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The notion of cultural landscape has been accepted in the World Heritage Convention since 1992 but the adoption for World Heritage inscription is different among regions. This paper aims to address the issues of applying the concept of cultural landscape in Asia and the Pacific. The article first takes an overview of the World Heritage List and current issues related to the cultural landscape. This is followed by a discussion of the cultural landscape by referring to previous studies, with detailed analysis pointing out the major characteristics of the listed cultural landscapes in Asia and the Pacific, which are tabulated using the numerical data. The final discussion concludes by addressing the discourse on applying the World Heritage Convention and the current issues on cultural landscape conservation in Asia and the Pacific.
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Introduction

The imbalance in the World Heritage List is one of the major obstructions to representing cultural diversity. There are various studies and documents provided by UNESCO and ICOMOS that address the issue of imbalanced inscriptions of World Heritage in each region. One of those is the ICOMOS report entitled The World Heritage List: Filling the Gap—An Action Plan for the Future, published in 2005. The aim of this report was to contribute to the Global Strategy 'to ensure a more representative, balanced and credible World Heritage list'. As for cultural landscapes, this report tried to ease the gaps by encouraging the States Parties to nominate and
to re-nominate their properties as cultural landscapes. Though there were efforts to address the issue of imbalance of cultural landscapes in the List, such as the work of Ken Taylor and Kirsty Altenburg,² there is a need to address the issue in more detail.

The purpose of this paper is first to have a clear view of what constitutes cultural landscape in the World Heritage context, then to address the issues of cultural landscapes in Asia and the Pacific and then to extract the implications for future consideration. To achieve this purpose, the paper is divided into three main sections. The first section gives an overview of the World Heritage List. The second section deals with the cultural landscape in the World Heritage context, including the notion of cultural landscape and the imbalance in the list. The final section is about the cultural landscape in Asia and the Pacific, addressing the characteristic of inscribed cultural landscapes, issues on applying the Convention, and current issues of cultural landscape conservation in the region.

**World Heritage List**

The UNESCO World Heritage Centre defines heritage as ‘our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritage are both irreplaceable sources of life and inspiration.’³ Based on this notion, UNESCO aims to ‘encourage the identification, protection and preservation of cultural and natural heritage around the world considered to be of outstanding value to humanity’.⁴ The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention), adopted in 1972, is one of the major international legal instruments that puts this philosophy into practice. To accomplish the protection of the ‘outstanding value to humanity’, the World Heritage Centre encourages the States Parties to sign the World Heritage Convention and to join in the nomination of sites for inscription. The nominated sites are also supported to establish management plans and reporting systems, as well as to support local participation and international cooperation in conservation for sustainable management.

According to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, the signatory States Parties are divided into five regions: (1) Africa, (2) Arab States, (3) Asia and the Pacific, (4) Europe and North America, and (5) Latin America and the Caribbean. As of 2006, the World Heritage List includes 830 properties, which consist of 644 cultural, 162 natural and 24 mixed properties in 138 States Parties.⁵ The distribution of the sites in each region is summarised in Table 1. As can be seen from this table, half are from Europe and North America. This so-called ‘Euro-centrism’ is widely recognised and has been addressed considerably in the works of ICOMOS as well as in many Heritage Studies curricula, such as the Brandenburgische Technische Universität Cottbus,⁶ Deakin University⁷ and United Nations University.⁸

How much of the Euro-centrism issue has been taken into account? Are there any differences in the implications of the concept of natural and cultural heritage among the regions? Is the concept of universal value really applicable? All of these questions
have been raised during a number of seminars, expert meetings, and international conferences, including the global strategy approved by the World Heritage Committee in 1994. However, the outcome from these is not evident.

Cultural Landscape in the World Heritage Context

Presentation of Cultural Landscape in the World Heritage List

As addressed by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, ‘In 1992 the World Heritage Convention became the first international legal instrument to recognise and protect cultural landscapes. At its sixteenth-session, [the World Heritage Committee] adopted guidelines concerning their inclusion in the World Heritage List.’ It was thought that including the concept of cultural landscape would widen the concept of World Heritage that could give more room in the nomination for heritage with different characteristics. Moreover, the inscription of cultural landscape would possibly increase as a result of the global strategy of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre adopted in 2002 that the priority in terms of inscription would be given to less represented categories. Nevertheless, in tracking the number of World Heritage inscriptions there is little difference between the numbers before and after 1992 (see Figure 1). The adoption of cultural landscape in the Convention seems to be having little effect on the List and it raises the question as to how much the concept of cultural landscape is embraced by the States Parties.

The Notion of Cultural Landscape

The word ‘landscape’, first recorded in 1598, was borrowed as a painters’ term from the Dutch during the 16th century. The original Dutch word *landschap* simply meant ‘region, tract of land’, but, over time, it had acquired the artistic sense, which it brought over into English, of ‘a picture depicting scenery on land’. The perception of landscape was deeply established in Europe and became well known as ‘English Garden’. It refers to the informal landscape style which was popular in the UK from the mid-18th century to the early 19th century.
In the first half of the 20th century, two approaches were addressed in geography studies in the UK and the USA. William H. Tishler explained that the first, often thought of as the British approach, related to the work of H.C. Darby\textsuperscript{12} and involved utilising past geographic documentation to determine landscape change over time. The second approach, pioneered by Carl Ortwin Sauer at the University of California, Berkeley, emphasised ongoing processes leading to the study of landscape change with special emphasis given to cultural features.\textsuperscript{13}

According to Sauer

The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a cultural group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result. Under the influence of a given culture, itself changing through time, the landscape undergoes development, passing through phases and probably reaching ultimately the end of its cycle of development.\textsuperscript{14}

The clear separation of cultural landscape and natural landscape as Sauer defined it is commonly practised in landscape protection. This issue was also a major concern in Europe as addressed in the Report of the Expert Meeting on European Cultural Landscapes of Outstanding Universal Value in 1996 that ‘Nature conservation in Europe does not often integrate the protection and development of cultural landscapes.’\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{Figure 1}  World Heritage inscriptions in each region. \textit{Source:} Sirisrisak and Akagawa, ‘Concept of Cultural Landscape Conservation in Thailand’, summarised from the World Heritage List (2006) by the authors.
In the USA, Cultural landscape was initially defined by the Department of the Interior through the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (HCRS), which eventually was transferred back to the National Park Service (NPS). The definition in 1977 was: ‘A cultural landscape: An open space, natural form or setting that is significant primarily for its environmental relationship to or historical association with other tangible or intangible cultural resources and that contributes fundamentally to the definition and interpretation of such resource.’\(^{16}\) Subsequently, the guidelines developed by NPS illustrate the comprehensive heritage management which consists of four major steps: (1) historical and physical study, (2) identification and recording, (3) evaluation of historic significance and integrity, and (4) determining the interpretation, conservation, and management options. In these guidelines, cultural landscape is defined as ‘a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values’.\(^{17}\)

The first specific international involvement in cultural landscape conservation was the establishment of the ICOMOS/IFLA International Scientific Committee for Cultural Landscapes by the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) in 1970. The second was the adoption of Historic Gardens (The Florence Charter) by ICOMOS in 1982. A recent one was the adoption of the concept of cultural landscape into the World Heritage Convention in 1992, which gave a broader definition to cover the diversity of cultural landscape in the world.

In Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention, cultural landscapes are defined as representing the ‘combined works of nature and of man’. Peter Fowler, a World Heritage Advisor, has pointed out that cultural landscape is the result of interaction of people with environment. He chose ‘folk’ to explain this sense by saying that culture means the lifeways, including the artefacts, of a group of people but the essence of ‘folk’, as in ‘folk-life’, is not just people but the result of their interaction with their environment over a period of time.\(^{18}\) His explanation is relatively close to the landscape recently defined in the European Landscape Convention in 2000 which stated that ‘Landscape means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors.’\(^{19}\)

The theme for cultural landscape identification in the World Heritage context has been intensifying since its first adoption in 1992. For instance, the continuation of an agricultural landscape (i.e. the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras) was first recognised in 1995, and of an industrial landscape (i.e. the Blaenavon Industrial Landscape) was first accepted in 2000. In 2003, five types of landscapes were suggested in the World Heritage Papers 7: Cultural Landscapes: The Challenges of Conservation: (1) urban landscape, (2) industrial landscape, (3) serial nomination of urban/hinterland/marine landscape, (4) military landscape, and (5) landscape of ideas/site with ideology.\(^{20}\) Recently, owing to rapid urbanisation and globalisation, historic urban landscapes which are under threat from new urban development and high-rise construction have been brought into the discussion. Regarding this issue, UNESCO held a meeting in Vienna in 2005\(^ {21}\) followed by a regional expert meeting in St Petersburg\(^ {22}\) in 2007,
entitled ‘Are Historic Urban Landscapes a Type of Cultural Landscape?’ All of these verify the diversity of cultural landscape in the world and at the same time illustrate the attention from international organisations.

Imbalance of the Cultural Landscape in the World Heritage List

Inscribing a site to the World Heritage List could help in the survival of heritage. In this regard, UNESCO has put considerable effort into promoting the concept of cultural landscape by supporting a series of conferences, workshops, and expert meetings in all five regions in recent years. This has included work on an action plan, approved in the 17th session of the World Heritage Committee in 1994, to encourage States Parties to revise the Tentative List and to re-nominate the inscribed properties as cultural landscape. However, as of 2005, more than half of the cultural landscapes on the List were situated in Europe and North America.

Among 53 cultural landscapes on the List (2005), 33 sites (66%) were located in Europe and North America while there were only 10 sites (19%) in Asia and the Pacific (see Table 2). Euro-centrism of cultural landscape inscription seen in the List and the Tentative List could be the result of lack of understanding and implication of the World Heritage Convention in other regions. The concept of cultural landscape is somewhat new and could take some time for the States Parties to apply within their contexts. Fowler suggests that ‘Cultural landscape might require more sophisticated management than sometimes the case with relatively straightforward monuments.’23 This indicates that a comparative study of the characteristics of cultural landscape and heritage management practice in each region would contribute to heritage diversity in the List.

Cultural Landscapes in the List and Criteria for World Heritage Selection

The World Heritage Committee divides cultural landscape into three categories, namely (i) clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man, such as gardens which have aesthetic value or historic associations, (ii) organically evolved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of cultural landscapes in the List</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab states</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and North America</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors compiled from ICOMOS, Description of World Heritage Cultural Landscapes with a Bibliography of Supporting Documents.
landscape which is a relict (or fossil) landscape or continuing landscape, such as archaeological remains or historic agricultural sites, and (iii) associative cultural landscape which basically focuses on the intangible heritage of human, especially Indigenous, groups.\textsuperscript{24}

To be inscribed in the List, cultural landscape needs to meet at least one of 10 criteria, comprising six cultural criteria and four natural criteria. As can be seen in Table 3, most of them (72\%) meet cultural criterion (iv): to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates a significant stage(s) in human history. This would imply that most of the current cultural landscapes in the List have high value because of their rarity.

It is worth mentioning that among 53 cultural landscape sites there are four cultural landscapes that include natural criteria. They have rich biodiversity and cover large areas: St Kilda (UK),\textsuperscript{25} the Pyrénées-Mont Perdu (France/Spain),\textsuperscript{26} Tongariro National Park (New Zealand),\textsuperscript{27} and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Australia).\textsuperscript{28} Among these, Tongariro National Park and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park have a cultural association (cultural criterion (vi)), especially in relation to their Indigenous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of the Convention (C = cultural criterion, N = natural criterion)</th>
<th>Keywords of each criterion</th>
<th>Number of cultural landscapes (A)</th>
<th>Percentage of total number of cultural landscapes [(A) / 53 \times 100]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C (i)</td>
<td>A masterpiece of human creative genius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (ii)</td>
<td>Developments in architecture or technology/monumental arts/town-planning/landscape design</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (iii)</td>
<td>Testimony to a cultural tradition/civilization</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (iv)</td>
<td>Type of building/architectural/technological ensemble/landscape</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (v)</td>
<td>Traditional human settlement, land use, or sea use</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (vi)</td>
<td>Directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (i)</td>
<td>Superlative natural phenomena/exceptional natural beauty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (ii)</td>
<td>Major stages of Earth’s history/the record of life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (iii)</td>
<td>Ongoing ecological and biological processes in evolution and development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (iv)</td>
<td>Natural habitats for in situ conservation of biological diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The total number of cultural landscapes in the List was 53 (as of 2005). Each site could score on multiple criteria.

\textsuperscript{a} According to ICOMOS, \textit{Description of World Heritage Cultural Landscapes with a Bibliography of Supporting Documents.}

Source: Adapted from Sirisrisak and Akagawa, ‘Cultural Landscape in the World Heritage List’, 16.
groups. Furthermore, as for the cultural criterion, there are four sites that meet
criterion (i): to represent a masterpiece of human creative genius. One of these is the
Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan),
which demonstrates outstanding Buddhist arts together with an astonishing transfor-
mation of the landscape. The others are Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape (Czech
Republic), the Loire Valley between Sully-sur-Loire and Chalonnes (France), and
Muskauer Park/Park Muzakowski (Germany/Poland), all of which demonstrate the
ensemble of an outstanding example of human creativity through gardening and
architectural design.

Cultural Landscape in Asia and the Pacific Region

Characteristics of the Cultural Landscapes in the List

The 10 sites situated in Asia and the Pacific are:

- Tongariro National Park, New Zealand (date of inscription: 1990; extension: 1993);
- Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Australia (date of inscription: 1987; extension:
  1994);
- Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, The Philippines (date of inscription:
  1995);
- Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural
  Landscape, Lao People’s Democratic Republic (date of inscription: 2001);
- Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley,
  Afghanistan (date of inscription: 2003);
- Rock Shelters of Bhimbetka, India (date of inscription: 2003);
- Bam and its Cultural Landscape, Islamic Republic of Iran (date of inscription: 2004);
- Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range, Japan (date of
  inscription: 2004);
- Petroglyphs within the Archaeological Landscape of Tamgaly, Kazakhstan (date of
  inscription: 2004);
- Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape, Mongolia (date of inscription: 2004).

According to the brief descriptions of inscribed cultural landscapes in Asia and the
Pacific provided by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, it is noted that they all
share some major characteristics. Analysis of the descriptions shows that most of
them have archaeological or architectural remains and express the religiosity or
powerful beliefs of the local people. Some sites are distinctive and have cultural asso-
ciation with the Indigenous groups. Some sites are testimony to remarkable man-
made landscapes; others have retained continuing historic land use for thousands of
years.

As summarised in Table 4, it is possible to derive five major characteristics from
inscribed cultural landscapes in Asia and the Pacific Region: (1) religiosity/Indigenous
belief, (2) archaeological/architectural remains, (3) continuing historic land use, (4)
outstanding landscape, and (5) distinctive nature.
**Table 4** Analysis of cultural landscapes in Asia and the Pacific region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Religiosity/Indigenous belief</th>
<th>Archaeological/architectural remains</th>
<th>Continuing historic land use</th>
<th>Outstanding type of landscape</th>
<th>Distinctive nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bam and its Cultural Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroglyphs within the Archaeological Landscape of Tamgaly</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Shelters of Bhimbetka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongariro National Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discourse on Applying the Convention

Regarding the application of the World Heritage Convention, the difficulty is not only for the States Parties to apply the Convention but also for the Committee to evaluate the nominations. Fowler states that ‘Evaluation of nominations has already become increasingly difficult where no comparative study exists. Expressed the other way round, evaluation is significantly improved where a comparative study has already been carried out, whether at local, state, regional or global level.’

In the report entitled The World Heritage List: Filling the Gap—An Action Plan for the Future, ICOMOS states that among the entries in the World Heritage List and Tentative List in Asia and the Pacific, a small number (2%) are cultural landscapes while the majority are archaeological properties, architectural monuments, and religious properties. The report could be reflecting the need for identification of cultural landscapes. At the same time it also sheds some light on whether the existing properties fit the associative cultural landscape category. In many cases, in Asia and the Pacific, archaeological or architectural remains exhibit the importance of religiosity and its associated intangible value. Temples, churches, mosques, or open spaces are usually located in the centre of human settlements. Taylor and Altenburg suggest that many existing properties on the List in Asia and the Pacific would admirably fulfil the category of continuing landscape of outstanding universal value with cross-reference to the associative cultural landscape category. There are two cases that underpin this idea. Tongariro National Park in New Zealand and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park in Australia were first nominated as natural heritage and have been re-nominated as cultural landscape by including the cultural association of Indigenous groups.

One of the significant contributions in defining the associative cultural landscape is the workshop organised by Australia ICOMOS in 1995. In this workshop, the phrase ‘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’, was raised in the discussion. Australia ICOMOS explained that cultural association could be acoustic, kinetic and olfactory, and visual. This could be expressed in many forms, for example songs in Papua New Guinea that are related to the songs of birds or the sound of waterfalls. In this sense, the relationship between intangible cultural heritage and nature is significant.

The implication of category (iii) of cultural landscape in the World Heritage inscription, the associative cultural landscape, also questioned the European experts in the meeting held in 1996; as shown in the report, ‘The question was raised if the Mont Blanc as an associative cultural landscape would qualify for World Heritage listing. The universality stems from the cultural connotation, however, how can a specific association of one culture be universal.’ The interpretation of the World Heritage Convention could be different among the State Parties. However, the identification of cultural landscape shall be based on scientific research with full respect and understanding of the history, nature and uniqueness of the place. Furthermore, the conservation of property in category (iii) requires deep understanding on how the place is valued.
Makoto Motonaga mentions in World Heritage Papers 7 that ‘Terrace rice fields and sacred mountains are the two major landscape resources that represent cultural landscape in Asia and Pacific Region’. In such landscapes water has been playing an important role in the long history of agricultural activities as well as the development of the city. Nowadays, efforts to bring back water into daily life have been seen in many world cities, such as a plan to bring greater vibrancy and activity to the waters of Marina Bay in Singapore, the ‘Tokyo Waterfront Beautification Initiative’, and ‘Cheonggyecheon’, a restored stream in downtown Seoul. It shows the depth of the relationship between Asian people and water, and at the same time, it reminds us how easy the cultural landscape can be swamped by urbanisation.

In many Asian countries, owing to rapid urbanisation, historic landscapes are commonly exploited and put under pressure to change by urban sprawl. Supporting this idea is the need for land to accommodate unexpected increases in the population. According to a UN study, population growth in major cities in the past four decades has been as follows: Bangkok, from 2.6 million in 1965 to 6.6 million in 2005 or 250% in 40 years; Hanoi from 0.9 to 4.2 million or 460%; Beijing from 5.3 to 10.7 million or 200%; Shanghai from 6.8 to 14.5 million or 210%; Jakarta from 3.3 to 13.2 million or 400%; Tokyo from 20.2 to 35.2 million or 170%; Seoul from 3.5 to 9.7 million or 280%; and Manila from 2.8 to 10.7 million or 380%. As Yukio Nishimura describes:

[H]igh population density is considered to be the single most influential feature in Asia. By 2025, there will be ten or more metropolises in Asia with a population exceeding 20 million [...] These figures suggest that many Asian megalopolises will eventually become unmanageable from an administrative viewpoint. High population density may lead to great difficulties in protecting cultural heritage in our modern times.

Change of landscape in Asia is often the result of government policy on mega-projects, often with little or no public dialogue. For instance, investment in infrastructure and city development in Thailand (e.g. public transport, airports, industrial estates, new town, etc.) prioritises the increase in the gross domestic product (GDP) of the country, which is considered as a positive factor for international investors and also increases the value in the stock market. This kind of development accelerates the change of landscape in suburban and rural areas as a result of inexpensive land, low-cost labour, and relatively relaxed environmental regulations.

One of the legal protections of cultural landscape is to designate a protection zone. The cultural landscape boundary is related to its characteristic as suggested in the World Heritage Operational Guideline (revised 2005) in paragraph 101:

boundaries should reflect the spatial requirements of habitats, species, processes or phenomena that provide the basis for their inscription on the World Heritage List. The boundaries should include sufficient areas immediately adjacent to the area of outstanding universal value in order to protect the property’s heritage values from direct effect of human encroachments and impacts of resource use outside of the nominated area.
In many cases, designation of the protection zone is the responsibility of the local authority. However, it is a particularly challenging task to convince local government to protect not only a monument but also its environment or landscape which is actually under pressure from new development.

Public dialogue or other approaches to participation in the decision-making process would be one of the appropriate ways to safeguard the cultural heritage. However, it is also difficult to bring this issue into the public interest, especially where the community is influenced by globalisation. For example, in the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras fewer people want to work in the traditional occupations under difficult conditions, which is understandable. This is happening in many places where globalisation and urbanisation have brought increasing mobility, a need for cash income, and accelerated ongoing change of lifestyle, etc. Another example—the Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley in Afghanistan—is a different situation where internal conflict and war are involved. These examples remind us about the risk of change from situations which are very difficult to control. Both sites are now on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Lastly, special mention should be made here of the recent efforts to apply the concept of cultural landscape in a national conservation system. In Japan, a new category—cultural landscape—was included in the amendment of the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties promulgated in 2004, which took effect in 2005. This was motivated by the international movement and also to cover the area which could not be included in the ‘Places of Scenic Beauty’ under the current national system. Notably, it is probably one of the first legal protections of cultural landscape at the national level in Asia.

**Conclusion**

The notion of cultural landscape gives one of the frameworks to manage a place by embracing the significance of its wider context. Cultural landscape has been adopted in the World Heritage Convention for over a decade, but nevertheless, as shown in this research, it has had little effect on the List, and a number of cultural landscapes in regions other than Europe and North America are not yet recognised. This situation indicates the need to address the issue of cultural landscape identification and landscape themes which could be nominated.

It is important to mention that conservation policy and mechanisms for safeguarding the cultural landscape in each State Party need to be implemented effectively. Protection of cultural landscapes needs to have appropriate management and better balance along with development and globalisation. Furthermore, in Asia and the Pacific, the issue of population and conservation policy, in particular, should be taken into account. Of particular concern in the protection of cultural landscape is the rapid change resulting from new development as a consequence of an increasing population in urban areas and depopulation in the rural areas.

In addition, the documentation prepared for conservation plans requires not only statistical inventory but also the description of intangible associations, such as local knowledge, tradition, belief, etc. The quality of those records and documents is
important for further study, especially when the site is in danger of disappearing or irreversible change.

Cultural heritage is an essential vehicle that conveys the message from the past in both its positive and negative aspects, both of which should be enlightened as a lesson for future development. To avoid new conflict or degradation of the place, the protection of cultural landscapes could be integrated into city planning and development rather than setting it aside as a separate measure as a part of heritage conservation.

This article has addressed the current situation by applying detailed numerical data to assist the understanding of the issues relating to cultural landscape conservation in Asia and the Pacific. It is hoped that this study will contribute to the basis of future research.

Notes

[4] Ibid.
[26] Date of inscription: 1997; extension: 1999; criteria: C (iii)(iv)(v) N (i)(ii). The site is also a pastoral landscape reflecting an agricultural way of life that was once widespread in the upland regions of Europe but now survives only in this part of the Pyrenees. Thus it provides exceptional insights into past European society through its landscape of villages, farms, fields, upland pastures and mountain roads.
[27] Date of inscription: 1990; extension: 1993; criteria: C (vi) N (ii)(iii). In 1993 Tongariro became the first property to be inscribed in the World Heritage List under the revised criteria describing cultural landscapes. The mountains at the heart of the park have cultural and religious significance for the Maori people and symbolise the spiritual links between this community and its environment. The park has active and extinct volcanoes, a diverse range of ecosystems and some spectacular landscapes.
[28] Date of inscription: 1987; extension: 1994; criteria: C (v)(vi) N (i)(iii). Uluru, an immense monolith, and Kata Tjuta, the rock domes located west of Uluru, form part of the traditional belief system of one of the oldest human societies in the world. The traditional owners of Uluru-Kata Tjuta are the Anangu Aboriginal people.
[30] The information used in the report is based on the World Heritage List, 2002. The description in the report uses the following information: the most represented category on the Tentative Lists of the Asia/Pacific region is that of archaeological sites (84 = 25%). The next most represented category is religious properties (59 = 18%). This demonstrates the importance of Buddhist temples, and also of Christian monuments (see the Tentative List of the Philippines, for example). Burial sites also increase from 4% on the List to 7.5% on Tentative Lists, as do technological/agricultural properties, from 3 sites (1%) on the World Heritage List to 12 sites (= 4% on Tentative Lists) and cultural routes (from 1 site = 1% on the World Heritage List to 5 sites (1.5%) on Tentative Lists). This is also the case for rock-art sites, from 10 sites (3%) on the World Heritage List to 12 sites (4%) on Tentative Lists, vernacular heritage from 5 sites (2%) on the World Heritage List to 7 sites (= 2% on Tentative Lists) and symbolic sites (from 7 sites = 2% on the World Heritage List to 10 sites (3%). Cultural landscapes diminish from 23 (8%) on the List to 7 (2%) on the Tentative Lists, as do historic towns (from 35 = 12% on the World Heritage List to 30 = 9% on Tentative Lists), architectural properties (from 67 = 23 on the World Heritage List to 59 = 8% on Tentative Lists), and military properties (from 11 sites = 4% to 9 sites = 3%). The Asia/Pacific region has no modern heritage sites, on either the World Heritage List or the Tentative Lists. There are no fossil hominid sites on the Tentative Lists of the Asia/Pacific region, whilst this category is represented by 2 sites (1%) on the World Heritage List.
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