitors in exchange for money (actually bimo have always performed for money, or for livestock …). Anything that allowed this tradition to continue, in whatever form, was worthwhile; it did not matter that the form was changed, since it would have changed anyway if left alone.

Having quoted the Yi Bimo example at length, let me add that it is not a \textit{carte blanche} imprimatur for all cultural parks. I have visited some appalling examples of ersatz

\textsuperscript{18} Veronica Bullock, The ANU, Research School of Humanities and Arts, pers comm: permission given to include the comment

\textsuperscript{19} See Chapter 1 brief discussion of the term ‘preservation’ as used in the USA as opposed to the internationally used term ‘conservation’.
representations of traditional cultural settlements and performances presented for tourists that can only be described as cringe making and a cultural insult.

I had a similar experience to the Bimo Cultural Park in 2008 visiting Xijiang Thousand Household Miao Village (Qiandongnan Autonomous Prefecture, Guizhou, China) as a participant in 2008 at ‘The International Academic Symposium of Conservation and Sustainable Development of Village Cultural Landscape’. The eight constituent villages of Xijiang are built on a series of steep hills on both sides of a river valley with the traditional 3 storey stilt houses cascading picturesquely down the slopes (Figure 2.4) bordered by native forests and agricultural plots (rice paddies, vegetables, wheat). There are over 1200 families living there with a population of c5000+. A joint policy by national and provincial governments has seen financing of various developments in Xijiang to deter rural migration to urban areas, diversify employment opportunities, encourage local crafts including silver-smithing and textiles, encourage continuation of ethnic traditions such as festivals and celebrations – dancing, singing, traditional foods – and open tourism opportunities.

By 2008 Xijiang had a tourist lookout atop one the hills giving a panoramic view of the landscape setting, a parking area capable of taking coaches, a central area for dance and music performances (Figure 2.5), an eco-museum built by locals housing traditional textiles and everyday goods such as baskets, silver jewellery. Also by 2008 two new streets of timber houses had been built to provide shops (Figure 2.6) in an architectural style reflecting but not imitating local vernacular. To support these initiatives major transport infrastructure projects in the region have made the area accessible and tourists, national and international, have come in increasing numbers. Since 2008 more changes have occurred including addition of a hotel, guest houses, bars and more shops. There is now an entry charge of 100 RMB ($20 Aus), and 20 RMB for local bus ride from and to the car park. Other changes have eventuated including the influx of outsiders who have come to share in the new economic opportunities encouraged by tourism. It is a matter of opinion on whether the success of the government initiated changes to open tourism and the consequences of growth have negatively affected local people’s values. Do we really want a European model of ‘the deliberately assembled museum town [and] vernacular museumification of existing towns and districts’ critiqued by Ashworth and Graham (2012: 591)? Here I am reminded of World Heritage listed Old Quebec which effectively shuts down after the shops close.
In 2008 a foreign expert (again) expressed concern at the then developments, not least the central dance and performance square where shows for visitors could be seen to corrupt and falsify the authentic, traditional, steeped-in-time meaning of the dances and music. The danger in this view is akin to drawing tight boundaries around heritage places, be they historic buildings/monuments sites or cultural landscapes, and declaring them to be static materially and culturally. This is particularly so in Asia where altering, adding to, or even completely rebuilding of what to the Western mind could be seen to be inviolate material heritage is acceptable. To the Asian mind the very action of human attention maintains the function and spirit of a place such as a building attached to which are meanings and values as part of everyday life. Taylor and Altenburg (2006) note that:

 replacement of fabric is acceptable because the significance of the place resides primarily in its continued spiritual meaning and symbolic value related to everyday use rather than pre-eminence of the fabric itself, the latter being held as a Western preoccupation’

The same applies to artefacts such as wall paintings on plaster for example in Thailand. If damage occurs and deterioration sets in resulting in loss of plaster and paintings, the damaged areas are replaced and repainted, even if the images change. As long as they are in keeping with the spirit of the place and its meanings the change is acceptable. The ultimate example is the Ise Grand Shinto shrine buildings at Naikū and Gekū in Mie Prefecture, Japan, which are rebuilt every twenty years. In contrast the conventional Western approach is to halt deterioration and stabilise a structure as it exists often freezing it in time.

‘Asian conservation is not so much about protecting the way a building or structure looks but what a building does’ (Staiff 2016:33). A cogent example is the three World Heritage listed properties in Beijing, in particular the Forbidden Palace and the Summer Palace where restoration and remedial work is an integral part of looking after these places, not least in renewing timber sections and the intricate artwork that adorns them. Again I had experience in 2007 at a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS meeting of a European ‘expert’ criticising structural renewal and redecoration. This was on the grounds some of the decaying structures should be stabilised and left to demonstrate age. How hanging sections of decayed timber and plaster work could be stabilised defies logic. This latter day misplaced Venice Charterism ignored the fact that timber does decay in Asian climates and that throughout the Qing and Ming dynasties renewal of fabric was de rigour. It was a legitimate cultural process which Chinese colleagues quietly and effectively demonstrated when they presented detailed instructions from the Ming and Qing historic archives on how to address renewal and rebuilding which guided their work. The view of the European ‘expert’ was effectively derailed.
The Xijiang example inevitably takes us into the difficult and contested terrain of change, but also I would add that it is the terrain of whose values are we, or should we be, addressing? (Taylor 2014). Here we need to look at who are the various stakeholders and their cultural values: people who live there, managers (including the local company that oversees operations) and tourists/visitors. At Xijiang many of the local people have seemingly entered into the heritage enterprise and for some it has clearly brought improved incomes as the place is thriving. Like the Bimo example, do long-standing cultural values of such ceremonies continue even though the context changes? Do they maintain meaning for local people? If government support had not been made available and the age of tourism not arrived, both processes bringing with them new forms of income for Miao people, would the ceremonies have slowly deteriorated as population inevitably diminished and young people left the area? The dilemma comes down in the end to the challenge of whose values are we addressing, or not addressing, and acknowledging that values change over time, however confronting this may be. Heritage is not static, it is a dynamic process.

A difficult and at times, vexed, example of whose values are being addressed or not addressed inheres in the ongoing contested view of whether local communities living around the World Heritage listed archaeological remains at Angkor, Cambodia, should be allowed to extend dwellings and/or build new ones. This has engendered disagreement between APSARA management authority20 and locals on appropriate/inappropriate building materials leading to ‘illegal’ construction. (Gillespie 2010). Indeed even whether some residents should be allowed to remain or be forcibly moved is mooted from time to time. In 2016 the Cambodian Center for Human Rights reported on a disagreement between APSARA and local people in the Banteay Srei district just north of the main Angkor Park. The tension focuses on a proposal to create an ‘eco village’ to rehouse some squatters on land that overlapped with farmland belonging to 270 families in Ta Ni village with APSARA trying to convince villagers to sell their land. The imbroglio is muddied by some villagers agreeing to sell but then felt they had been cheated whilst others refused and then a decision by the authorities that only 13 out of 38 families were eligible to receive replacement land. More recently families who have continued to crop rice inside a boundary created by APSARA have been threatened with destruction of their crops. In 2012 seven villagers had a complaint filed against them for illegally occupying land in spite of having documents indicating their legal occupation. Matters are complicated by land ownership laws in Cambodia and management dilemmas associated with such a famous heritage place. 21

Chapman (2016) reflecting on the latter point speculates whether APSARA is poised to move inhabitants from the site to new housing outside the park.22 Chapman (2016:55) suggests that for APSARA ‘local inhabitants interrupt the effort to create a “natural” park and introduce an ever increasing number of new vehicles and houses into the park landscape.’ People for over a thousand years have lived in villages and small towns surrounding the monuments, farming

---

20 APSARA is the Cambodian management authority responsible for protecting the archaeological park of Angkor. Founded in 1995, it is in charge of the research, protection, and conservation as well as the urban and tourist development of the park.

21 A similar case is quoted in Ekern et al 2012:214 relating to removal of long-time residents from the WH listed Hue citadel which can be seen as an infringement of rights as noted in a UNESCO/ICOMOS monitoring mission (2006) which recommended compensation. The case is however complicated in that under Vietnamese law displaced people have no legal right to occupy land within the World Heritage site. This may and does appear harsh to western sensibilities, but like heritage values, what we might see as fair laws relating to occupancy and compensation are not universal.

22 The monuments at Angkor and associated small towns/villages are inscribed within 5 spatial zones. Zones 1, 2 (Angkor Park) surround the monuments with Zone 1 having strictest controls and 2 acting as a buffer zone.
the land, growing rice, grazing animals, harvesting sugar palm. It has been estimated that at the height of the Angkor Empire up to 1,000,000 could have been spread across the park landscape and landscape of extensive surrounding areas. In effect it is an historic cultural landscape replete with human connections, values and meanings. The sheer historic engineering feat of bringing water from the surrounding mountains to the rice paddies and barays represents a remarkable human achievement that is still visible in the historic landscape. It is important to remember as Chapman reflects that the inhabitants play an important part in the day to day upkeep of the park’s landscape (Figure 2.7). Certainly one of the pleasures of visiting Angkor if you are prepared to move outside the famous monuments zone is seeing – and stopping – at local traditional settlements and actually making contact with local people (Figure 2.8). The agricultural activities give a sense of living history in the landscape, historic continuity and cultural context: a sense of reality able to tell the story of the intimate interrelationship through time between events, people and place. Once again establishing that the landscape if we know how to read it is the richest historical record we possess.

Figure 2.7 Angkor Park working landscape  Figure 2.8 Angkor Park village

Contrary to received wisdom from some experts and sometimes scholars who may criticise changes that take place, local communities may see things differently and welcome change that brings economic opportunity. Such is the case at the World Heritage site of Luang Prabang. Berliner (2012:773) addresses the idea of multiple and conflicting nostalgias between foreign heritage experts, expatriates and international tourists looking from a ‘Western romanticized perception of Buddhism and colonial perceptions of other people’s traditional life ... the charme nostalgique’ in contrast to perceptions and values of local people. Many of the latter rent their houses in the old centre to foreigners and happily go to live in the suburbs in what they see as better modern housing, or the houses are turned into tourist guest houses (Ekern et al 2012). What experts describe as ‘kitsch’ – pane glass and new windows, flower pots, fences and lacquer – ‘are widely adored by locals’ (Berliner 2012:775). Architectural and building regulations in place to control local people and what they can or cannot do – because locals are perceived as a threat to good preservation of Luang Prabang’s ambience – are ignored. Underneath all this Berliner points to how local people insist that tradition is not changing, custom is not disappearing, nor do they long for the world that some foreign experts and tourists lament has disappeared. In passing it is worth reflecting on Berliner’s critique of the UNESCOization of Luang Prabang and the town being turned into nostalgia land in the context of the reasons it was World Heritage listed in 1995. The three criteria used to establish its OUV are all fixated on architectural and building style. They stress

23 Special aerial photography has mapped the breathtaking geographic extent of the remains of this vast living complex covering Angkorian and pre-Angkorian times (9th to 13th centuries)
'the exceptional fusion of Lao traditional architecture and 19th and 20th century European colonial style buildings' (criterion ii) and the place as ‘an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble built over the centuries combining sophisticated architecture of religious buildings, vernacular constructions and colonial buildings (criterion iv). One may speculate whether such focus on integrity of architectural style and bricks, stone, timber seemingly devoid of socially meaningful cultural associative values would be prominent if the nomination had been a decade later in the mid to late-2000s when UNESCO thinking on urban conservation turned to the historic urban landscapes (HUL) paradigm and cities as cultural landscapes?

The culture nature binary.

Throughout Chapter 2 references are made to how the developing interest and understanding of the cultural landscape concept has engaged in discussion on the relationship between culture and nature and their critical role in the heritage process. It is a topic that is central to a number of the published papers discussed in Chapter 3 and reproduced in Chapter 4 (see in particular Papers 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13). There has been a widening of perspectives and narratives on what we mean by culture and nature, and rather than thinking of them as separate, how in fact they are linked. In the sub-section Landscape is ... (within Defining cultural landscape) attention is drawn to the link between culture and nature as a fundamental principle in the World Heritage cultural landscape categories with cultural landscape being

at the interface between nature and culture, tangible and intangible heritage, biological and cultural diversity – they represent a closely woven net of relationships, the essence of culture and people’s identity … they are a symbol of the growing recognition of the fundamental links between local communities and their heritage, humankind and its natural environment (Rössler 2006:4).

Indeed the culture-nature link, or as all too often has been the case, the culture-nature divide, has been the focus of debate in the cultural and natural heritage fields, particularly from the late 1980s onwards. Whilst there have been two opposing camps, attempts have been made, and continue to be made to bridge the divide.

It has always been apparent to me that there is a difference in modes of thinking on what is nature between Western views and those of Asia. Until the late 1980s there was some tension between cultural and natural heritage conservation. Culture and nature were uneasy, sometimes suspicious, companions. Reflective of this, cultural and natural criteria for assessment of properties of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) for World Heritage nomination and listing were separate until 2005 when they were sensibly combined into one set of ten criteria in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The separation was originally based on a hegemony of Western values where cultural heritage resided mainly in great monuments and sites and natural heritage in scientific ideas of nature and wilderness as something separate from people. The latter was an ideal espoused particularly in the USA. Edward Said (1994:63) pithily labels it the ‘Puritan errand into the wilderness’. It is reflective of Roderick Nash’s (1967) critical analysis of the American concept of wilderness where he posits its adoption as grounded in the idea of something distinctively American and superior to anything in the Old World: the sublime versus the antique. He refers to the wilderness idea as critical to a unique American white identity (my bold). In contrast to this Nash refers to Thoreau’s view that ‘What we call wilderness is a civilisation other than our own’ (Nash 1973:37).
Therefore we may ask what of the identity and history of occupation of US national park areas by native Americans before being ousted and their cultural landscape turned into someone else’s ‘wilderness’? That page of history is fuzzy in the heroic wilderness narrative, being as opaque as it was in the environmental ethics debate on natural values during the 1970s and 1980s, in particular that of whether nature has instrumental value or intrinsic value. Feng Han’s (2006) discussion on these values is instructive: instrumental value is assigned because of the usefulness of something; in contrast intrinsic value relates to values of things as ends in themselves. A further complication is the question of the origin of intrinsic value. Is it subjective, created by human thought and value systems? Alternatively is it objective where value is endemic in its own right, simply waiting to be recognised objectively as the deep ecology movement stridently claimed? Is nature valued as purely an object without any human interest or spiritual attachment? Where do traditional owners and societies with their knowledge systems fit into this (imperial core?) image of nature?

Examination of the World Heritage List for Asian countries shows some properties included under natural criteria where local community associations with these places are omitted, or worse, obliterated. In contrast to this approach ought to be recognition of the value systems that traditional communities associate deeply with so-called natural areas as part of their cultural beliefs. Added to this is the fact that many traditional communities live in or visit these places as part of their life systems and have done so for millennia, prompting the question of what do we mean by nature? Is it the 1960s American model enshrined in the Wilderness Act with its connections to Protestant Christian, colonial, and post-colonial cultural associations from the English speaking Western world? Or ought it to be the concept of nature and culture not as opposites, but where nature is part of the human condition? In this connection is J.B. Jackson’s (1984, 156)) view that landscape ‘is never simply a natural space, a feature of the natural environment . . . every landscape is the place where we establish our own human organization of space and time’.

Of note in the culture-nature and tangible-intangible landscape relationships is the mounting appreciation of links between cultural and biological diversity and traditional sustainable land-use. A landmark UNESCO-IUCN international symposium in 2005 explored the culture/nature diversity links; in an eloquent paper Lhakpa N Sherpa (2005) shows how beyul, the cultural phenomenon of sacred hidden valleys in the Nepalese Himalaya, traditionally support biodiversity conservation. But he also shows how Western influenced initiatives are targeting beyul for establishing protected areas without proper recognition of the symbiotic relationship between local communities and environmental conservation: the message is modern development, education, globalisation, and tourism are not supporting traditional stewardship.

In contrast and connecting with Feng Han’s (2006) view is the Thai example of Doi Suthep-Pui National Park, Chiang Mai. Here culture and nature coexist in terms of local Hmong communities allowed to remain living in the park and where interpretative presentation acknowledges the immutable relationship between people and nature. This is seen also in the value placed on the temples in the park, as with the venerable Pra That Doi Suthep Temple24, and elegantly expressed by Nantawan Munga and Vital Lieorungruang (2006) with the comment:

---

24 See also Paper No 13 discussion in Chapter 4
Despite all the stunning natural beauty, the main reason many visitors come . . . is to visit Phra That Doi Suthep Temple. For Thais, this site is a must for the visit, as it is a sacred place to pay homage to the Lord Buddha’s relic, . . . [it is] one of the most holy Buddhist sites in Thailand.

Who owns nature?

Worldwide in the belief systems of traditional and indigenous societies a division between culture and nature does not exist thereby raising fundamental questions of who owns nature and for whom is it to be protected. It is a topic that has been lucidly dissected by Descola (2008). In his provocative essay, *Who Owns Nature*, he notes that the Western view of nature – a product of the seventeenth century Age of Enlightenment – which he sees dominating the culture/nature debate, is far from being shared by all peoples of the earth who value different cosmological principles. He calls for more appreciation of the plurality of ideas on the concept of nature. Wylie also steps into this debate with the suggestion that ‘the traditional distinction made between “nature” and “culture” as two wholly separate realms of existence in many ways merely rephrases the error of dividing landscape up into two fields, objective facts and layers of subjective meaning’ (Wylie 2007:10). Perhaps it is more productive to reflect on cultural landscapes as a bridge between the two (Taylor and Lennon 2012).

An urban perspective and cities as cultural landscapes

Given that a major rationale behind this chapter is interrogating changes that have and are occurring in the broadening understanding of the cultural heritage process, it is appropriate to consider cultural heritage conservation theory and practice through the lens of the march globally into urbanisation. In this regard the question posed in the following commentary is apposite:

Current urbanization policies often ignore the importance of cultural heritage preservation and promotion and the great potential of creativity in addressing social, environmental and economic urbanization challenges. How does culture weigh in addressing urbanization challenges today?

Today, for the first time in human history, more than half of the world’s population lives in cities. According to UN-Habitat, within two decades, five billion people will live in cities, a majority of them in the Global South. Coincidentally, within the field of cultural heritage conservation, increasing international interest and attention over the past two decades has been focused on urban areas. This is timely because pressure for economic development and the prioritizing of engagement with the global economy have accompanied rapid urbanization. In many societies, and not least in Asia, pressures for economic development have privileged modernization efforts leading to the loss of traditional communities. Accompanying this has been a concentration in the field of urban conservation on famous buildings and monuments rather than seeing cities as communities of people with values and belief systems that are reflected in the city’s overall setting: its cultural landscape. As a result an alternative way of seeing cities - the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) paradigm – has evolved and it is discourse around this paradigm that I address in the following part of the chapter.

---

25 See Paper No 5, Chapter 3
Embedded in HUL is the recognition of the layering of significances and values in historic cities, deposited over time by different communities under different contexts (Bandarin & van Oers, 2012). It is an approach that relates closely to the cultural landscape concept of layers through time replete with social meanings. Cities may, therefore, be categorised as a type of cultural landscape (Taylor, 2015b). The cultural landscape paradigm can be seen to offer a trajectory of thinking relevant to the historic urban environment, not least because it connects with the notion of landscape study as a form of social history reflective of human values. The significance of the cultural landscape concept in the urban sphere is that it allows us to see and understand the approach to urban conservation that concentrates on individual buildings as ‘devoid of the socio-spatial context ... contributes to a deterioration of the [wider] urban physical fabric’ (Punekar, 2006:110). Greffe (2010:3) reinforces this urban landscape way of thinking as contrary to seeing the city as a closed view of architectural wonders of historic cities, but rather seeing the ‘ ... postmodern city where we are looking for feelings and emotions. The landscape then becomes an experience’.

For me as a cultural geographer and planner the move into landscape linked HUL is welcome, not least in that it builds on the pioneering work of distinguished geographers in urban studies, including Donald Meinig, Wilbur Zilenski, Fred Kniffen, John B Jackson, Peirce Lewis, Arthur E Smailes, and Edward Relph.

Central to such a paradigm shift emphasising the need for a cultural landscape approach is the inalienable role of human values. Continuing this line of thought Punekar (2006:111) makes a strong case for adopting a cultural landscape approach in the following comments:

A cultural landscape approach enables diverse communities to be seen as part of that landscape. That is, cultural, historical, and political conditions affecting contemporary communities are part of the process of human engagement with the place. The cultural landscape approach can be a means of reuniting fragmented approaches to valuing and constructing the environments we inhabit, a means of overcoming distinctions between historic environment and new development, nature and culture, built heritage and context.

To this I would add that the cultural landscape approach also acknowledges that change is an inevitable factor and has to be addressed.

Changes in line with expanded thinking generally on heritage conservation in the later 1980s started to be seen in urban conservation. Reflective, for example, of this are the 1987 ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns (Washington Charter) and the 2000 ICOMOS Hoi An Declaration on Conservation of Historic Districts of Asia (Table 2.1). The Washington Charter notes in particular (Article 3) that ‘the participation and the involvement of the residents are essential for the success of the conservation programme.’ Here came an understanding of the significance of built urban heritage as the places where people live their everyday lives, where social values and a sense of place exist. In this connection the perceptive observation by J B Jackson (1994: 151) is apposite:

Most of us, I suspect, without giving much thought to the matter, would say that a sense of place, a sense of being at home in a town or city, grows as we become accustomed to it and learn to know its peculiarities. It is my belief that a sense of place is something that we ourselves create in the course of time. It is the result of habit or custom.

The shift to an holistic, contextual view of urban heritage to include the idea of landscape as setting for people’s lives — and within this the idea of sense of place — is further seen in the
initiative of the *Seoul Declaration on Heritage and Metropolis in Asia and the Pacific* (ICOMOS 2007). Notably the *Declaration*, in relation to a wider understanding of heritage, proposes (ICOMOS 2007:6) that

> These heritage sites contribute to the life and memory of the metropolitan areas by the diversity of their uses. ... Along with geographical features and the living social ecosystem, cultural heritage contributes strongly to the personality and character of the metropolis. It is a source of a truly sustainable development of the metropolitan areas in Asia and the Pacific in achieving their strategic and economic roles.

Whilst the *Seoul Declaration* relates specifically to an Asian context, its five major recommendations are highly relevant to consideration of sustainable urban conservation needs globally:

1. Cultural heritage should be recognised as a diverse and non-renewable asset, essential to the sustainable and human development of metropolitan areas in Asia and the Pacific.
2. Conservation of cultural heritage should be integral to the development of the city, including policies, programs and projects, from their planning to their approval, implementation and updating.
3. Conservation is comprised of the on-going identification, evaluation, protection and management of cultural heritage supported by the necessary human, scientific and financial resources.
4. Conservation of cultural heritage requires the development and implementation of adapted tools founded on recognised best practice and local conditions and traditions.
5. Conservation in metropolitan areas requires information, involvement and cooperation among the public, private, academic, and non-government sectors as well as citizens and international organizations.

**Historic Urban Landscape**

The concept of the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) is a major initiative by UNESCO in the field of conservation of urban areas associated with change that is taking place in the world’s cities. It was first set out at a UNESCO conference in Vienna27, May 2005, and advocated in the *Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture - Managing the Historic Urban Landscape* (UNESCO 2005b). It followed concern by the World Heritage Committee about impacts of modern developments on historic urban areas and compatibility with the protection of their heritage values. This was particularly so with its proposition of the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) notion as a tool to reinterpret the values of urban heritage, and its indication of the need to identify new approaches and new tools for urban conservation.

The *Vienna Memorandum* was pivotal to the *Declaration on the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes* by the General Assembly of UNESCO in October 2005.28 Van Oers (2010:8) noted that:

> The Vienna Memorandum is not a Charter, nor was it intended as a finalized document that could guide urban development and conservation for decades to come – it represented a consensus product, established with the involvement of various professional entities, to serve as a catalyst for

---


opening up the debate … It is a transitional document which hints at a vision of human ecology and signals a change towards sustainable development and a broader concept of urban space suggested as ‘landscape’ – not so much the designed and evolved landscapes that are familiar to most conservation specialists, but rather associative landscapes or ‘landscapes of the imagination’.29

In this context its thinking and intention therefore paved the way for reviewing debate on new approaches to urban conservation. The establishment in the Vienna Memorandum of the HUL concept was, in effect, a high-water mark for the heritage conservation field. It marked the start of a shift away from the preoccupation with the historic city as visual object to an interest in the historic environment as a space for ritual and human experience. Van Oers summarises this shift towards the HUL paradigm in the following definition (Van Oers 2010: 14)30:

Historic Urban Landscape is a mindset, an understanding of the city, or parts of the city, as an outcome of natural, cultural and socio-economic processes that construct it spatially, temporally, and experientially. It is as much about buildings and spaces, as about rituals and values that people bring into the city. This concept encompasses layers of symbolic significance, intangible heritage, perception of values, and interconnections between the composite elements of the historic urban landscape, as well as local knowledge including building practices and management of natural resources. Its usefulness resides in the notion that it incorporates a capacity for change.

The culmination of thinking on new international approaches to urban conservation came in 2011 with the UNESCO General Conference Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape [HUL] (UNESCO 2011). This instrument recognised the layering of significances and values in historic cities deposited over time by different communities under different contexts. It is an idea that is succinctly summarised by the comment in UNESCO publication New life for historic cities (UNESCO 2013:5):

Urban heritage is of vital importance for our cities – now and in the future. Tangible and intangible urban heritage are sources of social cohesion, factors of diversity and drivers of creativity, innovation and urban regeneration.

The idea of layering also strikes a chord with, and relates closely to, the cultural landscape concept. The Recommendation recognises the challenges of contemporary urbanisation, as well as the importance of cities as engines of growth and centres of innovation and creativity that provide opportunities for employment and education. The Recommendation identified urban heritage, including its tangible and intangible components in their natural context, as a key resource in enhancing the liveability of urban areas and fostering economic development as well as social cohesion.

Communities and urban conservation: some Asian examples

The rapid changes taking place throughout cities globally all too often amount to an attack on urban variety and vibrant streetscapes that reflect interesting and traditional social patterns. This phenomenon is particularly relevant in Asian cities where so much of the traditional life is experienced on the streets and the communities associated with urban cultural landscapes of small provincial towns and also distinctive precincts in cities. Representing a vibrancy of

‘living history and heritage [which] exist in [their] cultural landscapes, traditions and representations’ (Taylor 2013b:193), such places are under threat as Worrasit Tantinipankul (2013:114) in relation to Thailand thought provocingly posits:

Historical urban communities in provincial towns across Thailand are facing rapid demolition as a result of urban development. Comprised of simple wooden shop houses reflecting humble architectural craftsmanship, the character of these historical provincial towns is one which reflects unique patterns of urban livelihood and culture in Thailand. And yet, this provincial urban cultural landscape does not figure into the official Thai conception of “architectural heritage.”

Tantinipankul further reflects that images of Thai heritage – and also a major focus of tourism – have since the 1920s centred on famous glittering monuments and sites: primary cultural heritage attractions such as World Heritage sites and sites on National Heritage registers that feature in countless glossy magazines, travel brochures, promotional tourism literature and will draw tourists and visitors in their own right (du Cros 2002). They are representative of the conventional approach (Wijesuriya et al 2013) to heritage conservation and management contrasting with the values led approach focusing on involving communities, cultural and participatory mapping to understand people’s values, intangible connections to places and sense of identity. In contrast to primary attractions are what can be termed ‘secondary attractions’. Hilary du Cros (2002:319), reviewing tourism attractions in Hong Kong, proposes ‘secondary attractions will appeal to tourists once they are already at a destination and are examining options for best use of their time and so become a more discretionary choice.’

Examples of secondary urban cultural landscape attractions: vernacular versus the famous

Thailand

Secondary attractions are the places we pass through on the way to primary attractions or places adjacent to primary attractions as in the case of Tha Tien district of Bangkok near the Royal Palace and Wat Pho (Pimonsathean 2006, Sirisrisak 2009). It is a lively and vibrant vernacular streetscape popular with tourists and local people (Figure 2.9) redolent with interesting and traditional social patterns. Tha Tien is an old community on a significant part of Rattanakosin Island flanking the Chao Praya River and adjacent to major heritage and tourist attractions including the Grand Palace, Temple of the Emerald Buddha (Wat Phra Kaew), and Temple of the Reclining Buddha (Wat Pho). Its general history dates to the seventeenth century when King Rama I established the new capital of Siam at Rattanakosin. The Tha Tien shophouses were built in the nineteenth century under the direction of King Rama V as rental housing and shops for low income people. ‘Due to its strategic location and significance, Tha Tien was subject to an ideal “beautification” concept’ in the Rattanakosin conservation and development master plan’ (Pimonsathean 2006:5) of 1997 under the direction of the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA). Of the 490 shophouses more than 400 were to be demolished, leaving only 61 to be restored and reused for tourist service or retailing. The major part of the site was to be given over to open space parkland supposedly for tourists. The fact that tourists visit such areas because of the vitality and living history character so redolent of cities like Bangkok seems to have escaped attention of the planners, as did the fact that ‘The provision of open space after the building demolition will destroy the historic fabric of Rattanakosin because the long established community will no longer exist.’
An alternative planning approach commenced in 1998 with a distinct series of steps:

Step 1: Scan the environment
Step 2: Household survey
Step 3: Architectural survey and documentation
Step 4: Integrative analysis
Step 5: Hearings and meetings:
   In this step, all the findings from the analysis have been presented to the community members and the BMA officials. The presentation and discussion were organized in many forms to facilitate the different profiles of the beneficiary groups such as government officials, affected residents, community development committee as well as local politicians. After a series of presentation, discussion and consultation, an alternative conservation plan for Tha Tien was formulated and presented in a community hearing. The hearing was organised with the community.
Step 6: Alternative proposal including a series of hearings, discussions and consultations have made it possible to propose an alternative conservation plan which has four features as follows: - the restoration of 319 units of shophouse instead of keeping only 61 units as defined in master plan.
Step 7: public presentation.

The restoration of 319 shophouses (Figure 2.10) has caused some social dislocation with not all original residents able to return. The type of goods on sale has to some extent changed with, for example, coffee shops opened catering for tourists. Nevertheless, the exercise of looking at an alternative to demolition with community input and some sense of continuity maintained has resulted in an outcome that reflects history. It also reflects different community urban heritage values to those of the government established national conservation committee.

Another similar example in Bangkok is Talud Phlu Canal Community, one of the historic canal communities along the Chao Praya River. In a research paper31 Tantinipankul (2014) sets out that present-day residents of the area are descendants of Chinese merchants and low-ranking bureaucrats who served the ruling class of Bangkok before modern development and that the area is under pressure from urban infrastructure developments. The research

31 Research project funded by National Research Council of Thailand undertaken by School of Architecture and Design, King Mongkut University of Technology Thonburi.
highlights the social meaning and identity of Talad Phlu community. It reveals the historic site is an integral part of the original settlement of Bangkok’s canal communities reflecting living history of petty bureaucrats, merchants and labourers from the perspective of different ethnic groups (Thai, Chinese, Mon, Muslim, Malay). The outcome is an inquiry into whether it is feasible to revive such a community through various cultural heritage tourism opportunities and networks involving such activities as cycling and walking routes, as well as improvements to canal transport safety and use with involvement of the Bangkok Metropolitan Authority (BMA) Office of Cultural, Sports and Tourism Promotion. It is acknowledged nevertheless that such an approach could trigger threats of deterioration of urban fabric and/or commodification of historic places as artefacts for global consumption disconnecting them from continuity and dynamics of community. Key to avoiding such an outcome is the imperative of appreciating the community’s learning process and effects of change and extent of change.

Critical to this process is addressing what are acceptable levels of change in the context of historic, natural and cultural resources. Crucial here is (a) ensuring that the business of tourism does not overwhelm community core values, ways of life and main occupations and (b) facilitating collaboration between local government and community. Such collaboration is facilitated through cultural and participatory mapping which documents heritage resources, meanings and values. In this way cultural mapping can help ‘to understand the notion of local distinctiveness [and] can be a tool to help local communities have their voice heard through their involvement in the mapping process’ (Taylor 2013).

Notwithstanding a preoccupation with monumental heritage, Tantinipankul (2013) notes that Thailand’s Tourism Authority (TAT) did launch in 2003 a new international campaign – ‘Unseen Thailand’ – to focus on local areas. Its 2012 plan includes ‘Thailand Experience and Smile’ aiming to incorporate small towns as tourist destinations. An example of the latter is Bang Luang on the Chin River, Nakorn Pathom province 73 kms from Bangkok. The community was established in 1903 by Chinese immigrants. With a long and invaluable cultural history, Bang Luang community has many attractive places which provide a glimpse back to Siam a century ago which are imbued with tangible and intangible values. There are [68] traditional wooden shop-houses integrating Thai and Chinese styles of architecture (Figure 2.11), local temples and local museum redolent of ways of life of a traditional market community creating close association with the Chin River (Thaisurya 2016). The vernacular

![Figure 2.11 Bang Luang historic street](image1) ![Figure 2.12 Bang Luang Chinese musical group](image2)
timber shop-houses line the main street and the town was once a central collecting point for local goods to be shipped to Tha Tien market in Bangkok. Fascinating relics from its history include a working metal casting forge, Chinese musical group (Figure 2.12), Chinese school, opium hall and shops, many of which specialise in local food delicacies. Notably Bang Luang is posted as a place to visit by The Tourism Thailand website Amazing Thailand (2017).

In a PhD research study Supot Thaisurya (2012) found potential for tourism development but outlines need for a tourism and heritage management plan. This does raise the question of how can such small urban communities replete with history and heritage values attract tourists. Lessons from the success of Amphawa community may be relevant, including the role that participatory planning has played in its successful approach to urban conservation and regeneration. Citing this example Peerapun (2011) indicates that in 2001 there were 351 building units along Amphawa Canal with about sixteen percent uninhabited. By 2009 there were 369 units and all were inhabited with many converted to tourist accommodation, restaurants, and souvenir shops following the successful regeneration of the Amphawa Floating Market in 2004. The town was part of the 2003 Thailand Cultural Environment Project which first drew attention to the heritage and tourism potential in Thailand of such urban cultural landscapes as Amphawa. The influx of tourists has certainly heralded changes. In this connection Siriporn Luekveerawattana (2012:396) notes that in coping with the influx of tourists

Stakeholders have to manage tourism in a sustainable way. They need to conserve the significance of tourism destinations in Amphawa area and interpret it to the tourists. When the tourists value these tourism destinations it likely guarantees that these places will be kept and submitted to the next generation.

West Guangzhou, China

A topical example of the type of urban area reflecting the characteristics of a lively and thriving Asian city area central to the HUL paradigm, one that is not on any heritage registers or lists, is En Ning Lu Urban Transformation (Renovation) Project area, West Guangzhou, China. The En Ning Lu project area is part of the Guangzhou Xi Guang Area (the West District of Guangzhou). Whilst the city of Guangzhou has a 2000 year history, its West District is a relatively modern urban landscape. Its foundation dates back about one hundred years, but many streets and buildings date from the 1920s and 1930s when there were major social economic changes in the city. Some changes of population and diversity of residents have occurred over the last thirty years or so when China has experienced major economic reform and developments. Notwithstanding, it remains a vibrant community, busy and thriving with an active street life (Figures 2.13 and 2.14). In a project first officially announced in Guangzhou’s newspapers in September 2007 the area was marked to face major changes and demolition of dwellings in a dangerous and dilapidated condition. Since then it has become a much debated subject that has sparked many discussions, arguments, protests and news reports as people have become more sensitive to their property rights leading them to question governmental planning departments on issues of resident relocation, property value evaluation

---

32 Sadly in early October 2016 a fire destroyed 30 of the timber shophouses; to date (Feb 2017) there is no information on rebuilding options.
33 The floating market, now a major tourist (domestic and international) attraction was originally an initiative of local women aiming to restart the defunct floating market (pers comm 2007 Dr Siriporn Luekveerawattana during fieldwork research for her PhD which I supervised). Nearby is the Damnoen Saduak floating market, a reconstruction project from the 1990s, and a major tourist attraction.
and other urban planning issues. Originally planned to proceed for the Asian Games held in Guangzhou in 2010, the project appears currently to be in a holding pattern and has been delayed after talks with developers and need to attract investment.

The future of the area is currently under discussion because, in terms of governmental efforts and procedure, it is common practice nowadays to include advisory group(s) formed by university professors and industry experts. Interestingly there are also voluntary groups and websites organized by enthusiastic individuals such as students and caring residents. Some have highlighted photography and documentation and others collections of furniture and old material evidence of the history of the area. This kind of action is undertaken by voluntary and community associations in China, often under difficult conditions. Notably however, one local newspaper (New Express 新快报) has featured articles on the area and its community spirit, speaking out in support of residents and expressing critical comment on planning proposals.

Such discussion in relation to Guangzhou’s heritage conservation experience needs to be seen in the light of what Lee and du Cros (2013:108) describe as ‘the conservation-development contradiction that has currently become pervasive throughout China.’ Lee and du Cros indicate that in Guangzhou the principal agent for heritage conservation is the Division of Cultural Relics (DCR) as part of the Cultural Bureau. Alongside this is the city’s Planning Bureau (PB) responsible for preparing conservation plans for historic precincts and the Historic City (designated in 1986), although Lee and du Cros suggest that heritage conservation has not been a top priority for the PB. The result of bureaucratic fragmentation of the agencies has resulted in an uneven outcome for the city’s heritage conservation efforts. ‘National level heritage sites and important archaeological sites are generally well conserved’ (Lee and du Cros:108), falling as they do under the aegis of the DRC.

Notwithstanding the long established designation of Guangzhou as an Historic City and that ‘the designation called for formulation of precinct level conservation plans, the Planning Bureau up until early 2012 has still not yet finalized the conservation plans for old urban quarters’ (Lee & du Cros:108) that are vulnerable to redevelopment projects. The En Ning Road area is one of these (ibid quoting Fung and Chen 201234). In spite of this Figures 2.13 and 14 show the En Ning Lu area to be a thriving, vibrant community with life continuing on the streets in the traditional way. The sense of community is palpable and epitomises the spirit

of the HUL concept notwithstanding the fact that physically some of the housing stock undoubtedly needs modernization and upgrading.35

One way of addressing and exploring the resilience and adaptability of local traditions, place identities and cultural richness is through the practice of urban conservation and identification of potential urban conservation areas within the boundaries of the HUL paradigm. This was a topic explored at a Roundtable meeting in Guangzhou in December 2014.36

Singapore

Experience suggests that the more distinctive, unique and special a city is, the more chances it has to succeed (Yuen 2005). Singapore is an interesting, if somewhat unexpected, example of using urban heritage successfully. In a remarkable about-face in the mid-1980s from a demolish and rebuild approach to city planning, there has been a greater effort to reinforce and integrate past heritage with present developments, with a major turning point being a 1989 planning act amendment (Yuen 2005). This saw the appointment of a conservation authority and designation of conservation areas with associated conservation requirements and guidelines. The number of identified conservation areas has increased to more than twenty (total area 751 ha). Many of these are interpreted and presented for tourist purposes through attractive, informative trail brochures such as for Jelan Besar. Involving historic shophouses being saved from demolition and specific restoration guidelines with information for owners, to help protect historic character, these Singapore exemplars demonstrate how change and adaptation towards improved environmental character underscore how the past should serve the future (Figures 2.15 and 2.16) involved in the conservation planning process. Architecturally, old and new combine to present a lively sense of socially vibrant urban life, rather than preservation of old areas virtually as museum pieces. The variety of old and new buildings, including high-rise framing skyline views, adds diversity and interest.

Figure 2.15 Jalan Besar, Singapore

Figure 2.16 Jalan Besar, Singapore

Ironically the very success of the Singapore examples raises the spectre and criticism of gentrification changes as articulated in a newspaper opinion piece ‘Do Singapore

35 K Taylor visited Guangzhou in September 2013 at the invitation of Guangzhou Association of International Historic Towns (GAIHT). He visits annually for discussions on urban conservation futures as Heritage Advisor to GAIHT
36 This was a meeting between GIHTA (Guangzhou International Historic Towns Assoc.) and UNESCO WHITRAP (World Heritage Institute for Training & Research Asia-Pacific), Shanghai which the author attended.
neighbourhoods risk death by cappuccino?’ (Pow 2015). But here we need to ask whose values are we addressing and to be mindful of the fact that local communities may see things differently and welcome change that brings economic opportunity. It is also necessary, given that heritage is subject to political considerations, to be mindful of government policies. Henderson (2012) examines Singapore government policies to show how heritage in neighbourhoods like Jelan Besar is seen to be multi-functional, not least as a tourist resource and economic growth driver giving rise to conflicts between such growth and heritage conservation. The success of places like Jalan Besar, from a living heritage perspective, rests heavily on local population groups such as local shopkeepers and café owners continuing to live there and also their involvement in the process of architectural restoration that has taken place. How long this will persist remains open to question as the process of heritagisation brings the risk of death by cappuccino. How long will traditional local eateries, eg Chinese restaurants, keep going in the possible face of gentrification and coffee shop society?

In dealing with urban heritage conservation it is vital that those involved – whether they be government, urban planning/urban design agencies, politicians, NGOs, or inhabitants of cities – understand that historic cities consist of a plurality of communities. These shift and change through time imposing different values, thereby contributing to the layering of the city. We may well ask therefore whether the idea of a circumscribed inner area of an historic city – for example Luang Prabang? – seemingly immutable in time, where rigid conservation of the architectural fabric may be enforced as a way of attempting to stamp a sense of local identity, irrespective of how social values and ways of living change is the best model to follow. In this vein Ashworth and Graham (2012:594) argue in relation to the post-war European city that if it ‘exists as an idea, then it is composed of conserved urban forms and the idealized urban form that these contain.’ They place this within the context of vernacularism ‘viewed as a self-conscious and deliberate expression of localism [where] the conserved historic city has adopted many vernacular elements drawn from the folk museum’ (Ashworth and Graham 2012:591). The authors then suggest that ‘it is a short step from the deliberately assembled museum town to the vernacular museumification of existing towns and districts’ (Ashworth and Graham 2012:591): a chilling thought.

That identity is grounded in heritage is well established. It is part of an inclusive sense of belonging that is communal and embracing; but it might also be exclusive. For tourism purposes for example, inclusivity is central to interpreting and presenting places for outsiders where, from this knowledge, they could imagine being involved in creating what it is that constitutes the identity of the place. The hustle and bustle of everyday street scenes with shophouses and markets in Asian cities is a cogent example. The streets are often thriving, living entities where everyday life — real vernacular as opposed to ersatz vernacular — and sense of living history are palpable. What we see is community identity grounded in heritage, central to sense of place, although even here change takes place as we saw in the Bangkok example of Tha Tien quoted above.

One of the dangers inherent in urban heritage is an historic city brand image with replicable heritage items, bric-a-brac, and standard ‘off the peg’ heritage. It is, according to Ashworth & Graham (2012:595), reflective of the hallmark of some European cities typified as ‘catalogue heritage’. Within this overall classification are separate categories or possibilities to market heritage distinctiveness. Ashworth and Graham refer to these as ‘popular optional “add-ons” ... “tourist-historic waterfront”, medieval old town, “ethnic” district, festival calendar, sanitized “red light”, and gentrified “urban village”; all devised to be different but ultimately becoming the same’ (Ashworth and Graham 2012:598). The cultural landscape model would
suggest that wherever possible this catalogue list approach to historic urban heritage conservation is best avoided, or at least restricted in extent and reproduction. Instead should be an approach where the socio-cultural and political context of the cultural landscape as process by which identities are formed is applied. Here I am not arguing per se against reconstruction of some special historic places, such as the Jewish Quarter of Warsaw or Williamsburg USA, where I would argue, cogent physical and spiritual reasons, whether one agrees or not, can be enunciated to support reconstruction.

Vigan, Philippines

A comparison with the World Heritage city of Vigan, northwestern Philippines, is instructive in light of Ashworth and Graham’s (2012) critique and impacts of tourism. Undoubtedly the town’s economic well-being derives very much from tourism and conservation of the town’s remarkable collection of buildings and streetscapes. Coincidentally there is a sense of social cohesion of different groups in the community, together known as Bigueños, and their shared attachment and palpable pride and sense of place in their city. The city was laid-out on a grid pattern spreading out from a central park ringed by administrative and religious buildings by the Spanish who arrived in 1572 (Figure 2.17). Later Chinese immigrants intermarrying with local Filipinos formed an affluent group who built their houses tightly strung along narrow streets in contrast to the grander scale of the Hispanic houses. Many of the city streets being closed to motorised traffic today offer an attractive sense of being able to wander at will (Figure 2.18).

A visitors’ brochure suggests that ‘Vigan remains to be the home of proud Bigueños who welcome everyone ... Images and sounds of modernity have established their presence, however they are unable to drown the stillness and elegance of the past. Vigan has opened itself to change but has not sacrificed the bountiful wealth of its heritage.’ Perhaps an enduring example of this is the fact that there is a McDonald’s in the main square and near the 1641 cathedral, although limits to the height of the building were imposed and McDonald trademark arches are absent. What is apparent is that Vigan, as claimed, is ‘a Living Historic City.’ The participation by local people in its management is clear.37 Whilst the architecture and streetscapes are intact, so is the sense of community and social history. The sense of authenticity and that of integrity expressed in the intangible cultural heritage of Vigan are

37 Led by the local mayor who enthused local people and involved them in the enterprise of recognising Vigan’s tangible and intangible heritage.
Vigan celebrates plurality of its identities and traditional value and belief systems as expressed and maintained by resident communities.

**Shanghai and Beijing, China**

Examples from Shanghai and one from Beijing are also instructive. The first is the canal town of Zhuijiajiao near Shanghai where changes have taken place, but they are changes that can be seen not to be simply touristically fashionable vernacularism. Such towns have rich histories, traditional architecture, and daily life that make them distinctly and unmistakably Chinese (Figures 2.19 and 2.20). Notably the local community consists of people who have traditionally lived here for generations; people who want to continue to live here because it is a community, not merely a population. It is a cogent example of changing social values where tourism now substantially helps the local economy, but where changes have not destroyed the place from the point of view of the traditional setting of vernacular buildings and canals and from the point of view of intangible values (people’s lives, community feeling and sense of place). Significantly the place still belongs to them and they belong to it. In one building you may catch a glimpse of a local aged persons’ group playing mah-jong. Heritage conservation planning addressed the views and feelings of local people who wanted to stay lived here for generations; people who want to continue to live here because it is a community, not merely a population. It is a cogent example of changing social values where tourism now substantially helps the local economy, but where changes have not destroyed the place from the point of view of the traditional setting of vernacular buildings and canals and from the point of view of intangible values (people’s lives, community feeling and sense of place).

The Beijing example is that of the Beijing 798 Art Zone. Formerly an industrial area with a Bauhaus architectural character, it has been transformed into a thriving art zone with galleries, design and artist studios, art exhibition spaces, fashion shops and a street of cafes and restaurants. Each September the area hosts the Beijing 798 Art Festival, it has become a leading exhibition centre of Chinese art and culture and significant focus for cultural and artistic activity.

---

38http://www.chinahighlights.com/festivals/beijing-798-art-festival.htm  
http://www.travelchinaguide.com/attraction/beijing/798-art-zone.htm
creative industries. Its presentation and character are redolent of the Creative City notion as promulgated by Charles Landry (2012)\(^{39}\) where imaginative action is brought into developing and running urban life. Landry (2012) shows how to think, plan and act creatively in addressing urban issues, giving examples of innovation and regeneration from around the world.

**Summary**

Parallel with the thinking on HUL is the growing recognition of urban areas as drivers of creative industries and values associated with the notion of cultural capital (Throsby 2010) – economics of art and culture – linked to cultural value as well as economic value. The creative industries idea is also linked to poverty alleviation, gender and youth empowerment, and sustainable use and conservation of natural resources. Petko Draganov\(^{40}\) suggests that considerable parts of output for creative goods and services are based on local culture where creative industries are small businesses based on traditional cultural resources operating at low investment levels. We may see therefore that links between traditional creative industries with their associated communities and the HUL approach to urban conservation in developing countries are palpable.

Both phenomena – HUL and creative industries – are inextricably associated with notions of heritage for which Throsby (2010) posits there are two values: economic value and cultural value. Economic value is measured in money terms whilst cultural value is multifaceted with no single unit of account. Throsby further argues that economic value deals with tangibles whether it is a use or non-use value. Cultural value involves intangibles such as symbolic meaning, social and spiritual values, historic values, authenticity. Within the realm of cultural value lies the idea of cultural capital where tangible and intangible assets have economic and cultural value. This suggests that within the realm of cultural industries thinking and in the associated heritage field, economic values should not be privileged over cultural values. Through the lens of the HUL paradigm this certainly should resonate with approaches to the phenomenon of galloping global urbanisation and questions of urban heritage. The converse is however all too often the norm as Jyoti Hosagrahar\(^{41}\) (2013:1) posits:

Such modes of urbanization have also been destructive of local ecologies, natural resources, including land and water bodies, and cultural resources including built heritage, building crafts, traditional knowledge and creative industries.

Pressures for economic development and for the prioritizing of engagement with the global economy have accompanied rapid urbanization. In many societies, pressures for economic development have privileged modernization efforts. However, a variety of modernization projects based on universal models and global technological capabilities have in the past led to the failure of such projects or have had negative consequences on the communities they were intended to benefit.

Hosagrahar then points to the relevance of the UNESCO HUL initiative with its identification of urban heritage as a key resource in enhancing the liveability of urban areas and its goals of urban heritage conservation fostering economic development as well as social cohesion. The

---

\(^{39}\) The first edition of this book was 1994 and it had\(=\)s gone through various updates.

\(^{40}\) Petko Draganov, Deputy Secretary of UNCTAD (see note 1 above). He made these comments at the Hangzhou UNCTAD meeting 2013.

\(^{41}\) Also at Hangzhou meeting.
HUL approach emphasises locality, context, historical continuities and identity, thereby addressing opportunities for achieving goals of equity and social justice. She stresses that cultural heritage and creativity are valuable cultural resource assets for the future well-being of cities and that there are three potential benefits of including cultural heritage and creativity concerns in urban development:

- As a driver for economic development in urban areas;
- As a resource for improving the liveability [sic] and sustainability of urban areas;
- As an enabler for increasing the effectiveness of development intervention in urban areas.

There is therefore a fundamental need to initiate a dialogue with city planners, urban designers, legal instruments and governments (national and local) on the HUL paradigm. It is important in this dialogue that it is understood that the concept of urban cultural landscape heritage conservation and the reality of city development and expansion are not mutually exclusive. Change to city form will be inevitable. Key to this are the following:

- Understanding of the city as an evolving process – living entity – not merely a series of objects (buildings): here the idea of process embraces intangible cultural heritage values, *genius loci*, and interaction between culture and nature.
- Address the overall urban morphology of the city in its landscape setting so that future development does not overwhelm the landscape physically or its intangible meanings and values.
- Urban landscape under the banner of visual and physical integrity is not just a matter of quantitative visual attributes where management is nothing more than dealing with views and skylines as seen objects.

HUL offers a context for a much needed dialogue with city planners, urban designers, legal instruments and governments (national and local) on how layered cultural experiences influence perceptions of the urban landscape and why these are important in urban renewal outcomes. It is important in this dialogue that it is understood that the concept of urban cultural landscape heritage conservation and the reality of economic and political influences on city development and expansion are not mutually exclusive, acceding that change to city form will be inevitable. Critical to HUL is managing this change, recognising urban heritage is of vital importance for cities because it constitutes a key resource in enhancing liveability in urban areas. It fosters economic development and social cohesion with urban heritage acting as a catalyst for socio-economic development treating cities as dynamic organisms (UNESCO, 2103a).

Crucial, therefore, to the application of HUL are three underlying principles: understanding of the city as an evolving process – living entity – not merely a series of objects (buildings): here the idea of process embraces intangible cultural heritage values, *genius loci*, and interaction between culture and nature; respect for the overall morphology of the city and its landscape setting so that future development does not overwhelm the landscape physically or its intangible meanings and values; understanding that conservation of physical material aspects of urban landscape must be balanced taking into account immaterial aspects to do with layers of meanings residing in the urban landscape.
Conclusion

This Chapter (2) situating the thesis has tracked what are tantamount to tectonic shifts in heritage thinking and practice over the last fifty years. The shifts relate particularly to the gradual opening post-1972 of a remarkable broadening critical debate and understanding of the concept of cultural heritage to that which had prevailed earlier in the 1960s and 1970s. It was a movement that emerged internationally in the late 1980s/early 1990s and, as it gathered pace, it paved the way for deeper and more critical thinking and approaches to cultural heritage, including questioning of what is heritage, what is culture, what are the social and political contexts of the globalisation of heritage. Suffusing all these aspects has been an increasing perception of the significance of people and communities under the banner of what can be expressed as ‘heritage is about people’.

We have also seen how the leitmotif of heritage has been the focus of contestation between different groups, each claiming the high ground on what heritage is, and, often more to the point, what in their opinion it is not. Askew (2010:19) pointedly summarises this state of affairs on discordant views on what heritage is and what it is not with the observation that

![Image]

most professionals and academics who critique its application and definitions ultimately rely on the term, whether because there is no adequate alternative, or because they have a key stake in the term's preservation as a carrier for their own alternative models (see, e.g., Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996; Smith 2006)

Contrary to academic and scholarly critiques of international agencies such as UNESCO and ICOMOS in the globalisation of heritage, I have pointed to actions and initiatives where such organisations have advocated for, and set in train, measures to protect culture and heritage globally. They have done this through protocols, charters, declarations of universal principles and compilation of inventories, the prime aim of which is to protect the world’s tangible and intangible heritage. Parallel with this movement has been the growing understanding of the importance of applying universal methods of action through the lens of whose values are at stake. Nevertheless we have seen how the best of international intentions can be upset by the actions of individual players such as nation states, a state of affairs neatly summarised by Askew (2010:20):

the globalised and institutionalised heritage system has not overcome nation-state-based power structures and nationalist agendas, but has rather enhanced them, and this severely compromises the ideal of forging a countervailing meta-national zeitgeist evoked by the term 'World Heritage'

Chapter 2, therefore, reviews and concludes how the forces and outcomes of change influenced the why of my thinking and writing in the published papers (included in the following Chapter 3) and how the publications are thematically linked. In my thinking, writing, work and teaching I have attempted to find common ground between theoretical discourse on changing and expanding ideas on what heritage is (and indeed what it is not) and practice in the real world. This has been particularly from the perspective of the universality of the cultural landscape concept and its inextricable links to culture and sense of place that underpin what heritage is in my opinion. I hope in this connection that I have made a modest contribution to the discourse. Certainly, it is encouraging now to see how the cultural landscape concept has increasingly been applied to inform debate on the relationship between people, community considerations and intangible aspects of the heritage process and, also, inform debate on the role of the culture-nature relationship. Indeed I conclude that the cultural
landscape concept has widened appreciation of what heritage is. It has assisted in advancing thinking away from the older, once entrenched, view of heritage as monuments and sites to living history and heritage essentially with a focus on people, culture and values. Cultural landscapes have the capacity to be a bridge between local and international concerns, between culture and nature, for closer involvement of people in the heritage process. They also bridge, in the sense of joining, the famous places with the ordinary everyday places in the heritage panoply. It has always seemed important to me as an academic that academics should be mindful of the real world practice with its foibles, frustrations and compromises. I also think it important to acknowledge that our deliberations should be geared to improving techniques used in practice, not merely being critical of them. There is a need to join the links between theory and practice as well as encouraging critical thinking and to demonstrate for students the how and why of this approach can work. These views are aptly summarised by Harrison (2013:10):

While academic heritage studies have provided a series of critiques of heritage that have influenced its development over the past four decades, I suggest that their impact has been limited by a narrow focus on certain themes, in particular politics of representation and discursive processes of meaning-making. While these studies have provided important insights, I suggest that we need to develop a broader critical agenda for heritage studies as a newly emerging academic discipline, one that is more attuned to the affective qualities of heritage, the ways in which it is caught up in local and global processes, and the distribution of power within the various administrative and governmental frameworks surrounding it.

Early in Chapter 2 in discussion on the heritagisation process I refer to Byrne (2009) where, on addressing intangible heritage, he suggest that those who have pushed for recognition of intangibility are those who have stressed cultural in cultural heritage to resist the tendency to reduce heritage to things and privileging physical fabric over social life. Whilst having some sympathy with this, I caution that such a dialogue should not encourage a view that disconnects conservation of material heritage from intangible aspects of heritage. As another author I quote (in my discussion on Authenticity), Skounti (2009:77) makes the point, with which I entirely agree:

…there is no one intangible cultural heritage, there is a wide spectrum, ranging from the non-material dimension of a material heritage element (site, monument, object) to the most tangible aspect (tale, poem, song, musical note, prayer scent, perfume etc). Furthermore, pure immateriality is a fiction … There is obviously a material dimension to every element of intangible heritage.

As I observed in my discussion on Authenticity: ‘is a focus on the real at odds with the focus on intangibility? I think not. It is my contention that some places/objects because of strong political and historical connotations can and do have inherent/intrinsic qualities (values?) that make people recognise them as heritage without any instruction from experts or learned arguments on whether values are universal’. Things – buildings, objects, places, ancient monuments – hold physical properties that people value for their physicality, their materiality, and curating these – physical restoration and management – is held to be important by people who own or visit such places.

My concluding observation is that heritage is about people, their places and objects and how they see and value the physicality of things deemed to be heritage. In this sense managing cultural heritage is about exchange of ideas or opinions between people and those involved in cultural heritage management. It is vital that in the move to embrace affective aspects of
heritage we do not lose sight of the need to care for the quintessential material properties and qualities of ‘things’. Above all there is a need to reinforce the idea that tangible and intangible heritage as demonstrated by the cultural landscape concept are not in opposition.

Postscript

Since writing the above and submission of the text for examination (April 2017) I have revisited Xijiang Miao Village (28 June 2017). On page 41 above I refer to changes that have taken place since 2008, but only had the chance to witness the enormity of these changes on my revisit. The population of the place has expanded from around 5000 to three or four times that number. Visitor numbers have rocketed from around 10,000 pa to 2 million+. The result is change on a massive scale to the landscape setting and ambience. The stilt timber houses (the original settlement, see Figure 2.4) remain but are now seen against a backdrop of commercial development on both sides of the valley and a major international style hotel (albeit just outside the main valley setting). The open performance ground (Figure 2.5) is now hemmed in by buildings; there is an extra charge for admission to a semi amphitheatre-like setting with tiered seats focusing on a stage with what to me seemed over-the-top stage decorations reflecting local oxen symbolism, a large gaudy video screen and commentators bellowing down microphones as they introduced the next dance performance.

Nevertheless the domestic tourists appear to be thoroughly enjoying the crowded feeling, shops, food stalls and opportunity to dress up in faux Miao costumes and fake silver adornments. The locals, it is reputed, are by and large happy with the changes and the influx of the tourist RMB. To what extent traditional values and ways of doing things and meaning of activities such as Miao dancing continue needs further investigation and field work42. What is clear is that change is there to stay and to continue.

42 A former ANU Chinese PhD graduate, Dr Rouran Zhang, will undertake this in August 2017
APPENDIX 2.1

SE & E ASIAN WORLD HERITAGE CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Australia  Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (1994). NB this was extension of 1987 inscription that limited Uluru to a natural site thereby ignoring Aboriginal values and meanings. Originally Aboriginal cultural values were included in the nomination, but became excluded at the site assessment stage (see Layton and Titchen 1995)\(^{43}\).

Cambodia  Sambor Prei Kuk Archaeological Site Representing the Cultural Landscape of Ancient Ishanapura (for 2107 consideration).

       West Lake Cultural Landscape and Hangzhou (2011).
       Cultural Landscape of Honghe Hani Rice Terraces (2013).
       Zuojiang Huashan Rock Art Cultural Landscape (2016).


New Zealand  Tongariro National Park (1993). NB Property previously inscribed in 1990 as a natural site; the 1993 extension recognised Māori traditional cultural values.

PNG  Kuk Early Agricultural Site (2008).


Vanuatu  Chief Roi Mata’s Domain (2008).


CHAPTER 3

DISCUSSION

Linking the publications

Chapter 3 traces critical links and themes associated with the publications (see Table 3.1) which are included in full at Chapter 4. Chapter 3 reviews how the forces and outcomes of change set out in Chapter 2 are reflected in my thinking and writing on global approaches to the heritagisation process with particular reference to Southeast and East Asia post 2000. In particular my main interconnecting foci of research have included:

- cultural landscapes: values, meanings and conservation management;
- cultural mapping and role of communities;
- historic site conservation management; and
- World Heritage management challenges.

These areas, in particular cultural landscapes, have extended in my research from an Australian perspective developed in the mid-1980s onwards to include the evolving interest in Asia on cultural landscapes with growing attention directed towards national and World Heritage values. Such interests and lines of inquiry, although already in my mind were given impetus in 2001 and 2002 when I was involved in helping to guide the syllabus for the planned International Program in Architectural Heritage Management and Tourism (IPAHMT), Architecture Faculty at Silpakorn University, Bangkok. Following this, and from 2002, ongoing teaching input into IPAHMT, including graduate courses in Management of Historic Places and Cultural Landscapes and postgraduate PhD supervision has positively suffused my thinking.

Lively interaction with students at Silpakorn University, particularly on Thai cultural heritage values, their increasing interest in everyday places and the cultural landscape concept, historic places management and intangible heritage and Thai way of life, augmented by experience in other parts of Southeast and East Asia – including for example Indonesia, Vietnam, Philippines, but particularly China – has given me invaluable hands-on contact and appreciation of Asian culture and sense of place. It is an experience that has been enhanced by involvement in various forums, some examples of which include:

- 2003 UNESCO Fourth Experts Meeting at Borobudur, Indonesia
- In 2005 I joined the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes (ISCCL) and attended a meeting at Xi’an in China giving a presentation on Asian cultural landscape meanings and values and how these distinguished them from Eurocentric views which had hitherto dominated ISCCL business.
- From the mid-2000s to 2012 involvement in a cooperative project between AusHeritage and ASEAN-COCI (ASEAN Committee on Culture and Information) in the field of protection, preservation, promotion and management of cultural heritage. A significant outcome was a project on cultural mapping strategies in which I was joint researcher. The project included site visits to each ASEAN country and meetings with cultural heritage managers and eventually publication of a book *A Contemporary Guide to Cultural Mapping. An ASEAN-Australian perspective* (Cook and Taylor 2013).
Refereed Articles:


Refereed book chapters:

• Joint AusHeritage/ASEAN COCI conference 2004 in Yangon, Myanmar, followed by field visit to Bagan with Myanmar Department of Archaeology including discussions on potential World Heritage nomination for Bagan and its cultural landscape setting.

• Advisor with team of post-doctoral students and staff from Tsukuba University, Tokyo, on a project researching heritage values of local I'nuago people at Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, a World Heritage Cultural Landscape property.

Linking themes in the publications

Following is a list of themes that recur through the papers thereby contributing to a coherent body of work and which connect back to the critical analysis discussion in Chapter 2:

• Cultural landscapes as rich historical record of human achievement displaying heritage values and as comprehensive documents of history: our culture on display.
• Concept of heritage not limited to the separate dots on a map syndrome where each is spatially and temporally isolated.
• Interrelationship between people, events and places through time.
• Intangible aspects of heritage.
• Concept of the ordinarily sacred where everyday places are as significant as the famous.
• In looking at heritage places and their meaning, whose values are we addressing and whose heritage is it?, particularly from the perspective of existential distinctiveness and human experience as central to the concept of place making.
• In cultural heritage management and related to the preceding dot point, whose culture are we presenting and why.
• Asian approach to heritage is a process based on the primacy of spiritual values and what is culturally valuable where the past lives on in memory rather than being concentrated on material fabric. It is a process of thinking and action whereby change to, and repair of, fabric are acceptable because spirit of place lives on through application of traditional skills and ways of doing things in replacing fabric. This is succinctly summarised in Paper No 3, (Taylor and Altenburg, 2006) as:

Replacement of fabric is acceptable because the significance of the place resides primarily in its continued spiritual meaning and symbolic value related to everyday use rather than pre-eminence of the fabric itself, the latter being held as a Western preoccupation.

Commentary on publications


This paper dating from 2003 marks my first paper specifically addressing an Asian heritage place, Candi Borobudur monument in central Java, highlighting critical issues of significance, cultural landscapes, intangible heritage and conservation. It is based on a paper presented at the UNESCO Fourth Experts Meeting at Borobudur in 2003 at which I was invited to discuss the concept of historic cultural landscape in the context of Borobudur. The monument itself set in a tightly enclosed and restricted area of land artificially separated from its larger setting had been inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991. Its setting is a vast and dramatic amphitheatre: a rural landscape of rice paddies and palm groves with small villages
surrounded by volcanic peaks and hills. The landscape pattern is reflective of centuries of occupation. Research had revealed that the pattern within the cultural landscape was not sufficiently understood. It had become apparent from scholarly research into the archaeology of the area that Borobudur, which is itself built in the form of a sacred mandala or cosmic diagram, was the central point of a larger landscape mandala consisting of hills, streams and other landscape features, sacralised by many small temples. The whole landscape is intended to replicate on Earth the universal mandala of the cosmos, with Mt. Merapi\textsuperscript{44} in the form of Borobudur, at its centre.

It had been concluded that the temple of Borobudur could not be properly understood in isolation; its full meaning deriving from its location within a sacred landscape. It was realised that this reconceptualization of the role of the temple of Borobudur had implications for the conservation management of the site, as a World Heritage monument within a cultural landscape. An important discussion topic at the meeting, therefore, focused on how the landscape setting should be the guiding concept behind the development of the site and its surrounding environment into the 21st century.

A striking aspect of the meeting was that representatives of a local village that had been demolished because of its location adjacent to the monument and its population rehoused were invited to the meeting. They were invited to participate actively and did so clearly voicing their concerns at being dispossessed and forcibly shifted as a result of World Heritage listing. It was my first experience of such action and listening to the stories of dislocation and loss of sense of place profoundly affected me and my views on heritage protection and whose values are we, or should we, be addressing, a topic which recurs in later papers. The paper discusses the concept of historic cultural landscapes and application to Borobudur ending with concluding comments on the kind of actions that could be taken to ensure right outcomes for the conservation of the monument and the economic and conservation future of its wider setting, including protection of local traditions and cultural heritage resources, within a comprehensive conservation management and tourism plan. It also addresses whether Borobudur and its setting would satisfy requirements for an extended inscription on the World Heritage List. It was a proposition that set me thinking about the possibility of other such World Heritage properties in Asia: a topic then addressed in Paper 3 ‘Cultural Landscapes in Asia-Pacific: Potential for Filling World Heritage Gaps’ (Taylor and Altenburg 2006).


This paper reflects on the globalising influence of agencies with particular reference to the challenge of whose values are we addressing and whose heritage is it, acknowledging that this terrain can be tendentious, as one reviewer of the paper remarked. In this connection the paper suggests that in the Asian context it is critical that Western conservation canons informing various charters are not imposed imperiously on Asian cultures to ensure that universality of practice and imposition of standards do not overwhelm local values. The paper is not an argument against global standards of good practice, but an argument for cultural relativism privileging local communities rather than cultural globalisation.

\textsuperscript{44} Mount Merapi is one of the volcanic peaks fringing the amphitheatre–like setting of Borobudur
The paper also notes the phenomenon of growth in popular heritage consciousness not centred solely on physical aspects of fabric – grand monuments and sites privileging the rich and famous – but embracing the ordinary, everyday places. The landscape setting of Borobudur (see Paper 1 above) is used as an exemplar where a famous monument and an ordinary landscape setting fuse seamlessly and there is a palpable relationship between monument and setting as part of a Buddhist cosmology.

It is noted that in relation to the question ‘whose culture?’ in an Asian setting, and with consequences on options for charters and conventions, is the manner in which most Asian cultures have a spiritual view of what is culturally valuable from the past. The past lives on in memory of people, of events and of places through time rather than concentrating on the material fabric which can change or be replaced. Cross reference is made to Wei and Aass (1989) who set out the Asian approach in a provocative paper where time is seamless and the spiritual and physical contributions of various generations are valued. Accretions of change and repair to fabric are accepted as the norm without detracting from the spirit of the place. It is suggested that, from this perspective, there are ramifications for the preparation of charters and principles for cultural heritage conservation and management relevant to Asian cultures.

Charters and principles critically discussed include The Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964); Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS46) and its values in which I question the efficacy of ‘aesthetic value’; Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China (China ICOMOS 2000); The Nara Document (ICOMOS 1994) and Hoi An Protocols (UNESCO Bangkok 2000 draft)47. With the subtitle Professional guidelines for assuring and preserving the authenticity of heritage sites in the context of the cultures of Asia and content with the Protocols an attempt to underscore the inter-relatedness of practices for the conservation of the physical heritage sites, the intangible heritage and cultural landscapes in Asia, it has always seemed amiss to me that they are not more widely quoted and used.

In the conclusion I note that the Nara Document and Hoi An Protocols refer to the need to determine authenticity in a way that respects diverse cultures and encourages cultures to develop analytical processes and tools specific to their nature and needs. Here there is cross reference to my comments in Chapter 2 on authenticity. There is also connection with the following paper (No 3).


This paper is a critical review of a discussion raised in Paper No 1, that of the setting of a famous monument in its wider landscape. The paper examines the concept of such heritage places as Angkor, Borobudur and Bagan and their potential, but missed, opportunity for interpretation within the concept of cultural landscapes replete with extensive intangible values and as outstanding examples of a continuous living/nourishing tradition and history. In this sense it is argued that the architectural monuments themselves need to be seen and understood as a component of a wider cultural landscape pattern to which they are inextricably

---

45 This is not to imply such a transaction does not exist in Western cultures. It does but has been to some extent camouflaged by focus on monuments and sites.
46 NB: this was the 1999 version.
47 NB: latest version is 2009.
tied. Seeing the monuments without seeing their cultural context is akin to seeing leaves but not the tree. In this connection the paper questions the separation of the archaeological monuments at Angkor, Borobudur and Bagan from their landscape setting.

The paper is set within the framework of concepts of authenticity and the increasing interest, at the time, in the cultural landscape concept in Asia. Underpinning the theme of the paper is the activity of reading the landscape with its sense of continuity and interrelationships between people, events and place through time, and transmitting this to visitors. The paper also examines authenticity, setting and site management from a Chinese perspective and I am grateful to my co-author, Kirsty Altenburg, for advice on, and contribution of, the China perspective.48

The aim of the paper was (and still is) to encourage a fresh and critically holistic look at how heritage places in the Asia-Pacific region might be seen, thereby offering fresh avenues for interpretation and understanding, not least for tourist purposes. The discussion is set within a World Heritage narrative and what the authors saw as the desirability and need to explore the infinite opportunities presented by the cultural landscape construct.


The fundamental premise promoting this paper in 2009 was that historic(al) landscapes with their heritage values – cultural landscapes – had reached key status in the field of cultural heritage conservation and planning. It notes the significance of the recognition of three categories of cultural landscapes in 1992 for World Heritage purposes, hinting at the potential this offered for widening the scope of heritage thinking and practice. It also notes that the term ‘cultural landscape’ was by 2009 widely circulated internationally, although its use in South-eastern and Eastern Asia presented problems. Notwithstanding this, the paper suggests that cultural landscapes that have evolved in Southeast and East Asia reflected beautifully the interaction between people and their environment, not simply as a tangible cultural product, but as a result of cultural process with associated intangible values. In this way, and like their Western counterparts, it suggests they are part of a dynamic ‘process by which identities are formed’ (Mitchell 1994:1) and also reflect organising philosophies and perspectives of different cultures imbued with value systems, traditional knowledge systems and abstract frameworks.

The viewpoint taken is that of the need to draw attention to the cultural landscapes of Southeast and East Asia, to look closely at regional values and their inextricable connection to the continuing process of landscape creation, and finally to place them in an international context. It was noted that by September 2008, out of 61 World Heritage Cultural Landscape Properties only 13 were in the UNESCO Asia Pacific Region, of which only 8 were in the Southeast and East Asian region (including Australia and New Zealand). The concept of ‘need to draw attention’ to the region is based on intent of such reports as *Filling the Gaps* (ICOMOS 2005) and in the light of changing ideas on living history and living heritage and history/heritage from below as I discuss in Chapter 2. At the time of the paper the Asian region was seen as a ‘missed opportunity’ in the ICOMOS report.

---

48 Kirsty Altenburg had been intimately involved in the evolution and drafting of the *Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China*. 
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The paper addresses the derivation of the word ‘landscape’ in English and its meaning literally from 500AD onwards. It notes that in Asian languages there is no such direct equivalent. There are, however, words that convey ideas of landscape similar to the way in which landscape and scenery have been interchangeable in English and their interrelationship with people: people in the landscape, people looking at landscape. This is particularly so in China. It is notable that since 2009 the use of the term ‘cultural landscape’ is well established and widely used in the Asian region.

An important discussion in the paper is that which focuses on Asian perspectives on the culture/nature relationship where, in contrast to some Western views, people are not seen as separate from nature. The culture/nature binary is a topic that is also addressed in Papers 5, 8, 9, 10, 12.


Included as the opening paper in a special issue of *IJHS* ‘Roles of local, national, and international designations in conserving biocultural diversity on a landscape scale’.

The underlying premise of this paper is that cultural landscapes are intended to increase awareness that heritage places (sites) are not isolated islands and that there is an interdependence of people, social structures, and the landscape and associated ecological systems. The paper explores whether the recognition of the 1992 World Heritage Cultural Landscape categories, the IUCN Protected Landscapes and the 2005 merging of cultural and natural criteria for World Heritage purposes have been effective in bridging the gap between culture and nature philosophically and in practice. With particular reference to opportunities presented in the Asia-Pacific region, where traditionally culture and nature are not regarded as separate, people are part of nature, the paper further critically reviewed the nature–culture link and its implications for North American-style national parks where cultural associations may not be seen to be necessary or even desirable. It suggests the imperative of highlighting and respecting in heritage nominations and inscriptions deep cultural associations of traditional communities with natural sites and implications for management to protect cultural and biological diversity and the need for thematic studies.

The paper from its discussion highlighted seven key issues attached to the cultural landscape construct in the light of almost two decades’ experience of World Heritage categories of cultural landscapes and IUCN Category V Protected Areas:

- interface between culture and nature must be acknowledged;
- cultural diversity and people’s identity are expressed in their response to landscape;
- biodiversity often evolving through traditional practices in the landscape;
- sustainable land-use and living with the land;
- traditional knowledge systems;
- tangible values and intangible values, with the latter often expressed through tangible ritual and lifestyles; ritual and lifestyles; and,
- human rights of Indigenous and local communities whose systems of looking at land and landscape will differ from western ideas embodied in World Heritage practice.

This paper addresses the role of cultural mapping as an essential part of the toolkit for coming to grips with intangible heritage and engaging with communities.

Its basic premise and foundation for critical discussion rests on the palpability of the worldwide interest in everyday culture, ways of living and doing things which underpin our sense of place. We have come to appreciate that there is an abundant culture out there with a rich array of meaning and significance. Nowhere is this more abundant than in Asia where outstanding examples of the continuous living/nourishing tradition of history and the binary of living history and living heritage are part of an intricate and beautiful tapestry of everyday life: the ordinarily sacred. This interest is reflected increasingly in our thinking on cultural heritage management. As with any concept or idea tools are needed to help us interpret, document, and present our cultural diversities. Cultural mapping has developed in response to this need. This paper reviewed what is meant by ‘culture’ and cultural mapping to understand the notion of local distinctiveness and how mapping can be a tool to help local communities have their voice heard through their involvement in the mapping process.

Much of the critical input into cultural mapping projects focuses on the inextricable link between tangible and intangible values. Art and craft activities, design activities, popular and mass culture, performing arts, religion, food, everyday living practices and traditional knowledge systems are part of any community’s storehouse of intangible values and meanings related to places, objects, and ways of doing. Cultural mapping offers a way of teasing these out and celebrating local distinctiveness and authenticity. Examples from Angkor, Nepal and Thailand (Surin Islands) are quoted.


This paper marks my interest in urban conservation and the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) paradigm that emerged post 2005.

The background to the paper as the abstract indicates is that today, for the first time in human history, more than half of the world’s population lives in cities. According to UN-Habitat, within two decades, five billion people will live in cities. Coincidentally, within the field of cultural heritage conservation, increasing international interest and attention over the past two decades has been focused on urban areas. This is timely because pressure for economic development and for the prioritising of engagement with the global economy has accompanied rapid urbanisation. In many societies, pressures for economic development have privileged modernisation efforts leading to the loss of traditional communities. Accompanying this has been a concentration in the field of urban conservation on famous buildings and monuments rather than seeing cities as communities of people with values and belief systems that are reflected in the city’s overall setting: its cultural landscape. The paper explores alternative ways of seeing cities particularly through the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) paradigm.

Integral to the focus on HUL is how the concept of cultural landscape and associated meanings over the last 40 years has developed (Taylor 2012) and, notably, become closely associated with townsapes. The cultural landscape idea is pivotal to HUL’s philosophical foundations:
this is a central theme to the paper. Embedded in HUL is the recognition of the layering of significances and values in historic cities, deposited over time by different communities under different contexts (Bandarin & van Oers, 2012). It is an approach that relates closely to the cultural landscape concept of layers through time replete with social meanings. Cities may, therefore, be categorised as a type of cultural landscape (see Paper No 11). Two focal points to my review are, first: conceptualising the notion of cultural landscape as a repository of social history and community values; second: the challenge of dealing with HUL in culturally diverse societies.

The paper proposes that HUL opens up a context for a much needed dialogue with city planners, urban designers, legal instruments and governments (national and local) on how layered cultural experiences influence perceptions of the urban landscape and why these are important in urban renewal outcomes. It is important in this dialogue that it is understood that the concept of urban cultural landscape heritage conservation and the reality of economic and political influences on city development and expansion are not necessarily mutually exclusive, acceding that change to city form will be inevitable. Critical to HUL is managing this change; recognising urban heritage is of vital importance for cities because it constitutes a key resource in enhancing liveability in urban areas. It fosters economic development and social cohesion with urban heritage acting as a catalyst for socio-economic development treating cities as dynamic organisms (UNESCO, 2103).

Finally, crucial to the application of HUL are three underlying principles: understanding of the city as an evolving process – living entity – not merely a series of objects (buildings) where the idea of process embraces intangible cultural heritage values, sense of place, and interaction between culture and nature; respect for the overall morphology of the city and its landscape setting so that future development does not overwhelm the landscape physically or its intangible meanings and values; and understanding that conservation of physical material aspects of urban landscape must be balanced taking into account immaterial aspects to do with layers of meanings residing in the urban landscape.


This book chapter fleshes out and extends material found in a number of refereed papers where the cultural landscape construct is central to a heritage discourse. It charts the shifting ground in the notion of landscape from physical determinant to cultural process. It examines the pre-concept of landscape as environmental product and environmental determinant where environment shapes cultures and people. It contrasts this with post-1970 concept of understanding landscape as process and its links to nineteenth century German geographical traditions – in particular Boasian tradition of historical particularism – of people shaping landscape in response to their customs, values and ideologies. It takes the point of view expressed by J B Jackson (1997:343) that ‘we are not spectators: the human landscape is not a work of art. It is the temporary product of sweat, hardship and earnest thought.’ Jackson’s interest was essentially in the patterns in the landscape and the processes that shaped these.

Four pages (34-38) are devoted to a critical discussion on the culture-nature dilemma and Eastern and Western views. The proposition being that a cogent example of divergent Western and Eastern views relative to cultural landscapes concerns is that of the concept of nature.
This discussion picks up and expands comments from my 2009 paper (Paper No 4: see above). It is a topic that is in my opinion crucial in the conduct of managing cultural landscapes and its inhabitants. I take my prompt here yet again from J B Jackson with his observation landscape ‘is never simply a natural space, a feature of the natural environment . . . every landscape is the place where we establish our own human organization of space and time.’ (Jackson J.B. 1984:156).

In conclusion to the chapter I propose that in reviewing a periphery perspective from Asia on cultural landscape heritage values, significance, and protection it is instructive to look at the issue through the lens of 

authenticity and integrity.

These are characteristics from UNESCO 2008 Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention where the spirit of place resides as much in the meaning and symbolism of places and their setting - intangible values - as it does in tangible physical fabric, i.e. landscape seen holistically. 

Authenticity (para. 80 of the Guidelines) concerns ‘the ability to understand the value attributed to the heritage depending on the degree to which information sources about this value may be understood as credible or truthful.’ We may see authenticity, therefore, as the ability of a place to represent accurately/truthfully what it purports to be.


This book chapter continues the theme running through my writings in the relationship between people (culture), landscape and heritage values from the point of view that heritage places are not separate dots on a map, rather that there is interdependence between people, events through time, and place. Linked to this is the notion that a deep human need for a sense of identity and belonging exists where a common denominator in this is attachment to landscape and how we find identity in landscape and place. Such attachment is universal and involves the relationship between culture – people – and nature, resulting in the formation of distinctive cultural landscapes as the settings for daily life, ritual, and contemplation. Therefore, it is critical to this discourse to understand the cultural traits of societies – their behaviours, beliefs, and symbols – and the necessity for examining them in their local context as demonstrated by Franz Boas over a century ago.

The chapter explores the cultural landscape construct in the context of prospects for Asian heritage protection alongside the growing international interest in the importance of intangible values that are central to understanding the cultural landscape paradigm. It also directs inquiry and concern to addressing human rights questions when looking at whose landscape and whose values are included or excluded in managing Asian heritage. It further speculates on opportunities to recognise of Asian cultural landscapes within the World Heritage framework.

Attention is given to concept of community landscape conservation in the context of the fact that the number of cultural landscapes with World Heritage status is limited and will remain. Nevertheless their existence is significant as it reflects the broadening appreciation and understanding of the inextricable relationship between people with their tangible and spiritual values and places in global heritage thinking. This broadening is effectively supported by formal governmental recognition worldwide of the IUCN Protected Areas (PAs), in particular

49 NB: 2016 version is same
Category V. Even so it has to be recognized that World Heritage examples augmented by PAs represent a limited number of landscapes internationally. The majority of landscapes will remain as landscapes cared for by local communities: Community Conserved Areas (CCAs). The chapter refers to how CCAs are significantly linked to the conservation of biodiversity, and this aspect needs to be acknowledged through an understanding that rural people conserve vast areas of land and biodiversity for their own needs, whether utilitarian, cultural or spiritual. A fact that has, in my view, widespread implications for cultural landscape management throughout Asia. In this regard the culture-nature relationship is again discussed and explored as is the linked topic of sacred natural sites and biodiversity.

The issue of human rights in the context of traditional landscape management is addressed and examples offered where local rights have been ignored or not upheld. Such discussion again touches on the key issue of whether the question of ‘whose values?’ is being respected. The chapter ends with a review of management and governance practices relating to IUCN Protected Landscape Category V (cultural landscapes by any other name).


This chapter continues the discussion and consideration of the desirability of integrating culture and nature rather than seeing them as separate. With a focus on Australia and some reference to international practice this chapter examines culture–nature interplays and associated dilemmas. It addresses a number of points which are a crucial part of the critical culture–nature discourse. These include Indigenous Australian values and spiritual integration with landscape within the spectrum of the deep and rich association between people and country; alternative conceptions of cultural landscapes; and biodiversity as a driver of cultural landscape values in the culture–nature continuum. These are examined in the light of shifts over the past decade from what may be seen to be the myopically entrenched views of some conservationists for whom the idea that people shaping landscapes (country), as well as adding value such as biodiversity by their actions, is anathema.

The idea of wilderness in the Western idiom is questioned. The discussion under way in the chapter prompts the questions of who owns nature, for whom is it to be protected, and whose nature is it any way? Allied to such concerns is an inquiry into the culture nature link in the concept of sacred natural sites. Following this is an inquiry into an Australian perspective from the view point of Aboriginal people, their relationship with Country, and the concept of Indigenous Protected Areas. In this context and the existence of national parks where Aboriginal cultural values inhere, questions such as the right to climb places such as Uluru are considered in the face of Aboriginal preference that people not climb on their sacred place. The overarching question is posed of what are the appropriate governance structures and processes that can lead professional practice in landscape management.


UNESCO’s initiative on managing the Historic Urban Landscape spearheaded by Francesco
Bandarin and Ron van Oers (World Heritage Centre) and presented at a UNESCO conference in 2005 in Vienna (UNESCO 2005b) was an innovative and ground-breaking approach to rethinking urban conservation. Of particular note was (and remains) the use of the word ‘landscape’ to the context of urban heritage conservation. It is notable because it transcends the thinking behind urban conservation from a focus on individual buildings or ensembles of building, divorced from their cultural context, to embrace the cultural landscape concept of layers through time reflecting people’s values, including ordinary everyday values at that.

My first foray into the HUL concept was at the 12th International Seminar of Forum UNESCO University & Heritage (FUUH) in Hanoi, April 2009 where I presented on ‘The role of landscape, memory and identity as a basis for sense of place and intangible values in the concept of historic urban landscapes’. Following this I was invited by China ICOMOS to speak at the Protection of Urban Cultural Landscape Heritage Urbanology Forum: Hangzhou China 23-24 Sept 2011 where I spoke on ‘Some thoughts on the Historic Urban Landscape paradigm as an approach to urban conservation’ and had the opportunity to discuss in detail HUL and its landscape connections with Dr Ron van Oers.

Harking back to my first university disciple, geography with considerable focus on human (cultural) geography and urban studies, the HUL paradigm appealed to me. The invitation by Dr van Oers to contribute a chapter ‘Cities as Cultural Landscapes’ in 2013 to the proposed book Reconnecting the City was therefore timely in my trajectory of thinking on cultural landscapes. The book chapter addresses relevant topics including Paradigm Shift in thinking on urban conservation; The Cultural Landscape Model: Landscape as History and Expression of Human Values and Identity; Urban Identity, Plurality, Sustainable Development Tools for Urban Landscape Planning and Conservation Practice. These are illustrated by reference to examples in Australia (Canberra), China, and Philippines (Vigan). A major plank in the discussion is that all cultural landscapes have associative values.


The book in which this chapter appears had its origin in a 2012 conference Cultural Landscapes: Preservation Challenges for the 21st Century organised by the Program in Cultural Heritage and Preservation Studies (CHAPS) at Rutgers University (New Jersey, USA) under the leadership of Archer St Clair-Harvey and working with a wide range of partners. It was one of many global events marking the fortieth anniversary of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, the twentieth anniversary of the World Heritage Committee’s 1992

---

50 The invitation came after China ICOMOS had contacted me in connection with a position paper that was being prepared on cultural landscapes. Whilst seeking my general comments on the term ‘cultural landscape’ and its meaning, there was a particular conundrum for Chinese colleagues: that of the idea of cultural landscapes being at the interface between culture and nature, particularly in relation to the category ‘Designed Landscapes’. How can a designed landscape be nature? In explaining the conundrum it really brought home to me how the Eastern mind, not least the Chinese, saw a designed landscape – a garden – as a cultural object replete with human meanings and values. How can it be nature? This very much reminded me of John Dixon Hunt’s essay ‘The Garden as Cultural Object’ (in Wrede S & Adams WH, 1988, Denatured Visions. Landscape and Culture in the Twentieth Century, New York: MOMA).

This conference was grounded on two premises. The first is that the cultural landscape concept offers a framework that encompasses an integrated view of the processes and relationships essential to a culture-based conservation strategy that respects the complexity and wealth of diverse values in a rapidly changing world. The second is that the key concerns in sustainable cultural heritage conservation and management are comparable around the world.

In introducing the papers included in the book the Introduction reflects on the following major points:

- **Cultural landscape: a useful and evolving concept** tracing the intellectual background of the term and such topics as the personal aspects of landscape that reflect history and culture. In this connection attention is drawn to the dilemma of how can we pay more attention to the ubiquitous vernacular landscapes, ie the continually changing contemporary landscape, the here and now. Reference is also made developing interest in large landscapes emphasising and encouraging consideration of their diverse values.

- **Forging a new paradigm for cultural landscape conservation:** how do we create strategies for management and systems of governance that acknowledge leadership role of local communities. Here are raised questions of interaction between people and nature, biodiversity protection, customary laws and community engagement vis-à-vis official legal protection. Inherent in such considerations is the issues of what are acceptable levels of change in these landscapes, examination of the intended and unintended consequences of heritage listing and the relationship to sustainability.

- **Significance of a widening understanding in global heritage thinking of the relationship between culture and nature, people and landscape, tangible and intangible values.**

In relation to the third dot point this Introductory chapter highlights the particular significance of seven chapters that robustly address Indigenous or local community stewardship of cultural landscapes over time. These are landscapes where culture and nature merge to form undeniably a cultural landscape, not a natural landscape or a landscape where physical/environmental factors have shaped culture: culture is the agent.


This book chapter arose from an invitation by one of the book editors (Bas Verschuuren) to contribute a chapter on a particular case in Thailand. I invited a then recent PhD graduate from Silpakorn University, Bangkok, Dr Narong Pongpandeche, to join me based on his dissertation *Reading the Cultural Landscape: Heritage Values "Mae Koong Bok Village", Tumbon Sanklang, San Pa Tong District, Chiang Mai* (Pongpandeche 2014) and his local knowledge of Lua people and their beliefs and relationship with their landscape.

Syncretism of indigenous spiritualities with mainstream faiths has waxed and waned across Asia, resulting in a diversity of folk religions retaining some form of nature spirituality. Struggles of religious and spiritual contestation and revitalisation are also represented in
heritage and conservation narratives about Asian sacred natural sites and their role in cultural identity, societal structure and self-governance. In Chiang Mai the Lua people follow ancestral animist and ancestral spirit worship traditions as well as honouring Buddhist values for the sacred mountains surrounding their communities. The building of Buddhist temples such as Doi Suthep on previously animist sacred places shifts the meaning and values of the places away from the natural element and its association with ancestor and spirit worship.

The chapter addresses two controversies associated with Lua culture. The first centres on discussion of the construction of a tourism observation tower on the Doi Suthep Mountain and the role of ‘commercial Buddhism’ that is aimed at tourists as well as believers. The chapter draws parallels between the role of the sacred mountains of the Lua and the Buddhist temple, focusing on their role in making a connection between heaven and earth based on the Lua legend of Dong Sakang. The second controversial topic focuses attention on Lua farming techniques related to their belief systems and nature conservation outcomes with particular reference to Lua swidden (shifting) farming. It is a traditional way of rejuvenating forest areas previously cleared for farming. It involves farming plots in nine-year cycles, i.e. a single plot of land is farmed for nine years before being abandoned for another plot. This enables the soil and forest from the previously farmed plot to be restored. The forest then takes 20 years to return to its natural form. The Lua revolving farming system is often mistaken for ‘slash and burn’ farming which leads to the rapid degradation of soil fertility.

The sequence of operations critical to successful swidden agriculture is covered in the chapter and how such precautions as fire buffer zones are setup when burning of a new area takes place, as well as the action of ensuring sufficient tree stock is retained to ensure reafforestation after 7 year cycle of agriculture. It is noted that while such methods may be successful and help maintain balance between humans, nature and spirits, the question of what are the conservation benefits arises. Equally this begs two other questions: the paucity of studies undertaken to measure biodiversity values of forests after regrowth in the swidden cycle and the challenge of whose values and human rights are involved. There is also the question of biodiversity benefits of swidden agriculture. Evidence from Lua descriptions suggest that there are biodiversity benefits. Whilst what is known about biodiversity benefits of Lua rotating agriculture is anecdotal, it is ‘common sensical’. In other words, it stands to reason that forest plots in various stages of regrowth would have more biodiversity than otherwise, although searches of literature databases have not revealed any specific studies, which suggests they might be published in Thai.

Further evidence of nature conservation through traditional management is associated with one Lua Village, La Oob and its sacred mountain of Tu Krong Kiak. It is suggested in the chapter that it could be considered a natural wildlife sanctuary and preserved forest area, given its abundant forest with natural water source on top of the mountain. This raises the issue of how such areas ought to be reviewed by relevant government conservation agencies in association with traditional owners to inquire into recognising a system of linked protected areas where local communities are integral to the governance operation. Also, it is forbidden to hunt in the area.
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CULTURAL LANDSCAPE AS OPEN AIR MUSEUM:
BOROBUDUR WORLD HERITAGE SITE AND ITS SETTING

KEN TAYLOR

‘It is the landscape as a whole – that largely manmade tapestry, in which all other artefacts are embedded ... which gives them their sense of place’. ¹

Candi Borobudur, built around 800AD and the largest Buddhist monument in Indonesia is located in Central Java some 40 kilometres from Yogyakarta. Regarded as one of the Wonders of the World this magnificent stepped pyramid style of building consists of nine terraces. The first six are rectangular and the upper three are circular, topped by a large bell-shaped stupa. There are four staircases facing east/west and north/south, the eastern one being aligned with Mount Merapi, the sacred mountain. The base measures 123 metres square; the whole edifice consisting of more than two million blocks.

Borobudur stands in the centre of the fertile and richly watered Kedu Plains flanked to the south by the jagged Menoreh Hills and to the east and north from Mount Merapi by a series of volcanic peaks linked by an undulating ridge. The whole setting is a gigantic amphitheatre with Borobudur standing in the middle on a low hill creating a memorable and evocative effect. The whole landscape ensemble is a vast outdoor museum of theatrical proportions. The shape of Candi Borobudur itself mirrors the volcanic peaks. The sight of the monument rising out of the landscape is awe-inspiring. Its presence in this landscape suggests an association...
between the monument and its setting that is palpable and rich in Buddhist meaning with Hindu overtones.

Two smaller temples, Candi Pawon and Candi Mendut, similar in style and craftsmanship, are in a perfect east west alignment towards Mount Merapi. But there are older markers in the landscape. These are the remains of around forty Hindu temples and archaeological sites which follow the lines of creeks and rivers. The Buddhist temples are surrounded by a rural landscape of rice paddies and palm groves with small towns and villages creating a sense of the stream of time and place.


Two and a half million people visit the site annually with around 2.2 million being domestic visitors. There is little interpretation of the Buddhist meaning of the site and its landscape setting, both of which are assumed to be a Buddhist mandala representation. Visitors swarm all over the stonework and the upper stupas. The steps are wearing away at the rate of 1mm per year. Around 2000 vendors collect around the entry and exit area and vehicle parking is chaotic. The sense of arrival is shattered by noise, inappropriate advertising and aggressive selling. Street vendors are a part of Asian heritage sites, but the sheer number of vendors and merchandise one can buy anywhere is a concern. Traditional crafts associated with the area such as stone carving or Wayang puppets are notably absent. Three recent high telecom-munication towers mar the view from Borobudur looking east across the rural landscape to Mount Merapi. Increasing development along approach roads is also impinging on the view of the temple as it rises majestically out of the landscape.

The purpose of this paper, given at the Fourth Experts Meeting was to...
explore the idea of historical cultural landscapes and suggest application to Borobudur. In the 1980s five management zones were delineated. Zone 1, or sanctuary area, is the monument itself (200m radius). Zone II is the archaeological park area (500m radius) with visitor facilities, parking, offices, exhibition building, vendor stalls; it includes a landscape park surrounding Zone I planted in a regimented unappealing gardenesque style which does not reflect the ninth century landscape which would probably have been shady groves of tropical trees where Buddhist monks taught and lived bisected by pathways and possibly flower and vegetable growing. Later as the local population increased village fields and animal grazing would have surrounded the temple. An engraving by FC Wilsen (c.1850) shows such a landscape. The rice paddies and two villages were removed to make way for the park.

Zone III, the land-use regulation zone (2km radius), includes rural lands and villages and Candi Pawon and Mendut as well as other archaeological sites. Development is supposed to be controlled to protect the setting of the monument. But encroachment by new buildings, erection of inappropriate signs, and increasing traffic all present management problems as they detract from the setting of the monument. Zone IV (5 kms) is the Historical Scenery Preservation Zone intended to protect the views and sense of address as one approaches Borobudur. It includes a number of villages and archaeological sites. Zone V (10 kms) is the National Archaeological Park Zone, intended to protect archaeological sites. Zones IV and V are important elements in the cultural landscape context of Borobudur, enhancing its meaning and its original raison d’être. The layers in this landscape create a sense of time and the concept of a vast outdoor museum.

In June 2003 the World Heritage Committee reviewed current management at Borobudur. It recommended, inter alia, the need to consider tourism impacts and advisability of evaluating and possibly redefining protective boundaries and management guidelines for the landscape areas surrounding the monument. This applies particularly to
Zones IV and V given that it is now thought that the mandala form of the monument is repeated in the wider landscape. The Committee also drew attention to the need for a comprehensive socio-economic study involving local communities and a marketing strategy for long term benefit to them. It also expressed concern over a recent proposal to build a large shopping complex in Zone III. It is with this background that the Experts’ meeting requested a paper on Historical Landscape Planning.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPES: A WORLD-WIDE PHENOMENON

Historical landscapes with their heritage values – now widely referred to as cultural landscapes – have reached centre stage in the field of cultural heritage conservation and planning. The term ‘cultural landscape’ is now widely accepted internationally. Recognition was extended in 1993 to World Heritage status with three categories of cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value:

- **Clearly defined landscapes designed and intentionally created by man.**
- **Organically evolved landscapes in two categories:**
  - (i) A relict or fossil landscape in which an evolutionary process has come to an end but where its distinguishing features are still visible.
  - (ii) Continuing landscape which retains an active social role in contemporary society associated with a traditional way of life and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress and where it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time. With the World Heritage Committee’s instruction in mind there is a need to evaluate whether the landscape surrounding Borobudur, as an inextricable part of the monument’s cultural and intellectual setting, original creation, and continuation, fits this category.

- **Associative cultural landscapes:** the inclusion of such landscapes is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element rather than the material cultural evidence. Uluru/Kata Tjuta National Park and the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras are two Asian/Pacific examples. Again it is germane to pose the question: does Borobudur and its wider landscape setting fit this category?

In addressing these two questions on the cultural context and authenticity of the whole setting of Borobudur it is important to visualise the cosmology of the Buddhist mandala (cakkavāla/cakravāla) assumed to be the crux of the building of Borobudur in its cultural (historical) landscape. A diagram reproduced in an early twentieth century collection of Daniel Gogerly’s writings on Buddhism, the cosmology of the Buddhist mandala (cakkavāla/cakravāla) is represented as a single, circular world system surrounded by a mountain of iron (cakravāla) and at the centre is Mount Meru’ (represented by Mount Merapi at Borobudur). It is a single world system where relationships exist between various parts of the universe and where myth and reason coalesce to offer an exquisite visualisation of the order of things. Just
to look out over the landscape from the terraces of Borobudur is a stunning and moving experience: the landscape speaks dramatically and persuasively of a mystical but real relationship between people, time, events, beliefs and place. Here are layers in the landscape waiting to be read and interpreted to tell us something about who we are in time. If Borobudur is, as assumed, a representation of the universe – the cakkavāla – then the following ancient reflection from The Ratu Boko Inscription of 792 AD, Central Java, is apposite:

I pay homage to the Cosmic Mountain of the Perfect Buddhas ... endowed with the awe-inspiring power of wisdom, – whose caves are knowledge, whose rock is excellent tradition, whose brilliancy is owing to its relic: the Good Wisdom whose streams are love, whose forests are meditation – truly the Mount of Few Desires, which is not shaken by the eight horrible winds: the worldly qualities.4

Historical landscapes under the banner of cultural landscapes emerged in the 1990s as a topic of great interest for the international conservation community. Thirty years after the Venice Charter the concept of value and significance that cultural landscapes brought with them challenged the long held distinction between cultural and natural values and the 1960s concept of heritage centring predominantly on monuments and sites of antiquity.5 This blurring of the boundary between what is natural – essentially a western view of the world dating from the Romantic period – and what is cultural has considerable attraction and merit in the context and cultural traditions of South East Asia. To this we may readily add Australia with its increasing understanding of the meaning of country in Aboriginal culture where there is a fusion between culture and nature in a world where mythical ancestors – animal and human – made the landscape.6

LANDSCAPES AS HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS

What has emerged is that we understand that in the historical landscape our sense of place and heritage are not limited to separate dots on a map each spatially and temporally isolated. We have embraced the concept of the inter-relationship between places, people, and events, through time. We see and feel in the landscape a sense of the stream of time which promotes attachment to our world. Further, and through historical cultural landscape study, there has been a growing understanding that cultural landscapes as an imprint of human history are the richest historical record we possess. They can tell us if we learn to read and interpret their stories something of the achievements and values of our predecessors, inform our own present-day values and, incidentally, those of future generations.7 They are a window onto our collective past, our culture on display.

Interest in the efficacy of historical landscapes as comprehensive documents of history with concomitant heritage values was recently further emphasised by the international workshop – Conservation of Cultural Landscapes Workshop – held in Rome in June 2003, organised by the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). Representatives from sixteen countries attended bringing mutually
inclusive variations on a theme of what is heritage in the landscape including physical, ancestral, cultural and spiritual emphasis. This again underpins the importance of recognising intangible values based on cultural traditions that are apparent in historical landscapes alongside their physical fabric or form. In other words they are not merely what we see, but a way of seeing. We see with our eyes but interpret with our minds.8

WRITING (SHAPING) THE LANDSCAPE: READING THE LANDSCAPE

In looking at historical cultural landscapes it is perhaps helpful to state the obvious, but sometimes perplexing maxim, that they are literally most of what surrounds us. They are the landscapes – the places – urban, suburban and rural in which we live, work, and recreate. They embrace an extraordinary richness and variety of life and scenes as the landscapes settled and modified by people over time. They are then a representation of our ideologies. We create and shape the human landscape over time according to our ideologies and in this way historical landscapes reflect our cultural traditions and intangible values. As a result we modify natural landscape elements and superimpose human patterns to create cultural landscapes. These patterns represent a montage of layers through time.

Reading and shaping the landscape is not a modern phenomenon. In prehistoric times people such as hunters and gatherers learned how to read the landscape as they searched for game and plants and manipulated the landscape through that seminal discovery, fire. This was the beginning of landscape planning. The use of fire for hunting and to control vegetation followed later by early forms of agriculture as people learned how to cultivate wild plants as crops involved deliberate change and manipulation of the landscape. For many societies natural components of the landscape itself – mountains, rivers, forests – have been and remain a reflection of their cosmological beliefs, and hence there evolved an intense sense of spirituality in the landscape, a sense of the sacred where culture and nature combined. This is not the sacred as opposed to the profane, but what we might now call the ordinarily sacred.10

The consciousness that people have formed of space around them since our early ancestors, that is where space becomes imbued with meaning and therefore becomes place, continues to inform the way we see the landscape around us both in its historical sense and in the present time. In his now classic text, Edward Relph classifies the kinds of spaces – for me places – that carry meaning and significance for human beings.11 He notes that the following different types of space are not separated by the human mind, but rather they are linked in thought and experience. Each has relevance to the task at Borobudur and its historical landscape surrounds in developing recommendations for the future with special focus on its spiritual, educational, and cultural values:

- Pragmatic or primitive space structured unselfconsciously by basic individual experience. This is organic space where we feel safe; it may have biological roots in our need for shelter and home. Habitation and agriculture of the Kedu Plains from ancient times has envisaged this kind of space thriving as it has through history on the well watered, richly fertile,
volcanic soils of southern Central Java. The pattern of ricefields, numerous rivers and canals, and villages has long antecedents at least back to the time Borobudur was built. J.G. de Casparis paints a fascinating picture in words of how the landscape of around 930 AD looked with clusters of many villages surrounded by ricefields and then green jungle, the whole pattern embraced by mountains: a synergy of culture and nature.

- Perceptual space which involves direct emotional encounters with the spaces of the earth, sea, sky or with built and created spaces. Again the mandala construct of Borobudur and its surrounds fit this model. The pattern on the ground reflects a perceptual view of universal perfection that is palpable in Borobudur’s undeniable sense of presence.

- Existential or lived in space where we create patterns and structures of significance through building towns, villages, houses, and the whole business of landscape making. This is space or place that is culturally defined. The landscape of the Kedu Plains again represents existential space, culturally defined and dating back to the tradition of Mahayana Buddhism and the control of Central Java by the Sailendra dynasty. The strong, common religion was undoubtedly a major force informing the building and meaning of Borobudur in relation to its landscape setting. There were also international connections with India and Sri Lanka as part of a well-ordered system and interchange of ideas that had started in the fifth century AD, leading to Java being an important centre for Buddhism from the seventh to the tenth centuries. The strong social ties that bound this Buddhist society, coupled with what de Casparis calls a pious sense of duty, offered a willing labour force of hard-working peasantry without which Borobudur may not have eventuated. The monument, mosaic of ricefields and surrounding mountains and ridges combine physically and mentally as part of a tightly knit social fabric where people and landscape have merged through time.

One of the problems facing us is communicating – that is interpreting – the meaning of one cultural group’s existential space to others, meanings which may grow opaque over time as societies change. This may be seen to have special relevance at Borobudur as we strive to see the monument in its historical landscape setting where myth, ceremony and ritual inform the setting.

- Architectural and planning space.

- Cognitive space with its reflective qualities referenced in maps, plans and designs. At Borobudur we might see cognitive space related to the Buddhist mandala concept in the holistic landscape setting with Mount Merapi, rivers of the Kedu Plain and the fringing mountains and in the monument itself as a mandala representation.

- Abstract space which is a creation
of human imagination and logical relations that allows us to describe space without necessarily founding these descriptions on empirical observations. Is this not the concept of the abstract/logical space of the mandala as represented at Borobudur? It permeates and excites the imagination.

Each of these spaces is closely linked in thought and experience. ‘Pragmatic space integrates man with his natural, ‘organic’ environment, perceptual space is essential to his identity, as a person, existential space makes him belong to a social and cultural totality, cognitive space means he is able to think about space, and logical space … offers a tool to describe the others’.14

INTANGIBLE VALUES AND HISTORICAL LANDSCAPES

A common theme linking these concepts of space/place and underpinning the idea of the ideology of landscape itself as the setting for everything we do is that of the landscape as the repository of intangible values and human meanings that nurture our very existence. This is where landscape and memory are inseparable because landscape is the nerve centre of our personal and collective memories. Notably in this regard are the words of Bambang Bintoro Soedjito, then Deputy Chair for Infrastructure with the Indonesian National Development Planning Agency, who suggested in 1999 that:

For us, the most important expressions of culture at this time are not the monuments, relics and art from the past, nor the more refined expressions of cultural activity that have become popularised beyond Indonesia’s borders in recent years, but the grassroots and very locally specific village based culture that is at the heart of the sense of community. And that sense of community, perhaps more that of the individual has been a strong shaping and supportive influence in times of trouble, through turbulence and now in strengthening a confident sense of identity as we combine heritage with a society opened to the opportunities of the world.15

Soedjito’s sentiment on expressions of everyday heritage links comfortably with current international notions of the significance of historical landscapes and ideas of the ordinarily sacred. Pivotal to this is the realisation that, in addition to our national cultural heritage icons, it is the places, traditions, and activities of ordinary people that create a rich cultural tapestry of life, particularly through our recognition of the values people attach to their everyday places and concomitant sense of place and identity. Identity is critical to a sense of place – genius loci – for people. Relph aptly summarises this in his proposal that ‘identity of place is comprised of three interrelated components, each irreducible to the other – physical features or appearance, observable activities and functions, and meaning or symbols’.16

So both tangible physical identity and intangible identity related to the existential distinctiveness of our lived-in world and human experiences are inextricably inter-woven with place meaning and significance for people. I believe this association has identifiable consequences also for the way we need
to see the inter-relationship between
cultural heritage interpretation and
presentation of places within the context
of tourism which has emerged as a major
issue in Asia. Here there is direct
relevance to the future planning,
interpretation and presentation of
Borobudur in its historical landscape
setting. A fundamental question is whose
culture are we presenting and why? The
extraordinary richness of Indonesian
culture represented at Borobudur and its
cultural landscape means that there is a
need for a plurality of presentations.

CONCLUSION: BOROBUDUR IN ITS
SETTING

What kind of actions ought we to propose
at Borobudur to ensure the right
outcomes for the conservation of the
monument itself and the economic and
conservation future of its wider setting,
that is, its historical cultural landscape?
Within the focus of outcomes we must
include the protection and enhancement
of local traditions and cultural heritage
resources whilst engaging them within a
comprehensive conservation manage-
ment and tourism plan for the region.
This is one where a dialogue is
couraged between conservation and
tourism, but where tourism is not driving
and selling heritage. It is where tourism
fits into a heritage planning framework as
part of an extensive sub-regional
cultural mapping project.

I recommend that this Experts’
Meeting consider proposing the concept
of a Borobudur Region Cultural Map be
initiated and that it include the following
actions:

1. Identify all stakeholders and
interest groups and devise a
program to involve them in future
planning. This means that no
particular group(s) should be
privileged over others. It also
means ensuring cultural context is
fully appreciated and that there
may need to be a change in how
Borobudur is recognised and
interpreted.

2. Recommend that an Historical
Cultural Landscape Study be
prepared by a multi-disciplinary
team. A key initial step will be the
definition of boundaries and it is
proposed that the boundaries of
the already recognised Five Zones
be used. Zones III to IV encompass
the wider landscape with its
patterns and components in-
cluding the communities that
surround the monument, several
smaller temples, archaeological
remains, topographic and hy-
drological features and the
landscape’s overall significance
historically as a mandala (cak-
kavā/cakravāla). These need to
be assessed and analysed as an
historical landscape with a
remarkable richness of layers and
meanings offering a basis for
future action. The cultural
landscape of these Zones may then
be appreciated in the context of
their cultural history and
connection to Zones I and II
immediately around and in-
cluding the monument. A major
focus of this task will be to re-state
the authenticity of the association
and meaning of Borobudur and its
landscape setting where elements
such as water, vegetation,
topography, orientation, arrange-
3. Site design for car park and vendor area promoting a sense of arrival and address, signage, interpretation centre and walks.

4. Development of interpretative programs to enrich the presentation of the monument itself and to offer the basis for wider cultural landscape interpretation in the form of brochures, guide books and heritage trail pamphlets. Education of guides and development of an enforceable code of behaviour for visitors are necessary. In this regard it would be productive to organise a Training Course involving experts, locals, tourist operators where aspects of authenticity, significance, visitor behaviour and management, constraints and opportunities, and site management and planning are discussed with all stakeholders. An excellent example at Yungang Caves is described by Sharon Sullivan.18 Such actions needs to link through to recommendation 5 below with cross referencing of tourism potential to the significance of cultural context and heritage resources.

5. Development of a cultural tourism plan linking tourism to the underlying social and cultural landscape and the economic well-being of the area whilst not detracting from the meaning, authenticity, and splendour of Borobudur and its setting.

6. Address the issue of whether we believe that Borobudur and its setting satisfy the requirements for re-inscription on the World Heritage List of Cultural Landscapes and propose that an objective of an Historical Cultural Landscape Study be to recommend whether it fits the two following categories:

- **Organically evolved continuing landscape** by virtue of the manner in which the landscape retains an active social role in contemporary society associated with a traditional way of life where the evolutionary process is still in progress and where there is significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

- **Associative cultural landscape** by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic, and cultural association of the natural elements in the landscape related to the cosmic significance of the landscape as a mandala representation of the universe with both physical and metaphysical manifestation.

The sense of continuity, fit with the setting, and Borobudur’s undeniable presence as the ‘Cosmic Mountain of the
Perfect Buddhas’ make it one of the remarkable edifices of not only Central Java but the entire Buddhist World. Its haunting presence reflecting an ancient belief in the indivisible junction between man and nature where Mt Merapi to the east and Borobudur itself are the focal points of a sacred landscape suggest it is timely that it be considered as a cultural landscape of outstanding universal value.

ENDNOTES
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Cultural Heritage Management: A Possible Role for Charters and Principles in Asia

Ken Taylor

A number of countries now have charters or principles to underpin approaches to conserving and managing cultural heritage resources. Notably, there is growing interest in their adoption in the Asia-Pacific region. Paralleling this is the development of university courses in heritage management and tourism in the region. Charters help to define the critical notion of significance which must try to embrace both the tangible and the intangible. Critical to the existence of charters and conventions is the process of establishing and assessing values. In Asia, integrity of heritage places and their continuing authenticity are fundamental concerns, particularly as the notion of heritage embraces traditions, and everyday places. This paper sets out to review current interest in cultural heritage and the various charters we use to assess significance and to offer comment on them with particular reference to heritage management in Asia.
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History and/or Heritage

Over the past two decades there has been a surge of popular interest internationally in social histories, in cultural heritage, and in heritage management. The attraction of heritage places fuels the lucrative tourism industry, domestically and internationally, where visiting heritage places, museums, events and cultural festivals is a major industry. McKercher and du Clos record that something like 240 million international journeys annually involve some element of cultural tourism. The link between heritage and tourism is inescapable but prompts the question as to how far should this
Richard Engelhardt (UNESCO Regional Advisor for Culture in Asia and the Pacific) recently expressed this somewhat forcibly:

… to preserve heritage only because you want to sell it to some foreign visitors is completely, completely the wrong strategy—it will never work. It will only lead to the simple deterioration and falsification of the heritage and everyone will end up unhappy and poorer for it … My opinion is that the preservation of heritage and culture has nothing whatever to do with tourism. If you are preserving heritage as a tourism product, this is not the preservation of heritage, this is the development of a tourism product; and perhaps you would be more well advised to develop a theme park from scratch out of concrete.2

This is an oversimplified critique: tourism and heritage are linked, not least economically for most Asian countries. It begs the question of how places and monuments and objects are presented to tourists. Colonial Williamsburg is substantially a re-creation popular with tourists, but this does not detract from its potential to inform people on history and develop heritage values. Muang Boran, an artificial historic park in Bangkok developed as a vignette of all aspects of Thai lifestyles and settlements is a theme park, but has the potential to be informative and provoke the imagination (see Figure 1).

What is needed in Asia is a synergy between heritage and tourism with improved modes of interpretation and presentation of sites to cater for a range of tourists from

\[\text{Figure 1} \text{ Floating Market, Muang Boran, Bangkok: Re-creation of Reflection of Traditional Thai Life along the River. Photo: K. Taylor.}\]
the informed to the novice. Management involving locals as well as professionals, and management informed by tourist experience of the site, are critical factors. Equally there is the need for management practices and machinery geared to local conditions, not based on sophisticated Western technology. Sullivan describes such an approach based on workshop discussions involving a range of stakeholders at Yungang Caves in China.³ It may be that tourism can be a powerful force in maintaining traditional places in Asian cities and countryside as ordinary places where lifestyle, traditions and fabric are supported by tourist spending.

Conversely, claims for spurious tourist developments based on notions of beautifying a place can be culturally destructive and lead to an impoverished visitor experience. In a recent case in the old city area of Rattanakosin, Bangkok, a local government plan to create a tourist park surrounded by various monuments involved clearing of traditional shop houses and a local group of people, the Mahakarn Fort community. They objected and found support from the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which Thailand joined in 1999, and from local NGOs.⁴ This was to no avail; the unnecessary tourist park is to proceed and tourists lose the opportunity to experience a local traditional lifestyle that enriches the experience of Bangkok. This example smacks of a globalised, sanitised approach. But it also raises an interesting question: would a comprehensive assessment of the area and its varied heritage resources based on a conservation plan arising from a charter have led to a different result?

It is essential that visitors'/tourists' needs, domestic and international, in terms of site planning and interpretation at heritage places in Asia are considered as part of the conservation management process. Whilst one may appreciate the sentiment that ‘If there is one thing more hateful than another it is being told what to admire and having objects pointed out to one with a stick’ surely the rider that ‘Of all noxious animals the most noxious is the tourist’ is destructive.⁵ So what is the attraction of our and other people’s history and heritage, why do we desire to conserve heritage places, and what intellectual and analytical mechanisms can we use to assist us?

Whose Values?

In considering such matters there is a fundamental question: ‘Whose values are we addressing and whose heritage is it?’ As one of the reviewers of this paper rightly raised, it is very tendentious. In the Asian context it is critical that Western conservation canons that inform various charters are not imposed imperiously on these cultures. The globalising tendency of the practices of international organisations such as UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICOM, and ICCROM is a powerful one. They lay ‘down international standards for professional practice—‘world best practice”—in the cultural heritage field as well as influencing thinking in those fields in less direct ways’. But they also stand accused of ‘imposing a common stamp on culture across the world and their policies creating a logic of global cultural uniformity [by seeking] to impose standards of “good behaviour” onto Member States and other states’.⁶
One outcome that universality of practice and imposition of standards can cause is that local values may be overwhelmed. This may be exacerbated by those practitioners educated outside Asian countries returning with Western-inculcated information systems. In this connection the expansion of heritage education programmes in the Asia-Pacific region is welcome. There is a need to ensure that a move to uniformity is challenged on these programmes and that students are challenged to think locally as well as being aware of global trends and practice. The latter is important because standards set by international agencies have improved professional standing of cultural heritage management. Nevertheless, a considerable body of literature over the past 10 years has criticised cultural globalisation,7 paralleled with a view that cultural relativism privileging local communities is more equitable than global standardisation. Edward Said was influential in building an intellectual framework for such ideas and the post-modern/cultural relativism critique of the high art/high aesthetics approach to heritage conservation.8 Documents such as the Australian Burra Charter9 try to avoid such an approach, but the inclusion of such values as ‘aesthetic’ leave lingering doubts, as discussed below.

The growth in popular heritage consciousness relates to the values people put on knowing about the history of events, places, and people through time, and not just distant history but the present. A notable phenomenon of this movement is that it is not centred solely on physical places or objects but is inclusive of their meanings. It has also passed from an earlier concentration on iconographic national sites and monuments privileging the rich and famous to include ordinary, everyday places where the notion of the ordinarily sacred applies.10 Ordinarily sacred places are those that reflect our relationships with places that have meaning because we, or our ancestors, have connections with them. Place making, and all it means to us, promotes a powerful feeling of belonging and a strong sense of place. Many sites in Asia, even where a national icon is concerned, embrace ordinary, everyday landscapes. A notable and timely example is Borobudur near Yogyakarta, Indonesia. This World Heritage Monument, the structure itself evoking for most visitors sheer awe, sits in a cultural landscape of stunning character and one can feel the palpable relationship between the monument and its setting as part of a Buddhist cosmology (see Figure 2).

Heritage is now a popular movement. It is socially inclusive and universal. We find comfort in looking back. Historic places, events, and even people from the past become surrogates that contain reassuring continuity for us. But is ‘the past thus conjured up … largely an artefact of the present’, as David Lowenthal claims:

However faithfully we preserve, however authentically we restore, however deeply we immerse ourselves in bygone times, life back then was based on ways of being and believing incommensurable with our own. The past’s difference is, indeed, one of its charms: no-one would yearn for it if it merely replicated the present. But we cannot help but view it and celebrate it through present-day lenses.11

Continuing this line of thought, it follows that heritage values defy objective analysis. The tangible fabric of heritage places and objects is capable of objective quantification, but it is the values we attach to places and objects that are the fuel of the fire of heritage.
The growing understanding of this in Asia is a significant factor that needs to be underlined often with local and city governments. Many of heritage’s data are social factors where personal and collective memory inhere and cannot be defined scientifically. What has occurred, where and when in history, can be studied objectively (there may be differences of opinion on verification of facts or whether something occurred), but it is the ‘who was involved’ and the ‘why they did things the way they did’ that fascinate people. Much of this can be, and is, open to interpretation. The result is that we get a sense that we could have been involved and this is what underlines much of the popular appeal of heritage. Notwithstanding the apparent dichotomy between objective and subjective analysis, this is where charters and principles are intended to help in establishing the significance of a heritage place.

Heritage is not our prime or sole link with the past. History maintains a significant role. But has the lure of heritage overtaken history as a prime way of recovering the past, as Lowenthal ventures to suggest? Perhaps such academic concerns are not overly important. What is significant is that heritage values, and reaching back into the past, have achieved remarkable popularity. Heritage is appealing and fashionable; it has the distinction now of embracing ideas of everyday ordinary heritage of people, events and places through time. People want to know about their history and want it interpreted in such a way that it suffuses their need for memory connections. Notably also in the enthusiasm for ordinary places there is a growing worldwide interest in the

**Figure 2** Borobudur in its Cultural Landscape Setting. Photo: K. Taylor.
heritage of cultural landscapes, urban and rural, which reflect everyday lives and ways
of living. This includes not just places from history but places that are part of vital day-
to-day contemporary living such as Georgetown in Penang or Chiang Mai in Thailand.
Here, past and present fuse and give a reassuring sense of the stream of time.13

This celebration of the ordinary has found a resonance in Asia. It was stressed, for
example, at the launch of Indonesian Heritage Year 2003 in January in Yogyakarta. It
continues what Bambang Bintoro Soedjito, then Deputy Chair for Infrastructure with
the Indonesian National Development Planning Agency, had said four years previously:

For us, the most important expressions of culture at this time are not the monuments,
relics and art from the past, nor the more refined expressions of cultural activity that
have become popularised beyond Indonesia’s borders in recent years, but the grass-
roots and very locally specific village based culture that is at the heart of the sense of
community. And that sense of community, perhaps more than that of the individual
has been a strong shaping and supportive influence in times of trouble, through
turbulence and now in strengthening a confident sense of identity as we combine heri-
tage with a society opened to the opportunities of the world.14

Soedjito’s sentiment on expressions of everyday heritage links comfortably with
current international notions of the significance of cultural landscapes and ideas of the
ordinarily sacred.15 Pivotal to this is the realisation that, in addition to our national
cultural heritage icons, it is the places, traditions, and activities of ordinary people that
create a rich cultural tapestry of life, particularly through our recognition of the values
that people attach to their everyday places and concomitant sense of place and identity.
Identity is critical to a sense of place—genius loci—for people. Relph, in Place and
Placelessness, aptly summarises this in his proposal that ‘identity of place is comprised
of three interrelated components, each irreducible to the other—physical features or
appearance, observable activities and functions, and meaning or symbols’ (see
Figure 3).16

So both tangible physical identity and intangible identity related to existential
distinctiveness and human experiences are inextricably interwoven with place meaning

![Figure 3](image_url)
and significance for people. So, in cultural heritage management, the key issue is whose culture we are presenting and why. Also fundamental to the issue in Asia, and with consequences on options for charters and conventions, is the manner in which most Asian cultures have a spiritual view of what is culturally valuable from the past; the past lives on in memory of people, of events and of places through time rather than concentrating on the material fabric which can change or be replaced. Thus the traditional skills employed in replacement are also integral to heritage value. Some years ago, Wei and Aass set out the Asian approach in a provocative paper in which they proposed that time is seamless and the cumulative spiritual and physical contributions of various generations are valued. Accretions of change and repair to fabric are accepted as the norm without detracting from the spirit of the place. From this perspective there are ramifications for the preparation of charters and principles for cultural heritage conservation and management relevant to Asian cultures.

Heritage, then, is what we absorb from the past and is part of the growing dependence we have on the past where we may in fact falsify history. Do, for example, historical re-creations falsify history? Here a comparison between Port Arthur in Tasmania (Australia) and Williamsburg in the USA is instructive. Interpretation and presentation at Port Arthur, focusing on the stabilised ruins of the colonial penitentiary and other buildings which stand in mute testimony to the cruelty of the prison system for the convicts shipped out from Britain and the somberly forbidding landscape setting, are highly evocative (see Figure 4). The atmosphere created reflects what J. B. Jackson eloquently calls ‘The Necessity for Ruins’. In contrast, Williamsburg relies on a vivid

Figure 4  Penitentiary, Port Arthur, Tasmania. Photo: K. Taylor.
re-creation of the whole cultural landscape in a sanitised history version of what the colonial town would never have looked like. But in the end does it matter? I think not, in that the stories told at Williamsburg draw people into learning about their history and thereby developing heritage values.

**Charters and Principles**

What is or can be the role of charters and principles in assessing the values we assign to cultural heritage places and their management? Fundamental to the process is the notion of significance. It is a difficult word to elucidate readily. A dictionary definition is ‘concealed or real meaning’. But this suggests more ambiguity, because, in heritage management, we are invariably dealing with concealed meanings. These must be elucidated through subjective assessment and analysis of objective data and cultural traditions that govern the way people have done things to shape their surroundings, creating the cultural places and landscapes we attempt to assess.

The fundamental role of charters is to offer statements or principles and guidelines for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance where conservation is regarded as an integral part of the management of these places. Charters may therefore be seen to have a professional ethics role in guiding the conduct of cultural heritage conservation practice. They invariably now address what is meant by such things as heritage values, conservation, significance, and the steps involved in the heritage conservation planning process. 'Every country now has national legislation to protect its heritage, but not all have a guiding methodology for effective implementation of conservation practice' suggests that there is scope for more countries to design charters.

*The Venice Charter, 1964*

The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, known as the Venice Charter, arose from an International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments in Venice in May 1964. Its focus is ancient monuments and buildings, reflecting the somewhat narrow scope of conservation in the 1960s, although it must be acknowledged that the Charter recognises that such buildings and monuments reflect age-old traditions and human values. It consists of a series of 16 Articles that define ancient monuments and set out guidelines for their treatment. Notably, it does acknowledge that the concept of such structures embraces the setting of architectural works as evidence of a particular civilisation, significant development or cultural event. Hence there is an attempt to acknowledge cultural context and there is reference to more modest works of the past as well as works of art. There are guidelines on restoration and the extent to which conservation works may extend. Emphasis is on physical fabric rather than social meanings, but the Venice Charter is the forerunner of other documents and marks an increasing concern about conserving the past for the present and future.
Commonly referred to as the Burra Charter, this document proposes that it ‘sets a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works at places of cultural significance including owners, managers and custodians’. It consists of 34 Articles covering such items as:

- Definitions.
- Conservation Principles.
- Conservation Processes.
- Conservation Practice.

It then has detailed Guidelines on:

- Establishing Cultural Significance.
- Development of Conservation Policy.
- Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports.

An important aspect of the Burra Charter is that it uses the term ‘place’ to define cultural heritage resources underpinning the concept of place as a cornerstone of Australian heritage practice. Place means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works and may include components, contents, spaces and views. Critical to this is the notion that place involves human activity and associated cultural traditions that have guided the activity/activities and its/their outcome. The term ‘place’, with associated cultural context and meaning, is less limiting than the notion of a monument, site, or building. The concept of place links integral components together and puts them into context with their cultural and intellectual background of which they are a product.

The importance and efficacy of the Charter as a basis for adaptable, systematic and replicable study is well established in Australian practice and recognised internationally. Its method of identifying data is objective. Evidence of existing material culture—buildings, plantings, structures, open space, land-use patterns—can be seen as physical objects. They are tangible patterns and components of the landscape that can be recorded and protected. But equally important are the intangibles—the traditions, beliefs and ideologies that have created the patterns and components and which give them meaning. Reputable analysis of the data and evaluation of significance therefore inevitably involve value judgements through the process of interpretation and presentation of the meanings of places.

The Guidelines to the Burra Charter present a philosophy and methodology for conservation which link management of places of cultural significance to the assessment of cultural values and the preparation of a statement of significance. Particularly notable for cultural landscapes is that the management and assessment process has been geared to address living sites where a sense of continuity, interrelationships and layering are recognisable. It therefore recognises and embraces the meaning of places as well as physical components and structures. The Guidelines to the Burra Charter define cultural significance as:
... a concept which helps in estimating the value of places. The places that are likely to be of significance are those which help an understanding of the past or enrich the present, and which will be of value to future generations.

The Guidelines propose that the concept of cultural significance is understood through a process of identification and assessment of relevant information, followed by its analysis and the development of a conservation policy and strategy. An important step is the preparation of a succinct statement of significance that summarises the assessment and analysis stages. The statement should state clearly why the place is of value. In assessment of information and its analysis to decide significance, the Charter recommends that significance means the following values for past, present or future generations:

- aesthetic value to do with sensory perception;
- historic value relating to historic events, figures, event, phases;
- social value embraces the qualities for which a place is a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment;
- scientific value depends on the importance of data, on rarity, quality or representativeness and ability to contribute substantial information.

It is recognised in Section 2.6 of the Charter that other value categories may be developed to understand a place better. I have found that additional evaluation and statement of the following may be useful in conservation studies.

**Interpretive value**

The ability of a place to inform and enlighten us on social history, promote a sense of place feeling, create links with the past; it is an understanding of where things have occurred, what has occurred, when they occurred, who was involved and why things occurred. It enhances the feeling of participation—we could have been involved—in the making of a particular place.

**Associative value**

The ability to put into context what has occurred and who promoted the actions; this value hinges on a knowledge and understanding of the way our predecessors have been involved in place making. It is a powerful human value related to our need to understand past human actions and the people who participated. It is very much a sense of a link with the past and the resultant values and meanings people attach to places. This value meshes with social value. Both underpin and emphasise the focal position of meaning and symbolism of places in cultural heritage management practice.

**Integrity**

This relates to the survival of components and patterns in the landscape and physical evidence from earlier periods. It is a means of establishing historic identity and
contributes to a sense of the stream of time (continuity) and links with the past through into the present. Integrity relates to tangible criteria such as design and materials and intangibles such as association and setting.

It is recognised in practice that one of the vexing questions associated with the Charter is that of thresholds. How significant is significant? At what benchmark does a place have value and significance, and for whom? Can we qualify value and significance and should we try? Significance is itself a human judgmental value, difficult to quantify, particularly by ranking it. Value and significance are concepts that do not sustain empirical analysis and objective quantification. We can substantiate that a building or historic landscape/district is a rare example of its kind and to lose it would lessen our material culture. But non-material culture, the traditions and practices that have created the places we value and give them meaning and the memories they entail are more difficult to rationalise and protect.

Significance and value are as much an outcome of the traditions and practices that have created the places we value and which encode them as memory places with meaning as they are an outcome of physical material fabric. The Guidelines to the Burra Charter propose (para. 3.3) that ‘The validity of the judgements will depend upon the care with which the data is collected and the reasoning applied to it.’ A statement of significance should be ‘clear and pithy, expressing why the place is of value’ (para. 3.4). It is this aspect of traditions and practices that has particular relevance to application of a Charter in an Asian context—a matter to which I shall return below.

The Burra Charter value that poses problems is that of aesthetic value. The Charter refers to criteria to do with sensory perception: form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric. It becomes confused with the Western history of aesthetics and particularly the 18th-century notion of aesthetics being equated with beauty and good taste. It maintains an unjustified high art/high aesthetics architectural imperative. Australia ICOMOS claims that the 1999 version deals better with intangible values and place meaning. The Charter may certainly be used to address these matters, but this takes skill and determination to adapt it. Aesthetic concerns are equally those dealing with experience and this can and does cover the ordinary everyday places that we may not usually refer to as beautiful. But why not? For many they are the places imbued through experience with a sense of belonging and sense of place where knowledge of ways of doing things is critical. Conversely, aesthetic value can be significant where it is expressed in architectural or landscape design terms as an achievement of a recognised high order of excellence; examples would include parts of the Grand Palace complex in Bangkok or the Taj Mahal in India.

Sullivan and Pearson similarly indicate concerns that the Burra Charter, after earlier revisions to the 1988 version, still encouraged undue concern with maintaining historic fabric. This is particularly in relation to its description of conservation practice. The 1999 version of the Charter still maintains this emphasis, reflecting its parent in the Venice Charter and the Western dogma of authenticity of historic fabric. The terms ‘fabric’ and ‘authenticity’ will be discussed below after discussion of the next document prepared specifically for China.
Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China (China ICOMOS)

These principles were drawn up in co-operation with the Australian Heritage Commission and the Getty Conservation Institute (California). They take the Burra Charter approach of identification and conservation of values and American experience to create a coherent set of guidelines specifically for China, meeting the needs of an Asian culture. This is recognised in the way heritage values are described (see below). In the Introduction, Zhang Bai, Deputy Director General of the State Administration of Cultural Heritage (SACHS), states that China began in 1950 to undertake a national inventory and initial assessment of significance of cultural sites and that there are now 300,000 registered sites. Of these, county, provincial, and autonomous regional and municipal authorities have designated 7,000 as the most significant with 1,268 of these in a national category (National Protected Sites) on the basis of historical, artistic, and scientific values. Additionally there are 99 historically and culturally famous cities. Cumulatively, these are seen as a record of China’s historic development and the creativity of its people, being an integral part of the country’s culture and history. The sites are regarded as forming a basis for understanding the past and a foundation for the future.

Of particular note is that the Chinese document is presented as professional guidelines that sit firmly within the existing framework of laws and regulations relating to the conservation of heritage sites. They are seen, therefore, as providing guidance for conservation practice as well as the main criteria for evaluating results. The Principles document is in two parts. The first part consists of 38 ‘Articles’ covering:

- General Principles.
- Conservation Process.
- Conservation Principles.
- Conservation Interventions.
- Additional principles.

The second part is a ‘Commentary on the Principles’ under 16 headings covering such matters as what conditions must be fulfilled for a site to be designated as a heritage site; retention of historic condition; social and economic benefits; assessment; conservation management plans; conservation process; management, maintenance, and interpretation; restoration; reconstruction; treatment of setting; archaeological sites; and commemorative sites. It is a comprehensive document and includes a helpful English–Chinese glossary where the Chinese interpretation of English terms is presented.

Article 1 establishes that heritage sites are the immutable physical remains that were created during the history of humankind and that have significance. In the glossary the literal meaning of ‘significance’ in Chinese is ‘value’. Article 3 determines that the heritage values of a site reside in its:

- historical value;
- artistic value;
- scientific value.
Historical value

This derives from reasons behind construction—and here immediately are intangible associations—and how the site authentically reflects historical reality; associated with significant events and figures and how the historic setting (see below) reflects these; how the site reflects customs, traditions or social practices (again important intangible values); ability of the site to supplement documented records; unique or rare qualities or representative of a type.

Artistic value

This derives from architectural arts including spatial composition, decoration, aesthetic form; landscape arts of cultural, urban, and garden landscapes, as well as vistas comprising ruins; sculptural and decorative arts; immovable sculptural works; creative processes and means of expression.

Two words expressing inherent fundamental cultural heritage values are ‘authenticity’ and ‘setting’. In particular, authenticity may have different nuances in Asian cultures to Western cultures, hence its notable inclusion in the Chinese Principles. In the glossary, authentic/authenticity literally mean true + fact/real. Article 23 proposes that artistic value derives from historic authenticity, and Section 2.3.1 that historical value derives inter alia from how a site reflects historical reality authentically. A synonym for setting in the glossary is landscape and presumably embraces the notion of cultural landscape reflecting how and why people have shaped their landscape or environment according to their ideologies. Article 24 directs that the setting—reflecting significant events and activities—of a heritage site must be conserved. Here there are comparisons with the Burra Charter, where setting means the area around a place and may include the visual catchment (Article 1.12). A guide to Treatment of the Setting is set out in Section 14 of the Principles and forms the basis for good site planning at heritage sites. Site planning is a process often not well understood in heritage management and calls for expertise able to respond to the genius loci of a site or place as well as an understanding of cultural heritage management issues. Many sites around Asia, for example Borobudur quoted above, are compromised by poor site planning where such ancillary facilities as car parks, visitor centres and facilities are sited incorrectly and where visual and physical intrusion from adjacent land uses may be abrupt and distracting to the setting and enjoyment of the heritage place.

The import of authenticity connects with the Asian approach to renewal of physical fabric. This is where replacement of fabric is acceptable because the significance of the place resides primarily in its continued spiritual meaning and symbolic value related to
everyday use rather than pre-eminence of the fabric itself. It is expressed by Wei and Aass (‘Heritage Conservation East and West’) in the following commentary:

Consequently, in the field of conservation of monuments such as Qufu, the Forbidden City or Cheng De, the allowing of continuous repairs or even rebuilding all respect this concentration on the spirit of the original monument. Although the physical form may change, the spirit and purpose of the original is not only preserved as a continuity, but can be enhanced through contributions of succeeding generations.23

Nevertheless there are explicit guidelines in the China Principles on maintenance, major and minor restoration, and reconstruction (Article 28 and Sections 10–13).

The Nara Document and Hoi An Protocols

In recognition of the significance of authenticity in cultural heritage management the drafting of The Nara Document on Authenticity24 aimed to challenge conventional thinking in the conservation field. It acknowledges the framework provided by the World Heritage Committee’s desire to apply the test of authenticity in ways that accord full respect to the social and cultural values of all societies in relation to cultural properties proposed for the World Heritage List. The Nara Document is a tacit acknowledgement of the plurality of approaches to the issue of authenticity and that it does not reside primarily in Western notions of intact fabric. It is an attempt to explore an ethos that acknowledges local traditions and intangible values. Logan suggests rightly that the Nara Document was ‘a powerful voice from the periphery, a veritable watershed’.25

The Nara Document acknowledges the need to respect cultural diversity and all aspects of belief systems. It proposes that authenticity judgements may be linked to a variety of information sources. These may include form and design; materials and substance; use and function; traditions and techniques; location and setting; and spirit and feeling. The Document points out that use of these sources permits elaboration of specific artistic, historic, social, and scientific dimensions of a cultural heritage place. Nevertheless, it has been misused within Asia to suit nationalist ideals (which are just as imperial as earlier Eurocentric or Americanised ones), possibly because of its generalised nature. It made a virtue of being non-specific.

The draft Hoi An Protocols document promulgated in 2000 by UNESCO is an attempt to rectify the woolly nature of the Nara Document. The sub-title of the Protocols, ‘Professional guidelines for assuring and preserving the authenticity of heritage sites in the context of the cultures of Asia’, is an important statement of the recognition of diverse and enduring cultural identities in Asian countries. The protocols recognise the impact of tourism in Asia and effects on restoration and presentation of heritage places for tourism purposes. The document includes a series of definitions that draw considerably on the Burra Charter. The inclusion of a section on Asian Issues is welcome, particularly in the mention of Indigenous and minority cultures and the need to find ways of interpreting sites within an appropriate context as a way of engaging visitors.

The Protocols are an attempt to ‘underscore the inter-relatedness of practices for the conservation of the physical heritage sites, the intangible heritage and cultural
landscapes’. Whilst they have potential to be a valuable guide, the separation of cultural landscapes from archaeological sites; historic urban sites/heritage groups; and monuments, buildings and structures in the section ‘Site Specific Methodologies for Asia’ is confusing. Indeed, it seems misleading in that cultural landscapes are the overall umbrella under which everything else sits.

**Conclusion**

The Nara Document on Authenticity and Hoi An Protocols lead to a concluding discussion of relevance in the Asian context. Both refer to the need to determine authenticity in a way that respects diverse cultures and encourages cultures to develop analytical processes and tools specific to their nature and needs. In this they will have various matters in common, including the advisability of ensuring multidisciplinary collaboration; ensuring attributed values are representative of a culture and diversity of interests; and the need to update authenticity documents in the light of changing values and circumstance. In other words this means that no particular group(s) should be privileged over others who are cultural stakeholders in the heritage place. It also means ensuring that cultural context is fully appreciated and that there may need to be a change in how a place or site is recognised and interpreted.

Given that Charters and Principles set the basis for conservation practice, and the widening understanding of authenticity, it is timely that Asian countries have their own documents to address regionally meaningful management of the rich tapestry of Asian cultural heritage places and living traditional environments. The Indonesian Network for Heritage Conservation and ICOMOS Indonesia have jointly issued a preliminary document. It eloquently stresses the heritage of Indonesia as the legacy of nature, culture, and *saujana*, a weave of the two. INTACH (Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage) in New Delhi is preparing a charter specifically for India that addresses a philosophy of conservation, concepts of living heritage, vernacular heritage and other categories with an Indian context. There will be others.

Further food for thought is that the Burra Charter in Australia also links to themes in history at national and state levels that guide heritage studies. These outline major themes in history that have shaped the way things have been and are done and help heritage students and managers to interpret historic places. They summarise human development of an area or region with associated human values. It is important to recognise that such themes contribute intellectually to ideas of significance and to national identity. Themes may be national, regional or local; some may have international connections such as travel and migration. The richness of themes that could inform Charters or sets of Principles for various Asian countries is boundless.

**Notes**
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Cultural Landscapes in Asia-Pacific: Potential for Filling World Heritage Gaps
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World Heritage listing and public presentation for tourism at Asian sites like Angkor has tended to focus on architectural ensembles, notwithstanding archaeological research involving wider aspects of landscape setting. Taking Angkor, Borobudur and Bagan as examples, this paper proposes a critical review of the concept of such heritage places and their interpretation under the wider concept of cultural landscapes replete with extensive intangible values and as outstanding examples of a continuous living/nourishing tradition and history. In this sense the architectural monuments themselves are a component of a wider cultural landscape pattern to which they are inextricably tied. Seeing the monuments without seeing their cultural context is akin to seeing leaves but not the tree. The paper is set within the framework of concepts of authenticity and the increasing interest in the cultural landscape concept in Asia. Underpinning the theme of the paper is the activity of reading the landscape with its sense of continuity and interrelationships between people, events and place through time, and transmitting this to visitors.
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Consult the Genius of the Place in all,
That tells the Waters or to rise or fall …

Alexander Pope (1791), An Epistle to Lord Burlington
The Rise of Cultural Landscapes

The 1990s saw a remarkable flowering of interest in, and understanding of, cultural landscapes: what David Jacques nicely calls 'the rise of cultural landscapes'. As a result, with the associated emergence of a different value system inherent in cultural landscapes, there came a challenge to the 1960’s and 1970’s concept of heritage focusing on great monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles, or historic sites with connections to the rich and famous. Widening interest in public history and understanding that 'the … landscape itself, to those who know how to read it aright is the greatest historical record we possess' underpinned the emergence of the cultural landscape movement. It also informed the notion that places or landscapes reflecting everyday ways of life, the way people create places, and the sequence or rhythm of life over time were significant. They tell the story of people, events and places through time, offering a sense of continuity, a sense of the stream of time. They also offer a cultural context for cultural heritage.

Critical to the new movement were the 1960s and 1970s writings of cultural geographers such as David Lowenthal, Peirce Lewis, Donald Meinig, with his inimitable essays on the everyday American scene, Dennis Cosgrove in Britain, or Dennis Jeans in Australia. They built on the late 19th-century German tradition of Otto Schlüter’s *Kulturlandschaft* with landscape morphology seen as a cultural product and Franz Boas who championed the idea that different cultures adjusted to similar environments and taught the historicist mode of conceptualising environment. They also followed the tenets of the American geographer Carl Sauer who, in the 1920s, continued this discourse with the view that 'the cultural landscape is fashioned out of a natural landscape by a culture group'. An underlining message was—and still is—to use one’s eyes and intellect out there, to read the landscape as a document of human history with its sense of time and layers replete with human values which inform the genius of the place.

Equally important to the new sense of history and heritage values in the cultural landscape idea was the concept that we could be involved in place making. Visitors to cultural landscapes could be given a sense of participation through presentation of appropriate interpretive material. So, in the 1990s, the cultural landscape idea gathered momentum. It permeated cultural heritage-management thinking and practice.

World Heritage Status

The term ‘cultural landscape’ is now widely accepted internationally. In 1993 cultural landscapes arrived on the world heritage scene with the declaration of three categories of cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value for World Heritage purposes:

- Clearly defined landscapes designed and intentionally created by man: e.g. Aranjuez Cultural Landscape, Spain (2001); no Asian inscriptions exist notwithstanding places like Suzhou, China, being World Heritage listed cultural properties.
- Organically evolved landscapes in two sub-categories:
(i) A relict or fossil landscape in which an evolutionary process has come to an end but where its distinguishing features are still visible, e.g. Gusuku Sites, Ryuku, Japan.

(ii) Continuing landscape which retains an active social role in contemporary society associated with a traditional way of life and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress and where it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time. Cultural landscapes inscribed on the World Heritage List in the Asia-Pacific region include, for example: Champasak cultural landscape including the Vat Phou temple complex, Lao PDR (inscribed 2001), in recognition of its presentation as a remarkably well preserved planned landscape more than 1,000 years old, shaped to express the Hindu relationship between nature and culture from the 5th to the 15th centuries; Orkhon valley cultural landscape, Mongolia (2004), reflecting the symbiotic relationship between nomadic, pastoral societies and their administrative and religious centres and the importance of the area in the history of central Asia; and Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (1995).

● Associative cultural landscapes: the inclusion of such landscapes is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element rather than the material cultural evidence. Tongariro, New Zealand (1993) and Uluru/Kata Tjuta National Park, Australia (1994) are two Asia/Pacific examples.

As further evidence of international attention, in 2003 UNESCO published two major reports: World Heritage Papers 6 and 7. Peter Fowler, in the first, analysed existing and potential cultural landscape inscriptions to the World Heritage List—i.e. existing cultural properties that Fowler proposes could be extended for inclusion—and notes that in 2003 there were only (our italics) 30 official World Heritage Cultural Landscapes. He identifies (table 8 in Fowler) 100 properties that meet one or more of the 1993 cultural landscape categories, but which have not been nominated or renominated as such since 1993. So there are 70 or so properties which the proposers have declined to nominate as cultural landscapes, including a significant number where the term ‘landscape’ figures in the nomination.

The reasons for the omissions are not readily clear. But the outcome is depressing given the effort that went into assembling the 1993 categories and the intellectual concept of cultural landscapes. The cultural landscape concept is not a slippery one; rather, it holds the key to understanding the cultural context and the setting of heritage places, and in the Asian context celebrating the remarkable existence of continuing living history. Here there is a direct link with the notion of the ‘continuous nourishing tradition’ of history to which Lowenthal surmises heritage may now be the heir in his discussion on the role of history, tradition, memory and heritage and human links with the past.11

Fowler speculates that the omissions are deliberate policy on the part of the nominators and in some cases due to the cool reception by ICOMOS assessors of some nominations (see page 45 and table 9 in Fowler). He posits, therefore, that ‘undeniable opportunities for inscribing cultural landscapes as such on the World Heritage List
have been lost’, adding that some examples were ‘indeed outstanding cultural landscapes by any criteria’ (45). If this is reflective of a global position then the outcome in the Asia-Pacific region is really a missed opportunity of palpable proportions. Of the 30 nominations only 4 at the time of the 2003 report were in the UNESCO Asia-Pacific region.12 By comparison, 21 were in the Europe–North America region, including relatively new examples such as the Loire Valley, France (2000).

The 2004 report by ICOMOS, The World Heritage List: Filling the Gaps—An Action Plan for the Future, further highlights the gaps in the Asia-Pacific region in the inscription of cultural properties on the World Heritage List in general, and cultural landscapes in particular.13 Figure 1 (Annex 1a in Fowler) indicates that the majority of places on the World Heritage or Tentative Lists are archaeological properties, architectural monuments and religious properties. Whilst this logically reflects the importance of Buddhist temples and archaeological sites, the paucity of such ensembles as cultural landscapes, vernacular architecture, and technological and agricultural sites represents a missed opportunity, taking into account the spirit of places in the region. Notable in this regard is the fact that many existing properties on the Lists would admirably fulfil the category of continuing landscape of outstanding universal value with cross-references to the associative cultural landscape category. They offer scope for renomination. Additionally, we suggest that future nominations, where appropriate, ought to be considered for cultural landscape nomination in addition to fulfilling World Heritage cultural criteria.

The foregoing discussion prompts the question: why is this so? Here it is instructive to look at the issue through the lens of authenticity and its relevance to notions of heritage in Asia. This is where the spirit of place resides as much in the meaning and

symbolism of places and their setting—intangible values—as it does in tangible physical fabric. The continuum between intangible values and sense of living history/heritage and continuity of traditions within the rubric of concepts of authenticity in Asia has been well explored. It has been held that differences are apparent between Western and Eastern cultures, particularly with the Asian approach to renewal of physical fabric. This is where replacement of fabric is acceptable because the significance of the place resides primarily in its continued spiritual meaning and symbolic value related to everyday use rather than pre-eminence of the fabric itself, the latter being held as a Western preoccupation.

However, authenticity is a contested issue in China where it is considered to be a professional/elite concept not shared by ordinary people rather than a difference between Asian and Western ideology. In effect the Chinese view reflects an international position where authenticity is really the realm of the expert rather than people at large. Even amongst experts there are likely to be different ideas of what authenticity is, according to academic discipline and whether applied to fabric and tangible heritage or values and intangible heritage. Peter Fowler, in reference to the Nara Document on Authenticity of 1994 (see below), suggests that

The essence of applying the test of authenticity … is in the verification of information sources about the relevant values. That is, that they are truthful and that the site is a genuine and authentic representation of what it claims to be … each individual site would still be assessed for its specificity and uniqueness, its genius loci. (20)

Whilst people in general may not be unduly concerned about such distinctions, nevertheless there are ramifications for interpretation and presentation of places which colour the way they are experienced and understood as part of the nourishing tradition of history. If authenticity is skewed then history runs the risk of being misrepresented; whether the issue of authenticity is adequately addressed in the interpretation and presentation of places for tourists is another matter on which we touch below.

**Authenticity, Setting and Site Management: Chinese Perspective**

Over the past decade the issue of authenticity in connection with the interpretation of heritage values in the Asia-Pacific region has gained timely recognition. The Nara Document on Authenticity and draft Hoi An Protocols document promulgated in 2003 by UNESCO Bangkok following a 2001 workshop propose a review of conventional thinking on authenticity in the region. Both take a fresh approach with an acknowledgement of the existence of a plurality of approaches to authenticity and that it does not reside primarily in maintaining the intactness of old fabric, but that this may be replaced without damage to the values of a heritage place.

In the matter of authenticity, the 2000 document Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China is critical in the context of Asian heritage practice. In the Principles two words expressing inherent fundamental cultural heritage values are ‘authenticity’ and ‘setting’. It is notable that the 15th General Assembly and Scientific Symposium of ICOMOS held in October 2005 at Xi’an in China had as its theme the important notion of ‘setting’ under the banner of ‘Monuments and sites in their
setting—conserving cultural heritage in changing townscapes and landscapes'. The background review for the conference proposes that settings seem to be in need of a better set of tools to help out with their definition, documentation, protection and management. Setting is just not about physical protection; it may have a cultural or social dimension. Tools need to acknowledge both the tangible and the intangible aspects of setting. They also need to reflect the complexity of ownership, legal structures, economic and social pressures that impinge on the physical and cultural settings of immoveable heritage assets …

Embedded firmly within the China Principles is a sequential process for the conservation of heritage sites: identification, assessment, formal proclamation, and the preparation, implementation and periodic review of a conservation master plan for the heritage site (Article 9). Articles 13–16 provide further guidance on the preparation and review of master plans and specific action plans. The conservation process is iterative and the guide to Treatment of the Setting—set out in Section 14 of the Commentary—follows the process. Here is a sound basis to inform good site planning—a process often not well understood in heritage management and notably so in the Asia-Pacific region. The dissemination of the Principles will provide China with usable guidelines for improving the planning and management of sites and their settings.

China is experiencing a dramatic increase in visitor numbers at heritage sites, with increasing numbers of international visitors in addition to the huge numbers of domestic tourists who are encouraged to take holidays and visit sites. In 1999 there

Figure 2  Chengde Imperial Summer Resort and Outlying Temples. Photo: K. Altenburg.
were 72 million international visitors (8.4 million foreigners and the remainder ethnic Chinese) and 694 million domestic travellers. In recognition of the need for improved management practice, including managing visitors, two World Heritage Sites in China, Mogao Grottoes and Chengde Imperial Summer Resort and Outlying Temples (see Figure 2), are developing master plans in accordance with the China Principles. Subsidiary visitor management and interpretation action plans are being developed, which reiterate the China Principles and Burra Charter concepts and methodology, firstly identifying all the values of the entire site, followed by developing policies and strategies for visitor management and planning for all the site. The primary objective of visitor management and interpretation is to inform visitors about the values of the site while ensuring that the values are not impacted either by visitors or facilities erected to provide services. Strategies include using visitor surveys and focus groups in order to gain a greater understanding of visitor expectations, knowledge about and experience of the site to assist management develop improved interpretive material and services, a well-sited visitor centre, circulation routes, exhibitions and displays, guides, signs, and access.

Another strategy is to work with tourist agencies rather than regarding them as the opposition. Initiating discussions with the tourist bureau and travel agents in Dunhuang, Gansu Province, has provided management at Mogao Grottoes with information on tourist arrivals, assisting with the installation of a reservation system, altering the uneven seasonal distribution, and forecasting future visitor numbers. A carrying-capacity study for the site aims to set scientific limits for visitor numbers to ensure no damage occurs to the values of the site. Establishing sound relations with the tourist authorities, so that they understand the carrying capacity, is for the long-term protection of the heritage site and thus for the ongoing benefit of local/regional/national communities.

China had a tradition of heritage tourism and pilgrimage which continued throughout the dynastic emperors from 2000 BC to AD 1900. It was broken only when China experienced a series of upheavals throughout the 20th century. Mandarins previously had been exhort to 'seek ultimate truth from the landscape' and their creative talents went into poetry, paintings, and calligraphy inspired by these landscapes. Such philosophical interpretations of China’s historical and sacred sites became—and remain today—part of Chinese ‘common knowledge’. Visiting these places becomes a powerful unifying experience, which foreign visitors are unable to experience fully. Chengde Imperial Summer Resort is a cultural landscape built by the Manchu Qing dynasty as a summer palace with an Imperial garden with lakes, prairie and mountain zones within an encircling perimeter wall beyond which are eight (formerly 12) temples. Every element was symbolically positioned to harmonise with the topography, with many gardens and scenic spots copied from famous landscaped gardens elsewhere in China, to represent all the beauty of the kingdom in one place. Chengde is the largest Imperial garden in China and the artistic values of the place are outstanding. Many of the architectural elements in the gardens that were destroyed in the upheavals in the 20th century have been restored or reconstructed to reinstate the artistic values of the place. Authenticity of fabric was considered of lesser significance than restoring the
authenticity of the design and the artistic values of the former Imperial gardens. The challenge, however, is to refrain from reconstructing every element of the Palace complex and gardens thus diminishing the historic values of the site’s latter history.

So the import of authenticity does seemingly connect with the Asian approach to renewal of physical fabric. Replacement is acceptable when the significance of the place resides primarily in its continued spiritual meaning and symbolic value related to everyday use rather than pre-eminence of the fabric itself.

Three Case Study Opportunities

Angkor

Most domestic and international tourists’ impressions of Angkor are likely to pivot on selected architectural and archaeological forms, the immediate physical space around them and the tourist drive. It represents presentation of heritage as separate dots on a map isolated from their cultural and intellectual setting—their cultural landscape. The following is the brief description given on the UNESCO World Heritage List Web site:

Angkor is one of the most important archaeological sites in South-East Asia. Stretching over some 400 sq. km, including forested area, Angkor Archaeological Park contains the magnificent remains of the different capitals of the Khmer Empire, from the 9th to the 15th century. These include the famous Temple of Angkor Wat and, at Angkor Thom, the Bayon Temple with its countless sculptural decorations. UNESCO has set up a wide-ranging programme to safeguard this symbolic site and its surroundings.

Tim Winter reflects that

one of the defining features of World Heritage Listing was Angkor’s spatial, legal and political isolation from its immediate surroundings … This often results in the visitor only travelling to Cambodia to see the World Heritage Site of Angkor, rather than visiting the country itself [and] typically make little connection between Angkor and Cambodia.22

This is not to deny the importance of structural preservation within an architectural and archaeological imperative. But it does conceive of Angkor as material heritage of the ancient past, something to be marvelled at, but divorced from the vibrant idea of living history and heritage. It is a commodification of heritage which privileges things rather than people where perhaps ‘restoration is the commerce of illusion’.23 The illusion is that behind and surrounding the monuments is a living landscape where people continue a way of life that has links with the people who created Angkor 1,000 years ago and to Pre-Angkorian period settlement (see Figure 3). Within this view of Angkor is the enduring survival of intangible values and authenticity of ‘traditions and techniques; location and setting; spirit and feeling’ as set out in the Nara Document.

Richard Engelhardt’s description of Angkor aptly catches the breathtaking extent of what Angkor really is about:

Commanding a strategic location on the uppermost tip of Cambodia’s great Tonle Sap lake, the ruins of the Angkor Empire expand north, east and west from the shores
of the lake up to the sacred Kulen mountain plateau. This entire 5,000 square kilometre site, once the location of one of the world’s largest metropolitan areas, is a relic cultural landscape—an environment which was intensively engineered by human activity over time to suit the Empire’s changing temporal needs.

Engelhardt shows how the landscape is a window into the past that continues into the present—a series of layers through time bearing testimony, if we but spend time to read it, to how the landscape has been shaped, why it has been shaped that way and who was involved. He further indicates that the Angkor area had a well-structured settlement pattern and appreciable density of population in the prehistoric period. Evidence from aerial photography and satellite imagery shows Pre-Angkorian settlement mounds scattered on the plain as forerunners of the heavily populated Khmer Empire. Remote sensing shows patterns of old field systems which were established across the Khmer Plain at an early date. Christophe Pottier of l’Ecole Française d’Extrême Orient, who worked with Engelhardt, has continued archaeological investigations of the early settlement patterns to uncover a fascinating pattern of development as another layer in the Angkor landscape. Subsistence farming, religious practices, vernacular architecture, craft traditions, and trade skills provide visible evidence of continuous living in the landscape on the Khmer Plain. Sugar palms, introduced from India in the Angkorian period, are

Figure 3  Cultural landscape at Angkor: example of the continuous nourishing tradition of living history and the interaction between people and environment which have created the cultural landscape and setting for the monuments of Angkor. Photo: K. Taylor.
harvested by householders to condense into palm sugar, and, wrapped in palm leaves, are sold to tourists visiting the Angkor sites. How do the local residents who live and work within the Angkor landscape see and value the landscapes in which they live? What would they like visitors to understand and learn about their place? Cambodian domestic tourists are visiting Angkor in ever increasing numbers. What are their views on how this deeply symbolic icon of Cambodian national and cultural identity should be presented to them and to the rest of the global community? These are critical questions that interpretation and presentation of Angkor needs to address.

In the context of Alexander Pope’s epigraph at the beginning of this paper, there is enormous potential at Angkor to ‘Consult the Genius of the Place in all / That tells the Waters or to rise or fall’ and present this as part of the visitor experience. In contrast, visitors are presented with what Bender terms an ‘attempt to “freeze” the landscape as a palimpsest of past activity … freezing time allows the landscape or monuments in it to be packaged, presented and turned into museum exhibits’.27 Here is a stimulating opportunity for new approaches to site interpretation and presentation of the story of the whole 5,000 km².

The vast extent and network of the Angkor setting admirably meet the World Heritage Cultural Landscape categories of an Organically Evolved Continuing Landscape and Associative Cultural Landscape of Outstanding Universal Value. Should it not be re-inscribed on the World Heritage List as such to celebrate it as one of Asia’s jewels of living heritage where everything in the everyday landscape is interconnected?

Borobudur

Like Angkor, tourists’ impressions of Borobudur are focused on the temple structure. The brief description on the UNESCO World Heritage List Web site for Borobudur is similar:

This famous Buddhist temple, dating from the 8th and 9th centuries, is located in central Java. It was built in three tiers: a pyramidal base with five concentric square terraces, the trunk of a cone with three circular platforms and, at the top, a monumental stupa. The walls and balustrades are decorated with fine low reliefs, covering a total surface area of 2,500 sq. m. Around the circular platforms are 72 openwork stupas, each containing a statue of the Buddha. The monument was restored with UNESCO’s help in the 1970s.

Borobudur, some 40 km from Yogyakarta in central Java, stands in the centre of the fertile and richly watered Kedu Plains flanked to the south by the jagged Menoreh Hills and to the east and north from Mount Merapi by a series of volcanic peaks linked by an undulating ridge. The whole setting is a gigantic amphitheatre with Borobudur standing in the middle on a low hill creating a memorable and evocative effect. The whole landscape ensemble is a vast outdoor museum of theatrical proportions. The shape of Candi Borobudur itself mirrors the volcanic peaks. The sight of the monument rising out of the landscape is awe-inspiring. Its presence in this landscape suggests an association between the monument and its setting that is palpable and rich in Buddhist meaning with Hindu overtones (see Figure 4). Two smaller temples, Candi Pawon and Candi
Mendut, similar in style and craftsmanship, are in a perfect east–west alignment towards Mount Merapi. But there are older markers in the landscape. These are the remains of around 40 Hindu temples and archaeological sites which follow the lines of creeks and rivers. The Buddhist temples are surrounded by a rural landscape of rice paddies and palm groves with small towns and villages creating a sense of the stream of time and place.

The cultural context and authenticity of the whole setting of Borobudur offers a compelling visualisation of the cosmology of the Buddhist mandala, thought by many scholars such as Miksic to be the crux of the building of Borobudur in its cultural (historical) landscape. Here is represented a single, circular world system surrounded by a mountain of iron and at the centre is Mount Meru (represented by Mount Merapi at Borobudur). It is a single world system where relationships exist between various parts of the universe and where myth and reason coalesce to offer an exquisite visualisation of the order of things. Just to look out over the landscape from the terraces of Borobudur is a stunning and moving experience; the landscape speaks dramatically and persuasively of a mystical but real relationship between people, time, events, beliefs and place. Here are layers in the landscape waiting to be read and interpreted to tell us something about who we are in time.

In the brief to the 2003 UNESCO Fourth Experts’ Meeting the World Heritage Committee included in its brief the instruction to review the boundary of the site.
The current boundary includes Candi Borobudur and its immediate surrounds. The Experts’ Meeting proposed that the boundary of the World Heritage listing be extended to recognise the outstanding cultural landscape values of Borobudur within the continuing and associative value categories. It also addressed problems of visitor management, site planning and interpretation, but that is another story.

Existing management at Borobudur recognises five zones. Zone 1 (under the direction of the Minister of Culture and Tourism) is the monument on its hill and Zone 2 (Ministry of Finance) is a surrounding archaeological park of about 85 ha from which two villages were removed in the early 1980s. Zones 3/4/5, managed within a hierarchy of local government and village hierarchies, encompass the communities that surround the monument, the wider landscape of rural lands, smaller nearby temples, and other archaeological sites including around 40 pre-Borobudur Hindu sites. Zone 4 is the Historical Scenery Preservation Zone intended to protect the views and sense of address as one approaches Borobudur within a 3 km radius of the monument. It includes a number of villages and archaeological sites. Zone 5, the National Archaeological Zone extending to a radius of 5 km, covers an area of 78.5 km² and is intended to protect archaeological sites. Zones 4 and 5 are important elements in the cultural landscape context of Borobudur, enhancing its meaning and its original raison d’être. The layers in this landscape create a sense of time and the concept of a vast outdoor museum.

The UNESCO Experts’ Meeting suggested that the cultural landscape setting bounded by Zone 5 offers an appropriate boundary for a wider site listing, recognising, however, that such a complex area does present protection and management problems. It was suggested, however, that such a boundary extension could be part of a wider management approach to Borobudur and its surrounds involving development of a tourism plan. Here, visitors would be introduced to an integrated interpretation and presentation of the area and encouraged to stay longer rather than the day-trip approach to Borobudur that currently predominates. The ultimate decision rests with Indonesia, as the State Party to the World Heritage Convention.

The sense of continuity, fit with the setting, and Borobudur’s undeniable presence as the ‘Cosmic Mountain of the Perfect Buddhas’ make it one of the remarkable edifices not only of central Java but the entire Buddhist world. Its haunting presence, reflecting an ancient belief in the indivisible junction between man and nature, where Mount Merapi to the east and Borobudur itself are the focal points of a sacred landscape, suggests it is timely that it be considered as a cultural landscape of outstanding universal value.

Bagan

Bagan, City of Pagodas, lies on the memorable floodplain landscape of the Irrawaddy River in central Myanmar. It is a remarkably vivid and memorable representation of the continuous nourishing tradition of association between people and landscape—a place where living, everyday history and symbolic meanings with associated intangible values abound. At Bagan, amongst the remaining 2,200 pagodas, local life continues as it has for centuries; fields are tended, crops grown, rice harvested. These are the
remnants of around 13,000 structures built between AD 1057 and 1297 and the sense of the ordinarily sacred is all-pervading.

There is a darker side to Bagan. Like village residents at Borobudur under Suharto, the residents of Old Bagan were forcibly relocated in the early 1990s by the military junta to New Bagan outside the designated archaeological zone. The official explanation that this was for archaeological excavation purposes is untenable. Like Borobudur, where at least no false excuse was attempted, it was undoubtedly for presentation of the site to tourists. Following a 1975 earthquake, some of the damaged pagodas had been rebuilt under direction of the junta in the 1990s. International criticism sees this as having been done without adequate documentary and archaeological evidence of the original structures. Here we enter the realm of authenticity and values with the inevitable questions: whose values and whose authenticity? These are vexed questions and offer the dilemma of whether the ruins should have been left. Or is rebuilding part of the Eastern approach where the spirit of the place continues within the new structure? The crux is the reason for rebuilding (perhaps entirely for tourism reasons) and one may pose the question: would the pagodas have been rebuilt by the community without government interference? With these factors in mind, Bagan was refused inscription on the World Heritage List ca 1995.

**Figure 5** Bagan: archaeological park zone showing setting of the pagodas and association with the cultural landscape reflecting over one thousand years of continuous living history. Also shows character of rebuilt pagaoda. Photo: K. Taylor.
Like most Asian sites, the impact of tourism—both international and domestic—at Bagan is abundantly evident. The Myanmar authorities decided in 2003 to build a viewing tower which is located at the northern edge of the archaeological park setting (see Figure 5). It has caused consternation internationally from some quarters. On balance it seems to be an acceptable part of the site planning for the area given that unfettered visitor access to the pagodas cannot be sustained without damage to the structures and accidents involving people.33 For example, the numbers crowding onto a number of terraces on pagodas to view the sunset has increased alarmingly.

Bagan is not on the World Heritage List, but its palpable presence sitting majestically, yet elegantly unobtrusive, in the landscape speaks of a synergy between people (culture) and nature. It is yet another example of an Asian cultural landscape of outstanding universal value. Perhaps it is time for its inscription to be reviewed and, as part of the required management plan, interpretation and presentation of the rebuilding be made clear to visitors as layers of change that have not obliterated its earlier history.

Conclusion

Our aim in this paper is to encourage a fresh and critically holistic look at how heritage places in the Asia-Pacific region might be seen, thereby offering fresh avenues for interpretation and understanding, not least for tourist purposes. We have set the discussion within a World Heritage narrative and what we see as the desirability and need to explore the infinite opportunities presented by the cultural landscape construct.
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Notes


[5] For example Jackson, *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape*. J. B. Jackson was a prolific and elegant writer on the American vernacular scene.
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6  Cosgrove, Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape.
7  See Jeans, Australian Historical Landscapes; and Spearritt, The Open Air Museum.
12  This figure increased in 2004 with the welcome inscription of Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Iran); Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape (Mongolia); and the Bamiyan Valley Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains (Afghanistan).
17  See Taylor, ‘Cultural Heritage Management’, 417–33, for a brief review of these documents.
23  Anon., comment made by a performer in a Dublin Fringe Festival presentation, September 2003.
26  Pottier, ‘Pre Angkor in Angkor’.
27  Bender, Stonehenge, 26, quoted in Winter, ‘Cultural Heritage and Tourism at Angkor, Cambodia’.
28  Miksic, Borobudur; Miksic, The Mysteries of Borobudur.
29  One of the authors, K. Taylor, attended this meeting to speak on historical landscape planning.
30  Mundardjito, ‘The Zoning System in the Borobudur Region’.
31  From The Ratu Boko Inscription of AD 792, central Java, quoted in Soekmono et al., Borobudur.
32  Johnstone, Borobudur.
33  In 2003 two foreign tourists died in falls from a pagoda.
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ABSTRACT Historic(al) landscapes with their heritage values—cultural landscapes—have reached key status in the field of cultural heritage conservation and planning. International recognition of cultural landscapes was extended in 1992 to World Heritage prominence with the establishment of three categories of cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value. The term ‘cultural landscape’ is now widely circulated internationally, although its use in South-eastern and Eastern Asia (hereafter SE and E Asia) presents problems. Notwithstanding this, cultural landscapes that have evolved in SE and E Asia reflect beautifully the interaction between people and their environment not simply as a tangible cultural product but as a result of cultural process with associated intangible values. In this way, and like their Western counterparts, they are part of a dynamic ”process by which identities are formed”, and also reflect organising philosophies and perspectives of different cultures imbued with value systems, traditional knowledge systems and abstract frameworks. The viewpoint of this paper is that of the need to draw attention to the cultural landscapes of SE and E Asia, to look closely at regional values and their inextricable connection to the continuing process of landscape creation, and finally to place SE and E Asian cultural landscapes in an international context.
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Introduction

Etymologically the word ‘landscape’ is a creation of the English speaking world with associated Germanic roots. Notwithstanding this, discussions concerning the definition of cultural landscapes and their management have spread to a wider audience than just the English speaking world. But there is, I believe, a slippage in meaning resulting from a tension apparent in the nuances of the application of the concept of cultural landscape between Western and many Eastern cultures. Hence the need to reconcile SE and E Asian regional values with the international meaning now enshrined in the three 1992 UNESCO World Heritage categories of cultural landscapes (see below).
When the term ‘cultural landscape’ is used in SE and E Asia there is often confusion as to what it really means. There is, therefore, a need to address this uncertainty through a global consensus on what the term signifies in order to reconcile international and SE and E Asian regional values, because the region has so much to offer the world in the cultural landscape arena. Indeed it is my view that some of the world’s greatest cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value exist here. These landscapes represent a particular way of living and provide examples of a continuous living history. They are therefore representative treasures, not only of living regional landscape culture, but of world culture and deserve to be recognised and celebrated as such. They are a vivid embodiment of landscape as cultural process as opposed to being an objective cultural product. Landscape is, therefore, not what we see but rather “a way of seeing that has its own history, but a history that can be understood only as part of a wider history of economy and society; that has its own assumptions and consequences, but assumptions and consequences whose origins and implications extend well beyond the use and perception of land; that has its own techniques of expression, but techniques shared with other areas of cultural practice”.

The Rise of Cultural Landscapes

The 1990s saw an expanding interest in, and understanding of, cultural landscapes: what David Jacques nicely calls “the rise of cultural landscapes”. As a result of this rise there came a challenge to the 1960s and 1970s concept of heritage that focused on great monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles, or historic sites with connections to the rich and famous that had been a primary influence in the heritage conservation movement after the Second World War. Cultural landscape study at this time was coincidental with a widening interest in the public history movement and everyday landscapes. Here was an understanding that—as the English historian W.G. Hoskins, one of the mid-twentieth century innovators of landscape study, proposed—“the . . . landscape itself, to those who know how to read it aright is the greatest historical record we possess”. It underpinned the notion that places or landscapes reflecting everyday ways of life, the ideologies that compel people to create places, and the sequence or rhythm of life over time are significant. They tell the story of people, events and places through time, offering a sense of continuity; a sense of the stream of time. They also offer the context for concepts and understandings of cultural heritage.

The concept of cultural context is critical to an appreciation of the rich layering inherent in the cultural landscape idea. The theme of the 2005 International ICOMOS conference held in Xi’an, China stressed the importance of context within the parameters of the concept of setting in the practice of conserving cultural heritage in changing towns and landscapes: “setting is not just about physical protection; it may have cultural or social dimension. Tools need to acknowledge both the tangible and intangible aspects of setting. They also need to reflect the complexity of ownership, legal structures, economic and social pressures that impinge on the physical and cultural settings of immoveable heritage assets”.

K. Taylor
Critical to the development of the 1990s movement was the 1960s and 1970s scholarly writings of cultural geographers like David Lowenthal, Pierce Lewis, Donald Meining, J.B. Jackson with his inimitable essays on the everyday American scene, Denis Cosgrove in Britain, or Dennis Jeans in Australia. They built on the late nineteenth/early twentieth century landscape studies’ thinking on *Kulturlandschaft* (land developed and cultivated by man) by German geographers such as Otto Schlüter (1872–1959). In the conjunction of the words *kultur* (English translation: culture, civilisation) and *landschaft* (English translation variously: countryside, landscape, scene, or in a political sense it can be territory, small administrative unit or bounded area of land), Schlüter “came to champion the view that the essential object of geographical inquiry was landscape morphology as a cultural product”. Franz Boas (1858–1942), anthropologist and geographer, extended this idea. He argued that it was important to understand the cultural traits of societies— their behaviours, beliefs, and symbols—and the necessity for examining them in their local context. He also understood that as people migrate, and as the cultural context changes over time, the elements of a culture, and their meanings, will change. This led him to emphasise the importance of studying local histories to aid the analysis of cultures. His teachings and ideas in social anthropology and geography remain central to present-day interest in the cultural landscape idea where “landscape is a clue to culture”.

Cultural geographers have also followed the tenets of the American geographer Carl Sauer. In the 1920s he contributed to the discourse with the view that “the cultural landscape is fashioned out of a natural landscape by a culture group”. An underlining message was—and still is—to use one’s eyes and intellect to read the landscape as a document of human history with its fascinating sense of time and layers replete with human values.

Equally important in the 1990s to the new sense of history and heritage values in the cultural landscape idea was the concept that we could be involved in place making. Visitors to cultural landscapes can be given a sense of participation through presentation of appropriate interpretative material. Accordingly in the 1990s the cultural landscape idea gathered momentum. It permeated cultural heritage management and planning thinking and practice. The breadth of ideas inherent in the rise of cultural landscapes found expression in the 2000 European Landscape Convention. Déjeant-Pons reviews how this landmark convention:

is aimed at promoting the protection, management and planning of European landscapes and organising European cooperation on landscape issues. It is the first international landscape treaty to be exclusively concerned with all dimensions of European landscape … It therefore concerns not just remarkable landscapes, but also ordinary everyday landscapes and blighted areas. (italics added)

The Preamble sets out what is meant by landscape which “… has an important public interest role in the cultural, ecological, environmental and social fields … contributes to the formation of local cultures … is a basic component of natural and
cultural heritage . . . is an important part of the quality of life for people everywhere (NB includes urban, countryside, and degraded areas as well as high quality areas) . . . and is a key element of individual and social well-being”.

The Convention defines landscape as “an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors [and which has evolved as] a result of being acted upon by natural forces and human beings [and that] landscape forms a whole [where] natural and cultural components are taken together not separately”. Given this catholic interpretation of landscape, Roe poses the question of whether “[T]he term ‘cultural landscape’ could therefore be seen as redundant?” She notes that Fowler has similarly argued the term is meaningless, particularly in a country like the UK.

What is a Cultural Landscape?

The word ‘landscape’ has its origin in Anglo-German language dating back to 500 AD in Europe. The words—landskipe or landscaef—and the notions implied were taken to Britain by Anglo-Saxon settlers. The meaning was a clearing in the forest with animals, huts, fields, fences. It was essentially a peasant landscape carved out of the original forest or weald, that is, out of the wilderness with interconnections to patterns of occupation and associated customs and ways of doing things. ‘Landscape’ from its beginnings therefore has meant a man-made artefact with associated cultural process values. It is an holistic view of landscape as a way of seeing—its morphology resulting from the interplay between cultural values, customs and land-use practices—recently critically explored by Wylie in his book Landscape; what Olwig calls “an active scene of practice”. Jackson indicates the equivalent word in Latin languages—with its antecedent like Germanic and other languages harking back to the Indo-European idiom—derives from the Latin pagus, meaning a defined rural district. He notes that this gives the French words pays and paysage, but that there are other French words for landscape including campagne deriving from champagne meaning a countryside of fields; the English equivalent once being ‘champion’.

The conjunction of the word ‘cultural’ with landscape also infers an inhabited landscape from its Latin origin colere (culture), with various meanings including inhabit, cultivate as in tillage, protect, honour. Additionally ‘culture’ like the German kultur (and hence ‘cultural’) is about development of human intellectual achievement, care (Oxford English Dictionary). French usage gives us paysage culturel, the term used in the World Heritage List inscription (2000) for The Loire Valley: notably it includes urban settlements as well as rural land. The assumption that is often made that ‘cultural landscape’ is only to do with agricultural settings is misplaced: it is concerned with all human places and the process of making them and inhabiting them.

In the seventeenth century in Europe, particularly England, the landscape idea became associated with two genres of landscape paintings. One was the Dutch realistic landscap school (known as lantskip or landskip paintings in English, as for example in John Milton’s words: “Streit mine eye hath caught new pleasures/Whilst the Lantskip round it measures”). The other was the imaginary historical paintings of artists such as Claude Lorrain with figures set in idealised pastoral scenes. In Claudian imagery landscape and scenery became synonymous and associated with
the idea of people in a humanised, yet natural, landscape. Notably there are intercultural connections here with the SE and E Asian traditions of landscape painting, for example, Chinese paintings. This is in spite of a major fundamental difference between the two traditions. Western landscape art since the Renaissance and the inception of perspective has focused substantially on portraying landscape reality even when the landscape portrayed is symbolic. In contrast, Eastern landscape art has often focused more on imaginary landscapes as in Chinese landscape art (and literature) where, over one thousand years ago at the end of the Tang Dynasty (618–907 CE), a deconstruction of material nature was taking place. This genre was accompanied by a representation of nature which “began to express its more spiritual side. Appearances became less important and spiritual reality emerged as the main focus … paintings became more and more abstract and symbolic”. In this way, Chinese depictions of nature—cultivated landscapes—were expressions of the mind and heart of the individual artist rather than of the real world, reflections of human beliefs and emotions. Even so, the often seemingly fantastic renditions in these landscapes do reflect the hauntingly beautiful shapes seen in Chinese landscapes. Nevertheless both forms, Eastern and Western, represent subjective notions of an ideal, perhaps illusive, nature.

In the nineteenth century ‘landscape’ became imbued with nationalistically religious and then scientific associations in Europe and North America. In North America it was particularly linked to the concept of wilderness or wild nature: something apart from people as discussed, for example, by Roderick Nash in *Wilderness and the American Mind*. Nash proposes in his analysis of the American concept of wilderness that its adoption was grounded in the idea of a distinctive American wilderness that was superior to anything in the Old World and a match for its antiquities. Wilderness was critical to a unique American identity. The ultimate wilderness experience became one of solitude: people and their trappings spoiled landscape in this image. The American ideal of national parks embraced the wilderness ethic, albeit linked to recreation opportunities of primitive nature, as enshrined in the American Wilderness Act of 1964. Griffiths argues that “in the identification of ‘earth monuments’ America made a competitive claim to antiquity, and, through its national parks system, established a ‘national monument’”. The wilderness ideal also took root in Australia and similarly became associated with national parks. In the USA and Australia there was the extreme notion that when colonial invaders landed they were confronted by a landscape as nature intended—wilderness untouched by human interference—thereby ignoring management by Aboriginal inhabitants. In the case of Australia, Aboriginal management through the agent of fire had spanned millennia creating, in effect, a continental-scale Aboriginal cultural landscape (it is most likely that changes brought by Aboriginal burning accompanied climatic changes from time to time where tree lines retreated and then grassy areas were maintained by burning).

During the 1990s criticism of the wilderness ethic emerged: it was seen as a creation of an English speaking imperial world with narrow protestant colonial/post-colonial foundations. It followed the 1970s and 1980s zenith of the wilderness ideology where nature and culture linkages were regarded by some natural heritage lobbyists in the Western tradition as antithetical. At the extreme, therefore, people were not seen as part of nature, and landscape was not seen as a cultural construct.
Landscape was held to have an objective scientific meaning. Whilst this was alien to Eastern views of the inextricable link between nature and people, the Western concept and practice of national parks has been imitated in a number of SE and E Asian countries, for example, India, China, Japan, Thailand36 where some indigenous/traditional communities have been dispossessed of their traditional rights and occupancy. These cases illustrate the dilemma confronting managers when ecological protection has to be considered, but all too often local community input into future management is ignored. Thus the contribution of traditional management to the maintenance of biodiversity is also unrecognised.37

Wilderness, like all ideas of landscape, is a cultural construct, a product of the mind framed by ideologies and experience. “Landscape is memory, there is no unmediated perception of nature”38 so that all landscape is a cultural construct, a mirror of our memories and myths encoded with meanings which can be read and interpreted. Simon Schama summarises this succinctly in Landscape and Memory with the contention that: “Before it can ever be the repose for the senses, landscape is the work of the mind. Its scenery is built up as much from strata of memory as from layers of rock.”39

Distinct from an exclusive natural heritage view of landscape is the view of landscape as a way of seeing, a result of cultural process. In other words all landscape is explained as a construct replete with humanistic meanings and values as, for example, in the European Landscape Convention. This must include the notion of wilderness, making it in reality a cultural construct and cultural landscape. Cultural landscapes are therefore critically

at the interface between nature and culture, tangible and intangible heritage, biological and cultural diversity—they represent a closely woven net of relationships, the essence of culture and people’s identity . . . they are a symbol of the growing recognition of the fundamental links between local communities and their heritage, humankind and its natural environment.40

The nexus between identity and landscape is central to understanding cultural landscapes and connections with people and that, importantly, landscape is where past and present meet. Pivotal to this is the realisation that, in addition to national cultural heritage icons recognised in the World Heritage category of designed cultural landscapes, it is the places, traditions, and activities of ordinary people that create a rich cultural tapestry of life, particularly through recognition of the values people attach to their everyday places and concomitant sense of place and identity. Identity is critical to a sense of place—genius loci—for people. Relph aptly summarises this in his proposal that “identity of place is comprised of three interrelated components, each irreducible to the other—physical features or appearance, observable activities and functions, and meaning or symbols”41 (see Figure 1).

A Living Entity and Record of Social History

Whilst there exist relict or fossil landscapes, most cultural landscapes are living landscapes where changes over time result in a montage effect or series of
layers, each layer able to tell the human story and relationships between people and natural processes. This is summarised in a 2004 paper ‘Understanding cultural landscapes—definition’ with the commentary that:

It is now widely accepted that landscapes reflect human activity and are imbued with cultural values. They combine elements of space and time, and represent political as well as social and cultural constructs. As they have evolved over time, and as human activity has changed, they have acquired many layers of meaning that can be analysed through historical, archaeological, geographical and sociological study.  

The character of the landscape thus reflects the values of the people who have shaped it, and who continue to live in it. Culture itself is the shaping force. Landscape is a cultural expression that does not happen by chance but is created by design as a result of human ideologies (Figure 2). In this vein, my definition of cultural landscapes is as follows:

We are surrounded by the landscapes that people have settled, modified, or altered over time. These landscapes are cultural landscapes, the everyday landscapes which surround us and in which we conduct our activities. They are the result of human intervention in the natural landscape and present a record of human activity, human values and ideologies. In this way they do not simply represent physical changes brought about by human intervention. They also represent evidence of material culture manifested in the landscape and thereby reflect human relationships with our surrounds. They are an inextricable and coherent part of our intellectual and cultural background.

Cultural landscapes are an imprint of human history. They can tell us, if we care to read and interpret them, something about the achievements and values of our predecessors. In this way cultural landscapes are symbols of who they are and can serve to remind us of the past. Because they are a record of past and present actions, cultural landscapes are a product of change. They embody physical changes which in turn reflect evolving attitudes towards the landscape. It is important that we learn to interpret cultural landscapes as living history and as part of national identities. They contain a wealth of evidence of our social and material history with which we readily associate heritage values.
Until the late 1980s there was some tension between cultural and natural heritage conservation. This was based on a hegemony of Western values where cultural heritage resided mainly in great monuments and sites—not least from the Old Classical World—and in scientific ideas of nature and wilderness as something separate from people, an ideal espoused particularly in the USA. Culture and nature were uneasy, sometimes suspicious, companions. Reflective of this, cultural and natural criteria for assessment of properties of outstanding universal value for World Heritage nomination and listing were separate until 2005 when they were sensibly combined into one set of ten criteria included in *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (para. 77). Concern for protection of the world’s cultural heritage emerged after the Second World War culminating in 1959 with international concern at the decision to flood the Abu Simbel temples in Egypt. As a result of a campaign costing US$80 million and others to save places such as Borobudur and Moenjodaro UNESCO initiated with the help of ICOMOS a draft convention on protection of cultural heritage. This was extended to include natural heritage following the 1965 White House Conference in Washington, DC for a World Heritage Trust that would stimulate interest in protecting the world’s superb natural and scenic areas and historic sites. In 1968 the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) developed similar proposals. These led to a single text, *Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (The World Heritage Convention) adopted by UNESCO on 16 November 1972.
The World Heritage Convention was therefore founded on the premise that places were important either for their natural or their cultural values. The opening preamble refers to cultural heritage and natural heritage as though each was a discrete entity, thereby reinforcing a Western notion of the separation of culture and nature. Both have separate descriptions listed under Article 1 (cultural heritage) and Article 2 (natural heritage). Article 1 refers *inter alia* to monuments, archaeological remains, groups of buildings and their value from the point of view of history, art or science; it does mention the combined works of man and nature but in an archaeological and historical context, ignoring the concept of people and nature living together. Article 2 refers to plants and animals, but not man. The introduction of World Heritage cultural landscape categories in 1992 went some way to resolving this dichotomy between culture and nature, but this still begs the question of the international currency of the term.

Environmental ethics were central to the debate on natural values, in particular that of whether nature has instrumental value or intrinsic value. Feng Han's discussion on these values is instructive: instrumental value is assigned because of the usefulness of something; in contrast intrinsic value relates to values of things as ends in themselves. A further complication is the question of the origin of intrinsic value. Is it subjective, created by human thought and value systems, or is it objective where value is endemic in its own right, simply waiting to be recognised objectively? Is nature valued as purely an object without any human interest or spiritual attachment? Entwined in human ideas of culture and nature is that of aesthetic appreciation. Berleant suggests that few would argue that aesthetic value of nature and that of creations from the cultural domain which we can call works of art—and here I include human shaping of the landscape—both exist, but that the kind of value appreciation each encourages within a Western historical and philosophical perspective has often been different. Doe the reason lie in the connection in European history between the ideal of landscape and the rich heritage of art and literature, perhaps encapsulated in Joyce Kilmer's famous couplet:

I think that I shall never see
A poem lovely as a tree

In this connection Roe points to the belief expressed by Phillips that the esoteric view of landscape has hindered development of discussion and policy in relation to landscapes at the global level. But in relation to some SE and E Asian countries such as China, the esoteric view of landscape through art and literature has strong roots (see below in discussion on Chinese words for landscape).

As noted above (note 36) in examination of the World Heritage List inclusions for SE and E Asian countries, it is possible to locate some properties included under natural criteria where local community associations with these landscapes are omitted, or worse, even obliterated. In contrast to this approach, and central to discussions on landscape conservation in the region, ought to be recognition of the value systems that traditional communities associate deeply with so-called natural areas as part of their cultural beliefs. Added to this is the fact that many traditional communities live in or visit these places as part of their life systems and may have done so for millennia, prompting the question of what do we mean by nature? Is it...
the 1960s American model enshrined in the Wilderness Act with its connections to Protestant Christian, colonial, and post-colonial cultural associations from the English speaking Western world? Or ought it to be the concept of nature and culture not as opposites, but where nature is part of the human condition? In this connection is J.B. Jackson’s view that landscape “is never simply a natural space, a feature of the natural environment . . . every landscape is the place where we establish our own human organization of space and time”.50 This has particular import in SE and E Asia where links between culture and nature are traditional. People are part of nature within a humanistic philosophy of the world. Here is an holistic approach to the human-nature relationship as opposed to the idea of human detachment from nature. In this vein in March 2004, the Natchitoches Declaration on Heritage Landscapes was adopted at an ICOMOS International Symposium.51 This declaration focuses on cultural landscapes in terms of the “interaction of people and nature over time” again stressing the culture–nature link.

Given the traditional relationship between nature and culture in Eastern cultures where people are not regarded as separate from nature, one may ask the question whether the term ‘cultural landscape’ does pose a dilemma in SE and E Asia, noting that Roe and Fowler (discussed above) ponder the same for Europe. Following this line of thought, Feng Han argues, for example, in China that the “term ‘Cultural Landscapes’ is . . . problematic”.52 She posits that people are part of the landscape experience and that landscape in the context of nature has its specific meanings which, she argues, contrast with Western notions, including inter alia that it is humanistic rather than religious; it is aesthetic rather than scientific; travelling in nature aims to be enjoyable, instead of solitude oriented; artistic rebuilt nature is more beautiful than the original. However, there are similarities with Western traditions in this nature–culture transaction. In the sixteenth-century Renaissance gardens of Italy it was held that design, whilst imitating nature, improved on nature. The idea of improving on nature was central to the English eighteenth-century landscape movement where one of the first practitioners of the new approach to landscape design, William Kent, was deemed to have “leaped the fence, and saw that all nature was a garden”.53 In the modern idiom landscape is equally viewed as humanistic in the European Landscape Convention and culture/nature are not divided. This culture-nature link is also a fundamental principle in the World Heritage cultural landscape categories. The old Germanic/English landscaef connotation has in effect been revitalised. If this is so, why then has there been comparative reticence in SE and E Asia with the term ‘cultural landscape’? A straightforward answer is that traditionally all landscape is cultural to the Eastern mind, hence the conjunction of ‘cultural’ with ‘landscape’ is a tautology.

Nevertheless, in trying to address this question and connecting with Feng Han’s view I refer to a Thai example, that of Doi Suthep-Pui National Park, Chiang Mai where culture and nature coexist in terms of traditional Hmong communities allowed to remain in the park and where interpretative presentation acknowledges the immutable relationship between people and nature. This is seen also in the value placed on the temples in the park, as with the venerable Pra That Doi Suthep Temple.

Despite all the stunning natural beauty, the main reason many visitors come . . . is to visit Phra That Doi Suthep Temple. For Thais, this site is a must
for the visit, as it is a sacred place to pay homage to the Lord Buddha’s relic, . . . [it is] one of the most holy Buddhist sites in Thailand.\textsuperscript{54}

It seems not to be just the word ‘landscape’ nor the nexus between culture and nature that can pose a problem of understanding of the cultural landscape idea in a SE and E Asian context. Indeed in this sense it may be argued that the West in its focus on cultural landscapes as the meeting ground of culture and nature through such instruments as the World Heritage Convention and the European Landscape Convention is catching up with the East (I am grateful to one of the reviewers of the paper for this observation). Rather it is the breadth of meaning in the Western modern conceptual basis of cultural landscapes, where ‘landscape’ is qualified by ‘cultural’, that can cause tension. This is enigmatic in that the broadening has embraced intangible cultural heritage values which are a fundamental attribute of SE and E Asian regional examples.

Part of the tension may well be because many regional languages generally have no direct equivalent of the word ‘landscape’ in the Germanic/English sense or in Latin derived languages. Nevertheless, SE and E Asian languages have words that convey various ideas of landscape similar to the way in which landscape and scenery have been interchangeable in English. It was in this vein that another twentieth-century innovative pioneer of landscape study, J.B. Jackson, in his reflections on what landscape is, refers to ‘the old fashioned but surprisingly persistent definition of landscape: ‘A portion of the earth’s surface that can be comprehended at a glance.’\textsuperscript{55} This is the consequence in Western ideology of the marriage of nature with the notion of pastoral landscape scenery in paintings as seen, for example, in the work of Claude Lorrain, and then its transfer to the actual scene with the landscape viewed admired as natural scenery.\textsuperscript{56}

In Chinese the word ‘\textit{f\textsuperscript{2}ngjing}’ is a general word for (abundant) scenery, the landscape you comprehend at a glance. Other words relating to landscape are helpfully included in the glossary of the China ICOMOS \textit{Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China}.\textsuperscript{57} Whilst ‘cultural landscape’ is used as a synonym for the Pinyin (Standard Mandarin romanisation) terms ‘\textit{renwen jingguan}’ and ‘\textit{renwen huanjing}’, their literal translation to English is ‘humanistic landscape’. ‘\textit{Ren}’ = people and ‘\textit{wen}’ = heritage, ‘\textit{jing}’ = scenery and ‘\textit{guan}’ = see. In ‘\textit{renwen huangjing}’, huangjing = environment, surroundings (viewed as scenery), and the full term has a literal translation to humanistic + setting. Translation to cultural rather than humanistic landscape recognises the universality of the term ‘cultural landscape’ (I am grateful to Kirsty Altenburg—who was involved through the then Australian Heritage Commission in the preparation of the China Principles document and has continued collaboration with Chinese colleagues—for explaining these terms). Although humanistic and cultural are conceptually connected in English, they have different nuances in Chinese: humanistic implies a man-made landscape so that, for example, physically a mountain as a natural landscape is not a humanistic landscape, but it can be a cultural landscape in terms of its symbolic cultural attachments (I am grateful to Dr Feng Han, Tongji University, Shanghai, for her explanation and help in explaining these nuances). Inherent in Chinese terminology is the notion of landscape as something expansively seen as scenery or the tradition of people embellishing nature. Chinese paintings with their symbolic
imagery during various periods of the country’s history include human figures contemplating, travelling through, or occupying nature as a coherent part of the ideology of nature and human relationships with it. A notable absence hitherto from World Heritage cultural landscape listings is China. Recognising this alongside the increasing international interest in cultural landscapes, SACH (State Administration for Cultural Heritage, the national agency responsible for management of cultural heritage management sites and policy and museums in China) has indicated that the subject of cultural landscapes is to be addressed. The Director of SACH at a recent (May 2008) ICOMOS Asia Pacific conference referring to the international significance of cultural landscapes declared they will be a focus of attention for China over the next few years (personal communication, Dr Feng Han). The December 2007 issue of Chinese Landscape Architecture was devoted to the topic, with the editorial commenting that “Cultural landscapes has [sic] recently become a major focus of attention of the international heritage conservation community . . . It is estimated that the concern of this topic in China will gradually increase and flourish.”

In the Thai language there is a similarity to Chinese in the sense of landscape being what is seen. The Thai word ‘tassana’, for example, in its relationship to ‘seeing’ means vision or opinion. To cover related meanings connected with landscape or what is seen or experienced, a prefix or suffix is added as in ‘tassangjon’ which means travelling (‘jon’ = walking or moving; so one travels through the scene and views it); ‘tassaneeyapab’ means perspective (‘pab’ may mean a picture); ‘tiewtas’ means view, scenery, vista; ‘poomitas’ is what the Thai language translates from ‘landscape’ (personal communication from Tiamsoon Sirisrisak of Tokyo University. I am indebted to him for his help in this area of the Thai language).

A significant initiative in Thailand was the publication in 2003 of the Draft Cultural Environment Conservation System (CECS), the word ‘environment’ used instead of ‘landscape’. The underlying purpose of the study was to focus attention on giving priority to the value of an area rather than any individual assets. Conservation in CECS mean preserving living environment whilst ensuring development that takes place respects values—tangible and intangible—created by ancestors and the traditional way of life. Conservation should be holistic and inclusive, covering traditional way-of-life, local belief and indigenous knowledge, or in short the ‘local ecosystem’. The study method developed has been applied to three areas: traditional canal system development in Nonthaburi Province, the historic canal town and wooden houses of Amphawa near Bangkok, and the historic area of Rattanakosin in Bangkok. This is cultural landscape study by any other name, but confronts the question of terminology.

For comparison, the practice in the Philippines and Japan where the terms ‘landscape’ and ‘cultural landscape’ are used is of interest. The Philippine language with its roots in Malay has no specific linguistic or cultural concept of cultural landscapes (I am indebted to Augusto Villalon for his explanation of Philippino practice and his words which I have interpolated here). Landscapes are simply landscapes, with or without actual or conceptual human interaction. Nevertheless the 400 years of Spanish and 50 years of American colonialism provide the Philippines with a broad ideological spread. As a result the notion of cultural landscape is used in heritage practice from international categories and charters
and simply (re?)interpreted in a local idiom, hence, for example, the 1995 World Heritage cultural landscape inscription of the Cordilleran Rice Terraces (see Table 1).

In Japanese professional and academic practice the term ‘cultural landscape’ has been absorbed. In Japan, ‘landscape’ can be taken as ‘*keikan*’, a word used in geography as an academic term to differentiate it from ‘*fu(−)kei*’ which is a general term for scenery: here again there are connections with Chinese and Thai words. The concept of ‘*landschap*’ in German geography was introduced to Japan and hence the term ‘*keikan*’ evolved as reflecting partially, but not entirely, the Western notion of landscape (personal communication from Natsuko Akakgawa of Deakin University. I am indebted to her for her help in this area of the Japanese language). Gehring and Kohsaka also point out that the use of the word ‘*keikan*’ was an attempt to translate the German *landschaft* into Japanese. They indicate that since the 1970s it has been used in scientific literature especially planning, natural sciences and politics, whilst the word ‘*fukei*’—a landscape dominated by natural elements, rice fields, trees and cultural objects like shrines and sacred natural elements—is a concept introduced from China in the eighth century, and is used in literature and the arts. The two are distinctive concepts of landscape that may not be taken as equivalent. 59

Like the Philippines, the international idea of cultural landscape has been absorbed into heritage conservation practice and Japan has two World Heritage cultural landscape inscriptions (see Table 1). Moreover, and of significance for international heritage practice, cultural landscapes are recognised by the national Agency for Cultural Affairs as an integral component of Japan’s cultural heritage and national treasures:

Table 1. UNESCO World Heritage Cultural Landscapes in Asia Pacific Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Property &amp; date inscribed</th>
<th>Typea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Cultural landscape and archaeological remains, Bamiyan Valley (2003)</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (1994)</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rock Shelters of Bhimbetka (2003)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Bam and its Cultural landscape (2004)</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Sacred Sites and pilgrimage Routes in Kii Mountain Range (2004)</td>
<td>1, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isami Ginzan Silver Mine and its Cultural Landscape (2007)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Petroglyphs within the Archaeological Landscape of Tamalgy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (2001)</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape (2004)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Tongariro National Park (1993)</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordillera (1995)</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>Chief Roi Mata’s Domain (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aType characteristics from Akagawa and Sirisrisak (2008), see note 66.

Source: http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape
Nurtured in the local climate and rooted in the soil of Japan, ‘Cultural Landscapes’ are the combined work of nature and man, representing modes of life of our people. Japan strives to preserve and utilise these cultural landscapes by designating them as cultural properties under the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties.

In addition, under the protection system, Places of Scenic Beauty and Important Cultural Scenery are designated. As noted, Japan currently has two World Heritage cultural landscape inscriptions (Table 1). Similarly, for Indonesia Amin recognises for instance, “the rich cultural landscape heritage in Indonesia” and the term is in use by professionals and academics.

**World Heritage Status**

The term ‘cultural landscape’ is now widely used internationally. In 1992 cultural landscapes arrived on the world heritage scene with the declaration of three categories of cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value for World Heritage purposes:

- **Clearly defined landscapes designed and intentionally created by man**, for example, Aranjuez Cultural Landscape, Spain (2001); no SE and E Asian inscriptions exist notwithstanding magnificent places like the Summer Palace, Beijing, or the classical gardens at Suzhou.

- **Organically evolved landscapes in two categories:**
  
  (i) A relict or fossil landscape in which an evolutionary process has come to an end but where its distinguishing features are still visible.

  (ii) Continuing landscape which retains an active social role in contemporary society associated with a traditional way of life and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress and where it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time. Cultural landscapes inscribed on the World Heritage list in the UNESCO Asia-Pacific region include, for example, Champasak cultural landscape including the Vat Phou temple complex, Lao PDR (inscribed 2001) in recognition of its presentation as a remarkably well preserved planned landscape more than 1000 years old, shaped to express the Hindu relationship between nature and culture from the fifth to fifteenth centuries; Orkhon Valley cultural landscape, Mongolia (2004) reflecting the symbiotic relationship between nomadic, pastoral societies and their administrative and religious centres and the importance of the area in the history of central Asia. The Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras inscribed in 1995 as the first Asian site have been regarded as the type model of an organically evolving landscape, but sadly also point to the potential vulnerability of such traditional models: due to shifts in cultural attitudes with the younger generation of traditional owners to the upkeep and management of the rice terraces landscape, it is now on the World Heritage in Danger List.
Associative cultural landscapes: the inclusion of such landscapes is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element rather than the material cultural evidence. Tongariro New Zealand (1993), Uluru/Kata Tjuta National Park, Australia (1994) are two UNESCO Asia/Pacific Region examples. Part of the evolving international attitude to the culture–nature dialectic inherent in the cultural landscape concept is evident in these two examples; both were originally inscribed on the World Heritage List for natural values (1990 and 1983 respectively). Their re-inscription acknowledged the values attached to them by New Zealand Maori and by Australian Aboriginal people who make no separation between nature and culture.63

SE and E Asia-Pacific: A Missed Opportunity?

By September 2008 there were 61 World Heritage Cultural Landscape Properties (note: more than 61 are listed, but a number are transnational inscriptions): of these 13 were in the UNESCO Asia-Pacific Region (Table 1). Additionally Tana Toraja is on Indonesia’s Tentative List. By comparison the figures for 2003 were 30 and four respectively. Whilst there has been some welcome increase, the relatively small number of Asia-Pacific nominations is due partly to the fact that the cultural landscape categories are latecomers to the World Heritage scene and have been perhaps better grasped by Europe and North America. Further recognition may be assisted by two initiatives: Peter Fowler’s 2003 report for UNESCO on World Heritage cultural landscapes64 and the September 2006 initiative by Sonia Berjman and Monica Luengo prepared for the ICOMOS International Committee on Cultural Landscapes. This is a proposal for a Universal Cultural Landscape Registry and/or Inventory Card. It marks a first step in the aspiration to have a universal inventory of cultural landscapes. The proposed list is the first step in a sequence directed to:

- discover a hidden heritage;
- promote human resources (informers, specialists, professional nets of national reach);
- establish organisations competent in the matter (creation of provincial, regional, national and international centre networks);
- promote multiple tasks, such as population enlightenment about cultural landscape values, education in all levels and develop specialised teachings, establish ties with the national and international economic communities, for the generation of economic, tourist and/or employment resources in different areas;
- establish diffusion and protection action plans;
- establish restoration and rehabilitation programs;
- study and regulate urban and landscape codes in accordance with the value given to the different inventoried cultural landscapes.

A 2005 report by ICOMOS The World Heritage List: Filling the Gaps—An Action Plan for the Future highlights the gaps in the Asia-Pacific Region in the inscription of cultural properties on the World Heritage List in general, and cultural landscapes in particular.65 Figure 3 indicates that the majority of places on the World Heritage or Tentative Lists are archaeological, architectural monuments and religious properties.
Whilst this logically reflects the importance, for example, of Buddhist or Islamic places and archaeological sites, the paucity of such ensembles as cultural landscapes, vernacular architecture, technological and agricultural sites—all within the cultural landscape spectrum—represents a missed opportunity taking into account the spirit of places in the region. Notable in this regard is the fact that many existing Asia-Pacific Region properties on the World Heritage List would admirably fulfil the category of continuing landscape of outstanding universal value with cross references to the associative cultural landscape category. They offer scope for re-nomination; for example, Ayutthaya in Thailand, whilst in China there are the Mount Qingcheng and the Dujiangyan Irrigation System or the Ancient Villages in southern Anhui-Xidi and Hongcun. Akagawa and Sirisrisak in a review on cultural landscapes and the World Heritage Convention map the characteristics of the 10 World Heritage cultural landscapes listed in 2006 in the Asia-Pacific region. They propose it is possible to define five major characteristics: 1) religiosity/indigenous beliefs, 2) archaeological/architectural remains, 3) continuing historic land-use, 4) outstanding type of landscape, 5) distinctive nature and that eight sites share at least two or more characteristics (Table 1). Comparing these with the characteristics of sites from the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists for Asia-Pacific (Figure 3) there is a correlation with the major types of site (e.g. religious, architectural, archaeological) and scope for further nomination work in such types as technological and agricultural, historic towns, cultural routes.

In reviewing an Eastern values perspective on cultural landscapes it is instructive to look at the issue through the lens of authenticity and integrity (characteristics from Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention and the relevance to notions of heritage value in the Asia-Pacific Region. This is where the spirit of place resides as much in the meaning and symbolism of places and their setting—intangible values—as it does in tangible physical fabric. The continuum between intangible values and sense of living history/heritage and continuity of traditions within the rubric of concepts of authenticity in the region has been well explored.

**Figure 3. Comparison of World Heritage list and Tentative lists, Asia and Pacific. Source: ICOMOS 2005 World Heritage List: Filling the Gaps, p. 44.**
Authenticity (para. 80 of the Guidelines) concerns “the ability to understand the value attributed to the heritage depending on the degree to which information sources about this value may be understood as credible or truthful”. In relation specifically to cultural landscapes we may see authenticity therefore as ability of the landscape to represent accurately/truthfully what it purports to be. Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes. Examining the conditions of integrity, therefore requires assessing the extent to which the property:

a) includes all elements necessary to express its outstanding universal value;
b) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the property’s significance;
c) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect.70

For cultural landscapes integrity involves understanding, reading, and interpreting intact layers in the landscape through time in association with cultural values and meanings. It is a palpable link between the tangible and intangible, reflective of a sense of the stream of time and continuity, a linking of the past with the present.

The Nara Document on Authenticity; Hoi An Protocols for Best Practice in Asia; Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China71

Special aspects of authenticity and spirit of places in Asia are addressed in these three landmark documents which have profound relevance to the cultural landscape idea and its application in Asia. In recognition of the significance of authenticity in cultural heritage management the drafting of The Nara Document on Authenticity (International ICOMOS 1994) aimed to challenge conventional thinking on monuments and sites in the conservation field. It acknowledges the framework provided by the World Heritage Committee’s desire to apply the test of authenticity in ways which accord full respect to the social and cultural values of all societies in relation to cultural properties proposed for the World Heritage List. The Nara Document is a tacit acknowledgement of the plurality of approaches to the issue of authenticity and that it does not reside primarily in Western notions of intact fabric. It is an attempt to explore an ethos that acknowledges local traditions and intangible values.

The Nara Document acknowledges the need to respect cultural diversity and all aspects of belief systems. It proposes that authenticity judgements may be linked to a variety of information sources. These may include form and design; materials and substance; use and function; traditions and techniques; location and setting; spirit and feeling. The Document points out that use of these sources permits elaboration of specific artistic, historic, social, and scientific dimensions of a cultural heritage place. The Nara Document is somewhat non-specific, but it was published before there was any real experience of cultural landscapes by the World Heritage Committee. Importantly, its attention to authenticity and global pluralism offer the way for wider consideration of cultural landscapes from a World Heritage perspective.

subtitle of the protocols Professional Guidelines for Assuring and Preserving the Authenticity of Heritage Sites in the Context of the Cultures of Asia is an important statement of the recognition of diverse and enduring cultural identities in Asian countries. The Protocols recognise the impact of tourism in Asia and effects on restoration and presentation of heritage places for tourism purposes. The document includes a series of definitions which draw considerably on the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter. The inclusion of a section on Asian Issues is welcome, particularly in the mention of indigenous and minority cultures and the need to find ways of interpreting sites within an appropriate context as a way of engaging visitors.

The Protocols are an attempt to ‘underscore the inter-relatedness of practices for the conservation of the physical heritage sites, the intangible heritage and cultural landscapes’. Whilst they have potential to be a valuable guide, the separation of cultural landscapes from archaeological sites; historic urban sites/heritage groups; and monuments, buildings and structures in the section ‘Site Specific Methodologies for Asia’ is, I believe, confusing. Indeed it seems misleading to me, in that cultural landscapes are the overall umbrella under which everything else sits.

Nevertheless, with particular application to the cultural landscape idea in SE and E Asia, a notable inclusion in the Protocols is the linking of the Cultural Significance of heritage sites and concepts of Authenticity and Integrity. The Protocols (p. 10) state that ‘The Cultural Significance of heritage sites has been defined by the Burra Charter as the ‘aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations’ which is ‘embodied in the place itself, its setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects’.’ The Protocols suggest the goal of conservation is to preserve this significance by ensuring that all interventions and actions meet the test of authenticity in all respects. Understanding the relative degree of significance of heritage resources is essential if we are rationally to determine which elements must be preserved under any circumstance, which should be preserved under some circumstances and which, under exceptional circumstances, will be sacrificed. Degree of significance can be assessed on the basis of the representativeness, rarity, condition, completeness and integrity and interpretive potential of a resource.

Authenticity in the Protocols is usually understood in terms of a matrix of dimensions: location and setting; form, materials and design, use and function and ‘immaterial’ or essential qualities. Together these form the composite authenticity from which significance derives (see Table 2). The retention of authenticity is the aim of good conservation practice as set out in the Protocols. The Hoi An Protocols document has the potential to advance the regional understanding of cultural landscapes in SE and E Asia (indeed for Asia as a whole) from an international perspective in its holistic view of heritage resources in their cultural context and setting and its approach to the dimensions of authenticity.

China ICOMOS Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China is a timely document for the way it complements and extends understanding of authenticity within a regional context. In the China document two words expressing inherent fundamental cultural heritage values are ‘authenticity’ and ‘setting’. In particular, authenticity may have different nuances in Eastern cultures to
Western based cultures, hence its notable inclusion. In the glossary authentic/ authenticity literally mean true + fact/real. Article 23 for example proposes that artistic value derives from historic authenticity and section 2.3.1 that historical value derives, *inter alia*, from how a site authentically reflects historical reality. A synonym for setting in the glossary is landscape and presumably embraces the universal notion of cultural landscape reflecting how and why people have shaped their landscape or environment according to their ideologies. Article 24 directs that the setting—reflecting significant events and activities—of a heritage site must be conserved. Here there are comparisons with the Burra Charter where setting means the area around a place and may include the visual catchment (Article 1.12). The inclusion in the glossary to the Principles of terms for the equivalent of cultural landscape as discussed above, and the understanding of the fundamental importance of setting (landscape) with an English equivalent of ‘environment’ (similar to the Thai CECS) in effect embrace the cultural landscape concept.

**Conclusion**

Increasing interest internationally in cultural landscapes and the existence in SE and E Asia of a rich heritage of cultural landscapes should be the touchstones for specific regional action to recognise and celebrate its cultural landscapes. There is a need to bridge the gap that exists between the international framework with its universal cultural landscape values and the establishment of a set of regional values firmly bedded in SE and E Asian cultural processes. Like any other global region, SE and E Asia is not an homogenous unit. There are regional diversities, but also commonalities do exist: these can be the foundation for a regional approach to cultural landscape recognition and development of management strategies. With a regional basis in place it will then be logical to look at applying World Heritage cultural landscape categories to future World Heritage nominations. Indeed each country should be encouraged to review its Tentative List of sites to inquire critically if and where each site fits one or more of the three World Heritage cultural landscape categories.

---

**Table 2. Dimensions of authenticity (Hoi An Protocols p. 10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and setting</th>
<th>Form and design</th>
<th>Use and function</th>
<th>Essence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Spatial layout</td>
<td>Use(s)</td>
<td>Artistic expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting ‘Sense of place’</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>User(s)</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental niches</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landforms and vistas</td>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>Changes in use over time</td>
<td>Emotional impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living elements</td>
<td>Building techniques</td>
<td>Spatial distribution of usage</td>
<td>Religious context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environ</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Impacts of use</td>
<td>Historical associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of dependence on locale</td>
<td>Stratigraphy</td>
<td>Use as a response to environment</td>
<td>Sounds, smells and tastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linkages with other properties or sites</td>
<td>Use as a response to historical context</td>
<td>Creative process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Western based cultures, hence its notable inclusion. In the glossary authentic/ authenticity literally mean true + fact/real. Article 23 for example proposes that artistic value derives from historic authenticity and section 2.3.1 that historical value derives, *inter alia*, from how a site authentically reflects historical reality. A synonym for setting in the glossary is landscape and presumably embraces the universal notion of cultural landscape reflecting how and why people have shaped their landscape or environment according to their ideologies. Article 24 directs that the setting—reflecting significant events and activities—of a heritage site must be conserved. Here there are comparisons with the Burra Charter where setting means the area around a place and may include the visual catchment (Article 1.12). The inclusion in the glossary to the Principles of terms for the equivalent of cultural landscape as discussed above, and the understanding of the fundamental importance of setting (landscape) with an English equivalent of ‘environment’ (similar to the Thai CECS) in effect embrace the cultural landscape concept.

**Conclusion**

Increasing interest internationally in cultural landscapes and the existence in SE and E Asia of a rich heritage of cultural landscapes should be the touchstones for specific regional action to recognise and celebrate its cultural landscapes. There is a need to bridge the gap that exists between the international framework with its universal cultural landscape values and the establishment of a set of regional values firmly bedded in SE and E Asian cultural processes. Like any other global region, SE and E Asia is not an homogenous unit. There are regional diversities, but also commonalities do exist: these can be the foundation for a regional approach to cultural landscape recognition and development of management strategies. With a regional basis in place it will then be logical to look at applying World Heritage cultural landscape categories to future World Heritage nominations. Indeed each country should be encouraged to review its Tentative List of sites to inquire critically if and where each site fits one or more of the three World Heritage cultural landscape categories.
In the case of continuing cultural landscapes and associative cultural landscapes it has to be a regional imperative to recognise the importance of traditional management and traditional knowledge systems where these continue as a means of benefiting future management and protection of landscapes. Much of the sense of a SE and E Asian identity and place resides in its landscapes, both rural and in historic urban areas and historic towns. Hence there is a need to understand better the meaning of places to people generally. This is particularly important to local and indigenous communities where we must harness their expertise and guidance in cooperation with expert professional heritage management thereby bringing “people together in caring for their collective identity and heritage, and [to] provide a shared local vision within a global context”.

The interface of culture and nature in the World Heritage cultural landscapes idea offers a primary foundation for extending the acceptance of the cultural landscapes in SE and E Asia whilst paying attention to the concept of universal value. Many existing properties in the region such as Borobudur or Angkor sit within a wider cultural landscape to which they are inextricably tied tangibly and intangibly. This relationship suggests a need to re-evaluate such properties with a view to re-inscription to celebrate their cultural landscape settings and their broader interpretation and presentation as a palpable link between past and present. Inscriptions such as Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape already do this.

In spite of cultural nuances and differences in landscape language globally it is time to move attention away from these and onto the common ground of attachment to landscape, cultural environment, or whatever the regional word variations are. It seems underneath the rhetoric there is commonality in the way people feel attachment to and association with our surrounds, no matter what terminology is used, be it cultural landscape, renwen jingguan, poomitas, Australian Aboriginal conception of country, French paysage, fu(-)kei and so on. There is a need to build on this intellectual capital and draw in more SE and E Asian examples of cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value.

To address overall an Asia-Pacific Regional cultural context it would be helpful to add additional explanatory material to the World Heritage Guidelines, particularly to cover the application of authenticity and integrity; in particular authenticity. This imperative arises not least in my view given the potential confusion arising from the UNESCO 2003 Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention and the associated Yamato Declaration abandoning the concept of authenticity for intangible heritage yet accepting cultural spaces within the intangible umbrella. Also it is difficult to see how considerable spheres of intangible heritage—song, literature, dance, crafts—can be separated intellectually from their cultural landscapes. Currently the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes is reviewing the World Heritage Guidelines in their application to cultural landscapes; authenticity is figuring prominently in the interchange of ideas. It would also be helpful within an Asia-Pacific Regional context to suggest sub-types of cultural landscapes covering rural and urban settings, having connections with such things as indigenous groups and lifestyles, agricultural practices, religion, cultural and biological diversity and the culture/nature binary, scenic areas, historic urban landscapes, historic towns.
Such initiatives could go some way to building capacity and confidence in the preparation of nominations to the World Heritage list for SE and E Asia.

In a global perspective World Heritage cultural landscape categories and various ICOMOS charters work well and have assisted international practice. The way ahead is to (re)interpret them to accommodate regional and local systems of beliefs and ways of living. Whether regional Asian equivalents to the European Landscape Convention are feasible remains debatable. Perhaps an organisation such as ASEAN through its Committee on Culture and Information (COCI) could consider this through a protocol or similar document within which various language nuances relating to landscape could be listed. The basis for this exists in the *ASEAN Declaration on Cultural Heritage* (2000)\(^6\) which acknowledges (para 2) the need to identify, recognise and protect *cultural landscapes*.

In summary, it appears that the term ‘cultural landscape’ is widely used in SE and E Asian practice, although it may on occasion be viewed with some hesitation. The underlying need is to bring it to the fore with politicians, government instrumentalities, and local communities and to interpret it within regional contexts. Certainly the indivisibility of culture and nature which the cultural landscape concept espouses and its closeness to Eastern ways of thinking offers a basis to address this need.
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Such a cursory overview cannot begin to do justice to the rich depth of meaning in Chinese history of people’s relationships, spiritual and physical, with nature. For a comprehensive overview, see Feng Han (2006, note 28).
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Cultural landscapes are intended to increase awareness that heritage places (sites) are not isolated islands and that there is an interdependence of people, social structures, and the landscape and associated ecological systems. The paper explores whether the recognition of the 1992 World Heritage Cultural Landscape categories, the IUCN Protected Landscapes and the 2005 merging of cultural and natural criteria for World Heritage purposes have been effective in bridging the gap between culture and nature philosophically and in practice. With particular reference to opportunities presented in the Asia-Pacific region, where traditionally culture and nature are not regarded as separate, people are part of nature, the paper will further critically review the nature–culture link and its implications for North American-style national parks where cultural associations may not be seen to be necessary or even desirable. It suggests the imperative of highlighting and respecting in heritage nominations and inscriptions deep cultural associations of traditional communities with natural sites and implications for management to protect cultural and biological diversity and the need for thematic studies.
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**Shifting ground**

A notable social advance of the post-World War II era has been concern for the world’s cultural heritage, with associated efforts to mobilise professional global agencies and initiatives to protect it. Initially, with the advent in 1964 of the Venice Charter,\textsuperscript{1} heritage was seen to reside predominantly and physically in impressive monuments and sites – and substantively monuments and sites of the Classical (Old) World – as great works of art. The UNESCO World Heritage Convention of 1972 firmly placed cultural heritage (and natural heritage) conservation on the world stage, and certainly early inscriptions on the World Heritage List focused on famous monuments and sites, sometimes referred to as the separate dots on a map syndrome. As the management of cultural heritage resources developed professionally and philosophically a challenge emerged in the late 1980s/early 1990s to the 1960s’ and 1970s’ concept of heritage focusing on monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles, or historic sites with connections to the rich and
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famous (Lennon 2006). Here was the inception of an enlarged value system embracing such issues as cultural landscapes and settings, living history and heritage, intangible values, vernacular heritage and community involvement. It was the beginning of the shift from concentrating wholly on what Engelhardt (2007) pithily designates the three ‘Ps’ of Princes, Priests and Politicians to include PEOPLE.

Critical to the expanded view of cultural heritage was and remains an appreciation of the inter-relationships through time between people, events and places involving associated intangible – spiritual – values as well as tangible values. Central is the concept of heritage inextricably linked to notions of identity and continuity, to private and public memories, to sense of place (genius loci). It is an approach with an intellectual basis not just in history but also one with a temporal and spatial perspective.

Inherent in the pre-1990s global view of heritage was some division, and hence tension, between cultural and natural heritage conservation. Cultural heritage residing mainly in great monuments and sites was divorced from scientific ideas of nature and wilderness as something separate from people, an ideal seen in the extreme wilderness ethic. Culture and nature were uneasy, sometimes suspicious, companions. Reflective of this, cultural and natural criteria for assessment of properties of outstanding universal value for World Heritage nomination and listing were separate until 2005 when they were sensibly combined into one set of 10 criteria included in Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2005, para. 77). This shift followed 13 years after the introduction of World Heritage cultural landscapes categories, itself a seminal part of the 1990s’ enlarged value system and embracing the idea of an interface between culture and nature (see below).

Support for the shifting discourse came at the highest level in terms of global concern for heritage through the concept of a global strategy. In 1994, the World Heritage Committee launched the Global Strategy for a Balanced, Representative and Credible World Heritage List (UNESCO 1994) with the aim of ensuring that the List reflects the world’s cultural and natural diversity of outstanding universal value. It was acknowledged that 22 years after the adoption of the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the World Heritage List lacked balance in the type of inscribed properties and in the geographical areas of the world that were represented. Among the 410 properties, 304 were cultural sites and only 90 were natural and 16 mixed, while the vast majority is located in developed regions of the world, notably in Europe. By adopting the Global Strategy, the World Heritage Committee stated that it wanted to broaden the definition of World Heritage to better reflect the full spectrum of our world’s cultural and natural treasures and to provide a comprehensive framework and operational methodology for implementing the World Heritage Convention. This new vision was seen as going beyond the narrow definitions of heritage to recognise and protect sites that are outstanding demonstrations of human coexistence with the land as well as human interactions, cultural coexistence, spirituality and creative expression.2

Cultural landscapes and protected landscapes

Cultural landscapes

During the late nineteenth/early twentieth century, thinking promulgated by German geographers such as Schlüter, Ratzel and Boas (who was also an anthropologist)
had championed the notion of cultural landscapes shaped by people in opposition to
the physical determinism school of geography. Schlüter (1872–1959) saw geography focusing on landscape as a cultural product whilst Franz Boas (1858–1942) extended this to embrace the idea that different cultures adjusted to similar environments and taught the historicist mode of conceptualising environment under the banner of ‘Historical Particularism’ (Livingstone 1992). Boas argued that it was important to understand the cultural traits of societies – their behaviours, beliefs and symbols – and the necessity for examining them in their local context and the importance of the concept of cultural relativism. This geographical scholarly endeavour was continued in the twentieth century through the work and writings of Carl Sauer, Fred Kniffen, Wilbur Zilensky, David Lowenthal, Peirce Lewis, Marwyn Samuels, Donald Meinig, Denis Cosgrove and others (Taylor 2009). It may be seen to have created a context for a global cultural landscapes discourse on a World Heritage scale.

The term ‘cultural landscape’ is now widely used internationally. In 1993 cultural landscapes arrived on the world heritage scene with the declaration of three categories of cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value for World Heritage purposes:

- **Clearly defined landscapes designed and intentionally created by man:** e.g. *Aranjuez Cultural Landscape, Spain* (2001); no Asian inscriptions exist notwithstanding places like Suzhou, China or Kyoto temples with their gardens being WH listed cultural properties.

- **Organically evolved landscapes in two categories:**
  
  (i) A relict or fossil landscape in which an evolutionary process has come to an end but where its distinguishing features are still visible, e.g. *Gusuku Sites, Ryuku*, Japan.

  (ii) Continuing landscape which retains an active social role in contemporary society associated with a traditional way of life and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress and where it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time. Cultural landscapes inscribed on the WH list in the Asia-Pacific region include, for example: *Champasak cultural landscape* including the *Vat Phou temple complex*, Lao PDR (inscribed 2001) in recognition of its presentation as a remarkably well preserved planned landscape more than 1000 years old, shaped to express the Hindu relationship between nature and culture from the fifth to fifteenth centuries; *Orkhon valley cultural landscape*, Mongolia (2004) reflecting the symbiotic relationship between nomadic, pastoral societies and their administrative and religious centres and the importance of the area in the history of central Asia; *Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras* (1995).

- **Associative cultural landscapes:** the inclusion of such landscapes is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than the material cultural evidence. *Tongariro New Zealand* (1993), *Uluru/Kata Tjuta National Park*, Australia (1994) are two Asia/Pacific example.
Cultural landscapes are regarded as being ‘at the interface between nature and culture, tangible and intangible heritage, biological and cultural diversity – they represent a closely woven net of relationships, the essence of culture and people’s identity … they are a symbol of the growing recognition of the fundamental links between local communities and their heritage, humankind and its natural environment’ (Rössler 2006 p. 334). Enlarging on this, the current Operational Guidelines for the World Heritage Convention propose that

Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature. Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use and can maintain or enhance natural values in the landscape. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. The protection of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore helpful in maintaining biological diversity. (UNESCO 2008, Annex 3, para. 9)

By mid-2010 66 cultural landscapes had been inscribed on the World Heritage List. As Bandarin (2010) reflects, most of these are living cultural landscapes and over time cultural landscape categories (including relict and associative) ‘provide an opening of the World Heritage Convention for cultures not or under-represented prior to 1992’. Bandarin (2010) quotes as examples the inscription of the Kaya Forest Systems in Kenya or the Chief Roi Mata’s Domain in Vanuatu, the Kuk Early Agricultural site in Papua New Guinea or the Tobacco production of Vinales Valley in Cuba, reflecting that none of these sites would have had a chance prior to 1992 of being recognised as cultural heritage on a global scale. Herein lies the major importance of the inclusion of the cultural landscape category in the operations of the Convention. Of the 66 inscriptions only 14 are located in the Asia-Pacific region. In contrast, many inscribed properties in the region listed as natural sites are in fact cultural landscapes and offer considerable scope for renomination and re-inscription, as happened in 1992 with Tongariro (New Zealand) and in 1994 with Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Australia). The question of renomination was addressed by Fowler (2003) in his 10-year review of the cultural landscape categories.

UNESCO acknowledges that these sites face major challenges. Of particular significance is the fact that it is the work of local communities and indigenous people that sees these sites maintained often through their own protection measures, rather than by official legal provisions. Notably therefore with the adoption of the cultural landscape categories, customary law and management systems have been accepted at a global level. This was another major step forward, which was only acceded to for natural heritage by IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature) in 2002. There is, however, a major need not only to assist in site management – managing the complex interaction between people and nature which is considered to be of outstanding universal value – but also in maintaining the integrity of these places in a world of global socioeconomic change and climate change and not imposing generic solutions (Taylor 2004).

Notwithstanding UNESCO’s adoption of conventions covering cultural diversity, intangible heritage and ecological sustainability, the heritage of some regions is inadequately understood and the Pacific is a notable example. Pacific heritage ‘reflects a living culture, a unique combination of customary law elements (including customary land ownership), the primacy of intangible heritage and an
emphasis on the spiritual and associative meanings of places’ (Logan 2004 p. 7). Much Pacific heritage can be conceptualised as cultural landscapes, though Logan notes that much work remains to give stronger status to ‘associative landscapes’ (ibid.). UNESCO’s adoption of intangible heritage should lead to greater recognition of the associative landscapes of this region and ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) in 2007 published a thematic study of cultural landscapes in the Pacific as a basis for further nominations.

Protected landscapes

Parallel is the IUCN Category V Protected Landscapes (IUCN 1994; Phillips 2002): landscapes where exceptional natural and cultural values have led to protection. This was followed in 2006 by a global guide, Managing Protected Areas (Lockwood, et al. 2006), covering 26 issues with many case studies. They may also provide some important lessons on how to achieve sustainable living. They are usually places of outstanding visual quality, rich in biodiversity and cultural value because of the presence of people. IUCN recognises six categories of Protected Areas ranging from strict nature reserve/wilderness status (Category Ia/b) to areas (Category V) ‘that encompass traditional, inhabited landscapes and seascapes where human actions have shaped cultural landscapes with high biodiversity’ (Dudley 2008, p. vii). IUCN notes the varied ownership status of the latter category, including sites owned and managed by governments, by private individuals, companies, communities and faith groups, realising that there is a far wider variety of governance than originally thought, which, it may be assumed, influences management approaches in connection with people traditionally occupying such areas. The influence of people is recognised by reference to ‘cultural landscapes or seascapes that have been altered by humans over hundreds or even thousands of years and that rely on continuing intervention to maintain their qualities including biodiversity’ (ibid., p. 14).

A link emerges therefore between cultural landscapes as the interface between people and nature and Category V Protected Landscape as ‘a protected area where the interaction of people and nature over time has produced an area of distinct character with significant ecological, biological, cultural and scenic value: and where safeguarding the integrity of this interaction is vital to protecting and sustaining the area and its associated nature conservation and other values’ (ibid., p. 20). The culture–nature link is stressed by Brown et al. (2005, p. ix) with the commentary that landscapes shaped by the interaction of people and nature are universal where these ‘landscapes … have contributed to biodiversity and other natural values, [that] have proven sustainable over centuries, and are living examples of cultural heritage. They are rich in natural and cultural values not in spite of but because of the presence of people’.

‘IUCN has also identified the following benefits within protected landscapes/seascapes’ (UNESCO 2009, p. 23):

- Conserving nature and biodiversity;
- Buffering more strictly controlled areas;
- Conserving human history in structures and land use patterns;
- Maintaining traditional ways of life (Figure 1);
- Offering recreation and inspiration;
- Providing education and understanding;
- Demonstrating durable systems of use in harmony with nature.
Figure 1. Panyi Island fishing village, AoPhang National Park, Thailand, maintaining traditional fishing and also catering for tourists (Ken Taylor).
Culture/nature interface: cultural and biological diversity

The 2001 UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity acknowledges the fundamental role of the protection of human rights of indigenous people, including respecting traditional knowledge and its contribution, for example, to environmental protection and management of natural resources and the synergy possible between modern science and local knowledge. Parallel with this is the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity that acknowledges that cultural systems, practices that favour natural resource management, and value and knowledge systems of indigenous and local peoples (Figure 2) can be role models for helping shift dangerous patterns in modern over-consumption of natural resources.

What has emerged, therefore, is an increasing appreciation of the inextricable links between culture and nature and indigenous knowledge systems, thereby forming, for example, a cornerstone of UNESCO’s landmark decision in 1992 to recognise the three cultural landscape categories for World Heritage purposes. This initiative enhanced the recognition of outstanding linkages between nature and culture, people and places, and between the intangible and tangible. It also provided a new focus on key areas of biological and cultural diversity, including sustainable use. At the same time innovations were introduced with the acceptance of traditional custodianship and customary land tenure in World Heritage protection. (Rössler 2006a p. 15)

Figure 2. Traditional palm sugar production, village near Angkor Wat World Heritage site (Ken Taylor).
It has also enhanced understanding of the importance of indigenous knowledge systems and was, for example, a major theme of a UNESCO/IUCN 2005 international symposium *Conserving Cultural and Biological Diversity: The role of sacred natural sites and cultural landscapes* (UNESCO/IUCN 2006). This has resulted in more World Heritage listings of such landscapes as noted above by Bandarin and an increase in indigenous customary management.

Environmental ethics have been central to the debate on natural values, in particular that of whether nature has instrumental value or intrinsic value. Feng Han’s (2006) discussion on these values is instructive: instrumental value is assigned because of the usefulness of something; in contrast, intrinsic value relates to values of things as ends in themselves. To complicate matters further is the question of the origin of intrinsic value. Is it subjective, created by human thought and value systems, or is it objective, where value is endemic in its own right and simply waiting to be recognised objectively? Is nature valued as purely an object without any human interest or spiritual attachment? Entwined in our ideas of culture and nature is that of aesthetic appreciation. Here, few would argue that the aesthetic value of nature and that of creations from the cultural domain which we can call works of art – including human shaping of the landscape – both exist, but that the kind of value appreciation each encourages within a western historical and philosophical perspective is often different (Berleant 1993). This schism has affected approaches to conservation where aesthetics of nature and culture have been separated within a western mindset. It is a way of thinking that often causes confusion in an Asian way of thinking.

In Asia the debate about cultural values has been preoccupied with World Heritage listing of only the main temple with its architectural and monumental values but missing cultural connections to the surrounding countryside including subsidiary temples which form part of the whole cultural significance of the place, as happened initially at Angkor Wat and Borobodur (Taylor and Altenburg 2006). In Japan, while some temples are of undoubted universal value, cultural landscapes of ordinary agricultural activity are now being protected as urban pressures lead to unsympathetic encroachments or abandonment in scenic mountainous areas (Committee on Cultural Landscapes Associated with Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 2003). A recent national *Landscape Law* is unprecedented in Japanese history, designed to coordinate the conservation efforts of three different national-level ministries, Construction, Agriculture and Education, all of which claim interests in landscape heritage resources. Together with the *Places of Scenic Beauty* report and suggested amendments to the existing *Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties*, this expanded view of heritage is based on accommodating landscape evolution. The *Landscape Law* is dedicated to the creation of vibrant communities with distinct personalities, not solely focused on a strict preservation of original historic fabric and environments. The resulting landscape – with mechanisation, tourists and new construction – ‘may not fit with strict Eurocentric conservation traditions but it will be authentic in the broader sense that is now being articulated in Asia’ (Pollock-Ellwand et al. 2009).

In the final analysis are not both culture and nature cultural constructs and to divide them is misleading? This was remedied philosophically in 2005 in the merging of aesthetic value in the World Heritage natural and cultural criteria. However, on the ground problems remain. This is often due to the training of local managers, officials, and their consultants in one discipline or another – art history, anthrop-
ogy, architecture and archaeology (the arts) or biological sciences – and the inability to form multidisciplinary teams for the task of integrating management of all values in the landscape including intangible local values arising from traditional beliefs, language and practices. In turn this dichotomy is further compounded at the international level by the two expert bodies advising the World Heritage Committee – ICOMOS and IUCN – selecting experts for site assessment of nominations (referred to as ‘missions’) based on their specific discipline and then forwarding separate reports with their own disciplinary bias. For cultural landscape nominations, the place is assessed as a cultural property under criteria i–vi, and is assessed by ICOMOS; or it may be nominated as a mixed property with one or more of i–vi and one or more of vii–x, and is assessed by ICOMOS for cultural value, and IUCN for natural value. Clearly this procedure requires close cooperation and agreement on criteria.

Fowler (2003) suggested that two centuries is the minimum time in which a landscape can become ‘traditional’, for anything less can hardly demonstrate the stability which is essential if the cultural landscape is to meet the World Heritage criterion of integrity. Training for managing such landscapes requires special modes of instruction, including learning traditional ways from elders, craft skills, understanding the ecological and cultural underpinnings of the traditional systems, as well as learning how to use new technologies (Figure 3). The challenge then is to integrate traditional cultural knowledge with local management systems to ensure protection of the outstanding universal values of the property (Lennon 2005a).

Focusing on World Heritage List inclusions for Asia, a number of properties are included under natural criteria and all too often human associations with these landscapes are omitted. Two Chinese examples are quoted by Feng Han (2006). First is the forced removal of traditional Chinese farming communities and villages in the Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area. It was listed in 1992 as a World Natural Heritage Site, not a cultural site. Since then tourism has exploded, with more than 5 million visitors annually. In 1998 the area was criti-

Figure 3. Grass drying racks, Nappa Hai, Zhongdiam, Yunnan (Jane Lennon).
cised by a WH Centre/IUCN State of Conservation Report because it was overrun with tourist facilities having considerable impact on the aesthetic qualities of the site. This begs the question of what are the site’s aesthetic qualities? Are they in reality purely physically natural in a western – or to be more precise, North American National Park – sense? Second is Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Interest Area: eco-restoration has led to removal of tourist accommodation and prohibition of grazing by local minorities. Traditional life and hence knowledge systems and connection with place formed over a period of 5000 years are compromised. Biological diversity has been ranked higher than cultural diversity and intangible cultural heritage values. Locals have at least been allowed to remain, but their prime purpose is for the dislocated tourist gaze like players on a stage, seen but not heard. This situation has been replicated in other Chinese reserves like Yulongxueshan Snow Mountain and villages in Yunnan with colourful minority populations.

The concept of nature and what is natural is central to a debate in the Asia-Pacific region on landscape conservation. The separation of World Heritage criteria was originally based on a hegemony of western values where cultural heritage resided mainly in great monuments and sites, and natural heritage in scientific ideas of nature and wilderness as something separate from people. The latter was an ideal espoused particularly in the USA. An American PBS television programme shown in Australia in 2010, ‘The National Parks. America’s Best Idea’, eulogised the grandness of American wilderness and nature virtually as a national symbol and exemplar reflective of Roderick Nash’s (1967) critical analysis of the American concept of wilderness. Nash posits that its adoption was grounded in the idea of something distinctively American and superior to anything in the Old World: the sublime versus the antique. He refers to the wilderness idea as critical to a unique American white identity. Therefore we may ask, what of the identity and history of occupation of US national park areas by native Americans before being ousted and their cultural landscape turned into someone else’s ‘wilderness’? That page of history is fuzzy in the heroic wilderness narrative, being as opaque as it was in the environmental ethics debate on natural values during the 1970s and 1980s, in particular that of whether nature has instrumental value or intrinsic value, as discussed above.

In contrast to the American model is that of British National Parks which are much more concerned with historic cultural landscape issues and the relationships between concepts of culture and nature through works of art and literature. The Lake District National Park and association with figures such as Wordsworth, Turner or Beatrix Potter is a case in point. It is also notable that much of the Lake District remains in private ownership where landscape protection – the picturesque rural and the sublime mountains – is a shared concern with the Lake District National Park Authority. Landscape is equally viewed as humanistic in the European Landscape Convention. The breadth of ideas inherent in the rise of cultural landscapes have found expression in the Convention where culture/nature are not divided (Taylor 2009). These are the models that fit nearest with traditional eastern values of people and nature, and we venture to suggest ought to be the ones adopted by governments and agencies in the Asia-Pacific region, as for example in Doi Suthep National Park, Thailand, where Doi Pui Hmong village and its people are part of the essential character, landscape history, and sense of place (Figure 4).
It should also be noted that whilst there is an increasing number of World Heritage cultural landscapes, there are hundreds of community-based cultural landscapes across the Asia-Pacific region, officially unprotected areas but protected by communities for their own livelihoods (Barrow and Pathak 2005). Not all cultural landscapes have universal values but they have national and regional values and form the basis of sustainable landscapes worthy of conservation (Figure 5).

Figure 4. DoiPui Hmong villagers, DoiSuthep National Park, Thailand (Nantawan Muangyai).
There are many examples all over the world of forests and plants conserved for their spiritual values. Sacred trees in India are revered along with ‘sacred groves’ found in Ghana, Kenya, Venezuela, Nepal, China and India (ibid.). The Dai people in Xishuangbanna region, Yunnan Province of south-west China manage holy hills or nong where the gods reside; these forested hills, number about 400 and between 30 and 40,000 ha in area, form green islands in which all utilisation of timber is

Figure 5. Kandyan garden, Sri Lanka (Jane Lennon).

Figure 6. Lake Bigu summer grazing, Yunnan (Jane Lennon).
prohibited. In the diverse landscapes of montane mainland South East Asia there has been increasing emphasis on indigenous knowledge for sustainable livelihoods and involvement of indigenous communities in resource governance (Jianchu and Mikesell 2003) (Figure 6).

**Intangible heritage and indigenous/local communities**

Central to discussions on heritage conservation in Asia ought to be recognition of the intangible value systems that traditional communities associate deeply with so-called natural areas as part of their cultural beliefs. Added to this is the fact that many traditional communities live in or visit these places as part of their life systems and may have done so for millennia, for example Nanda Devi and Valley of Flowers National Parks in India or Sagamartha National Park in Nepal, all listed only under natural criteria for World Heritage inscription, although at least the nomination of the latter does refer to the presence of Sherpas with their unique culture that adds further interest to this site. A 1999 state of conservation report adds, ‘The significant culture of the Sherpas is an integral part of the nature-culture continuum’ (UNESCO 1999). Of note in these culture–nature and tangible–intangible relationships is the mounting appreciation of links between cultural and biological diversity and traditional sustainable land-use. It begs the question of whether renomination as cultural landscapes ought to be seriously contemplated.

A landmark UNESCO/IUCN international symposium in 2005 explored the culture/nature diversity links and in an eloquent paper Lhakpa N. Sherpa shows how beyul, the cultural phenomenon of sacred hidden valleys in the Nepalese Himalaya, encourage biodiversity conservation. But he also shows how western-influenced initiatives are targeting beyul for establishing protected areas without proper recognition of the symbiotic relationship between local community and environmental conservation: modern development, education, globalisation and tourism do not lend support to traditional stewardship. The ancient beyul tradition and the modern protection both aim at biodiversity conservation and improved human livelihoods, but Lhakpa (2006) tellingly remarks that their implementation tools differ. National park protection depends on powerful national legislation and global scientific justifications. But whilst traditional residents have accepted protecting wild flora and fauna because it coincides with their own belief systems, the managers, policy makers and scientists have been slow in recognising the value of time-honoured traditions in biodiversity conservation. Similarly he suggests that modern infrastructure ignores sensitivity to the sacred nature of the land and is in danger of overwhelming traditional concepts, and also points to the need for modern education to integrate local culture into its system. Lhakpa (2006) suggests that beyul and other sacred natural sites can be an asset for ecosystem conservation and lead to conservation of significant intangible cultural values. He proposes a series of actions involving strengthening involvement of local people with greater recognition of indigenous knowledge; physical surveys; collection of oral and written evidence; documentation and publication of material; dissemination of information to local schools and communities to rekindle the spirit and pride in beyul.

The need for intercultural dialogue and for initiation of indigenous participation has long been recognised in Australia and New Zealand. Australia ICOMOS hosted the Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop on Associative Cultural Values in 1995 at which the link between the physical and spiritual aspects of landscape was seen as
critically important (Blair and Titchen 1995). In the World Heritage criterion (paragraph 39 (iii)) the term ‘artistic’ encompasses all forms of artistic expression, including literary. The term ‘cultural’ includes associations with historic events and traditions of indigenous and non-indigenous cultures. Associative cultural landscapes may include large or small contiguous or non-contiguous areas and itineraries, routes or other linear landscapes. These may be physical entities or mental images embedded in people’s spirituality, cultural tradition and practice. Associative cultural landscapes important to the Asia-Pacific region include Aboriginal dreaming tracks in Australia, Polynesian culture spread across the Pacific Ocean and the Silk Road from China to the West (Lennon 2005a).

Recognition of a cultural place as a World Heritage site can intentionally or unintentionally marginalise certain groups, the unrecognised ‘others’ with a long and verifiable association with the place. Seneviratne (2008) shows how the UNESCO ‘cultural triangle’ in the 1980s legitimised the ideological claims of the majority ethnic, linguistic and religious groups and incorporated the World Heritage site (WHS) of Anuradhapura into the Sinhala Buddhist ethos, yet much pottery from archaeological investigations there comes from India, China and the Mediterranean, illustrating a complex trade network and multicultural residential area which was excluded from the Site. Dambulla WHS is also seen primarily as a Buddhist heritage, not a universal one (ibid.) and in the nominated Central Highlands WHS the traditional occupiers of the forests, the Veddas, have been relocated to the buffer zones.

Conversely, recognition of the associative cultural landscape values of traditional people as being worthy of World Heritage listing can empower these groups into new management arrangements. This occurred with the Anangu of central Australia when Uluru Kata Tjuta was re-inscribed as a cultural landscape in 1993 further to its original listing in 1987 for its natural heritage value. Its re-inscription provided international recognition of Tjukurpa as a major religious philosophy linking the Anangu traditional owners to their environment and as a tool for caring for country. The listing represented years of work by Anangu to assert their role as custodians of their traditional lands and to refer to them by their traditional names Uluru and Kata Tjuta, rather than the non-Anangu names given by nineteenth century European explorers.

Current management practices give cultural heritage of the traditional owners primacy in land management (Lennon 2005b). The management plan acknowledges that the place as a cultural landscape is fundamental to the success of the joint management arrangement for how traditional owners and the Australian government work as partners by combining Anangu natural and cultural management skills with conventional park practices. For example, traditional knowledge and practice to patch burn the country and to care for rock holes and other water sources have been adopted as a major ecological management tool in the park.

A more detailed operational guide for landscape management programmes enables traditional owners to reclaim their ways of living in the land, referred to as ‘keeping country straight’. It was compiled through a series of community workshops and provides for the conservation of the cultural values of specific sites, storylines, story places, including sacred sites, birthplaces, rock art, camping places, rockholes and places important in the recent Anangu and Piranpa (‘white fella’) history of the area. Equally importantly, this plan also provides for the conservation of the cultural landscape in which these places exist and from which they are inseparable. It requires both physical conservation actions and attention to the maintenance of cultural heritage values that enliven it. This will be achieved through training of young Anangu, involve-
ment of traditional owners who live outside the park, keeping the stories about places strong, providing privacy for ceremonies, explaining cultural restrictions to visitors and recording oral history connected to people’s early experiences in the park including the struggle to win back their land. In addition to this park-wide cultural landscape plan, there are plans for specific sites, such as Mutitjulu Kapi (Mutitjulu waterhole), associated rock art sites and the physical features of the Kuniya and Liru stories, which require actions for managing visitor use as well as for vegetation, fire, rock art and restoration of trampled areas and the waterhole (Lennon 2005a).

The Surin Islands off the west coast of Thailand were settled by a group of Moken maritime hunter-gatherers in the recent past after a history of several decades of frequenting the area. Because of their intact marine and forest resources the islands were declared a national park in 1981 and village settlements restricted, and Moken were denied the right to continue unrestricted traditional resource harvesting. Like other indigenous minorities, Moken are not recognised as Thai citizens, so cannot own land. They have no written language, but have a rich oral tradition and associated way of life and crafts (UNESCO 2001).

In 1997 the Surin Islands Project was initiated to develop approaches and options for integrating traditional knowledge with heritage management and tourism development. One outcome of the Project has been the preparation and production of Moken Primers (educational materials). The Primer is a collection of short texts about Moken lifestyle, legends and crafts, the intention of which is to enable Moken children and adults to learn through their own language written in Thai script with Thai translation and through their own cultural context. Essentially the diary tells the story, through children’s eyes, of how the Moken live with the sea and why they escaped the ravages of the 2004 tsunami (Taylor 2008).

ICOMOS and IUCN are active in dialogue with the World Heritage Committee (WHC) on outstanding universal values, in particular ‘how references to values of minorities, indigenous and/or local people were made or obviously omitted’ in nominations (UNESCO 2007, p. 3). Both agencies presented progress reports in 2007 to the WHC (ibid.). IUCN notes in its commentary that it ‘has long emphasised the importance of involving indigenous people in the planning and management of protected areas’ (ibid., p. 33), that ‘many natural World Heritage properties have very significant cultural and spiritual values for local communities and customary owners’ but that ‘in recent years, the natural World Heritage nominations of the States Parties only rarely reflect on local cultures, the rights of these cultures, and prospective conflicts between these cultures and international efforts for protection (ibid., p. 34).

IUCN’s stance is elucidated by Adrian Phillips in ‘Turning ideas on their head: new paradigm for protected areas’ (2003) and outlined in ‘Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas [ICCA]: A Bold New Frontier for Conservation’ (IUCN 2009). ICCA makes the point that indigenous peoples and local communities, both sedentary and mobile, have for millennia played a critical role in conserving a variety of natural environments and species. They have done this for a variety of purposes, economic as well as cultural, spiritual and aesthetic. It also highlights that there is a growing recognition of ICCAs and acknowledgement of their role in the conservation of biodiversity. Some governments have integrated them into their official Protected Area Systems. Communities are not limited to the IUCN’s Category V protected areas. A number of IUCN commissions have stressed within IUCN the need to recognise the importance of customary management in protected areas where consistent with conservation needs (see for example Kothari 2000’ 2008).
Key issues
Abstracting from the above discussion and in the light of almost two decades’ experience of World Heritage categories of cultural landscapes and Category V Protected Areas, a number of key issues attached to the cultural landscape construct can be highlighted:

- interface between culture and nature must be acknowledged;
- cultural diversity and people’s identity are expressed in their response to landscape;
- biodiversity often evolving through traditional practices in the landscape;
- sustainable land-use and living with the land;
- traditional knowledge systems;
- tangible values and intangible values, with the latter often expressed through ritual and lifestyles;
- human rights of Indigenous and local communities whose systems of looking at land and landscape will differ from western ideas embodied in World Heritage practice.

The merger of cultural–natural criteria at World Heritage assessment level has resulted in more Cultural Landscape nominations and inscriptions of those judged to have outstanding universal values, but there is still poor on-the-ground understanding of management of all the integrated values expressed in the landscape, as shown in the Sri Lankan case study and in older national park management which required expulsion of populations with traditional links to that land for their cultural and economic livelihood. It is hoped that the Cultural Landscape designation and understanding leads to sustainability in the area around the lived in, loved landscapes, as shown by the new approach in Japan.

Notes on contributors
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Cultural Mapping: Intangible Values and Engaging with Communities with Some Reference to Asia

Ken Taylor

Australian National University, Canberra

The worldwide interest in everyday culture, ways of living and doing things which underpin our sense of place is palpable. We have come to appreciate that there is an abundant culture out there with a rich array of meaning and significance. Nowhere is this more abundant than in Asia where outstanding examples of the continuous living/nourishing tradition of history are part of an intricate and beautiful tapestry of everyday life: the ordinarily sacred. This interest is reflected increasingly in our thinking on cultural heritage management. As with any concept or idea tools are needed to help us interpret, document, and present our cultural diversities. Cultural mapping has developed in response to this need. This paper reviews what is meant by ‘culture’ and cultural mapping to understand the notion of local distinctiveness and how mapping can be a tool to help local communities have their voice heard through their involvement in the mapping process.

Keywords culture, local distinctiveness, cultural landscape, ordinarily sacred, cultural diversity

Background

The places where we live are marked by distinctive characteristics. These are tangible, as in the physical patterns and components of our surroundings, and intangible as in the symbolic meanings and values we attach to places, and also to objects and traditional ways of expression as in language, art, song, dance, and so on. In this way, physical spaces, sites, and objects become places in the wider cultural landscape setting. They offer a past, are part of the present, and suggest future continuity. It is these places with their identity and meaning which give rise to local distinctiveness and sense of place of indigenous and local communities.

Over thirty years ago, Meinig suggested in the Preface to the set of essays, The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes,1 that studies and research into valuing ordinary landscapes were part of a continuing lively and expanding realm of interest.
This interest, both academic and professional, continues to the extent that valuing ordinary places has contemporary significance internationally. It is central to the attachment to, and celebration of, our history and sense of place. Notably, it is part of the developing appreciation worldwide of the way in which everyday people, ordinary communities, and minority groups value what have nicely been called ‘ordinarily sacred places’ by Linda Sexson. They are part of a reassessment of an abundant cultural life which has been taking place over the past twenty years or so. Central to this is an interest in the pursuits, concerns, and places that give meaning and significance to everyday life and which recognize our cultural diversity.

Coincidentally with growth of interest in the ordinary has been that momentous social advance of the second half of the twentieth century focusing on concern for the world’s cultural heritage and the mobilizing of global initiatives to protect it. Initially, heritage was seen to reside predominantly and physically in great monuments and sites — and predominantly monuments and sites of the classical world — as great works of art. During the 1990s a challenge emerged to the 1960s and 1970s concept of heritage focusing on great monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles, or historic sites with connections to the rich and famous. Here was the birth of a different value system with attention focused on such issues as cultural landscapes, living history and heritage, intangible values, and community involvement.

Intangible values

Critical to changes in attitude is the concept of intangible cultural heritage (ICH), recognizing that value does not reside solely in tangible/physical expressions of culture. This is particularly applicable in Asia, where, in my view, some of the most outstanding examples of the world’s living history and heritage reside. In the past, communities have evolved traditional management systems and values related to their places. There is a need to recognize these and encourage their continuity so that heritage resources can be sustained as change takes place and impacts such as mass domestic and international tourism gather pace. ICH ‘comprises the living expressions and traditions that communities, groups and individuals [. . .] receive from their ancestors and pass on to their descendants. Constantly recreated and providing its bearers with a sense of identity and continuity, this heritage is particularly vulnerable’. Identity is a keyword, crucial to a sense of place where the tangible (physical features and functions) and intangible (meaning or symbols) coalesce, as illustrated in Figure 1.

The increasing understanding of the significance of ICH has been underscored in no small way by the rising interest in anthropologically based study of culture and the concept that places with their tangible and intangible connections — cultural landscapes — and people are not part of a static text, but are part of a dynamic ‘process by which [. . .] identities are formed’. A coherent part of these changes in attitude is the understanding that people’s heritage consists of ‘various, complex and interdependent [cultural] expressions, revealed through social customs as well as physical heritage’. Critical to this dimension is appreciating that associated intangible values are an inseparable part of the remarkable diversity of our cultural expressions and their meanings. The quest for meaning in the global plurality of cultural
expressions has underpinned a deepening appreciation of the significance of social customs and systems of beliefs, including myths, thereby giving us a better appreciation of people’s identity, creativity, and diversity.9

ICH needs to be seen within a broad framework of ideas and practices that give shape and significance to tangible heritage. This is in line with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Istanbul Declaration of 2002,10 which states, inter alia, that:

- The multiple expressions of intangible cultural heritage constitute some of the fundamental sources of the cultural identity of the peoples and communities as well as a wealth common to the whole of humanity. Deeply rooted in local history and natural environment and embodied, among others, by a great variety of languages that translate as many world visions, they are an essential factor in the preservation of cultural diversity, in line with the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity.11
- The intangible cultural heritage constitutes a set of living and constantly recreated practices, knowledge and representations enabling individuals and communities, at all levels, to express their world conception through systems of values and ethical standards. Intangible cultural heritage creates among communities a sense of belonging and continuity, and is therefore considered as one of the mainsprings of creativity and cultural creation. From this point of view, an all-encompassing approach to cultural heritage should prevail, taking into account the dynamic link between the tangible and intangible heritage and their close interaction.
- The safeguarding and transmission of the intangible heritage is essentially based on the will and effective intervention of the actors involved in this heritage. In order to ensure the sustainability of this process, governments have a duty to take measures facilitating the democratic participation of all stakeholders.
• The extreme vulnerability of the intangible cultural heritage, which is threatened by disappearance or marginalisation, as a result inter alia of conflicts, intolerance, excessive merchandising, uncontrolled urbanisation or rural decay, requires that governments take resolute action respecting the context in which the intangible cultural heritage is expressed and disseminated.

How to safeguard tangible heritage — archaeology, historic cities, cultural landscapes, works of art, etc. — is clearly defined and understandable. In contrast, ICH, which consists of processes and practices, is fragile by its very nature and much more vulnerable. Its safeguarding requires collection, documentation and archiving of data and records, and protection and support of its bearers. It is critical, therefore, that indigenous and local community interests are upheld, supported, and respected, and central to this is the need to appreciate the wider meaning of the word ‘culture’.

What is culture?

Central to the ideology of interest in the ordinary is the construct of ‘culture’ itself. Raymond Williams in *Keywords* proposes three useful associations for the term: process of intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic development; a particular way of life relating to people, a period in history, or humanity in general in material and spiritual senses; and artistic activity. Donald Horne suggests that culture is ‘the repertoire of collective habits of thinking and acting that give particular meanings to existence’. In the 2002 ASEAN Declaration on Cultural Heritage “Culture” means the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, intellectual, emotional and material features that characterise a society or social group. It includes the arts and letters as well as human modes of life, value systems, creativity, knowledge systems, traditions and beliefs.

Within the definitions is a commonality of intent: that of understanding private memories of places and collective memory as a shared view of the world around us. The concept is inclusive. It involves our traditions, values, and ideas and the sense of identity which flow from these for the places we know and how we interpret them. These are the places which give meaning and causality to life, continuity, and community connection. They are part of a shared heritage and fundamental to the notion of ‘cultural sustainability’. Cultural sustainability is to do with connecting people with their environment and heritage — their cultural landscape — and to be part of looking after it, conserving, planning, and developing it sustainably in ways that add social and economic value for the community. This is the essence of cultural mapping. Through research involving diversity of communities, cultural resources are identified and recorded. These include the physical components and intangible aspects relating to memory, meaning, and values.

Mapping (recording) culture

Culture can be seen as not limited to what is collectively referred to as the arts, including such things as painting, sculpture, music, dance, language, traditions, whether these be in the realm of so-called high art/high aesthetics or the equally important vernacular arts. While including the arts, ‘culture’ is a holistic idea of the way we do things collectively at local, regional, or national society levels. It
is ourselves on display, expressed simply but eloquently by the Australian author, David Malouf, with the words: ‘It is ourselves we are making out there’.16 The extraordinary cultural diversity around the world presents us with a rich heritage to be cherished and valued. Much of this fuels the mass tourist industry in the form of cultural tourism where we travel to see and experience other cultural forms and ways of doing things.

A 1994 monograph Mapping Culture proposes that:

Cultural mapping involves a community identifying and documenting local cultural resources. Through this research cultural elements are recorded — the tangibles like galleries, craft industries, distinctive landmarks, local events and industries, as well as the intangibles like memories, personal histories, attitudes and values [...] Cultural mapping is a way of defining what culture means to the community, identifying the elements of culture that add value (both social and economic), recording, preserving or building on these elements in new and creative ways. Each cultural mapping project will be as individual as the community it reflects (author’s emphasis).17

The UNESCO Bangkok website18 recognizes cultural mapping as a crucial tool and technique in preserving the world’s intangible and tangible cultural assets. Essentially, the idea of ‘mapping culture’ arises from a social, economic, or cultural need at the local or national level. Although it is not an end in itself, cultural mapping serves as a tool and methodology to answer this need.

Relevant to UNESCO is the mobilization of existing tools and instruments as a fundamental step in its general objective of safeguarding cultural diversity. Cultural mapping, as one such instrument, embraces a wide range of techniques and activities that range from community-based participatory approaches to identifying and documenting local cultural resources and activities to the use of innovative and sophisticated information tools like Geographical Information Systems (GIS). At any rate, collected data on cultural assets can be represented through a variety of formats like geographic maps, graphs, databases, and others. From this, a comprehensive view of a country’s cultural resources is acquired. Consequently, the documented data serve as a prerequisite to developing a sensitive national strategy and programme, taking into account the cultural heritage and respecting the cultural diversity of a country.

I suspect that there are practical problems for some professionals with the terms ‘map’ or ‘mapping’ in the process of cultural mapping, given they have clear cartographic associations for many people. We perhaps may explain the process of mapping as recording data which can be done in a number of ways including geographically (spatially through maps/plans), by film, videos, CD ROM, brochures (as in heritage trails and tracks), tourism strategies, artworks, plays and songs, textiles, urban improvement, and/or environmental planning. So, a cultural map is a way of helping people find ways of expressing themselves and their sense of place and belonging.

Within the field of cultural heritage management the majority of studies and projects we undertake where local communities participate essentially will form a version of a cultural map, that is, we are mapping culture. To recognize a fundamental goal of cultural mapping, however, studies and projects should help ‘communities recognise, celebrate and support cultural diversity for economic, social and regional development’.19
In places like Asia, for example, this has special relevance particularly because of the way in which traditional rural and urban communities are in close contact with their cultural roots and places. There is an inextricable link between people and their places and the idea of living history. In turn, this also has relevance to cultural tourism management and planning and the conduct of cultural tourism where visitors, national and international, go to places because of their cultural history and sense of the stream of time. The validity of the significance of acknowledging local and indigenous traditions and knowledge systems is recognized by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in its *Cultural Tourism Charter* (2002), particularly in one of its objectives: ‘To facilitate and encourage the tourism industry to promote and manage tourism in ways that respect and enhance the heritage and living cultures of host communities’.

**Community involvement and empowerment**

UNESCO has also proposed that:

> Cultural mapping involves the representation of landscapes in two or three dimensions from the perspective of indigenous and local peoples. It is potentially an important tool for UNESCO in its efforts to help Member States and civil society create platforms for intercultural dialogue and increase awareness of cultural diversity as a resource for peace building, good governance, fighting poverty, adaptation to climate change and maintaining sustainable management and use of natural resources.  

In addition to finding ways in which local communities may be involved in the interpretation and presentation of places — their places — we should, through cultural mapping techniques, be encouraging communities in activities that include producing histories, videos, CD ROMs, and artworks; heritage trails and routes brochures; ideas for historic urban area protection; involving school children in mapping stories of how they understand their sense of place; and linking monuments and archaeological remains to their cultural landscape and traditional ways of life which help put the monuments and remains into a cultural context. Connected in this way, cultural mapping and cultural maps comprise an indispensable tool for informing government agencies involved in such processes as environmental planning and tourism of the prerequisite of ensuring the participation of local communities in the land-use planning process.

All too often, local people are divorced from the presentation and visitor experience of places, whether they are ordinary everyday places or national icons. It is fine to have a system of licensed tourist guides/operators, but what about local people and their engagement with tourists? Can the existing system be extended from selling trinkets, artefacts, or T-shirts from stalls (artefacts etc., in fact, which all too often are not even made locally)? This separation, for example, is evident at many World Heritage sites. Angkor is an interesting example, although it should be stressed that it is by no means unique or atypical.

**Angkor**

Most domestic and international tourists’ impressions of Angkor are highly likely to pivot on selected architectural and archaeological forms, the immediate physical
space around them, and the tourist drive. It represents presentation of heritage as separate dots on a map isolated from their cultural and intellectual setting: their cultural landscape. The following is the brief description given on the UNESCO World Heritage List website:

Angkor is one of the most important archaeological sites in South-East Asia. Stretching over some 400 sq. km, including forested area, Angkor Archaeological Park contains the magnificent remains of the different capitals of the Khmer Empire, from the 9th to the 15th century. These include the famous Temple of Angkor Wat and, at Angkor Thom, the Bayon Temple with its countless sculptural decorations. UNESCO has set up a wide-ranging programme to safeguard this symbolic site and its surroundings.23

Tim Winter reflects that:

One of the defining features of World Heritage Listing was Angkor’s spatial, legal and political isolation from its immediate surroundings [...] This often results in the visitor only travelling to Cambodia to see the World Heritage Site of Angkor, rather than visiting the country itself [and] typically make little connection between Angkor and Cambodia.24

This is not to deny the importance of structural preservation within an architectural and archaeological imperative. But it does conceive thoughts of Angkor as material heritage of the ancient past, something to be marvelled at, but divorced from the vibrant idea of living history and heritage. It is a commodification of heritage which privileges things rather than people, where perhaps ‘restoration is the commerce of illusion’.25 The illusion is that, behind and surrounding the monuments, is a living landscape where people continue a way of life linked with the people who created Angkor a thousand years ago and prior to that to the Pre-Angkorian period settlement. Within this view of Angkor is the enduring survival of intangible values and authenticity of traditions and techniques, location and setting, spirit and feeling as set out in the Nara Document on Authenticity.26

Richard Engelhardt’s description of Angkor aptly catches the breathtaking extent of what Angkor really is about:

Commanding a strategic location on the uppermost tip of Cambodia’s great Tonle Sap lake, the ruins of the Angkor Empire expand north, east and west from the shores of the lake up to the sacred Kulen mountain plateau. This entire 5,000 square kilometre site, once the location of one of the world’s largest metropolitan areas, is a relic cultural landscape — an environment which was intensively engineered by human activity over time to suit the Empire’s changing temporal needs.27

Here we see how the landscape is a window into the past that continues into the present: a series of layers through time bearing testimony, if we but spend time to read it, to how the cultural landscape has been shaped, why it has been shaped in the way it is, and who was involved.

How do the local residents who live and work within the Angkor landscape see and value the landscapes in which they live? What would they like visitors to understand and learn about their place? Cambodian domestic tourists are visiting Angkor in ever-increasing numbers. What are their views on how this deeply symbolic icon of Cambodian national and cultural identity should be presented to them and to the
rest of the global community? These are critical questions which need to be addressed concerning the interpretation and presentation of Angkor.

The scope at Angkor for a number of cultural mapping inputs involving locals on site is palpable. While many local traditions and historic places are disappearing or crumbling at unprecedented rates, a remarkable opportunity exists at Angkor to involve locals in mapping resources that are meaningful to them. Local people are the key holders of intangible knowledge and tangible assets and they are capable of determining the types of cultural mapping exercises that are relevant and helping to produce them. In this way the invisible may become visible, providing real insights into cultural diversity, history, identity, and knowledge. Here is the very essence of cultural sustainability. From this approach could come economic benefit and enhancement of a sense of pride in traditional knowledge systems. In a visit to Angkor in February 2006 a stop at a local community producing palm sugar was instructive: it showed me the potential for engaging visitors in traditional activities that are connected with the story of Angkor in its wider sense of the interaction between people and place over many centuries. Here is a golden opportunity for a video or CD ROM for visitors to buy.

### Cultural and biological diversity and cultural mapping

The 2001 UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity acknowledges the fundamental role of the protection of human rights of indigenous people, including respecting traditional knowledge and its contribution, for example, to environmental protection and management of natural resources, and the synergy possible between modern science and local knowledge. Parallel with this is the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity, which acknowledges that cultural systems, practices that favour natural resource management, and value and knowledge systems of indigenous and local peoples can be role models for helping shift dangerous patterns in modern over-consumption of natural resources.

There has bloomed, therefore, an increasing appreciation of the inextricable links between culture, nature, and indigenous knowledge systems, which formed, for example, a cornerstone of UNESCO’s landmark decision in 1992 to recognize three cultural landscape categories for World Heritage purposes. This initiative:

Enhanced the recognition of outstanding linkages between nature and culture, people and places, and between the intangible and tangible. It also provided a new focus on key areas of biological and cultural diversity, including sustainable use. At the same time innovations were introduced with the acceptance of traditional custodianship and customary land tenure in World Heritage protection.

It has enhanced understanding of the importance of indigenous knowledge systems and was, for example, a major theme of a UNESCO/International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) 2005 international symposium on Conserving Cultural and Biological Diversity: The Role of Sacred Natural Sites and Cultural Landscapes.

UNESCO avers that cultural mapping is ‘an ideal tool for elucidating information about landscapes, sites, and territories from the perspective of local and indigenous peoples’, stressing the need to combine participatory mapping techniques with
cultural mapping. In this regard, it is difficult to see how cultural mapping can be seen to be successful without involving local community participation as in the Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) English role model ‘common ground’. Developed in the early 1970s, common ground helps people — local communities — to find ways of getting under the surface of places that they value. It is in essence an evolving celebration of the sense of place with a focus on local distinctiveness.

In relation to indigenous people and local communities, a significant advantage of cultural mapping is that it may be used to bring to the attention of dominant decision makers (state, influential social groups, private sector, etc.) the voice of subordinated or marginalized groups which otherwise usually would not be heard, or more to the point, not listened to. Within this process of intercultural dialogue it is vital that indigenous knowledge is not merely collected and documented, but is respected and revitalized through mapping techniques.

**Two case studies**

**Nepal**

The need for intercultural dialogue and initiation of a cultural mapping exercise with indigenous participation is highlighted in a review by Lhakpa Sherpa of The Mountain Institute, Nepal, on the topic of beyuls in ‘Sacred hidden valleys and ecosystem conservation in the Himalayas’.

The popular notion of Shangri-la is believed to have been inspired by the concept of beyuls which are isolated, tranquil Himalayan valleys suitable for spiritual retreat. According to Himalayan tradition, Padmasambhava brought Buddhism to the Himalayas and set aside many Himalayan valleys as future sanctuaries and hid them to be discovered by people in times of conflict, famine, disease, destruction and threats to spiritual freedom. In addition to their status as sacred valleys, beyuls are endowed with abundant natural resources including pure water, diverse ecosystems, and fertile soils. Growing external influences have compromised indigenous, time-tested wisdom and respect for the land. In response, many beyuls have been designated as parks and protected areas to conserve biological diversity and human cultures.

Lhakpa proposes the biggest challenge is that the power of the beyuls is waning and this intangible concept is vulnerable under the influences of globalization, tourism, domination, assimilation, and education. He also affirms that the incorporation of beyul into modern protected areas (i.e. national parks), without adequate recognition of their importance, is another problem. The ancient beyul tradition and modern protection both aim at biodiversity conservation and improved human livelihoods, but he tellingly remarks that their implementation tools differ. National park protection depends on powerful national legislation and global scientific justifications. But, while traditional residents have accepted protecting wild flora and fauna because it is in line with their own belief systems, managers, policy makers, and scientists have been slow in recognizing the value of time-honoured traditions in biodiversity conservation. Similarly, he suggests modern infrastructure ignores sensitivity to the sacred nature of the land and is in danger of overwhelming traditional concepts, also pointing to the need for modern education to integrate local culture into its system.
Lhakpa suggests that beyul and other sacred natural sites can be an asset for ecosystem conservation and lead to conservation of significant intangible cultural values. He proposes a series of actions involving strengthening involvement of local people with greater recognition of indigenous knowledge; physical surveys; collection of oral and written evidence; documentation and publication of material; and dissemination of information to local schools and communities to rekindle the spirit and pride in beyul. In essence, what is suggested is a cultural mapping exercise. A current project ‘Building Livelihoods along Beyul Trails’, supported by The Ford Foundation, is addressing these points with the following activities:

- Researching and documenting information on culture, spirituality, and the environment to generate learning materials and share information through workshops and publications.
- Developing interpretive facilities at Sagamartha National Park Gate for dissemination to visiting tourists.
- Developing a documentary film to educate outsiders and improve the self-esteem of local people in relation to their important cultural values and belief systems.
- Organizing regular cultural awareness programmes for visitors and local communities.
- Conserving the endangered Sherpa language by compiling dictionaries and illustrated publications as learning materials as well as training indigenous instructors to teach scripts and language in schools.
- Developing tourism home-stay programmes and cultural tourism activities in isolated and traditional villages to improve the livelihoods of economically marginalized communities.
- Establishing a multi-purpose mountain centre in collaboration with local and international partners to provide a permanent capacity building facility for local people in areas of cultural tourism, mountaineering, safety, sustainable farming, and other enterprise opportunities.
- Providing sub-grants to monasteries to develop income-generating opportunities and to restore traditional homes for tourism accommodation.

**Thailand**

One recent and beautifully illustrative example of a charming cultural map involving indigenous knowledge through the eyes of children is a 2008 diary which includes words and pictures by Moken children (‘Sea Gypsies from the Surin Islands’) telling the legend of the traditional relationship with the sea. The children’s words are written in Thai with an English translation and illustrated with colourful, enchanting images. The diary is called *Tale Diary 2008: Morgan Folk Tale.*

The Surin Islands off the west coast of Thailand were settled by a group of Moken maritime hunter-gatherers in the recent past after a history of several decades of frequenting the area. Because of their intact marine and forest resources, the islands were declared a national park in 1981, village settlements were restricted, and the Moken denied the right to continue unrestricted traditional resource harvesting. Like other indigenous minorities, the Moken are not recognized as Thai citizens, so cannot own land. They have no written language, but have a rich oral tradition and associated way of life and crafts.
In 1997, the Surin Islands Project was initiated and a report issued in 2001. It developed approaches and options for integrating traditional knowledge with heritage management and tourism development. One outcome of the project has been the preparation and production of Moken primers (educational materials). The primer is a collection of short texts about Moken lifestyle, legends, and crafts, the intention of which is to enable Moken children and adults to learn through their own language written in Thai script with Thai translation and through their own cultural context.

The 2008 diary is an innovative approach to cultural mapping. Essentially, the diary tells the story, through children’s eyes, of how the Moken live with the sea and why they escaped the ravages of the 2004 tsunami. As they are keenly aware of the sea, the Moken in some areas knew the tsunami that struck on 26 December 2004 was coming, and managed to preserve many lives. The beautifully written and graphic images from the diary, as told and drawn by the children, represent global intercultural dialogue at its best.

Conclusion
Much of the critical input into cultural mapping projects focuses on the inextricable link between tangible and intangible values. Art and craft activities, design activities, popular and mass culture, performing arts, religion, food, everyday living practices and traditional knowledge systems are part of any community’s storehouse of intangible values and meanings related to places, objects, and ways of doing. Cultural mapping offers a way of teasing these out and celebrating local distinctiveness and authenticity.
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12 Bouchenaki.  
13 Raymond Williams, Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society, revised edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 87–93.  
15 Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), ASEAN Declaration on Cultural Heritage, Bangkok
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ABSTRACT

Today, for the first time in human history, more than half of the world's population lives in cities. According to UN-Habitat, within two decades, five billion people will live in cities. Coincidentally, within the field of cultural heritage conservation, increasing international interest and attention over the past two decades has been focused on urban areas. This is timely because pressure for economic development and for the prioritising of engagement with the global economy has accompanied rapid urbanisation. In many societies, pressures for economic development have privileged modernisation efforts leading to the loss of traditional communities. Accompanying this has been a concentration in the field of urban conservation on famous buildings and monuments rather than seeing cities as communities of people with values and belief systems that are reflected in the city's overall setting: its cultural landscape. This paper explores alternative ways of seeing cities particularly through the Historic Urban Landscape paradigm.
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Introduction

Current urbanization policies often ignore the importance of cultural heritage preservation and promotion and the great potential of creativity in addressing social, environmental and economic urbanization challenges. How does culture weigh in addressing urbanization challenges today? (United Nations Conference on Trade & Development [UNCTAD], 2013)

The focus of this paper is an overview of the emergence of the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) paradigm and its evolving pivotal role in the discourse on historic urban conservation. Linked to this focus is how the concept of cultural landscape and associated meanings over the last 40 years has developed (Taylor, 2012) and, notably, become closely associated with townscapes. The cultural landscape idea is pivotal to HUL's philosophical foundations: this is the central theme of the paper. Embedded in HUL is the recognition of the layering of significances and values in historic cities, deposited over time by different communities under different contexts (Bandarin & van Oers, 2012). It is an approach that relates closely to the cultural landscape concept of layers through time replete with social meanings. Cities may, therefore, be categorised as a type of cultural landscape (Taylor, 2015). Given the nature and themes of other papers in this issue of the journal, and in the interests of synergy, two focal points to my review are, firstly: conceptualising the notion of cultural landscape as a repository of social history and community values, secondly: the challenge of dealing with HUL in culturally diverse societies.
The cultural landscape model: human values and identity

A common theme in studies of sense of place and identity is human attachment to landscape and how we find identity in landscape and place (Taylor & Lennon, 2012, p. 1). Landscape has been the focus of scholarly work by cultural geographers for the past 40 years. Cultural geographers have focused on different aspects of how human identity attaches to landscape. Nevertheless, a shared thread in their work is distinguishable, that is, ways of reading the landscape teasing out how humans creatively relate to the (cultural) landscape. In this humanistic sense landscape for Cosgrove (1984) is not what we see, but a way of seeing. Meinig’s aphorism that ‘landscape is an attractive, important, and ambiguous term […] that encompasses an ensemble of ordinary features which constitute an extraordinarily rich exhibit of the course and character of any society’ (Meinig, 1979, pp. 1–2) still holds true, as does the rider that ‘landscape is defined by our vision but interpreted by our minds’ (Meinig, 1979, p. 3). Geographical scholarly endeavour has continued in this vein (e.g., Wylie, 2007).

The cultural landscape paradigm can be seen to offer a trajectory of thinking relevant to the historic urban environment, not least because we are dealing primarily with vernacular culture where landscape study is a form of social history. Such discourse in turn supports the notion that views landscape as a cultural construct reflecting human values. The significance of the cultural landscape concept in the urban sphere is that it allows us to see and understand the approach to urban conservation that concentrates on individual buildings as ‘devoid of the socio-spatial context … contributes to a deterioration of the [wider] urban physical fabric’ (Punekar, 2006, p. 110). Greffe reinforces this urban landscape way of thinking as contrary to seeing the city as a closed view of architectural wonders of historic cities, but rather seeing the ‘… postmodern city where we are looking for feelings and emotions. The landscape then becomes an experience’ (Greffe, 2008, p. 1). For me as a cultural geographer and planner the move into landscape linked HUL is welcome, not least in that it builds on the pioneering work of distinguished geographers in urban studies, including Donald Meinig, Wilbur Zilenski, Fred Kniffen, John B. Jackson, Peirce Lewis, Arthur E. Smailes and Edward Relph.

Central to a paradigm shift emphasising the need for a cultural landscape approach in historic urban area management is the inalienable role of human values. A value-based approach to heritage conservation, including urban conservation, addressing intangible heritage should be de rigueur. It is an approach that is, for example, central to Australian practice not least through the document that guides Australian thinking and practice, The Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS, 2013) with its reference particularly to historic, social and spiritual values. Integral is the recognition of associations between people and places where ‘Associations mean the special connections that exist between people and a place’ (Article 1.15, p. 3) and the explanatory note that ‘Associations may include social or spiritual values and cultural responsibilities for a place’ (Australia ICOMOS, 2013).

Punekar (2006, p. 111) makes a strong case for adopting a cultural landscape approach:

A cultural landscape approach enables diverse communities to be seen as part of that landscape. That is, cultural, historical, and political conditions affecting contemporary communities are part of the process of human engagement with the place. The cultural landscape approach can be a means of reuniting fragmented approaches to valuing and constructing the environments we inhabit, a means of overcoming distinctions between historic environment and new development, nature and culture, built heritage and context.

Inherent in this mode of thinking is the role of landscape change that takes place over time with changing values in culturally diverse communities. Landscape is not static, it reflects changing human ideologies over time (Biger, 1992). In the urban landscape, it is critical that we are able to manage change so that historic cities, as they change in response to changing values, reflect their human history but do not become merely designated historic zones with a tight boundary around them devoid of a sense of lived-in places. The example of Zhuijiajiao quoted below is a case in point.
Historic Urban Landscape

A major initiative in the field of conservation of urban areas, associated with change that is taking place in the world’s cities, is the concept of the HUL. It was first set out at a UNESCO conference in Vienna, May 2005 (UNESCO, 2005a), and advocated in the Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture—Managing the Historic Urban Landscape. It followed concerns expressed by the World Heritage Committee at its 2003 meeting about impacts of modern developments on historic urban areas and compatibility with the protection of their heritage values. This was particularly so with its proposition of the HUL notion as a tool to reinterpret the values of urban heritage, and its indication of the need to identify new approaches and new tools for urban conservation.

Notably, The Vienna Memorandum was pivotal to the Declaration on the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes by the General Assembly of UNESCO in September 2005 (UNESCO, 2005b). ‘The Vienna Memorandum [was] not intended as a finalised document that could guide urban development and conservation for decades to come—it represented a consensus product, established with the involvement of various professional entities, to serve as a catalyst for opening up the debate’ (van Oers, 2010, p. 8). In this context, its thinking and intention can be seen to pave the way for reviewing debate on a shift to new urban conservation approaches. It ‘hints at a vision of human ecology and signals a change towards sustainable development and a broader concept of urban space suggested as ‘landscape’—not so much the designed and evolved landscapes that are familiar to most conservation specialists, but rather associative landscapes or ‘landscapes of the imagination’ (van Oers, 2010, p. 8).


HUL is a mindset, an understanding of the city, or parts of the city, as an outcome of natural, cultural and socio-economic processes that construct it spatially, temporally, and experientially. It is as much about buildings and spaces, as about rituals and values that people bring into the city. This concept encompasses layers of symbolic significance, intangible heritage, perception of values, and interconnections between the composite elements of the historic urban landscape, as well as local knowledge including building practices and management of natural resources. Its usefulness resides in the notion that it incorporates a capacity for change.

The memorandum gave impetus to thinking already internationally underway in the field of cultural heritage conservation, that of envisaging cities as cultural landscapes. Not that this is anything new to the body of knowledge in cultural geography as I have outlined above. Significantly, it offered an invitation for a dialogue among a broad cross-section of the community and between the disciplines on the issue of contemporary development in historic cities. By using ritual and experience as starting points for understanding the significance of historic urban spaces, conservation practitioners will be forced to challenge the legacy of twentieth century approaches’ (van Oers, 2010, p. 8).

Bandarin and van Oers (2012) in situating HUL reflect on how during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, historic urban areas were transformed through sanitation improvements and development schemes of the time and affected by the architectural and urban planning principles of the Modernist Movement that eschewed urban conservation. Gradually, a shift has taken place over the last 50 year period involving development of international and national levels of best practice supporting heritage conservation. As a result, we have seen the emergence of the idea of conservation of the historic city as a recognised heritage type and internationalisation of the concept of urban conservation that transcends merely conservation of individual buildings or ensembles purely on architectural grounds.

Bandarin and van Oers explain that historic urban conservation has become a specialised field, but whilst focusing on sectors of the city, it has become isolated from the management of urban processes. This has led to an understanding that revision is needed to facilitate an integrated view of urban management, where historic conservation is part of the process of management of urban development and urban renewal. It is a process also where cultural contexts are recognised in the sense that different cultures have different value systems. It is such thinking and shifts that informed...

Challenging orthodoxy

Julian Smith nicely refers to the orthodox approach being based on the ‘aesthetic bias’ approach to urban conservation where the architect and architectural historian are the key professionals (Smith, 2015, p. 184) and the ‘antiquarian approach’ which sees ‘historic places as remnant artefacts from earlier civilizations’ (Smith, 2015, p. 183). He contrasts these with the newly emerging twenty-first century concept of what he calls the ‘ecological bias: This is where the focus is ‘not so much on the object (whether considered of archaeological, commemorative or aesthetic interest) but rather on these objects in relationship to each other and to the people who shape them and use them. It is a dynamic rather than static concept, because ecological systems are not stagnant, although at their best they achieve some form of equilibrium and resilience’ (Smith, 2015, p. 185). This approach is fundamental to the HUL paradigm, in that the HUL is both a thing and a process: ‘It is a place understood through … a multitude of layered experiences. It cannot be mapped simply by measurement and observation. It has to be mapped through experience, and various cultural groups may map the same place in different ways’ (Smith, 2015, p. 186). Smith explains it as the ecology of a place at work, and as he posits, cultural landscape theory and practice exist within this ecological bias. For my part, I would qualify the word ‘ecology’ with ‘human’ to distinguish it from ecology as the study of the natural world.

Of note in this discourse is the reference to people who shape places, particularly understanding the role of people who experience, live, work and recreate in urban places. This notion is commensurate with the idea of layers through time inherent in cultural landscapes and reflecting values of people who inhabit them. Hence, such places are repositories of social history and communities as Hayden so elegantly explores in her book on urban landscapes as public history (Hayden, 1997). What we see are abrupt challenges to the long held orthodoxy of the focus of urban conservation that has historically been on architectural fabric and planning ensembles with an emphasis all too often on famous buildings or monuments. There are parallels with Laurajane Smith’s challenge to the idea and practice of what she terms the authorised heritage discourse: ‘a discourse that privileges expert values and knowledge about the past and its material manifestations, and dominates and regulates professional heritage practice’ (Smith, 2006, p. 4). She compares this with an understanding of heritage ‘as a discourse concerned with negotiation and regulation of social meanings and practices associated with the creation and recreation of “identity”’ (Smith, 2006, p. 5). Inherent in this thinking is that of involving communities in discussions on heritage and future planning and management actions as participants in the process.

The culmination of thinking on new international approaches to urban conservation came in 2011, with the UNESCO General Conference Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) (UNESCO, 2011). This instrument recognised the layering of significances and values in historic cities deposited over time by different communities under different contexts. It is an idea that is succinctly summarised by the comment in the UNESCO publication New life for historic cities (UNESCO, 2013b, p. 5):

Urban heritage is of vital importance for our cities—now and in the future. Tangible and intangible urban heritage are sources of social cohesion, factors of diversity and drivers of creativity, innovation and urban regeneration. The Recommendation recognises the challenges of urbanisation today, as well as the importance of cities as engines of growth and centres of innovation and creativity that provide opportunities for employment and education. The Recommendation identified urban heritage, including its tangible and intangible components in their natural context, as a key resource in enhancing the liveability of urban areas and fostering economic development as well as social cohesion.
Changing cities

The rapid changes taking place throughout cities globally all too often amount to an attack on urban variety and vibrant streetscapes that reflect interesting and traditional social patterns. This phenomenon is particularly relevant in Asian cities where so much of the traditional life is experienced on the streets (Figure 1) and from which I draw some examples. Comments on the place examples are based on my first-hand experience from site visits involved with related heritage work and interviews with local managers and local communities.

A topical example of the type of urban area reflecting the characteristics of a lively and thriving Asian city area central to the HUL paradigm, one that is not on any heritage registers or lists, is that En Ling Lu Urban Transformation (Renovation) Project area, West Guangzhou, China. The En Ning Lu project area is part of the Guangzhou Xi Guang Area (the West District of Guangzhou). Whilst the city of Guangzhou has a history of 2000 years, its West district is a relatively modern urban landscape. Its foundation dates back about 100 years, but many streets and buildings date from the 1920s and 1930s when there were major socio-economic changes in the city. Some changes of population and diversity of residents have occurred over the last 30 years or so when China has experienced major economic reform and developments. Nevertheless, it remains a vibrant community, busy and thriving with an active street life (Figure 2).

In a project first officially announced in Guangzhou’s newspapers in September 2007, the area was marked to face major changes and demolition of dwellings in a dangerous and dilapidated condition. Since then it has become a much debated subject that has sparked many discussions, arguments, protests and news reports as people have become more sensitive to their property rights leading them to question governmental planning departments on issues of resident relocation, property value evaluation and other urban planning issues. Originally planned to proceed for the Asian Games held in Guangzhou in 2010, the project appears currently to be in a holding pattern and has been delayed after talks with developers and need to attract investment.

The future of the area is currently the focus of further discussion because, in terms of governmental efforts and procedure, it is common practice nowadays to include advisory group(s) formed by university professors and industry experts. Interestingly, some residents indicate they want the area to be retained and there are also voluntary groups and websites organised by enthusiastic individuals such as students.

Figure 1. Tha Tian shop houses Bangkok (photo courtesy of Tiamsoon Sirisrisak).
and caring residents. Some have focused on photography and documentation and some others on collection of furniture and old material evidence of the history of the area. This kind of action is undertaken by voluntary and community associations in China, often under difficult conditions. Notably however, one local newspaper (New Express 新快报) has featured articles on the area and its community spirit, speaking out in support of residents and expressing critical comment on planning proposals. Retention of such areas in Chinese cities does raise questions of cost of upgrading residences and who pays given the factor of private ownership. One way of addressing and exploring the resilience and adaptability of local traditions, place identities and cultural richness is through the practice of urban conservation and identification of potential urban conservation areas within the boundaries of the HUL paradigm and the limits of acceptable change which may be appropriate. This was a topic explored at a roundtable meeting in Guangzhou in December 2014.²

It has been suggested that the more distinctive and special a city is, the more chances it has to succeed (Askew & Logan, 1994; Knight, 1989 in Yuen, 2005). Yuen (2005, p. 197) points out that success in this context, whilst measured tangibly through economic values and capital flows, ‘has led to a greater appreciation of the role heritage can play in urban development, whether through sustaining built and lived heritage, encouraging and investing in heritage industries or recognising the impact heritage plays in defining identity, generating civic pride and fostering empowerment’. Allied to an understanding of the benefits of urban heritage conservation will be enhancing liveability and place identity and also greater appreciation of the advisability of input from local communities in the process of urban renewal. Essentially, this is the HUL approach with its focus on urban conservation and localisation, ‘emphasising local solutions to national problems and reaffirming the conviction that urban liveability requires place-based strategies’ (Yuen, 2005, p. 198).

Singapore is an interesting, if somewhat unexpected, example of using urban heritage successfully, although criticism of gentrification effects is now being raised. In a remarkable about-face in the mid-1980s from a demolish and rebuild approach to city planning, there has been a greater effort to reinforce and integrate past heritage with present developments, with a major turning point being a 1989 planning act amendment (Yuen, 2005). This saw the appointment of a conservation authority and designation of conservation areas with associated conservation requirements and guidelines. The number of identified conservation areas has increased to more than 20 (total area 751 ha). Many of
these are interpreted and presented for tourist purposes through attractive, informative trail brochures such as for Jelan Besar (Figure 3). Involving historic shophouse areas being saved from demolition and specific restoration guidelines with information for owners to help protect authenticity, these Singapore examples, demonstrate how change and adaptation towards improved environmental character underscore how the past should serve the future. Architecturally, old and new combine to present a lively sense of socially vibrant urban life, rather than preservation of old areas virtually as museum pieces. The variety of old and new buildings, including high-rise framing skyline views, adds diversity and interest.

Nevertheless—and ironically—the very success of the Singapore examples raises the spectre of gentrification changes articulated in a newspaper opinion piece ‘Do Singapore neighbourhoods risk death by cappuccino?’ (Pow, 2015). Henderson (2012) examines Singapore government policies to show how heritage in neighbourhoods like Jelan Besar are seen to be multifunctional, not least as a tourist resource and economic growth driver giving rise to conflicts between such growth and heritage conservation. The enigma here, of course, is that of the changing city as an engine of growth and the views, values and aspirations of local people. In this context, we need to be mindful of the fact that contrary to received wisdom of experts and sometimes scholars who may criticise gentrification, local communities may see things differently and welcome change that brings economic opportunity. Such is the case at the World Heritage site of Luang Prabang where Berliner (2012) addresses the idea of multiple and conflicting nostalgias between foreign heritage experts and international tourists looking from a ‘Western romanticised perception of Buddhism and colonial perceptions of other people’s traditional life ... the charme nostalgique’ in contrast to perceptions and values of local people. Many of the latter rent their houses in the old centre to foreigners and happily go to live in the suburbs in what they see as better modern housing. What experts describe as ‘kitsch’—pane glass and new windows, flower pots, fences and lacquer—are widely adored by locals. Architectural and buildings regulations in place to control local people and what they can or cannot do—because locals are perceived as a threat to good preservation of Luang Prabang’s ambience—are ignored. Underneath all this, Berliner points to how local people insist that tradition is not changing, custom is not disappearing, nor do they long for the world that some foreign experts and tourists lament has disappeared.

Figure 3. Jalan Besar, Singapore (photo by Ken Taylor).
Another case is the canal town of Zhujiajiao near Shanghai where changes have taken place, but they are changes that can be seen not to be simply touristically fashionable vernacularism. Such towns have rich histories, traditional architecture and daily life that make them distinctly and unmistakably Chinese. Notably, the local community consists of people who have traditionally lived here for generations; people who want to continue to live here because it is a community, not merely a population. It is a cogent example of changing social values where tourism now substantially helps the local economy, but where changes have not destroyed the place from the point of view of the traditional setting of vernacular buildings and canals and from the point of view of intangible values (people’s lives, community feeling and sense of place). Significantly, the place still belongs to them and they belong to it (Figure 4). In one building, you may catch a glimpse of local aged persons’ group playing mahjong. Heritage conservation planning addressed the views and feelings of local people who wanted to stay in their community: here is the essence of the city as cultural landscape.

Conclusion

Internationally, within the field of cultural heritage conservation, increasing interest and attention over the past two decades has been focused on urban areas. This is timely given that the UN estimates that over 50% of the world’s population live in urban areas and that this will increase to about 70% by 2050. The emergence of the HUL paradigm is, in my view, a discerning initiative as is the use of the word ‘landscape’ as the operative noun. It seizes the dynamic conceptual meaning of landscape related to layers of human experiences in urban settings. Here, there is a cross reference to one aspect of modern urban cultural geographic scholarship, that of ‘straddling the material and immaterial worlds’ (Lees, 2002).

One may therefore legitimately ask why the preponderance of published works on landscape scholarship lionise rural settings? Looking through issues of Landscape Research for the last few years shows only a handful of papers remotely dealing with urban landscape, its realities and its meanings and how these may change over time. I remark on this not as a negative criticism, but rather from the point of view of missed research opportunities.
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HUL opens up a context for a much-needed dialogue with city planners, urban designers, legal instruments and governments (national and local) on how layered cultural experiences influence perceptions of the urban landscape and why these are important in urban renewal outcomes. It is important in this dialogue that it is understood that the concept of urban cultural landscape heritage conservation and the reality of economic and political influences on city development and expansion are not necessarily mutually exclusive, acceding that change to city form will be inevitable. Critical to HUL is managing this change, recognising urban heritage is of vital importance for cities because it constitutes a key resource in enhancing liveability in urban areas. It fosters economic development and social cohesion with urban heritage acting as a catalyst for socio-economic development treating cities as dynamic organisms (UNESCO, 2013a).

Finally, crucial to the application of HUL are three underlying principles: understanding of the city as an evolving process—living entity—not merely a series of objects (buildings): here the idea of process embraces intangible cultural heritage values, genius loci and interaction between culture and nature; respect for the overall morphology of the city and its landscape setting so that future development does not overwhelm the landscape physically or its intangible meanings and values; understanding that conservation of physical material aspects of urban landscape must be balanced taking into account immaterial aspects to do with layers of meanings residing in the urban landscape.

Notes

1. One of the reviewers for this paper made the valid point that the seemingly late arrival of HUL in conservation/heritage practice is remarkable, leading to the question of why such a time lag? It does have antecedents and synergies, for example, the growing interest in the idea of liveable cities in the 1990s onwards, seen, for example, in the 2000 publication Partners for Liveable Communities (2000). Also notable is the fact that changes in line with expanded thinking generally on heritage conservation from the later 1980s onwards also surfaced in urban conservation. Reflective, for example, of this are the 1987 ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns (Washington Charter) and the 2000 ICOMOS Hoi An Declaration on Conservation of Historic Districts of Asia.

2. This was a meeting between GAIHT (Guangzhou Association of International Historic Towns Assoc.) and UNESCO WHITRAP (World Heritage Institute for Training & Research Asia-Pacific), Shanghai which the author attended.
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Chapter 2

Landscape and meaning
Context for a global discourse on cultural landscapes values

Ken Taylor

Our human landscape is our unwitting biography, reflecting our tastes, our values, our aspirations, and even our fears in tangible visible form.

(Lewis 1979: 12)

The cultural landscape construct proposes that heritage places are not isolated islands and that there is an interdependence between people, social structures and the landscape. Inextricably linked to this cultural concept of landscape is that one of our deepest needs is for a sense of identity and belonging and a common denominator in this is human attachment to landscape and how we find identity in landscape and place. This chapter reviews emerging trends in the non-monumental cultural landscape approach; reflects on how the innovative ideas of cultural geographers and anthropologists from the late nineteenth/early twentieth century through the twentieth century shifted intellectual discussion on landscape from physical determinant to cultural construct creating a context for a global cultural landscape discourse; and reflects on cultural landscape opportunities in Asia.

Landscape: shifting ground from physical determinant to cultural construct

Post-1970: product or process?

Over the last thirty years or so there has emerged the idea of historic cultural landscapes being worthy of heritage conservation action. It is reasonable to ask why this has occurred. Where does the philosophical basis lie for the current interest in cultural landscapes, particularly in the interpretation of their meanings and their associative/intangible values? Here I propose to look critically at two periods in reverse chronological order. Enquiry on landscape in cultural (human) geography and related disciplines such as anthropology since the late 1970s has progressively delved into landscape not simply or predominantly as history or a physical cultural product, but
also – and more significantly – as cultural process reflecting human action over time with associated pluralistic meanings and human values.

From a cultural geography perspective landscape as process has connections with the aim of visual theorist, W.J.T. Mitchell (1994: 1) ‘to change “landscape” from a noun to a verb . . . [so] that we think of landscape not as object to be seen or a text to be read, but as a process by which identities are formed’. Landscape therefore infers cultural context, human action and activity and also change over time. It is what Olwig (2007) calls ‘an active scene of practice’. Mitchell sees his approach as absorbing two approaches to landscape. The first he calls contemplative, founded in art historical paradigms of reading landscape history. The second is interpretative, with efforts to decode landscape as a body of signs. Therefore:

_Landscape and Power_ aims to absorb these approaches into a more comprehensive model that would ask not just what landscape ‘is’ or ‘means’, but what it _does_, how it works as cultural practice. Landscape, we suggest, doesn’t merely signify or symbolise power relations; it is an instrument of cultural power, perhaps even an agent of power . . . independent of human intentions.

(Mitchell 1994: 1–2)

Robertson and Richardson (2003: 7) recognize that, while there has been within cultural geography ‘a shift from textual interpretation . . . to an interpretation of these texts in popular cultural practice’, it is also within the field of anthropology that the notion of landscape as cultural process finds consistent expression. The definition of landscape as cultural process is the stance taken by Hirsch (1995: 3) when he acknowledges the existence of cultural meaning in landscape but that this must be viewed in the context of ‘the concrete actuality of everyday social life (“the way we now are”)’. Like Mitchell, Hirsch proposes two landscapes: the one ‘we initially see and a second landscape produced through local practice and which we recognise and understand through fieldwork and through ethnographic description and interpretation’ (ibid.: 2).

The landscape as process thesis can be seen to have connections with the etymological derivation of the word in English from its Germanic roots (Jackson 1984; Olwig 1993, 2002). This dates back to 500 AD in Europe when the words – _landskipe_ or _landscaef_ – and the notions implied were taken to Britain by Anglo-Saxon settlers. The meaning was a clearing in the forest with animals, huts, fields and fences. It was essentially a peasant landscape carved out of the original forest or weald, that is, out of the wilderness with interconnections to patterns of occupation and associated customs and ways of doing things. Jackson further indicates the equivalent word in Latin languages – with its antecedent like Germanic and other languages harking back to the Indo-European idiom – derives from the Latin _pagus_, meaning
a defined rural district. He notes that this gives the French words pays and paysage, but that there are other French words for landscape including campagne deriving from champagne meaning a countryside of fields; the English equivalent once being ‘champion’.

‘Landscape’ from its beginnings therefore has meant a human-made artefact with associated cultural process values. It is an holistic view of landscape with its morphology resulting from the interplay between cultural values, customs and land-use practices critically explored by Wylie (2007).

The conjunction of the word ‘cultural’ with landscape also infers an inhabited, active being. Olwig (1993) links this to its Latin origin colere (culture), with various meanings including inhabit, cultivate as in tillage, protect, honour. Additionally ‘culture’, like the German kultur (and therefore ‘cultural’), is about development of human intellectual achievement, care (Oxford English Dictionary): hence the German term ‘kulturlandschaft’ (see below). French usage gives us paysage culturel, the term used in the World Heritage List inscription (2000) for the Loire Valley, which notably includes urban settlements as well as rural land. The assumption that is often made that ‘cultural landscape’ is only to do with agricultural settings is misplaced: it is concerned with all human places and the process of making them and inhabiting them.

Landscape as idea in the Western genre also has had since the sixteenth-century art historical connections with painterly renditions of landscapes, whether they be the history painting genre of the Italianate School (Poussin, Lorrain et al.) or the realism of the ordinary everyday landscapes of the Dutch School. This is the landscape as scenery interpretation. Wylie calls it ‘representational, symbolic and iconic meanings’, aestheticized pictures of the natural world and culture–nature relations, or a landowning elite way of seeing. It was the focus of critical commentary by cultural geographers in the 1990s. Olwig (1996), for example, proposes the need to understand and return to the substantive nature of landscape: a landscape that is real, not artistic; real in a legal sense, real rather than apparent. This standpoint meshes in a sense with his argument that landscape originally means a political community of people (polity) and associated customary, administrative local laws: ‘a nexus of law and cultural identity’ (Olwig 2002: 19). He points to the diverse local polities, i.e. landscapes or in German, ländschaft, a term still used (Jackson 1984) for a territory or administrative unit.

We may ask whether this attitude to landscape and art, which it must be noted is not universal, is representative of a wider view system that sees landscape art representation with its symbolism somewhat suspiciously. Is it predominantly a Western view? How does it sit with Eastern views? Western landscape art since the Renaissance has focused substantially on portraying landscape reality even when the landscape portrayed is symbolic. In contrast, Eastern landscape art has often focused more on imaginary landscapes as in Chinese landscape art (and literature) where, over one thousand years
ago at the end of the Tang Dynasty (618–907 CE), a deconstruction of material nature was taking place. This genre was accompanied by a representation of nature that "began to express its more spiritual side. Appearances became less important and spiritual reality emerged as the main focus . . . paintings became more and more abstract and symbolic" (Feng Han 2006: 79–80; Gong 2001: 228). In this way, Chinese depictions of nature – cultivated landscapes – were expressions of the mind and heart of the individual artist rather than of the real world, reflections of human beliefs and emotions (Metropolitan Museum of Art 2000). Even so, the often seemingly fantastic renditions in these landscapes do reflect the hauntingly beautiful shapes seen in Chinese landscapes. Nevertheless both forms, Eastern and Western, represent subjective notions of an ideal, perhaps illusive, nature. If this is a way of seeing landscape, should it be eschewed? I think not: it is for me integral with the idea of landscape as process even if it is the process of making imaginary landscapes.

To this end modern cultural geography, as Denis Cosgrove (1993) suggested, delves into how intellectual forces and spiritual sensibilities are as important as economic, social and environmental constraints in understanding how people transform and view their surrounds. He points out that landscape interpretation involves a dialogue between changing social and economic structures and human visions of a harmonious life within the natural order. As a result ‘no longer is the geographical landscape confined to visible and material features on the earth’s surface’ (ibid.: xiv).

Pre-1970s: environmental product or cultural process?

In the early nineteenth century the primacy of the natural order and creationist views in determining environmental form were clear. While Darwin rocked the theological boat, he did little to shake the conviction that natural forces shaped us and our world. Alternative evolutionary theories as in the Neo-Lamarckian model of adaptive modification of organisms passing on qualities they acquired entrenched the scientific view that environment was the shaper of people, their landscape and even their values. Such views were attractive to the increasingly vocal discipline of geography that craved to be accepted into the scholarly world as a science in the latter half of the nineteenth century. A scientifically deterministic view of environment firmly established itself in the geographical mindset. But this was challenged by an emergent German human geography tradition, thereby laying the foundations for how we have come to understand the cultural landscape construct.

Nevertheless the early foundations still inferred natural factors as the determining agent. Alfred Hettner (1859–1941) emphasized the concept and practice of Länderkunde (regional study). Here distinctive regional landscapes are established as a reflection of the relationship between people
and their environment where natural factors determine regional landscape patterns. It was a continuation of the early nineteenth-century geographic tradition of Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859). Humboldt, one of the founders of modern geography, emphasized measurement and mapping based on the inter-connectedness between life forms and environment. The earth for Humboldt consisted of distinctive natural regions each with its own particular life forms.

This view was supported by the English geographer Halford Mackinder. In 1887, in his address to the Royal Geographical Society, Mackinder maintained that geography’s task was to reintegrate society and environment and to build a bridge over the gap between the natural sciences and the study of humanity. The growing union between the natural sciences, particularly biological sciences, and geography was a significant aspect of the developing nineteenth-century scholarly base of geography. Livingstone (1992: 190–192), in his history of the foundations of geography, calls Mackinder’s approach ‘the geographical experiment – an experiment to keep nature and culture under one conceptual umbrella’ and proposes that while this was centred on the relationship between nature and culture with Mackinder seeing man as the initiator, nevertheless ‘nature in large measure controls’. In these evolving constructs we may, I suggest, see early stirrings of the current view of cultural landscapes being at what Rössler (2006: 334) calls ‘the interface between nature and culture, tangible and intangible heritage, biological and cultural diversity’.

In a reaction to Hettner’s physical basis for regional geography – Länderkunde – there was a move towards emphasising human activity – culture – in shaping landscape patterns. Thus started the German geographical tradition of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in landscape studies. Its recognition of the significance of kulturlandschaft, as for example in the work of Otto Schlüter (1872–1959), is seminal to our present understanding of cultural landscapes.

The emergent German school of cultural geography questioned the entrenched deterministic view of geographers, which concentrated on the thesis that regional landscape form was determined by natural factors. It was Otto Schlüter who ‘came to champion the view that the essential object of geographical inquiry was landscape morphology as a cultural product’ and he ‘emerged as a major exponent of the significance of the cultural landscape (Kulturlandschaft) in contrast to the natural landscape (Naturlandschaft)’ (Livingstone 1992: 264). Principles of Landschaftskunde were seen to offer a more holistic view of the relationship between people and land: the landscape. Nevertheless the German cultural geographers first concentrated on the material aspects of culture visible in the landscape rather than including aspects of custom, values or traditions. Interest in non-material aspects of landscape making came later. Neither did Schlüter abandon the notion of the influence of natural environment on regional human landscapes. It was
left to subsequent geography scholars to trace the influence of non-material culture on regional landscape morphology.

The perceptive and innovative thinking and practice of Franz Boas (1858–1942), anthropologist and geographer, extended the new human geography to embrace the idea that different cultures adjusted to similar environments and taught the historicist mode of conceptualising environment (Livingstone 1992). It was a philosophy that emphasizes culture as a context (‘surroundings’), and the importance of history: a Boasian anthropological approach referred to as historical particularism. Boas argued that it was important to understand the cultural traits of societies – their behaviours, beliefs and symbols – and the necessity for examining them in their local context. He established the contextualist approach to culture known as cultural relativism. He also understood that as people migrate, and as the cultural context changes over time, the elements of a culture, and their meanings, will change. This led him to emphasize the importance of studying local histories to aid the analysis of cultures.1 His teachings and ideas in social anthropology and geography remain central to present-day interest in the cultural landscape idea where landscape, as Lewis (1979) opines, is a clue to culture.

Geographical scholarly endeavour was continued in the twentieth century through the work and writings of influential thinkers. Nevertheless there have been, and remain, tensions in various schools of cultural geography landscape studies. It is a tension that Wylie posits is between proximity and distance, body and mind, sensuous immersion and detached observation. Is landscape the world we are living in, or a scene we are looking at, from afar . . . a set of visual strategies and devices for distancing and observing?

(Wylie 2007: 1–2)

Here is the tension between our lived-in world concept and landscape as an artistic and historical genre.

Landscape as lived-in process has built on the work of scholars such as Carl Sauer, Fred Kniffen, Wilbur Zilensky, David Lowenthal, Peirce Lewis, Marwyn Samuels, Donald Meinig, Tuan, Denis Cosgrove, Duncan and Duncan, and historians such as W.G. Hoskins. It was Hoskins as a landscape historian in the 1950s in England who saw the advantages of being out in the landscape rather than just studying in the archives. In this mode his work had similarities to that of Carl Sauer. It is a body of work that I contend acted as a necessary precursor to the establishment in the 1990s of the construct of landscape as process discussed above.

Sauer established the Berkeley School of cultural geography in the 1920s. He continued the *kulturlandschaft* tradition and elaborated an empirical cultural and historical geography tradition by championing the idea of reading the landscape based on clear observation and recording in the field. Sauer’s
view that ‘[t]he cultural landscape is fashioned out of the natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result’ (Sauer 1925: 46) is still quoted, and all too often uncritically in relation to cultural landscape and heritage conservation concerns for it remains a too positivist view of landscape as product rather than as process. Sauer’s approach to landscape morphology narrowly kept within the bounds of scientific method and he concentrated on material aspects of cultural diversity in what Robertson and Richards (2003: 2) regard as ‘unnecessarily deterministic’. He did not emphasize the visual and affective aspects of landscapes or what Peter Jackson (1989: 19, quoted in Wylie 2007) refers to as its ‘social dimensions’. Jackson proposes more consideration be given to the non-material or symbolic qualities of culture that cannot be ‘read off’ directly from the landscape.

**A cultural construct: not spectators**

An enduring contribution to the idea of social dimensions of landscape are the writings and understanding by J.B. Jackson of the American vernacular landscape, the landscape people inhabit and make through everyday activities. He suggests, for example, that ‘we are not spectators: the human landscape is not a work of art. It is the temporary product of sweat, hardship and earnest thought’ (Jackson 1997: 343). His interest essentially was in patterns in the landscape and the processes that shaped these, rather than individual buildings. Jackson’s writings in *Landscape*, the journal he started, are still worth reading. Notably also he gave attention to the contemporary urban landscape rather than the rural. Current interest in the idea of historic urban landscapes (HULs) at World Heritage level has antecedents here.

During the late 1980s and 1990s humanistic approaches to understanding landscape as a cultural construct used the metaphor of landscape as text. Duncan and Duncan (1988: 117) claim texts ‘are transformations of ideologies into a concrete form’. They argue cogently that landscapes can be seen as transformations of social and political ideologies. They base their claim on insights from literary theory applied to the analysis of landscapes and reading them as texts. Duncan and Duncan were dismissive of the then contemporary work of cultural geographers as naive (a word they use twice in their opening paragraph) in that it views landscape as a kind of cultural spoor, indicating the presence of a cultural group. In my view their argument of landscape as text is better seen as adding further to the insights on symbolism in landscapes. Central to these has been the connection between present landscapes and the way in which they reflect vital links, tangible and intangible, with history. As a result we respond affectively to them, to the symbolism of the memories, ideas and associations inherent in their very existence, as well as to the tangible material patterns and structures that represent how the landscape has been, and is continually actively used, shaped and changed.
A coherent aspect of an accumulation of approaches is, therefore, that landscape is a cultural, or social, construct that demands examination. It is not simply what is seen as an assembly of physical components and natural elements, but rather, as Cosgrove proposes (1984: 1), it is a way of seeing that has its own history, but a history that can be understood only as part of a wider history of economy and society; that has its own assumptions and consequences, but assumptions and consequences whose origins and implications extend well beyond the use and perception of land; that has its own techniques of expression, but techniques which it shares with other areas of cultural practice.

Cosgrove further argues that landscape is an ideological concept and this theme resonates through his writings (Cosgrove 1984, 1990). Cultural landscape form, past and present, is therefore profoundly and systematically influenced by political, religious, economic and social values and forces.

**Tourism**

More recently new forces such as tourism and its ideological baggage have the potential to mould perceptions of cultural landscapes and possibility of adding new layers to an already rich assemblage. The growth in cultural tourism, for example, has potential to influence cultural landscape appreciation and, coincidentally, our view of the past through interpretations and presentations of history. A series of essays in a volume edited by Ringer (1998) delves into these considerations through viewing cultural landscapes of tourist destinations as socially constructed places, the extent to which tourism both establishes and falsifies local reality and effects on local cultures not least through manipulations of history and culture. In this connection Sigala and Leslie (2005) probe how the three components of cultural tourism – travel, the tourist and sites – interact. Two management questions arise from this interaction: how may we identify which tourists wish to seek interaction with traditions, behaviours and ways of life of local people; and how to capitalize on such interest in interpretation and presentation of local cultural context within the rubric of cultural landscape settings?

Discussions in tourism often give attention to marketing, facility management or growth statistics. In contrast, in a focus on Asian tourism, the essays in *Asia on Tour* (Winter et al. 2009: 6) eschew these ‘to situate tourism within its wider social, political and cultural contexts, addressing an array of topics, including aesthetics . . . heritage . . . and nation building’. The authors, in centring on Asian tourists in Asia, address important issues of the links between heritage and tourism and explore how Asian tourism challenges many accepted assumptions and norms based on an Anglo-Western slant. In the Conclusion Winter proposes that what is needed in scholarship
in tourism in Asia is a pluralistic approach to help understanding of the profound changes resulting from Asian tourism.

How do Western notions of visiting exotic so-called ‘unspoiled places and peoples’ sit with how Asians view their heritage as mass tourism gathers pace? Examples such as Samchuk Market (Hundred-year-old Market) in Suphanburi Province near Bangkok show how local effort and solidarity in the face of economic slowdown have led to success and a feeling by locals that they have maintained their identity. Extended, the old part of the market survives, with original timber shop-houses transformed into grocery stores, toy shops and many others stimulating childhood memories. Original Thai food and desserts are also offered in shop-houses and kiosks. Boat trips are popular with domestic visitors who flock to the market; locals man the house museum and proudly explain their history to visitors. As a result Samchuk Market is a lively, thriving place. Is it a new face of Asian heritage tourism with a sense of stepping back in time for visitors (Figure 2.1)?

Tourism has the potential, and does, raise the profile of heritage places, but too often in developing countries tourism is seen mainly as an economic driver with the aim of increasing tourist numbers quickly (Smith 2003) and focusing them at well-known or famous hot spots while ignoring the cultural landscape context and setting (see reference to Borobudur and Angkor below). Silverman (2010) illustrates these various points with reference to the practice of heritage management and also associated global tourism concerns at Luang Prabang (Lao People’s Democratic Republic (PDR)) and at
Phimai (Thailand). At Luang Prabang quoting from research by Dearborn and Stallmeyer (2010), Silverman (2010: 1357) observes that there is erasure by the Lao PDR government managing agency of particular physical and socio-cultural pasts that are seen as unpalatable for tourists, or incongruent with contemporary development, or do not serve the needs of the current Lao PDR government [resulting in] little room for locally embedded everyday activities or multiple readings of heritage.

At Phimai, which is on the World Heritage Tentative List, Silverman suggests there is varied support for the inscription resulting from a lack of consultation with local stakeholders and exacerbated by a master plan that calls for expropriation of several blocks of homes and businesses surrounding the temple in the middle of the town. In such cases of global or local we may well ask whose values are significant (Taylor 2010) and, allied to this, how to foster a better appreciation of the cultural landscape construct and its relevance to the cultural heritage management process. As the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) cogently argues, there is a pressing need generally, and not just in World Heritage sites, ‘to strike a balance between the local and the universal . . . to anchor action in human solidarity at the local level’ (IUCN 2007: 3).

The rise of cultural landscapes

The cultural geography, anthropological and historical discourses on constructs of landscape cumulatively may be seen to have created a context for a global cultural landscapes discourse that developed in the 1980s/1990s. As the management of cultural heritage resources developed professionally and philosophically a challenge emerged in the late 1980s/early 1990s to the 1960s and 1970s concept of heritage focusing on monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles or historic sites with connections to the rich and famous. Here was the inception of an enlarged value system embracing such issues as cultural landscapes and settings, living history and heritage, intangible values, vernacular heritage and community involvement. It was the beginning of the shift from concentrating wholly on what Engelhardt (2007) pithily designates the three ‘Ps’ of Princes, Priests and Politicians to include People. Community involvement is discussed further by Lennon in Chapter 3.

The 1990s expansion of interest in, and enlarging understanding of, cultural landscapes is what Jacques (1995: 91) nicely calls ‘the rise of cultural landscapes’. Cultural landscape study at this time was also coincidental with a widening interest in the public history movement and everyday landscapes. It underpinned the notion that landscapes reflecting everyday ways of life, the
ideologies that compel people to create places, and the sequence or rhythm of life over time in Olwig’s (2007) active scene of practice are significant. They tell the story of people, events and places through time, offering a sense of continuity: a sense of the stream of time. They also offer the context for concepts and understandings of cultural heritage, a point discussed in Chapter 3 by Lennon in relation to archaeology shifting from focusing on the alienated artefact towards a concern with social and spatial context in the landscape.

The concept of cultural context is critical to an appreciation of the rich layering inherent in the cultural landscape idea. The theme of the 2005 International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) conference held in Xi’an, China stressed the importance of context within the parameters of the concept of setting in the practice of conserving cultural heritage in changing townscape and landscapes:

“Setting is not just about physical protection; it may have cultural or social dimension. Tools need to acknowledge both the tangible and intangible aspects of setting. They also need to reflect the complexity of ownership, legal structures, economic and social pressures that impinge on the physical and cultural settings of immovable heritage assets.”

(ICOMOS 2005a)

The term ‘cultural landscape’ is now widely used internationally. In 1992 cultural landscapes arrived on the World Heritage scene with the declaration of three categories of cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value for World Heritage purposes: landscapes designed and created by man; landscapes that have evolved organically; and associative cultural landscapes (see Chapter 3 for more detailed review).

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s commentary (UNESCO 2007a: 115) on associative landscape as being ‘particularly crucial in the recognition of intangible values and the heritage of local communities and indigenous people’ has particular relevance for the Asia-Pacific region. They symbolize ‘the acceptance and integration of communities and their relationship to the environment, even if such landscapes are linked to powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural elements rather than material cultural evidence’ (ibid.).

The declaration stands as a timely initiative and precursor to the 1994 Global Strategy for a Balanced, Representative and Credible World Heritage List. The strategy acknowledged lack of balance in the type and geographical distribution of properties represented, with the lionisation by developed countries, notably Europe. Enlarging on this UNESCO proposes:

Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature.
Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use and can maintain or enhance natural values in the landscape. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. The protection of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore helpful in maintaining biological diversity.

(UNESCO 2008: annex 3, para. 9)

By mid-2011 seventy-three cultural landscapes had been inscribed on the World Heritage List. Dresden was delisted in 2009 (see Chapter 17) giving a total of seventy-two listed cultural landscapes. Bandarin (2009: 3) reflects most of these are living cultural landscapes and that over time cultural landscape categories (including relict and associative) ‘provide an opening of the World Heritage Convention for cultures not or under-represented prior to 1992’. He quotes as examples the inscription of the Kaya Forest Systems in Kenya or the Chief Roi Mata’s Domain in Vanuatu, the Kuk Early Agricultural site in Papua New Guinea (Figure 2.2) or the Tobacco production of Vinales Valley in Cuba, reflecting that none of these sites would have had a chance prior to 1992 of being recognized as cultural heritage on a global scale. Herein lies the major importance of the inclusion of the cultural landscape category in the operations of the Convention.

Of the seventy-two existing inscriptions only eighteen, as Lennon examines in Chapter 3, are located in the Asia-Pacific region. In contrast many inscribed properties in the region listed as natural sites or mixed natural/cultural are in fact cultural landscapes and offer considerable scope for renomination and re-inscription as happened in 1992 with Tongariro (New Zealand) and 1994 with Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Australia). Mount Lushan in China is an interesting example inscribed in 1996 as a mixed site but with ICOMOS assessors commenting that it ought also be recognized as a cultural landscape. As Feng Han discusses in Chapter 5 the cultural landscape values of Lushan are now being re-investigated in China. The general question of renomination of landscapes was addressed by Fowler (2003) in his ten-year review of the cultural landscape categories and by Taylor and Altenburg (2006) for the Asia-Pacific emphasizing the continuity maintained by people through living traditions associated with the landscape settings to famous monuments and remains.

When the term ‘cultural landscape’ is used in South East and East Asia there is often confusion as to what it really means. There is, therefore, a need to address this uncertainty through a global discussion on what the term signifies to try to reconcile international and South East and East Asian regional values, because the region has so much to offer the world in the cultural landscape arena. This is not limited to deservedly well-known significant places – Bagan in Burma, Tana Toraja in Indonesia, or the rice terraces/subak system of Bali (see Chapter 4) with associated Hindu temples.
– but includes everyday landscapes and vernacular settlements such as the klong (canal) towns and surrounds of central Thailand (Figure 2.3). These landscapes represent a particular way of living and provide examples of a continuous living history. They are therefore representative treasures, not only of living regional landscape culture, but of world culture and deserve to be recognized and celebrated as such (Taylor 2009). They are a vivid

Figure 2.2 Kuk early agricultural site Papua New Guinea.
Source: J. Golson.
embodiment of landscape as cultural process as opposed to being an objective cultural product.

The culture–nature dilemma: Eastern and Western views

A cogent example of divergent Western and Eastern views relative to cultural landscape concerns is that of the concept of nature (Taylor 2009). Until the late 1980s there was some tension between cultural and natural heritage conservation. Culture and nature were uneasy, sometimes suspicious, companions. Reflective of this, cultural and natural criteria for assessment of properties of Outstanding Universal Value for World Heritage nomination and listing were separate until they were sensibly combined into one set of ten criteria in UNESCO (2005) Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (para. 77). The separation was originally based on the hegemony of Western values where cultural heritage resided mainly in great monuments and sites and natural heritage in scientific...
ideas of nature and wilderness as something separate from people. The latter
was an ideal espoused particularly in the USA reflective of Roderick Nash’s
(1967) critical analysis of the American concept of wilderness. Nash posits
its adoption was grounded in the idea of something distinctively American
and superior to anything in the Old World: the sublime versus the antique.
He refers to the wilderness idea as critical to a unique American white
*identity* (my italic).

Examination of the World Heritage List for natural heritage and mixed
properties in Asian countries shows some properties included where local
community associations with these places are omitted, or worse, obliterated
because they were not seen as part of the intrinsic value. In contrast to
this approach ought to be recognition of the value systems that traditional
communities associate deeply with so-called natural areas as part of their
cultural beliefs. Added to this is the fact that many traditional communities
live in or visit these places as part of their life systems and have done so for
millennia, for example Nanda Devi and Valley of Flowers National Parks
(India) or Sagamartha National Park, Nepal. These are listed only under
natural criteria, although at least the nomination of the latter does refer to
presence of Sherpas, with their unique culture that adds further interest to
this site. A 1999 state of conservation report adds: ‘The significant culture of
the Sherpas is an integral part of the nature-culture continuum’ (UNESCO
1999). Of note in these culture–nature and tangible–intangible relationships
is the mounting appreciation of links between cultural and biological
diversity and traditional sustainable land-use. It begs the questions of whether
renomination as cultural landscapes ought to be seriously contemplated and
what do we mean by nature? Is it the 1960s American model enshrined in
the Wilderness Act with its connections to Protestant Christian, colonial
and post-colonial cultural associations from the English-speaking Western
world? Or ought it to be the concept of nature and culture not as opposites,
but where nature is part of the human condition? In this connection is J.B.
Jackson’s (1984: 156) view that landscape ‘is never simply a natural space,
a feature of the natural environment . . . every landscape is the place where
we establish our own human organization of space and time’.

Jackson’s aphorism has particular import in Asia where links between
culture and nature are traditional. People are part of nature within a
humanistic philosophy of the world. Here is an holistic approach to the
human–nature relationship as opposed to the idea of human detachment
from nature. Lennon (2007) – see also her comments in Chapter 3 – notes
that there are hundreds of community-based cultural landscapes across the
Asia-Pacific region, officially unprotected areas but cared-for by communities
as everyday working landscapes. Many of these cultural landscapes have
national and regional values and form the basis of sustainable landscapes
worthy of conservation. Why is this so? It is because cultural landscapes are
regarded as being
at the interface between nature and culture, tangible and intangible heritage, biological and cultural diversity – they represent a closely woven net of relationships, the essence of culture and people’s identity . . . they are a symbol of the growing recognition of the fundamental links between local communities and their heritage, humankind and its natural environment.  

(Rössler 2006: 334)

A landmark UNESCO/IUCN international symposium in 2005 on sacred natural sites and cultural landscapes (UNESCO/IUCN 2006) explored the culture–nature diversity links. In an eloquent paper Lhakpa N. Sherpa (2006) enlarges on how beyul, the cultural phenomenon of sacred hidden valleys in the Nepalese Himalaya, traditionally support biodiversity conservation. Lhakpa (2006) shows how Western-influenced initiatives are targeting beyul for establishing protected areas without proper recognition of the symbiotic relationship between local communities and environmental conservation: the message is modern development, education, globalization and tourism are not supporting traditional stewardship. Lhakpa suggests that beyul and other sacred natural sites can be an asset for ecosystem conservation and lead to conservation of significant intangible cultural values. He proposes a series of actions involving strengthening involvement of local people with greater recognition of indigenous knowledge; physical surveys; collection of oral and written evidence; documentation and publication of material; dissemination of information to local schools and communities to rekindle the spirit and pride in beyul.

Notably this theme of the important conservation network value of recognizing the inextricable links between nature and culture and linked protection of biological and cultural diversity at sacred natural sites is continued by Verschuuren et al. (2010). The concept and developing recognition of cultural landscapes as a bridge between culture and nature is similarly explored by Taylor and Lennon (2011). Head (2010) takes what she calls the nature–culture dichotomy as a major theme in her review of cultural landscapes. She critically discusses how for much of associated history the two have been seen as oppositional, but then exploring how the gap, for instance, is being bridged through ‘emerging trends . . . to discuss issues of biodiversity conservation in humanised landscapes, for example through traditional agricultural ones’. (ibid.: 429). Head further proposes that ecologists are increasingly recognizing that ‘management of “nature” cannot happen only in protected areas, but must include landscapes where humans are dominant’ (ibid.: 434). In this vein Berkes and Davidson-Hunt (2006: 35, quoted in Head 2010: 35) maintain that ‘most of the world’s biodiversity is in areas used by people. Hence, to conserve biodiversity, we need to understand how human cultures interact with landscapes and shape them into cultural landscapes.’
In contrast to purely nature conservation in some Asian national parks is the Thai example of Doi Suthep-Pui National Park, Chiang Mai, where culture and nature coexist in terms of traditional Hmong communities allowed to remain living in the park and where interpretative presentation acknowledges the immutable relationship between people and nature. This is seen also in the value placed on the temples in the park, as with the venerable Pra That Doi Suthep Temple (Nantawan Muangyai and Vitul Lieorungruang 2006):

Despite all the stunning natural beauty, the main reason many visitors come . . . is to visit Phra That Doi Suthep Temple. For Thais, this site is a must for the visit, as it is a sacred place to pay homage to the Lord Buddha’s relic, . . . [it is] one of the most holy Buddhist sites in Thailand.

The Doi Suthep landscape is representative of the deeply felt associative values between local communities and indigenous people in Asia and their cultural landscapes. It underscores the need for intercultural dialogue and for initiation of local community and indigenous participation in cultural landscape conservation and management so that the links between physical and spiritual aspects of landscape are respected. This view is grounded in the fact that it is the cognitive and spiritual values of cultural landscapes in the Asia-Pacific region that are their most salient features (Engelhardt 2001). Recognition of a cultural place for heritage purposes can intentionally or unintentionally marginalize certain groups, the unrecognized ‘others’ with a long and verifiable association with the place. Examples such as Borobudur (Indonesia) and Angkor (Cambodia) are cases in point where the surrounding cultural landscape and its meanings are seemingly divorced from the archaeological monuments. At Angkor, for example, is an extensive engineered landscape extending over 5,000 sq. kms, (Figure 2.4): a cultural landscape reflecting the history of the area and everyday activities of people, which continue to this day (Taylor and Altenburg 2006; Engelhardt 1995).

ICOMOS and IUCN are active in dialogue with the World Heritage Committee on outstanding universal values and ‘how references to values of minorities, indigenous and/or local people were made or obviously omitted’ in nominations (UNESCO 2007b: 3). IUCN (2007: 33–34) notes in its commentary that it has long emphasised the importance of involving indigenous people in the planning and management of protected areas [and that] many natural World Heritage properties have very significant cultural and spiritual values for local communities and customary owners [but that] in recent years, the natural World Heritage nominations of the States Parties only rarely reflect on local cultures, the rights of these cultures, and
prospective conflicts between these cultures and international efforts for protection.

Lennon in Chapter 3 draws particular attention to the challenge of the imposition of scientific and external ideas affecting property, people’s rights and traditional practices.

**Filling the gaps and thematic studies: cultural landscapes and Asia**

UNESCO (2007a: 116) in its report *World Heritage Challenges for the Millennium* reflected: ‘The geographically unbalanced representation of cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List . . . is striking.’ Proportionately Asia is not well represented. The *Millennium* report also notes that many cultural landscapes have building techniques, vernacular architecture and management schemes that often relate to complex social and contractual arrangements. The example of the rice terraces and irrigation system of the
Philippine Cordilleras is indicative of this where indeed, if the physical or the social structure collapses, the whole landscape and ecological system is threatened (see Chapter 15). UNESCO further notes that the category of continuing landscapes, particularly agricultural landscapes, has great potential but needs to be backed by global and thematic studies to provide a basis for nominations.

An ICOMOS (2005b) report highlights the gaps in the Asia-Pacific region in the inscription of cultural properties on the World Heritage List in general, and cultural landscapes in particular. It indicates that the majority of places on the World Heritage or Tentative Lists are archaeological, architectural monuments and religious properties. While this logically reflects the importance, for example, of Buddhist or Islamic places and archaeological sites, the paucity of such ensembles as cultural landscapes, vernacular architecture, technological and agricultural sites – all within the cultural landscape spectrum – represents a missed opportunity taking into account the spirit of places in the region. Notable in this regard is the fact that many existing Asia-Pacific region properties on the World Heritage List would admirably fulfil the category of continuing landscape of outstanding universal value with cross references to the associative cultural landscape category. They offer scope for renomination, for example, Ayutthaya in Thailand, while in China there are the Mount Qingcheng and the Dujiangyan Irrigation System or the Ancient Villages in southern Anhui-Xidi and Hongcun. Another important area for consideration is that of vernacular villages with the ICOMOS report noting the lack of vernacular buildings and settlements on the World Heritage List. It is another area where Asia has a rich heritage and where cultural diversity and biological diversity are palpable.

**Conclusions**

In reviewing a periphery perspective from Asia on cultural landscape heritage values, significance and protection, it is instructive to look at the issue through the lens of *authenticity* and *integrity*. These are characteristics from UNESCO (2008) *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* where the spirit of place resides as much in the meaning and symbolism of places and their setting – intangible values – as it does in tangible physical fabric, i.e. landscape seen holistically. *Authenticity* (para. 80 of the *Guidelines*) concerns ‘the ability to understand the value attributed to the heritage depending on the degree to which information sources about this value may be understood as credible or truthful’. We may see authenticity, therefore, as ability of a place to represent accurately/truthfully what it purports to be. Table 2.1, from UNESCO Bangkok’s (2009: 8) *Hoi An Protocols* document, illustrates the importance of authenticity within an Asian context.
Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the cultural heritage and its attributes. Examining the conditions of integrity, therefore, requires assessing the extent to which the property (1) includes all elements necessary to express its outstanding universal value; (2) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes that convey the property’s significance; and (3) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect. In relation to (3) I would add that judgement will be required when the whole might lack sense of integrity yet some parts or remnants possess it. The decision on overall integrity then will depend on how the parts with integrity are able to be read and interpreted to give an overall sense of continuity.

Finally it is apt to close with a quintessentially timeless quote by David Lowenthal (1975: 12):

It is the landscape as a whole – that largely manmade tapestry, in which all other artefacts are embedded . . . which gives them their sense of place.

Notes
2 His quote is from Jackson’s article ‘Goodbye to evolution’, Landscape 13: 2, 1–2. It is included p. 343 in J.B. Jackson (1997), Landscape in Sight. Looking at America, edited by Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz.
3 The figure of seventy-two includes seven new inscriptions (World Heritage Committee meeting, June 2011).
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The challenges of the cultural landscape construct and associated intangible values in an Asian context

Ken Taylor

Central to the cultural landscape construct is that heritage places are not separate dots on a map, rather that there is interdependence between people, events through time, and place. Linked to this is the notion that a deep human need for a sense of identity and belonging exists where a common denominator in this is attachment to landscape and how we find identity in landscape and place. Such attachment is universal and involves the relationship between culture – people – and nature, resulting in the formation of distinctive cultural landscapes as the settings for daily life, ritual, and contemplation. Therefore, it is critical to this discourse to understand the cultural traits of societies – their behaviours, beliefs, and symbols – and the necessity for examining them in their local context as demonstrated by Franz Boas over a century ago.

In an Asian context, cultural landscapes have evolved reflecting the physical and emotional interaction between people and their environment, not simply as a tangible cultural product but as a result of cultural processes and associated intangible values. This is acknowledged in Hoi An Protocols (UNESCO Bangkok 2009) with the comment that ‘[i]dentification and inventory... should include intangible aspects as essential elements, which in Asia are often integral to authentic meaning and sense of place...’ A further significant aspect of intangible values and meanings, not least in Asia, is found where people and nature traditionally are not separate; this is seen in the increasing attention being paid to the concept of sacred natural sites that are embedded within everyday cultural landscapes. Linked to this is the concern for human rights and traditional knowledge systems where cultural and biological diversity have been protected.

This chapter explores the cultural landscape construct in the context of prospects for Asian heritage protection alongside the growing international interest in the importance of intangible values that are central to understanding the cultural landscape paradigm. It also directs inquiry and concern to addressing human rights questions when looking at whose landscape and whose values are included or excluded in managing Asian heritage. It further speculates on opportunities to recognise of Asian cultural landscapes within the World Heritage framework.
Landscape: an interpretation of the mind

Over thirty years ago Donald Meinig (1979:1) proposed that ‘Landscape is an attractive, important, and ambiguous term [that] encompasses an ensemble of ordinary features which constitute an extraordinarily rich exhibit of the course and character of any society’ and that ‘Landscape is defined by our vision and interpreted by our minds’ (ibid: 3). In other words, to understand ourselves, we need to look searchingly at our landscapes for they are a clue to culture (Lewis 1979), not just national icons, but also our ordinary everyday landscapes. The klong (canal) settlement of Lad Cha Do near Ayutthaya, Thailand, is a case in point (see Figure 10.1). It is a mixed fishing and rice-growing community of Thai and Hmong peoples. Additionally it has an historic market which is visited by locals and domestic tourists, and a boat festival which celebrates the customs and intangible values of the community and its deep relationship with its landscape setting. It is a redolent example of how people see and make landscapes as a result of a shared system of beliefs and ideologies: it reflects indelibly much of the invaluable mosaic of Asian cultural landscapes.

Landscape is, therefore, a cultural construct, a mirror of our enduring memories and myths encoded with meanings which can be read and interpreted. In this context Simon Schama in Landscape and Memory contends that:

Before it can ever be the repose for the senses, landscape is the work of the mind.
Its scenery is built up as much from strata of memory as from layers of rock.
(Schama 1995: 6–7)

Images of landscape are evident in a remarkable range of our creations: literature, poetry, paintings, ceramics, tapestries and weaving, myths, gardens, cultural

Figure 10.1  Lad Cha Do, Supanburi Province, Thailand.
(Source: K. Taylor)
activities, films, television documentaries, travel material, maps, and advertising. We laud our virtues and achievements through iconic landscape imagery, often forgetting that the ordinary everyday landscape equally reflects deeply who we are and is a storehouse of private and collective memories. In this vein Jane Austen, in the novel *Emma*, has Emma see a ‘sweet view, sweet to the eye and the mind. English verdure, English culture, English comfort, seen under a bright sun, without being oppressive’ (Austen 1816: 335).

In the seventeenth century in Europe, particularly England, the idea of landscape was supplemented and enriched when it became associated with landscape paintings in the picturesque genre. These schools included the Dutch realistic *landschap* (landscape) school and the Italianate School history paintings by artists such as Claude Lorrain, with figures set in idealized, picturesque pastoral scenes. Particularly through the latter genre landscape and scenery as an idealized representation of nature became fused. Here, as John Dixon Hunt (1992: 4) suggests, ‘it was and continues to be a mode of processing the physical world [i.e. nature] for our consumption or for our greater comfort’. Landscape as idea and entity was thus reinforced, importantly, in the Western mind as the meeting point of culture and nature. A similar meeting point had existed in the Eastern mind in a tradition going back a thousand years. This is seen, for example, in Chinese landscape paintings or landscape backgrounds to the traditional stories depicted on murals in Thai Buddhist temples, as shown in Figure 10.2, Bang Ka Phom Temple in Amphawa, Thailand (Luekveerawattana 2006).

![Figure 10.2 Bang Ka Phom Temple (c.1769), Amphawa District, Samutsongkhram, Thailand: embossed mural depicting scenes (Jatakas) from the life of the Lord Buddha.](Image)

(Source: K. Taylor)
Philosophical shifts

Post-Second World War concerns which gathered international momentum in the 1960s led to the adoption of the World Heritage Convention in 1972. Then in the 1980s, a conservation philosophy emerged that would challenge the 1960s and 1970s concept of heritage focussing on great monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles, or historic sites with art historical connotations. It was a refreshing broadening of a heritage conservation value system that now embraced the notion of cultural landscapes, ordinary everyday places coalescing with the idea of living history, intangible values and community involvement. Importantly, the cultural landscape movement had as a major platform of its thinking the interconnection of culture and nature. This is a fusion that is critical to the cultural landscape construct (Taylor 2012), in particular the landmark decision in 1992 to recognize three categories of cultural landscapes for World Heritage purposes (see Table 10.1). The fusion was further strengthened in 2005 when cultural and natural criteria in the World Heritage Operational Guidelines (UNESCO 2005) were merged instead of being separate. Mechtild Rössler (2006:15) neatly captures the mood and the movement in this connection with the comment:

Table 10.1  World Heritage cultural landscape categories

Cultural landscapes fall into three main categories (UNESCO Operational Guidelines, 2008, Annex 3), namely:

The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man. This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.

The second category is the organically evolved landscape. This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories:

- A relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form.

- A continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

The final category is the associative cultural landscape. The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.

(Source: UNESCO Website; Available HTTP: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/#1>
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World Heritage is no longer strictly limited to the protection of nature and the world’s monuments; the diversity of living cultural places, natural sacred sites and cultural landscapes is also now included on the World Heritage List.

By mid-2012 there were around 78 listed landscapes worldwide, where, as Francesco Bandarin (2009: 3) points out, ‘most of them are living cultural landscapes, less relic[t] and associative.’ He further draws attention to the fact that all three categories ‘provide an opening of the World Heritage Convention for cultures not or under-represented prior to 1992’ and quotes as examples the inscription of the Kaya Forest Systems in Kenya, Chief Roi Mata’s Domain in Vanuatu, the Kuk Early Agricultural site in Papua New Guinea, and the Tobacco production of Vinales Valley in Cuba. He speculates ‘none of these sites would have had a chance prior to 1992 of being recognized.’ In the context of Asia, it is perhaps somewhat disappointing, that there are only twenty inscriptions, although this is an improvement on the 2008 figure of thirteen out of a total of sixty-one worldwide (Taylor 2009).

Intangible spiritual values and landscape

Underpinning the concept of the ideology of landscape itself as the setting for everything we do is a common theme that the landscape is the repository of intangible (spiritual) values and human meanings that nurture our very existence. This is why landscape and memory are inseparable: because landscape is the nerve centre of our personal and collective memories. Expressions of everyday heritage incumbent in the cultural landscape concept link comfortably with current international notions of the significance of cultural landscapes and ideas of the ordinarily sacred. Pivotal to this is the realisation that the places, traditions, and activities of ordinary people create a rich cultural tapestry of life. This occurs particularly through our recognition of the values people attach to their everyday places and concomitant sense of place and identity, where identity is critical to a sense of place (genius loci).

This line of thought suggests, therefore, that both tangible physical identity and intangible identity related to the distinctiveness of our lived-in world and human experiences are inextricably interwoven with place meaning and significance for people and the symbols, images, and meanings associated with places and landscapes. Nowhere is this more relevant, in my view, than in the Asia-Pacific region, where some of the world’s outstanding examples of living history and heritage exist in its cultural landscapes, traditions and representations. Examples include the wider landscape settings of places such as Angkor, Borobudur, and Hue. Each has deep associative cultural landscape meanings inherent in the way human modifications to the natural landscape features emphasize the landscape’s symbolic meaning. Engelhardt (2001: 9), with specific reference to Asia and the Pacific region, proposes that it is ‘clearly the cognitive and spiritual values of cultural landscapes... that are their most salient features’.
As noted above, the number of cultural landscapes with World Heritage status is limited and will remain so given that inscription rests on demonstration of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). Nevertheless their existence is significant as it reflects the broadening appreciation and understanding of the inextricable relationship between people with their tangible and spiritual values and places in global heritage thinking.

This broadening is effectively supported by formal governmental recognition worldwide of the IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature) Protected Areas (PAs), in particular Category V^5 (see Phillips 2002 and Dudley 2005). Even so it has to be recognized that World Heritage examples augmented by PAs represent a limited number of landscapes internationally. The majority of landscapes will remain as landscapes cared for by local communities (see Figure 10.1) what Barrow and Pathak (2005) term Community Conserved Areas (CCAs). Linking the idea of CCAs to the conservation of biodiversity, they make the following observation that, in my view, has widespread implications for cultural landscape management throughout Asia:

In the emphasis on “official” protected areas, one aspect has been consistently overlooked, or not understood, namely that rural people conserve vast areas of land and biodiversity for their own needs, whether utilitarian, cultural or spiritual (ibid: 65).

Parallel with CCAs are IUCN’s Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCCAs). These are regarded as ‘natural and/or modified ecosystems containing significant biodiversity values, ecological services and cultural values, primarily conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities, both sedentary and mobile through customary laws and other effective means’ (IUCN 2009: 3–4).

This role of customary laws as a conservation tool is of crucial importance, recognizing that, for millennia, traditional management has played a critical role in conserving a variety of natural environments and species for a range of purposes, economic as well as cultural, spiritual and aesthetic. It is noted that significantly ICCAs, inter alia, help maintain essential ecosystem functions (such as water security) provide biological corridors, and are built on sophisticated collective ecological knowledge integrating customary and statutory laws. The customary subak system of water management (irrigation) for paddy fields in Bali is a cogent example. Subak is not simply a mechanical device providing water, but is linked to associated temples and the water allocation is controlled (Lansing 1987). The system has been in existence since about the ninth century, based on the philosophy of the Hindu-Balinese principle of Tri Hita Karana. It ‘emphasizes that happiness, prosperity and peacefulness can only be attained if gods, humans, and nature live in harmony with each other’ (UNESCO Jakarta & Ministry of Culture and Tourism 2008). Notably the system, nominated in 2011 as a World Heritage cultural landscape by Indonesia, was inscribed on the
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World Heritage List in June 2012 under the title Cultural Landscape of Bali Province.

People–nature relationship

Biodiversity and people

In the cultural landscape idea – landscape as a cultural construct – culture and nature coexist within a humanistic philosophy of the world around us (Taylor 2012). It is a holistic approach to the human-nature relationship as opposed to the idea of human detachment from nature (Taylor and Lennon 2012). It is also a non-Western paradigm common to traditional communities and indigenous people worldwide and is reflective of the relationships between people and nature in Asia. In this paradigm there is no division between culture and nature as in the Western conceptual division based on a scientific view of nature rather than a humanistic view; the activities of humans and nature are fundamentally bound for mutual survival.

Traditional communities live in, or visit, so-called natural places in the Western idiom as part of their life systems, and may have done so for millennia, for example, Nanda Devi and Valley of Flowers National Parks in India, or Sagarmatha National Park in Nepal. Notwithstanding this cultural connection, both are listed only under natural criteria for World Heritage inscription, although at least the nomination of the latter does refer to the presence of Sherpas with their unique culture that adds further interest to this site (Taylor 2012). A 1999 state of conservation report adds: ‘The significant culture of the Sherpas is an integral part of the nature-culture continuum’ (UNESCO 1999). Of note in these culture–nature and tangible-intangible relationships is the mounting appreciation of links between cultural and biological diversity and traditional sustainable land use. It begs the question of whether renomination as cultural landscapes ought to be seriously contemplated of some listed sites in Asia inscribed as either natural sites, or mixed natural and cultural.

Head (2010) takes what she calls the ‘nature-culture dichotomy’ as a major theme in a review of cultural landscapes. She observes how, for much of associated history, the two have been seen as oppositional, but then explores how the gap is being bridged, through:

... an emerging trend in some ecological studies, particularly historical ones, to use the cultural landscape concept to recognize the human presence in the landscape and/or to discuss issues of biodiversity conservation in humanized landscapes, for example through traditional agricultural ones (ibid: 429)

Head further proposes that ecologists are increasingly recognizing that ‘management of “nature” cannot happen only in protected areas, but must include landscapes where humans are dominant’ (ibid: 434).

Debate and thinking on the culture–nature link was the focus in 2011 of a theme issue of Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal
In setting the context, a wide-ranging overview by Brown and Khotari (2011) addresses traditional landscapes and community-conserved areas. The authors suggest a number of key points emerging from the review (ibid: 139):

- the role of traditional ecological knowledge systems;
- cultural practices and social institutions in creating these landscapes and ensuring their stewardship;
- the importance of securing customary governance; and
- the need for dynamic socio-ecological indicators to measure the resilience of different landscapes.

They critically probe the role of what they call living landscapes in sustaining agro-diversity as well as inherent wild biodiversity values, ensuring ecosystems function, and supporting livelihoods and food security. They further propose that:

Among the striking features of traditional agricultural landscapes across diverse settings are their sophistication, complexity and resilience. Landscapes rich in agro-diversity are often the product of complex farming systems that have developed in response to the unique physical conditions of a given location, such as altitude, slopes, soils, climates and latitude, as well as cultural and social influences (Phillips and Stolton 2008). These landscapes, in many cases created and cared for by indigenous peoples and local communities, have been shaped by the dynamic interaction of people and nature over time by sophisticated knowledge systems and practices. They encompass a variety of ecological settings, embody human ingenuity, and are continually evolving and adapting. They are rich in agro-diversity as well as inherent wild biodiversity and intangible cultural and spiritual values.

(Brown and Khotari 2011: 139–40)

In addressing the challenge of conservation governance, Brown and Khotari note the shift in conservation paradigms emanating from the World Park Congress in Durban in 2003. This Congress produced the Durban Accord and Action Plan, the Message to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and over thirty specific recommendations. ‘All these outputs strongly stressed the need to centrally involve indigenous people and local communities in conservation, including respecting their customary and territorial rights, and their right to a central role in decision-making’ (Brown and Khotari 2011: 142).

Sacred natural sites and biodiversity

A significant aspect of intangible values and meanings in Asia is that people and nature traditionally are not separate; this is seen in the increasing attention being paid to the concept of sacred natural sites that are embedded within everyday living cultural landscapes. UNESCO’s commentary (2007: 115) on associative
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landscape as being ‘particularly crucial in the recognition of intangible values and the heritage of local communities and indigenous people’ has particular relevance for the Asia-Pacific region. These landscapes symbolize ‘the acceptance and integration of communities and their relationship to the environment, even if such landscapes are linked to powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural elements rather than material cultural evidence’ (UNESCO 2007: 115).

This was the theme and focus of a significant UNESCO/IUCN international symposium Conserving Cultural and Biological Diversity: The Role of Sacred Natural Sites and Cultural Landscapes in 2005 (UNESCO/IUCN 2006). This theme was also critically explored by Verschuuren et al. (2010) in Sacred Natural Sites: Conserving Nature and Culture. The UNESCO/IUCN symposium addressed questions of how cultural and biological diversity can be safeguarded in a globalizing world, as well as the role sacred natural sites and associative cultural landscapes might play in conserving diversities.

In some Asian countries, mimicking the Western wilderness and science-based national park ethic, the removal or marginalising of traditional people and local communities in selected national parks and World Heritage areas has regrettably occurred. In a telling essay, Lhakpa Sherpa (2006) shows how beyul, the cultural phenomenon of sacred hidden valleys in the Nepalese Himalaya, encourages biodiversity conservation. He also shows how Western influenced initiatives are targeting beyul for establishing protected areas without recognising the symbiotic relationship between the local community and environmental conservation: modern development, education, globalisation and tourism do not lend support to traditional stewardship.

The ancient beyul tradition and modern protection both aim at biodiversity conservation and improved human livelihoods, but Lhakpa Sherpa (ibid) reflects on how their respective implementation tools differ. National park protection depends on powerful national legislation and global scientific justifications. But, whilst traditional residents have accepted protecting wild flora and fauna because it coincides with their own belief systems, the managers, policy makers and scientists have been slow to recognise the value of time-honoured traditions in biodiversity conservation. Modern infrastructure ignores sensitivity to the sacred nature of the land and is in danger of overwhelming traditional concepts. Beyul and other sacred natural sites can be assets for ecosystem conservation and lead to conservation of significant intangible cultural values. Sherpa therefore proposes a series of actions involving: strengthening involvement of local people with greater recognition of indigenous knowledge; physical surveys; collection of oral and written evidence; documentation and publication of material; and dissemination of information to local schools and communities to rekindle the spirit and pride in beyul.

In line with involving local people in national park settings are two examples from Chiang Mai in Thailand: Doi Suthep and Doi Inthanon national parks. In both these parks, local Hmong hill-tribe people are allowed to live in their traditional villages, continuing traditional lifestyle and crafts. One spin-off is tourism attraction, which in turn, gives them earning capacity. Additionally, in Doi
The twenty-seven essays in *Sacred Natural Sites* (Verschuuren et al. 2010) are a welcome addition to the academic and professional literature on the relationship between people and nature. The book’s theme underscores the inextricable links between cultural and biological diversity with the intimacy that exists between indigenous and traditional communities and their landscapes. The concern for the links relates closely to the work of IUCN, where sacred natural sites play a particularly important role, demonstrating the special relationship between nature and people. Instances of clashes between traditional management and that based on a Western scientific notion of national parks are recorded in various chapters. One highlighted aspect is the increasing challenge in conservation management of the rights of traditional owners. This is lucidly articulated by Studley in his review of the eco-spiritual domains and sacred values of peoples in Eastern Kham (Studley in Verschuuren *et al*). In particular, he suggests that:

> The sacred dimension can and does play an important role in landscape care and nature conservation but eco-spiritual values continue to be ignored as a result of the mono-cultural myopia of dominant western research epistemologies. Intangible values only make sense when research epistemologies are predicated on pluralism, holism, multi-culturalism and post-modern logic and science. (Studley 2010: 117)

Addressing the challenge of recognizing both the role of sacred forests and cooperation between local actions and government initiatives, Pei (2010 in Verschuuren *et al.*) uses the example of the Dai people and other minority groups in Yunnan, China. He acknowledges the importance to biodiversity of their balanced relationship with nature through the practice of traditional knowledge, technologies and cultural beliefs. This is in the context of Yunnan’s rich and diverse flora and fauna, representing 52 per cent of the plant taxa, and 54 per cent of the total vertebrate species for all China. The remarkable biodiversity related to dramatic geographical variations is matched by its high cultural diversity, with twenty-six ethnic groups in Yunnan. This example shows how the tradition of worshipping mountains and sacred forests has resulted in protection of natural elements through ‘history and culture value systems based on respect of the biological environment’ (Pei 2010: 99).

Such examples are the opposite of the modernist view of natural resources (e.g. forests as valuable only for their economic return from resource exploitation). To acknowledge wider values as against mainstream ‘perverse economic theory [and] cultural elitism of western science’ (*ibid.*: 115) requires government action and policies to safeguard traditional management regimes in areas where cultural and natural diversity are deemed important. It follows that such policies require further appropriate studies by enlightened governments in association with traditional and indigenous owners.
**Human rights**

A recurring theme and challenge in the debate on the link between traditional landscape management practices and biodiversity is that of human rights. Here two international instruments are relevant. The first is the 2001 UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity which acknowledges the fundamental role of the protection of human rights of indigenous people. This includes respecting traditional knowledge and its contribution, for example, to environmental protection and management of natural resources and the synergy possible between modern science and local knowledge. Preceding this, but of relevance, is the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity. This instrument acknowledges that cultural systems, practices that favor natural resource management and value and knowledge systems of indigenous and local peoples, can be role models for helping shift dangerous patterns in modern over consumption of natural resources. Many traditional Asian agricultural landscapes fit this model. The otherwise seemingly unremarkable Vietnamese rural landscape in Figure 10.3 is an example.

In the human rights discourse and its applicability to landscape management in Asia, of fundamental concern is that of the need – and wisdom – of balancing local values against universal international practices and values. The latter have had the tendency to dominate management approaches based on a Western hegemony of conservation rationale both in cultural and natural heritage. This is reflected in the famous sites and monuments approach on the one hand and scientific underpinnings of nature on the other. In World Heritage terms, the introduction of cultural landscape categories has been seen as an antidote. Similarly, on a

---

Figure 10.3  Rural landscape near the World Heritage sites of Hoi An and My Son in Vietnam.
(Source: K. Taylor)
wider scale, is the broadening of understanding of Protected Area landscapes and the role of people in their management. As IUCN cogently argues, there is a pressing need generally, and not just in World Heritage sites, ‘to strike a balance between the local and the universal... to anchor action in human solidarity at the local level.’ (IUCN 2007: 3; emphasis added). In looking at international standards, the fundamental question arises:

… ‘[W]hose values are we addressing and whose heritage is it?’ Whilst acknowledging the importance of establishing professional standards of practice for protection of the world’s cultural heritage, it is imperative that universality of practice and adoption of standards do not overwhelm local values.

(Taylor 2010: 1340)

IUCN plays a major role in arguing to strike a balance between universal values and local values. For example, in Policy Matters: Conservation and Human Rights, it (2007) draws attention to how ‘conservation has too often undermined human rights’ (IUCN 2007: 6). From an Asian perspective, examples from China, Thailand, Nepal, and India are discussed in this document (ibid: 76–114), a summary of which are given below. The Chinese case is that of the Dulong ethnic minority in the Dulongjiang valley, a tributary of the Irrawaddy. Traditionally the Dulong have sustained a rotational type of agriculture (swidden) involving the cultivation of Alnus nepalensis, a nitrogen-fixing tree (Wilkes and Sicai 2007). A new national soil and forest conservation project in 2003, the Sloping Land Conversion Programme, ended traditional Dulong practices. The effect has been to increase dependency on grain hand-outs and decrease agrobiodiversity, which threatens to wipe out the Dulong’s bio-cultural heritage. The change stems from the 1999 Chinese central government’s Sloping Land Conversion Programme (SLCP) aimed at increasing tree cover on farmland slopes over 25 degrees, accompanied by providing grain subsidies to meet subsequent needs of farmers. The subsidies, however, are limited to eight years. In 2003, the major proportion of the Dulong’s traditionally cultivated land under the swidden system in the valley, 66 per cent, was on slopes over 25 degrees. The remainder was permanent arable land. In 2003, the swidden rotational system stopped on the sloping land and villagers were given subsidized grain supplies, to bring them at least to the accepted poverty line. But there is a price to pay, including abandoning traditional agriculture, with the subsequent loss of rare plant species particularly suited to traditional rotational farming. Looming over this is the long-term impact if grain subsidies are withdrawn or reduced. Additionally, traditional grain foods from swidden agriculture have been central to the Dulong culture: importantly, they are not only connected to ecological knowledge, but also to religion and social organization. Traditional Dulong grains are nutritious, and Dulong cultural views hold that mixed grains other than rice—not a major food for the Dulong people—are healthy.

The Chinese government upholds people’s rights to subsistence, rights to development, and rights to enjoy an upgraded environment. Nevertheless, the
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Case study of the Dulong raises the issue of rights of cultural practices and rights over bio-cultural heritage, local communities embodying traditional lifestyles are empowered, as set out in the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity. The conclusion to the Dulong case study warns that:

Without formal recognition of the concepts of rights over biocultural heritage in national law, and without government supported mechanisms in place through which indigenous communities can make effective claims, the future of the Dulong – and countless other indigenous experts and communities facing similar challenges – looks bleak.

(IUCN 2007:83)

The Thai example (Abreu 2007) outlines how, even where conservationists have good intentions, if local people are not involved, their livelihoods can be damaged, and the traditional ethical and religious beliefs that contribute to conservation can be undermined. The case study centres on the development of a new tourist hotel in the Silalang area of Nan Province, in northern Thailand, sited in a remote valley surrounded by farming communities near Doi Phuka National Park. Local people have mainly depended on rice cultivation augmented by collecting non-timber forest products (NTFP), even within the boundaries of Phuka National Park. In contrast, the Royal Thai Forest Department (RTFD) favours a conservation policy that restricts local peoples, not least in NTFP collection. As one villager points out the RTFD does not understand the villagers’ livelihoods and reflects that traditional ways of using forest products are not at odds with conservation. The hotel owner vowed to support official conservation efforts. With the hotel owner’s imprimatur, monks from a local temple ordained the area, including the trees with the beehives, so that they became off limits for local people. Photographs of the ordination were then used as advertisements for the hotel. As a result, three poor families were denied the right to collect honey once a year in April, the sale of which helped them to pay for their children’s school fees. In effect, conservation based on a Western hegemonic approach compromised the children’s human right to education, let alone the traditional activity of the community. This is an example of how conservationists’ good intentions can damage livelihoods and undermine traditional ethical and religious beliefs that could in fact contribute to conservation, when there is no local people’s involvement.

The commentary on India (Wani and Khotari 2007) reviews the impact of some of India’s conservation policies on the livelihoods of communities living within protected areas (including national parks where human activities are prohibited, and wildlife sanctuaries where some activities and rights are permitted). This is set against the background of both the United Nation’s Millennium Development Goals of halving extreme poverty by 2015 and the human rights framework. The context of this is around 600 Protected Areas, covering 6 per cent of India to protect ecosystems and wildlife. However, these areas are also home to 3 to 4 million people, and 275 million people depend on NTFPs for their
livelihood. As the authors reflect, the official conservation policy of India is in many ways unsuited to the country, as it is based on the Western model, in particular the US Yellowstone National Park. They do, however, make a number of recommendations with the dual purpose of addressing gaps within current conservation policies while ensuring that human rights are safeguarded.

The case studies, particularly the Thai and the Chinese examples, are cogent examples of what, in the social sciences, are known as unintended consequences (i.e. outcomes that may not be the results intended by a purposeful action). At the international level, in 2007 the World Heritage Committee requested that ICOMOS and IUCN comment on the inclusion of local people in World Heritage nominations. A submission, Joint statement of indigenous organizations on continuous violations of the principle of free, prior and informed consent in the context of the World Heritage Convention, was made to the 2011 World Heritage Committee meeting. In this connection Silverman (2010), in discussing the case of Phimai, Thailand, on the World Heritage Tentative List, reports that there is varied support for the nomination. This is a result of a lack of consultation with local stakeholders, further exacerbated by a master plan that has called for the expropriation of several buildings, including homes and businesses, surrounding the temple in the middle of the town. Originally the space surrounding the central temple was open. Conservation management founded on the tenet of returning places to something resembling their original layout, based presumably on what someone, or some agency, deems significant and authentic, may be seen to ignore what local people deem to be significant, based on their attachment to the place and associated daily activities. Within a cultural landscape ambit, such considerations also bring into play the concept of layers through time, and the question of ‘whose place is it?’ When Borobudur was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991, villagers in a settlement near the foot of the monument were evicted and their land was appropriated. The village had existed for generations and was part of the cultural landscape setting of Borobudur, its context and meanings. This was one year before the introduction of the cultural landscape categories into the World Heritage Convention and raises the question of whether dispossession of local people would now be acceptable. The village was a part of the cultural landscape setting of Borobudur, reflecting a millennium of human history and landscape management.

In reviews of World Heritage nominations by ICOMOS, reviewers, where appropriate, may draw attention to the lack of inclusion of local community and indigenous values. In 2011, for example, the nomination for the Yapese Stone Money Sites in Palau and Yap was deferred; re-nomination was recommended for a number of reasons, including the requirement to ‘[d]ocument and archive the cultural tradition of the layout of discs [money] and the rituals associated with the money and dancing grounds for the benefit of future generations’ (UNESCO 2011: 200). Furthermore, the World Heritage Committee noted that ‘ICOMOS recommends the encouragement of involvement of the traditional owners in consideration of the nomination and in an overall transboundary joint management committee’ (ibid: 198) and that ‘the traditions and rituals associated with
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the stone money exchange and location are an important component of the property’s value but have not been documented’ (ibid: 199–200).

This discussion brings into focus the deep and enduring relationship between traditional knowledge and skills, and the way in which this connection is embedded in people’s memory and place meaning, thereby making it central to human rights issues. Whilst this phenomenon has tangible associations with place and objects, the relationship encompasses spiritual values and associations with these places and objects. The latter aspect intensifies a sense of meaning for people within the traditional spectrum and application of knowledge systems. This factor needs to be taken into account when judging traditional management regimes for landscapes of another culture, not least that changes that may be taking place in those landscapes. It can be a thorny challenge.

By way of example in Asia is that of particularly spectacular rice paddy landscapes; at least they are spectacular in a global heritage conservation context. I will use the example of the Rice Terraces of the Philippines Cordilleras (listed in 1995 as a World Heritage continuing cultural landscape) and the Ifugao people, the traditional owners and managers of the landscape. Underlying any discussion is a series of questions: What is their meaning to the Ifugao people with the traditional knowledge systems and ways of managing them? What are their rights within an international spectrum of conservation? Who listens to them? How do we accommodate change? In our zeal to see such places conserved what do we, or should we, in human rights terms, ask of the local communities who own the land?

Originally not part of the World Heritage nomination process in 1995, the Ifugao people have now been brought into the management and governance equation (Villalón 2012). This occurred after management responsibility was transferred from central government agencies to the Ifugao Provincial Government, following the placement of terraces on the World Heritage in Danger List in 2001. Villalón (2012: 301) explains how the provincial government works closely with Save the Ifugao Terraces Movement (SITMo), a local non-governmental organization (NGO). Together, they are addressing programmes recommended by the World Heritage Committee, including reviewing the existing management plan, carrying out stakeholders’ meetings, and ensuring that site conservation and management are planned and undertaken in a comprehensive and sustainable manner.

The Provincial Government set about correcting issues that were causing difficulty in implementing the management plan for the rice terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras:

• introducing an integrated site management approach to raise awareness in all levels (especially in decision making at the national level);
• updating the Six-Year Master Development Plan vis-à-vis experiences encountered by the Ifugao Terraces Commission and its successor, the Banuae Rice Terraces Task Force;
• improving training for Task Force and community level managers;
• improving training among community leaders to assure their participation in site management;
• improving public involvement in site management;
• manifesting sustainable benefits of conservation (cultural, agricultural, environmental and specially economic);
• reviving cultural, agricultural and ecological traditions; and
• reviving pride of place among the local community.

One of the major challenges facing the terrace management groups is making decisions on future acceptable levels of change, as the terrace landscape is changing in many ways. These include pressure for new buildings in the landscape; younger people become less interested in farming; there is a need for income generation; there are tourism pressures; the need to upgrade infrastructure such as road access; and the question of how to grow enough rice for local consumption. These are challenges for local management, but also for the experts from UNESCO and ICOMOS in realizing that such landscapes are not museums, but living, changing entities as local people’s values change: hence the term ‘acceptable levels of change.’ At least now, local people are actively involved in their landscape’s future. Their traditional knowledge and expertise are recognized within a human rights perspective of the management of this World Heritage site.

Management and governance

Khotari reflects that since the 2003 Durban World Park Congress meeting there have been ‘shifts in international conservation paradigms and that the inescapable conclusion is that the future of conservation lies, at least partly, in the past’ (Khotari 2008: 23). He lists three broad features which highlight the growing recognition of the role of indigenous people and local communities in government-designated protected-area management and the importance of landscapes managed by communities themselves:

• expanding the governance of protected areas to include communities, either as partners in government and/or NGO-run areas, or in their own right as custodians and managers;
• moving out of the island mentality of protected areas and looking at landscapes and seascapes as a whole [focusing] as much on their political, economic, and cultural aspects as on their crucial biological values; and
• linking protected areas to the goals of addressing poverty and livelihood security, and significantly enhancing the generation of conservation related benefits to local people.

Similar attention at the World Heritage level is also present with a set of six principles promulgated as a foundation for a management framework of cultural landscapes. The ‘six principles embody many of the fundamental ideas and approaches that should underpin strategies and also inform specific
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activities for the management of World Heritage cultural landscapes’ (UNESCO 2009: 35):

- people associated with the cultural landscape are the primary stakeholders;
- successful management is inclusive and transparent, and governance is shaped through dialogue and agreement;
- the value of the cultural landscape is based on the interaction between people and their environment and the focus of management is on this relationship;
- the focus of management is on guiding change to retain the values of the cultural landscape;
- management of cultural landscapes is integrated into the larger landscape context; and
- successful management contributes to a sustainable society.

Feng Han (2012: 105) gives the successful example of the Miao Ethnic Group village of Kongbai, Guizhou Province, China. She observes that, from the perspective of respect for local values, the conservation management proposals for this village cultural landscape aim to protect and revitalize the vulnerable traditional customs and stimulate traditional management. Respect for the wisdom and knowledge systems of the villagers, rather than imposition of proposals from outside, is critical. Ethnographers worked in the village and successfully reactivated the traditional power of the Head of the village to organize the construction of a new road that benefits every family. This regenerated landscape values and collective memory for the village people that had been almost lost during modernization and the addition of new buildings. Economists helped the villagers with their traditional handcraft – silver jewellery – to enter the market and to form an association to protect intangible cultural heritage aspects.

Fundamental to shifting management processes is the understanding of the importance of various governance options. For example, IUCN recognizes diverse governance types for its protected landscape categories (Dudley 2008) that include:

- governance by government (at federal/state/subnational or municipal level);
- shared governance;
- private governance; and
- governance by indigenous peoples and local communities.

Critical to achieving good outcomes in managing cultural landscapes as the interconnectedness of culture and nature – the fusion that is critical to the cultural landscape construct (Taylor 2012) – is how these governance types can be made to interact. Rather than see them as discrete, there is an advantage in recognising how and where various governance approaches may, and indeed should, overlap in the management of cultural landscapes, whether they be IUCN Protected Landscapes, CCAs, ICCAs, or World Heritage properties. This is particularly important in connection with the role of indigenous and local communities.
As Khotari (2008) notes there is increasing participation of local communities and other citizens in the management of areas that were once solely government controlled, thereby shifting into a collaborative management mode. He also comments that there is increasing recognition of indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) existing in diverse forms across the world and observes that:

[t]here is no comprehensive assessment of how many countries have moved into these directions. However, a survey of protected area agencies just prior to the World Parks Congress, gave a good indication. In the period 1992–2002, of the 48 PA agencies that responded to the survey, over one-third reported that they had moved towards some form of decentralisation in their structure, and engaged a larger range of stakeholders than before. Over half reported that they now required, by law, participatory management of PAs. In 1992, 42% of the agencies had said they were the only decision-making authority; by 2002, only 12% said the same. Overall, the survey showed that “PA managers recognise that community support is a requirement of ‘good governance’ and more effort is being directed at involving various stakeholder groups. The general perception is that increased participation has resulted in more effective decision making” (Chape et al. 2008).

(Khotari 2008: 25)

Examples of the collaborative approach to cultural landscape management exist in Canada’s thirteen national parks. These are managed between Parks Canada and native groups; in Australia’s Indigenous Protected Areas (IPAs) programme which is part of the Australian Government’s ‘Indigenous Australians Caring for Country’ programme (Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities 2011); or in Doi Suthep and Doi Inthanon in Thailand (see above in Sacred natural sites and biodiversity).

Additionally, UNESCO, in considering natural values of cultural landscapes, notes that IUCN has identified the following benefits within protected landscape and seascapes:

- Conserving nature and biodiversity;
- Buffering more strictly controlled areas;
- Conserving human history in structures and land use patterns;
- Maintaining traditional ways of life;
- Offering recreation and inspiration;
- Providing education and understanding;
- Demonstrating durable systems of use in harmony with nature.

(UNESCO 2009:23)

Presumably, the inference in this comment by UNESCO is that the identified benefits should be taken into consideration when preparing management plans for World Heritage cultural landscapes. Further, within the mosaic of forward-looking
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management and governance regimes is the recognition of the spiritual as well as material benefits of protecting traditional communities and indigenous cultural landscapes. Finally, key questions we need to keep at the forefront of our management/governance deliberations are Who owns nature? and For whom is it to be protected? (Descola 2008).

Conclusion

The concept of the cultural landscape has broadened international appreciation of the role of intangible values in place meaning and added to the body of knowledge on critical heritage thinking. As indicated, the concept has started to take a firmer hold in an Asian context, with an accompanying increase in the number of Asian cultural landscapes nominated for World Heritage listing (albeit that these are still limited). A number of places on the World Heritage List, including prominent Asian examples which have not been nominated or inscribed as cultural landscapes, undoubtedly fit the cultural landscape idea, as Fowler flagged in a review of World Heritage cultural landscapes for the period 1992–2002 (Fowler 2003). Additionally, he suggested 100 other sites on the Tentative List that could be nominated as cultural landscapes.

In my opinion, the cultural landscape settings of World Heritage places like Borobudur, Ayutthaya or Angkor all qualify for serious consideration as addenda to the listed areas. Whether such action will take place is debateable, given that each signatory country to the World Heritage Convention is permitted only one nomination per year. An addition to an existing nomination is allowed where the additional information or reasons for re-nomination do not involve major changes to the existing nomination. The new nomination may not necessarily be easy to establish, and countries are not keen to lose the opportunity for additional nominations to their league table. A World Heritage listing carries with it high stakes and prestige.

In light of the above discussion, a number of key points emerge for further consideration:

• Recognition of the fact that it is the familiar, everyday landscapes that have meaning for most people and the ones they wish to conserve.
• Acceptance of the concept of limits of acceptable change based on the fact that people’s values – such as traditional owners – change through time and between generations, and that these values will be manifested through changes in the landscape. Landscapes are not immutable museum pieces. We need to be able to understand and empathize with people’s values. When we refer to experts, always remember that expertise also rests with locals based on traditional knowledge systems.
• Address ways of empowering and encouraging local people to participate in conservation management initiatives.
• The concept of bio-cultural heritage needs to be formally recognized in national law in order to empower traditional communities to
effectively negotiate the impacts of conservation and development (IUCN 2007: 77).

• Use the cultural landscape concept to recognize the human presence in the landscape and/or to discuss issues of biodiversity conservation in humanized landscapes, for example through traditional agricultural landscapes (Head 2012: 429).

• Encourage NGO participation, as with SITMo at the Philippine Cordilleran Rice Terraces.

• Aim for balance between local values and universal international practice and values (i.e. whose values do we need to address).

• Always think of possible unintended consequences of our management actions.

Notes

3 ICOMOS International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites reflected this thinking in Article 3: ‘The intention in conserving and restoring monuments is to safeguard them no less as works of art than as historical evidence’. < www.international.icomos.org/venicecharter2004/index.html >. Cached - Similar
5 IUCN recognizes six categories of Protected Areas ranging from strict nature reserve/wilderness status (Category I a/b) to areas (Category V) ‘that encompass traditional, inhabited landscapes and seascapes where human actions have shaped cultural landscapes with high biodiversity’ (Dudley 2008: vii).
6 Organized by IUCN’s World Commission on Protected Areas.
7 See www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/wpc3003
8 See http://www.cbd.int/convention/text/
9 The concept has long existed, but was named and popularised in the 20th century by American sociologist Robert K. Merton; Online. Available HTTP: < http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unintended_consequences >
11 See, UNESCO WHC Decision 35 COM 12E.
12 Phimai dates from the eleventh to the twelfth century and has connections with Angkor.
14 The author was fortunate to be invited by Professor Nobuko Indaba, Tsukuba University (Graduate School, World Heritage Studies) to accompany a research team of staff and PhD students to a field exercise 4-11 March 2012 at the Cordilleran Rice Terraces. The team worked in the fields with local Ifugao people and SITMo at Hungduan, reviewing What is HERITAGE for the Hungduan People, culminating in a workshop with the local community. An illustrated research report is available, see http://gnp.hass.tsukuba.ac.jp/
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Confronting the challenge of the integration of culture and nature

Ken Taylor and Keven Francis

Introduction

With a focus on Australia and some reference to international practice this chapter examines culture–nature interplays and associated dilemmas. It addresses a number of points which are a crucial part of the critical culture–nature discourse. These include Indigenous Australian values and spiritual integration with landscape within the spectrum of the deeply rich association between people and country; alternative conceptions of cultural landscapes; and biodiversity as a driver of cultural landscape values in the culture–nature continuum. These are examined in the light of shifts over the past decade from what may be seen to be the myopically entrenched views of some conservationists for whom the idea that people shaping landscapes (country), as well as adding value such as biodiversity by their actions, is anathema.

Until the 1990s there was a clear, if to some of us, uneasy, division between cultural and natural heritage conservation. This was based on a hegemony of Western values where cultural heritage resided in monuments and sites and scientific ideas of nature and wilderness as something separate from people. Culture and nature were divided. Reflecting this, for example, cultural and natural World Heritage criteria were separate until 2005 when they were sensibly combined (UNESCO 2005).

Environmental ethics were central to the debate on natural values, in particular that of whether nature has instrumental value or intrinsic value. Instrumental value is assigned because of the usefulness of something; in contrast intrinsic value relates to values of things as ends in themselves (Feng Han 2006). To complicate matters further is the question of the origin of intrinsic value (ibid.). Is it subjective, created by human thought and value systems, or is it objective where value is endemic in its own right and simply waiting to be recognised objectively? Is nature valued as purely an object without any human interest or spiritual attachment? Entwined in our ideas of culture and nature is that of aesthetic appreciation. Here,
few would argue that aesthetic value of nature and that of creations from the cultural domain which we can call works of art – and here we include human shaping of the landscape – both exist, but that the kind of value appreciation each encourages within a Western historical and philosophical perspective is often different (Berleant 1993). This schism has affected approaches to conservation where aesthetics of nature and culture are separated. But in the final analysis are not both cultural constructs and that to divide nature and culture is misleading?

Complicating matters even further was the emergence in the 1970s of deep ecology (Naess 2003) which inspired extension of the debate on nature preservation for its own intrinsic values. To preserve nature for its own sake was regarded as a mark of supreme respect, and amongst the avid wilderness lobby still is. Nature is concerned with the natural world; it is the phenomenon of the physical world – flora, fauna, natural environments and their physical components, and the processes that shape these – and excludes made objects and human interaction. In this concept even the word nature itself is a tool of separation and a means of valorising a Western perspective of framing nature as a fixed commodity, which is traded on the academic and commercial market.

**The idea of wilderness: what do we mean by nature?**

Central to the discourse on nature has been the concept of wilderness with its Western connotations of supreme value where people are visitors but not residents. Indeed as visitors they are often viewed by wilderness purists as a nuisance because they spoil the solitude experience. But the question here is, whose solitude and whose values?

Another question also is whether the very act of visiting and looking renders a place no longer wilderness as alluded to in Wallace Steven’s poem, *Anecdote of the Jar*:

> I placed a jar in Tennessee,
> And round it was, upon a hill,
> It made the slovenly wilderness
> Surround that hill.
> The wilderness rose up to it,
> And sprawled, no longer wild.

Even more critical are the value systems that traditional communities worldwide associate deeply with so-called natural areas as part of their cultural beliefs, and the fact that many traditional communities live in or visit these so-called wilderness places as part of their life systems and may have done so for millennia. This prompts the question of what do we mean by nature? Is it the 1960s American model enshrined in the Wilderness Act with its connections to Protestant Christian, colonial, and postcolonial cultural associations from the English-speaking Western world? It is what Edward Said pithily refers to as the ‘Puritan errand into the wilderness’ (Said 1994: 63). Such concepts of nature have now assumed a global perspective where some so-called ‘natural areas’ are seen as conservation (preservation?) national park options with local inhabitants either evicted or marginalised to perform for tourists.

The role model for the national park approach rests in the United States’ nineteenth national agenda of sublime, awe-inspiring natural wonders as a basis for national parks. They were regarded, as Nash (1973) critically explores, as symbolic of something special
to the New World bequeathed by God to the civilising hand of white Christian immigrants who would look after them as God intended. That the first national park at Yellowstone had been the ancestral home of Native Americans was ignored in this heroic epic; their forced and brutal eviction swept under the carpet of civilising history. Tourism and cleansing contact with ‘nature’ for city dwellers overruled any rights and traditions of looking after the land of their ancestors that the original owners had. The continuing tragedy of this is that it is a pattern of land management that continues to the present day in the name of national parks.

Certainly criticisms of this model arose in the 1990s. Notably one criticism came from the Indian writer, Ramachandra Guha, in 1989 (in Feng Han 2006). He condemned wilderness as harmful to developing countries because its creation, which excludes people, ignores the needs of local communities. Twenty years ago he saw wilderness preservation areas as a new, American, imperialist project. As places for rich visitors they transfer resources from the poor to the rich. This is now having wider impacts as some places in Asia are declared the equivalent of Western-inspired national parks, opened for tourism that is either restricted or is mass tourism oriented but where local communities are evicted and sometimes man-made structures are demolished.

It is our view that we should recognise culture and nature as entwined components of landscape. The alternative of extracting humans is a distorted concept built on the Western paradigm of separating nature from human occupation and shaping of the landscape.

In the cultural landscape idea – landscape as a cultural construct (Taylor 2012) – culture and nature coexist within a humanistic philosophy of the world around us. It is an holistic approach to the human–nature relationship as opposed to the idea of human detachment from nature (Taylor and Lennon 2011). It is also a non-Western paradigm central to the Indigenous Australian concept of country and the bond between people, beliefs, ancestors and the total environment, beneath, on and above the land or water. In this paradigm there is no division between culture and nature as in the Western conceptual division, the activities of humans and nature are fundamentally bound for mutual survival. All country is part of a made world, a cultural landscape.

Indigenous people have a holistic meaning for ‘country’, which encompasses land and landforms, water and marine resources, the plants, trees, animals, and other species which the land and sea support, and cultural heritage sites. The whole cultural landscape and the interrelationships within the ecosystem are encompassed in the term ‘Country’, and these relate to landowners under customary law in diverse ways, for example through links to totemic species. (Hunt et al. 2009: 1)

Who owns nature?

The forgoing discussion prompts the fundamental questions of who owns nature and for whom is it to be protected? Descola (2008) lucidly probes these questions in an essay that takes as its starting point how international policies for environmental protection are predicated on a very specific – narrow? – conception of nature from the European Enlightenment. He proposes that this conception is far from being shared by all peoples of the earth who value different cosmological principles. He calls for the preservation of biodiversity (which often
drives the call for nature protection) within a paradigm of understanding plurality in the understanding of nature.

Underlying much of the debate on environmental conservation and the human–nature relationship is a focus on biodiversity protection, and to those concerned with human diversity, on cultural diversity. A notable UNESCO/IUCN international symposium in 2005 (UNESCO/IUCN 2006) served as a platform to address the developing interest in the link between environmental conservation, biodiversity and cultural diversity and for informed discussion on environmental conservation and sustainable development based on tradition belief systems. From a World Heritage perspective, for example, considerable attention over the last decade has swung towards an integrated concept of natural and cultural heritage (Rössler 2006). Reflective of this was the merging of cultural and natural criteria in the 2005 Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2005), helping to ‘provide a new vision [where] natural and cultural heritage are not separable’ (Rössler 2006: 15).

**Whose nature is it?**

> What we call wilderness is a civilization other than our own. (Thoreau 1859, in Nash 1989: 37)

Emerging from the debate has been an increasing questioning in the literature and in professional practice of the idea that in the field of nature conservation people are considered to be ‘disturbances of the natural ecosystem that result in some sort of loss of integrity’ (Dove et al. 2005: 2). Traditional human activities are, *ipso facto*, seen as a negative, disturbing influence in this paradigm. Such a conservationist mantra remained unquestioned until recently, particularly in relation to the initiation and management of national parks. We are used to hearing the overused adjective ‘pristine’ in connection with a Western view of ecosystem preservation where there is a blinkered and historically insupportable assumption that anthropogenic disturbance has somehow negatively altered and debilitated what is supposed to be pristine. This is seen particularly in colonial settler societies, for example North America and Australia, but has spread to Asia where in some instances the instigation of national parks has been accompanied by removal or marginalisation of traditional communities and land-use management practices. ‘Pristine’ is associated with what some conservationists assume is a precolonial, untouched landscape as nature intended taking its cue from the assertion that ‘Purely untutored humanity interferes comparatively little with the arrangements of nature’ (Marsh 1864).

Two examples serve to illustrate our point. The first concerns Yosemite National Park where abandonment of fire as a traditional historic management tool as used by Native Americans resulted by the 1960s in a landscape that ‘no longer resembled the “pristine” ecosystem that the park service set out to preserve’ (Dove et al. op cit: 4). Solnit (1994, in Dove et al. op cit: 5), writing about the treatment of fire in the American landscape, quotes the following from a plaque in a restored valley meadow at Yosemite:

> Two hundred years ago the Valley’s meadows were much more extensive. Oak groves like the one across the way were larger and healthier. By setting fire to the meadows, and allowing natural fires to burn unchecked, the Valley’s Native American inhabitants
burned out the oak’s competitors and kept down underbrush for clearer shots at deer. With leaf litter burned away, it was easier to gather acorns – the Indians’ main food source. Without fires incense cedars are encroaching on the left side of the meadows and beginning to shade out the oaks, but now with controlled fires the NPS is reintroducing a natural process.

Even here the park service cannot accept that the process historically was never natural, that it was the fire management of the landscape by traditional owners that created the meadows and open woodland in the first place and contributed to the biodiversity of the area.

The second example comes from Australia. It is intimately associated as Gammage (2011) demonstrates with the traditional, carefully predetermined fire management by Aborigines. Over millennia Aboriginal management created a fecund and productive landscape scattered with trees, rich with an understorey of grass, interspersed with extensive grassy areas through which game and people could pass, treed areas where game could hide, and tracts of land farmed to raise crops such as yam vines. The result was a picturesque, park-like landscape that so delighted the early British explorers and settlers: for example Elizabeth McArthur summarised the landscape so created:

The greater part of the country is like an English park, and the trees give it the appearance of a wilderness or shrubbery, commonly attached to the habitations of people of fortune, filled with a variety of native plants, placed in a wild irregular manner.

*(Quoted in Taylor 2000a: 60)*

Notably the association between Aborigines and their country and the way it was managed did not escape some of the more astute early observers. In January 1847 the explorer Thomas Mitchell (1847, quoted in Gammage 2011: 186) observed:

Fire, grass, kangaroos, and human inhabitants, seem all dependent on each other for existence in Australia; for any one of these being wanting, the others could no longer continue. Fire is necessary to burn the grass, and form these open forests . . . But for this simple process, the Australian woods had probably continued as thick as those of New Zealand or America.

Of equal note is that a hardcore of Australian environmentalists and natural scientists today still, as Gammage (2011) reflects, deny the role of Aboriginal burning in spite of historical observational evidence from diaries and from images in colonial paintings. On 17 March 1841 Louisa Clifton (1993: 3 and 5) recorded in her diary as she arrived off the coast of Western Australia:

We are laying within sight of the Australian shores . . . A native fire has been distinguished on the shore . . .

I cannot easily cease to remember . . . the native fires burning along the country, the smoke of which we only saw.

Australian colonial landscape paintings in the picturesque genre consistently show broad sweeps of open park-like landscapes that we now understand as a product of the process.
of Aboriginal management dependent on predetermined sophisticated regimes of fires (Gammage 2011; Taylor 2000b). In some instances scenes of Aboriginal burning and hunting are depicted (Figure 2.1); in others we see smoke from fires dotted around the landscape. It was an Aboriginal cultural landscape that, soon after colonial occupation and cessation of carefully controlled regimes and mosaics of burning, degenerated into thick scrub and increasingly impenetrable woodland and forest prone to wildfires.

**Culture–nature link**

**Sacred natural sites**

The culture–nature discourse has been given a high profile in a recent theme issue of *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal* (Vol. 22, No. 2, 2011). In the opening overview paper on traditional landscapes and community conserved areas Brown and Kothari (2011) demonstrate the role of what they call ‘living landscapes’ in sustaining agro-diversity as well as inherent wild biodiversity values, ensuring ecosystems function, and supporting livelihoods and food security. Their findings are that:

> Across diverse settings, traditional agricultural landscapes, created by indigenous peoples and local communities, have been shaped by the dynamic interaction of people and nature over time. These landscapes, rich in agro-diversity as well as inherent wild biodiversity and cultural and spiritual values, embody human ingenuity and are continually evolving.

*(Ibid.: 139)*
In addressing the challenge of conservation governance Brown and Kothari note the shift in conservation paradigms starting with the World Park Congress in Durban in 2003. The latter produced the Durban Accord and Action Plan, the Message to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and over 30 specific recommendations. ‘All these outputs strongly stressed the need to centrally involve indigenous peoples and local communities in conservation, including respecting their customary and territorial rights, and their right to a central role in decision-making’ (Brown and Kothari 2011: 142).

The indivisibility of culture–nature is further explored by Verschuuren et al. (2010) in *Sacred Natural Sites: Conserving Nature and Culture*. The 27 essays in this excellent book are a welcome addition to the academic and professional literature on the relationship between people and nature. Its theme underscores the inextricable links between cultural diversity and biodiversity intimately existing between indigenous and traditional communities and their landscapes. The concern for the links relates closely to the work of IUCN where sacred natural sites play a particularly important role, demonstrating the special relationship between nature and people.

One aspect highlighted in *Sacred Natural Sites* is the increasing challenge in conservation management of the rights of traditional owners. It is articulated clearly by Studley (2010: 117):

> The sacred dimension can and does play an important role in landscape care and nature conservation but eco–spiritual values continue to be ignored as a result of the mono–cultural myopia of dominant western research epistemologies. Intangible values only make sense when research epistemologies are predicated on pluralism, holism, multi–culturalism and post–modern logic and science.

In some countries in the developing world mimicking the Western wilderness ethic, the incidence of traditional people and local communities being removed or marginalised in some national parks and World Heritage areas has regrettably occurred. Instances are recorded in various chapters in *Sacred Natural Sites*. Following this line of thought, it is notable that a submission under the title *Joint Statement of Indigenous Organizations on Continuous Violations of the Principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent in the Context of the World Heritage Convention* was made to the 2011 World Heritage Committee meeting. In this connection it is instructive to consider the indigenous people/landscape relationship through the IUCN concept of protected landscapes. IUCN recognises six such categories (I–VI) for which its Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas takes responsibility. A protected area is defined as ‘an area of land and/or sea especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed through legal or other effective means’ (IUCN 1994). The six categories and management focus are:

I. **Strict protection:**
   - Ia) Strict nature reserve
   - Ib) Wilderness area

II. **Ecosystem conservation and protection** (i.e. national park).

III. **Conservation of natural features** (i.e. natural monument).

IV. **Conservation through active management** (i.e. habitat/species management area).

V. **Landscape/seascape conservation and recreation** (i.e. protected landscape/seascape).

VI. **Sustainable use of natural resources** (i.e. managed resource protected area).
It is noted that the National Park Category II is intended to focus primarily on ecosystem protection and visitor opportunities (Dudley 2008). Nevertheless it is also noted (ibid.: 16, note 3):

that the name ‘national park’ is not exclusively linked to Category II. Places called national parks exist in all the categories (and there are even some national parks that are not protected areas at all). The name is used here because it is descriptive of Category II protected areas in many countries. The fact that an area is called a national park is independent of its management approach. In particular, the term ‘national park’ should never be used as a way of dispossessing people of their land.

(Our emphasis)

Not dispossessing a local ethnic community in a national park is exemplified in Doi Inthanon national park near Chiang Mai, Thailand, where Hmong hill-tribe people are allowed to live in their traditional villages continuing traditional lifestyle and crafts. Further they are allowed to undertake intensive market gardening raising produce for urban markets (Figure 2.2).

It is the practice whereby traditional owners who have managed the landscape often for hundreds, even thousands, of years, are dispossessed in the name of national parks that is, in our view, insupportable. It involves, all too often, extinguishing human rights and spiritual attachment to landscape. Accompanying this is the ignoring of the fact that rich biodiversity

FIGURE 2.2 Doi Inthanon national park, Chiang Mai, Thailand, showing intensive market garden activity within the wider landscape (Ken Taylor 2010).
is often linked to traditional cultural practices and what in effect is conservation management based on local knowledge systems and deep attachment to the land.

In 1992, with key support from ICOMOS and deepening international interest in the cultural landscape construct, UNESCO introduced three categories of cultural landscapes of Outstanding Universal Value for World Heritage recognition and inscription. Their purpose is to link culture and nature, tangible and intangible heritage, and cultural diversity and biodiversity (Figure 2.3). Enlarging on this the current Operational Guidelines for the World Heritage Convention propose that:

Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature. Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use and can maintain or enhance natural values in the landscape. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. The protection of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore helpful in maintaining biological diversity.

(UNESCO 2008: Annex 3, para. 9)

By mid-2012 eighty cultural landscapes had been inscribed on the World Heritage List. As Bandarin (in UNESCO 2009) reflects most of these are living cultural landscapes and

over time cultural landscape categories (including relict and associative) provide an opening of the World Heritage Convention for cultures not or under-represented prior to 1992. Bandarin (in UNESCO 2009) quotes as examples the inscription of the Kaya Forest Systems in Kenya, or Chief Roi Mata’s Domain in Vanuatu, the Kuk Early Agricultural site in Papua New Guinea or the tobacco production of Vinales Valley in Cuba, reflecting that none of these sites would have had a chance prior to 1992 of being recognised as cultural heritage on a global scale. Herein lies the major importance of the inclusion of the cultural landscape category in the operations of the Convention. Of the 80 inscriptions only 17 are located in the Asia-Pacific region. In contrast many inscribed properties in the region listed as natural sites are in fact cultural landscapes and offer considerable scope for renomination and re-inscription as happened in 1992 with Tongariro (New Zealand) and 1994 with Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Australia) (Taylor 2012).

An Australian perspective

In the Australian context, the division between culture and nature continued along the North American convention of managing natural landscapes under the philosophy of separation of people from their land. In part this can be considered a continuance of the British colonisation of Australia in 1788 and the forced or coercive removal of Indigenous Australians from their traditional lands by successive governments. In contemporary Australian landscape management, there is a move to recognise the necessity to manage both the natural and cultural aspect of landscape as one integrated environment. This is being led by the engagement with Indigenous Australians. ‘Indigenous people do not generally separate natural resources from cultural heritage, but refer to both in a holistic way when talking about “looking after country”’ (Hunt et al. 2009: ix).

The revision of landscape management terminology such as Natural Resource Management (NRM), when dealing with cultural and natural landscapes, has been progressive but slow in the Australian context. The term Cultural and Natural Resource Management (CNRM) is starting to be used to replace NRM, as utilised in 2011 Indigenous Cultural and Natural Resource Management Futures (Altman et al. 2011). Contributing to this shift in terminology is the policy development of the Australian government in seeking to improve the well-being of Indigenous Australians. Associated research, supported by the Australian government, such as the Healthy Country, Healthy People project (Garnett and Sithole 2007), considers an integrated approach to deliver both environmental and cultural outcomes through Indigenous CNRM.

The potential of the leadership in Indigenous landscape management is that it may translate into general landscape management models and provide meaningful cultural and natural sustainability. With regard to cultural sustainability the reference is related to sustaining the integrity of Indigenous authority, maintenance and evolution of their own intangible and tangible cultural heritage. In considering cultural and natural landscape management several Australian national models seek to link culture and nature more closely in properties that involve shared management with Indigenous Australians. These include, but are not limited to, National Parks and Indigenous Protected Areas, which both can be considered as shared management models linking culturally divergent stakeholders into a partnership for mutual benefit.
The term shared management, in the context of this discussion, is considered a philosophical and dynamic practical process. It incorporates interactions between groups, and individuals who have a common interest in a landscape, but a different understanding of its significance through their own cultural paradigm. It can also be expressed as joint or collaborative management where different parties manage a cultural and natural landscape together, with separate degrees of authority over the landscape management dependent on circumstances. In considering shared management the space of interaction is the common ground where each party is engaged with the other in dialogue. This meeting place is where participants can work cooperatively together, whilst still recognising the hidden conflicts of interest generated through secret sacred cultural practice, commercial in-confidence, government confidentiality, cabinet in-confidence and other interests held by the parties.

National parks

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, previously known as Uluru (Ayers Rock-Mt Olga) National Park is a demonstration of a significant Australian national park model. The park is managed under a joint management arrangement with the Anangu who were granted freehold title to the park on 26 October 1985, through their organisation Uluru-Kata Tjuta Aboriginal Land Trust. Subsequent to the granting of title, and on the same day, the park was leased to the Australian government for a period of 99 years. The current 2010–2020 Plan of Management (Director of National Parks 2010) states on its cover Tjukurpa katutja Ngapa tjutja, which translates into Tjukurpa above all else or Tjukurpa our primary responsibility. Here the management of nature and culture blur into one holistic concept of interdependence of people and the environment.

Whether the policies and programmes implemented at this location have been successful or not is not necessarily the primary issue, as this can be considered simply a reflection of a historically unaware government policy response to shared landscape management with Indigenous Australians. This is particularly so when informed by colonialist and wilderness perspectives. The most opportune issue is the continuing development of the underpinning philosophy of integration, which has become established within a Western management model supported by local Indigenous knowledge. The integration of cultural and natural landscape management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park further pushes Western landscape management in that it also demonstrates a contemporary approach that recognises the integration of the intangible heritage of Tjukurpa and the tangible physicality of its entwined geological, biodiversity and human interaction.

An extension to this approach of landscape management modelling, where culture and nature are fundamentally intertwined, is the consideration that intangible and tangible heritage portray a symbiotic relationship, holding the physicality of landscape and its cultural interpretation. Detaching the intangible from the tangible causes a shift in understanding of place and is demonstrated when the same tangible heritage, such as the geological mount Uluru (Ayers Rock), is shared by different cultures with different intangible heritage understandings, interpretations and value within each party’s particular cultural paradigm. The Anangu relate to Uluru experientially through Tjukurpa, whilst others including settlers and Indigenous Australians not traditionally linked culturally to the site, attach an intangible value to the mount through their own history and interpretation. The Anangu and non-Anangu understandings of place attachment, aesthetics and phenomena, linked to Uluru-Kata
Tjuta National Park’s landscape, are often separated by cultural divisions. They identify different intangible heritage values and a different understanding of what natural conservation is appropriate and what processes are needed to maintain site-specific cultural landscape integrity.

Cultural values in opposition

Such potentially disparate cross-cultural interpretations of a landscape’s heritage values can paint a dark picture for sustainable joint management. They also reflect the potential crippling consequences of a lack of common valorisation of the intangible and tangible heritage of place held by the partners. In regard to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, this outlook needs to be questioned as a general position, when there exists such a vast array of entwined shared history and a stated partnership intent that ‘Anangu and Pitjantpa will work together as equals, exchanging knowledge about our different cultural values and processes and their application’ (Director of National Parks 2010: i).

A demonstration of the complexity, collaboration and conflict emerging within the realm of intangible heritage interpretation of the tangible is the issue of tourists climbing Uluru. The Anangu, with assistance from park officials (both Anangu and Pitjantpa), some tourist operators and many supporters, have been attempting to close the Uluru climb for decades. Many people have been injured and more than 30 people have died attempting to climb the very steep Uluru path (Director of National Parks 2010: 90). Senior Anangu have continued to make statements about the Uluru climb, including Kunmanara Nguraritja (ibid.: 90):

That’s a really important sacred thing that you are climbing . . . You shouldn’t climb. It’s not the real thing about this place. The real thing is listening to everything. And maybe that makes you a bit sad. But anyway that’s what we have to say. We are obliged by Tjukurpa to say. And all the tourists will brighten up and say, ‘Oh I see. This is the right way. This is the thing that’s right. This is the proper way: no climbing’.

In the face of these deaths, injuries and cultural petitions ‘Many people feel that Uluru is a national icon and that all Australians have a “right” to climb it’ (Reconciliation Australia 2010). The 2010–2020 Plan of Management (Director of National Parks 2010: 92) attempts to address the issues and commits to permanently closing the Uluru climb under specific conditions. Whether these conditions will ever be met and the commitment fulfilled will largely rely on the will of politicians in the face of intense commercial and nationalist lobbying.

A tangible consequence of the continuation of the climb at Uluru is the physical degradation of the rock surface being continually etched by the feet of thousands of tourists. The climbing track is now a scar visible for several kilometres and the etching continues. The landscape in this example is managed within a joint management framework under cultural and natural World Heritage criteria. The result is that the intangible heritage of the Anangu has been detached from the tangible and replaced by the intangible heritage perceptions of another culture. Under this alternative regime the management of the mount’s physical degradation is seen as acceptable when linked to the new intangible nationalistic or colonial heritage that proclaims the right to climb Uluru and view the landscape from above.
Thus the intangible heritage of the Anangu has been subverted by the intangible heritage of the settler within a domain of joint or shared management. Whilst the management of Uluru and the actions of the dedicated park officials recognised the integration of culture and nature plus the relationship between intangible and tangible heritage, still the contradiction of the climb exists. Here another important aspect to cultural and natural landscape management arises: the disparity that can exist between heritage policy intent, its interpretation and implementation.

In the face of such contradictions, and in the light of a landscape management model that has received international acclaim through being awarded the UNESCO Picasso Gold Medal (1995) for World Heritage management, more innovative management solutions are needed. These must provide governance, policy and process models that deliver sustainable and meaningful outcomes for all parties, whilst supporting biodiversity and cultural integrity.

Indigenous Protected Areas

An alternative cultural and natural landscape management model is the Indigenous Protected Area (IPA) concept, which is part of the Australian government’s Indigenous Australians Caring for Country programme (Figure 2.4) (Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities 2011). The first declared IPA was in 1998 at Nantawarrina in central South Australia. It covers an area of approximately 23 million hectares. The declaration of the Nantawarrina IPA marked ‘the first time that a formal Protected Area has been set up voluntarily in Australia by an Indigenous community rather than through government legislation’ (Muller 2003: 30). Today there are over 50 declared IPAs across Australia. A recently declared location is the Mandingalbay Yidinji Indigenous Protected Area, which includes the environments of mangroves, wetlands, rainforest, beaches, reef and islands. It was declared in November 2011 and was the first IPA to be established over existing government protected areas.

The shared management aspect within this model is built into the relationship of the government providing funding based on an understanding of negotiated outcomes. The Indigenous partners and government often have divergent views on the priority of such outcomes, which include: Indigenous health, education, economic and social benefits; biodiversity; cultural resource conservation; cultural maintenance. The partners’ different priorities are illustrated in the comparison of the two statements below, which are published on the same departmental web page (ibid.).

FIGURE 2.4 Yolngu at Garanhan (Macassan Beach), Laynhapuy Indigenous Protected Area, located in north–east Arnhem Land in northern Australia (Nicholas Hall, 2006).
The government states:

An Indigenous Protected Area is an area of Indigenous owned land or sea where traditional owners have entered into an agreement with the Australian Government to promote biodiversity and cultural resource conservation. Indigenous Protected Areas make a significant contribution to Australian biodiversity conservation.

The Nari Nari Tribal Council from the Toogimbie IPA in New South Wales states:

Our vision is to protect and enhance our culture and history, while encouraging and protecting the natural environment and conserving biodiversity.

The Indigenous priority is clearly towards Indigenous culture and history, which in Indigenous understanding is integrated with nature. The government’s statement however emphasises biodiversity and references culture as a resource in relation to the broader Australian estate.

The dissimilarity in emphasis and referencing articulated by the two parties reflects an underlying difference in management priority. This has the potential, even with the current goodwill and respect, to produce conflict and misunderstanding within the IPA model, particularly when the financial viability of the IPA projects relies on Indigenous compliance with government funding conditions.

In considering the Australian government national parks and Indigenous Protected Area models for cultural and natural landscape management, it appears evident that significant progress has been made to address the contradictory Western wilderness construct of separation of natural heritage management from cultural heritage management. In addition the importance of the interdependence, rather than separation, of the intangible understandings of tangible heritage is gaining recognition. This bodes well for the creation of understandings and intellectual foundations on which new cultural landscapes can be created, managed and protected.

**Conclusion**

The international discourse plus the actions of UNESCO and IUCN illustrate a philosophy leading towards more holistic practices in the management of cultural and natural landscape, particularly when encompassing shared management with traditional cultures. A more informed understanding is emerging that recognises the need to address the artificial separation of culture from nature and intangible from tangible heritage. As yet, the reduction of these separations is more akin to straddling the problem rather than reducing the chasm of division.

To implement this philosophical change there needs to be a movement beyond the debate of whether there is validity in the integration of culture/nature and intangible/tangible within landscape management. There needs to be an investigation into the governance and management of landscapes where they are treated as integrated environments.

Two questions, among many, arise from the struggle facing Indigenous people and governments working in the arena of shared management of cultural and natural landscape management. What are the governance structures and processes that can lead professional practice in the management of cultural and natural landscapes, when such landscapes are perceived and managed as a single integrated environment? How can the recognition of the
symbiotic relationship of intangible and tangible heritage, within management policy and process, contribute to continued cultural maintenance, sustainable development, conservation and biodiversity?

Notes
1 Indigenous Australians include the diverse range of Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures.
2 The term ‘country’ encapsulates the fertile human meaning of interrelationships between people and places, as in Indigenous Australian culture and in the European notion of ‘landscape’ and its human associations.
3 Organised by IUCN’s World Commission on Protected Areas.
4 See UNESCO WHC Decision 35 COM 12E.
6 Note: the Rice Terraces were placed on the World Heritage in Danger List in 2001 as a result of changes taking place that were seen to affect adversely the Outstanding Universal Value of the Terraces. The Report on the Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras 13/24 March 2011 recommended to the 2011 meeting of the World Heritage Committee that they remain on the list pending recommended management actions: Decision 34 COM 7A.26, WHC-11/35.COM/7A.Add. See http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4102 (accessed 18 March 2012)
7 ‘Anangu is the term that Yankunytjatjara and Pitjantjatjara Aboriginal people from the Western Desert region of Australia use to refer to themselves . . . it has come into common use in the region as a term referring to Aboriginal people, as opposed to non-Aboriginal people, as well as Aboriginal people who come from other parts of Australia’ (Anangu Tours 2011).
8 ‘Tjukurpa or Wapar is our law, culture, history, and our world view all bundled into one. Our ancestors have lived around Uluru (Ayers Rock) for many thousands of years, maintaining Tjukurpa, the law of the ancestors. Our grandparents taught us our Tjukurpa, just as their grandparents taught them. The term, Tjukurpa/Wapar, includes many complex but complementary concepts. Tjukurpa/Wapar encompasses:
   • Anangu religion, law and moral systems;
   • the past, the present and the future;
   • the creation period when ancestral beings, Tjukaritja/Waparitja, created the world as it is now;
   • the relationship between people, plants, animals and the physical features of the land; and
   • the knowledge of how these relationships came to be, what they mean and how they must be maintained in daily life and in ceremony.
   . . . Tjukurpa is the foundation of Anangu life.
   (There is not a single word in English that conveys the complex meaning of Tjukurpa. This is why at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park we use the Pitjantjatjara word. The Traditional Owners who speak Yankunytjatjara use the word Wapar to mean the same complex body of Law and beliefs)’ (Anangu Tours 2011).
9 Piranpa is a Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara term meaning, literally, ‘white’, but now used to mean non-Aboriginal people (Director of National Parks 2010: 175).
10 Kunuapara is a Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara ‘substitute used name when the name of a living person is the same as, or sounds like, the name of someone recently deceased’ (Director of National Parks 2010: 175).
11 The conditions for the closure of the tourist climb at Uluru are stated in Section 6.3.3 (c) of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Parks Management Plan 2010–2020 (Director of National Parks 2010: 92). Section 6.3.3 (c) states:
   ‘The climb will be permanently closed when:
   • the Board, in consultation with the tourism industry, is satisfied that adequate new visitor experiences have been successfully established, or
   • the proportion of visitors climbing falls below 20 per cent, or
the cultural and natural experiences on offer are the critical factors when visitors make their decision to visit the park.'
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Most of us, I suspect, without giving much thought to the matter, would say that a sense of place, a sense of being at home in a town or city, grows as we become accustomed to it and learn to know its peculiarities. It is my belief that a sense of place is something that we ourselves create in the course of time. It is the result of habit or custom.

John Brinckerhoff Jackson

Reflections

The late 1980s and 1990s were particularly fruitful for the heritage conservation discipline in terms of the opening of a critical debate and understanding of the concept of cultural heritage. This was also the time in which a comprehensive definition of, and operational framework for, cultural landscapes was elaborated, building on the innovative thinking and work particularly of geographers.¹

The inception of the three categories of cultural landscapes adopted by UNESCO in 1992 for World Heritage purposes extended concepts and international cultural heritage conservation thinking and practice to embrace associative values rather than a focus on tangible, physical fabric. It was an initiative that proved to be of great significance also as a driver to re-think other heritage categories and their conservation principles established in earlier periods. Underscoring these changes was the understanding of the significance of intangible values as a driver of heritage, which was aided substantially by increasing understanding of the cultural landscape concept.

As my interest in the cultural landscape concept developed from the early 1980s onwards with its potential for throwing open the door of cultural heritage thinking, it seemed paradoxical that the focus of cultural landscape work zeroed in so heavily on the non-urban sphere. Perhaps this was a result of my UK university education in cultural geography, followed by town planning (with a good dose of emphasis on townscape and people), and then landscape architecture. Within geography the class was given the option of studying a final year course in urban geography. It was not simply a study of urban morphology, but also the relationships between people, their experiences and urban form not least through the medium of cognitive mapping. This learning experience, coupled with an earlier introduction to the fascination of reading the landscape, led to my view that understanding urban environments, apart from the
incontrovertible fact that this is where most people lived, offered a rich field of study best understood under the cultural landscape umbrella.

In the light of these introductory comments and the imperative to improve management processes, several challenges offer fertile ground for discussion and resolve, including:

- How the notion of landscape embraces, in particular, its importance as a repository of social history and community values;
- How the cultural landscape concept relates to the historic urban environment: what are the similarities and possibly differences that exist between the two;
- How the identity of a city consists of a plurality of identities and traditional value and belief systems, as expressed and maintained by resident communities;
- How to sustain and enhance this as a way to brand the city; and,
- Which practical tools can be developed and integrated into urban landscape planning and conservation practice.

This chapter explores these challenging issues. It also aims to provide operational indicators in order to orient innovative planning and management processes. Underlying the chapter’s rationale is the premise that cities do not exist in a cultural vacuum. They are places with a social history and cultural context.

**A Paradigm Shift**

The introductory commentary is not intended to intimate that built area conservation did not exist. It did, but its focus was architectural conservation or planning ensembles with a concentration on buildings – and all too often famous buildings or monuments – as opposed to looking at built urban heritage as the places where people lived their everyday lives, where social values and a sense of place inhered. A foundation for the latter approach was presaged in the townscape studies of Cullen² and Lynch³ inquiring into how people experience urban spaces. The declaration, therefore, at a conference in Vienna⁴ in May 2005 of the UNESCO Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture. Managing the Historic Urban Landscape, was timely. It followed concern by the World Heritage Committee about impacts of modern developments on historic urban areas and compatibility with the protection of their heritage values. This was particularly so with its proposition of the Historic Urban Landscape notion as a tool to reinterpret the values of urban heritage, and indication of the need to identify new approaches and new tools for urban conservation. Of seminal importance was the primal shift in thinking on the urban environment away from purely physical architectural fabric to that of one fitting the cultural landscape model as seen in the Memorandum which refers to the historic urban landscape as:
... ensembles of any group of buildings, structures and open spaces, in their natural and ecological context, including archaeological and paleontological sites, constituting human settlements in an urban environment over a relevant period of time, the cohesion and value of which are recognised from the archaeological, architectural, prehistoric, historic, scientific, aesthetic, socio-cultural or ecological point of view. This landscape has shaped modern society and has great value for our understanding of how we live today.5

Discussions on, and scrutiny of, the Vienna Memorandum at a Round Table in 2006 at the University of Montreal6 reflected ‘that it was best seen as a transitional document that supports the gradual shift away from the preoccupation with the historic city as visual object to an interest in the historic environment as a space for ritual and human experience.’2

Building on the Vienna Memorandum a major intellectual endeavour of rethinking and broadening of ideas has evolved in urban conservation. Specifically the Historic Urban Landscape approach, through its recognition of the layering of significance and values in historic cities – deposited over time by different communities under different contexts – relates intellectually to the cultural landscape concept. Van Oers lucidly summarises this thinking in the following definition:8

Historic Urban Landscape is a mind-set, an understanding of the city, or parts of the city, as an outcome of natural, cultural and socio-economic processes that construct it spatially, temporally, and experientially. It is as much about buildings and spaces, as about rituals and values that people bring into the city. This concept encompasses layers of symbolic significance, intangible heritage, perception of values, and interconnections between the composite elements of the historic urban landscape, as well as local knowledge including building practices and management of natural resources. Its usefulness resides in the notion that it incorporates a capacity for change.9

As background to the growing interest in a shifting approach to urban conservation is the global phenomenon of the ever growing concentration of people living in urban areas. UNESCO notes that there is ‘a veritable explosion of urban populations, increasing each day [and] populations living in urban areas increase by 1.25 million every single week [and that] the current total is projected to double over the course of the next generation … [with] more than half of the world’s most populous cities and urban regions … found in Asia.’10

Whilst universal, the explosion, therefore, has particular relevance for the study and practice of urban heritage conservation in Asia where the impact on Asian cities is manifestly palpable. The growth of Asian cities is reflective of what is occurring throughout the developing world overall. Zetter and Watson11 note that globalisation has dramatically impacted city design with two particular negative outcomes. One is the accelerating destruction of the patrimony of indigenously designed and developed urban places and spaces, with culturally-rooted built environments eroding. The other is that the pressures are commodifying the place-identity of
historic urban spaces, detaching them from their local, spatial, and temporal continuity, whilst still representing them as preserved authentic artefacts for global cultural consumption.

Asia will continue the trend of the 1990s as one of the fastest urbanising regions in the world. Rapid economic growth meant that 111 of the 140 new large or big cities emerging after 1990 were in the region.\textsuperscript{12} Winter and Daly note, ‘China has built more housing in the last twenty-five years than any nation in history.’\textsuperscript{13} They further note that, in addition to on-going rural/urban migration, 1.25 billion people will be added to Asia's population by 2025, more than half of which will live in cities.

The shift to a holistic, contextual view of urban heritage to include the idea of landscape as setting for people's lives – and within this the idea of sense of place – is further seen in the initiative of the Seoul Declaration on Heritage and Metropolis in Asia and the Pacific. Notably the Declaration, in relation to a wider understanding of heritage, proposes that:

These heritage sites contribute to the life and memory of the metropolitan areas by the diversity of their uses….Along with geographical features and the living social ecosystem, cultural heritage contributes strongly to the personality and character of the metropolis. It is a source of a truly sustainable development of the metropolitan areas in Asia and the Pacific in achieving their strategic and economic roles.\textsuperscript{14}

Whilst the Seoul Declaration relates specifically to an Asian context, it is worth noting that its five major recommendations are highly relevant to consideration of sustainable urban conservation needs globally within a cultural landscape way of thinking:

1. Cultural heritage should be recognised as a diverse and non-renewable asset, essential to the sustainable and human development of metropolitan areas in Asia and the Pacific.

2. Conservation of cultural heritage should be integral to the development of the city, including policies, programs and projects, from their planning to their approval, implementation and updating.

3. Conservation is comprised of the on-going identification, evaluation, protection and management of cultural heritage supported by the necessary human, scientific and financial resources.

4. Conservation of cultural heritage requires the development and implementation of adapted tools founded on recognised best practice and local conditions and traditions.

5. Conservation in metropolitan areas requires information, involvement and cooperation among the public, private, academic, and non-government sectors as well as citizens and international organisations.\textsuperscript{14}

Documents such as the Vienna Memorandum and Seoul Declaration can be seen as a move ‘towards an awareness of the broader social and political histories of an urban environment … a shift in emphasis towards understanding of urban places as lived spaces and sites of collective identity [within] the broader socio-cultural and political contexts within which heritage sites.’\textsuperscript{15} Such notions link to the concept of the setting of heritage sites and places. In
stating the contribution of setting to the significance of heritage monuments, sites and areas the ICOMOS Xi’an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas further underscores a changing language and paradigm of urban heritage, not least in its reference to urban landscapes:

The setting of a heritage structure, site or area is defined as the immediate and extended environment that is part of, or contributes to, its significance and distinctive character. Beyond the physical and visual aspects, the setting includes interaction with the natural environment; past or present social or spiritual practices, customs, traditional knowledge, use or activities and other forms of intangible cultural heritage aspects that created and form the space as well as the current and dynamic cultural, social and economic context.

Heritage structures, sites or areas of various scales, including individual buildings or designed spaces, historic cities or urban landscapes, landscapes, seascapes, cultural routes and archaeological sites, derive their significance and distinctive character from their perceived social and spiritual, historic, artistic, aesthetic, natural, scientific, or other cultural values. They also derive their significance and distinctive character from their meaningful relationships with their physical, visual, spiritual and other cultural context and settings.\(^{16}\)

These relationships can be the result of a conscious and planned creative act, spiritual belief, historical events, use or a cumulative and organic process over time through cultural traditions.

In the discussion on changing thinking on urban conservation we may ask whether it is coincidental that the word ‘landscape’ and association with the word ‘culture’ has taken place, and hence the ‘cultural landscape’ linked to the urban environment. Here we think of how the conjunction of the word ‘cultural’ with landscape infers an inhabited, active/being. Additionally ‘culture’ like the German kultur (and therefore ‘cultural’) is about development of human intellectual achievement, care (Oxford English Dictionary): hence the German term kulturlandschaft from the scholarly work of late nineteenth/early twentieth century German geographers and from which our term ‘cultural landscape’ originates.\(^{17}\) Kulturlandschaft emphasises human activity – culture – in shaping landscape patterns, including urban landscape patterns, or streetscapes, or cityscapes, whatever we choose to call them.

### The Cultural Landscape Model: Landscape as History and Expression of Human Values and Identity

The places where we live are marked by distinctive characteristics. These are tangible, as in the physical patterns and components of our surrounds, and intangible as in the symbolic meanings and values we attach to places, and also to objects and to traditional ways of expression as in language, art, song, dance and so on. In this way physical space, sites and objects become places in the wider cultural landscape setting. They offer a past, are part of the present and suggest future continuity. It is these places with their association of meanings, which give rise to local identity and sense of place of communities.
A common denominator in sense of place and identity ‘is human attachment to landscape and place.’ Donald Meinig’s aphorism that ‘[L]andscape is an attractive, important, and ambiguous term … [that] encompasses an ensemble of ordinary features which constitute an extraordinarily rich exhibit of the course and character of any society’ still holds true, as does his rider that ‘[L]andscape is defined by our vision but interpreted by our minds. It is a panorama which continuously changes as we move along any route.’ It can be seen to offer a trajectory of thinking relevant to the historic urban environment, not least because ‘we are dealing primarily with vernacular culture’ where landscape study is a form of social history. ‘We regard all landscape as symbolic, as expressions of cultural values, social behavior (sic), and individual actions worked upon particular localities over a span of time.’

Such discourse in turn supports the notion that views landscape as a cultural construct reflecting human values: essentially the cultural landscape concept. Its significance in the urban sphere is that it allows us to see and understand the approach to urban conservation concentrating on individual buildings as ‘devoid of the socio-spatial context’ and can lead to a deterioration of the wider urban physical fabric. This is in contrast to the cultural landscape approach because of the human values the landscape approach embodies. Greffe posits this urban landscape way of thinking as contrary to seeing the city as a closed view of architectural wonders of historic cities, but rather seeing the ‘… postmodern city where we are looking for feelings and emotions. The landscape then becomes an experience.’

Central to the comprehensive cultural landscape approach developed since the late 1970s through the work of cultural geographers and related disciplines such as anthropology is the manner in which it ‘has progressively delved into landscape not simply or predominantly as history or a physical cultural product, but also – and more significantly – as cultural process reflecting human action and over time and associated pluralistic meanings and human values.’ Here there are connections with W.J.T. Mitchell and the proposition that ‘we think of landscape not as object to be seen or text to be read, but as a process by which identities are formed.’ The comprehensive cultural landscape model of landscape as cultural construct is illustrated in Figure 7.1.
**Figure 7.1** Interactive phenomenon of landscape.  Copyright of Ken Taylor.

In this model inherent landscape values and ideologies result in the multifaceted cultural landscape manifested as a spatial and political phenomenon and a way of seeing that is replete with meanings. The urban cultural landscape is therefore also ‘the inhabited landscape, the physical world that people participate in directly, modifying it as they are able to according to their needs, aspirations and means.’

A major theme underpinning the cultural landscape paradigm is the relationship or interaction between culture and nature and the association between people and natural elements. Here natural elements are not seen as merely physical entities, but entities and landmarks that reflect deep associations in the landscape and have meaning for people as seen in Figure 7.2.
The inception of the three categories of cultural landscapes for World Heritage purposes in 1992 recognised the culture-nature interaction as summarised by Mechtild Rössler:

Cultural landscapes are at the interface between nature and culture, tangible and intangible heritage, biological and cultural diversity – they represent a closely woven net of relationships, the essence of culture and people's identity.  

**Bangkok and the Chao Phraya River**

The culture-nature phenomenon is just as convincing in the urban setting in relation to urban form and identity. Natural elements contribute to the urban spirit of place, as well as shaping the city's morphology, and have legibility. They are often historically the *raison d'être* for the physical setting of the city, or strong contributor to it. Bangkok established in 1782 on the Chao Phraya River delta is a case in point. Bangkok without the vibrancy of the Chao Phraya River, where the life and historic pageantry of the city are displayed and experienced, as well as reflecting the historic importance of water transport, is unimaginable. **Figure 7.3** highlights this aspect of the city in the Royal Barge Procession celebrating the King's birthday in 2007 at Rattanakosin Island, site of the Grand Palace and many important Buddhist temples such as Wat Phou. At a Royal Barge Ceremony in 1982 marking Bicentennial celebrations of the city Askew notes that, as the Royal Family paid homage to their ancestral spirits at the main palace gate, ‘the ceremony of homage was familiar enough to the majority of ordinary Thais who customarily pay respects to the Chaw Thi (land spirit) of their home. Homage and respect, key features of Thai social relations (both between people and the supernatural beings that
inhabit the world, unseen but nonetheless real) were enacted in the royal ritual, tapping a common cultural source.’26 Equally the modern busy business districts along the River are vibrant scenes reflecting the indelible identity of the city.

![Royal Barge procession, Chao Praya River, Bangkok.](image)

**Figure 7.3** Royal Barge procession, Chao Praya River, Bangkok.

**Canberra**

An example par excellence of the interface between culture and nature is the city of Canberra, the federal capital of Australia, a remarkable example of twentieth century city planning. From its inception in the nineteenth century, and before the Walter Burley Griffin entry won the 1911 international competition for the city’s design, the concept and ideal of an Australian federal capital envisaged a city in the landscape. This set in train the foundation for Canberra as a remarkable city. In the true sense of the word it is a unique city, for there is no other city like it in the world. Walter Burley Griffin declared in 1912 that he had planned a city not like any other city. These were prophetic words, for its development over the years has maintained its status of being unlike any other. Why is this? There are roads, houses, offices, schools, shops, parks – all the components we associate with urban development – as in any other city.

The underlying reason lies in the way landscape defines and articulates the city morphology starting with the Griffin plan. Changes over the years to the form of the city and hence to the Griffin ideal have taken place. Nevertheless the landscape basis, which binds form and content, remains vividly coherent in the city plan. The form of the physical landscape – natural and created – is a palpable, tangible presence defining the city; but equally so is its content or intangible, symbolic meaning. Underlying the city’s spatial structure is the fundamental premise of Canberra as a city in the landscape. Its spatial structure has been progressively and incrementally planned from the beginning to maintain continuity with existing design elements,
in particular the hills, ridges, and valleys (see Box 7.1).

From the symbolic heart of the city and the nation in the National Triangle (Figure 7.2) with its serene symmetrical beauty, out through the tree-lined streets, neighbourhood and district parks and open spaces to the hills, ridges, and valleys – the National Capital Open Space System (NCOSS) – it is the landscape nature of the city that predominates physically. In turn this tangible physical presence has inextricable, intangible meanings and values, confirming that landscape is not just what we see, but a way of seeing.27

When you look out over the magnificent prospect from Mount Ainslie towards Parliament House (Figure 7.2) across the city to the surrounding hills that form the embracing backdrop for the city, or enjoy the tree-lined streets, gardens, and parks of the suburbs, the landscape itself is more than physical elements. It has a meaning and significance that inform what Canberra is (see also Box 7.1).28

Cultural Landscape Characteristics

As interest in cultural landscapes developed, particularly from the 1980s, it became clear that cultural landscapes are a complex phenomenon. They need research information beyond simple historical documentation to embrace detailed investigation, including field surveys, using multi-disciplinary input to document landscape characteristics. Documenting landscape characteristics and associated features is, therefore, a fundamental requirement for understanding landscapes, rural or urban. In effect this is taking up the geographer's idea of reading the landscape where 'the basic principle is this: that all human landscape has cultural meaning, no matter how ordinary that landscape may be.' In this sense 'Our landscape is our unwitting biography, reflecting our tastes, our values, our aspirations, and even our fears in tangible visible form'.29

Landscape characteristics or the forces that shape a cultural landscape can be summarised as follows:

- PATTERNS in the landscape resulting from the PROCESS of landscape making (Spatial Organisation and Land-use).
- NATURAL ELEMENTS.
- CULTURAL TRADITIONS.
- INDIVIDUAL COMPONENTS.30

Fundamental to understanding the significance of the cultural landscape paradigm in urban conservation is that landscapes are not static entities. They change through time resulting in us being able to recognise layers in the landscape. They tell the story of people, events and places through time, offering a sense of continuity: it is what Lynch nicely sees as a sense of the stream of time.31 The concept of ‘landscape’ therefore infers cultural context, human action and activity and also change over time. From a cultural landscape perspective, the concept of layers as essential to a contextualised understanding of urban heritage in contrast to a fabric
oriented discourse is neatly expressed in the following commentary by Panjabi and Winter:

As densely populated, historically layered environments, today's cities draw upon their material and social fabric to express a multitude of values – including social equity, multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism or nation building. Invariably, it is these very values that define the city as place.

Consideration of these factors suggests a number of key issues to help guide urban cultural landscape study:

- Landscapes are a clue to culture, they tell a story which can be interpreted and read.
- Landscapes are inhabited, the world in which we participate, and are therefore subject to change.
- Existence of continuity in the landscape: they represent a composite image (layers) rather than separate dots on a map – everything is interconnected.
- They represent inter-relationships between people, places and events through time.
- They are significant reminders of the past and the present and a guide to the future.
- They reveal social history arousing associative values and interpretative values.

In the light of the above discussion we may appreciate, therefore, that the cultural landscape paradigm presents a firm conceptual basis for urban conservation and operation of the Historic Urban Landscape model. It is a platform on which to build a sustainable approach to urban heritage planning focused on protection of not merely physical built fabric, but equally social values and intangible cultural heritage. The critical word under a cultural landscape approach is that of ‘values’ leading to a value-based approach to heritage conservation, including urban conservation. It is an approach that is, for example, central to Australian practice not least through the document that guides Australian thinking and practice, the Burra Charter with its reference to social and spiritual values. Integral is the recognition of associations between people and places where ‘Associations mean the special connections that exist between people and a place’ (Article 1.15, p.3) and the explanatory note ‘Associations may include social or spiritual values and cultural responsibilities for a place.’

Building on these numerous documents, Australian heritage practice focuses, inter alia, on guiding the central platform of values. For example Steps to sustainable tourism. Planning a sustainable future for Tourism, Heritage and the Environment of the Commonwealth of Australia, in particular its ten steps diagram. This has been developed in Stepping Stones for Heritage (Stepwise Heritage & Tourism) into the concept of a ten steps guide for heritage as a way of guiding people through the heritage management process:

1. Vision for the future?
2. Who is involved?
3. What we know?
4. What is important?
5. What the issues are?
6. Strengths and weaknesses?
7. What the ideas are?
8. What the objectives are?
9. Action plans?
10. Making it happen.

Notably it is a guide that speaks to people, not just experts. It is reflective of Jackson's aphorism that 'We should never tinker with the landscape without thinking of those who live in the midst of it.'

The shift in thinking about heritage places since 1992 that has accompanied the instigation of the three World Heritage cultural landscape categories is one that links people, places and events through time, and not just the rich and famous people. It has led to the increasing appreciation of intangible values that inhere in places because of the association of ideas between people and place. In this way we can appreciate that all cultural landscapes have associative values. Julian Smith expresses this as follows:

… it is useful to think of cultural landscapes as ideas embedded in a place, and to consider the recording of cultural landscapes as an exercise in cognitive mapping rather than that physical mapping. The challenge of this approach is that a cultural landscape cannot be observed, it must be experienced. And it must be experienced within the cultural framework of those who have created and sustained it … some would argue that this kind of cultural landscape is an associative cultural landscape.

The discussion on associative value suggests that it is time to review and alter the definition of Associative Cultural Landscape with its emphasis, mistakenly, on 'powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element’. It is intended to relate to indigenous aboriginal cultures, but fails to appreciate that for aboriginal cultures, natural elements of their world are part of the made-world of people and ancestors as in the Australian Aboriginal concept of the Dreaming.

Urban Identity, Plurality, Sustainable Development Tools for Urban Landscape Planning and Conservation Practice

In dealing with urban heritage conservation it is vital that those involved – whether they be government urban planning/urban design agencies, politicians, NGOs, or inhabitants of cities – understand that historic cities consist of a plurality of communities. These shift and change through time imposing different values, thereby contributing to the layering of the city. With this
imagery in mind, the idea of a circumscribed inner area of an historic city, immutable in time, where rigid conservation of the architectural fabric may be enforced as a way of attempting to stamp a sense of local identity irrespective of how social values and ways of living change is not necessarily the best model to follow. Such an approach is in danger of leading to a product that is nothing more (or less) than the driver of heritage tourism or enveloping gentrification. In connection with the latter phenomenon Justin Davidson, New York Magazine architectural critic, speculated on WYNC Radio (New York), 15 October 2012, that preserving urban districts architecturally does not prevent change, it accelerates it in effect because it leads to gentrification. It preserves architectural integrity but not communities. This is not a blanket dismissal of gentrification, but rather an emphasis that there will be examples where local community voices need to be heard and allowed to participate in change that does not disenfranchise them: the example of Zhuijiajiao (near Shanghai) given below is a case in point.

Additionally for historic cities there is the curse or benefit – depending on your point of view – of tourism. We may also question whether the circumscribed historic city as driver of tourism is truly commensurate with the cultural landscape idea, notwithstanding the latter's incorporation of change into its intellectual menu. It is how change is understood and handled that is critical. Even so, it has to be acknowledged that the tourism cityscape is a cultural landscape form: but so is Disneyland. In this vein Ashworth and Graham argue in relation to the post-war European city that if it ‘exists as an idea, then it is composed of conserved urban forms and the idealised urban form that these contain.’ They place this within the context of vernacularism ‘viewed as a self-conscious and deliberate expression of localism [where] the conserved historic city has adopted many vernacular elements drawn from the folk museum’, suggesting then that ‘it is a short step from the deliberately assembled museum town to the vernacular “museumification” of existing towns and districts.’ This for me is a chilling thought.

That identity is grounded in heritage is well established. It is part of an inclusive sense of belonging that is communal and embracing, but it might also be exclusive. For tourism purposes for example, inclusivity is central to interpreting and presenting places for outsiders where, from this knowledge, they could imagine being involved in creating what it is that constitutes the identity of the place. Alternatively they might evoke an interest in a place and want to know more about it and to explore it. The hustle and bustle of everyday street scenes with shop houses and markets in Asian cities is a cogent example. The streets are often vibrant, living entities where everyday life – real vernacular as opposed to ersatz vernacular – and sense of living history are palpable. For urban communities identity grounded in heritage is central to sense of place, a sense of being at home, ‘something that we ourselves create...It is the result of habit or custom.’

One of the dangers inherent in urban areas of what is termed ‘heritagisation’ (ghastly word) is an historic city brand image with replicable heritage items, bric-a-brac, and standard ‘off the peg’ heritage. It is, according to Ashworth and Graham, reflective of the hallmark of some European cities typified as ‘catalogue heritage.’ Within this overall classification are separate categories or possibilities to market heritage distinctiveness. Ashworth and Graham refer to
these as ‘popular optional ‘add-ons’ … ‘tourist-historic waterfront’, medieval old town, ‘ethnic’ district, festival calendar, sanitised ‘red light’, and gentrified ‘urban village’; ‘all devised to be different but ultimately becoming the same.’

The cultural landscape model would suggest that wherever possible this catalogue list approach to urban heritage conservation is best avoided, or at least restricted in extent and reproduction. Instead should be a systematic approach where the socio-cultural and political context of the cultural landscape as process by which identities are formed is applied.

In contrast to these examples are some from Shanghai. The first concerns the changes taking place along the Suzhou River in Shanghai where older brick warehouse buildings are being adaptively reused as professional studios, workshops making such things as furniture, and shops selling the furniture or designed goods. Figure 7.4 shows a group of old warehouse buildings, adaptively reused as studios and workshops and seen against a background of modern multi-storey apartment developments. This example represents a model of how changing values and economic change have led to changing use of the buildings whilst retaining their structures, sense of place and functional link with the past: another layer in the urban cultural landscape. The second is the famous example of the major waterfront of The Bund, Shanghai, China, where, although a huge tourist attraction and changes have occurred, there is a sense of the stream of time engendered in the conserved art deco waterfront buildings and the sheer exhilarating, kaleidoscopic view of the river with its constant movement of boats of all kinds – working boats, tourist boats, ferries – plying the water. It is a layered Historic Urban Landscape where the ultra-modern city development of Pudong heightens the sense of exhilaration.
**Figure 7.4** The Suzhou River in Shanghai.

A third example is the canal towns of Shanghai such as Zhuijiajiao. Taking Zhuijiajiao we see changes have taken place, but they are changes that can be seen not to be simply tourist fashionable vernacularism. Such towns have rich histories, traditional architecture, and daily life that make them distinctly and unmistakably Chinese (**Figures 7.5 a,b**).
Figure 7.5  (a) The old town of Zhujiajiao near Shanghai. (b) Local craftsperson displaying traditional skills to the public.

Notably the local community consists of people who have traditionally lived here for generations; people who want to continue to live here because it is a community, not merely a population. It is a cogent example of changing social values where tourism now substantially...
helps the local economy, but where changes have not destroyed the place from the point of view of tangible values (traditional buildings and canal setting), and from the point of view of intangible values (people's lives, community feeling and sense of place). Significantly, the place still belongs to them and they belong to it. In one building you may catch a glimpse of a local aged persons' group playing mahjong. Heritage conservation planning addressed the views and feelings of local people who wanted to stay in their community: here is the essence of the city as cultural landscape. The sense of authenticity and that of integrity are palpable.

**Tools**

The synergy between a cultural landscape approach and the Historic Urban Landscape is inherent in an overview of the changing socio-economic and political conditions affecting the holy Indian city of Varanasi. Singh establishes the need for urban heritage to be seen as a sustainable resource for future development of the city where heritage is protected and monitored continuously; impact of heritage protection constantly evaluated; development follows specific heritage guidelines; where there is active participation of residents and stakeholders and where heritage brings sustainable economic benefits to the local population.44

The cultural landscape is an approach convincingly expressed by Punekar in the following comments:

A cultural landscape approach enables diverse communities to be seen as part of that landscape. That is, cultural, historical, and political conditions affecting contemporary communities are part of the process of human engagement with the place. The cultural landscape approach can be a means of reuniting fragmented approaches to valuing and constructing the environments we inhabit, a means of overcoming distinctions between historic environment and new development, nature and culture, built heritage and context.45

There is a fundamental need to initiate a dialogue with city planners and urban designers on the Historic Urban Landscape paradigm. It is important in this dialogue that it is understood that the concept of urban conservation and the reality of city development and expansion are not mutually exclusive, acceding that change to city form will be inevitable. Inherent in this process are some or all of the following considerations:

1. Understanding the city as an evolving process – living entity – not merely a series of objects (buildings). The idea of process embraces intangible cultural heritage values, genius loci, and interaction between culture and nature, as well as tangible heritage aspects.

2. Addressing the overall urban morphology of the city in its landscape setting so that future development does not overwhelm (a) the landscape physically, or (b) its intangible meanings and values, thereby maintaining the link between culture and nature and intangible connotations. The case of the World Heritage Dresden Elbe Valley cultural landscape delisted in 2009 is a case in point where the construction of a four lane bridge was deemed to destroy the values of the landscape setting of the city.
3. Urban landscape under the banner of visual and physical integrity is not just a matter of quantitative visual attributes where management is nothing more than dealing with views and skylines as seen objects. Rather it is to do with the cultural context of the way of seeing dynamic urban form and its relationship with the wider setting: who has been involved and why are some views important. Of note in this connection is the following reference by Moggridge:

During the Ming and Qing Dynasty (XIIIth and XIVth century) it was the custom of every city or town in China to select generally eight [sometimes a few more] best landscape scenes in the vicinity that best represented the local character. The selected scenes were normally those preferred by the local people and were the most popular destinations.46 From this we may see as Moggridge posits ‘special views are a major cultural resource of cities.’

In the category of special resources forming the setting for cities are, inter alia, views of hills and mountains visible above or between buildings. Some cities have taken the line of constructing cones of view circumscribing views which are identified as needing protection, for example Vancouver. The urban morphology management regime of Paris achieves a similar outcome by protecting identified significant inner urban zones from overshadowing by high-rise development. By this mechanism the significant morphology rooted in history of the planning of Paris is recognised. Others such as George Town, Penang, look at how to control heights for new buildings to safeguard sense of place and landscape settings.47 There are lessons and conclusions for the city of Hangzhou and World Heritage listed West Lake, China (Box 7.2), which are critical to a Historic Urban Landscape approach to interaction between the city and the lake setting.

4. Organising regional workshops, through NGOs and agencies such as UNESCO and ICOMOS, to propel the idea of thematic studies that critically examine urban development and conservation practice. Such studies open the opportunity to focus not only on major cities, but secondary towns/cities and their settings, and vernacular settlements as suggested in World Heritage: Challenges for the Millennium.51 The role of NGOs should not be underestimated. The Penang Heritage Trust (PHT), for example, has been active since 1986 in promoting conservation needs for the historic urban area of George Town, Penang, and is a leading example. Its conservation efforts have been recognised by seats on various state heritage committees, local government committees and the UNESCO World Heritage Committee. PHT publishes a regular newsletter and heritage trail brochures, and offers school education programmes.

5. Use of Urban Heritage Zoning as described by Yuen in Singapore where a shift in the mid-1980s from a demolish and rebuild approach to city planning has seen a greater effort to reinforce and integrate past heritage with present developments, with a major turning point being a 1989 planning act amendment.52 This saw the appointment of a conservation authority, designation of conservation areas with associated conservation requirements and guidelines. The number of identified conservation areas has increased to more than twenty (total area 751 ha). Many of these are interpreted and presented for tourism purposes.
through attractive, informative trail brochures such as for Jalan Besar, Balestier and Bukit Timah. Involving historic shop house areas being saved from demolition and specific restoration guidelines with information for owners to help protect authenticity, these Singapore exemplars demonstrate how change and adaptation towards improved environmental character shows how the past should serve the future as Yuen neatly expresses it. Architecturally, old and new combine to present a vigorous lively sense of socially vibrant urban life, rather than simple preservation of old areas. The variety of old and new buildings, including high-rise framing skyline views, adds diversity and interest. A prominent example of treating a city through the Historic Urban Landscape approach and using complementary cultural mapping exercises is Vigan, Philippines (see Box 7.3). As Eric Zarrudo observes ‘Vigan was declared a World Heritage city in 1999. It is the most intact nineteenth century district with the fusion of Asian and European architectural and artistic expressions in the Philippines. It has a rich fabric of heritage resources, natural, built, intangible and movable. The local government has developed a Vigan Master Plan and the Vigan Municipal Ordinance N.4 and has embarked on various community programs that protect and enliven the heritage precinct.’

6. Educating planners to understand the importance of social significance of urban heritage places and the need for conservation management plans that address identified zones.

7. Understanding the role of communities of people and stakeholders and the need to organise for their participation. In this part of the process it is essential that differing communities are identified from a range of socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. Central to this aspect is that urban communities are not cohesive single units, but pluralistic and changing. A technique available to deciding on community groups and keeping dialogue flowing is found in REAP methods (Rapid Ethnographic Assessment Procedure). REAP can assist in revealing conflicts and differences as well as similarities in community opinions and values.

8. Understanding by planners of vernacularism, as an expression of localism alongside the existence of regional differences in urban areas, as for example in the Zhuijiangao case.

9. Understanding the role and importance of cultural mapping and cognitive mapping in urban conservation work. Cultural mapping is the term used to describe the set of activities and processes for exploring, discovering, documenting, examining, analysing, interpreting, presenting and sharing information related to people, communities, societies, places and the material products and practices associated with those people and places. A cultural map may be created as an end in itself or provide an input into another endeavour. The cultural mapping process may focus on the past, the present and also the future. In this respect cultural mapping can be used to monitor change in material culture as well as intangible cultural practices. Cultural mapping is to do with teasing out local distinctiveness and identity.
Box 7.1 City as Evolving Process: Need for a Historic Urban Landscape Approach for Canberra, Australia's National Capital

Canberra was conceived and planned as a city not like any other for the first 75 years of its conception from the Griffin plan of 1912 with planning guidelines specifically modelled to maintain it as the city in the landscape. It was a cumulative approach over the years that may be seen to be a forecast of the Historic Urban Landscape paradigm (Figure 7.6, 7.7, 7.8 and 7.9). Since self-government in 1988 planning has been governed increasingly by the mantra of increasing urban densification, urban consolidation and high-rise buildings without regard for the fundamental significance of its historic landscape ethos leading to loss of landscape space and trees and blocking views of the surrounding hills that are quintessential to the setting and ambience of the city. Action needs to be focused on the following to reflect the Historic Urban Landscape:

- Special nature of the city as with its vision of a planned ideal city – a city not like any other;
- *Genius loci* of the city inherently centred on the culture-nature interaction;
- Preparation of metropolitan plan for the whole city rather than separate piecemeal plans for separate suburbs or groups of suburbs;\(^4\)
- Within metropolitan plan need for precinct plans for suburbs that relate to specific character of the suburb(s) and where local residents are consulted; currently the model is the development of precinct codes that are then incorporated into the Territory Plan as technical amendments without local community input; planning for cones of view and protecting significant vistas;
- Need to establish appropriate partnership between planning authority and residents for local area (suburb) planning.
**Figure 7.6** Nature and culture in the city setting.

**Figure 7.7** Nature absent in Canberra new medium density development.
Figure 7.8  Academy of Science National Heritage listed building, 2011.

Figure 7.9  New high-rise building impact on the setting and context of the Academy of Science, 2013.
Box 7.2 Hangzhou and West Lake, China: maintaining Visual and Physical Integrity

Hangzhou and World Heritage listed West Lake (Figure 7.10), China: critical aspects of Historic Urban Landscape approach to interaction between the city and the lake setting:

- Maintain special qualities of the meaning of West Lake as the city grows in the future by not allowing city form to overwhelm the scale and ephemeral poetry of landscape qualities of the Lake. Expansion zones for the city and high rise development are kept away from the eastern side of the lake (Figures 7.11 and 7.12).

- Protect hill and mountain view sheds as backdrop to vistas from the lake using cones of views.

- Engage with local people and tourists through such tools as cultural mapping to research and understand how people see and appreciate the special character, *genius loci*, of place. In cultural mapping terms this is known as local distinctiveness. Engage with Chinese domestic tourists and their perceptions from an Asian perspective. Discussions in tourism often give attention to marketing, facility management or growth statistics.

- Think of the cultural landscape of West Lake and Hangzhou in terms of the idea of an *associative cultural landscape*. Here the critical question on determining future urban form should focus on whether new development ‘disrupts existing aesthetics and valued rituals or whether it respects them’ and where it may add to the dynamic quality of the urban form and its relationship with the landscape of West Lake with all its accumulated meanings (Figure 7.13).
**Figure 7.10**  West Lake looking east towards protected hills. Hangzhou city is on the right.

**Figure 7.11**  Model looking south showing relationship of city with the lake and protection of the eastern, western and southern hills along the lake.
Figure 7.12  Protected low density urban area on east side of lake.

Figure 7.13  Enjoying a lake park near the city.
### Box 7.3 Vigan

Heritage mapping project of the heritage city of Vigan, Ilocos Province, the Philippines. Transforming heritage resources for economic and societal development.

#### Heritage Mapping Project of the Heritage City of Vigan

**Goals**

- To identify and map out the heritage resources of Vigan.
- Nature heritage
- Movable heritage
- Intangible heritage
- To develop activities/projects based on mapping data to add value to community life.

**Methodology**

- Identify resources
- Understand & record
- Generate interest/approval
- Conduct community organizing activities
- Conduct skills development and capacity building workshops
- Resurvey existing heritage program
- Insulate practical applications
- Create useful products

**Participants and stakeholders**

- Academics
- Architects
- Businesses
- Consultants
- Engineers
- Faculty and students of UST
- Housewives
- Local government officials
- Journalists
- Policy makers
- Public school teachers
- Religious leaders
- Tourism officers
- Urban planners

**Key issues**

- Some significant City personnel with responsibilities for implementation of conservation guidelines for Vigan do not participate.

**General outcomes**

- Increased understanding of the integral relationship between heritage & development
- Promotions of research material for conservation advocacy & other applications

**Mapping product package**

- 3 volumes on natural heritage resources
- 2 volumes on built heritage
- 6 volumes on intangible heritage
- 2 volumes on sensitive heritage

**Future funding strategies**

- Publication budget should be integrated into project budget for publication of Vigan Heritage Map
- Funding for applied projects should have been allocated
- Social media on funds management and cultural industries should have been integrated

**Practical outcomes**

- Creation of new & strengthening existing community organizations
- Amendment & review Vigan conservation ordinance
- Project feasibility case studies of abandoned spaces & structures
- Heritage-based curriculum for schools
- Commercial products development
- Accreditation system and continuing education for architects practicing within the city’s core and buffer zones
- Establishments of Talents, Workshops for traditional skills
- Exhibition of Cultural Mapping Project in the university and the city’s cultural centers
- Development of new heritage and cultural tourism programs
- Rehabilitation of river systems for communications, transport, education and heritage promotion
- Preparation for the organizational setup of the Metro Vigan ConDOT including four other adjacent municipalities


### Conclusion

In 1933 Fernand Léger at the Fourth International Congress of Modern Architecture opined that:

There are some essential qualities to which the average person is attached and which he insists on having. If you destroy those qualities, then you have to replace them. The problem is an essentially human one. Put your plans back in your pocket, go out to the street and listen to the people breathe; you have to be in touch with them, steep yourself in the raw material, and walk in the same mud and the same dust. 55

It is therefore fundamentally important to listen to communities and learn how to communicate
findings to planners, politicians and developers who will be influential in making land-use policy decisions. A model for listening to community voices of ordinary people in an historic urban setting is found in the work of Chin and Jorge in Malacca:

We began by listening: Listening to the young; listening to the old. Listening to shopkeepers and craftsmen, traders and fishermen (...) We began listening to those who are often not heard. And to countless more who often dare not speak.56

Notes


6 See Proceedings of Round Table on ‘Heritage and the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes’ organised by the Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage, Montreal, 9 March 2006.
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I argued this point in 1993 when Australia was given the task of commenting on the Associative category. In my view the reference to natural element is a Eurocentric Romantic notion of the deep relationship between Aboriginal Australians and their country (landscape).
See website: http://www.wnyc.org/story/243306-urban-development-bloomberg-years/


Canberra's underlying plan is a grouping of six towns linked by open space corridors. Each town is subdivided into suburbs with groups of suburbs forming districts.
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1 Introduction: Cultural Landscapes

Twenty-First Century Conservation Opportunities and Challenges

Ken Taylor, Archer St Clair, and Nora J. Mitchell

...landscape could perhaps best be thought of as a series of tensions: tensions between distance and proximity, observing and inhabiting, eye and land, culture and nature; these tensions animate the landscape concept, make it cogent and productive.

Wylie (2007:216)

In October 2012, the Program in Cultural Heritage and Preservation Studies (CHAPS) at Rutgers University (New Jersey) worked with a wide range of partners to convene an international conference Cultural Landscapes: Preservation Challenges for the 21st Century. This conference was one of many global events marking the fortieth anniversary of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, the twentieth anniversary of the World Heritage Committee’s 1992 recognition of cultural landscape categories for World Heritage purposes, and the approval of the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL), in November 2011 (see also Postscript ‘The Road from Rutgers’).

This conference was grounded on two premises. The first is that the cultural landscape concept offers a framework that encompasses an integrated view of the processes and relationships essential to a culture-based conservation strategy that respects the complexity and wealth of diverse values in a rapidly changing world. The second is that the key concerns in sustainable cultural heritage conservation and management are comparable around the world. Exchange among countries and sharing of experiences are essential to developing successful theoretical and practical approaches to conservation. A global perspective was, therefore, a critical factor for the conference. As a result, this book consists of twenty-two chapters (including this Introduction) developed from conference presentations by leading professionals and scholars. In total they present a contemporary and evolving international view of the concept of cultural landscape conservation—including urban cultural landscapes—recognizing the cultural landscape as a significant setting for all human activities.
Ken Taylor et al.

The cultural landscape concept is intended to increase awareness that heritage places are not isolated islands and that there is interdependence between people, their social structures and ecosystems, and landscape conservation. The conference papers and panel discussions focused on new and innovative approaches to conservation in two areas. The first concerns the broadening of the understanding and importance of the spirit and meaning of the cultural landscape idea and the implications for conservation. The second concerns the extension, over the past five years, to embrace the concept of the historic urban landscape (HUL). The UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL), approved by the 17th General Assembly of UNESCO in November 2011, extends an interdisciplinary cultural landscape approach to urban settings as a way to engage with the multiple aspects of urban historic conservation rather than a focus predominantly on architectural elements. The chapters in this book articulate this evolving concept and new directions in conservation of cultural landscapes and illustrate, through many case studies, how landscape meaning and human values are conceived and acted upon in different places across the world.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE: A USEFUL AND EVOLVING CONCEPT

Cultural landscapes are the places where human culture is on display where ‘our human landscape is our unwitting biography, reflecting our tastes, our values, our aspirations, and even our fears in tangible visible form’ (Lewis 1979:12). Cultural landscapes consist therefore of tangible physical patterns and elements, but also importantly, reflect intangible values and associations. Cultural landscapes are a window onto our past, our present and our future and our evolving relationship with the natural environment. Inextricably tied to this notion is that of landscape as process, rather than merely as product (Selman 2012; Taylor 2012). It is an understanding of landscape ‘as a process by which identities are formed’ (Mitchell 1994:1). Such a view of landscape—landscape as cultural construct—embraces not only the physical, practical ways in which people shape and structure their landscapes through time, but also seeks to understand the significance of the beliefs, values and ideologies that people bring to the shaping of landscape. In cultural landscape studies there are two consistent questions that the critical mind asks. First, why do our landscapes—the ordinary everyday places as well as the special or protected places—look like they do (not simply what do they look like)? Second, why have our predecessors, and now ourselves and our contemporaries, shaped the landscape in particular ways to give us the contemporary scene?

The intellectual background to a modern understanding of the term ‘cultural landscape’ arose from the work of German geographers and anthropologists in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In particular, Otto Schlüter (geographer) who introduced the term ‘kulturlandschaft’ (James
and Martin 1981) and Franz Boas (anthropologist and geographer) who ‘argued that it was important to understand the cultural traits of societies—
their behaviours, beliefs, and symbols—and the necessity for examining them in their local context. He established the contextualist approach to culture, known as cultural relativism’ (Taylor 2012:26; see also Franz Boas, Wikipedia). Boas ‘understood that as people migrate from one place to another, and as the cultural context changes over time, the elements of a culture, and their meanings, will change, which led him to emphasize the importance of local histories for an analysis of cultures’ (Franz Boas, Wikipedia). Here Boas embraced ‘the historicist mode of conceptualising environment’ (Livingstone 1992:29) and understood that different cultures may adjust to similar environments differently. There are parallels with Schlüter’s view that ‘the essential object of geographical inquiry was landscape morphology as a cultural product’ (Livingstone 1992:264). He studied the settlement patterns in the Unstrut Valley, Germany, and ‘came to see the importance of the different cultures of German and Slav settlers in transforming the landscape’ (Livingstone 1992:264).

While the cultural geographical movement certainly did not invent the idea of landscape and association with people, it did give it an intellectual and practical foundation on which modern interdisciplinary cultural landscape studies have built. Peter Howard, in discussing how landscape study is spread across many disciplines, nevertheless speculates that there is . . . a very simple reason for this. Landscape is not very rational. It is intensely personal and reflects our own history and culture, our personal likes and dislikes. It is always about ‘my place’, or at least somebody’s place.

Howard (2011:2)

Inherent in Howard’s comment on personal aspects of landscape—and its conflation with place—reflecting history and culture is the significance of shared community heritage values of landscapes. The idea of shared heritage is a continual theme in many of the cases discussed in this book where the contemporary is as relevant as the historical, but where history informs our contemporary perceptions. Recognition of the significance of the contemporary and not merely the historical landscape was a salutary lesson consistently taught by J. B. Jackson. He had an infectious enthusiasm for the everyday scenes, what he referred to under the rubric of the vernacular landscape as ‘a humbler, less permanent, less conspicuous sort’ (Jackson 1984:xi) as opposed to what he called political spaces created by some form of legislative act. Herein lies the dilemma: how can we pay more attention to the vernacular, the ordinary everyday landscapes that are ubiquitous, and across which human history is written, and also include the continually changing contemporary landscape, the here and now? Chapter 22 by Akobirov and Chapter 17 by Rodriguez-Navarro in this book are singular
and poetic reminders of the value that this type of a seemingly unremarkable landscape can have for a community of people. In contrast to the vernacular, we have often focused primarily on landscapes that have some form of official designation and protection, a point to which we return in the section below, ‘Forging a new paradigm for cultural landscape conservation’. In the context of the vernacular, it is notable that the European Landscape Convention (ELC) recognizes the potential value of all landscapes to communities suggesting:

In particular, the ordinary landscapes where most people live are seen as having value to someone, even though the quality may be low in terms of many of the commonly identified indicators such as scenic beauty, biodiversity rating, range of use and accessibility. The emphasis here is very much on the value to someone (communities, cultures and individuals).

(Roe and Taylor 2014:6)

It is worth noting that the developing interest in large landscapes addressed in this book, particularly in Parts I, II, and IV, emphasizes and encourages consideration of the diverse values outlined in the ELC and how they fit within the cultural landscape concept.

The joining of the word ‘cultural’ with ‘landscape’ to make ‘cultural landscape’ invites the question of what do we mean by ‘cultural’? It is, in essence, where culture is the agent that fashions our cultural landscapes from the natural landscape (Sauer 1925). ‘Culture’ as a word has various origins as for example in the Latin word *colere* (Olwig 1993), with various meanings including inhabit, cultivate as in tillage, protect, honour. Additionally ‘culture’ like the German *kultur* (and therefore ‘cultural’) is about development of human intellectual achievement, and caring (Oxford English Dictionary). Raymond Williams (1985) sees culture as a general process of intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic development; a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period, or a group; and works and practices of intellectual and artistic activity. Horne (1986:4) has a more pithy description of culture as ‘the repertoires of collective habits of thinking and acting that give particular meanings to existence’. In these interpretations we are able to see how the twinning of culture with landscape fits our understanding of what we mean by cultural landscape: a process that reflects how our modes of thinking and acting, coupled with our beliefs, and how we perceive and interact with nature are manifested in the landscapes we create through time. They reflect a story of events, people, and place through time. In this context and over the past thirty years or so, there has been, and continues to be, a steady source of literature addressing the topic of landscape, its meanings and values, including perception of landscape, landscape in literature and in travel; the following references are representative of this literature.
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The book chapters collectively espouse an holistic view of a cultural landscape concept. This is where meaning and values are not tied to immutable historical factors, but reflect change over time, including changing human values, changing views of the natural environment, and changing sense of identity and belonging. Here is the very essence of cultural landscapes reflecting layers and change through time. As illustrated by the diverse range of chapters in this book, cultural landscapes are now seen as embracing everything from urban to associative landscapes. These chapters also reveal that there has been a shift of focus to living, evolving sociocultural ecosystems, valuing both tangible and intangible heritage and integrating this concept within society. These shifts in the cultural landscape concept are a major underlying theme of the book. Landscapes and associated human values are not static, leading to dilemmas on how we define conservation strategies and often how—and how often—we need to redefine them. New approaches to both cultural landscapes and historic urban landscapes have increasingly recognized that the goal is guiding future change through management processes and governance systems, rather than simply the protection of the fabric of the past. Nevertheless the latter is often an important part of conservation where aspects from the past—representing tangible forms and associative intangible values—embody significance. The importance of associative values cannot be stressed enough when thinking of cultural landscapes. Here we are thinking of intangible values as the mirror of cultural diversity, where diversity comprises the living expressions and traditions that communities, groups, and individuals receive from their ancestors and pass on to their descendants. Constantly recreated and providing its bearers with a sense of identity and continuity, this heritage is particularly vulnerable. (UNESCO 2007:19)

Given the complexity of addressing associative values of cultural landscapes and describing the attributes that carry their values, this aspect of landscape conservation continues to present challenges.

FORGING A NEW PARADIGM FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION

The late 1980s and early 1990s were particularly fruitful for the cultural heritage conservation discipline in terms of critical debate and understanding—and expanding—the concept of heritage. It is particularly relevant to understand how many landscapes—whether World Heritage–listed or not—face major conservation challenges when seen through the lenses of whose
values are represented in cultural landscapes, questions of indigenous and local community values, considerations of human rights, and what are, or should be, conservation priorities. Such an approach also raises questions of interaction between people and nature, biodiversity protection, customary laws and community engagement vis-à-vis official legal protection. It also raises the issue of what are acceptable levels of change in these landscapes and examination of the intended and unintended consequences of heritage listing and the relationship to sustainability (Taylor 2013).

Today, there are also major emerging challenges for cultural heritage management and conservation worldwide. These include threats of terrorism, war, and religious and ethnic conflict combining with the challenges of climate change, population growth and migrations, the explosion of domestic and international tourism, and unsustainable consumption of resources. Rapid urbanization, socioeconomic change, and the difficulties of continuing traditional forms of use within rural or urban settings threaten the sense of place and identity of communities. Those involved in cultural heritage management are challenged to devise strategies that move beyond interaction to collaboration, emphasizing the role of community-based decision makers and governance structures that are essential to the sustainability and resilience of cultural landscapes, rural and urban. In this context, heritage management can be taken to mean ‘a process of maintaining (and sometimes enhancing) the significance of a particular heritage and making it available for relevant groups of people to engage with it’ (Chapagain 2013:9). While acknowledging that heritage, by its very nature, is relevant to people, often there is a need to deconstruct it and interpret significance and engage and, in some cases, reconnect people in considering its value, for it is not always self-evident. This is particularly so in the case of the everyday (vernacular) landscape. It is what Lewis (1979) in his essay on ‘Axioms for Reading the Landscape’ calls ‘the axiom of landscape obscurity [where] most objects in the landscape—although they convey all kinds of “messages”—do not convey those messages in an obvious way’ (Lewis 1979:26). It is fundamentally important, therefore, to acknowledge that conservation of cultural landscapes relies on engagement and collaboration with people from communities associated with a landscape, as well as those that are not as closely linked. This is important for a range of landscapes from those designated for special protection to the everyday, vernacular landscapes so eloquently presented in J. B. Jackson’s essays (1984). Engagement with people is a common thread through all the chapters in this book.

A critical question stemming from the approach to landscape as process is how do we create strategies for management and systems of governance that acknowledge the leadership role of local communities and their ways of life? An underlying focus of the conference discussions was the need to refine theoretical frameworks and practical applications, and, through critical inquiry, to encourage innovations to meet these conservation challenges. With this in mind it is worth noting six guiding principles offered as a foundation
for a management framework that “is directly related to the value and characteristics of cultural landscapes” (Mitchell et al. 2009: 35). While these are elucidated for World Heritage cultural landscapes, they apply equally to other landscapes as well:

1) People associated with the cultural landscape are the primary stakeholders.
2) Successful management is inclusive and transparent, and governance is shaped through dialogue and agreement.
3) The value of the cultural landscape is based on the interaction between people and their environment; and the focus of management is on this relationship.
4) The focus of management is on guiding change to retain the values of the cultural landscape.
5) Management of cultural landscapes is integrated into the larger landscape context.
6) Successful management contributes to a sustainable society.

Challenging traditional notions of cultural heritage conservation, *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* chapter authors take a dynamic multifaceted approach to conservation. Central to the purpose of the book, and particularly noted by the reviewers of the book proposal, is to bring many of the diverse ideas in this emerging field of study and practice into one volume cohering around ways to address conservation of cultural landscapes, both designated as well as everyday places. This book brings together perspectives from academics within the humanities and humanistic social sciences, natural scientists, and conservation and preservation professionals and practitioners to rethink the meaning and practice of cultural heritage conservation, encourage international cooperation and stimulate collaborative research and scholarship. Case studies address contemporary issues under the umbrella of cultural heritage conservation theory and practice.

One area of increasing international attention is the deeply felt indigenous and local community associations with their cultural landscapes that are the touchstone of associative values. This was a recurrent theme in papers and discussions at the conference and a number of chapters address this important field, some with deeply felt personal messages of people’s association with place. These chapters addressing indigenous aspects of cultural landscape conservation are particularly important and timely contributions. It should also be pointed out that, in addition, several other papers make reference to the importance of recognizing and acknowledging indigenous voices and traditional knowledge systems.

Collectively, contributors illustrate that a successful approach to cultural landscape conservation—rural and urban—recognizes cultural as well as natural values, sustains traditional connections to place, and engages people in conservation where they live and work. What distinguishes this book is
its assumption of this fundamental challenge of conservation, rather than protection, within a heritage perspective and that this underscores how cultural landscapes contribute to current conservation thinking around four emerging directions:

- reorientation of heritage leadership from institutional direction to community stewardship, with its emphasis on diversity;
- radical shift of focus to looking at cultural landscapes, including historic urban landscapes, as living, evolving socio-ecosystems, and as systems and processes, rather than primarily as sites as objects;
- expansion of value recognition to immaterial expressions, including the cognitive and spiritual values of indigenous association with the landscape and traditional knowledge;
- the contribution of cultural landscapes in understanding the relationships between sustainability, environmental change and heritage.

Many of the chapters deal with designated cultural landscapes. Four chapters (2–5) in Part I are devoted to critical discussion relating to aspects of World Heritage cultural landscape conservation. This is quite deliberate in that, in addition to the fortieth anniversary of the World Heritage Convention, the conference marked the twentieth anniversary of the recognition of Cultural Landscapes as a category within the Convention in 1992. This landmark event reflected international discussions on how to extend World Heritage cultural properties beyond a focus on the famous archaeological and architectural monuments and sites. Notably this recognition was complemented in 1994 by the UNESCO Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List (UNESCO 1994), the aim of which was to broaden the definition of World Heritage to reflect better the spectrum of the world’s cultural and natural heritage.

While focusing on a World Heritage context, the 1992 cultural landscape definition and categories do have application outside the realm of the World Heritage Convention. This international recognition has also proved to be of great significance as a catalyst for rethinking other heritage categories and their conservation principles that were established in earlier periods. In addition, Bandarin (2009) reflected that most of the seventy-two listed cultural landscapes (at that time) were living cultural landscapes and, over time, cultural landscape categories (in particular, continuing, relict, and associative) have provided an opening to the World Heritage Convention for cultures not represented or under-represented prior to 1992. The number of cultural landscapes listed since 2009 indicates this opening has continued to be used by States Parties to the World Heritage Convention nominating properties as cultural landscapes.

Although the number has grown noticeably over the last five years or so, the overall number of cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List will presumably remain limited. By April 2014, the number of cultural
landscapes listed has grown to eighty-five. Their existence, however, is significant given that it reflects a widening understanding in global heritage thinking of the relationship between culture and nature, people and landscape, tangible and intangible values. This World Heritage experience discussed in Part I is complemented by chapters in Parts II–V that present case studies addressing ordinary everyday landscapes, some of which are designated protected areas.

One of the reasons for acknowledging cultural landscapes for World Heritage purposes was predicated on the perceived need to forge a closer link between culture and nature where the culture–nature binary represents the ‘combined works of nature and of man’ designated in Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1972). It is a theme that is stressed in the UNESCO (2013) *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. A number of chapters reflect on this (Rössler, Chapter 2; Denyer, Chapter 3; Cameron, Chapter 4; Leitão and Badman, Chapter 5; and Tano, Chapter 20); indeed the culture–nature binary idea suffuses the discussion in virtually every chapter. Nevertheless, as Leitão and Badman (Chapter 5) opine, cultural landscapes nominated for World Heritage listing rest solely on *Operational Guidelines* Criteria i–vi which cover only cultural values for determination of Outstanding Universal Value (UNESCO 2013). Criteria vii–x address natural values, but for a cultural landscape to be evaluated on any of these natural criteria it must be nominated as a mixed (cultural/natural) property. On the face of it, this would seem not to be a difficult approach to take, and indeed some World Heritage listed properties are inscribed as mixed as, for example, Uluru in Australia and Papahānaumokuākea in Hawaii.

The debate on this point is however complicated by the fact that in the belief systems of many traditional and indigenous societies worldwide a division between culture and nature does not exist. Thoreau summarised this view as ‘What we call wilderness is a civilization other than our own’ (Thoreau quoted in Nash 1973:371). The fundamental questions, for example, of who owns nature and for whom is it to be protected are recurrent throughout the book, either explicitly or implicitly. It is a topic that has been lucidly dissected by Descola (2008). In his provocative essay, *Who Owns Nature?*, he notes that the western view of nature—a product of the seventeenth-century Age of Enlightenment—which he sees dominating the culture/nature debate, is far from being shared by all peoples of the earth who value different cosmological principles. He calls for more appreciation of the plurality of ideas on the concept of nature. Wylie also steps into this debate with the suggestion that ‘the traditional distinction made between “nature” and “culture” as two wholly separate realms of existence in many ways merely rephrases the error of dividing landscape up into two fields, objective facts and layers of subjective meaning’ (Wylie 2007:10). Perhaps it is more productive to reflect on cultural landscapes as a bridge between the two (Taylor and Lennon 2012).
This is a theme robustly taken up in a number of chapters (Ortsin, Chapter 8; Mamyev, Chapter 9; Rodriguez-Navarro, Chapter 17; Sarmiento and Viteri, Chapter 19; and Tano Chapter 20). It is beautifully but simply expressed by Akobirov (Chapter 22) in the final chapter which is a personal essay expressed with gentle passion:

By deeply observing nature, I came to realize that we have to assess the cultural landscape according to our understanding/experience, both spiritually and scientifically. The ecological landscape i.e. mountains, lands, rivers, plants, trees and all natural resources were created by God. However, a human being can assist this sacred process by co-creating the landscape and building upon nature’s beauty.

The synergy between nature and culture is also given formal recognition within the IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature) Protected Area Management Categories, in particular Category V2 (see Phillips 2002, Brown et al. 2005, and Dudley 2008). In Category V landscapes, the culture and nature synergy is stressed and, in particular, the associated biodiversity values as a result of traditional human management practices (Phillips and Brown 2008; Dudley and Stolton 2008).

Notwithstanding the existence of landscapes recognized by international instruments, the majority of landscapes will remain those cared for by local communities including Community Conserved Areas (CCAs). Barrow and Pathak link CCAs to the conservation of biodiversity:

In the emphasis on ‘official’ protected areas, one aspect has been consistently overlooked, or not understood, namely that rural people conserve vast areas of land and biodiversity for their own needs, whether utilitarian, cultural or spiritual.

(Barrow and Pathak 2005:65)

Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) are similar to CCAs (IUCN 2009). These are seen as ‘natural and/or modified ecosystems containing significant biodiversity values, ecological services and cultural values, primarily conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities, both sedentary and mobile through customary laws and other effective means’ (IUCN 2009:3–4). Although we would observe that this definition, once again, poses the question of what is meant by ‘natural’ and whose nature is it? That aside, of note is reference to the role of customary laws as a conservation management tool and the recognition that such management indeed has played a critical role conserving a variety of environments and species for a range of purposes, economic as well as cultural, spiritual and aesthetic. ICCAs, inter alia, help maintain essential ecosystem functions such as water security, provide biological corridors, and are built on sophisticated collective ecological knowledge integrating customary and statutory...
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laws. The various chapters in this book addressing indigenous management and belief systems explicitly underscore these points.

AIMS OF THE BOOK

With the above factors in mind the aims of the book are to focus attention on:

• how the cultural landscape approach offers a framework that encompasses an integrated view of the processes and relationships essential to a culture-based conservation strategy that respects the complexity and wealth of diverse values in a rapidly changing world.
• how the key concerns in sustainable cultural heritage conservation, management, and governance are comparable around the world. Global exchange and sharing of experiences are essential to developing successful theoretical and practical approaches to conservation.
• how to integrate theoretical and practical approaches to conservation planning and systems of governance so that local stakeholders and custodians together with institutions and practitioners can collaborate and recognize the leadership of local communities in planning and implementation with respect for diverse cultural interests, and respect for human rights.
• how to promote an approach that incorporates bio-cultural diversity conservation with cultural and natural protection policies and strategies at the local, national, and global levels.
• how to involve a new generation of scholars and preservation professionals in an integrated approach to cultural heritage conservation defined by human relationships to place, and characterized by patterns, interactions, and associations as much as by physical features.

In line with the format of the conference, the book is subdivided into five thematic parts following this introduction. While there are five parts, they are not separate, discrete entities. Rather there is cross-referencing of information between chapters in the various parts. It is also intentional that chapters on indigenous and local community cultural landscapes, which we see as one of the strengths of the volume, are distributed through a number of sections (particularly Parts II, IV, and V). There are also references in chapters in Parts I and III to indigenous or local communities and their cultural landscapes. While internationally renowned landscapes play an important part in the ethos of the book, cultural landscapes protected at a variety of levels, ranging from national to local, feature equally prominently. In this way the book is not focused mainly on internationally renowned landscapes although these quite rightly play an important part in the book. In the title of the book and throughout the text the word ‘conservation’ is used rather than ‘preservation’ (often used in the USA and Canada) on the basis that
‘conservation’ is the recognized term in international practice. Authors from a range of backgrounds and knowledge bring together a body of international work and case studies that challenges readers to address not only current issues of management and conservation, but future directions within the rapidly changing world of the twenty-first century.

Part I Reflections on Past and Future Directions (Chapters 2–5)

Part I brings together four essays focusing on those landscapes that are recognized through some form of protection at an international level, as for example, through World Heritage listing. A consistent theme running through the chapters is that of the culture–nature relationship, deemed to be one of the inherent touchstones of cultural landscape thinking.

Rössler (Chapter 2) outlines general principles associated with the concept of cultural landscapes and examines the World Heritage landscape definition and its three categories. She highlights critical issues including the distinction between cultural landscapes and mixed (cultural–natural) World Heritage places; aspects related to management, authenticity and integrity; and differences between instruments covering ‘cultural landscapes’, ‘landscape’, and ‘historic urban landscape’. She points out how the addition of cultural landscapes to the World Heritage Convention not only opened the way for a new type of heritage where the outstanding universal value lies in the interaction between people and their environment, but also created the potential for better representation of the heritage in underrepresented regions, including sub-Saharan Africa, the Caribbean, and the Pacific. Importantly, Rössler, in looking to future opportunities suggests cultural landscapes can be examined as case studies for sustainable conservation particularly through leadership and the close involvement of the people maintaining them. She stresses the point that the World Heritage Convention is not only about the conservation of the heritage of past generations, it is very much about the heritage of our future. It is thus strongly linked to the concept of intergenerational equity. In Chapter 3, Denyer also focuses on cultural landscapes deemed to have Outstanding Universal Value in World Heritage terms. She critically discusses how these cultural landscapes often display remarkable resilience in terms of the long-term ability of their communities to adapt to change and development, while making the best use of scarce resources and sustaining traditional cultural practices. In five geographically distinct case studies (from Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Italy, Bali, and Ethiopia), she illustrates ways in which resilience has often been gained over many centuries, through communal efforts, and is based on extensive local knowledge passed down through the generations. She advocates that communal responses to the environment, as exemplified in these case studies, deserve a much higher profile, as do the multiple benefits that many of them deliver. Once lost, these complex socio-cultural-economic systems cannot readily be recreated, if at all.
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Cameron (Chapter 4) highlights how the World Heritage system, which focuses on conservation actions aimed at protecting Outstanding Universal Value, engenders difficulty in defining the parameters of a designated cultural landscape, thereby making the development of a conservation management strategy more challenging. Cameron argues that more effort is needed to refine the theoretical framework for such sites and that as larger, more expansive cultural landscapes are nominated, their complex and dynamic make-up will require the development of new approaches to evaluation and conservation. In particular, she sees the need for discussion among experts and communities to determine more clearly how good stewardship can be achieved for large-scale landscapes. She also cogently raises questions about whether the World Heritage Convention is the most appropriate international framework for this kind of site.

In the final contribution to this section, Leitão and Badman (Chapter 5), taking the stance of IUCN, argue that changes to the way in which the World Heritage criteria are understood, evaluated, and connected to management of sites are needed to allow better integration between culture and nature. They point to suggestions by some agencies that the criteria themselves may need to be reconsidered. For instance, they consider one possibility that would reinstate the wording on inseparable linkages between people and nature as part of the description of one or more natural criteria.

Part II Community Stewardship and Diverse Values (Chapters 6–9)

Part II consists of four essays addressing stewardship and diverse values, topics which promoted enthusiastic and lively debate at the conference. Focal issues, as Brown summarizes in Chapter 6, were the need to:

• sustain the core values underlying stewardship, such as tradition, language, respect and love of place;
• reinforce the central role of communities not only in management but in governance;
• honour the importance of distinctive spiritual relationships to the land;
• recognize traditional knowledge alongside western systems of science; and
• support and develop livelihood opportunities, recognizing the dynamic nature of this challenge in the context of globalization.

The concept of the sacred (in the context of sacred lands, sacred sites, sacred landscapes, and sacred natural sites) is a recurring theme, emphasizing the deep and meaningful relationships that many indigenous people, traditional communities, and local people feel towards such places. To distinguish these sacred places from the ecclesiastical meaning of sacred, Linda Sexson (1992) coined the term ‘ordinarily sacred’ which she takes to apply to the details and commonplaces of ordinary life. Permeating this section,
not surprisingly, is the theme of the importance of recognizing the inextricable links between culture and nature cross-linked to protection of biological and cultural diversity at sacred natural sites. The deep and meaningful relationship that many indigenous and local people have with nature is evident globally in the ubiquity of sacred natural sites. It is a phenomenon explored by Verschuuren and colleagues (2010) in the book *Sacred Natural Sites: Conserving Nature and Culture*.

Brown (Chapter 6) provides a comprehensive overview by critically exploring the role of communities in stewardship of cultural landscapes using the lens of protected area governance. She reviews key conceptual and policy developments over the past decade that reinforce collaborative and community governance of protected areas and of the broader landscape/seascape. The protected area management categories were recently updated by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) including the addition of a cross-cutting governance framework (Dudley 2008). Reflecting on case-study experience from diverse world regions, she discusses examples of community stewardship within the principal protected area governance regimes that offer models for further application.

Brabec and Goetchus (Chapter 7) offer insight into the critical relationship between a people, their land, and their communities through an analysis of how the cultural heritage of the Gullah Geechee people in the southeastern US evolved. Like many social and cultural groups they have created communities that are socially supportive and self-reliant through interactions with the landscape, local laws, and customs. The authors explain how the greatest threat to Gullah cultural heritage continues to be the direct and indirect impacts of land development. Much of this chapter’s discussion focuses on the largely rural and intact Gullah Geechee community of St. Helena Island, Beaufort County, South Carolina, where efforts over the past four decades have resulted in high retention of land use patterns, family compounds, and artisan skills. Federal heritage recognition and municipal and nonprofit land conservation efforts have resulted in protection and conservation of the community by the community. However, many Gullah Geechee communities located close to major urban areas and other areas developed for large, second home and retirement communities have not fared as well. Studies of the area contributed to the 2012 Management Plan for the Gullah Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor that is aimed at raising awareness and promoting action on behalf of the area’s cultural heritage values.

Ortsin (Chapter 8) addresses the challenge of managing traditional sacred and agricultural landscapes in the coastal savannah ecosystem of Ghana and shares community experiences in standardizing practices and methodologies for building ecological and sociocultural resilience. After exploring paradigm shifts in the implementation and management of cultural and traditional landscapes within the perspectives of twenty-first century global conservation challenges, he analyses the traditional practices and key issues relating to community stewardship of sacred landscapes within the dry
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Marginal forest ecosystems of Ghana. Based on this knowledge, he proposes the need for a paradigm shift in the management of traditional landscapes for the conservation of culture, biodiversity, sustainable agriculture, livelihood development, and knowledge management. With this paradigm shift, he projects that the design and implementation of effective management strategies and action plans will help prevent rapid degradation of the forests, wildlife, and water resources, as well as sustain biodiversity to address the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Chapter 9 is an essay by Mamyev suffused with feelings that reflect a rich personal association with place and meaning. In poetic language, he explains how a cultural landscape—the Karakol Valley in the Altai region inhabited by Siberian indigenous peoples—is, from the perspective of indigenous traditional culture, a continuing Message from Our Ancestors. As Erjen Khamaganova explains in the translator’s introduction to the essay, Mamyev understands sacred sites to be the nexus of the Karakol Valley cultural landscape and he uses metaphor and symbolism as analytical tools in his examination of the functions of these sites. His exploration of the meaning of cultural landscapes relies on a traditional ontology as it addresses the need to understand and restore the original meaning of cultural landscapes as sacred lands. As Mamyev reflects, the chapter highlights the need for further study of sacred lands as key elements in the cultural landscapes of indigenous people. Sacred lands are repositories not only of a historical cultural legacy, but also contain the accumulated holistic traditional knowledge housed in deliberately constructed sites featuring subtle and useful information for contemporary survival. These lands could become new spiritual-ecological educational centres producing and generating holistic knowledge.


Behind the move for recognition of the HUL paradigm set out in the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL), approved in 2011, is the massive urbanization of the last generation. This urbanization has resulted in many cities worldwide changing rapidly, and often in a haphazard fashion, as a result of urban regeneration, new growth areas, large movements of migrants, deterioration of centres, pressures for greater density, tourism development, and demolition of historic precincts. The HUL initiative responds to this rapid urbanization by promoting the integration of heritage conservation management concerns with mainstream urbanism. A fundamental question is, how will we redefine a sense of balanced city planning with conservation as a cogent input into the planning process? There is also a need to establish an integrated framework for urban regeneration and the management of cities as “socio-economic ecosystems”. The complexity of preserving and wisely utilizing urban heritage assets in
highly dynamic metropolitan areas . . . requires a specialized approach with updated knowledge and skills’ (Van Oers 2012:2). Currently, this capacity is not available in many countries, particularly developing countries. Even in countries where capacity is available, city planning too often disregards many types of heritage assets in favour of seeing heritage as single monuments and sites. This is not to say that heritage precincts do not exist, but there is evidence worldwide that they are increasingly coming under development pressure under the rubric of revitalization programs and urban infill. There is a need, therefore, to clarify terms and assumptions embedded in the HUL recommendation (especially the use of ‘landscape’) and highlight successful cases of conservation-centred urbanism that also abide by the cultural landscape paradigm with its holistic approach, participatory and democratic process, and long-term vision.

O’Donnell (Chapter 10) structures her chapter as an explication employing sections of the HUL text to make clear the meaning of terms and ideas inherent in the HUL paradigm. She weaves examples into the text to express the implications and diversity of applications of this important statement on the urban future. She stresses that the overarching goal of the HUL approach is to manage urban continuity and change and to retain tangible and intangible heritage values while cities thrive. The historic urban landscape is one of the strongest communicators of the history and character of a village, town, or city, expressing tangible heritage resources and serving as a vessel for intangible heritage. O’Donnell stresses that managing cities within the context of their historical development and accumulated character respects inherited urban heritage and passes it on to the coming generations. She highlights how a diverse, robust tool kit, components of which she explores, can be applied to management efforts and tested in a range of historic urban landscapes.

Smith (Chapter 11) argues for the application of cultural landscape theory and practice to the urban context in order to move from the object-centred universe of traditional heritage protection and management to an ecological framework that considers the relationship among objects as much as their individual distinctiveness. He presses the point that, more importantly, his approach is an ecology that is both natural and cultural, involving humans as integral parts of these relationships. He places this idea in the context of the evolution of the heritage conservation field over the last several hundred years through what he sees as a set of sequential biases: antiquarian, commemorative, aesthetic, and, currently, ecological. Smith argues cogently that the UNESCO HUL Recommendation is both a thing and process, particularly when seen through the lens of cultural landscape theory and practice, existing within the ecological bias. He persuasively translates theory into practice with a number of examples from Canada that nicely fall under the vernacular landscape umbrella. These examples skilfully demonstrate how the HUL paradigm and its techniques can apply at the local town precinct scale for community-based initiatives.
In Chapter 12, Van Oers and Taylor, within the rubric of the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) paradigm, address the rapid changes that are occurring in Asian cities and illustrate these changes through insightful case studies. The city of Guangzhou in southern China is cited, in particular the old urban quarter of the En Ning Lu area of the city with its traditional community. This example hints at the rising public concern and involvement in the future of such precincts by citing commentaries by voluntary groups and websites organized by enthusiastic individuals such as students and caring residents. Some comments have focused on photography and documentation and others on collection of furniture and old material evidence of the history of the area. This kind of action is undertaken by voluntary and community associations in China, often under difficult conditions. From a wider perspective, the authors firmly claim that the definition of Historic Urban Landscape, its concept and approach, and its integration into Asia-Pacific traditions of urban planning and conservation will need to take into account non-Western notions of cultural landscape if it is to be successfully applied. The chapter lays out a comprehensive program for a broad selection of pilot cities to demonstrate the merit and benefits of the HUL approach in a variety of socioeconomic, spatial, and institutional-cultural contexts with preliminary results from Indian examples in association with World Heritage Institute for Training and Research for the Asia Pacific Region (WHITRAP) based in Shanghai.

Part IV Confronting the Everyday Challenges of Cultural Landscape Management (Chapters 13–17)

In Part IV, five essays address the shift of focus to the integration of evolving socio-ecosystems with tangible and intangible values that is at the core of the cultural landscape approach. The cultural landscapes under consideration in this part, whether listed as World Heritage or at national or state levels, vary dramatically in size and scope, reflecting the complexity of integrating theoretical and practical approaches that respect a wealth of diverse values. Consistent themes here include the grounding of management strategies in the values of those represented in the landscapes and the recognition that guiding future change through management processes is essential to sustaining their values. A notable focus of the authors (Lennon, Dolan, Barrett, Laidet) is the existence of the dramatic, complex and dynamic large cultural landscapes, which present challenges at both theoretical and practical levels and demand new approaches to evaluation, conservation, and stakeholder involvement—a point to which Cameron (Chapter 4) also draws attention.

Lennon (Chapter 13) examines three Australian cultural landscapes protected under World Heritage, Commonwealth of Australia, and state and local governments. In one case study, Lennon charts the process through which diverse stakeholder values have been negotiated at the cultural
landscape of Victoria Lake in New South Wales. The landscape, which contains the largest number of Aboriginal burials in Australia, provides an example of the complex strategies designed to balance protection of Aboriginal culture and the landscape, with the need of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority to continue to operate a dammed lake for water storage, despite recognized adverse effects on the cultural heritage and environment in the area. The result is a management plan in which Aboriginal heritage and contemporary Aboriginal involvement in the management process have played a major role in the redesign of water and land management.

Rodriguez-Navarro (Chapter 17) underscores the challenges to ongoing indigenous stewardship in his study of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, one of the most distinctive, diverse, and threatened areas in South America. In doing so, he stresses the urgent need to provide for conservation of the natural and cultural values of this significant cultural landscape. Rodriguez-Navarro examines the ways traditional knowledge and stewardship of an ancestral cultural landscape, transmitted across generations, have resulted in the development of sustainable practices that have preserved the cultural and biological diversity of the area. Central to his argument is the need to recognize the value of landscape management that benefits from indigenous insights, transmitted over time through memory and ritual, to protect and sustain invaluable biological resources. He argues cogently that indigenous self-governance and independence are essential for ensuring that traditional management by the indigenous groups of the Sierra Nevada remains a valued conservation approach for maintaining the heterogeneity of the ecosystem and its biodiversity.

Chapters 14, 15, and 16 in Part IV of the book address the conservation of large landscapes. This has particular significance in the United States where the landscape approach grew out of efforts to achieve natural resource conservation over large areas and the need to work across political boundaries. Today, while large landscape management in the United States remains predominantly nature-centred, initiatives such as the US National Park Service’s (NPS) National Heritage Area (NHA) program signal a shift of emphasis to cultural landscapes shaped by both human activity and nature. Barrett’s case study (Chapter 14) of the 41,440 km² (16,000 sq. mi.) Crown of the Continent trans-boundary region of the Rocky Mountains, which includes the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park (designated a Biosphere reserve in 1979 and a World Heritage Site in 1995), provides a critical example of the shift over time from a nature-centred to a human-centred approach, also employed in the NHAs, that incorporates the concerns of community residents around issues of sustaining their economic activity and maintaining their cultural identity within the landscape over time. Like the landscape of the Sierra Nevada of Santa Marta (Rodriguez-Navarro, Chapter 17), the landscape of the Crown of the Continent reflects not only the history of the way nature has been shaped by human activity,
but equally important it is the territorial memory of the projects of previous
generations on the site that guides and gives meaning to the present.

Dolan (Chapter 15) addresses some of the management issues that have
emerged for certain types of cultural landscapes within the US National
Park Service, where conservation through continuing traditional use has,
until recently, been a relatively untapped strategy. Her chapter examines
current efforts to implement policies, management guidelines, and pro-
grams that support continuing, or in some cases reinstating, historic and
traditional uses as well as through engagement with the communities who
inhabit them. Dolan underscores the enormous challenge facing the NPS in
its efforts to conserve cultural landscapes in perpetuity despite great forces
of socioeconomic and environmental changes, climate change in particular,
and the importance of adaptive and cooperative management that involves
communities and looks to sustaining cultural landscapes for the future
rather than seeking to simply preserve the past. She illustrates her thesis by
using examples that include the Modernist 1960s designed landscape of the
Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Missouri, the Navajo-
owned Canyon de Chelly National Monument in Arizona (established in
1931), and the cooperatively managed Kalaupapa National Historical Park
in Hawaii, where almost none of the land is owned by the NPS (established
in 1980). She provides valuable insights into grounds maintenance issues
that challenge park managers’ efforts to retain the historic character of land-
scapes while adapting to changing conditions in the twenty-first century.
She also calls for increased engagement with traditional users whose knowl-
edge increases the authenticity of cultural landscapes and whose collabora-
tion extends the sustainability of the cultural landscape’s social relevance.
Ultimately, the perpetuation of traditional knowledge and cultural values
may present the best opportunities for cultural landscape conservation in
perpetuity.

In contrast to the nature-centred genesis of the large landscapes in the
United States, Laidet (Chapter 16) examines the ‘Val de Loire’, the median
section of the Loire River Valley in France inscribed on the UNESCO World
Heritage list in 2000. This inscription incorporates the physical, cultural,
economic, and social environment of the landscape, including its monu-
ments and the people who interact with it as a living and evolving cultural
landscape. The cultural landscape encompasses a 280 km long segment
of the Loire River, with a surface area of 800 km², and a population of
1.2 million inhabitants. Laidet provides a comprehensive assessment of an
approach in which landscape value becomes the common property of the
territorial communities, defined and implemented under French law with
the involvement of institutional stakeholders and the inhabitants of a land-
scape that includes six urban areas and two administrative regions. The
region’s collective memory defines its heritage values, and the many facets
of this landscape have become a resource that lets the inhabitants imagine the
future. Like Barrett (Chapter 13), Laidet stresses the need for collaborative governance and emphasis on the common values that define the way people interact with the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environment of the large landscape.

Part V Climate Change and Global Transformation: Sustaining Cultural Landscapes for the Future (Chapters 18–22)

Part V consists of five essays that address divergent issues associated with sustaining cultural landscapes in the face of climate and environmental change. Chapters 19, 20, and 22 approach the topic through indigenous eyes, further strengthening the claim of the book to address questions of management and governance of indigenous cultural landscapes. The other two chapters interrogate cultural landscape viability through the lens of climate change (Chapter 18) and through human response to natural hazards and disasters (Chapter 21).

Melnick (Chapter 18), quoting from the US National Research Council in 2012, confronts us with the fact that challenges inherent in global climate change span the continuum of diametrically opposed knowns and unknowns. He points out that these challenges are both disconcertedly understood and incomprehensible at the same time. While cultural resources in general, such as historic structures and archaeological sites, face serious threats from the impacts of climate change, we have the enigma that cultural landscapes are presented with different and, in some cases, even more problematic issues. He proposes that challenges to long-term cultural landscape viability derive from many arenas, including political will; economic conditions; landscape identification; diversity of significance guidelines; and often ill-defined policy, management, and protection frameworks. Nevertheless, as Melnick notes, the effects of global climate change present perhaps the greatest, and least controllable, challenge to long-term resiliency and viability of significant cultural landscapes across international borders. His chapter addresses some of those challenges and explores efforts under way to address these with links to the examples described in the other chapters in this section with a focus on common global issues and particular local concerns. It concludes with a set of suggestions and recommendations. He sees that perhaps the greatest set of issues to arise in this discussion focuses on national, regional, and local capacities to respond to anticipated and unanticipated climate change threats and impacts with respect to both the cultural processes that developed and sustain each cultural landscape and the physical evidences of those processes.

Sarmiento and Viteri (Chapter 19) use Andean examples to demonstrate how the Andean Mountains region was conceived in practice as a cultural landscape from the first descriptions of the *cordillera general* by the chroniclers of the Spanish Conquest, to the later use of *cordillera de los Andenes* and its shorthand version found in letters that reached Spain,
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As cord. Andes. They underline how the prevalence of cultural agency on the mountain ecosystems of the Andes is undeniable. It has, through time, created current landscape patterns, including the denuded slopes of the Lomas in coastal ranges of northern Chile and Peru, the deforested extent of the Puna and the location of the bofedales in the plateau of Bolivia and Peru, and the encroachment of pasture instead of cloud forest in the highland Páramo of Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela. In an absorbing reading of the indigenous landscape, we see how the hidden works of farmers and nomadic groups that shaped entire tropical rain forests and mountain cloud forests in the Andes remain largely ignored, except by those who know how to read them. The authors propose that it is time for a new paradigm in heritage conservation, whereby the cultural landscape concept is used with ease not only in academic circles but also by conservation practitioners, both in public and private sectors and in formal and informal management of resources. This paradigm emphasizes the new wave of conservation of the twenty-first century to cope with the anthropocene’s most pressing issues: sustainability and carrying capacity. The authors suggest that recognition of what they term ‘heritage cultural landscapes’ will allow local priorities of development within acceptable margins of change, and will allow national policies to become effective tools to bring pride, respect, and restitution to emblematic resources within the heritage cultural landscape. Even international conservation will benefit from bringing down the tone of overuse of resources and optimize—instead of maximize—profits in the short term in lieu of the long-term maintenance of a better standard of living.

Tano (Chapter 20) examines the threats to indigenous cultural landscapes globally. He proposes, however, that no discussion directly addresses a major threat of global climate change to indigenous cultural landscapes: the marginalization and destruction of native systems and institutions that create the religious, artistic, or cultural associations between the natural element and a people who are the predicate to cultural landscapes. In this context, he argues that officially sanctioned reports comport with and support the view that climate change impacts pose a direct threat to indigenous societies because of their reliance on resource-based livelihoods. He then counterargues that such characterizations of climate vulnerabilities of indigenous peoples and the adaptive management policies, plans, research, and programs undertaken by international organizations, NGOs, governments, and corporations based on these characterizations may prove inadequate, ill-adapted, and even inimical to the myriad interests of indigenous peoples in protecting and preserving their cultural landscapes. Taking three indicators—environmental effects, effects on cultural practices, and effects on identity—Tano comments on the impact of these effects on a number of diverse indigenous cultural landscapes in Alaska, Siberia, Arizona, and Washington State. He then critically discusses the role of traditional knowledge in managing cultural landscapes. It is notable that he uses the term ‘clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man’—which
equates to Category 1 World Heritage cultural landscapes normally assigned
to designed landscapes in the context of designed parks and gardens—when
he refers to certain organically evolved indigenous landscapes examples.
These include the terraces and irrigation systems of the Incas; irrigation
networks constructed by the prehistoric Hohokam in the American South-
west from A.D. 600 to 1450; or the Kīkī-a-Ola or the Menehune Ditch in
Hawaii, located just above Waimea town, a remarkable feat of engineering
and stonework built to bring water from the upper Waimea River to the
lo’i kalo (taro patches) in the valley. The question we may ask is, why not
indeed see these as designed landscapes, rather than as a category usually
reserved for historic parks and gardens? Tano then critically examines the
role of traditional knowledge in managing cultural landscapes illustrated
with case studies.

Mitchell (Chapter 21) opens with the observation that goods, storms,
earthquakes, and other natural hazards make contributions to the world’s
cultural landscapes that are frequently misunderstood and underappre-
ciated. Usually thought of as uncertain and undesirable departures from
everyday human existence, these kinds of events are widely viewed not just
as atypical of the places they occur, but also—because of their destructive
potential—seemingly more worthy of elimination than conservation. Mitch-
ell opines that this stance is reflected in the bulk of the professional and
scholarly literature about natural hazards in relation to heritage conserva-
tion. He observes that flagship conservation instruments like the World Her-
itage List do not presently showcase the importance of human adjustment to
hazard in the construction of civilizations. In addition, they tend to reflect
ideas about hazard management that emphasize only a few of the means
by which humans have historically accomplished this task, often reifying
suboptimal approaches that are but partial representations of a much richer
historical experience. In his conclusion, Mitchell proposes it is now time to
redress these gaps and celebrate a more complete cultural heritage, a heri-
tage that has very real present-day value as a stimulus to improved hazard
management. He then offers four proposals as first steps towards a broader
and more detailed engagement with this task.

In the final essay, Akobirov (Chapter 22) presents a singular and poetic
reminder of the value that a seemingly unremarkable landscape can have
for a community of people. He outlines how the restoration of the cultural
landscape of the Rasht valley in Tajikistan was accomplished. He lovingly
describes the valley as extremely beautiful. All four seasons are almost of
equal length and on any summer day you can see all the seasons stretched
out vertically with winter showing itself at the highest altitudes. Pure springs
pour forth from the cliff sides. The soil in this mountainous area is home
to more than four thousand species of plants and flowers, many of which
are medicinal. Springtime in his mountains means a mass of flowers and
new growth. In addition, there is plenty of wildlife such as bear, wolf, snow
leopard, deer, fox, jackal, and wild pig. But he also reflects on the valley's
sad human history. In 1949, thirty thousand people perished as a result of an earthquake that measured 9 on the Richter scale. The Rasht landscape was also temporarily rendered barren. After that natural disaster the government forced most, but not all, of the remaining population to migrate to the Vaksh valley in southern Tajikistan where they needed agricultural labourers. Akobirov tells how he created a garden in the valley and reinstated fruit trees. He then proposes how to bring culture and nature in harmony to work towards creating a healthy landscape based on traditional knowledge where pride of place, tradition, memory, and heritage inhere. As the story of one man’s engagement with a landscape he loves, it is a fitting final essay for the book.

NOTES

1. As Descola (2008) reflects, this book ought to be requisite reading for anyone contemplating what is meant by nature with ideas of inherent value and instrumental value based on a western ethic.
2. IUCN recognizes six categories of Protected Areas ranging from strict nature reserve/wilderness status (Category Ia/Ib) to areas (Category V) ‘that encompass traditional, inhabited landscapes and seascapes where human actions have shaped cultural landscapes with high biodiversity’ (Dudley 2008:vii).
3. The organically evolved landscape form Category 2 of the World Heritage cultural landscapes. Such a landscape results from an intimate social, economic, administrative and/or religious imperative and has developed present form by association with and in response to its natural environment.
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Dear Professor Ken Taylor,


My best regards,

Akarin Pongpandecha
PART 6
Dualing spirits and sciences
Revisiting the foundations of conservation

Over thousands of years syncretism of indigenous spiritualities with mainstream faiths has waxed and waned across Asia. In comparison to other places in the world – take for example the way in which Christianity did away with the supernatural dimensions sacred natural sites (Byrne, 2010) – this process in Asia has been described as far more gentle and resulting in a diversity of folk religions retaining some form of nature spirituality (O’Brien and Palmer, 2007; Verschuuren et al., 2010). At a deeper level syncretism has also caused anxiety and contestations of religious and social identity further exacerbated by processes of modernisation and economic growth (Briggs, 1951; Rutherford, 1951). As of old, religions have hardly been indifferent to maintaining relationships to power, politics and governance of the ruling classes. Struggles of religious and spiritual contestation and revitalisation are also represented in heritage and conservation narratives about Asian sacred natural sites and their role in cultural identity, societal structure and self-governance.

In Chiang Mai the Lua people follow ancestral traditions as well as honouring Buddhist values for the sacred mountains surrounding their communities. The building of Buddhist temples such as Doi Suthep on previously animist sacred places shifts the meaning and values of the places away from the natural element and its association with ancestor and spirit worship. Pongpandecha and Taylor (Ch. 21) discuss the construction of a tourism observation tower on the Doi Suthep Mountain and the role of ‘commercial Buddhism’ that is aimed at tourists as well as believers. The chapter draws parallels between the role of the sacred mountains of the Lua and the Buddhist temple, focusing on their role in making a connection between heaven and earth.

Studley and Awang (Ch. 22) claim that although Tibetan spiritscapes are exemplars of biodiversity and may constitute 25 per cent of the Tibetan Plateau they have been seemingly discursively excluded from official narratives. Consequently they are not recognised or protected nationally or internationally as unique refugia in their own right (Studley, 2010). As their custodians are under pressure from misinterpretation and domination from mainstream Buddhism their roles are of unmistakable importance to the conservation of biocultural diversity of the Tibetan spiritscapes of Southwest China.
The spiritual values of Takht-e Soleyman World Heritage Site in Iran have been related to fire and water for thousands of years, throughout Zoroastrianism, Islam and back again (see Ch.1). Hassani Esfehani (Ch. 23) describes Zoroastrians’ return to the site in the face of unfavorable government policies and management practices. Their return, however, results in re-practising rituals, and resuming traditions that pose significant conservation opportunities for the protected area but more socio-cultural freedom for small religious communities will need to be gained in the process.

Hou (Ch. 24) explores the concept of spiritual governance that is based on Tuvan peoples’ spiritual connections with their sacred land- and spiritscapes (Studley, Ch. 22). Through ceremony and ritual, indigenous Tuvans gather wisdom and strength to act on their traditional shamanistic cosmovision as a means to shape their lives in the face of modernisations, increasing tourism and other pressures induced by development and societal change. Enacting these spiritual bonds with each other, the spirit-world and nature, they revitalise deep reverence for nature as well as ancient practices of natural resources.

This section connects with Annex 1, The Darvi Declaration. This is a watershed declaration of the sacred sites’ guardians and traditional cultural practitioners of the Pamir, Tien Shan and Altai Sayan biocultural mountain systems. Based on their lifelong experiences and worldviews they call for greater recognition of their cultural and spiritual heritage. Their key point is to seek indigenous representation in the process of nomination as well as the management and governance of World Heritage throughout the region and in doing so they join a global quest, see Disko and Tugendat (2014).
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LUA PEOPLE

Traditions, beliefs and sacred natural sites in Northern Thailand

*Narong Pongpandecha and Ken Taylor*

**Introduction**

The Lua people of the Chiang Mai area (Figure 21.1), also known as Lawwa (Schliesinger 2000), have a deep spiritual relationship with the various sacred mountain sites along the Thongchai mountain range. In particular they have a close affinity to Doi Kham and Doi Suthep. They follow ancestral traditions as well as honouring Buddhist values for the mountains. Each year, for example, they hold sacrificial rites at Doi Kham near Doi Suthep. The Lua have been in Chiang Mai the longest of all races in the region and it is thought they were the first people to inhabit the Chiang Mai Valley over 1,300 years ago. Penth (1994), for example, indicates that Lua culture predates the historic Lan Na period. Today they are assimilated into Northern Thai society (Lan Na region) in the villages along the Thongchai Mountain range on the west of Chiang Mai – Lamphun basin.

The Lua believe in good and bad spirits and profess a belief in Buddhism. Although many have adapted their lifestyles to that of a Buddhist, they are generally animists by tradition, and ancestor worshippers. In this regard Byrne (2010: p. 53) draws attention to: ‘the numinous character – that is having an indwelling spirit – of sacred sites, which are found in the landscape, or spiritscapes of folk religion’, which we suggest applies to the Lua and their beliefs: ‘Those people who hold these places to be sacred believe them to be occupied or constituted by spirits or deities which have certain powers . . . commonly described as supernatural or magical’ (Byrne 2010: p. 53).

The chapter focuses on the Lua people, their animist culture and association with their traditional lands and sacred mountains, including some specific references to these mountains. It also reviews the conflict that arose when the Buddhist abbot master and temple committee of Doi Suthep temple proposed a scenic observation tower beside the main stupa of the temple.

**Doi Suthep temple**

Doi Suthep temple was built on the mountain with its forest that was traditionally a sacred place for the Lua people. In this regard Byrne (2010: p. 54) points out ‘in Indonesia and
FIGURE 21.1 Thailand and Chiang Mai province

Source: Bas Verschuuren, adapted from D-Maps.
Thailand animist religions were in place long before the arrival of Buddhism. With the flourishing of the La Na kingdom of Northern Thailand from the thirteenth to the eighteenth centuries the mountain became a sacred place for the Buddhist Chiang Mai and Lan Na people, ultimately becoming one of the holiest Buddhist places in Thailand. Underlying such change is the suggestion by Byrne (2010) that, while Buddhism and a conservation ethic are linked, many Thai Buddhists view forests as representing darkness in contrast to animist cultures such as the Lua. Notably in these changes can be seen an example in Thailand of where the building of Buddhist temples on previously animist sacred places shifts the meaning and values of the places away from the natural element and its association with ancestor and spirit worship.

The observation tower, a project promulgated by the abbot master and temple committee, mimics the shape of the stupa and is coated in artificial gold paint. In the authors’ views, it is a misguided attempt to have the tower fit into the landscape traditionally dominated by the temple alone. In effect it results in a skyline image of twin towers atop Doi Suthep Mountain, thereby diminishing the original cultural and visual dominance, sense of place and intangible cultural heritage of the temple. Protests by Chiang Mai people were mounted for a few months without any support from the government sector (Manager 2015). This is because the temple claims it has legal right and full ownership of the site as a whole and the land where the tower was constructed is outside the protective authority of the Departments of Fine Arts, Forestry, and National Parks. Finally, a meeting between protestors and temple representatives took place and the temple committee agreed to remove the spire on the tower and reduce the height by one floor.

The outcome reflects the face of what the locals call ‘commercial Buddhism’ that is aimed at tourists as well as believers. This begs the question of whether the temple has lost integrity and its original spiritual value associated with it being built to house Buddha relics by King Kueana (1355–1385 AD) and to commemorate the first Lanka sect Buddhism installation in the Lan Na kingdom. Notably there is no interpretative presentation of this original meaning and significance.

Doi Suthep, in addition to its cultural significance, is also home to a preserved forest area set up in 1949 and the Doi Suthep–Pui National Park promulgated in 1979. Doi Suthep–Pui National Park is one of over 240 protected areas in Thailand, 122 of which are national parks. It is designated as one of Thailand’s 222 IUCN Category II Protected Areas which cover approximately 20 per cent of the country’s land area in total (Protected Planet 2015):

Category II protected areas are large natural or near natural areas set aside to protect large-scale ecological processes, along with the complement of species and ecosystems characteristic of the area, which also provide a foundation for environmentally and culturally compatible spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational and visitor opportunities.

(Dudley 2008: p. 16)

The primary objective of such areas is ‘To protect natural biodiversity along with its underlying ecological structure and supporting environmental processes, and to promote education and recreation’ (Dudley 2008: p. 16) and with the rider that their management should take into account the needs of indigenous people and local communities, including subsistence resource use, in so far as these will not adversely affect the primary management objective.
‘Dong Sakang’ connecting heaven and earth

The Lua legend of Dong Sakang talks about connecting heaven and earth. Hongsuwan (2008) refers to the idea of a ‘Sky Support Column’, which most ethnic groups across Southeast Asia believe as the device that divides sky and earth from each other. In Northern Thailand there are two interpretations in local ethnic mythologies to sustain the concept of sky support mechanisms that dominate in the belief systems of Tai (Schliesinger 2000). The first group believes that the sky support column is a large creeper tree or plant connecting heaven and earth. The second group believes that mountains serve as sky support columns to divide the earthly realm from the heavenly realm. In relation to mountains as the support mechanism Hongsuwan (2008: pp. 302–305) proposes that: ‘mountains are the communication centre that links the two realms earth and heaven together. Mountains, nevertheless, do not represent only geographical status, but also contain sacred meanings relating with the origin of the ethnic Tai tribes.’

The Lua legend has it that there used to be large numbers of Lua people who owned the earth. However, their ambitions drove them to believe they could build stairs to heaven. Therefore, Lord Baloang then drafted people to build a staircase to heaven. Once finished, Lua people then raced to climb the staircase in chaos. This caused God to be angry and he struck the lower part of the staircases with lightning and split it causing death to most of the people. The survivors, fearing the mighty wrath, then ran away and scattered in small groups unlike the former time. This legend reflects the idea that to disobey the taught codes is considered a sin. God then ordered sky and earth to be separate.

As a result of these legends mountains are regarded as a bridge to heaven (see Bernbaum, Ch. 3). They are a frontier between earth and heaven by which humans are able to make contact with the heavenly ghost or God. Hongsuwan (2008) suggests this could possibly be the reason why Lua people avoid living on top of particular mountains they consider sacred. This phenomenon is illustrated by reference to the Lua village of La Oob (Figure 21.2) in Mae La Noi district of Mae Hong Sorn province (Pers. comm. Mr Gumerng Ngarmjaru Kriengkrai, local scholar, 2014). Lua people believe that their ancestors have lived for generations in the Chiang Mai and Lua Gon area. Ongsakul and Tanratanakul (2006: p. 3031) record in legends of Lord Buddha’s visit to the region that ‘All chronicles agree that a Lua community had lived in the area for a long time’. The last Lua king was Lord Wilangka.

Legend holds that Wilangka committed suicide at his settlement near Doi Suthep after being defeated. His dying wish was to be buried on the summit of Doi Suthep with one condition that his dead body should have never crossed any watercourse. The reason for this condition is that due to his magical force, water courses could have been made to run dry and thereby adversely affect the lives of his people as explained by Gumerng Ngarmjaru Kriengkrai, an elder local scholar who is knowledgeable in local Lua of La Oob village history. As a result Lua people travelled for 12 months with his coffin before reaching the burial site where he could observe the view of his defeated kingdom in the Chiang Mai – Lamphun basin. The defeat of Lua kingdom resulted in the Lua being scattered around the north and south of their former kingdom. Some Lua of La Oob escaped southward through Hod town while others settled in Bo Luang in the present-day Hod district, Pa Pae and Chang Mor villages in present-day Mae Sarieng District. Their spoken language is still similar to that of the Lua of La Oob village.
Lua beliefs: animism, Buddhism and spirit worship

The Lua people believe in good and bad spirits and also profess a belief in Buddhism. Although many have adapted their lifestyles to Buddhism, they are generally animists by tradition, and ancestor worshippers. Many of the Lua have found ways to adapt their own traditional religious beliefs to that of Buddhism. Buddhism lends itself well to this, as it is sometimes considered more of a philosophy than a religion. Animists believe that every living thing on Earth possess a soul or spirit, including animals and plants; this belief extends also to some non-living things such as rocks or water for example. In this way the Lua’s traditional belief in spirits and ancestors deeply influence and guide their traditions and their way of life in relationship with nature and associated farming activities. Like other tribes such as Mon and Tai, an ancestral ghosts worshipping ceremony is still held annually among the animist/Buddhist Lua.

The annual ceremony is conducted with animal sacrifices, as tradition requires. However, the sacrificed animals have changed from water buffalos to pigs and chickens for economic reasons. The ceremony is known as ‘Nokh Sa Pah’ and conducted for the sake of happiness and abundance of the village. In the ceremony all clans had to contribute one buffalo per family.

Lua farming, belief systems and nature conservation

To understand traditional Lua belief in spirits and how these guide their relationship to nature conservation it is crucial to understand the way Lua live and rely on mountain farming tradition and procedure (Figure 21.3). They justify their traditional farming method of swidden farming or shifting cultivation (Forsyth and Walker 2008) based on scientific grounds as well
as on animistic grounds. This is explained by Singha Wongtae Chairman of Lua community network and a highly respected figure of La Oob village (Pers. comm. Chairman Lua Community Network to N. Pongpandecha 2014).

Nevertheless the swidden system is all too often seen by government agencies as inappropriate. As a result Lua are faced with ‘a serious challenge to their existing ways of interacting with their environment’ (Ross et al. 2011: p. 19). This is because the swidden system is the indigenous Lua’s traditional way of rejuvenating forest areas previously cleared for farming. It involves farming plots in nine-year cycles, i.e. a single plot of land is farmed for nine years before being abandoned for another plot. This enables the soil and forest from the previously farmed plot to be restored. The forest then takes 20 years to return to its natural form. The Lua revolving farming system is often mistaken for ‘slash and burn’ farming which leads to the rapid degradation of soil fertility.

In contrast, the Lua swidden farming method takes into consideration forest regrowth. The cycle starts with the selection of plots of land just large enough to feed a family. The main crop grown on their farms is rice. Lua will grow farm rice at the beginning of the rainy season while paddy field rice relies on engineered water connections to natural water sources. The Lua also grow other crops such as vegetables, herbs and fruits randomly within the rice farms. The ratio of rice to other crops is 80 to 20.

The year that Lua move on to the next farming plot, they will start by preparing a forest fire buffer zone measuring approximately 6–8 metres wide. The buffer zone will be cleared of all dry fallen leaves and any trees within it will be cut down to prevent them acting as fuel and damaging the surrounding forest in the event of a fire. Trees in the area to be burnt are reduced to a stump level which ensures regrowth. In each nine-year period, they will gradually grow back and by the time the Lua farmers move on to the next plot of land, these trees

---

**FIGURE 21.3** Swidden fields of La Oob Village.

Source: Photo: N. Pongpandecha.
would have been grown to a moderate height and will continue to grow back into a thick forest again during the next ten years or more.

The swidden farming method has been the backbone of Lua community such as La Oob village for over a millennium and its importance will remain in the future. What this generation is doing is preparation for the next. In each farming cycle, parents will be able to teach their children to farm in accordance with their traditions which will then be passed on to their grandchildren the cycle after. Beyond this backbone of the Lua’s life, strong animistic belief in ghosts and spirits guide them to live side by side with nature.

**Swidden farming and animistic rites and beliefs**

According to Orng Supklom, the *Ta Ph* or shaman of La Oob village: ‘Lua people believe that there are spirits in every single tree’ (pers. com. Orng Supklom). His main social duty is to conduct *Nokh*, i.e. presenting ritual offerings reflecting original Lua animistic belief and its involvement with humans and nature from the day they were born until the day they left the world. *Ta Ph* is the position of shaman of the village. It is preferable that men from the Samung family take such a position in the village because they are descended from the indigenous Lua kings/leaders. However, if they do not, other families can take over the task. In La Oob village, some members of the Samung family have converted to Christianity, therefore, they are not comfortable with taking animal sacrificial duties. Orng Supklom, the present shaman from ‘Yong Tah Plong’ family is considered a knowledgeable and respectful local scholar and has taken over the sacrificial task (Pers. comm. 2014).

The sequence of operations in the swidden system is directly linked to, and guided by the animistic beliefs of the Lua and their social makeup. First a village meeting is held to agree on the farming area for the year. The *Per Ku Yong* rite is organised to worship *Kum La Wu* – the protecting/ruling spirit of the village – to protect the villagers in the farm land preparation process. In this rite, a *Nokh* is organised and four bottles of local white whisky are all it needs for this process. Farm land preparation is then conducted after the *Per Ku Yong* rite is completed and villagers-farmers will cut down trees in the area and leave it for half a month. The farmers then organise a ‘Fire buffer zone’ rite before they start *Nokh Pai* or burning the area. For this rite, farmers must sacrifice 21 chickens, one dog and two bottles of whiskey. Singha Wongtae explained the meaning of this rite as a way of pleasing *Ta Tuh* the guardian spirit in the forest to watch out for the forest fire that could be caused by burning the farming area. Therefore, the rite will be conducted alongside physical work on creating fire buffer zones. Apart from asking the guardian spirit for protection from fire, farmers also ask for the blessing of abundant crops and prosperous living. Forest preservation is assured as well as the well-being of the people. Farmers will build a small imitation spirit house for the guardian spirits. After the fire buffer zone ritual is completed, farmers then proceed with burning and the beginning of the process of growing crops.

As noted above with the case of Lua and traditional farming in Doi Phukha National Park (Delcore in Ross et al. 2011) – another IUCN designated Category II Protected Area – while such methods may be successful and help maintain balance between humans, nature and spirits, the question of what are the conservation benefits arises. Equally this begs two other questions: the paucity of studies undertaken to measure biodiversity values of forests after regrowth in the swidden cycle and the challenge of whose values and human rights are involved. The Doi Phukha park director in the mid 2000s was not at all sympathetic to the Lua but
his successor was much more open. Whether this has led to concrete action is not known. What is known about biodiversity benefits of Lua rotating agriculture, while anecdotal, is ‘common sensical’. In other words, it stands to reason that forest plots in various stages of regrowth would have more biodiversity than otherwise, although searches of literature databases have not revealed any specific studies, which suggests they might be published in Thai (pers. comm. Delcore).

In setting the context, a wide-ranging overview by Brown and Khotari (2011) addresses traditional landscapes and community-conserved areas. The authors suggest a number of key points emerging from the review (Brown and Khotari 2011: p. 139):

• the role of traditional ecological knowledge systems;
• cultural practices and social institutions in creating these landscapes and ensuring their stewardship;
• the importance of securing customary governance;
• the need for dynamic socio-ecological indicators to measure the resilience of different landscapes.

The authors also highlight the role of what they call living landscapes in sustaining agro-diversity as well as inherent wild biodiversity values, ensuring ecosystems function, and supporting livelihoods and food security. They further propose that traditional agricultural landscapes are often sophisticated, complex and resilient, cared for by indigenous peoples and local communities, have been shaped by the dynamic interaction of people and nature over time by sophisticated knowledge systems and practices. They continually evolve and adapt and can be rich in wild biodiversity coherent with their intangible cultural and spiritual values. Inherent in such a discourse is that of ‘whose values are we addressing and whose heritage is it’ (Taylor 2010: p. 1340) and the challenge of recognising the need for a balance to be struck between universal values and local values.

Tu Krong Kiak, the sacred mountain of Lua people of La Oob village

Lua people of La Oob believe that their ancestors dwelled in Chuangh Mul City (Lua original name for Chiang Mai) and were forced to migrate into the area they are living in at present. The Lua of La Oob also have their own sacred mountain and forest area that they will not enter if it is not necessary, known as Tu Krong Kiak. It is believed to be the dwelling place of a fierce and furious jungle ghost known as Bueak. Within this place, forest and rare animals are traditionally conserved. Tu Krong Kiak is approximately 10 Rais (approx. 16,000sq m) in area.

In general, Lua people believe ghosts are everywhere, but Tu Krong Kiak is believed to be more haunted than any other place due to this well respected figure. The ghost has the habit of playfully haunting people by stealing and hiding lunch boxes, farming tools and other belongings of farmers. But they will normally get their belongings back after conducting a small rite and respectfully asking the ghost to return their belongings. People who enter the area will always behave and be careful of their activities to prevent upsetting the ghost.

Apart from being a haunted/sacred site for the villagers, Tu Krong Kiak could be considered a natural wildlife sanctuary and preserved forest area, given its abundant forest with natural water source on top of the mountain. This raises the issue of how such areas
ought to be reviewed by relevant government conservation agencies in association with traditional owners to inquire into recognising a system of linked protected areas where local communities are integral to the governance operation. Also, it is forbidden to hunt in the area. Although not confirmed, Orng Supklom claims that some people have seen a rare breed of white barking deer and white crow living in the area. Other wild animals such as ordinary barking deer (Muntiacus muntjak), wild boar (Sus scrofa), jungle fowl (Gallus gallus), loris (Nycticebus bengalenisis) and many other kinds of species take refuge in the area where they will be protected. It is said that people who break the sacred rule by hunting in the area will find themselves meeting a mysterious death.

Doi Suthep mountain

Doi Suthep holds the status as the most significant and sacred mountain of the Lan Na region. It is a place where culture and nature coexist and where there is a palpable and immutable relationship between people and nature. This is seen also in the value placed on the temples in the park, as with the venerable Pra That Doi Suthep Temple:

Despite all the stunning natural beauty, the main reason many visitors come... is to visit Phra That Doi Suthep Temple. For Thais, this site is a must for the visit, as it is a sacred place to pay homage to the Lord Buddha’s relic, ... [it is] one of the most holy Buddhist sites in Thailand.

(Muangyai and Lieorungruang 2006: p. 8)

The Doi Suthep landscape is representative of the deeply felt associative values between local communities and indigenous people in Asia and their cultural landscapes. Taylor (2012: p. 37) based on Engelhardt (2001) suggests that:

It underscores the need for intercultural dialogue and for initiation of local community and indigenous participation in cultural landscape conservation and management so that the links between physical and spiritual aspects of landscape are respected. This view is grounded in the fact that it is the cognitive and spiritual values of cultural landscape that are their most salient features.

The main stupa of Phra That (Figure 21.4) is the repository of a Lord Buddha relic said to have been brought from Sri Lanka by a Theravada Buddhist monk known as Phra Maha Sawami Sumana Thera, a Sukhothai monk who graduated from Sri Lanka and established Lanka Vamsa sect of Buddhism in Sukhothai, a former capital of Thailand in the thirteenth century. Nimmanhaeminda (1981) suggests this sacred relic was brought in 1369 from Bangcha, one of the towns of the Sukhothai Kingdom, by Phra Maha Sumanathera, in tribute to King Kuena, ninth king of the Mengrai (Mang Rai). The King then had a stupa constructed atop Doi (Mount) Suthep to house the relic along with a temple surrounding it. Doi Suthep which had been a sacred mountain for the Lua as the burial place of King Wilangka therefore became a sacred Buddhist place. Theravada Buddhism was made the state religion with the establishment of the Thai kingdom of Sukhothai in the thirteenth century AD (Ongsakul and Tanratanakul, 2006). Phra That Doi Suthep became one of the most significant stupas of Thailand and site of Buddhist pilgrimage through to the present day.
Conclusion: controversy at Phra That Doi Suthep

Due to its accessibility by road approximately 11 kilometres from the mountain foot, Doi Suthep temple has become a magnet for tourists as well as Buddhist pilgrims. The result is a visual chaos of buildings, structures and vehicles: a scene that hardly contributes to a fitting sense of arrival at a sacred place. Notably the temple precinct is excluded from the area covered by the forest area and national park. The temple has its own land deed and is entitled to manage its space without interference from government agencies.

The latest developments at Doi Suthep are the focus of protests by a group of local Chiang Mai people based on heritage interests. A three-storey observation tower was planned to be constructed in stupa-like shape to serve as a senior monks’ reception area, observation tower, library and museum. It was designed to be finished in gold paint and similar height to the
stupa of Doi Suthep temple vying with the original. Further it would have blocked the view of the stupa from the Chiang Mai city below. After considerable negotiations and discussions it was agreed by the temple to remove the top part of the viewing tower.

Doi Suthep is an example of how changing cultural values affect the way humans may interpret and treat the landscape of sacred natural sites from an intangible heritage perspective. In the case study in this chapter we see both Lua animist tradition with Buddhist overtones and then Buddhist tradition of the Tai/Thai responding differently to sacred natural sites according to their ideologies and value systems. The Lua with their Animist/Buddhist culture consider particular mountains as sacred and people avoid living on the summits. The Tai/Thai Buddhist culture allows summits of sacred sites to be used for buildings such as Phra That Doi Suthep.

The mountain held sacred status when the Lua dwelled there with a deeply fused respect for cultural and natural values. Once the Tai drove them away beyond the mountain range and seized their sacred sites, Buddhist temples and sanctuaries were constructed in a way that might be construed to represent triumph over original beliefs and represent social and political domination.
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