The Heritage from Cultural Turn to Inclusive Turn.
The Cultural and Sacred Landscapes of the UNESCO List: a Sustainable Track to overcome the Dichotomy between Tangible and Intangible Heritage?

Fiorella Dallari

Associate Professor
Bologna (Italy)
fiorella.dallari@unibo.it

Abstract

The term 'heritage' has considerably changed its meaning over time, especially in recent decades and among contemporary local communities, partially owing to the instruments developed by the UNESCO jointly with the World Heritage Center. On the basis of the endless debate within the UNESCO and many theoretical suggestions, this paper aims at providing a framework for the ever changing inter-relationship between tangible and intangible heritage in inclusive values of the UNESCO list cultural landscapes. In the author's opinion, cultural landscapes are a strategic key for an inclusive turn, where tangible and intangible values intertwine. In this framework, the WHC with the World Heritage Convention of Cultural Landscapes (1992) and the European Landscape Convention (2000) meant to broaden the definition of World Heritage and European Landscape to better reflect the full range of our world's cultural and natural treasures. The aim was to implement and balance the World Heritage Convention throughout all geographical areas in the world, thanks to rapid social changes linked to deep and widespread processes of local inclusion.

The paper assumes a change in the paradigm of cultural shift towards an inclusive shift, starting from the WHC endless debate of tangible/intangible dichotmy, thus the Conventions of Cultural Landscapes, to analize Italian landscapes within the WHL's 88 properties that embody an exceptional spiritual relationship between people and nature, iconic symbol of the inclusive approach for an Intangible Social Heritage supported by a sacred/spiritual gaze. Can Sacred Landscapes be the first known strategic key among all landscape categories? Is Cultural Landscape likely to produce an Intangible Social Heritage suitable to overcome the historical and geopolitical dichotomy of Tangible and Intangible Heritage and support a shift towards an inclusive society? The paper hopes to contribute to this issue.

Keywords: *Inclusive Turn, WHL Cultural Landscapes, Sacred Landscapes, Italian Landscapes, Sacred Gaze, Religious Properties*

Chapter 1. The landscape as a tool to achieve social-ecological sustainability

The Cultural Heritage is still mainly distinct in the two tangible and intangible categories, concepts born at different times at different stages of the common cultural assets. The first is much older and can be traced back to the sixteenth century with the opening of the first museums by the papal institutions for the benefit of the people in Rome; the second, i.e. the intangible, takes shape almost at odds with the recognition of the tangible / material cultural Heritage by UNESCO Convention in 1972 after an intense reflection from the second world war [Nahlik, 1975]. When dealing with cultural tangible-built heritage, the enhancement strategies are generally rooted in history and based on the embedded values of cultural goods themselves, rather than on the multiplicity of their contemporary tangible and intangible values**.** In those years, the new theory of general systems [Von Bertalanffy, 1972] underlines the inescapable importance of a holistic view and in any case according to a process of integration and inclusion. In this vision, the environment is the heart and home of human creativity, where the communities live in their living landscapes and routes [18th General Assembly]; in the author's opinion, a fusion of the landscape heritage and the cultural dimension can be considered the main target of our reflections and suggestions to put in place a sustainable society based on the four core values of socio-ecological sustainability: ecosystem equilibrium, economic efficiency, intra/infra generational equity and culture.

In 1992, jointly with United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, which was devoted to sustainable development issues, the UNESCO approved the World Heritage Convention [Rössler, 2000], the first international legal instrument conceived to recognize and protect cultural landscapes. The Committee defined cultural landscapes as a representation of the "combined works of nature and of man" (Article 1 of the Convention) and 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 [Cultural Landscapes].

First of all, a short but very important history starting from the WHL endless debate of this dichotomy underlines the increasing importance of putting into focus concepts and actions to support the Cultural Heritage and the common values; thus, the Cultural Landscapes Conventions with UNESCO categories will be analyzed. Secondly the Italian eight properties among the WHL eighty-eight properties with 4 transboundary properties (1 delisted property) are discussed as case studies due to their importance in the landscape history and the long Italian tradition in this field [Sereni, 1961]. Finally, we will focus on the Sacred Landscapes, as a proposed category to provide the first strategic key in our

knowledge, being the religious heritage the largest and most representative heritage in the Italian (and in Mediterranean) region.

Chapter 2. Cultural Heritage between Tangible and Intangible Values: an endless debate?

The issue of conservation, perpetuation and valorisation of the cultural heritage has long been - since the 18th century a controversial one, fuelling several and endless debates at a national, international but most of all local scale.

Heritage is the contemporary use of the past [Ashworth & Larkham, 1994] and cannot be defined "*a priori*", or unique: what is considered Heritage, passed down from one generation to another cannot be then reviewed by the latter on the basis of Social Common Values of contemporary people and communities. Inheritance makes sense only if those who inherit are able to interpret the Heritage within the framework of contemporary Cultural and Intangible Values defined as the sharing of identity in a group of people: this implies not only language skills, but also spatial, cultural, and traditional or better everyday practices, creating for each community a specific and influential cultural district that can be also defined as Territorial Heritage [Dallari & Calanca, 2015].

Indeed, the definition of 'Cultural Heritage' has changed its content considerably in recent decades, partially owing to the international legal instrument developed by UNESCO from 1950s with « two-track » history [Kurin, 2004]. One track is technical and legal, and concerns the ownership of cultural property (a copyright and its application to folklore and traditional culture), which is still an open question. The other track (national level) is focused on social and cultural policies useful to support those traditions that embodied the national-cultural heritage of governments. The Law for the protection of Cultural Properties (1950) and its revision (1954) defined tangible and intangible cultural properties and people as «living treasures»: all national resources and assets have to be protected, appreciated, utilized and managed not for commercial profit, but for the very survival of the civilization.

2.1. The framework of the first formal effort to protect the Heritage

The first formal effort by UNESCO was the Convention for the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage and the initiation of the World Heritage List (WHC, 1972), an international recognition with a national support for the restoration, conservation, and preservation of tangible monuments, sites, and landscapes. Simultaneously, the theory of general systems [Von Bertalanffy, 1972], a very important scientific literature, addresses the issue of environmental, energy and economic crisis related to industrial society and its economic model [Meadows, Randers, & Pecceli, 1972]. The first UNESCO initiative builds

the foundations of the world cultural turn, a driver to the knowledge of the identity roots in the last decades of the second millennium. In those years, however, an unbalanced WHS was formed, where European regions have reached a wide primacy position. At this first stage, Bolivia, alongside few other countries, proposed addressing oral traditions- as Kurin [2004] highlights. However, little action followed- at least until the mid-1990s. A few experts' meetings held in the 1980s and the Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore of UNESCO (1989) defined feasible practices[1] which could be adopted by governments to preserve their Intangible Cultural Heritage. By the mid-1990s, several issues were re-addressed following the effects of globalization, the new paradigm of sustainable development, and a greater international awareness. Whilst local, regional and even national traditions were being forgotten, neglected and increasingly put at risk by the industrial society, many governments became «sensitive» to the topic as a crucial one for their international prestige. In 1992, the same year of the Summit Earth in Rio de Janeiro, the Committee adopted the Convention of Cultural Landscapes, that became the first international legal instrument to recognise and protect cultural landscapes. The overcoming of the second millennium begins in 1994 with the Global Strategy [Labadi, 2005]: the WHC meant to broaden the definition of World Heritage to better reflect the full spectrum of our world's cultural and natural treasures and implement the World Heritage Convention in all geographical areas of the world. The WHC has been criticized for legitimizing a particular Western perception of Heritage [Byrne, 1991; Sullivan, 2004]. The List has been shown to be Eurocentric in composition and also dominated by monumentally grand and aesthetic sites and places [Cleere, 2001; Yoshida, 2004; Smith & Akagawa, 2008]. The renewed attention to the issue of local, regional, and national cultural traditions could be noted during the global conference at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington (1999). Its impact was of strategic importance to the UNESCO. Suddenly, in 2003, the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICHC) [3 Downloaded], was adopted, as a sort of counterpoint to the WHC, an attempt to acknowledge and prioritize non-Western expressions and practices of the living Heritage. The reframing of the protection of cultural and natural heritage in all its forms [Religious Sacred Heritage] starts again. Since 2003, religious heritage and sacred sites have received special attention in research studies and analyses by ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN[2] as

---

[1] The Recommendation has shown to be a somewhat ill-construed, "top-down", state oriented, "soft" international instrument that defined traditional culture in essentialist, tangible, archival terms, and had little impact around the globe upon cultural communities and practitioners [10, p.68].

[2] ICCROM 2003 Forum on the conservation of Living Religious Heritage, the 2005 ICOMOS General Assembly resolution calling for the "establishment of an International Thematic Programme for Religious Heritage", and 2011 ICOMOS General Assembly Resolution on Protection and enhancement of sacred heritage sites, buildings and landscapes, as well as the UNESCO MAB/IUCN Guidelines for the Conservation and Management of Sacred Natural Sites.

well as in scientific literature linked to a complete and valuable world heritage and inclusive common values.

Chapter 3. Cultural Landscapes among the UNESCO, European Conventions and the geographical vision

In December 1992, the already mentioned Cultural Landscape Convention turns its attention to the conservation of nature and culture [Rössler, 2000], recognizing cultural landscapes as a fundamental category in the World Heritage List, suitable to transmit to future generations cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value [Cultural Landscape]. For the Committee, natural landscapes represent the "combined works of nature and humankind", in a dynamic process and intimate relationship among the human society, their natural environment and successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal. After the Action Plan for the Future was adopted in December 1993, ten expert meetings were held between 1993-1999 in the context of an overall global strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List. Methodologies for identifying cultural landscapes were developed and suggestions made towards the classification and evaluation of cultural landscapes. In this period, 16 Cultural landscapes were inscribed in the World Heritage List, three of which were Italian[3]. In 2001 the Council of Europe adopted in Florence (Italy) the Landscape Convention or Florence Convention, the first international treaty to be exclusively concerned with all dimensions of European landscape to promote the protection, management and planning of European landscapes and establish co-operation on a European scale on landscape issues [European Landscape]. Within the European Council, the landscape holds an important public interest role in cultural, ecological, environmental and social fields, especially with reference to the development of local cultures as fundamental components of the European natural and cultural heritage, contributing to human well-being and the consolidation of the European identity – both in terms of outstanding beauty and ordinary areas. An awareness which was already evident in 1987, when the Route of Santiago de Compostela was declared a cultural itinerary by the European Council. A few years later, the European Institution of Cultural Itineraries (EICI) was established in Luxemburg: as of today, 34 European itineraries have been officially acknowledged, in some cases in cooperation with the Unesco[4], as a demonstration of the contemporary significance of an ancient phenomenon.

---

3 The Costiera Amalfitana (1997), Portovenere, Cinque Terre, Palmaria, Tino, and Tinetto Islands (1997), and Cilento and Vallo di Diano National Park with the Archeological Sites of Paestum and Velia, and the Certosa di Padula (1998).

4 This is the case of the Route of Santiago de Compostela.

In the same period, geographers were approaching again to an inclusive interpretation of landscapes[5] from the "biography of landscape" [Samuels, 1979], as a concrete forms of the territory) and its representation. From this perspective, the landscapes are a social formation and symbolic property representing the space and the territory through the vision and human relationships, a cultural concept originated in western countries during the Renaissance [Cosgrove, 1984]. A few years later, the interpretation of the landscape was based on written and read signs by different social actors – such as authors, readers, insiders and outsiders in an intertextual way, with implicit signification and dynamic sign or symbol, all open to continuous reinterpretation. As Duncan [1990] claims, the landscapes are not only culturally produced as Cosgrove underlines, but they also influence governing ideas of political and religious life, which was then confirmed by Michell [1994]. Afterwards, the question of the obliteration of everyday practices drove towards a greater attention to issues related to performances and territorial persistence. The landscape is more rooted in everyday experiences and in material practices: it's a space where people live, work and produce in their everyday life. Movements and practices settle and make authentic common practice and build landscapes, places, streets, routes ... and pilgrimages. Cresswell [2003] underlines the experiential practices on landscapes among inhabitants, people, outsiders, tourists, travelers, hikers and others in a greater impressive inclusive turn. Finally, the role of geographical point of view in the development of social and cultural life is the focus of the research. Studies on tourism and the related practices show an increasing focus on cultural tourism [Smth, 2003] among " tourist gazes" [Urry, 1990] and performances [Perkins & Thorns, 2001].

3.1. Three categories of Cultural Landscapes

In this ever-changing context the term "cultural landscape" includes an increasingly variety of interactions between man and its natural environment. Specific techniques of land-use can be identified, with a spiritual relationship with nature [Pungetti, Oviedo & Hooke, 2012], supporting the natural and cultural/spiritual/religious values, and biological diversity in many regions of the world. In this cases the aesthetic value could match the Greek concept of "καλοσκαιαγαθος"! In 2008 the UNESCO Committee adopted three main categories of landscapes [Categories], namely:

1. the landscape designed and created intentionally by man (garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons often associated with religious reasons)

---

[5] The landscape is a concept of Vidal de la Blache [1903], including thus "settings" (milieux), "regions", "lifeways" (genres de vie).

2. the organically evolved landscape (resulting from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and subsequently evolved with and in response to its natural environment)

    a. a relic (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past

    b. 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

3. the associative cultural landscape (included by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element).

In the last few years the issue of an integrated strategy (steering group: UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN) has emerged with reference to the whole cultural heritage proposing guidance for the management of heritage of religious interest[6], with the involvement of civil and religious authorities at every level.

3.2. The Properties of Religious Interest - Sustainable Management (PRI - SM)

In recent years, the UNESCO has perceived the 'gaps' and the underrepresented categories thanks to a shared approach to integrate the operational guidelines. At the end of 2010 the UNESCO Initiative on Heritage of Religious Interest is launched, and the Cultural Landscapes become finally a strategic concept across the globe. The author claims this as a feasible way to overcome the dichotomy between Tangible and Intangible in a context of sustainable development, especially in industrialized areas with a long history such as the Mediterranean basin, where Greece and Italy are the cradle of the Western civilization.

The term "Religious property", as used in the ICOMOS study "Filling the Gaps - an Action Plan for the Future", defines "any form of property with religious or spiritual associations: churches, monasteries, shrines, sanctuaries, mosques, synagogues, temples, sacred landscapes, sacred groves, and other landscape features, etc." [Jokilehto, 2005]. The term "Sacred site" embraces areas of special spiritual significance to people and communities, with the term "Sacred natural site" corresponding to areas of land or water having special spiritual significance [IUCN/UNESCO, 2008]. Among the 16 categories of religious interest, five groups are deemed to require a sustainable management: archaeological,

---

[6] I would like to thank Christopher Young for the information of his report at the Round Table "Sacred Landscapes: from Concepts to European Perspectives" (Francigena Conference, 29 April 2016, Piacenza).

urban, landscapes (including both natural and cultural), monuments/structures, and routes (cultural itineraries - pilgrimage routes; cultural itineraries including religious structures). According to WHC [PRI-SM], the religious heritage has characteristics that distinguish it from other forms of heritage; the religious areas are the oldest protected places of the planet, and "have a vital importance for safeguarding cultural and biological diversity for present and future generations". According to the UNESCO data base, PRI represent the widest category across Europe, with 54% of all properties (n.453) considered to have religious/sacred/spiritual values; 65% of properties reported as a factor affecting religious value; in SE and Med Europe 110 (65%) out 172 properties are considered to have religious/sacred/spiritual values, 122 reported as a factor affecting religious value, and 47% of properties without religious/sacred/spiritual values reporting as a factor affecting this value. Approximately 20% of the properties inscribed in the World Heritage List have some sort of religious or spiritual connection, and constitute the largest single category on the List. Considering the significance of this heritage, supposedly the oldest and in large part still "alive", the author highlights the evidence of a high degree of potential sustainable value compared to other heritages; consequently, an increased awareness and wider involvement of religious communities will be crucial in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Defining methods to the identification of PRI and the need for management guidance should be the main aims for the future.

3.3. The WHL Italian Cultural Landscapes

Among 88 Cultural Landscapes inscribed on the World Heritage List, Italy has seven Cultural Landscapes among Mediterranean seacoasts, plains, hills, and mountains. In three properties (Cilento and Vallo di Diano National Park with the Archeological Sites of Paestum and Velia, and the Certosa di Padula, Sacred Mountains of Piedmont and Lombardy, and Val d'Orcia) the sacred landscape and sacred/religious heritage is the first or second asset, whilst other properties are not believed to retain significant religious/sacred/spiritual values. This is not the case of "Sacri Monti" or "Sacred Mountains Piedmont and Lombardy" inscribed in 2003 and managed through nine separate complexes located in the mountains of Northern Italy. Each complex includes a number of chapels and other architectural features, created in the late 16th and 17th century and dedicated to different aspects of Christian belief [Sacri Monti of Piedmont and Lombardy]. The first example of this phenomenon in Italy was the Sacred Mountain of Varallo, in 1480. Supported by the Bishop of Milan and the ideas originated from the Council of Trent, it became a model for other Sacri Monti that followed and were dedicated not only to Christ but also to cults devoted to the Virgin Mary, the Saints, the Trinity, and the Mysteries of the Rosary. At a first stage, the "Sacri Monti" all shared common rules and standards as for typology and architectural style. Subsequently, each of them evolved with their own unique

art and architecture, with distinct themes or roles. The Sacro Monte of the Blessed Virgin of Succour at Ossuccio contains 14 Baroque-style chapels on the slope of a mountain leading to a sanctuary at the summit. In the early 18th century, Michelangelo da Montiglio, a monk, developed Sacro Monte of Belmonte (Valperga Canavese) to recreate Biblical sites from the Holy Land with a circuit of 13 chapels symbolizing the principal incidents in the Passion (processional route). The Sacred Mountains" of Northern Italy represent the successful integration of architecture and fine art into a landscape of great beauty for spiritual reasons at a critical period in the history of the Roman Catholic Church. This sacred landscape presents an implementation of architecture and sacred art into a natural landscape for didactic and spiritual purposes, which achieved its most exceptional expression in the "Sacred Mountains" and had a profound influence on subsequent developments elsewhere in Europe.

Figure 1 . Val d'Orcia, along the Via Francigena (Tuscany by Tuscany Region)

The property Val d'Orcia, inscribed in 2004, is an exceptional reflection of the way the landscape was re-written in Renaissance times to reflect the ideals of good governance and to create an aesthetically pleasing pictures. The landscape of the Val d'Orcia was celebrated by painters from the Siennese School, which flourished during the Renaissance. The images, and particularly depictions of landscapes where people are portrayed as living in harmony with nature, have come to be seen as icons of the Renaissance and have profoundly influenced the development of landscape thinking. The landscape of Val d'Orcia is part of the agricultural hinterland of Siena, redrawn and developed when it was integrated in the territory of the city-state in the 14th and 15th century to reflect an

idealized model of good governance and to create an aesthetically pleasing picture. The landscape's distinctive aesthetics, flat chalk plains out of which rise almost conical hills with fortified settlements on top, inspired many artists. Their images have come to exemplify the beauty of well-managed Renaissance agricultural landscapes. The inscription covers: an agrarian and pastoral landscape reflecting innovative land-management systems; towns and villages; farmhouses; and the Roman Via Francigena and its associated abbeys, inns, shrines, bridges, etc. [Val d'Orcia]. Here the Italian Landscape is born: from Renaissance to sacred and cultural landscapes of the "romei" pilgrims to Rome, and tourists of the Grand Tour, it is still present and growing.

Conclusion

A sacred gaze: the awareness of religious heritage as a territorial issue?

Over the last 25 years, UNESCO and Council of Europe have launched a series of initiatives on the Cultural Landscape and, more recently, the Heritage of Religious Interest. There is a growing awareness of religious/sacred/spiritual/ritual heritage for its great variety, quantity, ancientness, history, and cultural inclusion: a obviously good practice of sustainability and resilience in any form of property with religious or spiritual associations, where tangible and intangible values intertwine? The author agrees. In any case, in the future this heritage is likely to face a wide range of social, economic and politic issues such as resourcing, impacts of external and internal development pressure, new and non-religious lifestyles, the impact of climate change, pressure of mass tourism, and a lack of involvement of local communities (religious and other local communities). Can contemporary sacred gaze [Morgan, 2005] embody the knowledge of religious heritage as a territorial issue? The author agrees. An -underestimated assessment has listed at least 100.000 Italian bishopric churches, as well as a wide variety of sacred landscapes in the rural and agricultural Italian landscapes and the historical urban network. A mostly declining heritage, due to historical reasons and new issues: the abandonment of churches is a process that needs to be explored. The planning and implementation of new management methods enhancing the role of believers, groups, associations, other collaborative stakeholders, and religious bodies requires the most urgent attention; overall, a greater mutual understanding of different perceptions and viewpoints of sacred gaze is needed. Pope Francis'proposal (May 12, 2016) to open the doors to the possibility of ordaining women as deacons, as a thousand years ago, holds a revolutionary potential to support the inclusive turn!

Literature

[1]   18th General Assembly http://culture-routes.net/events/18th-general-assembly-and-scientific-symposium.The website is currently under maintenance. (Downloaded: 6. April 2015)

[2]   Ashworth, G.J. & Larkham P.J. 1994. *Building a New Heritage. Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe.* London: Routledge.

[3]   Byrne, D. 1991. Western Hegemony in Archaeological Heritage Management. *History and Anthropology*, 5, 269–76.

[4]   Categories, http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/#2 (Downloaded:6. May 2016).

[5]   Cleere, H. 2001. The uneasy bedfellows: universality and cultural heritage. In Robert Layton & alia (eds), *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*. Routledge, London, Great Britain, pp.22-29.

[6]   Cosgrove, D. E. 1984. *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.

[7]   Cressell, T. 2003. Landscape and the obliteration of practice. In Kay Anderson, Mona Domosh, Steve Pile & Nigel Thrift (eds). *Handbook of Cultural Geography.* London: Sage, pp.269-81.

[8]   Cultural Landscapes, http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape (Downloaded: 6. May 2016)

[9]   Dallari, F. & Calanca, D. 2015. Craftsman activities in the Mediterranean region as intangible heritage of a civilisation. The case study of the fashion ecomuseum in Romagna. In Anna Trono & alia (eds.), *Cultural Heritage for the Sustainable Development of Mediterranean Countries:* 313-322. Galatina (LE): Congedo Editore.

[10]   Duncan, J. 1990. *The city as text.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

[11]   European Landscape, http://www.coe.int/en/web/landscape/home (Downloaded: 6. May 2016)

[12]   ICHC, www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/convention (Downloaded:6. May 2016)

[13]   IUCN/UNESCO 2008. Guidelines for the Conservation and Management of Sacred Natural Site. https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/pa_guidelines_016_sacred_natural_sites.pdf (Downloaded: 6. May 2016).

[14]   Jokilehto J. 2005. *The World Heritage List Filling the Gaps – an Action Plan for the Future. Paris*: ICOMOS; http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/activities/documents/activity-646-3.pdf (Downloaded: 6. May 2016).

[15]   Kurin, R. 2004. Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO. *Museum International*, 56/1-2, pp.66-77.

[16]   Labadi, S. 2005. A review of the Global Strategy for a balanced, representative and credible World Heritage List 1994–2004. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites,* 7/2, 89-102.

[17]   Meadows, D. H., Randers, J., & PecceIi, A. 1972. *I limiti dello sviluppo*. Roma: La Biblioteca dell'EST.

[18]   Mitchell, W. J. T. 1994. Imperial landscape. In W. J. T. Mitchell, (ed.). Landscape and Power. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. pp. 5–34.

[19]   Morgan, D. 2005. The sacred gaze: Religious visual culture in theory and practice. Berkeley: Univ of California Press

[20]   Nahlik, S. E. 1975. International law and the protection of cultural property in armed conflicts. Hastings LJ, 27, 1069.

[21]   Perkins, H. C., & Thorns, D. C. 2001. Gazing or performing? Reflections on Urry's tourist gaze in the context of contemporary experience in Antipodes. *International Sociology*, 16(2), 185-204.

[22]   PRI-SM.   http://whc.unesco.org/en/religious-sacred-heritage/#prism   (9 Downloaded: 6. May 2016).

[23]   Pungetti, G., Oviedo, G., & Hooke, D. (Eds.). (2012). *Sacred species and sites: Advances in biocultural conservation.* Cambridge University Press.

[24]   Religious Sacred Heritage, http://whc.unesco.org/en/religious-sacred-heritage/ (Downloaded: 6. May 2016)

[25]   Rössler, M. 2000. World Heritage Cultural Landscapes. Landscape Stewardship: New Directions in Conservation of Nature and Culture. *The George Wright Forum* 17 (1): 27-34.

[26]   Sacri Monti of Piedmont and Lombardy. http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1068 (Downloaded: 6. May 2016).

[27]   Samuels, M. 1979. The biography of landscape. In D. W. Meinig (ed.), *The interpretation of ordinary landscapes: geographical essays.* New York: Oxford University Press. pp. pp. 51–88.

[28]   Sereni, E. 1961. *Storia de paesaggio agrario italiano*. Bari: Laterza.

[29]   Smith L. & Akagawa N. 2008. *Intangible Heritage*. London: Routledge.

[30]   Smth, M.K. 2003. *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies*.London:Routledge

[31]   Sullivan, S. 2004.Local involvement and traditional practices in the World Heritag System. In Eléonore de Merode, Rieks Smeets & Carol Westrik C. (eds) Linking Universal and Local Values: *Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage. World Heritage Centre*. Paris, France.

[32]   Urry , J. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.

[33]   Val d'Orcia. http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1026 (Downloaded: 6. May 2016).

[34]   Vidal de la Blache, P. 1903. *Tableau de la géographie de la France*. Paris: Hachette.

[35]   Von Bertalanffy, L. 1972. *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications.* New York: George Braziller.

[36]   Yoshida, K. 2004. The museum and the intangible cultural heritage. *Museum International,* 56/1–2, pp. 108–12.