For many centuries, mountains all over the world have been the focus of religious veneration and artistic production. They are what could be called 'mountains of meaning', mountains that have special meanings or spiritual values attributed to them, or mountains that inspire creative works or thoughts. The purpose of the 2002 'Celebrating Mountains' conference was to rejoice at the diversity of mountains, and their meanings to our society. There can, perhaps, be no greater accolade than for a mountain to be included on the UNESCO World Heritage List: 'sacred mountains are the World Heritage sites that enshrine the highest physical and spiritual values' (Bernbaum 1997: 34). 'Associative' cultural landscapes are another type of property that the World Heritage Committee recognises. These too can have special meanings or spiritual values attributed to them, or are places that inspire creative works or thoughts. This category can also include mountains landscapes.

This paper will firstly review the mechanisms that are in place to accommodate the inclusion of 'mountains of meaning' and 'inspirational' landscapes on the World Heritage List (List). This will involve an examination of the criteria for World Heritage inscription that allows for the inclusion of non-material, intangible, heritage values on the List. The paper will then examine 'mountains of meaning' that have been included on the List in the past, and review their outstanding, intangible heritage values. It will also consider World Heritage mountains that have intangible cultural heritage values ascribed to them, but which are not inscribed on the List for such values. The types of 'mountains of meaning' that might be included on the List in the future will also be considered. In particular, this paper will look at those mountains that might be included for their "inspirational" qualities, rather than for their spiritual associations, as 'associative' cultural landscapes. Finally the paper will discuss the theoretical and methodological problems in identifying 'inspirational' associative cultural landscapes for inclusion on the World Heritage List. It will also consider the problems of monitoring and managing the intangible cultural heritage values of 'inspirational' landscapes, and 'mountains of meaning', included on the List, now, and in the future.

Review of World Heritage inscription

UNESCO adopted The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, also known as the World Heritage Convention (the Convention), in 1972. It is an international treaty that endeavours to identify, and protect, the natural and cultural heritage of 'mankind as a whole' that is of 'outstanding universal value'. The Convention identifies two types of heritage that can be included on the List, natural and cultural.

Article 1 of the Convention identifies the types of cultural heritage to be included, monuments, groups of buildings and sites. 'Sites' are 'works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view'.

Article 2 of the Convention identifies the types of natural heritage to be included: 'natural features', 'geological and physiographical formations' and 'natural sites'. 'Natural sites' are 'precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty'.

'Associative' cultural landscapes can be considered under Article 1 as the 'combined works of nature and man', which have outstanding universal value. 'Mountains of meaning' would be considered under Article 2 of the Convention as natural sites that have outstanding universal value because of their 'natural beauty', but can also be considered under Article 1 in the same way as 'associative' cultural landscapes.

In order for a property to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, it has to be nominated under one, or more, of four natural or six cultural criteria, or a combination of both. These criteria are the benchmark for the inclusion of properties on the List. Cultural criterion (vi) is the World Heritage criterion used to identify non-material, associative, intangible cultural heritage values of cultural places/sites, which includes 'associative' cultural landscapes, on the List. Intangible heritage value is an ascribed value that is related to an association with a place. It is the 'special connections that exist between people and a place' (ICOMOS 1999) and the meanings that people attribute to a place; often this is related to a spiritual association. A place has to be:

(vi) directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural) (UNESCO 2000).

Natural criterion (ii), like cultural criterion (vi), can be interpreted as a criterion that identifies 'intangible' heritage values of places which contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance (UNESCO 1994).

Natural criterion (ii) is included in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (Operational Guidelines) (UNESCO 2000) as a criterion for the inclusion of natural properties on the List. The assessment of
exceptional natural beauty' is, however, a cultural construction and it should really be considered as an intangible cultural heritage value, not a natural one, as UNESCO describes it.

Mountains of meaning' can be included on the List as cultural 'sites', as individual places. They can also be included as a sub category of cultural landscapes, as associative cultural landscapes. The Operational Guidelines define three types of cultural landscape categories, but it is the 'associative' cultural landscape that is of interest in relation to 'mountains of meaning' and 'inspirational' landscapes discussed in this paper.

The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent (UNESCO 2000).

The category of 'associative' cultural landscapes encapsulates two types of landscape. These are known within World Heritage circles as 'spiritual', i.e. those with religious associations and 'inspirational' such as artistic or cultural associations. They are not included on the list because of their material heritage or natural values, but because of their non-material, intangible cultural heritage values.

Of places already considered for inscription by the World Heritage Committee as 'associative' cultural landscapes, Tongariro National Park, New Zealand, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Australia, Vat Phou, Laos, and Kii Mountain Range, Japan are associated with 'mountains of meaning'.1 Tongariro National Park in 1993, and Uluru-Kata Tjuta in 1994, were both inscribed on the List as 'spiritual' mountain landscapes because of their significance to their indigenous communities and their associated belief systems (ICOMOS 1993: 1994). They were the first places to be recognised as 'associative' cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List. Vat Phou in Laos was inscribed on the List in 2000 as a cultural landscape and where the Phou Kao Mountain is the dwelling of the god Shiva (ICOMOS 2000). The Kii Mountain Range in Japan was inscribed in 2003 also as an 'associative' cultural landscape because of its associations with both Shintoism and Buddhism (ICOMOS 2003).

The first cultural landscape to be inscribed on the List partly on the basis of its association with an artistic production was the Italian landscape of Val d'Orcia:

(vi) The landscape of the Val d'Orcia was celebrated by painters from the Sienese School, which flourished during the Renaissance. Images of the Val d'Orcia, and particularly depictions of the landscape where people are depicted 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 (ICOMOS 2004: 5).

Val D'Orcia was inscribed for its association with painters from the Sienese school of art. The inscription would appear, however, to be based more on the fact that the paintings depicted an 'ideal' cultural landscape, and the harmonious union of man living with nature, as a type of record of those landscapes, and ideas and ideals associated with the landscape, than on the fact that the landscapes inspired the painters to paint. Val d'Orcia was also inscribed under criterion (iv) as a cultural landscape, which illustrates a significant stage in human history.

The mountainous landscape of the Lake District National Park is on the UK's tentative list. It is currently being considered for further nomination to the World Heritage List, partially on the grounds of its inspirational qualities, as an 'associative' cultural landscape (Department for Culture, Media and Sport 2003). Its inspirational qualities are related to the associations that exist between the Lake District and Wordsworth and other 'Lake Poets', and writers such as John Ruskin and Beatrix Potter and painters such as William Turner. Places that could be given the same consideration as the Lake District, in the category of 'inspirational' landscapes, and have been mooted in World Heritage circles for inscription, include the Montagne Saint Victoire, France, the mountain Paul Cezanne painted many times. No mountain landscape has yet been included on the List because of its inspirational nature, but 'Montagne Sainte Victoire et sites Cézanniens' is on France's tentative list for possible future inscription to the World Heritage List. In 1996, Mount Lushan was evaluated and identified by the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) as an 'inspirational' landscape, but it was not recognised as such through its inscription on the World Heritage List (ICOMOS 1996).

Mount Tai

Mount Tai is in the Province of Shandong, China. It has played an important part in the cultural and religious history of China since the seventeenth century B.C., and is the most sacred of the five sacred mountains in traditional China. The mountain is most importantly associated with Confucianism. Taoists and Buddhists also consider the mountain to be sacred (ICUN 1987). It is also associated with artistic and literary works, and is the place where a new form of Chinese calligraphy occurred in 219 BC (ICOMOS 1987). It was inscribed in 1987 under cultural criterion (v) for the following reasons: 'Mount Tai is directly and tangibly associated with events whose importance in universal history cannot be minimized, i.e. the emergence of Confucianism the unification of China and the appearance of written literature in China' (ICOMOS 1987: 4).

Mount Tai was also inscribed on the List for its associated cultural values under cultural criterion (vi) and its natural values under natural criterion (iii); 'Superlative natural and cultural beauty. Mt Taishan is a majestic site, its dense forests and ancient temples complementing each other' (ICUN 1987: 2).

Mount Lushan

Mount Lushan is in Jiangxi Province and was the first of the Chinese sacred mountains to be the inspiration for artistic works. Lushan was the home and inspiration to great Chinese poets, painters and calligraphers. The pioneer of the Chinese sect of Buddhism also worked at Lushan (ICOMOS 1996).
Mount Lushan is inscribed under cultural criterion (vi) for these inspirational and spiritual associations. It is not, however, inscribed for its natural values, which are not considered to be of 'outstanding universal value'. Nor is it inscribed as an inspirational landscape, as was recommended by ICOMOS in its evaluation of the mountain in 1996:

Mount Lushan is an area of striking scenic beauty and interest from the point of view of the natural environment that has attracted spiritual leaders and scholars, and also artists and writers for over two millennia. The mountains have been the inspiration for some of the finest classical poetry. It is a landscape that has inspired philosophy and art... and as such it qualifies for recognition as a cultural landscape as defined in the Operational Guidelines (ICOMOS 1996: 4).

**Mount Emei**

Mount Emei is another of the five sacred Chinese mountains. It is in Sichuan Province and was inscribed, in 1996, for its cultural and natural values, including criterion (vi) (but not for its natural beauty). It was described by ICOMOS as:

an area of exceptional cultural significance, since it is the place where Buddhism first became established on Chinese territory and from where it spread widely throughout the east. It is also an area of natural beauty into which the human element has been integrated with skill and subtlety, to produce a cultural landscape of outstanding quality (ICOMOS 1996: 4).

There are more than thirty temples on Mount Emei, some of them very ancient, and they reflect the sacredness of the mountain and of the relationship between the man-made and natural elements.

**Mount Wuyi**

The justification for the inscription of Mount Wuyi on the World Heritage List in 1999 was under cultural criterion (vi):

Mount Wuyi was the cradle of Neo-Confucianism, a doctrine that played a dominant role in the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Asia for many centuries and influenced philosophy and government over much of the world (UNESCO 1999). and under natural criterion (iii) : 'the riverine landscape of Nine-Bend Stream (lower gorge) is also of exceptional scenic quality in its juxtaposition of smooth rock cliffs with clear, deep water' (UNESCO 1999). Here again cultural criterion (vi) and natural criterion (iii) are used together to capture the heritage values of natural beauty and the spiritual association of these Chinese 'mountains of meaning'.

**Mount Qincheng**

Mount Qincheng, Sichuan Province, was inscribed on the List in 2000 under cultural criterion (vi), together with (i) and (iv). It was here that Zhan Ling founded the doctrine of Taoism. Later, temples were built on Qincheng and it became the centre of Taoist teachings. (ICOMOS 2000).

(vi) The temples of Mount Qincheng are closely associated with the foundation of Taoism, one of the most influential religions of East Asia over a long period of history (ICOMOS 2000).

Qinching is not inscribed for any natural values.

A brief analysis of the 'mountains of meaning' in China shows that they are closely related to some of the major religions of the world: Buddhism, Hinduism and Taoism. Their natural beauty and elevation attracted the holy men of these religions and, in turn, these attracted pilgrims, artists and writers to capture the sacredness of the place in artistic forms. These then are truly 'mountains of meaning' and although some of them combine the 'highest physical and spiritual values' (Bernbaum 1997: 34), they have been included on the World Heritage List, not as associative spiritual or inspirational cultural landscapes, but as individual 'sites' as defined by the Convention. In Europe, there are two mountains that have been inscribed for their spiritual values and associations, Mount Athos, Greece and Mount Sinai (St Catherine's Area), Egypt.

**Mount Athos**

Mount Athos was inscribed under cultural criterion (vi) in 1988, because of its spiritual associations which have existed since 1054 AD, and because of its influence on Orthodox art (UNESCO 2002b). It was also inscribed under natural criterion (iii) by the Committee because:

The Committee accepted the ICOMOS proposal to add natural criterion (iii) - outstanding universal value from the point of view of natural beauty - to cultural criteria, since this site involves a humanized landscape the characteristics of which are due to persistence of farming practices and traditional arts and crafts linked to the stringent observance of monastic rules (UNESCO 1988).

**Mount Sinai**

Mount Sinai was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2002 under cultural criterion (vi), because of its associations with Christianity, Islam and Judaism:

The St Catherine's area, centred on the holy mountain of Mount Sinai (Jebel Musa, Mount Horeb), like the Old City of Jerusalem, is sacred to three world religions: Christianity, Islam, and Judaism (UNESCO 2002a).

This brief overview of the 'mountains of meaning' that have been included on the World Heritage List to date, shows that, in spite of the introduction of the Global Strategy in 1994, for a more representative and credible list, the List still reflects the values of mainstream religions and arts. What then of indigenous belief systems and artistic production associated with mountains and their representation on the List? It would appear that these values are not adequately represented. In fact, only the inscription of the 'associative' mountain landscapes of Tongariro National Park and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park recognise such values. I would suggest that this is as result of the individual State Parties being slow to re-evaluate properties already on the List for wider World Heritage values, in response to the more plural approach to the identification of culture by UNESCO (UNESCO 1995). This may be as result of a lack of direct political will, and/or perhaps as a lack of capacity and understanding of the broader themes of the World Heritage Committee's Global Strategy. The following section will review some mountains which are on the World Heritage List, but where the sacred associations have not been recognised through their inscription.

'Mountains of Meaning': intangible heritage values not inscribed

There are many mountains on the World Heritage List which, although imbued with sacred or spiritual values, are inscribed only for their natural values. Mount Everest, also known as
Sagarmatha, which in Nepali means 'whose head touches the sky' (Nepal 1979), in Sagarmatha National Park, India, is one such mountain. It was inscribed in 1979, not for its sacred values, but for its natural values, under natural criterion (iii) for its exceptional natural beauty:

It contains unique, rare or superlative natural phenomena, formations or features of areas of exceptional natural beauty.

There can be no doubt that their unsurpassed elevation qualifies Sagarmatha and the Great Himalayan Range as unique. In addition, the park includes a mountain complex of superlative grandeur, beauty and challenge complemented by cultural elements of great interest (Nepal 1979).

In spite of the fact that Mount Sagarmatha was inscribed for its natural values alone, it is a sacred mountain to the local Sherpa people, who call it Chomolongma, 'Goddess Mother of the World' (Nepal 1979). Thus, Sagarmatha National Park could also have been inscribed using cultural criterion (vi) to reflect the intangible, spiritual value of these mountains and the interaction of man and nature.

Another such mountain on the World Heritage List, inscribed in 1988 for its natural values alone, is Nanda Devi in Nanda Devi National Park. Nanda Devi is in the Indian part of the Himalaya and these mountain landscapes are referred to in ancient Hindu scriptures as Dev Bhumi, 'the land of the Gods' (Ramakrishnan 2000).

With these two examples alone, it can be seen that 'mountains of meaning' exist within the World Heritage List beyond those explicitly inscribed for such meanings. Other mountains inscribed on the World Heritage List for natural values alone, but which have been noted for their spiritual values, are: Mount Kinabalu, Malaysia, Mount Kenya, Kenya, and Yakushima, Japan, and there are undoubtedly others. There is a need for States Parties to the Convention to consider an extension of the World Heritage values of some of these mountains. These should include consideration of intangible heritage values, of outstanding universal value, under cultural criterion (vi), in order that a true reflection of their cultural significance be provided.

What is a World Heritage 'inspirational' landscape or mountain?

One of the major issues concerning 'inspirational' landscapes and mountains is the theoretical and methodological process to be used in their identification. It will be recalled that only one 'inspirational' landscape, but no 'inspirational' mountains, have been inscribed explicitly on the World Heritage List to date. These landscapes are identified because 'of the powerful...artistic or cultural associations of the natural element' and inscribed using criterion (vi) 'directly or tangibly associated...with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance'.

The Oxford English Dictionary definition of inspiration is: 'A breathing in or infusion of some idea, purpose, etc. into the mind; the suggestion, awakening, or creation of some feeling or impulse, esp. of an exalted kind'. Thus, 'inspirational' landscapes and mountains can be said to be "those places associated with positive and inspiring aesthetic or cultural perceptions of a place and experiences derived from that place" (Australian Heritage Commission 2002).

The ascribed values of 'inspirational' landscapes and mountains are dependent on their association with what the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu would call a 'cultural production', in other words an art form (Bourdieu 1993). This art form is associated with, and inspired by, an identifiable landscape. In the narrowest interpretation, such a cultural production would relate to paintings or poetry, but in its widest sense could include film, television, literature, photography, music, etc.

As an 'inspirational' landscape or mountain has not yet been explicitly inscribed on the World Heritage List primarily for those values, there have been no debates within the World Heritage Committee on the nature of the values acceptable for inscription under this sub-category of 'associative' cultural landscapes. Neither has there been any debate or discussion about how, or in what way, a landscape can be assessed as having artistic or cultural associations with 'artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance' (UNESCO 2000).

In 1995, Dr Henry Cleere, at that time, World Heritage Convenor of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), proposed an early interpretation of cultural criterion (vi) and how it would be applied to places which had associations with artistic and literary works:

The basic criterion must surely be that of the 'outstanding universal value' of the artist concerned. The success of a hypothetical nomination of the Montagne Sainte Victoire would depend upon the evaluation of the universal significance of Cézanne who painted it so often. This is an aspect of the concept of associative cultural landscapes that requires long and deep consideration, and by an organization other than ICOMOS, which is not equipped to pronounce upon matters of non-material culture of this kind (Cleere 1995: 56).

Thus, Cleere’s suggested interpretation is that an artistic or literary work can only be of ‘outstanding universal value’ if the artist is of world renown. The views of selected World Heritage experts and professionals, about how ‘inspirational’ landscapes and mountains can and should be identified, have been canvassed as part of recent research by the author. Most of those interviewed also interpreted the application of criterion (vi) in the same way as Cleere, i.e. based on the outstanding universal value of the artist concerned; although they do not necessarily agree with its premise. Domicjej (Interview 27 July 2002) clearly diverges from this view and has suggested that the ‘outstanding universal value’ referred to in criterion (vi) relates to the art-work itself, not the artist.

A crucial methodological question for the World Heritage Committee, and ICOMOS, is how will they evaluate one subject of cultural production, one inspirational landscape/mountain, associated with one ‘consecrated’ artist over another? When recently asked how ICOMOS might deal with an evaluation of a nomination of an ‘inspirational’ landscape to the World Heritage List, Cleere had not changed his view of 1995 of the artist as ‘genius’, and suggested that there should be a ‘hit-list of premier league...thinkers, writers, painters, composers and other brains’ (Interview 24 January 2002). One wonders how such a ‘hit-list’ would be linked to the World Heritage Committee’s Global Strategy and how its representativity could be ensured? Perhaps every geo-cultural region would have to identify key artists and thinkers who were considered to be of outstanding universal value.

The divergence in views, concerning the interpretation of criterion (vi) and its application to ‘inspirational’ landscapes and mountains, between World Heritage professionals, illustrates...
the ambiguous nature of not only the category of cultural landscape, but also of the wording of the criterion used to inscribe such inspirational places on the World Heritage List. The interpretation of criterion (vi) ‘artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance’ to mean that the artistic production must be by an artist who is considered to be of ‘outstanding universal significance’, highlights some crucial issues in the consideration of ‘inspirational’ landscapes and places for World Heritage inscription. A critical theoretical and methodological question for the application of the World Heritage Convention is why is it that the ‘consecration’ of an artist, i.e. an artist who is accepted as ‘great’, apparently confers ‘sacredness’, as Bourdieu puts it, not only on the art work produced by such an artist, but also on the subject of their cultural production, in this case, landscapes? The majority interpretation of criterion (vi) in relation to ‘inspirational’ landscapes opposes Bourdieu’s theories (Bourdieu 1993). He argued that the merit of the artistic creation lay in the representation (as does Domicel), not in the object represented.

At the Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop on Associative Cultural Landscapes in Sydney in 1995, a discussion that considered ‘inspirational’ landscapes revolved around the concept of the ‘artist’s vision’. The concept is based on the assumption that famous artists, by virtue of their talent, have the necessary skills to identify beauty. For instance, a landscape that is selected for depiction by an artist is considered by others to be ‘inspirational’ and beautiful (Interview 19 March 2002, Sharon Sullivan). The idea of an ‘artist’s vision’ and the identification of the artist rather than the artwork as being of ‘outstanding universal value’, in World Heritage evaluation processes, plays to the ‘charismatic ideology’ of the artist as ‘genius’ (Bourdieu 1993). The corollary of this approach is that if the artist is not of ‘outstanding universal value’ then the subject of his/her cultural production will be unworthy of consideration and, by association, the places depicted not worthy of World Heritage inscription. Thus, inspirational qualities of landscapes and mountains, and other places, may only be considered to be valid if they inspire great artists to produce art, although not if they inspire thousands of non-consecrated amateurs to paint the same scene. This premise has repercussions in relation to the continual authenticity of a landscape, which will be discussed in the last section of this paper.

In considering these issues of artistic merit, together with the suggested World Heritage methodology behind the identification of ‘inspirational’ landscapes – which is somehow tied in with the ‘artist’s vision’ (Interview 19 March 2002, Sharon Sullivan) – one can ask if the World Heritage Committee is actually attempting to include landscapes on the List that are admired on purely aesthetic grounds? If this is the case, is the Committee proposing to use the connection of certain landscapes with consecrated artists to construct some form of cultural benchmark in order to justify their identification and evaluation for inclusion on the List?

The theories of Bourdieu provide a critical analysis of the application of the Convention in relation to landscapes, mountains and places associated with artistic productions. The identification of ‘inspirational’ landscapes and mountains, for inscription on the World Heritage List, is an issue that requires detailed and urgent consideration by the World Heritage Committee and by ICOMOS, as its Advisory Body. It is also an issue that requires the application of clear intellectual rigour and a strong theoretical basis.

### Authenticity, monitoring and management of inspirational landscapes

A requirement of the Operational Guidelines (UNESCO 2000) is for cultural places nominated to, and included on, the List to meet the test of authenticity. If authenticity is taken to mean ‘genuine’, one can question what this means for ‘inspirational’ landscapes and mountains. They are, by their definition, associated with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal value that are often of some antiquity, and where the values of the place are intangible. Can an inspirational landscape, or mountain, be authentic in the twenty-first century if it was the inspiration of an artistic production in the nineteenth century? Perhaps the interpretation of authenticity in this case means that a landscape is genuine in its spirit or feeling, i.e. that it is still inspirational today. This authenticity will therefore be linked to the maintenance, and protection of its physical attributes.

In order to identify whether a landscape is still inspirational, cultural indicators need to be identified. Unlike spiritual values, which, although intangible, can have quantifiable, verifiable indicators to illustrate that those values are still held, indicators for heritage values associated with ‘inspirational’ landscapes are not as easy to define. In order to illustrate that an ‘inspirational’ landscape is still authentic, still inspirational – using the World Heritage Convention methodology – perhaps the Lake District and Montagne Sainte Victoire would still be painted by famous artists and other landscapes written about by famous poets. Alternatively, perhaps the logical indication of a landscape’s inspiration should be related to indicators such as its number of visitors. The inspirational qualities of the Lake District to a twenty-first-century tourist, amateur painter, bushwalker, or potholer might be the same physical ones as those that inspired Wordsworth.

If it is the association of a landscape with a famous cultural production that is of paramount importance, it raises an interesting question in relation to the future management of ‘inspirational’ landscapes. Should views and vistas, as painted by famous artists, be conserved or restored, or is this taking it all a bit too far? In a paper on “The landscape of nostalgia, the landscape of decline” Michael Rosenthal examines the landscape of Constable’s ‘Hay Wain’ which the National Trust has now cleared from its overgrown state to restore the vista that Constable painted (Rosenthal 1994).

It is possible to quantify physical change in an ‘inspirational’ landscape, or mountain, from visual depictions, and restore a vista to its original form? The same question can be posed for landscapes that provide musical inspiration? How does a heritage manager ensure that a place retains the physical authenticity it had when it was the muse for a great piece of music? What assumptions are in play in this interchange of authentic and what is perceived to be authentic? These are crucial questions in the identification, maintenance and management of authenticity of ‘inspirational’ landscapes and mountains, as well as significant methodology questions that must be addressed by the World Heritage Committee.

It is more constructive to think of artworks as ‘indicators’ of heritage values associated with particular landscapes. In order for this approach to be adopted, the term ‘inspirational’ in relation to a landscape would need to be clearly defined to justify its inclusion on the World Heritage List. Perhaps this requires reference back to the natural values and criteria as
outlined by the Operational Guidelines (UNESCO 2000), or a more verifiable way of identifying landscapes that were, and still are, special and inspirational to our societies. This could involve the consideration of more inclusive indicators, rather than relying solely on celebrated artistic productions as indicators of such value.

Perhaps it is the physical character of a landscape that is the real draw, provides the real inspiration, and holds the real value, and the art works that have been inspired by these landscapes are just indicators of such value. It would then be logical that the physical attributes of a landscape associated with such inspiration should be maintained. Using cultural indicators that may include artistic cultural productions, what will be managed and preserved, therefore, will be the physical landscapes that are considered by current societies to be of value.

It is, however, problematic to try and identify cultural indicators, which illustrate the currency of intangible heritage values of "inspirational" landscapes and mountains. By their very nature, heritage values are mutable, and change over time. Thus, the values that a given society invests in a place are non-static. One generation may celebrate a certain type of landscape whereas another may loathe it. For example, before the construction of the ideal of the 'picturesque', mountainous scenery, such as the Lake District that Wordsworth depicted, was considered to be frightening, dark and evil. Not only can social appreciation of landscape change, but appreciation of certain artists and their works, can also alter. Artists, and their cultural productions, go in and out of fashion with different generations. Once again, this highlights questions of viability in identifying an inspirational landscape or mountain solely through its association with an artist and their cultural productions. It, again, suggests that such productions should be used as indicators, not identifiers, of "inspirational" landscapes.

The question of the mutability of intangible heritage values is not, however, one that is confined to the consideration of "inspirational" landscapes. It is a question that confronts heritage managers at all places where the values of the place are those ascribed by a particular society, at a particular time, and which have no material manifestation. The currency of a heritage listing for such values will always be questionable unless quantifiable, verifiable, indicators can be identified through which to monitor them. The suggestion here, therefore, is that it is not possible to protect the intangible heritage values of an "inspirational" landscape but only to record their currency. It is a challenge for heritage professionals to find a way to develop non-material value cultural indicators for the management of "inspirational" landscapes. Only when this is achieved will heritage managers be able to identify when the values for which a place has been initially inscribed are under threat or no longer extant.

**Conclusion**

In this paper, I have illustrated that there are "mountains of meaning" both within and without the World Heritage List. I have also shown that even those mountains that are inscribed on the World Heritage List, may not have their intangible cultural heritage values recognised through their inscription. I have suggested that States Parties to the Convention should reconsider the values for which their World Heritage mountains are inscribed on the List, in order to better reflect the plural heritage of the humanity.

Associative cultural landscapes are a further category of property, with intangible cultural heritage values, that I have considered in this paper. 'A work of art has meaning and interest only for someone who possesses the cultural competence that is, the code, into which it is encoded' (Bourdieu 1993:7). The quotation underlines the issue of utilising particular cultural indicators to identify associative, inspirational qualities of mountains and cultural landscapes. This paper demonstrates that, within the World Heritage arena, the identification of artists of 'outstanding universal value' and their cultural productions is fraught with methodological problems; that particular artists and productions should be used as indicators, not identifiers, of 'inspirational' landscapes.

It has been suggested that artistic associations, which are subject to taste and fashion, should be used only as one type of cultural indicator, in conjunction with others. These should be able to demonstrate society's current appreciation of a landscape, and the reasons that a particular physical landscape is valued for its inspirational qualities. Following on from this, it has also been suggested that it is the physical landscape, which has been represented by art, and has inspired tourism, which retains value for current society. As a result, it is the physical landscape that must be managed according to its current, not past, visions and representations.

Once intangible cultural heritage values are recognised, wherever possible, they need to be protected. Protection of the values for which a World Heritage property is inscribed on the List is key to its successful management. The protection of intangible cultural heritage values poses more of a problem than, for example, the protection of material fabric, or of wildlife habitat. The protection of ‘mountains of meaning’ or ‘inspirational’ landscapes requires not only the protection of the natural landscapes, which are the repository for their heritage values, but also requires the protection of the culture that ascribes meanings and associations to that location. In the case of the 'mountains of meaning' discussed in this paper, this protection would require the continuity of religious practice and observance at these mountains. This is, of course, beyond the authority of any State Party, or international organisation, and emphasises the mutable quality of intangible cultural heritage values, that can evolve and change over time, as different groups construct different values at different places.

Intangible cultural heritage values of 'inspirational' landscapes and mountains are ascribed to the physical place and it is only the material, physical values that can be protected and managed. Cultural indicators that reflect the intangible values of a place, such as artistic associations, can, however, assist with management of such landscapes and mountains. Cultural indicators also mark whether the intangible cultural heritage values of a place are still extant. If they are not, the question of the continued inspirational authenticity of the place is raised, as is the legitimacy of maintaining such places on the World Heritage List. This poses a wider question: should the World Heritage List be reviewed on a cyclical basis to ensure the authenticity and currency of its inscribed intangible cultural heritage values?
Table 1: Mountains and cultural landscapes discussed in the text, illustrating criteria for inscription and identified values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Cultural Criterion</th>
<th>Living Tradition</th>
<th>Ideas</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Artistic/Literary Works</th>
<th>Natural Criterion</th>
<th>Beauty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tongariro NP, New Zealand #421, 1993</td>
<td>(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uluru–Kata Tjuta NP, Australia #447, 1994</td>
<td>(v)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vat Phou, Laos #481 rev</td>
<td>(ii)(vi)(v)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kii Mountain Range, Japan #1142, 2003</td>
<td>(ii)(v)(iv)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val d'Orcia, Italy #1026, 2004</td>
<td>(iv)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Tai, China #437, 1987</td>
<td>(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lushan NP, China #778, 1994</td>
<td>(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Emei Scenic Area, China #779, 1996</td>
<td>(iv)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Wuyi, China #911, 1999</td>
<td>(iii)(v)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii)(v)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Qincheng, China #1001, 2000</td>
<td>(ii)(iv)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Athos, Greece #454, 1988</td>
<td>(i)(ii)(vi)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Sinai (St Catherine's Area) Egypt #954, 2002</td>
<td>(i)(ii)(vi)(vi)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagarmatha NP, Nepal #120, 1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nana Devi NP, India #335, 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinabalu Park, Malaysia #1012, 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Kenya NP, Kenya #600, 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i)(ii)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakushima, Japan #662, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii)(ii)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Endnotes

1 It is not clear from the ICOMOS evaluation report what type of cultural landscape Val Phou was inscribed as. It is a planned, intact, landscape but the mountain, which is central to the design, also has living spiritual associations.

2 The Lake District National Park was first considered by the Committee as a 'mixed' cultural and natural, cultural landscape in 1987. ICOMOS supported the nomination but IUCN did not; the nomination was therefore deferred until the Committee clarified its position concerning these types of cultural landscapes. In 1989 the Lake District was once again nominated, but this time just as a cultural area. The Committee in 1990 again deferred the nomination pending further consideration of the issue of the inclusion of rural landscapes on the List. Following on from its consideration of the Lake District nomination in 1990, the Committee asked the Secretariat to the Committee to develop criteria that would accommodate such rural, cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List. This recommendation resulted in an expert meeting on Cultural Landscapes at La Petite Pierre, France in 1992 where the three categories of cultural landscapes were developed. At the time of writing, the Lake District National Park has not yet been re-nominated to the List.

3 On the issue of protecting the non-material values of Protected Areas, and especially mountains, see works of The World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the Protected Areas Programme, which especially consider the heritage values, metaphysical values of sacred mountains and landscapes.

4 Sherpa culture has developed in close association with the mountains in the area and this is reflected in the folklore and belief systems (Sherpa 2001).

5 The cultural landscape of Val d'Orcia, Italy, was inscribed on the List in 2004, amongst other things, for its inspirational values. Mount Lushan, China, was inscribed in 1996. The World Heritage Committee has not, however, formally recognized Lushan as an 'associative' cultural landscape (WHC-96/CONF.201/21) although it is inscribed under cultural criterion (vi) for its inspirational and spiritual associations.

6 As discussed previously in this paper, it is unclear as to whether the landscape of Val d'Orcia fits into this category of an inspirational landscape, which clearly refers to associations of 'artistic and literary works' or 'outstanding universal significance'.

7 Interviews in 2002 with Dr Harry Cleere, Ms Joan Dorrington, Professor Peter Fowler, Ms Jane Lennon, Professor Ken Taylor, Ms Sharon Sullivan.

8 This meeting was convened by Australia ICOMOS and UNESCO at the Sydney Opera House, Sydney and in the Blue Mountains, outside Sydney, in April 1995.

9 This approach is, in fact, being taken by the Australian Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Heritage in their assessment of inspirational landscapes for inclusion on the new National Heritage Register.