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Abstract

The number of cultural parks has been steadily increasing in recent years throughout the world. But what is a cultural park? The aim of this dissertation is to provide an answer to this question or at least to set out the basis for an academic debate that moves beyond technical narratives that have prevailed to date. It is important to open up the topic to academic scrutiny given that cultural parks are becoming widespread devices being employed by different institutions and social groups to manage and enhance cultural and natural heritage assets and landscapes. The main problem to deal with is the predominant lack of theory-grounded, critical reflection in the literature about cultural parks. These remain largely conceived as technical instruments deployed by institutions in order to solve an array of problems they must deal with. Also, cultural parks are overall regarded as positive and constructive tools whose performance is associated with the preservation of heritage, the overcoming of the nature/culture divide, the reinforcing of identity and memory and the strengthening of social cohesion and economic development. This dissertation critically explores these issues through the analysis of the literature on cultural parks. Also, it provides a novel theoretical conceptualization of cultural parks that is connected and underpins a tentative methodology developed for their empirical analysis.
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1. Introduction

“Even within the park and historic preservation communities there is little understanding of what heritage areas represent. ... Heritage Areas don’t fit neatly within any concept or specialization we are familiar with. ... Planning, development and management of heritage areas requires the coordination of many specialized skills including those of architects, landscape architects, planners, historic preservationists, educators, and tourism and economic development specialists to address the intricate relationships found in a living landscape encompassed in a heritage area. A positive consequence of this circumstance is the opportunity to enlarge the dimension of specialized skills by linking up disciplines. But it has left heritage areas to be an orphan without one specialized profession able to claim it as its very own” (Bray 1994a: 34)

The quotation from Paul Bray brilliantly captures the essential traits of cultural parks and heritage areas. He highlights the general lack of knowledge about their existence, their constitutive interdisciplinary character and the absence of professionals and scholars dedicated to their development and study. Notwithstanding, their number is growing rapidly. In fact, the present research is tightly linked with real problems encountered when I was given the responsibility for a project for the creation of a cultural park in Maragatería (Spain) by the regional Government of Castilla y León in 2009. The complete absence of theory-grounded debate on the one hand, and the lack of any pragmatic guidelines for the development of cultural parks on the other, made me aware of the necessity for further research in the topic.

The first striking fact when addressing the topic of cultural parks is the general lack of academic and institutional publications about them. Paradoxically, this
deficiency is probably due to the fact that renders them so interesting from my point of view, that is, their interdisciplinary and complex nature. A cultural park is a good example of what Law and Mol (2002) called “slippery objects”. In a cultural park it is impossible to disentangle some aspects from others, to “purify” and analyze separately each element. Spatial planning, tourism, institutional organization, heritage and museum management among others interact in such a way that it is impossible to define precise areas of activity for each discipline. Thus, cultural parks can take different meanings depending on the disciplinary root of the author who is accounting for them. They can be simultaneously spatial planning instruments, cultural heritage stewards or vectors for tourism attraction. In parallel, cultural parks can be articulated differently at the local level depending on who plans and supports them, with which objectives and in what context. Hence, the analysis of cultural parks calls for a holistic approach, one that conceives of them as a whole entity.

Another factor which partially explains the lack of academic attention they have received is their dynamic nature. Cultural parks must be conceived as constantly evolving processes, a fact that hampers the standard scientific effort of fixing and stabilizing meanings and functions (DeLanda 2004). This situation is interesting with regard to the study of heritage as it induces the researcher to avoid essentialist conceptualisations of it. That is, a heritage asset within a cultural park is not defined by the functions or features that the researcher externally attributes to it. Rather, it is determined by its particular articulation in a broader scheme where issues ranging from economy to politics, from science to folklore, intersect constantly.

Cultural parks move beyond the conception of a “park” as a publicly-owned, enclosed space, aimed at conservation. Cultural parks seek to actively preserve
extensive inhabited landscapes and their heritage resources, linking them to the tourist enterprise through the development of a management structure. Thus, they overcome the idea of a “heritage site” as a dot in space, embracing the notion of “territorial heritage” or cultural landscape. This change in focus would allow cultural parks to overcome the nature/culture (Sabaté 2004b) and tangible/intangible dichotomies (Bustamante 2008) thanks to a holistic conception of human’s relation with space. According to different authors, the involvement of local communities and a number of social actors in decision-making regarding heritage and landscape management would preclude the commodification of the area in spite of the increase in touristic inflows. Likewise, this would be so because cultural parks allegedly maintain a close link between people and their heritage (Daly 2003). Despite these assumptions have never been proved against actual case studies, cultural parks are overall regarded as positive technical territorial interventions and devices of local development based on “heritage resources”.

Consequently, the conception of cultural parks as “technical devices” has prevailed hitherto both in the literature and in management practices. This situation stems from the fact that architects and engineers have to pragmatically address the design and implementation of parks along with the problems and difficulties that it entails as we shall see later. Also, “technical” conceptions prove useful for institutions that can easily link cultural parks with politic and socio-economic discourses. Then, cultural parks become instruments to strengthen the identity and memory of local communities, to slow down rural depopulation or to reverse the process of economic decline derived from the end of local productive activities. This empty rhetoric pictures cultural parks as stable and simple structures, therefore reducing their complexity and
agency. In addition, from this viewpoint heritage is regarded as a bare “resource” to be 
enhanced for the well-being of the community.

Clearly, this standpoint precludes the possibility of a socio-political analysis of 
the performance of cultural parks by leaving out many controversial issues. But in fact 
cultural parks play an important role in defining what heritage is, what narratives will be 
remembered and represented and which not, thus performing an overtly political task 
concerning issues of identity, inclusion and exclusion. Furthermore, cultural parks can 
be political in other ways. For instance, they can bring to the public eye hidden 
controversies such as ecological degradation, depopulation, lack of democracy, etc.

Therefore, the subject of cultural parks is worthy of further research as it is 
related to many socio-political and academic issues and debates. They provide an 
outstanding framework for analysing a wide array of matters such as identity politics, 
cultural display ethics, representation, tourism, heritage property, commodification and 
modern dichotomies such as the nature-culture divide. But cultural parks also entail 
huge economic, physical and affective investments by different social actors and real 
changes in the lives of people. Thus, commonplace assumptions and potential 
mismatchings between theory and practice may bring about harmful consequences in 
different ways: investments may be wasted, communities may feel excluded from the 
project or heritage could be damaged. This dissertation aims to be a useful contribution 
to the academic and practical fields, two areas that are often inextricably linked in every 
cultural park project.
1.1 Aims

The present dissertation aims to set up the basis for the analysis of cultural parks and to open up the topic to academic scrutiny. The purpose is not to reach an all-encompassing definition of cultural parks. Rather, the aim is to map the different elements that play a role in their constitution and to explore critically dominant assumptions about them in order to build a new theory and methodology for their study. The purpose, therefore, is not primarily to answer the problems raised by cultural parks, but to access the epistemological and ontological assumptions behind their development. On this basis, it will be possible to move beyond technical narratives that have prevailed to date and elucidate how cultural parks could be studied more effectively.

In other words, the aim is to reveal the potential motivations behind the decision to construct cultural parks, to establish what conceptions of cultural parks they are rooted in, and to assess to what extent they may function according to their perceived roles. Therefore, it is essential to shed light on the “genealogy” of cultural parks, that is, the antecedents and elements that have rendered them possible. Also, it is necessary to account for their empirical constitution, comprising their social and institutional organisation and structure. These developments will facilitate the task of analysing the role heritage plays within cultural parks.

Instead of considering cultural parks as technical instruments, this dissertation conceives them as emergent processes. From this stance, the paper will question whether cultural parks really do overcome the nature/culture dichotomy and, if so, how they do it. Afterwards, the dissertation brings into question the validity of essentialist
statements straightforwardly assuming that cultural parks “preserve identity and memory” or “reinforce community cohesion”. Finally, cultural parks will be set as a definite object of study or “research problem”. This paves the way for the development of a methodology that allows the study and explanation of the empirical performance of cultural parks.

1.2 Methodology

The approach used here to account for cultural parks is largely qualitative. Also, the investigation calls for an inductive reasoning stance. The newness of the topic and the particular methods of the Heritage studies discipline make it difficult to work within a deductive, hypothesis-testing standpoint. Rather, an exploratory and qualitative methodology is required in order to elucidate the more relevant issues about cultural parks and to provide a novel framework for their analysis.

Essentially, a library-based work has provided the necessary data to carry out the investigation. The main resources consulted have been journal papers, books and normative texts from different institutions such as UNESCO, ICOMOS, European Council, National Park Service of the United States along with national and regional governments. Moreover, some cultural park promoters have provided me with planning guidelines and information. Also, during a research stay at the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya in June 2011, Professor Joaquin Sabaté allowed me to consult the documentation produced by his research group after the implementation of four cultural parks in Catalunya (Spain).
The majority of cultural parks do not publish, or their publication range is limited to the local level. Hence, the information retrieved from official Websites and blogs is essential. Digital leaflets, maps, itineraries and short guides provide useful data about the story of the park, the administrative framework, the main heritage resources or the socio-economic context. The information gathered from these sources has been organised and analysed according to the requirements of the specific tasks to be performed.

Finally, it is important to justify the fact that no fieldwork has been carried out. Although, I believe that it is not enough to analyze discourses and that fieldwork research is crucial to understand heritage issues, given the underdeveloped theoretical state of the subject it is necessary to set out the basis for a realistic empirical research agenda before plunging straight into the field. The present investigation aims at establishing a connection between a theoretical framework, an ethnographic methodology and a clear object of study, an endeavour that will enable me in the future to carry out meaningful and problem directed fieldwork.

1.3 Some remarks on literature about cultural parks

There are some general remarks to be made before turning to the commentary of the different bodies of literature concerning cultural parks. As already stated, scholarship dealing specifically with cultural parks is scarce and comes mainly from the fields of architecture and spatial planning. This does not mean they are totally isolated at an academic level. Cultural parks bring together knowledge and expertise from different lineages and fields, among which essentially museology, spatial planning and protected area management, architecture and archaeology. Similarly, at an
epistemological level they are part of discussions that affect the social sciences at large, such as the nature/culture dichotomy or the conflict over representation embodied in the subject/object dialectic. Then, when I mention the lack of specific investigations on cultural parks I am referring to the absence of research integrating the different fields of knowledge and dealing with the various epistemological and practical controversial issues that they entail.

Then, not only there is a lack of interdisciplinary works about cultural parks, but almost all the studies come from the U.S. and Europe due to the fact that very few cultural parks exist out of these areas and access to information is more difficult. In fact, only three cases have been found in China (Zhi-fang & Peng 2001) and Australia (Henry 2000; Ryan & Huyton 2002). In South America cultural parks are conceived as open air museums, such as the “Parque Cultural del Caribe” in Colombia or the “Parque Cultural Valparaiso” in Chile (Holmes et al. 2009) A further difficulty is that management guidelines and projects are rarely made public apart from exceptional cases (i.e.Casas 2006).

Normally, papers about cultural parks tell the story of their development, the involvement of different institutions, the socio-economic context and the heritage resources included in the park. Each author deploys a different understanding of what is a cultural park and how it works, taking for granted that their particular concept is universal. Also, there is a tendency to bring cultural parks into each author’s disciplinary framework without the necessary epistemological translation. Thus, for archaeologists they become a good solution for the problem of the preservation of archaeological remains (Fairclough & Rippon 2002; Ballesteros Arias et al. 2004), for spatial planners an instrument for the management of special territories such as cultural
landscapes (Hernández & Giné 2002) whereas for economists they are seen as an opportunity to generate wealth and development (Pecchia 2003). Finally, it is relevant that only one author acknowledges the fact that the cultural park that he is studying has failed (Rubio Terrado 2008). Cultural parks are only accounted for when they become thriving projects with positive performances.

The only investigation dealing specifically with cultural parks has been carried out by Dennis Frenchman and Joaquín Sabaté (2001). Also, Leonel Bustamante has extended their previous research under the guidance of Joaquín Sabaté (Bustamante 2008). Both works approach cultural parks from an architectural stance that privileges issues of landscape design and spatial planning. The rest of studies in Europe focus on individual cases and specific types of parks such as regional (Fernández Mier & Díaz López 2006), hydraulic (Muñoz Sánchez 2009), agricultural (Ferraresi et al. 1993; Torre 2007), archaeological (Battaglini et al. 2002) or industrial (Butler et al. 1994; Goodall 1994; Hayward 1987; Kunzmann 1999). The works of the Cultural Park system in Aragón (Spain) stand out because they provide a coherent framework for the six parks in the system (Aragón 1997). These authors analyse the performance of cultural parks in relation to spatial planning, sustainable development and tourism. Furthermore, the promoters of the Val di Cornia Cultural Park (Toscana, Italy) developed a comprehensive study of their own park which represents the most in-depth account carried out to date on the issue. In a book produced by themselves (Zucconi 2003), the promoters critically analyse the development of the park from many different standpoints, ranging from economy to heritage management.

In the case of the U.S., information about cultural parks (denominated also Heritage Parks or National Heritage Areas (NHA) comes from different sources. Papers
exist dealing with particular cases (e.g. Hayward 1987; Laven et al. 2010; Hamin 2001; Hart 2000). Occasionally, the National Park System (N.P.S.), the organism responsible for the management of National Parks in the U.S., provides some technical information about NHA. However, most of the information comes from their own NHA. promoters (i.e. Prola 2005) and from private Cultural Resource Management consultants (i.e. Bray 1994a). In particular, the N.H.A. Web pages provide useful information about the park's history, heritage resources and the subject matter.

Overall, critical and theory-grounded literature on cultural parks is lacking. There is a clear predominance of positivist and functionalist narrations merely presenting the history of the development of the park and its heritage resources. Normally, authors rely on essentialist and commonsense categorizations that assume normative definitions to create watertight categories where cultural parks fit. The idea that cultural parks are neutral instruments that smoothly translate the “great narratives” of sustainable development or heritage preservation into praxis permeates the vast majority of the literature reviewed.

1.4 Overview

The text is divided into two distinct sections. The first five chapters set out the noteworthy factors that have led to the formation of cultural parks and explore their functioning and structures. The last two chapters comprise a theoretical reflection and focus on the development of a methodology for the empirical study of cultural parks.

“The ambivalence of landscapes: between representation and reality”. The chapter examines the epistemological evolution of the concept of “landscape” and how
it interweaves with issues of governmentality. The aim is to show how the ambivalence of the notion of landscape was generated in parallel with the development of the modern epistemology and the scientific paradigm. The chapter shows how some of the controversial aspects of cultural parks stem from placing the idea of landscape at the heart of its spatial and heritage planning efforts. Finally, two institutional frameworks for the management of landscapes are analysed.

“**Territory and heritage: from cultural landscapes to cultural parks**”. This chapter investigates how the ambivalence of the notion of “landscape” is reproduced in the conceptualization of cultural landscapes. Also, it shows how under the apparently positive character of “cultural landscapes” lies a utilitarian notion that opens the door to the reification and commodification of landscapes. Finally, it presents the different views of UNESCO and the N.P.S. and how these influence the nature of cultural parks in each area.

“**Charting the road to cultural parks**”. The chapter points to some of the museum practices and protected areas’ management frameworks that have been most influential in the development of cultural parks. To this end, the main theoretical trends and some practices in Europe and U.S. are exposed. The chapter aims to show how the cultural park phenomenon is not entirely original, but rather a hybridization of previous traditions and practices that undergo different articulations at the local level.

“**Cultural parks**”. The chapter provides an overview of the process of implementation and operation of cultural parks. The various definitions of cultural parks are reviewed along with several key issues that play a role in their constitution such as
the inventories, the storytelling process and the role of institutions, legislation and commonplace objectives.

“Some issues for discussion”. The objective of the chapter is to discuss some contentious issues about cultural parks while at the same time linking them with other disciplines and subjects and in particular with the field of heritage studies. A further aim is to open the subject to academic scrutiny and potential future research.

“A new conception of cultural parks: towards a methodology of analysis” provides a theoretical conceptualization that serves as a base for the development of a methodology for the ethnographic study of cultural parks. To do this, I start from a critical review of the methodologies that have previously been used by other authors. Then, cultural parks are conceptualized as complex “assemblages”. Afterwards, some suggestions for the creation of a methodology for their study are provided.

“Conclusions” reviews the main points of the dissertation and discusses their significance.
2. The ambivalence of landscapes: between representation and reality

2.1. The concept of “landscape”

The etymology of the word for “landscape” derives from the Latin “pagus” in the Romance languages\(^1\) and refers to a place where a human being has been born or lives and to which a person feels attached (Muñoz 2006). The same link between place and identity is reproduced in English with “land” and “landscape”, in this case deriving from the Dutch “Landschap” or German “Landschaft”. Moreover, the literature on landscapes shows a wide range of positionings on the origins of the modern meaning of the term. Maderuelo (2006) situates it in the fifth century Chinese artists’ conception of space, while Zimmer (2008) locates it in the modern Flanders. For Burckhardt (2004) and the cultural geographers (see Cosgrove 1985) the modern idea of landscape emerged with the Italian Renaissance paintings. These paintings placed the artist-observer outside the frame, a movement that Cosgrove relates with the incipient birth of modern science’s epistemology. Moreover, this conception breaks with medieval landscape paintings which expressed the manifestation of the divine order in nature (Fuller 1988) without establishing a separation between man and nature nor even a linear perspective that could represent the world accurately (Berque 1997).

The long process whereby medieval epistemology was replaced by the modern one gave rise to a neutral and scientific notion of nature and the world (Livingstone 1992). The landscape becomes part of the biopolitical machinery deployed by modern

---

\(^1\) “Paisaje” in Spanish, “paysage” in French, “Paesaggio” in Italian, “Paisagem” in Portuguese or “Peisaj” in Romanian.
states to control and discipline the population (Foucault 2007). Mitchell (2002) and Cosgrove (2003) provide examples of how the representation of landscape served to establish a real domination over spaces and populations in Italy, England and other European states during the modern era: every new spatial theory implies a new socio-political order (see Fagence 1983; Foley 1960; Kramer 1975; Reade 1987).

Thus, by tying together morals and politics, science and aesthetics, the adaptation of the notion of landscape in the discipline of Geography became controversial and derived in a conflict throughout the eighteenth century in France and Germany between a “pure geography” aspiring to be a neutral and scientific discipline, and the “State geography”, which focused on supporting the performance of the aristocratic State (Dematteis 1985). This second position derived in what was known in the United Kingdom as geography for the sake of the Empire (Wallach 2005). The coming to power of the bourgeoisie in France and Germany during the nineteenth century led to an ambiguous compromise between knowledge and power (Minca & Bialasiewicz 2008) whose precarious balance still weighs heavily in our way of managing and understanding space (Foucault & Gordon 1980).

Alexander von Humboldt transformed the aesthetic concept of landscape into the scientific notion commonly used in the social sciences still today (2003). The scientific adaptation of the term was charged with ambivalence, since “Landschaft” referred both to the reality of a neighbourhood and the figurative representation of the neighbourhood itself. It comes by no surprise that this dialectic between representation and reality will impinge on the operation of cultural parks. This is so because the aesthetic, emotional and affective dimension of landscape is confused with its concrete physical, material dimension. The modern scientific quest to “purify concepts” (Latour 1993b) has
prevented the acceptance of “landscape” as a hybrid where the objective and subjective dimensions coexist. From Humboldt’s conceptualization onwards, the diverse approaches to landscapes have only swung the balance toward the objectivist or the subjectivist side, with the result that “territory”, “space” and “place” are confused with “landscape”.

In the early twentieth century a “descriptive-cartographic” turning point transformed landscapes into sets of objects, a move that could be linked to war needs of the states at that time (Vázquez Varela & Martínez Navarro 2008). From the 1940s onwards there was a revolution in landscape studies in the U.S. and the U.K. thanks to the works of John Brinckerhoff and William Hoskins with his classic work “The making of the English Landscape” (1955). It was Carl Sauer who reinstated the significance of existential values in the notion of landscape, conceived as a stable territory with a specific identity (Getis & Getis 2006; Rubenstein 2010). Interestingly, this view led him to propose the preservation and enhancement of historic landscapes already in the 1950s (Mathewson & Kenzer 2003).

During the 1960s the works of Augustin Berque integrated the concept of landscape within the phenomenological tradition (Relph & Mugerauer 1985; Muñoz Jiménez 1979). Heideggerian phenomenology caused a shift in the conception of landscapes by placing the subject as “being-in-the-world” in the centre of its ontology (Safranski 1998). Consequently, the observing subject is what gives meaning to the outer world and the landscape becomes a human experience rather than a part of the objective world (Berque et al. 1994). Afterwards, the New Cultural Geography hybridized phenomenology with Marxism providing a strong characterization of “landscape” as a “visual ideology” (Cosgrove 1985) or “way of seeing” that serves to
sustain mystification (Berger 1972; see also Ingerson 2000). Cultural Geography has been harshly criticised by anthropologists considering that this paradigm conveys an “elitist” vision of the landscape (Zusman 2004). In fact, some recent approaches to landscapes could be regarded as a response to the “culturalist” perspective (e.g. Bender & Winer 2001; Tilley 1994; Hirsch & O'Hanlon 1995).  

From the 1990s onwards, there is an outburst of works on landscapes from heterogeneous viewpoints whose detailed review exceeds the scope of this thesis. Recent scholarship has questioned the functionality of the notion of landscape and tried to bridge the epistemological gap between nature and culture (see Thrift 2008; Whatmore 2002). Currently, the acceptance of the interweaving between nature and culture seems to be widespread in scientific contexts (see Naveh 1995; Antrop 2006; Palang & Fry 2003). This recognition runs in parallel with the acknowledgement that no ecosystem can be defined as external to man and that no scientist can claim to be totally foreign to its object of study, thus accepting the contingency of his categories (Couston 2005). However, according to Gerard Chouquer (2007) the epistemological split will continue to exist as natural science requires the separation of nature and culture. This is so since otherwise its sphere of influence would be reduced as everything would be “socially constructed”. For this reason, it is important to maintain the term “environment”, a concept that enables natural science to keep an a-historical conception of nature where man has not intervened (Chouquer 2000).  

Despite the progress of the academic forefront, two trends with different conceptions of landscapes remain clearly separated. First, the objectivist paradigm, “illustrated by the many surveys of landscapes which classify and evaluate their quality”

---

2 See Appendix 1: “Definitions of landscape”.
Secondly, the subjectivist paradigm that “requires the assessment of respondent preferences of landscapes and, through the use of statistical methods, the contribution which the landscapes’ physical components make to its quality is identified” (idem: 179). Lothian shows that there is an insurmountable break between institutional objectivist assessments and academic subjectivist approaches. The objectivist trend has gained momentum recently thanks to the development of the “applied geography” and the strength of institutions such as the Countryside Agency in U.K. and similar entities in Europe (see Mata Olmo et al. 2003; Martínez de Pisón & Sanz Herráiz 2000).

Moreover, the issue becomes increasingly complex considering that the objectivist hypotheses generates otherness and is inherently appropriative: the will to know runs in parallel with the will to dominate (Adorno 1997). The process of objectification-reification makes possible the act of “possessing” and facilitates the entrance of the possessed object into the sphere of the market: colonialism reified dominated cultures which became “resources” available to the imperialist (Bru Bistuer & Agüera Cabo 2000). Then, the objectification of the landscape can open the door to processes of enhancement and touristification. Thus, for most institutions and for “pure” science, landscape is still considered from an utilitarian and functional perspective.

This utilitarian position is reflected in the use modern states make of the “archetypal landscapes” to tell their own histories and gain legitimacy (see Minca 2000; Schama 1995 for examples of these practices in the U.K. and the U.S.) through the establishment of an exemplary ideal of “order” (Turri 1998). This is possible thanks to the appropriation of the subjective communicative potential of landscapes (Turco 2002; Guarassi 2002) that is channelled through the emotional and aesthetic elements giving
rise to feelings of belonging (Cosgrove & Daniels 1989). The affective dimension comprising the myths, obsessions and memories which make up the “landscape as a shared culture” (Schama 1995) is thus reified with political or economic objectives, as is the case with cultural parks. Therefore, it is not possible to perform a technical or neutral action on landscapes: their management always revolves around the political and ideological control of the meanings attached to the territory and the limits set to it.

In conclusion, despite the diversity of academic approaches to the landscape, an objectivist viewpoint prevails among most scholars, politicians, planners and journalists. Is it possible to reconcile the subjective understanding of landscape as gaze, as feeling, as a narrative of our past, with a scientific-bureaucratic notion that reifies it? Does a reifying conception of landscapes transform them into fetishes to which meanings, experiences and products can be associated for a passive subject who consumes them as a tourist or a citizen? These problems inherent to the concept of landscape will also haunt cultural parks from their inception.

2.2 Managing landscapes

This section reviews two influential European texts on landscape management that have served as an inspiration for the creation of cultural parks. Both texts keep a precarious balance between the two facets of the concept of landscape. Also, they show an incipient interweaving between territory\(^3\) and heritage that opens the door to the advent of cultural landscapes and cultural parks.

\(^3\) “Territory” can be understood in many ways. Here it is conceived in a political manner as a physical area under control of a social group. As a reified category, it can be equated with the objectivist conception of “landscape” as a delimited area in space that sets aside the interference of the human perception or gaze.
2.2.1 European Landscape Convention (ELC)

The ELC (2000) 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”. The aim of the chart is to safeguard everyday and even degraded landscapes where the majority of Europeans live, instead of merely preserving the aesthetically beautiful or outstanding (see Priore 2002).

The simple and integrating definition put forward purports a dynamic and relational view of landscapes where the subjective, social and non elitist components are prioritised (Spingola & Pizziolo 2002). The ELC stands in contrast with other texts that present a narrower understanding of the concept: the UNESCO opts for “cultural landscape” (Rössler 2006), environmental policies normally refer to “natural landscapes” while the European Charter on Spatial Planning (1984) refers to “rural landscapes”. This positioning is related to the will to make the legislation extensive to the whole territory, a notion that breaks with all previous legislative mechanisms that focused on restricted areas of planning (Pedroli & Van Mansvelt 2006). According to Florencio Zoido (2001), the extensive conception of landscape generated an intense debate among the promoters of the chart because some groups opposed it arguing that an excessive safeguarding of landscapes would threaten economic development.

The ELC stresses the idea of change as an inherent reality of landscapes (Vos & Meekes 1999). Thus, in response to the diverse menaces threatening landscapes, the aim should be to “guide and harmonise changes which are brought about by social,
economic and environmental processes” through three distinct attitudes toward landscapes: protection, management and planning.⁴

The ELC shows an inclination to relate landscape to spatial and urban planning (Zoido Naranjo 2004). This peculiarity opens the door for architects to actively intervene in the management of landscapes, a path that has led many to participate in the implementation of cultural parks. The convention has received a broad normative recognition, but its practical implementation has only been considered by Holland and Denmark. The Nordic Council, the British Countryside Agency and the Swiss Federal Bureau have also adopted it within their working framework. Furthermore, many landscape catalogues and inventories are underway throughout Europe with different degrees of intensity (Clark et al. 2004; Abellán & Fourneau 1998; Gómez Mendoza & Sanz Herraiz 2010) and methodological originality (see Galstyan 2005; Wascher 2005).

Despite being a key text for the management and understanding of landscapes, the ELC poses unattainable objectives for many countries (Gambino 2003). Thus, the document remains a “utopian projection” (Magnaghi 2005) as it is not a realistic goal to manage all territories with the same care. This fact paves the way for the spread of cultural landscapes conceived as isolated areas to be safeguarded. Also, the ambivalence of the ELC may lead to a disjunction between discursive assumptions and practical aims. Despite highlighting the importance of the existential properties of landscapes, these are actually treated as “territory” to be delimited, inventoried, and managed by spatial planning instruments. Therefore, the underlying character of the norm presents a clear tendency towards the objectification of landscape.

⁴ See Table 1.
2.2.2 Belvedere Nota: “Conservation through development”

The Dutch “Belvedere Nota” (1999) continues with an original tradition on spatial planning that develops an understanding of spatial and heritage planning unprecedented in other countries (Ploeg 1999; Ministerie van Cultuur 1996; Feddes & Platform 1996). The two crucial areas of the Nota are, firstly, the combination of historical and cultural disciplines with spatial planning. Secondly, the selection of Belvedere areas of heritage value throughout the country. These areas are not restrictive and can bring together large frameworks of cities, landscapes, historical and archaeological areas (Schoorl 2005).

The Nota is concerned about national landscapes becoming homogeneous, thus highlighting the necessity of strengthening the material links between past, present and future. This fact does not entail a “preservation at all costs” policy as “we cannot live in the past –we must build and design to meet and reflect the culture of our own age” (p. 5). The most salient characteristic of the Nota is that it places “landscapes” in the centre of the planning efforts, acknowledging and dealing creatively with their ambivalence. The daunting dichotomy of change-preservation is overcome thanks to an understanding of conservation not as preservation but as management of change (Beresford & Phillips 2000; Brown et al. 1999).

Instead of establishing a clear-cut separation between spatial planning and heritage management, the Nota underscores the need to keep both fields in a close dynamic interrelation. Accordingly, cultural history disciplines should not only focus on the preservation of isolated cultural heritage elements, but should be also concerned with the cohesion of areas and current spatial developments. In turn, spatial planning should
contribute to the enhancement of cultural and heritage values and the strengthening of each area’s identity. Thus, landscape planning “demands a supplementary, integrated approach … assuming an intrinsic interrelationship between archaeology, the conservation of listed buildings and that of historic landscapes. Independent elements and patterns are thereby to be regarded as forming part of a greater whole. This implies a regional approach” (p. 19). Then, “when both disciplines widen their field of vision in this way, looking back and looking forward, will become extensions of each other and each will contribute to the forging of the link between past and future” (p. 19-20).

The Nota combines its technical nature with an openly political stance. In fact, it can be included within the multiculturalist set of policies that aim to mitigate the social, religious and ethnic fragmentation of the Netherlands (see Scheffer 2011). Actually, the text prioritizes notions of identity over authenticity (Schoorl 2005) in order to reduce the gap between native groups and immigrant communities. This political positioning has raised criticisms of the Nota claiming that it represents a social-engineering attempt that aims to use spatial and heritage planning to “shape society” (Pellenbart & van Steen 2001).

The Nota considers issues of social cohesion, ecological sustainability, scientific and aesthetic interest and cultural identity as legitimate benchmarks to judge spatial interventions independently of the utilitarian aspects (VROM-Raad 1998). Hence, it performs a turning point concerning landscape and heritage planning. In particular, three aspects stand out that strongly condition the development of cultural parks: the emphasis on a holistic and regional approach to planning, the disciplinary and empirical coalescence between heritage and space management and the balanced articulation between identity, ecology, aesthetics and economic interests.
3 Territory and Heritage: From Cultural Landscapes to Cultural Parks

The ELC intended to extend landscape planning on a continental scale in Europe. The impossibility of implementing this utopian projection often reduces landscape management to places deemed of “outstanding value” or, as recognized by Italian legislation, a “beautiful panorama” (Campanelli 2004). Despite their apparent similarity, “landscapes” and “cultural landscapes” need to be conceptualised separately. The concept “cultural landscape” is somehow close to that of “heritage”, implying an idea of something valuable that has to be preserved, a trait that is no straightforwardly present in “landscape”. Moreover, the differentiation between them is at the root of the problem of protected areas’ management. Is it preferable to implement holistic landscape and heritage management plans comprising whole territories or to focus on taking care of some specific landscapes? Is it fair to give preference to some areas in democratic states where theoretically all people and their landscapes should be treated equally, as the ELC states?

The conceptualization of cultural landscapes has to be necessarily open since all definitions are based on a particular epistemological foundation, resulting partial and sometimes even contradictory (Maderuelo 2006; Vázquez Varela & Martínez Navarro 2008). New perspectives based on post-structuralism and artistic practice are added to the traditional positivist viewpoint deriving from natural sciences or from phenomenology. For cultural geographers, the same space can be constituted in different cultural landscapes depending on the observer’s perspective (Ballesteros Arias et al. 2004). Moreover, from the point of view of Actor-Network-Theory the concept

5 See Appendix 2 “Definitions of cultural landscape”.
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“cultural landscape” can refer to many different realities: that of legislation, the academic, that of the local association or the tourist, etc. All of them are connected but are not necessarily the same (Pinch 2003).

The origins of the concept date back to the works of nineteenth century German geographers (Minca 2001) and to the romantic will to see the monument in its original spatial context (Busquets et al. 2009). Carl Sauer offered the first definition of cultural landscape in his “Morphology of Landscape”: “the cultural landscape is shaped from a natural landscape by a cultural group. Culture is the agent, nature is the means, the cultural landscape is the result” (Sauer & Leighly 1963 [1925] :343).

In Europe, the works on cultural geography carried out by Sorre (1967) anticipated the consolidation from the 1960’s onwards of a tendency towards a spatialised notion of heritage (Alvarez Areces 2002). Landscape archaeology has contributed to the process since the 1980s by widening the concept of “archaeological site” and providing landscapes with scientific narratives (see Criado-Boado 1997; Clavel-Lévêque et al. 2002; Darvill et al. 1993; Fairclough & Rippon 2002). Accordingly, Archaeology gained legitimacy to participate in the management of landscapes with its own methods and to promote the idea of “landscape heritage” in spatial planning guidelines (Cacho 2006). Especially since the 1980s, archaeologists have increasingly acknowledged that cultural heritage can no longer be perceived in isolation, thus recognizing the need for unitary legislation covering cultural heritage, environment, territory and landscape (Marciniak 2000).

However, despite the increasing recognition that the concept has gained in different disciplines, it is not free of contradictions. Sabaté considers that the idea of
“cultural landscape” is redundant because every landscape “is cultural” (2002) and all people have a “cultural relation” with land (O'Flaherty & California State Parks n.d.). Then, one might wonder why it is so commonly used, even within Sabaté’s research group⁶. Again, the disjunction between actual practices and institutional and academic discourse is patent. On one side, the concept of cultural landscape seems to be used because it satisfies the need of the State to define limits, create boundaries and classifications for management purposes. On the other side, it suits the functioning of the market as it produces differences, a source of added territorial value (Rullani 2006; Galindo González & Sabaté Bel 2009). In fact, place differentiation is the constitutive cornerstone of tourism (Prats 2003; Vázquez Barquero 2009).

From this standpoint, the cultural landscape becomes a scarce commodity that goes into the struggles for social appropriation, whether symbolic or real (Duncan & Duncan 2004). Also, the reification of the notion stems from its conception as “artwork” (e.g. Ojeda Rivera 2004; Zimmer 2008). According to this view, to manage a cultural landscape “planners need to be artists as well as scientists” (von Haaren 2002: 80). This “artistic” viewpoint entails the reification of cultural landscapes, which far from being artworks are the outcome of a specific utilitarian relation of past societies with their surroundings (Chouquer 2000).

Nowadays, a novel and more complex form of utilitarianism is deployed whereby landscape and heritage are linked with tourism and development (Urry 2002) under the motto of “conservation through change” (Sabaté 2007; see also Schofield 2009). Therefore, the ambivalence of the “landscape” remains in the notion of “cultural landscape”. Likewise, the contradiction persists between discourses and actual practices

⁶ See Table 2.
and between the representative and the objective dimensions of landscapes. This opposition is difficult to overcome because any present intervention on the landscape is mediated by technology and bureaucracy (Cauquelin 2002). Better then to acknowledge that cultural landscapes are concepts oriented toward functional objectives. As Domenech Reinoso points out, “while traditional historical preservation sought to recognize and protect the distinctive material traits of a shared past, the goal of cultural landscapes is to promote and put to work these features for new forms of economic development” (2005: 64).

3.1 The UNESCO Framework

The most widely applied definition of “cultural landscape” is provided by the UNESCO. The definition has been criticized for its clear Universalist and Western epistemological bias (Castillo Ruiz 2007). Of course, it does not address issues of economy or touristic management.

The UNESCO laid the foundations of the concept in the World Heritage Convention (1972) due on one side to the threat that industrialization posed to landscape preservation and on the other to the academic theoretical developments that were taking place at that time (Martínez de Pisón Stampa 2004). The definitive establishment of cultural landscapes as a working category came in the “La Petit Pierre” meeting (October 1992) and in the “Expert meeting on Cultural Landscapes” (October 1993). The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention (2006) already includes the category “cultural landscapes” along with specific instruments for their identification, protection and preservation (Rössler 2003; see also Rössler 2006). Cultural landscapes “represent the combined works of nature and of man
… 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” (UNESCO 2006 items 45 - 47).7

To date, sixty-six cultural landscapes have been inscribed on the World Heritage List.8 The subjective and controversial task of deciding which landscapes are “cultural” and which not has caused difficulties for the UNESCO. In response, the UNESCO has provided some guidelines to facilitate the process of inscription (i.e. Prada Bengoa 1994; UNESCO 1996 prf. 6 and 39) that have been complemented by academic attempts to establish a definite set of assessment criteria (i.e. Darvill 1994; Mascarenhas 1995).

3.2 The National Park Service framework

As early as 1983 the N.P.S. recognised cultural landscapes as a specific kind of heritage, establishing a set of criteria to define and identify them (Birnbaum 1994). A cultural landscape is “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” (Birnbaum et al. 1996).9

Contrarily to UNESCO’s, N.P.S. pragmatic definitions reflect the actual commitment to manage and present cultural landscapes to the American public. Within the N.P.S. framework, cultural landscape characterization is the first step in the

---

7 See Table 3.
8 See UNESCO’s Webpage for an updated list: http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape
9 See Table 4.
implementation of broader “preservation plans”. Also, cultural landscape assessment is openly tied to political objectives that aim to reinforce the identity of the American Nation.

Therefore, the underlying conception of cultural landscapes diverges between UNESCO and N.P.S.’ frameworks despite the apparent similarities (Hall et al. 2000). The N.P.S. straightforwardly considers cultural landscapes as spaces that must be associated with events and a number of heritage assets (Rowntree 1996). Then, cultural landscapes should “tell stories” that connect heritage resources with an identity (García López 2008). The N.H.A. phenomenon is a clear outcome of this standpoint.

Probably this conception derives from the formation process of the country whereby vast natural regions were put at the service of human development in a short time. The sense of durability is scarce and therefore the American point of view is more instrumental than philosophical or aesthetic (Conzen 2001). Furthermore, the lower human alteration of the U.S. landscapes fosters an idea of territory as “natural space”. Thus, it is difficult for Americans to get used to the idea that people live within parks as is normal in Europe (Bray 2000).

Instead, the European view represented by UNESCO regards cultural landscapes as the result of a gradual sedimentation of long-term socio-economic historical processes (Gambino 2002). Consequently, the cultural landscape cannot be separated from the communities that crafted it (Waterton 2005). Furthermore, UNESCO’s objectivist standpoint does not favour any pattern of management. This fact leads to a preservationist approach: cultural landscapes are isolated from the rest of the “landscapes” and apparently the only legitimate approach becomes the “preservation of
difference”. These structural divergences in the epistemological conception of the relation between heritage and territory are reflected in the two different understandings of cultural parks on either side of the Atlantic\textsuperscript{10}.

### 3.3 Concluding remarks on landscapes

The landscape – cultural or otherwise – is a difficult concept to grasp. If it is considered as a social construction it cannot be simply equated with a territory, but neither with a subjective individual representation (Greider & Garkovich 1994; Delgado Rozo 2010; Foster 2005). Also, it is believed that landscapes hold intrinsic qualities that foster a sense of belonging, identity and memory. Moreover, they have an ontological character as they produce subjectivities and social realities. According to the main institutional texts (ELC, Belvedere Nota, etc.), in theory all landscapes have the same value and should be managed equally. Supposedly, in landscapes nature and culture along with the material and existential dimensions of space are harmoniously unified. In practice, however, UNESCO and N.P.S. support the idea of cultural landscapes, which is already a politically charged decision as it entails the establishment of territorial hierarchies, instead of purporting a view of “landscape” as a common social value: some landscapes are “cultural” and valuable whereas others are not.

According to Bray (2004a), Whatmore and Boucher (1993) several underlying narratives pervade discourses on landscape preservation. First, the conservationist narrative values landscape as a scientific and aesthetic “natural” reserve that is necessary to preserve, in opposition to change and development. The ecological and historical narrative considers landscape as a common support of wild and human life as

\textsuperscript{10} See Table 5.
well as a source of sense of belonging. Finally, the utilitarian narrative regards landscapes as an “added value”.

However, away from the field of discourse heritage managers and spatial planners have to deal with the complexity and hybridity of the real world. Therefore, I believe that “landscapes” should be conceived as an entity that can “stand for something”: norms, affects, desires, identities, ways of life and so on (Schein 2003: 202-203). But also as a “field of tension” (Wylie 2007: 1) where market forces, bureaucracies, the social desire for the past, etc. intersect with the epistemological dichotomies of modernity (i.e. nature-culture, etc.). To manage landscapes involves that a social group or institution must project towards the future a certain way of understanding and handling its relation with its surroundings. The issue at stake is to discern whose representation of landscapes prevails in their management.
4. Charting the path to Cultural Parks

“Heritage areas are like a view of the landscape in that everyone sees them, and their origins, differently because those involved have different values, goals, and backgrounds. This description of the evolution of heritage areas is one view of the movement. ... The heritage areas movement began, arguably, in a dozen different places and points in time. The approach that is being used in hundreds of places evolved from a number of separate but related conservation, historic preservation, land use and economic development movements” J. Glenn Eugster (2003: 50).

This chapter outlines the practices that have been most influential for the development of cultural parks in the fields of museum and protected areas management. The term “background” has been intentionally avoided to keep away from setting a clear-cut division between a before and an after. In reality, the different management experiences intermingle taking a little from here and there to result in heterogeneous instruments (Mose 2007). Thus, an ecomuseum like Bergslagen (Sweden) has recently been renamed as a cultural park (Bergdhal 2005) without a radical change in its structure. Although the U.S. and European cases have been considered separately, it would be misleading to convey an image of isolation between them. In fact, the exchange of influences concerning heritage and landscape management date back to the nineteenth century as evidenced by the works of Ralph Emerson (1971) and George Perkins (1965).
4.1 Europe

The European case is complex given the heterogeneity of practices in each state. However, it is possible to identify a more or less common management framework at a continental level throughout the twentieth century. At present, the legislation of UNESCO and the Council of Europe tend to standardize management practices all over the continent.

A crucial factor in Europe is the conceptualization of the museum (i.e. Prado, Louvre, etc.) as a fundamental cultural foundation of the legitimacy of the nation state born in the nineteenth century (Sherman 1989). This idea is still very influential and has led to a clear-cut separation between museums and protected areas such as National or Natural parks\textsuperscript{11}, which are more associated with the idea of natural preservation. Actually, National parks appeared relatively late in comparison with the U.S., first in Sweden (1909) and then in Switzerland (1914), Spain (1916) and France in the 1960s. Moreover, several processes and specific forms of management have facilitated the advent of cultural parks throughout the twentieth century:

- Scandinavia has a significant tradition of open-air museums where folkloric collections were exposed in contact with nature. Examples include the outdoor section of the first Scandinavian museum of ethnography (1873), origin of the future Nordiska Museet (1880) (Layuno 2007), and the Skansen museum (1891). The influence of this

\textsuperscript{11} National Parks are State-owned areas set aside for the preservation of nature with a view to purposes of recreation. Normally, these are conceived as enclosed spaces with clear limits where human intervention is absent or reduced to a minimum degree.
tradition is clearly discernible in contemporary Scandinavian ecomuseums and cultural parks such as Bergslagen (Hamrin 1996).

- The advent of New Museology and the ecomuseum phenomenon was a turning point in the conception of museums throughout the world (see Rivard 1984; Hubert 1985; Evrard 2009; Desvallées 1980). The aim of ecomuseums is to become a synthesis of man-nature relationships in time and space (Vergo 1997) in stark contrast with traditional forms of museums (Corsane & Holleman 1993; Davis & Gardner 1999; Davis 2000). At the same time it becomes a representative of the community where the ecological traits, the characteristic buildings and folkloric elements converge “in the same way of ethnological outdoor museums” (Rivière 1993: 189). Ecomuseums were innovative in their quest to become instruments of economic and social growth (Maggi & Falletti 2000). Subsequent international museum meetings adopted some of its precepts thereof (see Meijer 1989; General Conference of Icom 1995) up to the current definition of a “museum-territory” (Ballart & i Tresserras 2001). Thus, ecomuseums move from the symbolic and representative traditional museum to a conception of museums as producers of identities and territories (Cancellotti 2011). Although ecomuseums can be considered as immediate antecedents of cultural parks, Balerdi (2008) warns that ecomuseums do not manage cultural landscapes and that most of them are just “open air sites”.

- The Italian tradition of protected area management is noteworthy because it never conceived parks as enclosed spaces or wildlife sanctuaries but as part of a complex ecological and cultural fabric (Gambino 1997). Moreover, the Italian paradigm has a strong cultural character, in contrast to the naturalist-functionalist American school. This tradition has resulted in the elaboration of complex “landscape plans” (see
that have served as a base for the constitution of cultural parks and cultural park networks such as the one in Toscana (Italy) (Toscana 1995). Also, the Italian experience stands out in the management of large archaeological sites (see Battaglini et al. 2002; Orejas 2001) influencing the development of similar experiences in other countries (Baptista et al. 2007; Querol 1993; Sánchez-Palencia Ramos et al. 2001).

- Probably, the closest precedent to cultural parks is the French regional park scheme operating since the 1960s. Whereas national parks are owned and managed by the State, regional parks are locally-driven initiatives that involve different types of ownership and social actors (Frenchman 2004). The parks encompass both natural and cultural heritage resources deemed representative of the French culture, giving preference to spaces threatened by degradation (Hernández Prieto & Plaza Gutiérrez 2007). According to Lacosta Aragües (1997), natural and cultural heritage conservation is not a scope in itself. Instead, these resources provide the region with an image of quality that supports socio-economic development, attracting tourism and research and enhancing local capabilities.

- Finally, the development of Industrial Archaeology from the 1960s has been a determining factor on both sides of the Atlantic. The discipline has contributed to the transformation of the idea of heritage and its management. First, it sets out a spatial conception facing the enhancement of industrial sites (Benito del Pozo 2002). Also, grassroots groups have played an essential role in protecting industrial heritage and bringing its management close to local communities. Finally, Industrial Archaeology practitioners seek to link the industrial remains with socio-economic development (Casanelles Rahola 1998). The 1970s witnessed the birth of the enhancement projects in
New Lanark (Beeho & Prentice 1997), Le Creusot-les-Mines in France (Jacomy 1982; Maiullari & Whitehead 1997) and Ironbridge Gorge in England (Cossons 1980). Interestingly, these initiatives combine the ideas of Industrial Archaeology and ecomuseums with the traditional concept of museum. Thus, these projects do not embrace the idea of “territorial heritage”, but instead create “networks of museums” where the main objective is preservation (Frenchman 2004). The Ironbridge’s case is exemplary in this regard. Therefore, these initiatives remain conceived as “territory-museums” (Layuno 2007: 149). Halfway between these enterprises and cultural parks lies the Emscher Park in the Ruhr (Germany). The park was developed throughout the 1980s with the collaboration of seventeenth institutions and different social groups that created a complex territorial network (Schwarze-Rodrian 1999). In addition to decontaminate the area (Kunzmann 1999), the main aim was to provide an economic outlet for the region after the industrial decay (Shaw 2002; Brown 2001). The initiative promotes an open idea of heritage management and has been recently considered as a successful cultural park (Ling et al. 2007). Emscher Park has served as a model for other projects of territorial reinvention after deindustrialisation in Europe (Yáñez 2008).12

4.2 United States

The National Park scheme in the U.S. began with Yellowstone (1872) and was institutionalized with the establishment of the National Park Service in 1916 (Winks 1996). Since their beginning, the parks functioned as a “pastoral myth” (Bray 1994a), that is, as repositories of the national identity (Albright & Cahn 1985). In a way, they play the role of national museums in Europe. National Parks strive to reach a balance

---

12 See Table 6.
between preservation of natural wilderness and the narration of the conquest of that nature and the events associated with it. The constitution of cultural parks has been a controversial and difficult process to assume in the U.S. due to a deeply rooted idea of parks as conservationist and enclosed spaces with gates that are publicly owned and managed (Bray 1988).

According to Eugster (2003), the creation of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (1949) and the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966) opened the door to the emergence of American cultural parks or National Heritage Areas (N.H.A.). Then, from the 1960s onwards there was a shift in the management of the parks associated with the environmentalist turn represented by the ecological planning school in the U.S. (see Steiner et al. 1988; Steinitz 1968) and landscape ecology in Europe (Forman & Gordon 1984). This new paradigm overcomes the idea of a Park as a delimited space to embrace an all-encompassing idea of large ecosystems that include socio-cultural elements. Also, the appearance of Industrial Archaeology was a determining factor due to its emphasis on territorial heritage and community involvement. The reactivation program of the decaying industrial city of Lowell (see Hayward 1987; Mogan 1972; Mogan 1975; David 1975; Weible 1984) broke with previous ideas about what is considered heritage, what is a park, and how to manage them. The “Lowell National Historical Park” paved the way for the emergence of similar initiatives throughout the U.S. such as Blackstone (Kihn et al. 1986) and Lackawanna (McGurl & Kulesa 2001).

The 1980s witnessed the appearance of new spatial and heritage management programs in the states of Connecticut, Illinois, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. These State-lead parks seek to improve the regional economy and enhance its heritage values
(Bray 2003). The state of New York fostered the development of a different type of protected spaces denominated “Urban cultural parks” (New York State Parks 1982). These parks promote the participation of local communities (Frenchman & Lane 1979) and seek to bring the rural to the city following the original idea of Frederick Olmsted to “provide the citizens with the beneficial influences of nature” (Schuyler 1988; in Bray 2004b para. 3). Also, the parks included economic objectives in the urban planning schemes (Cranz 1982). Gradually, the idea that park planning should be extended to the entire city and then to the region permeated among planners and politicians (Mumford 1984).

These initiatives were set within a context of transformation of the concept of “protected areas” in America. According to Nelson and Sportza (1999) the maintenance of a unilateral management by public bodies is problematic and unsustainable. On one hand, the human dimension is lost in the absence of local participation. On the other hand, the wide variety of public, private and social agents involved in spatial and heritage management today preclude the possibility of an unilateral corporate vision. The “National Parks for a new generation report” (1985) marked a turning point on the issue. In fact, the report acknowledged that State-led and local initiatives were actually “parks” and should therefore be supported and recognized as such by the N.P.S., which had neglected them hitherto (Alanen & Melnick 2000)\(^\text{13}\).

Again, Bray (1988) captures the essence of the problem when he states that the difficulties of the current park management schemes have not been addressed properly. Given the pragmatic need to change the conception of parks, two incipient alternatives have been implemented without any institutional or academic debate on the subject.

\(^{13}\) See Tables 7 and 8.
Firstly, it has been suggested to replace them “by broader environmental policies applied in regional systems” (Bray 1988: para. 16). Secondly, they have been considered as frameworks to manage whole natural and cultural landscapes. Instead, the best solution for him would be to “create an expanded park idea that will give U.S. the city or region as a park” (idem: para. 17). Thus, the solution for him would be to recognize and extend the N.H.A. management framework throughout large areas of the country.

In both the European and American cases the institutional and epistemological transformations are crucial to understand the emergence of cultural parks. However, it would be reductionist to consider that cultural parks are the immediate consequence of the aforementioned developments. In fact, their appearance is equally conditioned by the rise of new socio-economic problems to which cultural parks may pose a solution in one way or another.\(^{14}\)

\(^{14}\) See Table 9.
5. Cultural Parks

The aforementioned changes at the academic, institutional and socio-economic levels have resulted in the emergence of a new form of heritage and space planning that responds to new political and socio-economic problems. This phenomenon, that has received different denominations such as “cultural park”, “heritage park” or “heritage area”, cannot be assimilated to previous forms of management. Also, it is useless to pursue an essentialist definition of “what is a cultural park”. This is so due to the wide variety of legislations, academic, administrative and socio-economic contexts and the intermingling of different former management frameworks. Therefore, it is more functional to provide an outline of “a way of doing” that is characteristic of cultural parks. As any abstract discourse, this approach reduces the complexity of the phenomenon and sets aside some of its traits. In return, it provides an overview that will bring up the essential elements and controversial issues raised by cultural parks. Thus, the aim is to refocus the study around the key elements that can lead to interesting conclusions in the face of future research.

5.1 From definitions to structures

The ambivalence and hybrid status of cultural parks has paradoxically encouraged various authors to seek precise definitions of what they are. Actually, the abundance of definitions shows in itself the futility of the enterprise. None is mistaken and all capture a part of the cultural parks phenomenon, but in the end all respond to their own disciplinary and epistemological conditionings.
There is no need to quote at length each definition to notice the variety of views on cultural parks. For instance, for the archaeologist Almudena Orejas (2001: 6) it would be an “instrument of heritage coordination”, whereas for the geographer Rubio Terrado (2008: 26) it is “an spatial planning proposal in rural areas”. According to the Cultural Park Act of Aragón (Spain) it would be a “territory where cultural heritage is concentrated and managed” (1997). For Daly, a N.H.A. promoter from the U.S. they are “dynamic regional initiatives that build connections between people, their place, and their history” (2003: 2), while Rosemary Prola considers them as landscapes where “community leaders and residents have come together around a common vision of their shared heritage” (2005: 1). For urban planners Bustamante and Ponce cultural parks are “projects that seek to build an image of regional identity” (2004: 10). Finally, the architect Sabaté considers them as “instruments of projecting and managing that put into value a cultural landscape, whose scope is not only heritage preservation or the promotion of education, but also to favour local economic development” (Sabaté 2009: 21-22). For him, cultural parks are tightly linked with cultural landscapes, poetically described as “the trace of work on territories, a memorial to the unknown worker” (Sabaté 2006: 19)\(^\text{15}\).

All these definitions show a tension similar to what Healey (2006; 2007) has identified in the field of spatial planning as a divergence between a “transcendent ideal” of cultural park and the empirical perception of its complexity. Actually, the ambivalences of “landscape” are reproduced in cultural parks. On one side, there is contradiction between existential issues related to identity and a utilitarian vision of

\(^{15}\) See Appendix 3 “Definitions of cultural parks”
space. On the other side, tension arises between those who consider them as future-oriented projects and those who see them as instruments for the preservation of the past.

Nevertheless, some elements are repeatedly highlighted in every definition, namely the importance of local participation, the establishment of heterogeneous management partnerships and the “regional vision” of landscape and heritage. However, some definitions pose heritage preservation as the main objective whereas others place economic development in the centre. Thus, for Bustamante and Ponce (2004) the aim would be to construct a “strong regional image” to achieve the economic objectives. Instead, for Sabaté the first premise is to increase the self-esteem of local communities, “tourism will arrive later” (Sabaté 2004a). Daly considers that the main purpose of a cultural park should be to use cultural heritage as a basis for the development of a common project for the future planned by a social group at a regional scale, a view also shared by Casas (2008).

These definitions outline a more or less clear definition of cultural parks. However, there is only one work based on specific research on cultural parks (i.e. Sabaté and Frenchman (2001). All the other conceptualizations are built on common-sense reasoning or on occasional practical engagement of the authors in their management.

5.2 Institutions and Management schemes in Europe and the United States

Despite local variables, the analysis of various cultural parks allows establishing some common trends in the specific “ways of doing”. One of the most difficult
processes to trace is the birth of the idea to create a park. In this respect, as in many others, the American and European contexts differ. In the U.S., most N.H.A. arise from local initiatives supported by each State. In some cases the initiative comes from the city council but in others it is groups of heritage enthusiasts, widely denominated “task force”, who promote them. Conzen (2001) points that during the 1990s the habitual promoting groups were local non-profit or public interest organizations, with particular prominence of environmental groups. The participative and consultative character of the American framework contrasts with the European context where the intervention of regional or national institutions is essential. Such a situation is conditioned by the different management traditions and by socio-economic constraints. For instance, it would be strange to receive private financial support to develop a cultural park in continental Europe whereas in the U.S. it is usual16.

In Europe, the implementation of cultural parks is carried out through a top-down approach. Although local groups are usually involved, they do it under the framework provided by a regional or national institution (Iranzo García & Albir Herrero 2009). In any case, the creation of cultural parks is a complex process that varies in accordance to the local context. For example in Aragón (Spain) the trusts governing each cultural park are composed of representatives of the regional government, the University of Zaragoza, local councils and local associations of all kinds, from corporate partnerships to environmentalist groups (Vázquez Varela & Martínez Navarro 2008). Sabaté (2004b) notes that in the case of Catalonia the development of cultural parks was initially an academic endeavour which found the support of regional institutions and local groups. In fact, the role of Universities in Europe has been essential in facilitating the relation among different social agents and providing expertise, knowledge and support.

16 See Table 10.
In the U.S. public support is important in a different way. Contrarily to Europe, the process tends to work from bottom to top. Hence, local groups place pressure on institutions to obtain official recognition in order to facilitate the attraction of private investments. Normally, local promoters seek to gain recognition from the Congress and from the N.P.S. which has always maintained an ambiguous stance regarding N.H.A. To date, N.H.A. have been officially recognized by the Congress (Vincent et al. 2004) but their status remains vague as they have not been integrated within the N.P.S. scheme, which provides occasional technical support and funding (Bray 1995).

The local groups run the N.H.A. through corporate management schemes where it is usual to rely on private “cultural resource management” consultants and to perform “best practices” contests among them. Also, they develop quantitative tools to measure the impact of the park in the regional economy and qualitative methods to assess the consequences for issues of identity, sense of belonging, etc. (see Hiett 2007; Vincent et al. 2004). A situation which is probably motivated by the cut of N.P.S. funding after 5 to 15 years after the designation (Copping & Martin 2005). These sorts of practices and the large number of entities involved in their management have commonly led to denominate N.H.A. as “partnership parks” (see Hamin 2001; National Park Service 1991). Actually, the development of N.H.A. has been strongly influenced by the parallel expansion of the Cultural Resource Management sector during the 1990s. Heritage consultants have been criticised for their clear utilitarian approach to heritage issues where economic and legal issues prevail (see Birch 2010). A similar situation can be witnessed in the entrepreneurial character of museum management throughout the U.S. This stands in sharp contrast with the European system, where bureaucratic
management prevails and cultural heritage management is usually carried out by archaeologists or architects with little or no presence of economists and lawyers\textsuperscript{17}.

5.3 The inventory and the story

A first step in the implementation of a cultural park is the delimitation of the area to consider as a park. This requires a task of historical documentation and a justification of the boundaries established according to criteria of geographical, administrative or cultural uniformity. Then, promoters normally carry out an inventory and classification of heritage assets in the area which are commonly referred to as “resources” (Bustamante 2008). In Europe, inventories are normally carried out by universities or bureaucratic technicians, whereas in the U.S. grassroots groups perform the task. The catalogues provide a homogeneous cartography and data record that facilitate the planning process whereby the structure of the park is defined.

According to Sabaté (1998) every successful cultural park must tell a story. Moreover, heritage assets must be organized in a hierarchy in order to fit the narrative of the event or story to be narrated. However, this does not happen in the European cases with the exception of Italian Literary Parks (Barilaro 2004) and the cultural parks designed by the own Sabaté. Instead, his argument is valid in the U.S. where it is assumed that each N.H.A. must “tell a story” such as the conquest of the West, or be “associated with an event” like a Civil War battle. This has to do with the very origin of the Parks in America as depositories and narrators of the “national identity” (Bray 1994a)\textsuperscript{18}.

\textsuperscript{17} See Table 11.
\textsuperscript{18} See Table 12
Sabaté notes that the importance of the narrative may be due to the strong roots that “storytelling” has in American culture. Indeed, he considers that to create a heritage park skills are needed “similar to those of a scriptwriter” (Sabaté 2004b: 23). Consequently, for him the keyword becomes “interpretation” of the material remains. In fact, some stories deployed in the N.H.A. are conceived as or based on films (e.g. George Washington Frontier National Heritage Area 2009). This would explain the large amount of American parks associated with linear elements or “heritage corridors” such as rivers, canals, roads and railways that facilitate the deployment of the narrative (see Conzen & Wulfestieg 2001). In Europe, recognition of ICOMOS and UNESCO to “Heritage Canals” (UNESCO 1994) has raised awareness concerning this type of “linear” heritage, leading to the implementation of many successful projects such as cultural park Duisburg Nord (Latz 2004).19

In contrast to the U.S. paradigm, the European vision of cultural parks regards them as sources of territorial identity, ecological balance and economic development. Cultural heritage assets are not ranked according to any unitary pattern. In some occasions, cultural parks bring together homogeneous landscape areas. In other cases they create a regional network that works as an “umbrella” to assemble a number of existing heritage resources and museums. Then, while American N.H.A. are relatively easy to associate with a specific topic, European parks amalgamate heterogeneous elements which overlap in the different historical layers of the landscape palimpsest.20

19 See Table 13.
20 See Table 14.
5.4 Objectives, planning and legislative framework

I have attempted to show how the structure of the cultural park varies depending on the social group that creates it and the particular heritage and territorial context. It is also important to understand what kinds of objectives are posed by each cultural park and their capacity to achieve them. While each cultural park tends to articulate its aims in relation to the local context, there are a number of recurring objectives in many of them:

- To link the local people with their heritage and history.
- To develop mechanisms for heritage conservation in accordance with the “preservation through change” scheme.
- To improve cooperation and dialogue between institutions and local communities.
- To integrate the park in the daily lives of residents, promoting education and improving recreational areas.
- To pursue sustainable economic development by using heritage to attract tourism and investments.\(^\text{21}\)

After having acquired a good knowledge of the heritage resources and given the objectives posed, it is necessary to develop a management plan that sets out the actions required to create the territorial structure of the park. In Europe, these plans are normally developed by teams of experts from universities or public institutions. In the U.S. the local groups of promoters craft them with the sporadic support of the N.P.S. and private consultants. In addition, it is common for the American parks to regularly

\(^{21}\) See Table 15.
update the Park guidelines to meet the requirements posed by the Congress and the N.P.S., or to plan the prospective development of the park (Copping & Martin 2005).

The technical issues of architectural design, that have most interested many authors exceed the purpose of this dissertation and will only be superficially reviewed. The essential investigations in this regard are the already mentioned works by Sabaté and Frenchman. Also, a few park projects have been published (Casas 2006; AAVV 2000a; AAVV 2000b). According to Sabaté, the design of cultural parks can be equated to the syntax put forward by Kevin Lynch in his book “The image of the city” (1960). Accordingly, five elements can be clearly identified:

- Global scope and sub-domains of the Park (areas).
- Heritage resources and services (milestones).
- Gates, accesses, interpretive centres and museums (nodes).
- Paths and roads linking the overall structure (routes).
- Visual and administrative limits of the intervention (edges).

Nonetheless, it is important to consider that what Sabaté is presenting here is his “ideal cultural park scheme” and not a pattern deduced from the analysis of existing cultural parks. Far from being neutral, his vision is distinctly rooted in the interventional American tradition. Thus, design prevails over preservation and efforts are geared towards the artificial reinforcing of the identity of the different elements of the park. For instance, the limits (edges) should be evidenced by the use of vegetation or signposting so that “we always know whether we are inside or outside the park” (Sabaté 1998: 240). This approach would be unthinkable in other European cultural parks such as the ones in Toscana or Aragón where the degree of intervention through architectural planning is
low. Moreover, it reinstates some of the elements present in traditional parks that allegedly cultural parks overcome. For example, the need to create gates and borders breaks with the conception of landscapes as open and limitless entities.

Therefore, his scheme can be easily applied to some American cases where the aforementioned elements and a linear narrative “in stages” are present, such as Illinois & Michigan Canal N.H.A. (Conzen & Wulfestieg 2001), Rivers of Steel N.H.A. (Greer & Russell 1994), Illinois and Michigan Corridor (Peine & Neurohr 1981) or the Allegheny Ridge Heritage Park (AAVV 1992). In other cases such as the Tennessee Civil War N.H.A. (Center for Historic Preservation 2001) or the Lackawanna Heritage Valley (AAVV 1991) the system does not work so well and still less in most European cases where the boundaries are diffuse and structures are scarcely linear.

Even in the cases where linear cultural parks are planned in Europe as in the Po-Adige (Piemonte 1989; Calzolari 1991), the Ripoll (Vidal Palet 1999) or Besós rivers (Alarcón et al. 1997), they are more about a holistic management of heritage and space rather than the “design of a park”, as Campeol has shown (1990). Accordingly, in Aragón (Spain) cultural parks are considered useful tools in areas with a wide variety of historical, geographical and natural resources to be protected together by legal constraints to promote sustainable development (Hernández & Giné 2002). This stands in sharp contrast with the Illinois and Michigan Heritage Corridor which as early as 1981 planned to create visitor centres according to a definite plan to tell the story of the canal (Peine & Neurohr 1981)\textsuperscript{22}.

\textsuperscript{22} See Table 16.
It is clear then that Sabaté’s model is halfway between the “preservation through change” of the Belvedere Nota and ELC, and the interventionist U.S. paradigm. In any case, his vision favours a transformation in the forms of designing protected areas, promoting the compatibility of activities and the dialogue among different social agents. This conception of heritage and spatial planning avoids contentious issues like “zoning” which restricts land use in protected areas and usually produces rejection among local people (Bustamante 2008). This rejection is particularly strong in the U.S. where “planners are well aware of the resistance to land use planning in rural areas (Means 1999). Therefore, the complexity of cultural parks is also evinced at the level of spatial design. Somewhat, cultural parks “compel” planners to pay similar attention to matters of identity, storytelling and community involvement than to traditional technical issues of architectural planning such as land use, zoning, design, etc.

Finally, it is important to note that the tendency for all kinds of protected areas to adopt the management scheme of cultural parks is expected to increase. This is primarily due to the widespread will to link protected areas to economic development. But it is also the result of the increasing social and institutional awareness of the impossibility to manage parks and reserves as islands with defined limits. Actually, most protected areas worldwide face threats to their assets from outside their borders. In the U.S. up to 85% of them are threatened in one way or another (GAO 1994). This controversial question is impossible to solve through a unilateral management scheme that does not rely on different agents and communities to deal with problems. According to the former N.P.S. Deputy Director Denis Galvin "the future of our parks, their ecological integrity and quality of their historic settings, depend on our ability to establish lasting partnerships with adjoining landowners and communities. We must move beyond the old notions about conflicts between parks and adjacent lands to a new
era that recognizes the shared interests of parks and their neighbours” (in Bray 2004a: para. 14).

Then, the problem that arises is that legislation is slower than the creation of new parks. As a consequence, these tend to have trouble fitting in the administrative spatial and heritage framework. In this regard, the case of the N.H.A. in the U.S. is paradigmatic. Despite having been active for more than three decades in some cases, their administrative status remains unclear and ambivalent. Meanwhile, in Europe there is no legal form of “cultural park” except in some Spanish and Italian regions and the French Regional Park system that could be included in this category. In fact, only the regional governments of Aragón (Spain) and Tuscany (Italy) have established specific laws on cultural parks hitherto. Elsewhere, cultural parks are occasionally included as a generic heritage management tool in heritage legislation (i.e. Spanish regions of Valencia, Asturias, Andalucía and Castilla y León). Therefore, although there is a trend towards the expansion of cultural parks, these remain an unknown, poorly studied and controversial minority. For all these reasons, confusion and commonplace assumptions concerning their conceptualization, implementation and operation still prevail.
6. Some issues for discussion

This section attempts to identify the distinctive elements of cultural parks with regard to other forms of spatial and heritage management. At the same time, cultural parks are linked with broader topics with particular emphasis on matters concerning heritage issues. Moreover, the chapter explores some controversial issues identifying the elements that need further investigation.

6.1 Governmentality, local communities and spatial planning

“We are living in a shifting and evolving framework for protected areas, nature conservation and sustainable development. This situation is marked by the involvement of many government agencies and private groups … Pluralism needs to be explicitly recognized and to be dealt with in a collaborative rather than a predominantly or exclusively corporate manner.” (Nelson & Sportza 2000)

The novelty that cultural parks introduce in the field of spatial planning is to place the concept of “landscape” in the centre of the planning and administrative efforts. This approach assumes that property and territory come together in the concept of landscape, which implies a holistic conception of space. According to Sabaté (2004b) the combination of “nature/culture” in cultural parks replaces previous models of territorial planning based on industry, infrastructures and demography, enabling to find a balance between preservation of the past and sustainable future-oriented creation.

Thus, as the Belvedere Nota envisaged, there is a convergence between the tendency to include heritage in spatial planning (Cacho 2006) and that of extending the
concept of archaeological and heritage site to encompass large areas (Ballesteros Arias et al. 2004). As previously mentioned, this marks a break with previous planning forms which prioritized zoning and land use without considering landscape identity and the various viewpoints of stakeholders (Lamme 1989). Also, this shift enables planners to avoid the controversial traditional sectoral policies where the management of heritage, forests, infrastructures, space, etc. corresponded to different entities without coordination, a situation deriving from the positivist planning theory of Faludi (1987)\(^2\)

However, as Bray (1994a) points out, the fact that the projection and implementation of cultural parks require the participation of so many fields of knowledge has left them outside the academic debate and the different administrative frameworks. Still, according to Sabaté (2004b), interdisciplinarity is the only factor that ensures the possibility of accounting for the complexity of managing landscapes. This would be necessary because every cultural park implies the notion of project and a subsequent territorial intervention, which raises the fundamental problem of how to translate landscape and heritage identity into physical planning and management.

Here lies the essential difficulty, which is that landscapes are ambivalent and move in a twofold dimension. Similarly, most spatial planning paradigms, either culturalist or naturalist, tend to act exclusively on the material dimension. Consequently, these approaches to landscape generate representations that reify and objectify it, thus eroding the linkage with the local inhabitants. A similar phenomenon to what occurs in the field of conservation (Handler 1985) or what Byrne terms the “thingification of heritage” (2009). In this regard, Bustamante (2008) argues that the only legitimate way to overcome this impasse is to allow and encourage the local people

\(^2\) See Table 17
to participate in the construction of the representation of their own territory through the idea of cultural park as a “common project”. In any case, the proposal put forward by Bustamante to overcome the representational impasse is more discursive than real. This is so because it is planners themselves who determine the conditions under which local communities are involved and participate in the cultural park, especially in Europe.

Also, it is common to use the term “community” as a fixed element that exists “out there”, in a world which is ‘more or less specific, clear, certain, definable and decided’ (Law 2004: 24-25) along with other concepts such as “groups, individuals, race, attitudes, intentions, the State, societies or symbols” that spatial planners take for granted (Alvesson 2002: 52). Therefore, the holistic understanding of cultural parks becomes troublesome if spatial planners maintain that they can create accurate and valid representations of landscape and heritage objects in texts, maps and plans (Hillier 2008). Also, the will of planners to focus on community inclusion, an issue that is clearly present on cultural parks, is questionable. In most cases “inclusion” means the depolitisation of conflicts and the legitimisation of government and private sector interests (Gunder 2010). The “community” becomes a one-dimensional entity that unites to compete for the scarce resources available from the State and the market. Then, people would “leave “old” antagonisms behind and become reasonable, rational, sensible, communicative, responsible agents with smooth relations with central government and its funding bodies” (Baeten 2009: 247). Thus, ideological deconstruction and political antagonism are negated by “particularizing and making locally contestable what have traditionally been universal demands of class based on equity and fairness” (Gunder 2010: 302). Probably, a field investigation would point to a greater distance between the viewpoints of local groups and planners of what literature on cultural parks reveals.
Still, assuming that the inclusion of local communities in cultural park planning and development was real and set into practice, it would be problematic. The question arises of which groups within the community are responsible for carrying out the representation of landscape and heritage, whose interests and objectives they serve and what values they promote. Also, the fact that cultural parks are regional projects where the views of “what should landscape stand for” can vary widely from one place to another can not be overlooked. Actually, it is usual that local groups responsible for implementing cultural parks regard the past as something alien, “stable and reified” (Mowaljarlai et al. 1988; Merriman 1991). Only then it is possible for these groups to consider themselves and their heritage as a resource “to value”. A process through which self-knowledge and self-expression become repositories of value underpinning the enhancement process (Corsin Jimenez 2009). Actually, there is no intrinsic relation between community and heritage, it “is a relation constituted after gaining awareness of the potential value an asset can have for life within an environment” (Guerra & Skewes 2008: 30). Therefore, the projection of the park that a group elaborates may not satisfy the entire community, and may not correspond with the ideas of planners. For example, according to Knight “green groups are typically the drivers of Heritage Areas … These are oftentimes the initiative of national organizations or small wealthy organizations within the locality” (2006b).

Moreover, in many occasions planners and local groups intend to use the cultural park as a way to “reconstruct” the local civil society (Prola 2005). However, the potential of heritage to function as a kernel of local belonging and participation is uncertain and varies in each case (Zapatero 2002). Hence, whereas in Bergslagen (Sweden) the cultural park has served to promote participatory social democracy, in the
There are complaints pointing that some parks benefit local oligarchies (Peyton Knight 2002; Parker 2011, March 2). It is therefore impossible to judge the role played by cultural parks in general without specific ethnographic case studies.

In any case, to acknowledge that people and their way of seeing and understanding place is a constituent part of landscapes in a similar way to its material components hardly fits with current forms of management and planning (Phillips 2003). Actually, while institutions discursively accept and adapt the terminology of “landscapes”, they are not ready to manage them without reducing landscapes to their objective dimension (Lothian 2000). These contradictions between representation and reality connect cultural parks with a general transformation in the forms of governmentality (sensu Foucault 2007) towards management schemes that involve a wider number of agents, a shift that directly affects issues of heritage and space management (Gunder & Hillier 2007). This change has been facilitated by the advent of neo-liberal policies advocating a “weak state” and the hybridisation of market and State whereby public tasks are adapted to the corporate logic (Hardt & Negri 2009). In fact, current forms of spatial planning rely on competitive market logics, combining the reality of globalisation with an ideology of utopian transcendent ideals of economic sustainability, community participation, etc. (see Kipfer & Keil 2002; McGuirk 2007).

Then, cultural parks can only be understood within this new governmentality and spatial planning framework. In fact, from the viewpoint of the modern governmentality scheme, cultural parks would represent a threat as they entail a loss of legitimacy for the State. On one hand, the State delegates (not decentralizes) significant management tasks in civic local groups (especially in the U.S.), which affects one of the pillars of the modern State: the control over territory, people and heritage as a source of legitimacy.
(see García Canclini 1990; Hardt & Negri 2000). On the other hand, it means the recognition of heritage and landscape as a common dimension of a social group. This undermines the prevailing liberalist and individualist ideas as evidenced by the angry reactions of the Property Rights Association against N.H.A. in the U.S. (Peyton Knight 2006a; 2004; 2005).

The paradox of the American experience is that whereas cultural park promoters gain independence and capacity to act aside from the State, at the discursive level their performance is oriented primarily towards the legitimising of the idea of “Nation” through the narration of its founding myths and great deeds. A disjunction Lazzarato (2009) identifies as characteristic of neo-liberalism. On one side, it promotes a “hipertecnification” and enlargement of the private sphere at the expense of the State, while on the other side it reinvigorates the “neo-arcaisms” of nation, race, family, etc. Thus, the significance of heritage as an instrument to reinforce national identity (see Meskell 1998; Boswell 1999; Tsing et al. 2009) reaches a new dimension with cultural parks where heritage intersects with the neo-liberal context (see Herzfeld 2005).

In relation with the issue of governance, Bray (2004b) compares the complexity of tackling climate change with managing a cultural park. It could be said that cultural parks involve a similar turning point for heritage management than climate change for environmental science in the 1990s. That change influenced not only the environmental sciences but also forms of governance, deriving in the rise of novel proposals for political and scientific organization based on cooperation and dialogue between actors such as “MODE2” (Nowotny et al. 2007) or “Post-normal science” (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff 2000). These currents acknowledge the impossibility of reaching a “scientifically accurate” solution for several problems and the inability to continue to
deal with them unilaterally. The same goes for cultural parks and heritage, for which there is no ideal or universally valid projection, that is, no intrinsic answer to the question of ‘what is to be done with cultural parks and heritage’.

Thus, what the Belvedere Nota openly acknowledged becomes apparent: all landscape and heritage planning attempt is essentially political (Miró Alaix 1997). This realization evinces the futility of thinking that “planners’ representations of people and space are value-free and objective” (Hillier 2008: 25). However, the Nota is a document intended to reach the discursive and institutional levels aiming to implement a policy in a territory. Instead, cultural parks work at a different political plane because they do not only act at the discursive or metacultural level (see Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004). They must deal with real-world situations, producing subjectivities at the local and regional scale through the use of heritage. In the “messy” politics of cultural parks, discourses are important but do not determine the final outcome of the enterprise.

**6.2 Preservation through change?**

The traditional perception of the “park” as a delimited space linked to the ideals of preservation, recreation and scientific management of natural and cultural sites is still pervasive among the European and American populations (Carr 2007). To assess and create these Parks the prevailing ideas of “significance” were the possession of impressive scenic views, scientific or historic values (MacGimsey & Davis 1984). At the epistemological and academic levels the conservationist paradigm has been criticised from different positions. Adorno already pointed to the close relation of this ideal with Rousseau’s naïve “back to nature” (1983). In fact, most parks generate “artificial wilderness” as they actually are “intensively managed spaces subject to
myriad crosscutting interests” that strive to represent the nation’s purest and most altruistic expression (Meskell 2007: 386). For Lucas the conservationist stance of these initiatives “stop the clock for material remains, but in doing so, help to create the very distance and disconnection to the present that archaeological narratives try so hard to close” (Lucas 2005: 126). Cultural parks distance themselves from preservationist parks, refraining from turning the landscape into a museum and recognizing its dynamism and the fact that only its monitored transformation can ensure the endurance of heritage and regional identity (Nogué i Font 2005). Preservation through change is the motto (Sabaté 2006)24.

Again, this idea adapted from the Belvedere Nota is problematic as it was intended only for the “material dimension” of space and cannot account for the intangibles of landscape. Despite the positive rhetoric of discourse, cultural park designers end up promoting the same materialistic logic because, after all, it is the “physical features, elements and heritage areas which endow a landscape with a specific identity. Therefore, we believe that a cultural landscape enhancement project needs to be conceptualized from its tangible manifestations” (Bustamante 2008: 246). From this standpoint, “preservation” means conservation of the material forms, while “change”, connotes the touristification/commodification of these forms.

The core of the problem lies in the essentialist consideration of material heritage remains as “the expression of the identity and memory of a community” (Sabaté 2006: 342). From this viewpoint, territorial heritage would work as a signifier of a deeper signified in the form of social memory or identity. Thus, this move overlooks the problem of dealing with the question of the different dimensions of the landscape.

24 See Table 18.
Moreover, when landscape and heritage are linked to an “existential dimension” they become more valuable for touristic purposes. Therefore, rather than “preservation through change”, what this conception of planning entails is the commodification of heritage, or better, of landscape as heritage (Birch 2010).

In this respect, Mitchell (2001) coincides with Harvey (2001) in highlighting that in situations of “creative destruction” or heritage commodification converge the entrepreneurial drive to accumulate profit, the need of capitalism to reinvent itself and the social desire to accumulate nostalgia or, with Urry (1990) signposts of the past and aesthetic experience. For Taylor and Konrad (1980) economic factors are secondary. The key role of heritage would be to satisfy the human psychological need to establish continuity between present and past. Moreover, Connerton (2009; 1989) believes that this shared representation of memory is a prerequisite for maintaining social order and, according to Grenville (2007), individual stability as well.

Parr (2008) goes further affirming that market forces impede U.S. to forget because memory can be turned into capital. From this perspective, the rhetoric held by Jameson (1991) who argued that postmodernism fosters amnesia loses its sense. From another point of view, Criado-Boado (2001) points to the possibility of a positive use of memory as the foundation for a social project for the future based on some shared social values. Cultural parks are placed halfway between these extremes. On one hand, they promote the preservation of the past and the reification of memory for tourist purposes. On the other hand, cultural parks involve a common vision of what the residents in a region want their future to be and how to get there (Prola 2005).
On one side, cultural parks strive to differentiate themselves from preservationist parks. On the other side they mark the distances with theme parks as symbols of the maximum degree of commodification, reification and deterritorialization of space. Accordingly, Sabaté considers that the border between theme park and cultural park can be very thin if the past and memory are reduced to performances managed through commercial strategies. Therefore, every cultural park should “offer a type of service that is closely linked to a region’s cultural identity” (Sabaté & Frenchman 2001: 47). In a similar vein, Daly considers that in contrast to other “inauthentic” touristic destinations, cultural parks are “the expression of the people who live, work and shape the land” that “provide a bridge connecting the past with the present and the people to their place” (2003: 4).

Interestingly, Disneyland has been used from time to time as a yardstick to measure the degree of “authenticity” in heritage sites (see Solà-Morales 1998; O'Guinn & Belk 1989; Gable & Handler 1996; Teo & Yeoh 1997; AlSayyad 2001 among others). As is the case with cultural parks, theme parks have been poorly researched. Theme parks are areas of corporate management (see Sorkin 1992; Atkins et al. 1998) that through the spatialization of imagination organize an area around one or several issues in order to make profits (Eyssartel et al. 1992; Chassé & Rochon 1993). The great difference from cultural parks is that theme parks can not be defined by the identity or by the relationships established by its inhabitants, but rather by the absence of memory and society (Augé 2008).

The American N.H.A. experience is close to theme parks in that they tell a highly abstract story, with the significant difference that this story is supposedly based on a scientific narrative. Nonetheless, the long-term consequences of the heritage-tourism
combination are unpredictable and tend to generate a dijuncture between material culture and social memory (Mitchell & Coghill 2000). Well-known examples are the touristification process of the historic centres of Barcelona (Tironi 2009; Harvey 2002) and Singapur (Teo & Huang 1995), or places such as Puy du Fou where it is impossible to tell whether it is a cultural area or a theme park (Martin & Suaud 1992).

The issue of theme parks should not be taken lightly as they are being highly influential in the ways of producing space, urbanism and society in the U.S. and beyond (Bryman 1999). This trend is characterised by the promotion of the thematisation of territories with a view to their inclusion into a new economic model based on leisure (Clavé 1999). Far from causing a postmodern spatial relativism of empty signifiers à la Baudrillard (1994), this situation fosters a widespread rationalization of space and of the relations of production and consumption (Ritzer & Liska 1997). Interestingly, theme parks are breaking with preconceived notions by including well-documented ethnographic exhibitions and creating sustainable urban projects like “Celebration City” (Frantz & Collins 2000; Didier 1999). More interesting is the recent turn of theme parks towards a lower degree of thematization and abstraction, a fact that brings them closer to cultural parks. Starting from the adaptation of Disneyland to France (Altman 1995) and China (O’Brien 1999), theme parks are undergoing a shift towards the hybridization with local history and heritage (Jones et al. 1993). This phenomenon is particularly intense in Southeast Asia where their number increases exponentially (Robertson 1993).

Therefore, cultural parks can be included within an overall socio-economic shift towards the leisure sector and the thematization of space (Molitor 1999). Currently, cultural parks differ from theme parks in many obvious ways: they are not run by corporations, involve different actors, start from a given empirical context, etc.
However, it is important to reframe the terms of the debate and set cultural parks in a context where the boundaries between leisure and culture, identity and economy, heritage and tourism are blurred. From this standpoint, it becomes possible to analyze how each cultural park is organized and articulated diversely depending on its main tendency: to set up closer bonds with the territory and local communities, to use it as a background to deploy an abstract narrative for tourists, and so on.

6.3 A story for whom?

Many cultural Parks in Europe and especially in the U.S. are structured around the narration of a story. For instance, the Llobregat C.P. tells the story of work in the Llogregat river under the slogan “Europe’s hardest working river” (Casas 2004), the Blackstone Valley (Worcester Historical Museum & Chafee 2009) narrates the story of the industrial revolution in the area whereas the South Carolina Heritage Corridor (2005) tells the story of the Civil War. According to Sabaté (2002) the story narrated has to be original and work as the backbone of the park. Hence, it must attach meanings to objects, create hierarchies and facilitate the creation of links among different heritage areas. Moreover, the story enables the public to venture into the territory following a definite pattern, instead of visiting a mere juxtaposition of elements (Miró Alaix 1997).

From this perspective, the story can be equated to what Zaera-Polo (2008) has called “the envelope” in architecture. His theory, discussed and extended by Žižek (2010), considers the façade of the building as an envelope that materializes the division between inside and outside. Therefore, it is immanently political as it defines the boundary between inclusion and exclusion. Also, it is conceived as an aesthetic mechanism that attracts people acting as a representation towards the exterior that
generates value in the process. The envelope works as a device to affect and communicate with people, to order visibilities, distribute spaces and plan movements, to convey messages and feelings.

In a somewhat similar fashion to the façade, the story can be conceived as an aesthetic device sustained by scientific knowledge whose objective is to attract external visitors and generate profit. It is politically loaded because as discursive processes, stories can convey all kind of meanings (Shaviro 1993) and affect micropolitical realities (Connolly 2007). Also, stories can reproduce dominant narratives and disregard the histories of less powerful groups (Hall 2000). For instance, the main aim of N.H.A. in U.S. is to tell the founding myths of the nation, deeds of heroism and progress that convey a univocal and fixed idea of the past. For instance, the proposal to establish the George Washington Frontier Area as a N.H.A. states that its main aim is to narrate the struggle of “the Nation” against Native Americans along with the heroic acts of George Washington (2009). Therefore, discursive statements in cultural park plans that emphasize the potential of heritage to foster inclusion are undermined by real practices deploying exclusionary narratives.

At the same time, the story conditions the organization of the internal parts of the cultural park. The physical organization of paths, museums, heritage sites and hotels, the value attributed to the sites and marketing strategies are all related to the story being told. To analyze cultural parks according to their story or lack of it may provide a better framework to establish classifications that could be related to social and politically relevant issues. Then, instead of elaborating lists with “types” of parks it would be more functional to speak of “degrees” of complexity and abstraction of the story being told25.

25 See Scheme 19
Further research is needed in order to clarify who is responsible for crafting the story, as it is not possible to elucidate it from the literature about cultural parks. The “ideal CP scheme” sketched by Sabaté (2004b) sets out a solid interdisciplinary research as a support for the story. Also, some landscape archaeologists consider that part of their research should focus on providing a narrative for territorial projects of interpretation such as cultural parks. The aim and the challenge would be to render landscapes understandable and meaningful for a wide audience without oversimplifying those (Orejas 2001; Criado-Boado 1996). Nevertheless, none of the cultural parks reviewed or academic accounts of them define a clear strategy for creating the story.

Another point of discussion is the affirmation put forward by Sabaté (2006) that cultural parks lacking a story are less successful in terms of economic development and local involvement. It is impossible to assess the validity of this claim as it is rare to find accounts of failed projects. In fact, only one of the cultural parks reviewed has been deemed unsuccessful. This is the case of the Albarracin CP (Spain) which despite its outstanding cultural richness (Merino 2005) has not reached the objectives posed by the original plan (Rubio Terrado 2008). Actually, this example would support Sabaté’s claim because the Albarracin C.P. does not deploy a story. However, many other factors could be involved in its failure. The study of failed projects is another interesting area of research as the “leftovers of modernity” can offer as much information as successful enterprises (Lien & Law 2011).

To avoid becoming a failure, the story told by the park can not be only oriented towards the exterior to attract visitors, but must take into account the local perspective as well. Drawing an analogy with architecture, Zizek states that “managers cannot
simply rely on performances to provide a sufficient attraction; the building must create a new experience, and a sense of place, for its increasingly demanding audience” (2010: para. 29). Thus, it is essential for cultural parks to maintain a certain internal cohesion and identification with local communities if they are to keep a high degree of place attachment.

Nonetheless, the issue of place attachment and belonging is quite complex and involves several factors such as affect and amusement (Proshansky & Fabian 1987), cognitive factors (Williams et al. 1992) or environmental ones (Altman & Low 1992; Vorkinn & Riese 2001). With regard to cultural parks, the most challenging issue is to be able to represent the different perspectives of the local community. A failure to do so could entail the exclusion of minorities that may not feel attached to the story told or the heritage elements enhanced. In fact, exclusionary or assimilationist narratives such as those deployed in some N.H.A. can foster a sense of identity associated with a reactionary vocabulary (Harvey 1996: 202; Keith & Pile 1993: 20; Massey 1994: 169-171) and a concept of community subject to exclusionary impulses (Young 1990: 236).

Also, multiculturalist policies such as the Belvedere Nota have been criticised as well (see Vink & van der Burg 2006). Despite seeking to preserve the heterogeneity of territories through heritage and landscape conservation, this is done for the sake of keeping the singularity of the dominant one (Badiou 2000). Multiculturalism can be considered as an upper-middle class western liberal phenomenon (Zizek & Schelling 1997) willing only “to accommodate a filtered other which conforms to dominant liberal-capitalist standards” (Hillier 2007: 116). Furthermore, Nancy Fraser considers multiculturalism and identity politics in general as a way of undermining claims for socio-economic redistribution (1997).
Then, the challenge for cultural parks is to create inclusive stories without stopping the clock of material past remains. This would enable cultural park promoters to avoid conveying a fixed image of the past that supplants “a community’s memory-work with its own material form” (Young 1992: 272-273). Failing to do so would preclude different social groups from feeling attached to the cultural park project and could cause a disjunction between representation and reality. Instead, when cultural parks are conceived as *common projects for the future*, they can provide a novel alternative to the dichotomy of multiculturalism and assimilationist policies. To do so, identity can not be considered as an essence but as an active process driven by “the capacity to form new relations, and the desire to do so” (Buchanan 1997: 83). The most original cultural parks such as Val di Cornia (Italy) are already moving in this direction with positive outcomes hitherto (Francovich 2003).

### 6.4 Nature – Culture and the conflict over representation

Allegedly, one of the main differences between cultural parks and other types of parks and protected areas is that their performance does not establish an a priori separation between the natural and cultural planes. This affirmation is reflected in two patterns of empirical functioning:

1. Projects where different natural and cultural resources are brought together under one “umbrella” designation, such as Aragon’s Cultural Parks or the majority of N.H.A. in the U.S.
Projects in which the concept of landscape is placed in the centre of the planning efforts, assuming that nature and culture converge in it. This is the case of the Llobregat, Val di Cornia or Bergslagen cultural parks.

In the first case it is clear that the overcoming of the dichotomy is merely discursive. Actually, in these parks resources are assorted since the early stages of the project under the customary watertight categories of nature-culture, tangible-intangible, etc. This view sets out an utilitarian conception of space (Zimmer 2008) that reveals how institutions and academic disciplines are not prepared to work without the cardinal epistemological divisions of modernity (Couston 2005).

In the second case the matter is more complex. By placing landscape in the centre of planning, the hybrid condition of reality and the impossibility to split nature and culture are assumed. However, the use of the concept of landscape brings about the dilemmas of its twofold reality: to be a fragment of a territory and its abstract representation. Thus, the question outlined before arises again articulated in a different way: how can cultural park planners and promoters generate abstract cultural representations of landscape, interpreting and managing it, without losing the link with its natural dimension?

Actually, this issue is related to the hermeneutical and postmodern readings of landscape that reformulate their ambivalence in terms of the signifier – signified couple. Accordingly, “landscape encompasses more than an area of land with a certain use or function … and the immaterial existential values and symbols of which the landscape is the signifier” (Antrop 2006: 188). This interpretation is recurrently reproduced by cultural park promoters for whom landscapes “are the expression of the memory and
identity of a region (Bustamante & Ponce 2004). Thus, when a landscape is enhanced and the influx of tourism transforms the area the reading that follows is that there has been a break between the existential and material dimensions, signified and signifier (e.g. Knudsen & Greer 2008). These interpretations derived from the philosophy of Baudrillard have influenced the field of heritage studies as well. For instance, Lowenthal (1986) establishes a break between a supposedly neutral “real history” and heritage as a “fake”, a stance that has conditioned the works of many authors (see Peleggi 1996; Olshin 2007; Waitt 2000).

From my standpoint, it is useless to apply this interpretation to cultural parks because it rearticulates the nature-culture split into another false dichotomy between copy and original (Massumi 1987). Also, it ignores the fact that many variables that affect the configuration of heritage and cultural parks like identity, memory or the functioning of the market can not be reduced to a textual representation based on the signifier-signified couple (Guattari 1980). In reality, there is no original landscape or nature to which the representation has to fit rigorously. Therefore, to say that there has been a break between reality and representation is merely an empty affirmation (Massumi 1987). What is at question is to understand cultural parks and its heritage assets as original creations or emergent realities that transform the previous context through the negotiation and rearticulating of meanings, affects, power relations, material forms, etc.

Hence, cultural parks transform the relation of a society with space. This task is inherently political because value systems and dominant beliefs are reflected in the ways through which space is created. Ideology shapes what each person deems important and conditions planning objectives and long term goals (Gunder & Hillier
Against this background, it is now clear that landscape and heritage, nature and culture have become assets among many others within a society that shamelessly blends spectacle and production (Thrift 2006). Therefore, it is crucial to analyze in specific cases how a cultural park articulates the balance between nature and culture in the production of new spaces. Only then will it be possible to elucidate whether these categories are still considered and managed separately or if on the contrary they are interpreted as a whole and managed as such.

6.5 Economic forces and Cultural Parks

“The name itself for this national heritage area raises serious questions. It seems improper, even indecent, to name this the Hallow Ground Corridor and claim it is to appreciate, respect and experience this cultural landscape that makes it uniquely American, when it tramples on the very principles of private property rights, individual liberty and limited government that the Founding Fathers risked and gave their lives for” R.J. Smith (in National Center for Public Policy Research 2006: 4).

The existence of parks and nature reserves has been tied to economic matters since its inception, when the Northern Pacific Railroad supported the creation of Yellowstone National Park in 1872 (Sellars 1999). At that time, Omlsted estimated the huge impact of Central Park in increasing real estate values in adjacent areas of New York (Cranz 1982). At the municipal and regional levels, economic development and parks have always been in close relation. However, economic issues were always considered as “external” to the development of the park. The Urban Park system created in the 1980’s by the New York State was the first project to include economic development among its main goals (Bray 2004b). The plan considered four areas where the parks influenced
economic development: tourism, increment in real estate values, knowledge workers and retirees that would be attracted to work and live and homebuyers that would purchase homes (Bray 1994b).

Despite this intrinsic relation between parks and economy, the scarce scholarship about cultural parks has neglected both macroeconomic and local economy issues, only referring succinctly to the potential of cultural parks to foster sustainable development. It is important to consider that the creation of cultural parks is framed within a general process of financialisation of economy in Europe and North America. This process leads to the concentration of wealth and profit in large metropolis whereas the productive sectors or “real economy” tend to disappear (see Marazzi 2010; Lucarelli 2009). Then, there is an overall passage from a paradigm of profit generation towards a model where rent becomes crucial in its many forms: territorial, financial, real estate, etc. (Vercellone 2008; Harvey 2002).

The vast spaces that remain between the metropolises lose their productive function (relocated in Asia or South America) and go on to become “junkspace” (Koolhaas 2002) or just abandoned areas. Consequently, territories are forced to re-invent themselves. A good option is to do it through the enhancement of landscape and heritage that become sources of territorial rent (Rullani 2009). For some, this is a subtle way to disguise what in reality are processes of touristification of areas (Bertoncello & Geraiges de Lemos 2006) placing ecological and cultural objectives in the background (Rojek & Urry 1997). From this perspective, cultural parks could be considered as devices to control, articulate and extract rent from heritage and landscape. The issue becomes patent when moving away from the Western context. In Asia, for example, the current relevant question is not how to gain profit from cultural landscapes, but how to
protect them from massive development and industrialisation (Taylor 2009; Taylor & Altenburg 2006).

This generic framework is structured in various ways at the local level. For example, Hays considers that in the U.S. there is a historic opposition between a utilitarian vision of territory focused on economic development, represented by the West and an environmentalist perspective in accordance to the values of the East (1999). This context places N.H.A. promoters under pressure to demonstrate both the economic and environmental viability of their projects to local communities and the institutions and corporations that support them, something that happens to a lesser extent in Europe.

In Europe, the need to link cultural parks and sustainable economic development is emphasized. Without getting into the review of this concept (see Latouche & Harpagès 2010; Great Britain. Sustainable Development Commission & Jackson 2010) it is important to note that its birth and implementation relied on the existence of a strong welfare state (Huber & Stephens 2001). Quite the contrary to the current situation where the weakness of central administrations and institutions is patent and heritage preservation tends to be set aside. Further investigation is required to understand how cultural parks manage to attain sustainability in this adverse environment and what would be the role of heritage in the process.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the main factor of development in cultural parks is tourism. Thus, it would be essential to research in empirical contexts how the issue of sustainability is articulated with the couple heritage-tourism that has prompted
so much research (see Prentice 2001; Joliffe & Smith 2001; Silberberg 1995; Poria et al. 2003).

According to Sabaté (2004b) there are two types of tourism: a tourism that can be done anywhere and the kind of tourism offered in cultural parks where the visitor comes into contact with the local identity and culture. However, the question is more complex. First, because it is difficult to maintain a sustainable economy based on tourism (Precedo & Míguez 2007). Secondly, because in most cases the interpretation and presentation of cultural assets has to adapt to the requirements of foreign visitors, usually urban and with specific tastes (Almirón et al. 2006). This is known as the passage from product-driven tourism to consumer-driven tourism which can cause a disjunction between the touristic product and the local interpretation and enjoyment of heritage (Apostolakis 2003). Thus, the process of selection and heritage enhancement is twofold. First, the promoters decide which assets should be enhanced. Afterwards, the tourists perform a second selection that may not match the choice of the promoters (Almirón et al. 2006). Accordingly, some authors consider that tourists end up consuming just a symbol that obliterates history and deterritorializes the material reality of the place (Knudsen & Greer 2008). In this sense Terrado and Hernández are clear: for cultural heritage to have use value and generate benefits it must meet a social demand (2007).

Therefore, cultural parks must be able to generate a representation of landscape and heritage that meets external demands without overlooking the interests of the local community. Similarly, the cultural park must contest the tendency to override the heterogeneity of landscape and heritage brought about by the implementation of planning regulations and heritage enhancement plans (Tonts & Greive 2002). If a
cultural park homogenizes and reifies the landscape for tourist consumption it remains exposed to contestation from other agents with different perspectives on what do landscape and heritage should stand for.

The dispute over the property rights in the U.S. is exemplary in this regard. The Property Rights association believes that the N.H.A. system violates the basic principles of the American State, deadening economic development and enabling environmentalist groups to take over control of land use (Peyton Knight 2005). N.H.A. represent for them a veiled form of expansion of the bureaucratic state regulations under the guise of protecting heritage (see Herzfeld 2006 ; Breglia 2006 on heritage and the expansion of bureaucratic management). According to James Burling “the legacy we will leave to future generations will not be the preservation of our history, but of the preservation of a façade masquerading as our history subverted by the erosion of the Rights that animated our history for the first two centuries of the Republic” (National Center for Public Policy Research 2006: 3). Similarly, Joe Waldo considers that “the elderly, minorities and the poor are most impacted by regulatory measures that restrict property owners in the use of their land.” (National Center for Public Policy Research: 3). Therefore, advocates of the Property Rights have a different ontological conception of heritage. Accordingly, heritage is not a material, tangible remain but an intangible “way of doing”, in this case the founding principles of the American State based on private ownership and utilitarianism. For them, what Americans “share” is a set of ideals that cannot be reduced to any material expression.

In conclusion, it is useless to understand economy and culture as incommensurable fields (Gudeman 1986), the former dealing with quantification and concreteness, the latter with abstraction and qualification. In cultural parks both fields
mingle in a constant interaction between economic and cultural interests in a wide sense. This situation is related to the different understandings of landscape and heritage each park deploys. These tend to be either materialist and objective or existential and subjective. Also, for each social group heritage and landscape holds a different ontological status. That is, in every cultural park there are not only different material remains but also diverse ways of understanding, valuing and representing these remains. Therefore, each cultural park must be articulated in a different manner to adapt to the local reality adequately without losing sight of its objectives. Only the empirical analysis of specific cases could shed light on how this process is put into action.
7. A new concept of Cultural Parks: towards an ethnographic methodology

“On neither side [rationalist and culturalist] are systematic explanations for political and economic outcomes being integrated with contextually informed analyses of social relations. Yet we need works of such combinatorial weight more than ever before, in a world where global endeavors cross multiple contexts” (Hall 2007: 134).

The objective of this section is to set out the foundation of a methodology for the ethnographic study of cultural parks. As Castañeda (2008) remarks, all methodologies are derived from a specific theoretical framework, whether explicitly or not. Accordingly, a novel theoretical formulation of cultural parks that connects them to the methodology constructed is developed and exposed. This “theoretical image” has been elaborated from the foregoing reflections on landscapes and cultural parks, and from the review of theories and methods of other authors from different disciplines that can be tailored to suit the analysis of cultural parks.

Also, the methodologies employed so far for the study of cultural parks have been critically reviewed. In this sense, the main reference is the work of Sabaté, subsequently extended by another member of his research group, Bustamante. Another key investigation is the collaboration between the research teams of Sabaté - Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, UPC - and Frenchman - Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT - (2001). Each team studied nine cultural parks in their respective geographical contexts using different methodologies.
The UPC team developed a morphological and typological approach that focused on the identification of patterns in the resources and the physical manifestations of each cultural park. Instead, the MIT team was less faithful to their architectural disciplinary root. They developed a structural and broader approach focusing in the history and evolution of the Parks, the role of the institutions, the story narrated through the cultural resources and finally their physical design. According to them, this disparity can be related to the different regional planning traditions in Europe and the U.S. For both, the eighteen cultural parks studied fall under three close-cut categories: river corridors, industrial or agricultural parks. Also, cultural parks seem to be the result of some institutional decision or master plan put into operation through the use of technology. Either way, both approaches are rather reductionist. In Sabaté’s case, cultural parks are merely considered as planning projects and classified according to their physical shape or prevailing heritage resources26.

In Frenchman’s case, cultural parks are reduced to their historical evolution and institutional structure. Bustamante (2008) extends their work in an attempt to combine both methodologies, achieving similar outcomes. He widens the range of parks studied and elaborates more accurate classifications. Also, he connects cultural parks to planning and architectural theory, considering those as the most evolved planning instrument for rural areas. In any case, their approaches do not provide a useful framework to develop a holistic explanation of cultural parks as they leave no room for complex relations and processes.

Their is a good example of how methodologies create what researchers are looking for (Law 2004), revealing the tight links between methods and theoretical

26 See Scheme 20
standpoints (Castañeda 2008). Thus, from their work it would seem that cultural parks are mere planning instruments that attain some objectives following a linear causality thanks to the use of technology. Also, the theory behind their respective views is firmly anchored in the dichotomies of modernity, subject-object, nature-culture, tangible-intangible, and so on. This position could be summarized in the already mentioned affirmation that cultural landscapes are “the expression of the identity and memory of a community”. Thus, the image of cultural parks is simplified and its hybrid nature obliterated by “the purification of the elements” through classification and systematization (Latour & Woolgar 1986).

**7.1. Assembling Cultural Parks.**

On the basis of the ideas exposed above I intend to set out a novel theoretical conceptualization of cultural parks. These are the initial hypotheses:

1. Like landscapes and cultural landscapes, cultural parks are hybrid entities or “messy objects” (Law & Mol 2002). Therefore, binary thinking is not functional for their study, whether as the signifier-signified couple, the real history-fake heritage dialectic or in the form of traditional modern dichotomies.

2. An epistemological turn is needed to understand cultural parks and to avoid the categories of modernity. However, it is necessary to acknowledge their ontological status as well. Actually, cultural parks produce subjectivities, change the relationship between humans and their environment, their identity and their past, creating new socio-economic territorial contexts or “matters of concern” (sensu Latour 2004).
3. Cultural parks are complex and many different elements converge in their constitution. Therefore, strictly disciplinary research can not account for them either at a practical or ideological level (Nguyen & Davis 2008). Thus, it is necessary to recognize the impossibility of “purifying” and isolating an element for its analysis in a cultural park. All its constituent parts are interrelated and in continuous reciprocal determination through different processes.

4. There is no need to place cultural Parks in a useless dichotomy between the local and the global. These are not the consequence of macro processes but neither “local splinters” of a world in fragments (Geertz 2000). In cultural parks different issues and processes converge with branches on different scales.

These premises pave the way for the conceptualization of cultural parks as “assemblages”. To elaborate this formulation I have drawn on previous works conducted in several disciplines, from anthropology (Rabinow 2008) to political science (Srnicek 2007). The concept of assemblage was originally conceived by Foucault and Deleuze (Deleuze 1988; see Srnicek 2007 for an in-depth account of "assemblages") from the work of Danish linguist Louis Hjemslev (see Bell 2008; Pisters 2003)27. The concept was intended to overcome the structuralist, phenomenological and Marxist interpretations of the social world. However, its use has spread due to the appropriation of the concept by the Actor-Network-Theory (see Latour 2005b; Callon & Caliskan 2005) and the recent Deleuzian-turn in anthropology (Hamilton & Placas 2010).

Actor-Network scholars consider assemblages as “loose descriptors of heterogeneous structures, consisting of human as well as non-human elements” (Palmås

27 See Scheme 21
Hence, it is “like an episteme with technologies added ... connoting active and evolving practices rather than a passive and static structure” (Watson-Verran & Turnbull 1995: 117). Non-linear and complex relations prevail among the components of the assemblage because “assemblages are formed and affected by heterogeneous populations of lower-level assemblages, but may also act back upon these components, imposing restraints or adaptations in them” (Zaera-Polo 2008: 90). Thus, assemblages can be equated with “boundary objects” (Star & Griesemer 1989) or “global forms”. These are a “set of templates that organize, in specific situations, values, norms, morals, modes of self formation and ethical reasoning” (Collier & Ong 2005: 11) articulated in local situations by specific administrative apparatuses, technical infrastructures or value regimes (Frohmann 2008).

Moreover, assemblages do not only account for discourses but also for material realities (Lazzarato 2002), enabling to make sense of the emergence of new socio-economic configurations. Foucault’s analysis of the disciplinary system provides a good example: at the non-discursive, material level (content of the assemblage) there is a prison (form) and prisoners (substance). The “substance of content” is the human and physical resources arranged in the assemblage, whereas the form of content is the material way of sorting and compartmentalising these resources (Bell 2008: 9). At the discursive level (expression of the assemblage), “the form is “penal law” and the substance is “delinquency” in so far as it is the object of statements” (Deleuze 1988: 47)\textsuperscript{28}. When assemblages are stabilized they are called “structures” that are more or less stable, like the disciplinary system (see DeLanda 2009 for an explanation of

\textsuperscript{28} See Scheme 22 & 23.
assemblages in social contexts). Starting from this formulation, a tentative model of cultural park can be set out\textsuperscript{29}.

The abstract representation of the assemblage has the advantage of not differentiating from the outset between nature-culture, object-subject or tangible-intangible. This fact enables the researcher to analyze in empirical contexts how these dichotomies are established and negotiated during the process of implementation. Furthermore, the formulation of cultural parks as assemblages does not allow the investigator to establish a direct linear relationship between discourses on heritage, sustainability, memory and identity (substance of expression) and the material territory (substance of content). There should always be some sort of intervention distributing value and meaning and arranging the material reality in accordance with a logic. In some cases, this rationale will be determined by research and a story to be told. In others, the architectural design and planning will have a greater weight.

Thus, this model prevents an essentialist conception of heritage that defines it by its intrinsic functions. Within the assemblage, the role of heritage is always negotiated and variable because relations are always external to the internal constitution of the elements (Zourabichvili et al. 2004). Therefore, it is necessary to analyze how heritage is functioning assembled within structures (Dolphijn 2004). Also, cultural parks are not the expression of the identity and memory of a place, but a way of arranging, assembling these elements along with many others into a co-functioning system with a purpose. Thus, both expression and content are reciprocally conditioned avoiding any causal or linear relationship (Lazzarato 2004). This move prevents falling into

\textsuperscript{29} See Scheme 24
determinism: a cultural park is not exclusively the result of the socio-economic content as in Marxism, nor the outcome of the discursive expression as in structuralism.

Furthermore, the assemblage reflects the complexity of the cultural park showing the futility of conceiving it as an outcome of a transcendental, top-down ordering of reality, whether as a planning guideline or the will of an institution. Conversely, the cultural park is considered as an emergent element that adapts locally through ongoing processes of negotiation and reciprocal determination. Then, as can be appreciated in the graph, there are four main subdivisions traversed by two axes. The pre-existing material (content substance) includes items such as institutions, material remains from the past or the local people. These components are the subject of academic study regarding of the creation of inventories to facilitate architectural design or the development of a story. The planning efforts and the story sort out these material elements of the past and some specific contemporary practices turning them into “heritage” to be enhanced, valued, and presented to a public.

These elements are affected and in turn determine the physical structure of the cultural park and the management of space and heritage (content form), that is, the material way of compartmenting and sorting resources. The spatial planning blueprints are closely related to the local context and the “image of the park” (expression form), that is, with scientific research and the story that is narrated. This section is politically loaded, enabling to analyse cultural park’s performance considering the story as an “envelope”. Issues of identity politics, inclusion and exclusion can be addressed here, looking at processes whereby some heritage resources, memories and stories are highlighted whereas others fall in oblivion. Normally, when a cultural park narrates a story it becomes the hub of its performance. This fact opens the door to an investigation
of the park from the story told: Is it based on research? And if so, what kind of research, and who does it? Is it reflecting the local identity or is it an abstraction to attract tourism? How does the story affect the meanings and uses of heritage?

Finally, the pre-existing discourses (expression substance) support and shape the idea of “heritage-as-value” in its various forms: as cultural landscape, as identity, etc. Also, this section includes discourses considering heritage assets as the basis for economic development, that is, heritage-as-development (World Bank 2001). At the same time, these discourses determine how actors should act, fixing ideas of how space, heritage and economic development should be managed. Therefore, this area is closely related to regulations and legislation developed by national and international institutions (UNESCO, ICOMOS, World Bank, national heritage laws and so on). Both “expression substance” and “expression form” would allow for an analysis of the ideological underpinnings of the cultural park in the sense of Zizek or Rancière (see Rancière 2004; Goodwin & Taylor 2009; Jackson & Jackson 2009; Butler et al. 2000; Swyngedouw 2010).

Once all these elements are conjoined and assembled, the cultural park becomes a structure, or rather a “cultural image of stability” (DeLanda 2002), because it does not lose its changing and dynamic status. At this point, it is not enough to affirm that the assemblages exist. It is necessary to analyze how they touch ground in real contexts, how they take on institutional grip and human valence. To do so, it is necessary to use the “tools of anthropology, philosophy, metaphysics, history, sociology to detect how many participants are gathered in a thing to make it exist and to maintain its existence” (Latour 2005b: 256).
The analysis of real assemblages is the only way of accounting for the *diagram* lying behind cultural parks (Palmås 2007). The diagram is different from a rational blueprint or a project; it is not a top-down plan that grounds the whole cultural park. It could be defined as a structure-generating process or the “functions or principles” (Hardie & MacKenzie 2007) underpinning the workings of the assemblage. In plain, what is at stake when seeking to map the diagram of a social structure is to understand how the same concept “cultural park” can produce different territorial configurations and how heritage can be articulated in many ways. That is, “how do the assemblages come about in a variable way in each particular case? … Foucault gives it its most precise name: it is a “diagram”, a “functioning, abstracted from any obstacle” (Deleuze 1988: 34). The diagram facilitates the task of tracing the key elements of cultural parks according to “degrees”, instead of relying on closed categories: to which extent is heritage being commodified? To what degree is the story fostering a fixed and exclusionary idea of identity?30?

The hypothetical representation of a diagram presents the main variables that play a role in the constitution of a cultural park. The diagram does not reintroduce a dichotomous thinking since it does not classify or judge some elements according to pre-existing criteria. Instead, it evaluates the “intensity” with which each element operates, sorting it in a gradient where certain “attractors” are at work, in complexity theory parlance (Ansell-Pearson 1997). Thus, it is possible to explore what kind of transformation a cultural park causes in the relation between a society and its landscape and heritage. To analyze the behaviour of a cultural park and “map” the underlying diagram at work, it is necessary to conduct fieldwork research.

---

30 See Scheme 25.
7.2 An ethnographic methodology for the analysis of cultural parks

In connection with the study carried out and the foregoing reflections, this section provides some ideas for a suitable methodology for the investigation of cultural parks. First, the methodologies developed by the research teams of the UPC and MIT should not be completely dismissed. The analysis of physical planning and knowledge about the history of the park and the role of the institutions in its development is relevant. Indeed, these perspectives help to overcome the difficulties of anthropological studies in linking macro contexts with ethnographic narrative (Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009). However, Sabaté and Frenchman already pointed out that “we have a long way to go to fully understand the implications of these examples. Thus, there is an important role for practice-based inquiry into this field” (2001: 35). Therefore, a study that seeks to “problematis” the performance of cultural parks should be based on ethnographic research of one or several case studies. This approach would enable researchers to deepen several controversial issues and to draw comparisons between different cultural parks.

In addition to the methodological contributions in the field of heritage studies (see Sørensen 2009), the “ethnography of archaeology” provides a valuable research framework. In particular, Castañeda’s notion of transculturation (2008) can prove useful for the analysis of the “social life” of cultural parks (sensu Appadurai 1986). He extends the use of the term to comprise not only the borrowing of meanings across ethnic groups but also “between socio-cultural communities and diverse kinds of institutions, sets of practices, bodies of knowledge and social agents” (Castañeda 2009: 263). Also, Lynn Meskell’s investigation at Kruger National Park (2005; 2009) provides an outstanding
methodological framework that meshes archaeology and anthropology following the call to “decolonize methodologies” (see Smith 2008).” In her account she analyzes issues of inclusion, the nature-culture divide, cultural display, tourism and representation in the Park. However, Kruger (1926) is the stereotype of a traditional “natural reserve” National Park. Therefore, her methodology should be adapted to the particularities of cultural parks.

The methodology must take into account that “messy objects” as cultural parks need a holistic, long-term ethnographic approach because these can mean different things for each actor. Also, the methodology should combine an etic (broad or common) and emic (culture specific) approach (Morris et al. 1999), working at two levels. The first would comprise structured interviews in order to establish similar patterns of analysis to facilitate inter-contextual comparison. At the second level, free and semi-structured interviews should be carried out (see King & Horrocks 2009) enabling to “follow the actors” instead of merely collecting data to fit a hypothesis (Sørensen 2009).
8. Conclusions

Most authors who have written on the subject agree that the most innovative feature of cultural parks is that they place landscape at the heart of planning efforts. More specifically, they rely on the idea of cultural landscape which itself incorporates a broad notion of heritage or “territorial heritage”. Supposedly, in this way cultural parks move beyond the dichotomies between nature-culture, intangible-tangible, etc., so clearly embodied by the traditional national parks or nature reserves. In theory, the prevailing role of landscape should prevent the process of economic development and touristification that every cultural park entails from breaking with the local communities’ activity and cultural forms of self-representation.

The investigation has attempted to show that the picture is more complex. The purpose of the review of the notions of landscape and cultural landscape was to show how their roots lie in modern epistemology and how their development was parallel to that of the scientific paradigm. Although the “landscape” can overcome certain dichotomies such as nature-culture, it reintroduces others because it implicitly carries the notions of “material territorial reality” and at the same time the “visual representation” of that reality. Therefore, it is necessary to re-establish their unity and close the gap opened up at the heart of landscapes by the modern Humboldtian appraisal of them.

Also, it is usual to articulate the landscape in cultural parks following the problematic linguistic duality of signifier-signified: the landscape as an expression of memory and identity. In fact, the conception of landscape has historically oscillated between objectivism and subjectivism depending on the epistemological trend or social
agent that interpreted and put it to work. On one side, the subjectivist paradigm has evolved from the connotative interpretations of romanticism to the phenomenological and social constructivist positions (see Wylie 2007). On the other, objectivist trends starting from the denotative interpretations of Enlightenment endured in positivist approaches and in technical disciplines. This latter utilitarian perspective has been assumed by institutions and States since the eighteenth century. It was also embraced by the hard sciences, which needed to maintain an autonomous idea of nature to avoid a universal social constructivism that would threaten the isolation of their object of study (Chouquer 2007).

For its part, UNESCO (Rössler 2006) added “cultural landscape” to its categories, endorsing definitely the hybridization between heritage and landscape according to Western standards. The questionable objectivist standpoint of UNESCO does not go into contentious areas such as management or ownership, opening the door to the management of “cultural landscapes” in different ways and with clear economic purposes. Cultural parks represent one of these forms of management. They provide a cultural landscape with a structure and organisation, linking a material state of affairs (e.g. a beautiful vineyard valley) with a discourse (e.g. UNESCO’s discourse on “organically evolved landscapes” as valuable) and extracting an economic rent from it.

All the aforementioned contradictions and epistemic inheritances from modernity are reflected in the crucial question that every cultural park has huge problems to deal with, that is, how to translate “landscape identity” into spatial and heritage planning. The fact that local groups and various stakeholders can participate in the process of implementation and management of the cultural park facilitates this task. However, it is difficult to assess to what extent is local people involved and which specific groups are
the most active in the process. Nonetheless, this possibility is not really an original contribution of cultural parks but stems from a number of issues. On one hand, transformations in the economy and forms of governmentality have left a prospect of weak States that gives way to the intervention of different agents with more weight in the territory. On the other hand, changes in scientific paradigms and subsequently in the conceptualisation of heritage, museums, parks and protected areas are determining. Thus, open-air museums, networked museums and ecomuseums condition the development of cultural parks. Similarly, managers of national and nature parks are gradually abandoning the idea of the park as an isolated wildlife sanctuary with clear limits, therefore trying to connect it with local communities and society at large.

Under these premises, cultural parks began to emerge during the 1990s conforming to different criteria in Europe and the U.S. Also, their forms and structures are highly heterogeneous due to the wide variety of local articulations and the participation of different social agents in their implementation. This reality renders cultural parks highly political entities. Externally, they require funding, political negotiation, bureaucratic management and institutional support. Internally, their performance is tied to the politics of identity because they link heritage with representations of identity and memory that may play a role in issues of social inclusion and exclusion. The situation becomes more intricate if the park narrates a story as in the American National Heritage Areas.

The research has tried to show how the technical approaches and their theoretical foundations used so far to account for the complexity of cultural parks do not suffice to understand them. It is not that these are wrong, but they only provide a partial view of cultural parks. Something that would also happen if the researcher places himself on the
other side and conceives cultural parks as social constructions (see Carman 1995 on heritage as social construction). Therefore, to build the theoretical image of cultural parks I have tried to follow Latour (1993a) and adopt a symmetric stance whereby a cultural park becomes a technical and a social entity, a set of objects, negotiations and exchanges.

A purely technical perspective like the ones deployed by Sabaté, Frenchman or Bustamante overlook that every technical project involves a series of parallel social processes that render it possible and keep it alive. Thus, the technical procedures are in constant dialogue and engagement not only with the material realities they deal with and shape, but with different social actors. Therefore, it is trivial to give a technical explanation of the performance of cultural parks to which some “external” social and political components are added later. Equally, it is useless to focus on social issues and the “social construction” of cultural parks without considering the technical aspects.

Hence, it should be assumed that the material and technical framework is socially negotiated. Then, to keep the symmetry it should be recognized that the own cultural park can also enrol and incorporate different social actors in its development. Consequently, the cultural park has agency and ontological potential to create new territorial truths that decentre previous equilibriums (Law 2004). They can create delimited frameworks with “new sets of rules” (Serres 1982) where it is easier to individuate particular issues to deal with (Latour 2005a).

From this perspective, it becomes unproductive to try to “purify” cultural parks seeking to identify and individuate their functions. For instance, the researcher should not aim to unravel and neatly separate what is culture and what is economy within
cultural parks in order to “judge” and criticise their performance if they tend to focus on economic objectives that entail the commodification of heritage. This would imply the introduction of preconceived notions and contexts from outside the assemblage determining what it means and what is to be done with heritage, culture, nature, economy, etc. Instead, the researcher’s work should be to follow those agents involved in the creation of the cultural park and to investigate how other actors are involved in different ways, joining or disengaging from the project. Only in this manner it is possible to understand how social actors create different categories, attach meanings, decide what are landscape and heritage, culture and nature, and what to do with them. From this stance, the investigation would probably reveal that local conceptualizations diverge from the researcher’s own preconceptions, a situation that leads to an encounter that generates knowledge.

Also, the idea of what is and what to do with heritage varies in accordance to the different evaluations and classifications. The inventories elaborated in cultural parks define what heritage consists of. A further selection organises them in a hierarchy based on their value and utility in relation to the story or the goals pursued. This categorization can be challenged and can either match or not the representations of local communities, the criteria of heritage experts and tourists. Thus, the axis of the debate must be rethought in different terms. The question is not whether or not heritage represents the memory and identity of a community, but why is there a need to bring them together, for what purposes, how is it negotiated and among which actors, how would the material reality of the place be affected, and so on. In short, how heritage is assembled into a larger framework where it has also agency, the capacity to engage stakeholders around it.
Finally, for a cultural park to be constituted and stay active it must be located at the “intersection” where the wills of different social actors converge. At present, the “active principle” of cultural parks lies in the intersection of a growing number of heterogeneous social groups and institutions across the U.S. and Europe. It is at this intersection where the researcher should situate her/himself, half way between technical objects and social interests, in order to account for the exchanges and relations between them. The concept of assemblage enables us to assume an intermediate position, without prioritising any of the two fields.

In hindsight, this investigation has allowed me to focus, formulate and conceive cultural parks as a concrete research problem now open for future research and academic scrutiny. In this regard, almost everything remains still to be done.
9. Appendices

Appendix 1. Definitions of Landscape

- Tim Ingold (1993): “Landscape, in short, is not a totality that you or anyone else can look at, it is rather the world in which we stand in taking up a point of view on our surroundings. And it is within the context of this attentive involvement in the landscape that the human imagination gets to work in fashioning ideas about it”.

- Evans, M.J., Roberts, A, Nelson, P. (2001): “Landscapes are “symbolic environments” that people create to give meaning and definition to their physical environment”.

- Sánchez Palencia & Pérez García (1996): “Landscape is a cultural creation, not only for the society that constructed it but also to contemporary society that approaches it”.

- Marc Antrop (2006): “Landscape encompasses more than an area of land with a certain use or function. I consider landscape as a synthetic and integrating concept that refers both to a material-physical reality, originating form a continuous dynamic interaction between natural processes and human activity, and to the immaterial existential values and symbols of which the landscape is the signifier”.

- Wikipedia (access January 20, 2011): “Landscape comprises the visible features of an area of land, including the physical elements of landforms, water bodies such as rivers, lakes and the sea, living elements of land cover including indigenous vegetation, human elements including land uses, buildings and structures, and transitory elements such as lighting and weather conditions”.

- Milton Santos (1997):
- “Landscape is the realm of the visible. It is not only constituted by volumes, but also by colours, movements, smells, sound, etc. Landscape is the collection of objects that our body grasps and identifies.”

- “Landscape comprises the reality that can be visually perceived from a point of observation. It is constituted by natural and human elements, presents a dynamic character and is the product of human work and history”.

  - Joan Nogue (2007): “Landscape is a physical reality and the cultural representation we make of it. It comprises the geographic physiognomy of a territory along with all the human and natural elements present on it. Also, landscape comprises all the sentiments and emotions arisen when it is contemplated. In conclusion, landscape is socially constructed, as the cultural projection of a society in a limited space determined from a material, spiritual and symbolic dimension”.

  - Roberto Barocchi (1982) “Landscape is the form of the environment”.

  - Vázquez Varela & Martínez Navarro (2008): “Landscape is the phenomenological expression of social and natural processes in a given time, directly related to the spatial planning of productive as well as cultural activities, according to the varying social options that apply”.

**Appendix 2. Definitions of Cultural Landscape**

  - María Ángeles Layuno (2007): “Against natural landscapes, cultural landscapes, imply a human contribution, that is, the modification or transformation of landscape by human action over time”.

98
• Almudena Orejas (2001): “Cultural landscape is a kind of cultural asset whose value lies in the combination of the natural and the cultural realms, that is, the interaction between people and their surrounding environment”.

• Charles Birnbaum and N.P.S. (1994): “a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values”.

• Ballesteros Arias, Otero Vilariño and Varela Pousa (2004): “Cultural landscape is a part of the territory containing different natural, historic, monumental and archaeological elements. It comes into being only when it is appreciated by the observer. The gaze builds the landscape. Without an observer and a code landscape is only a space”.

• Peter Fowler (2003): “Memorial to the unknown worker”.

• Carl Sauer (1925): “The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape the result”.

• Joaquin Sabaté (2006): “Cultural landscape is a geographic ground associated to an event, an activity or a historical character, containing aesthetic and cultural values”.

• Ministry of Culture, Government of Spain (n.d.): Cultural landscape is the result of human activity in a particular territory, whose component parts are:
  1. Natural substratum (orography, soils, vegetation, hydrography...).
  2. Human action: modification and/or alteration of natural elements and constructions with a determinate scope.
  3. Kind of activity performed in the area (a functional component in relation with economy, beliefs, culture, ways of life...).
• Ramón Buxó (2006): “Cultural landscapes are multidimensional constructions resulting from the interaction between certain historical structures and contingent processes”.

• California State Park scheme (n.d.): “Cultural landscapes portray how humans have used and adapted natural resources over time, whether through agricultural, mining, ranching and settlement activities, or traditional Native American cultural practices”.

• Fernández Mier and Díaz López (2006): “Cultural Heritage currently incorporates the territory, because territory is the natural and humanized landscape, a product of the human alteration of the environment in order to obtain the necessary resources to enable its survival and to progress in the organization and economic sustain of the society. This is what we mean by cultural landscape”.

• Michael O'Flaherty (n.d.): “Since all people have a (cultural) relationship to land and its other inhabitants, the term "cultural landscape" is redundant. Our goal should not be to defend the simple fact that landscapes are cultural but to find ways to describe the myriad of relations and their interaction with one another”.

• Jaume Domenech (2005): “Cultural landscapes are the outcome of a continuous and gradual sedimentation of historic socio-economic processes, reflecting the growth of a society in a territory. We should not discuss about landscape, art or heritage without taking into account the protagonism of man in the territory. Man is the actor and agent of the transformations that leave traces in the landscape”.

Appendix 3. Definitions of Cultural Park / Heritage Area

• Aragón Cultural Park Act (1997): “A territory containing relevant cultural heritage elements that are integrated within a geographic environment of singular
ecological and natural value, that will enjoy of promotion and protection as a whole, with specific measures for the protection of the aforementioned relevant heritage elements”.

- Joaquín Sabaté (2009): “I understand Heritage Park as an tool to Project and manage, to recognize and enhance an specific Cultural Landscape, whose aim is not only to preserve heritage or to promote education, but also to favor local economic development”.

- Joaquín Sabaté (2004b): “A Cultural Park implies the necessity to ensure the preservation of heritage assets and to enhance and value them in order to foster economic development within a particular Cultural Landscape”.

- Leonel Pérez Bustamante and Claudia Parra Ponce (2004):
  - “Heritage Park is an initiative or project that privileges the production of an image that grants an identity to a territory, where heritage along with other natural and cultural resources are combined, presented, and promoted intentionally in order to form a patterned landscape that tells the story of such territory and its dwellers”.
  - “Heritage Park is a concept with the implicit notion of “project”. As such, it entails the composition of an image contributing to the enhancement of territorial identity providing the territory with some elements that facilitate economic development”.

- Pascual Rubio Terrado (2008): “The Cultural Park constitutes an evolution of the traditional enclosed museum, or “museum-institution”, of historic and anthropological character, that extends throughout a whole territory. It can be likened to a field with specific common characteristics in the majority of the cultural manifestations present on it. Therefore, the essence of a Cultural Park is the territory that represents the complex workings of a determinate culture through a varied array of forms and elements. Each Cultural Park is configured according to all the cultural
manifestations present in the territory, whether material (archaeological sites, monuments, landscapes, etc.) or intangible (beliefs, habits, folklore, etc.). Local participation is essential for the enhancement and protection of heritage and for the consolidation of the Park”.

• Jane Daly (2003): “While the language can be confusing, the basic principle is not. Heritage areas are dynamic regional initiatives that build connections between people, their place and their history. These connections are strengthened by capturing and telling the stories of the people and their place. These stories, when linked together, reflect a regional identity and support a collective awareness of the need to protect and enhance what makes our places unique. They give rise to opportunities for economic development that promote and preserve the region’s assets”.

• Peyton Knight (2006b): “But what is a National Heritage Area? In short, it is a pork barrel earmark that harms property rights and local governance. Let me explain why that is. Heritage Areas have boundaries. They are very definite boundaries, and they have very definite consequences for folks who reside within them. What happens when a Heritage Area bill passes is that a management entity is tasked with drawing boundaries around a particular region and then coming up with a management plan for the area”.

• Rosemary Prola (2005): “The heritage area movement in the United States represents a strategy for protecting heritage that transcends the traditional focus of historic preservation of structures and sites to encompass the conservation of their historic, cultural, and natural contexts. Heritage areas are founded on the concept that the best way to preserve historic and cultural landscapes is through partnerships and community participation. With its concern for creating sustainable local economies as a means of resource protection, the heritage area movement incorporates current historic preservation practice, which is increasingly concerned with revitalizing “main streets,”
bringing back urban neighborhoods, and protecting farmland, with landscape-scale conservation, interpretation and tourism”.

- Paul M. Bray (1988): “Heritage areas are multi-resource urban and regional settings with a coherence or distinctive sense of place based on factors like rivers, lakes, transportation systems (canal and historic railroad lines) and cultural heritage. They have been called partnership parks because of the diversity of stakeholders (including private land owners, NGOs and multiple units of governments and functional governmental agencies) involved in the planning and management for the area's intersecting goals of preservation, recreation, education and sustainable economic development like cultural and eco-tourism. Successful heritage areas keep current residents in the forefront in terms of ownership, control and celebration”.

- San Francisco Planning Department (n.d.): “Heritage Areas feature historic and cultural resources that are integral with their geography. The combined landscape and development of a Heritage Area tells a story”.

- National Park Service (n.d.): “A national heritage area is a place designated by the United States Congress where natural, cultural, historic, and recreational resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography. These areas tell nationally important stories about our nation and are representative of the national experience through both the physical features that remain and the traditions that have evolved with them”.

- Brenda Barrett and Suzanne Copping (2004): “Heritage areas and heritage corridors are large-scale living landscapes where community leaders and residents have come together around a common vision of their shared heritage”.

- Rafael Martínez Valle (2000): “What is a cultural park? It is an approach to landscape that focuses on the relations between human beings and their environment. The cultural park as a museum can be equated with what Querol defined as an archaeological
park. However, in cultural parks the archaeological heritage is only one element among others”.

- Burillo, F., Ibañez, E.J., and Polo. C. (1994): “Cultural landscapes represent a total archaeology: they a single thematic unit that is distributed throughout a territory. Then, the philosophy is to foster rural development on the basis of research and heritage”.

- Ewa Bergdahl (2005): “A cultural park contributes to the economic development of a region, a unusual objective for a traditional museum. Thus, cultural parks are projected towards the future”.

- Heritage Act of the Comunidad Valenciana (1998): “A space containing significant cultural heritage elements integrated within a environment with relevant landscape and ecological values”.

- Matilde González Méndez (1997): “In contrast to archaeological parks, cultural parks strive for the protection and promotion of larger areas with more of a cultural presence than that found in archaeological remains and their surroundings. They therefore promote the control of the archaeological historical and natural resources in large areas. A cultural park is more than a single site within a group of natural and historical resources in an area which may be opened for public use”.

- Almudena Orejas (2001): “A cultural park is an open and dynamic support to address the cultural, social and economic enhancement of cultural landscape. It is an instrument that coordinates and integrates the interests of researchers, heritage administrations and diverse publics, working as an useful framework for the protection and management of heritage”.

- Battaglini G., Orejas, A. Clavel-Lévêque, M. (2002): “A cultural park must be able to bring together many different elements while at the same time constituting itself as a dynamic reality. The park must also integrate the present to propose potential ways
of change in relation with the past elements. Also, the park must become a living landscape able to conduct visitors from the present territories to the ancient ones … parks are structured on a geo-historical space and around a specific theme from a central reference: an archaeological area, a site, or a regional complex”.

Appendix 4. The Val di Cornia Partnership Cultural Park.

This appendix presents and briefly analyses the constitution and evolution of the Val di Cornia cultural park. This case study cannot be considered as a “test proof” of the methodology developed in the dissertation because no fieldwork has been carried out. Instead, my aim is to illustrate how a cultural park is created in practice, thus complementing the more theoretical perspective assumed in the dissertation. I have chosen the Val di Cornia because I know well the area (I spent six months there working as an archaeologist) and because I consider the book “Un’impresa per sei parchi” (Casini & Zucconi 2003) the best work carried out to date focusing on a single cultural park. In fact, the book reflects the conception of the park as it brings together contributions from the wide array of professionals involved in its development. Also, the authors insist in considering the park as an ongoing process that needs to be constantly updated and rethought.

The Val di Cornia region and the park.

The Val di Cornia is a coastal area located in the south of the region of Toscana (Italy), comprising five city councils with a chief urban centre called “Piombino”. The area has been known since medieval times for its intensive dedication to the steel and, more recently, the iron industries. Most people in the area worked in the industry sector
during the twentieth century. However, the 1980s brought about a worldwide crisis of the iron industry that affected directly the Val di Cornia. Consequently, unemployment and social unrest rocketed during that decade. For some politicians and professionals, the only way out of the economic downturn would be the focus on agricultural production and tourism (Casini & Zucconi 2003: 6). Accordingly, since the late 1980s large areas of the region comprising archaeological remains, coastal areas, forests and mountains were subjected to a public regime of protection through expropriation or voluntary transfer (idem: 23). The outcome of this process was the creation of different parks owned directly by the city councils.\textsuperscript{31} Since then on, many other areas and archaeological remains have fallen under public control. Obviously, the process was not devoid of controversy as many people thought that investments should be directed to the maintenance of the industrial and extractive sectors, whose activities were irreconcilable with the creation of the park due to the high environmental damage and degradation that they entailed.

Notwithstanding this contentious issue, the idea of the park gained popular support during the early 1990s. Instead of focusing solely on conservation policies and the creation of “protected areas”, the promoters of the park moved towards an active position aiming at the development and enhancement of certain environmentally and historically valuable sites (idem: 50). Accordingly, the promoters sought a form of management that enabled them to holistically consider issues of heritage, infrastructures, residential and industrial spaces, tourism, services, landscape and archaeology. Finally the “Parks of Val di Cornia Partnership” was created in 1993 with the following objective: “To activate the Val di Cornia Parks framework through the

\textsuperscript{31} Namely, the Archaeological Park of Populonia and the Coastal Park of Sterpaia in Piombino, the Coastal Park of Rimigliano in San Vincenzo, the Mining Archaeological Park of Sal Silvestro in Campiglia Marittima, the Natural Park of Montioni in Suvereto and the Forestal Park of Poggio Neri in Sassetta.
creation of the necessary management facilities and services located in the affected areas, promoting the protection and development of social, economic and territorial cohesion”32 (idem: 5). The Val di Cornia became one more of the 25 areas considered as “Cultural Parks” by the Toscana region, subsequently receiving funding from it and later on from the E.U. as well (AAVV 1995). Then, without going into detail, it is easy to identify in Val di Cornia the main issues at work in most cultural parks:

- The project starts as a consequence of the transition from industrial-productive economies to post-productive economies based on the service sector.
- The project is based on the assumption of an extended idea of “heritage and territorial value” that underpins the whole process.
- The project entails a shift from the preservationist stance focusing on the creation of natural parks to the active and entrepreneurial management of heritage as a “resource”.
- Economy is considered at two levels. The first focuses on direct profits from museums, parks or touristic expenditure mainly. But the second level takes into account the added value of the “identity of the region” that only heritage can provide (see Casini & Zucconi 2003: 165)33

**Structures and functioning of the park**

The governing body of the parks of Val di Cornia is a complex structure that brings together many professionals from different fields of expertise such as economy, management, archaeology, biology, curatorial studies, sociology or engineering. Also, many features of the park are original in the European context and entail a rethinking of

---

32 Translated from Italian by the author.
33 See Scheme 26
concepts of heritage, territory and management, in some cases with clear political connotations.

The partnership and the relation with other institutions.

The Val di Cornia is the first entrepreneurial partnership created by city councils with the participation of private companies in Italy (idem: 7). In Italy and many other European countries the parks are established through complex bureaucratic procedures involving national and regional institutions that subtract powers to local governments. Instead, in Val de Cornia the parks are the direct emanation of the city councils: their delimitation, roles, interventions, management and planning are carried out by the partnership. Therefore, Val di Cornia has clearly chosen a framework whereby the local government becomes an autonomous entity that not only grants some public services but decides how to plan its own future in a complex manner, establishing an equal relation with different other bodies such as the regional, national or European institutions, the universities and the specific public Boards of Archaeological and Cultural Heritage. Clearly, this stands in opposition with the Italian Constitution that endows the State with competences on cultural goods and the Regions with competences on tourism. Moreover, in the late 1990s the development of the park transcended to the political level with the creation of a political institution called “circondario” (district) that brings together the five city councils and does not fit with the traditional administrative framework of the Italian State. The situation created in the region thanks to the development of the park is not only due to a political stance, but is related to pragmatic concerns. As the authors state, the regional and national governments lack the necessary rapidity to respond to the necessities of a decaying

---

34 However, there are attempts at present to move towards a greater decentralisation of the Italian State that would grant more competences to the regions.
Consequently, discussions revolving around issues of ownership of cultural and natural heritage become secondary. What is at stake is to understand how to manage these resources successfully in order to generate profits, employment and provide high quality services for the population. Accordingly, the partnership of the park manages archaeological sites owned by the State, historic buildings property of the Province and forests of the Region, thus avoiding sectoral policies and overlapping competences. Instead, the guiding motto has been “integration” (idem: 8). First, the integration of both natural and cultural goods. The park distinguishes clearly both at the discursive and the practical level of management between nature and culture: some areas are “natural” and other areas are “cultural” or “archaeological” (idem: 119-122). Secondly, traditional “cultural services” such as natural preservation, museums or restoration are integrated with the ownership of hotels, restaurants and commercial services at large, thus enabling the park to be economically sustainable. The promoters consider the partnership model as a solution for the problems that managing territorial networks of cultural heritage entails (idem: 38)

Therefore, the promoters of the park reject the traditional vision of heritage as a pristine element owned and preserved by the State. Heritage is for them a “resource” or “cultural asset” that underlies the whole enhancement process in a wide conceptualization: for instance, the promoters take into account that contemporary industrial factories can become valuable assets in the future in the form of industrial
heritage. They do not discuss ownership but management, what is at stake for them is to provide new opportunities for local people and to generate a new territorial identity.

In parallel, they consider that the neo-liberal model whereby public institutions are in charge of the expenditures derived from taking care of cultural heritage whereas the private sector collects profits is outdated. For them, the only possibility of achieving a real sustainability lies in a fair share of expenditure and profit between the private and public sectors. Moreover, the public sector should work following entrepreneurial models of flexibility and mobility. This model facilitates the partial self-funding of the partnership and the redistribution of benefits towards university-led research. Indeed, the establishment of the park has significantly increased the investments on culture-related activities and research in an area without a tradition of heritage or nature enhancement due to the historical focus on industry.

The role of archaeology and research

In the case of the Val di Cornia it could be said that archaeology was one of the main catalysts for the development of the cultural park, a fact that cannot be separated from the figure of the medieval archaeologist Riccardo Francovich. For him, archaeology is conceived as a tool that could and should be linked to social action. Accordingly, the archaeological charts of the south of Toscana ceased to be mere inventories of sites and took the form of landscape archaeology to deal with issues of spatial change and planning that could be linked with current forms of spatial and heritage planning (Francovich et al. 2001). Something that promoters in Val di Cornia bear in mind themselves, as they believe that archaeologists need to expand the scope of their research if they are to discuss face to face with politicians and planners (Casini &
Zucconi 2003: 80): “It is therefore asked to archaeologists to work according to their own methods, but at the same time to adequa te their own work to the exigencies of landscape architecture and spatial planning … The University admits, then, that to affirm the independency of scientific research does not entail setting aside the socio-economic problems of the area where research is carried out” (idem: 81).

Thus, for Francovich "incisive archaeological research should not only involve those who work in it, but also the territorial policies widely. There cannot be a policy for the protection of archaeological and heritage goods without taking into account issues of urbanism and planning” (Francovich 2003). Then, all research conducted in Southern Toscana was included within an overall strategic plan, integrated through the pioneering use of GIS software at the service of public institutions (Francovich 2002; Francovich & Valenti 1999).

In fact, the Val di Cornia Park builds on the previous archaeological work carried out in the area. The origins of many of the “cultural parks” of the partnership lie in the diggings conducted by Francovich in the area, which culminated in the development of the archaeological park of Rocca San Silvestro (Francovich & Jamie 1995). In this case, archaeology is in charge of telling “different stories for the same network” in the park, providing an scientific narrative for the whole territory that serves as a basis for the enhancement process (Casini & Zucconi 2003: 89). However, this fact does not entail the “reinvention” of an exclusionary identity for the region. Rather, it merely highlights some of the processes that leave traces in the landscape, some of which have endured until recent times as the iron industry, which is present in the area since medieval times (Francovich 2003). Similarly, the identity put forward by the park has overcome the regionalisms that had begun to emerge since the steel industry crisis claiming that the
creation of a new province in the area of Val di Cornia was necessary and the localisms that fostered competition between the different cities in the area (Casini & Zucconi 2003: 47).

At the same time, the economic success of the initiative has ensured the continuity of archaeological works, heritage enhancement and research. Subsequently, archaeology has really become “public” and has installed itself in the daily life of the place: in education, world view, imagination, the relationship with the environment and so on. Therefore, archaeology does not only play a role in providing a “narrative of identity” to the area but also participates in processes of decision and management of the park and the territory.

**Assembling Val di Cornia**

In this final section I apply the concept of “assemblage” to the park of Val di Cornia. As previously mentioned, the scope of this analysis is limited and its aim is to illustrate briefly some of the concepts and topics exposed above. It is necessary to understand that the park is an ongoing process that will never be finished, as it is constantly improving and posing new objectives for the future. The assemblage traces the main elements that play a role in the development of the park and analyses them symmetrically without getting rid of their complexity.

- **Content substance** comprises all the elements that are brought together and re-arranged by the park structure through expropriation or voluntary transfer, ranging from natural and coastal areas, hotels, restaurants, residential and productive areas, roads,
archaeological remains, re-utilised buildings and the dwellers of the area, specially unemployed ex-workers of the iron industry.

**- Content form** establishes how the elements are arranged into a new co-functioning system. In Val di Cornia this is the more politically charged area of the assemblage instead of **expression form**, which refers to ideological and discursive issues. The park has challenged traditional forms of territorial and heritage management practices in Italy putting forward a novel view focusing on local autonomy and down to top planning strategies. Moreover, the promoters have set out a management structure whereby both public and private sector share loses and profits. The local promoters have organised the elements to fit entrepreneurial models of management that revert in the local economy thanks to the profit generated by tourism and investments. The plan of the whole region has drawn on an archaeological understanding of the territory that places landscape in the centre of its research agenda. However, architects and spatial planners have decided to divide the management of nature and culture into clear-cut administrative sections working with different frameworks and getting rid of the idea of “landscape”. However, they have integrated the whole set of elements into a large scheme whereby hotels, tourism and marketing are in close contact with researchers from different universities and the local population.

**- Expression form** is related with the discursive and ideological elements present in the park. In Val di Cornia there is not an all encompassing narrative. Instead, the prevailing motto is “many stories into one network” (Casini & Zucconi 2003: 81). The stories are based on scientific research carried out by archaeologists mainly and are restricted to the archaeological sites. The promoters put effort into changing the external perception of the area, traditionally regarded as an industrial region. The aim of the park is therefore to “look for a new identity for the area” (idem: 41) and to shift towards a model of leisure-tourism that enables to relate the park with nature preservation and
cultural activity. Then, it can be said that the denomination works as an umbrella under which all the resources are assembled and managed as a system to fit into a new model based on a link between heritage and identity.

- **Expression content** comprises the discourses assembled into the park that, in turn, are reinforced and put to work by it. The main discourses are related with the need to fight for the autonomy of local communities and the need to share profits and expenditures between the private and public sectors. But also there is a declared will to bring the public sector into entrepreneurial private management schemes. Therefore, discourses on efficiency, flexibility, results culture, mobility, economic diversification mingle with discourses on heritage and landscape preservation and enhancement. Consequently, the overall discourse of the park fits with the model of an integrated view of culture and leisure.

The view offered here is clearly partial as it has been already mentioned. However, it shows how cultural parks are complex enterprises that use heritage to produce a significant territorial shift towards post-productivist economic models based on the couple “culture and leisure”. Thus, in cultural parks heritage cannot be isolated from other elements: the role it plays depends on many other factors and, in fact, the concept pervades the whole assemblage. That is, everything “tends” to become heritagised, from the abstract identity, the coastal and forest areas, the archaeological sites, the agricultural products, the villages to the recently abandoned steel factories.

Clearly, the park is not just the product of a “technical” arrangement of the territory. Despite these issues can only be accounted for through ethnographic fieldwork, there must be many social bounds and a high degree of cohesion between different actors to sustain such a complex project. This is not to say that the plan is
devoid of controversy. However, it is not possible to assess the relation between the representation generated by the promoters and the perception of local people without carrying out fieldwork. Finally, analysing cultural parks can prove useful for researchers to understand how “heritage” cannot be isolated from the complex assemblages that give meanings and values to it and extract profit from it through different practices. In cultural parks, heritage is the product of a social construction as much as it is the outcome of a complex technical procedure.

**Appendix 5. Tables and schemes**

The classifications of cultural parks have been developed according to different patterns. Actually, I agree with Bitonti (2008) that classifications are only useful when typologies can be linked with their potential social and political effects. However, only ethnographic research on cultural parks can offer this possibility. Thus, assuming that the typological approach provided is tentative, it can provide a useful outline that clarifies some of the issues exposed above.
**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape policy</td>
<td>An expression by the competent public authorities of general principles, strategies and guidelines that permit the taking of specific measures aimed at the protection, management and planning of landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape quality objective</td>
<td>The formulation by the competent public authorities of the aspirations of the public with regard to the landscape features of their surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape protection</td>
<td>Actions to conserve and maintain the significant or characteristic features of a landscape, justified by its heritage value derived from its natural configuration and/or from human activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape management</td>
<td>Action, from a perspective of sustainable development, to ensure the regular upkeep of a landscape, so as to guide and harmonise changes which are brought about by social, economic and environmental processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape planning</td>
<td>Strong forward-looking action to enhance, restore or create landscapes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Main definitions established by the ELC. Adapted from “European Landscape Convention” (Council of Europe 2000).*
**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literary Culture</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legends and stories (Shared narrations)</td>
<td>History (Documented narration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Culture</td>
<td>Place (Form + information)</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape (documented narration and form)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the formulation put forward by Joaquín Sabaté and Dennis Fenchman of cultural landscapes as a socially constructed expression of a “real place”. This binary conceptualisation is problematic as it reinstates new dichotomies while trying to overcome the previous “modern” ones. Adapted from Sabaté (2004b).
**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape designed and created by man</th>
<th>This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organically evolved landscape</td>
<td>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. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative cultural landscape</td>
<td>The inscription 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table with the categories of cultural landscapes defined by UNESCO. Adapted from Fowler (2003).*
**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Landscape Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Designed Landscape</strong></td>
<td>A landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, or horticulturist according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Vernacular Landscape</strong></td>
<td>A landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped that landscape. Through social or cultural attitudes of an individual, family or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of those everyday lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnographic Landscape</strong></td>
<td>A landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Site</strong></td>
<td>A landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person. Examples include battlefields and president's house properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table with the categories of cultural landscapes defined by the N.P.S.. Adapted from Birnbaum (1996)*
**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Landscapes N.P.S.</th>
<th>Cultural Criteria</th>
<th>Cultural Landscapes UNESCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Designed Landscape</td>
<td>(i) A masterpiece of human creative genius.</td>
<td>Landscape designed and created intentionally by man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Historic Vernacular Landscape | (ii) An important interchange of human value, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design. (iii) A unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or civilization, living or disappeared. (iv) An outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which – a key, and much misunderstood phrase, this – illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history. (v) An outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use, representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when under threat. | Organically evolved landscape:  
- A relict (or fossil) landscape  
- A continuing landscape |
| Ethnographic Landscape | (vi) Be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. | Associative cultural landscape |

*The table compares N.P.S. and UNESCO frameworks on cultural landscapes.*

*Adapted from Fowler (2003) and Birnbaum (1994).*
### TABLE 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1972-Industrial heritage and urban revitalisation projects</th>
<th>1980-Regional initiatives with focus on industrial heritage</th>
<th>1985-Heritage Canals and Rivers, territorial historical infrastructure</th>
<th>1990-Focus on landscapes</th>
<th>1996-Diversification of resources and themes, development of national/regional programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Paterson National Industrial District</td>
<td>-Oil Region SHP</td>
<td>-Illinois &amp; Michigan Canal NH Corridor</td>
<td>-IBA Emscher Park</td>
<td>-Ohio &amp;Erie NHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lowell National Historical Park</td>
<td>-National Road SH. Corridor - Lincoln</td>
<td>-Southwestern Pennsylvania NH Route</td>
<td>-Duisburg Nord LP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Beamish Open Air Museums</td>
<td>-Highway SH Corridor</td>
<td>-Delaware &amp; Lehigh NHC</td>
<td>-Ripoll FP</td>
<td>-Quinebaug &amp; Shetucket Valley NHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Dunaskin Open Air Museums</td>
<td>-Endless Mountains SHP</td>
<td>-IBA &amp; Furst Püeler Land</td>
<td>-IBA Routes</td>
<td>-Augusta Canal NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Rhondda Heritage Park</td>
<td>-California Citrus SHP</td>
<td>-Emscher Park</td>
<td>-Navás-Berga FP</td>
<td>-South Carolina NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-French Regional Park system</td>
<td>-Skagit Valley</td>
<td>-Ciaculli Palermo AP</td>
<td>-Ohio &amp;Erie NHC</td>
<td>-National Coal NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ironbridge Gorge OA Museums</td>
<td>-District Cumberland</td>
<td>-Baix Llobregat AP</td>
<td>-Colony Llobregat CP</td>
<td>-Cache La Poudre River Corridor NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-New Lanark WHS</td>
<td>-Military Park</td>
<td>-Grenoblois AP</td>
<td>-Essex NHA</td>
<td>-Aragon CP scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Hudson River Valley NHA</td>
<td>-Po FP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-Camín de la Mesa CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Lackawana Heritage Valley NHA</td>
<td>-Alba-Ter FP</td>
<td>-Automobile NHA</td>
<td>-Colonies Llobregat CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Allegeny Ridge SHP</td>
<td>-Camín de la Mesa CP</td>
<td>-Silos &amp; Smokiestacks NH Park</td>
<td>-Shenandoah Valley Battlefields NH District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Rivers of Steel NHA</td>
<td>-Val di Cornia CP</td>
<td>-Tennessee Civil war NHA</td>
<td>-Tennessee Civil war NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Schuykill NHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development of Heritage Areas and Cultural Parks. NHA: National Heritage Area NHC: National Heritage Corridor NHD: National Heritage District SHP: State**

**Heritage Park OAM: Open Air Museums EC: Ecomuseum FP: Fluvial Park, WHS**


**Source:** elaborated by the author from different sources.
**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Objectives</strong></th>
<th><strong>Local people</strong></th>
<th><strong>Wider context</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- “Set aside” for conservation, in the sense that the land (or water) is seen as taken out of productive use</td>
<td>- Planned and managed against the impact of people (except for visitors), and especially to exclude local people</td>
<td>- Developed separately—that is, planned one by one, in an ad hoc manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Established mainly for scenic protection and spectacular wildlife, with a major emphasis on how things look rather than how natural systems function</td>
<td>- Managed with little regard for the local community, who are rarely consulted on management intentions and might not even be informed of them</td>
<td>- Managed as “islands”—that is, managed without regard to surrounding areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Managed mainly for visitors and tourists, whose interests normally prevail over those of local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Placing a high value on wilderness—that is, on areas believed to be free of human influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- About protection of existing natural and landscape assets—not about the restoration of lost values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Governance</strong></th>
<th><strong>Management skills</strong></th>
<th><strong>Finance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Run by central government, or at least set up at instigation only of central government</td>
<td>- Managed by natural scientists or natural resource experts</td>
<td>- Paid for by the taxpayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Expert-led</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A classic model of protected areas. Adapted from Phillips (2002).*
### TABLE 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Local people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Run also with social and economic objectives as well as conservation and</td>
<td>- Run with, for, and in some cases by local people—that is, local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation ones.</td>
<td>are no longer seen as passive recipients of protected areas policy but as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Often set up for scientific, economic and cultural reasons—the rationale</td>
<td>active partners, even initiators and leaders in some cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for establishing protected areas therefore becoming much more sophisticated.</td>
<td>- Managed to help meet the needs of local people, who are increasingly seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Managed to help meet the needs of local people, who are increasingly seen</td>
<td>as essential beneficiaries of protected area policy, economically and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as essential beneficiaries of protected area policy, economically and</td>
<td>culturally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognizes that so-called wilderness areas are often culturally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important places.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- About restoration and rehabilitation as well as protection, so that lost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or eroded values can be recovered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Run by many partners, thus different tiers of government, local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities, indigenous groups, the private sector, NGOs, and others all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are all engaged in protected areas management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management technique</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Managed adaptively in a long-term perspective, with management being a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selection, planning, and management viewed as essentially a political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercise, requiring sensitivity, consultations, and astute judgment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paid for through a variety of means to supplement—or replace—government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsidy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main elements of the novel paradigm for protected areas. Adapted from  
**TABLE 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in Heritage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• From territorialisation of heritage to heritagisation of territory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Widening of the concept of heritage: spectacular growth in sites to be protected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change in the objectives of protection: from access to culture and enjoyment of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural goods to a functional economic standpoint focusing on revenue. Heritage as a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source for direct and indirect, tangible and intangible profit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing awareness among heritage professionals concerning the necessity of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interdisciplinary, institutional and local collaboration: need for a comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislation comprising environment, territory, heritage, landscape and ecology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in Territory and Space</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural landscapes as communicative places where stories and meanings can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attached to forms and spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural landscapes are viewed as non-renewable, increasingly scarce and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Against the widespread of non-places, the loss of meaning and globalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Parks become strongholds of identity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reaction against the consequences of the European Common Agricultural Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the shift from traditional to technological productivism: homogenisation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscapes due to the uniform way of working the land, growth of parcel surface,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disappearing of singular landscape symbols: walls, trees, hedges, paths, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also, there is an increasing number of fenced enclosures in contrast with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional openfield landscape: land is seen in terms of productivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing income gap between urban and rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Air, water and soil pollution, erosion and land abandonment entail an increase in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forest fires, abandonment of vernacular architecture houses, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural areas accumulate waste from wealthier urban areas, along with other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmentally and visually aggressive activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spatial planning policies take into account endogenous resources in order to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reinvent and render efficient withered territories: development is increasingly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on the singularity of territories and their social capital.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shift in focus on territorial policies. Whereas the paradigm of the XX century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stressed the importance of demographic and industrial development policies, in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the XXI century the main couple is a mix of nature and culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Social and spatial fragmentation and exclusion: growth of enclosed Parks and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaces, excluded social groups, social obsession for security and lack of open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and communicative spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New alternatives in spare time activities and tourism as a reaction to massive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rapprochement of urban culture to the rural and “urbanization” of the rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through the media. Growing demand of rural values from urban population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social demands of culture run in parallel with the commodification of it: culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as entertainment, linked to the concept of “Park”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public policies prioritize preservation and presentation to the public over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worry about the disappearing of “traditional” peasants as referents of vernacular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ideas, know-how, myths and symbols that provide meaning to their associated landscapes. This fact is related to depopulation in rural areas and deindustrialisation.

- Landscape as a source for environmental education and physical and psychological overall well being.
- Social acknowledgement of the value of landscape as a valuable externality, whose quality and worth decreases within market conditions. There is a need for public intervention in order to achieve an optimal equilibrium.
- Respect for local values and decisions in policy-making, fostering self-management according to sustainable development principles.
- Social awareness of the importance of the culture sector in the creation of employment and wealth.
- Environmentalist turn in developed countries.
- The politization of culture runs in parallel with the increasing social claim to have access to culture: development of “cultural rights”.
- Increasing social concern about aesthetics along with the disempowerment of ideology: a demand for the right to beauty.
- Social claim for a strengthening of the local identity against the global tendency to homogenization

### Summary of the main arguments put forward by different authors to explain or contextualize the appearance of cultural parks. Source: elaborated by the author from different sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National Heritage Area and State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Illinois &amp; Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Delaware &amp; Lehigh National Heritage Corridor PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Route (Path of Progress) PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Cane River National Heritage Area LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Quinebaug &amp; Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor CT &amp; MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Cache La Poudre River Corridor CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>America’s Agricultural Heritage Partnership IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Augusta Canal National Heritage Area GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Essex National Heritage Area NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>National Coal Heritage Area WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Ohio &amp; Erie Canal National Heritage Corridor OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>South Carolina National Heritage Corridor SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Tennessee Civil War Heritage Area TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Automobile National Heritage Area MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Wheeling National Heritage Area WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Schuykill River Valley National Heritage Area PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Erie Canalway National Heritage Area NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Blue Ridge National Heritage Area NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Mississippi Gulf Coast National Heritage Area MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>National Aviation Heritage Area OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Oil Region National Heritage Area PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arabia Mountain National Heritage Area GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Atchafalaya National Heritage Area LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Champlain Valley National Heritage Partnership NY &amp; VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage Area NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Freedom’s Frontier National Heritage Area KS &amp; MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Great Basin National Heritage Area NV &amp; UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor NC, SC, GA, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>National Mormon Pioneer Heritage Area UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Northern Rio Grande National Heritage Area NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>National Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area CT &amp; MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Abraham Lincoln NHA, P.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Journey through Hallowed Ground N.H.A. P.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Niagara Falls N.H.A. NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Susquehanna Gateway N.H.A. PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Valley NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sangre de Cristo NHA, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>South Park NHA, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Northern Plains NHA, ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Baltimore NHA, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Freedom's Way National Heritage Area, MA/NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Mississippi Hills National Heritage Area, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Mississippi Delta NHA, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Muscle Shoals NHA, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Kenai Mountains-Turnagain Arm NHA, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Buffalo Bayou NHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Heritage Areas:** year of designation and State. Source:
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### TABLE 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River</td>
<td>Lackawanna Heritage Valley NHA</td>
<td>Rivers of Steel NHA</td>
<td>IBA Emscher Park</td>
<td>Lowell NHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley NHC</td>
<td>Allegheny Ridge SHP</td>
<td>-Ohio &amp;Erie Canal</td>
<td>South Carolina NHA</td>
<td>New Lanark WHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Augusta Canal N.H.A.</td>
<td>N Heritage Corridor</td>
<td>Hudson River Valley NHA</td>
<td>Navás-Berga FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Oil Region SHP</td>
<td>-Automobile N.H.A.</td>
<td>Schuykill Heritage Corridor NHA</td>
<td>Skagit Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coal HA</td>
<td>Augusta Canal N.H.A.</td>
<td>-Essex N.H.A.</td>
<td>National Road Heritage Corridor</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware &amp; Lehigh NHC</td>
<td>Oil Region SHP</td>
<td>Ecomusee Le Creusot-Montceau</td>
<td>SHP</td>
<td>Enterprise District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois &amp; Michigan Canal</td>
<td>Beamish Open Air Museums</td>
<td>Les Mines</td>
<td>Toscana CP scheme</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHC</td>
<td>Dunaskin Open Air Museums</td>
<td>Ironbridge Gorge O A Museums</td>
<td>Aragón CP scheme</td>
<td>-Baix Llobregat AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache La Poudre River</td>
<td>Rhondda Heritage Park</td>
<td>Silos &amp; Smokestacks NH partnership</td>
<td>Lincoln Highway Heritage Corridor</td>
<td>-Alba-Ter FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor NHA</td>
<td>Ripoll FP</td>
<td>Grenoble AP</td>
<td>SHP</td>
<td>-Colonies Llobregat CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane River NHA</td>
<td>Sud Milano AP</td>
<td>IBA Routes Emscher Park</td>
<td>Endless Mountains S. Heritage Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg N. Military</td>
<td>Ciaculli Palermo AP</td>
<td>Emscher Park</td>
<td>-Po FP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Shenandoah Valley Battlefields NH District</td>
<td>Tennessee Civil War NHA</td>
<td>-Duisburg Nord LP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBA Fürst Pücler Land</td>
<td>-Quinebaug &amp; Shetucket</td>
<td>-California Citrus SHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bergslagen EC/CP</td>
<td>-Rivers Valley N Heritage Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camín de la Mesa CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Management framework of Heritage Areas and Cultural Parks. Source: elaborated by the author from different sources.*
**TABLE 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High formal value</th>
<th>High communicative potential</th>
<th>Low communicative potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reenacted sites</td>
<td>Scenifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruins and material remains</td>
<td>Traditional Museums and exhibitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heritage practices according to communicative and formal potential. From Sabaté (2004b).
TABLE 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linear (river, canal, historic route, etc.)</th>
<th>Homogeneous natural or administrative area</th>
<th>Decentralized network of Heritage elements</th>
<th>Monocentric projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Illinois &amp; Michigan Canal NHC</td>
<td>- Lackawanna Heritage Valley NHA</td>
<td>- Southwestern Pennsylvania NH Route</td>
<td>- Lowell NH Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Blackstone River Valley NHC</td>
<td>- National Coal HA</td>
<td>- South Carolina NHA</td>
<td>- Cane River NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IBA Emscher Park</td>
<td>- Allegheny Ridge SHP</td>
<td>- Quinebaug &amp; Shetucket Rivers Valley Heritage Corridor</td>
<td>- New Lanark WHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delaware &amp; Lehigh NHC</td>
<td>- Hudson River Valley NHA</td>
<td>- Automobile NHA</td>
<td>- Duisburg Nord LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ohio &amp; Erie Canal NHC</td>
<td>- Aragón CP scheme</td>
<td>- EC Le Creusot Montceau-Les Mines</td>
<td>- Beamish Open Air Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rivers of Steel NHA</td>
<td>- Toscana CP scheme</td>
<td>- Ironbridge Gorge O.A. Museums</td>
<td>- Dunaskin Open Air Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schuylkill Heritage Corridor NHA</td>
<td>- Essex NHA</td>
<td>- IBA Routes Emscher Park</td>
<td>- Rhondda Heritage Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National Road Heritage Corridor SHP</td>
<td>- Oil Region SHP</td>
<td>- Aragón CP scheme</td>
<td>- Skagit Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lincoln Highway Heritage Corridor SHP</td>
<td>- Endless Mountains SHP</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Augusta Canal NHA</td>
<td>- Silos &amp; Smokestacks NH Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cache La Poudre River Corridor NHA</td>
<td>- Tennessee Civil war NHA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Po FP</td>
<td>- Shenandoah Valley Battlefields NH District</td>
<td></td>
<td>- California Citrus SHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ripoll FP</td>
<td>- IBA Fürst Pücker Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ciakulli Palermo AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alba-Ter FP</td>
<td>- Grenoblois AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Baix Llobregat AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Navàs-Berga FP</td>
<td>- Val di Cornia CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gettysburg N Military Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bergslagen CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Camin de la Mesa CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Candestlick Point CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects classified according to their topological shape. Source: elaborated by the author from different sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Heritage: artistic or architectural</th>
<th>Territorial Heritage: Industrial, built and agricultural landscapes</th>
<th>Natural Heritage: natural areas, areas of ecological interest</th>
<th>Recreational areas with routes or scenic views and landscapes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Lowell NH Park</td>
<td>-Blackstone Valley NHC</td>
<td>-South Carolina NHA</td>
<td>-Illinois &amp; Michigan Canal NH Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Southwestern Pennsylvania NH Route</td>
<td>-Lincoln Highway Heritage Corridor SHP</td>
<td>-Quinebaug &amp; Shetucket Rivers Valley NH Corridor</td>
<td>-Ohio &amp; Erie Canal NH Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Allegheny Ridge SHP</td>
<td>-Tennessee Civil War NHA</td>
<td>-Po FP</td>
<td>-Cache La Poudre River Corridor NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Augusta Canal NHA</td>
<td>-IBA Emscher Park</td>
<td>-Alba-Ter FP</td>
<td>-Silos &amp; Smokestacks NH Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cane River NHA</td>
<td>-Rivers of Steel NHA</td>
<td>-New River American Heritage River</td>
<td>-Skagit Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-New Lanark WHS</td>
<td>-Delaware &amp; Lehigh NHC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Agriculture Enterprise District Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Duisburg Nord LP</td>
<td>-Schuykill Heritage Corridor NHA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-California Citrus SHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Beamish Open Air Museums</td>
<td>-Hudson River Valley NHA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Sud Milano AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-IBA Routes Emscher Park</td>
<td>-Toscana CP scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Baix Llobregat AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-National Road Heritage Corridor SHP</td>
<td>-Ironbridge Gorge O.A. Museums</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Louisville Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lincoln Highway Heritage Corridor SHP</td>
<td>-Navás-Berga FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Candestlick Point CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shenandoah Valley Battlefields NH District</td>
<td>-Val di Cornia CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Camin de la Mesa CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Gettysburg N. Military Park</td>
<td>-Bergslagen EC/CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Ripoll FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-National Coal HA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Essex NHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Oil Region SHP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Automobile N.H.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Endless Mountains SHP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Tennessee Civil War NHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-IBA Fürst Pücler Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Grenoblois AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification according to the prevailing type of heritage resource. Source: elaborated by the author from different sources.
### TABLE 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic development</th>
<th>Cultural preservation</th>
<th>Natural preservation</th>
<th>Education, interpretation and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Hudson River Valley NHA</td>
<td>- Delaware &amp; Lehigh NHC</td>
<td>- Quinebaug &amp; Shetucket Rivers Valley NHC</td>
<td>- Ironbridge Gorge Open Air Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rivers of Steel NHA</td>
<td>- Lackawanna Heritage Valley</td>
<td>- Oil Region Heritage Park</td>
<td>- Beamish Open Air Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ohio &amp; Erie Canal NHC</td>
<td>- Allegheny Ridge SHP</td>
<td>- Duisburg Nord Landscape Park</td>
<td>- Shenandoah Valley Battlefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South Carolina N.H.A.</td>
<td>- Navás -Berga FP</td>
<td>- Po FP</td>
<td>NH District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schuylkill Heritage Corridor SHP</td>
<td>- Automobile NHA</td>
<td>- Land Garden Show IBA</td>
<td>- Tennessee Civil war NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cache La Poudre River Corridor NHA</td>
<td>- Ripoll FP</td>
<td>- Nordstern Landscape Park IBA</td>
<td>- California Citrus SHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Augusta Canal NHA</td>
<td>- Essex NHA</td>
<td>- Lakeside park IBA</td>
<td>- Bergslagen EC/CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IBA Emscher Park</td>
<td>- Cane River NHA</td>
<td>- New Lanark WHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grenoblois AP</td>
<td>- Lowell NHP</td>
<td>- Lincoln Highway Heritage Corridor SHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Silos &amp; Smokestacks NH Partnership</td>
<td>- New Lanark SHP</td>
<td>- National Road Heritage Corridor SHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Baix Llobregat AP</td>
<td>- Endless Mountains SHP</td>
<td>- Endless Mountains SHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cisculli Palermo AP</td>
<td>- Skagit Valley</td>
<td>- Colonies Llobregat CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Agriculture Enterprise District Cumberland</td>
<td>- Val di Cornia CP</td>
<td>- Camín de la Mesa CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Val di Cornia CP</td>
<td>- Camín de la Mesa CP</td>
<td>- Blackstone River Valley NHC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Camín de la Mesa CP</td>
<td>- Camín de la Mesa CP</td>
<td>- Hudson River Valley NHA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification according to the predominant stated objective of the project.

However, in most cases all objectives are interrelated. Source: elaborated by the author from different sources.
**TABLE 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valley, region</th>
<th>Linear development (river, historic route, etc.)</th>
<th>Sub-region / group of local communities</th>
<th>Local area, historical site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Blackstone Valley NHC</td>
<td>-Illinois &amp; Michigan Canal NHC</td>
<td>-Lackawanna Heritage Valley NHA</td>
<td>-Augusta Canal NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IBA Emscher Park</td>
<td>-Delaware &amp; Lehigh NHC</td>
<td>-Allegheny Ridge S. Heritage Park</td>
<td>-Lowell N. Historical Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-South Carolina NHA</td>
<td>-Ohio &amp; Erie Canal NHC</td>
<td>-Oil Region SHP</td>
<td>-Cane River NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Quinebaug &amp; Shetucket Rivers Valley NHC</td>
<td>-Rivers of Steel NHA</td>
<td>-Val di Cornia CP</td>
<td>-New Lanark WHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-EC Le Creusot-Montceau-Les Mines</td>
<td>-Schuylkill Heritage Corridor NHA</td>
<td>-Endless Mountains SHP</td>
<td>-Duisburg Nord LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-National Coal Heritage Area</td>
<td>-Colonies Llobregat CP</td>
<td>-Cane River NHA</td>
<td>-Beamish Open Air Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Hudson River Valley NHA</td>
<td>-Southwestern Pennsylvania NH Route</td>
<td>-Essex NHA Automobile NHA</td>
<td>-Dunaskin Open Air Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Parco Fluviale del Po</td>
<td>-National Road Corridor SHP</td>
<td>-Ironbridge Gorge O. A. Museums</td>
<td>-Rhondda Heritage Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Proyecto Alba-Ter, FP</td>
<td>-Lincoln Highway Corridor SHP</td>
<td>-Skagit Valley</td>
<td>-Skagit Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Silos &amp; Smokestacks NH partnership</td>
<td>-Cache La Poudre River Corridor NHA</td>
<td>Agriculture Enterprise District</td>
<td>-Lackawanna Heritage Valley NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Tennessee Civil war NHA</td>
<td>-Ripoll FP</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>-Allegheny Ridge S. Heritage Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shenandoah Valley Battlefields NH District</td>
<td>-Navás-Berga FP</td>
<td>-Oil Region SHP</td>
<td>-Duisburg Nord LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBA Fürst Pücler Land</td>
<td>-IBA Routes, Emscher Park</td>
<td>-Val di Cornia CP</td>
<td>-Beamish Open Air Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Grenoblois, AP</td>
<td>-Camín de la Mesa CP</td>
<td>-Endless Mountains SHP</td>
<td>-Dunaskin Open Air Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Bergslagen EC/CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Cane River NHA</td>
<td>-Rhondda Heritage Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification according to the territorial scope of the project. Source: elaborated by the author from different sources.
**TABLE 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional park management framework</th>
<th>New tendencies in park management framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>- Set aside for conservation</td>
<td>- Run also with social and economic objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Established mainly for spectacular wildlife and scenic protection</td>
<td>- Often set up for scientific, economic, and cultural reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Managed mainly for visitors and tourist</td>
<td>- Managed with local people more in mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Valued as wilderness</td>
<td>- Valued for the cultural importance of so-called Wilderness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- About protection</td>
<td>- Also about restoration and rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td>- Run by central government</td>
<td>- Run by many partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local people</strong></td>
<td>- Planned and managed against people</td>
<td>- Run with, for, and in some cases by local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Managed without regard to local opinions</td>
<td>- Managed to meet the needs of local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider context</strong></td>
<td>- Developed separately</td>
<td>- Planned as part of national, regional and international systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Managed as “islands”</td>
<td>- Developed as “networks” (strictly protected areas, buffered and linked by green corridors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>- Viewed primarily as a national asset</td>
<td>- Viewed also as a community asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Viewed only as a national concern</td>
<td>- Viewed also as an international concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management techniques</strong></td>
<td>- Managed reactively within short timescale</td>
<td>-- Managed adaptively in long-term perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Managed in technocratic way</td>
<td>- Managed with political considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td>- Paid for by taxpayer</td>
<td>- Paid for from many sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management skills</strong></td>
<td>- Managed by scientists and natural resource experts</td>
<td>- Managed by multi-skilled individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Expert-led</td>
<td>- Drawing on local knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Summary of differences between park management frameworks. Adapted from Phillips (2003).*
TABLE 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1960+</th>
<th>1980+</th>
<th>1990+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of nature</td>
<td>-Wilderness</td>
<td>-Ecosystem; biodiversity; ecoregions</td>
<td>-Culture in nature and nature in culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental values</td>
<td>-Theocentric and anthropocentric</td>
<td>-Anthropocentric and cosmocentric</td>
<td>-Anthropocentric and cosmocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis of environmental problems</td>
<td>-Overpopulation; exceeding the land’s carrying capacity</td>
<td>-Poverty; overpopulation</td>
<td>-Power relations; North-South inequalities; what counts as a problem and to whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representations of local people</td>
<td>-People are the threat</td>
<td>-People can’t be ignored; people are a resource</td>
<td>-Align with rural people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions and technologies</td>
<td>-Exclusionary protected areas</td>
<td>-Buffer zones, integrated conservation and development programs; sustainable use; community-based conservation</td>
<td>-Alternative protected areas; participatory natural resource management; human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power relations</td>
<td>-Alliances with elites</td>
<td>-Thechnocratic alliances</td>
<td>-Alliances with grassroots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key influences</td>
<td>-Colonial conservation; elitist interests</td>
<td>-Sustainable development debate; growing concern for livelihoods</td>
<td>-Democracy / human rights movement; participatory development; post-modern influence on natural and social sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evolution of management practices during the last decades. Adapted from Sally Jeanrenaud (2002).
**SCHEME 19**

Lack of story.
Preservation of material reality.
Natural – Natural Parks
Unchanged landscape and heritage.
Territorialized.

1. Lack of story and enhancement of pre-existing landscape and heritage resources.

2. Scientific research serves as a base for the organization of the Cultural Park and the enhancement of its resources.

3. The Cultural Park is organized around a story based on scientific research.

4. The story prevails over scientific research. High degree of intervention and organization of the material resources into a hierarchy around the story.

5. High level of abstraction and intervention. There are re-enactments, restorations and new buildings. Scientific research subordinated to the story.

Abstract story
Change of material reality
Thematic Parks
High degree of intervention
Deterioralized

**Tentative classification of cultural Parks according to the negree of abstraction of the story. Source: author.**
Scheme summarising Joaquín Sabaté's view of cultural parks according to his "ideal cultural park" formulation. Source: author from Sabaté (2004b)
**SCHEME 21**

The scheme shows the different conceptions of the functioning of language according to Saussure and Hjemslev. Source: author.

**SCHEME 22**

**MICHEL FOUCAULT'S DISCIPLINARY SYSTEM ASSEMBLAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SUBSTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-discursive</td>
<td>The architecture of the prison.</td>
<td>The bodies of singular prisoners with their own properties and capacities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>The distribution of light and darkness in Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon principle.</td>
<td>The physical material required for the prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The practice of regimentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPRESSION</td>
<td>Penal law:</td>
<td>The discursive objects produced by the various definitions of “delinquency/criminality”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive</td>
<td>The set of statements pertaining to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayable</td>
<td>delinquency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The history of legal precedents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The organization of legal arguments, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michel Foucault's disciplinary system assemblage. Adapted from Foucault (1975).
**SCHEME 23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SUBSTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-discursive</td>
<td>Human resources arrangement within the corporation: inspection and control</td>
<td>Workers, Professionals, Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive</td>
<td>Economics, management theory, corporative law, etc.</td>
<td>Raison d’être of the corporation: Notions of professionalism based on a rational, objective and profit-maximising ideal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Karl Palmas’ “modern corporation” model of assemblage. Adapted from Palmas (2007).
The image shows an ideal formulation of a cultural park conceived as an "assemblage" following the ideas of Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. Source: author.
The scheme shows an ideal formulation of the diagram in a cultural park. The diagram does not reinstate binary thinking but rather traces how the social actors create and put to work these dichotomies. Moreover, it does so according to degrees of intensity and not to clear-cut categories. No real park ever entirely coincides with either category, only approaching the different categories as a limit: the park becomes more or less preservative or creative depending on the degree to which it approaches the connections laid out for it by a social group. The scheme shows the most common oppositions at work in cultural parks that play a key role in their constitution and functioning. Source: author.
Scheme showing the administrative framework of the Val di Cornia Partnership Park. There is a clear division between nature and culture management and between issues of “heritage” and “marketing”. Source: adapted from (Casini & Zucconi 2003).
Appendix 6. Images

*IMAGES 1 - 2*

Photography of Lowell (U.S.) and map of the Ironbridge Gorge Museum (U.K.).

The enhancement process of both industrial sites during the 1970’s opened the door for the implementation of similar projects throughout Europe and the United States.

1. From www.historycooperative.org

2. From www.ironbridgegorgewhs.co.uk
Maps of Emscher Park (Germany) and Ekomuseum Bergslagen (Sweden). Both projects were implemented during the 1980’s, deploying a similar vision of “territorial heritage” that paved the way for the constitution of cultural parks in Europe. Actually, Bergslagen Ecomuseum is also denominated “Cultural park”.

3: From www.lwl.org

Map of the Aragón Cultural Park scheme and picture of the historic village of Albarracín (Spain). The system has developed an innovative legislation and conception of parks as “partnerships” that facilitate the participation of local groups. This framework is unmatched in Spain and the only one in Europe dealing specifically with cultural parks.

5: From www.naturalezadearagon.com

6: From www.viajesdiarios.com
Italy has developed different management frameworks for cultural parks. The first image (above) is the logo of the “Literature Parks scheme”. Below, the picture at the left shows the cover of a book summarising the different cultural parks at work in Tuscany. At the right there is a map of the Val di Cornia Park scheme, one of the most innovative and evolved management experiences in Europe.

7: From www.turismo.it

8: From www.michelucci.it/node/69

9: From www.olaszorszagbajottem.wordpress.com
Map showing the location of National Heritage Areas in the United States.

From http://www.N.P.S..gov/history/heritageareas/VST/INDEX.HTM
Logo and picture of the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area (U.S.). This park is one of the most active Heritage Areas in the U.S., performing historic recreations of the civil war battles, as shown in the picture.

12: From www.civilwar.com

13: From www.flickr.com
Logo and picture of the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park (Australia). The park mingle aboriginal culture preservation with a high-end touristic experience.

13: From www.svc111.wic859dp.server-web.com

14: From www.cairnstours.org
Logo and picture of one of the textile colonies spread along the Llobregat River (Barcelona, Spain). This park was the first designed by Joaquín Sabaté in Catalonia trying to follow American management strategies.

15: From www.turismeprophbarcelona.cat

16: From www.intermediatelandscapes.wordpress.com
Logo of the Rivers of Steel and Motorcities National Heritage Areas and picture of the Tennessee National Heritage Area merchandising. In contrast to the European cases, U.S. parks normally deploy entrepreneurial management strategies comprising a corporative image and merchandising.

17: From www.pittsburghgives.guidestar.org

18: From www.logosdatabase.com

19: From www.tnvacation.com
Pictures showing Disney Celebration city (U.S., left) and Puy du fou (France, right). There is a clear spreading tendency from the U.S. to Europe and Southeastern Asia, to mingle leisure, tourism and heritage. Actually, urban and land planning is increasingly tending towards the “thematization” of spaces rather than to the traditional positivist planning schemes based on infrastructures and demography or the ecologist paradigm based on preservation of landscapes. Cultural parks and heritage areas participate to some extent in this process whereby large areas are deterritorialised and adapted to fit into a different socio-economic environment.

20: From www.puddleofred.com

Logos of the American Land Rights Association and the Northwest Arkansas Property Rights Association. These groups are growing rapidly in different States of the U.S. They oppose public ownership of land and strongly reject the creation of National Heritage Areas throughout the country. For them, these areas go against the principles of the American nation and are a form Green groups and public institutions use to take over land control and impede economic development.

22: From www.alra.com

23: From www.nwapra.com
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