



## ***THE CONSERVATION AREA AND THE REGISTERED LANDSCAPE***

### *Lecture 4: Cultural landscape on the UNESCO WHL*

*Katarzyna Palubska, PhD*

*ICOMOS-POLAND*

*katarzyna.palubska@gmail.com*



# Erasmus+

# Cultural landscape on UNESCO WHL

The Conference of UNESCO in **1972, developed the Convention of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.**

On the basis of the Committee of UNESCO created the **World Heritage List**, which is supposed to represent the unique cultural diversity and richness of nature in all regions of the world (the requirement of integrity and authenticity).

Entry shall be:

- cultural heritage
- historic towns
- **cultural landscapes**
- natural heritage

**Since 1992 significant interactions between people and the natural environment have been recognized as cultural landscapes.**

The first such property was inscribed in 1993: Tongariro National Park (New Zealand), a natural site recognized for its associative cultural value, a sacred site and cultural landscape. This inscription, as well as the one of Uluru Kata Tjuta (Australia) in 1994, demonstrated at the same time that there was a major change taking place in the interpretation of this global conservation instrument that is the World Heritage Convention: an opening towards cultures in regions other than Europe (Pacific, Caribbean, sub-Saharan Africa), a recognition of the non-monumental character of the heritage of cultural landscapes, the acknowledgement of the links between cultural and biological diversity, specifically with sustainable land-use. (Wh26, s4)



*Kalwaria  
Zebrzydowska: the  
Mannerist Architectural  
Park and Landscape  
Complex in Poland, WHL -  
category 1,  
photo © Paweł Mazur*

# World Heritage Convention, 1992

**In 1992 the World Heritage Convention became the first international legal instrument to recognize and protect cultural landscapes.**

The Committee at its 16th session (Santa Fe, USA, 1992) adopted guidelines concerning their inclusion in the World Heritage List.

The Committee acknowledged that cultural landscapes represent the “combined works of nature and of man” designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They **are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time**, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal.

The term “cultural landscape” embraces a diversity of manifestations of **the interaction between humankind and its natural environment**. 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.**

Cultural landscapes are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal. They should be selected on the basis both of their outstanding universal value and of their representativity in terms of a clearly defined geo-cultural region and also for their capacity to illustrate the essential and distinct cultural elements of such regions.



# World Heritage Convention, 1992

The Committee has adopted guidelines for the entry on the UNESCO World Heritage cultural landscapes.

Currently on the list of the 161 objects recognized as cultural landscapes, usually on the basis of cultural criteria, but also mixed: cultural-natural (in 2018).

The three categories of World Heritage cultural landscapes adopted by the Committee in 1992 and included in Paragraph 39 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2002) are described in Appendix 2. In 2005 and again in 2008 the *Operational Guidelines* were revised and all categories of heritage were included in Annex III of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Cultural landscapes fall into three main categories (Operational Guidelines, 2008 Annex III), namely:

- **clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man**
- **organically evolved landscape**
- **associative cultural landscape**

# Cultural landscapes into categories of UNESCO

1. 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.



*Muskauer Park / Park  
Mużakowski, Germany/Poland  
WHL 2004, category 1, photo ©  
K. Palubska*



# Cultural landscapes into categories of UNESCO

2. 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.
- 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.

*Alto Douro Wine Region,  
Portugal WHL 2001, category 2b,  
photo © K. Palubska*





# Cultural landscapes into categories of UNESCO



3. 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.

*Nepal,  
photo © M.Rosinski*



# Categories of entries on UNESCO WHL

- **Mixed Landscapes**

If the natural resource value of the cultural landscape is significant the property may be nominated as a mixed site, embodying both natural and cultural values and in such a case the nomination will require review and evaluation from IUCN as well as ICOMOS and evaluated for one or more cultural and natural criteria.

*Examples: Blue and John Crow Mountains, Jamaica*

## **Heritage Routes as Cultural Landscapes**

- Cultural landscapes may also be manifest as a route as stated in the *WH Operational Guidelines* 'heritage routes may be considered as a specific, dynamic type of cultural landscape' (UNESCO 2013: 87-89) and as such they may also fall into any of the three categories as previously described. A cultural landscape may also have significant heritage features such as heritage route or a heritage canal within them.

# Categories of entries on UNESCO WHL

## **Serial Properties**

Cultural landscapes may be components of a serial group. Serial nominations are outlined in paragraphs 137-139 of the WH Operational Guidelines (UNESCO 2015:36-37) while the World Heritage Resources Manual (Marshall and Denyer 2011: 46-50) describes serial groups as follows: Serial properties are a series of individual or discrete components / areas which are not contained within a single boundary. Components may be quite close or geographically remote.

Serial properties will include component parts related because they belong to:

- the same historico-cultural group;
- the same type of property which is characteristic of the geographical zone; or
- the same geological, geomorphological formation, the same biogeographical province, or the same ecosystem type;

Further information is in paragraph 137 of *WH Operational Guidelines*.

Proceedings from a workshop on challenges for nominations and management of natural World Heritage properties discusses the challenges and concluded that a serial nomination can apply when two or more component parts are required to express the outstanding universal value and that the overarching story being told across all component parts is the essential base (Engels 2009:6).

## **Transboundary Properties**

When properties are a continuous land or sea area which extends across the borders of two or more adjacent properties they are known as transboundary properties. Marshall and Denyer (2011:44-45) provide further explanation and examples.

*Example: Muskauer Park, astride the Neisse River and border Poland and Germany*

## **Serial Transnational Property**

When cultural landscapes are the component parts of the serial group but in the territory of different State Parties, they would be referred to as serial transnational properties. In such cases the group is nominated with the consent of all States Parties concerned as a serial transnational property.



# Exemples on WHL - Muskauer Park, 2004

## **Criteria: I i IV.**

A landscaped park of 559.9 ha astride the Neisse River and the border between Poland and Germany, it was created by Prince Hermann von Puckler-Muskau from 1815 to 1844.

Blending seamlessly with the surrounding farmed landscape, the park pioneered new approaches to landscape design and influenced the development of landscape architecture in Europe and America.

Designed as a 'painting with plants', it did not seek to evoke classical landscapes, paradise, or some lost perfection, instead using local plants to enhance the inherent qualities of the existing landscape. This integrated landscape extends into the town of Muskau with green passages that formed urban parks framing areas for development. The town thus became a design component in a utopian landscape.

The site also features a reconstructed castle, bridges and an arboretum.

*Muskauer Park /  
Park Mużakowski,  
Germany/Poland WHL  
2004, category 1,  
photo © K. Palubska*







*Muskauer Park /  
Park Mużakowski,  
Germany/Poland WHL  
2004, category 1,  
photo © K. Palubska*





*Muskauer Park /  
Park Mużakowski,  
Germany/Poland WHL  
2004, category 1,  
photo © K. Palubska*



# The World Heritage criteria

---

The analysis shows that cultural landscapes are written primarily based on **criterion: III, IV, V.**

III - bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared; or

IV - be an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history; or

V - be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

*Kyoto, Japan, photo © M.Rosinski*



# WH Operational Guidelines (2013)

The WH Operational Guidelines (2013) adds guidance for the inscription of cultural landscapes in three paragraphs as follows:

11. The extent of a cultural landscape for inscription on the World Heritage List is relative to its functionality and intelligibility. In any case, the sample selected must be substantial enough to adequately represent the totality of the cultural landscape that it illustrates. The possibility of designating long linear areas which represent culturally significant transport and communication networks should not be excluded.
12. General criteria for protection and management are equally applicable to cultural landscapes. It is important that due attention be paid to the full range of values represented in the landscape, both cultural and natural. The nominations should be prepared in collaboration with and the full approval of local communities.
13. The existence of a category of "cultural landscape", included on the World Heritage List on the basis of the criteria set out in Paragraph 77 of the *WH Operational Guidelines*, does not exclude the possibility of properties of exceptional importance in relation to both cultural and natural criteria continuing to be inscribed (see definition of mixed properties as set out in Paragraph 46). In such cases, their Outstanding Universal Value must be justified under both sets of criteria.

*WH Operational Guidelines* (2012: 87-88) Annex 3: paragraphs 6-10, Inscription of Cultural Landscapes on the World Heritage List



# Cultural and natural value

## **Cultural values:**

Landscape interpretation and cultural landscape go together, for both are about ideas and meanings, concepts and interpretations, dynamics and dialogues. It is increasingly apparent that the historical identity of individual landscapes is emphasized. Memories and associations are taken away in the mind of the viewer of a landscape. Through the preservation approach the landscape itself remains as a lasting memorial to the past. A cultural landscape may be directly associated with the living traditions of those inhabiting it, or living around it in the case of some designed landscapes like gardens. These associations arise from interactions and perceptions of a landscape; such as beliefs closely linked to the landscape and the way it has been perceived over time. The cultural landscapes mirror the cultures which created them.

## **Natural values:**

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 also 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.





*The Cultural Landscape of Sintra in Portugal. The Cultural Landscape as mixture of natural and cultural values, photo © K. Palubska, 2010.*



# Universal value

Outstanding universal value is the key concept for selection of sites for the World Heritage List. It is not defined as such in the World Heritage Convention, but interpreted in the Operational Guidelines. It provides a link between universality, uniqueness and representativity of a certain cultural phenomenon or natural feature. For the purposes of the Convention, cultural landscapes are suitable for inclusion in the World Heritage List, if the interaction between people and nature is of outstanding universal value.







*Castle of the Teutonic Order  
in Malbork, Poland WHL  
1997, photo © K. Palubska*





## Authenticity of cultural landscapes

For World Heritage listing, it is required that each property nominated must meet the conditions of integrity; and for cultural sites also the conditions of authenticity (the Operational Guidelines (2005) Chapter II.E).

The 1994 Nara Conference recognized that the concept of the “test of authenticity” should not be limited to the four aspects described in the Operational Guidelines of the time: material, design, workmanship, setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components.

Accordingly, in **the Nara Document on Authenticity**, knowledge and understanding of original and subsequent characteristics of cultural heritage, their meanings, and sources of information are a prerequisite for assessing all aspects of authenticity, including form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, language and other forms of intangible heritage, and spirit and feeling. This was taken into account in the 2005 version of the Operational Guidelines.

The essence of applying the conditions of **authenticity** in the assessment of nominated sites is in the verification of information sources about relevant values. That is, that they are truthful and that the site is a genuine and authentic representation of what it claims to be. Even though cultural heritage resources in the landscape can be classified according to type or historic function, each individual site would still be assessed for its specificity and uniqueness, its *genus loci*. Cultural heritage must be considered within the cultural context to which it belongs.



# Integrity of cultural landscapes

Since 2005, all properties nominated must satisfy the conditions of **integrity**. This was specifically requested by many global, regional and thematic expert meetings on cultural landscapes. The meaning of the word integrity is wholeness, completeness, unimpaired or uncorrupted condition, continuation of traditional uses and social fabric. 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, this means specifically for cultural landscapes and for other living properties that relationships and dynamic functions present in cultural landscapes should be maintained;
- 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. This should be presented in a statement of integrity.

In the specific context of Cultural Landscapes, integrity is the extent to which the layered historic evidence, meanings and relationships between elements remains intact and can be interpreted in the landscape. It is also the integrity of the relationship with nature that matters, not the integrity of nature itself. If a clearly defined landscape, designed and intentionally created by man remains as created without substantial modification, it would satisfy the integrity conditions. Continuing landscapes reflect a process of evolution in form and features which can be 'read' like documents, but their condition of historical integrity can also be defined by the continuity of traditional functions, and the relationship of parts with the whole landscape.



# References

- Ceccarelli P., Rossler M. (eds), *Cultural Landscapes: The Challenges of Conservation*, World Heritage Papers 7 (2003): UNESCO World Heritage Center, Paris.
- Fowler P., *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes 1992-2002*, World Heritage papers 6 (2003): UNESCO World Heritage Center, Paris.
- Mitchell N., Rossler M., Tricaud P. (ed.), *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes. A Handbook for Conservation and Management*, World Heritage Papers 26 (2009): UNESCO World Heritage Center, Paris.
- UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE. 2012. World heritage operational guidelines; Cultural landscape definitions, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>.
- World Heritage List, a map of all sites, and the List of States Parties, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list>



**Project "SURE - Sustainable Urban Rehabilitation in Europe"  
implemented in frames of Erasmus+ Programme  
Key Action 2: Strategic Partnership Projects  
Agreement n° 2016-1-PL01-KA203-026232**

**This publication has been funded within support from the European Commission.**

**Free copy.**

**This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.**

**Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union**







# Project "SURE - Sustainable Urban Rehabilitation in Europe" implemented in frames of Erasmus+ Programme Key Action 2: Strategic Partnership Projects Agreement n° 2016-1-PL01-KA203-026232



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).