

## **Cultural landscape as action arena – an identity-based concept of region-building**

### **1. Introduction**

Cultural landscapes are increasingly understood as something not merely to be protected. The European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) and the European Landscape Convention (ELC) as well as the new Concepts and Strategies for Spatial Development in Germany propose considering cultural landscapes also as a force to promote cooperative regional development. Common historical roots, special landscape features, typical products, cultural traditions as well as innovative projects are possible initial points for identity-based region-building processes. In connection with governance arrangements cultural landscapes can be constituted as action arenas for regional development. These region-building processes can be understood as a special form of regionalism.

The paper follows the following structure. First, the theoretical background for the constitution of cultural landscapes as identity-based action arenas will be explained (2). Next the institutional framework regarding new approaches to cultural landscape at the European level and in Germany will be analysed (3). Then the difficulties and synergies of the constitution of cultural landscapes as action arenas will be exemplified through case studies from Berlin/Brandenburg and North Rhine-Westphalia in Germany (4). Finally, some conclusions will be drawn (5).

### **2. Theoretical background**

In the following section the theoretical approach for the understanding of cultural landscapes as identity-based action arenas will be developed with reference to other ideas of regionalism and region-building.

During the last decades different processes of region-building have emerged to solve new challenges of regional development. The concept of New Regionalism highlights the importance for region-building processes independent of administrative structures. Its problem-oriented approach possesses a diversity of goals, actors, institutional arrangements, cognitive and communicative processes and governance structures and offers the possibility to integrate regional identities, images or other “soft” regional potentials (cf. Blatter 2006, 19). The New Regionalism was originally a concept to solve problems in metropolitan regions. Brenner (2002, 4) highlights that “metropolitan regionalism encompasses a broad range of institutional forms, regulatory strategies and governance projects – including, for instance, attempts to modify existent jurisdictional boundaries through annexation, merger or consolidation”. In face of globalisation the new metropolitan regionalism has stimulated many reform attempts solving functional, social and economical problems of socio-spatial segregation, sustainable development and economic competitiveness (Blatter 2006, 5).

The concept of Regionalism has also been adapted to rural regions, where in excess of economic arguments “a broader purpose for regionalization will be necessary” (Hamin & Marcucci 2008, 468). Rural areas thus face often polyvalent situations of significant landscape and cultural change under conditions that limit the role and effectiveness of formal governance. „A culture of volunteerism combined with suspicion toward and lack of capacity in local governments makes grassroots, community-based approaches both possible and necessary for rural areas“ (Hamin & Marcucci 2008, 470). With the change of agricultural policy new rural territories have led to differentiated rural spaces in Europe (Marsden 1998).

Allen *et al.* (1998, 34) “begin from the proposition that ‘regions’ (more generally, ‘places’) only take shape in particular contexts and from specific perspectives”. Paasi (2002a, 807) concludes therefore that “the various organizations, institutions and actors involved in the institutionalization of a region may have different strategies with regard to the meaning and functions of the region and its ‘identity’”. For the institutionalisation of regions as a sociospatial process Paasi (1991, 243) elaborates four partly simultaneous stages from a perspective of new geography:

---

<sup>1</sup> Leibniz-Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning (IRS), Erkner (Germany), Contact: [Roehring@irs-net.de](mailto:Roehring@irs-net.de)

- the development of territorial shape referring to the localisation of social practices and the definition of boundaries,
- the formation of the symbolic shape establishing specific structures of the territorial symbols,
- the emergence of institutions as formal establishments and practices in the spheres of politics, economics, legislation and administration and
- the establishment of a region in the spatial structure and social consciousness.

Since the end of the 1990s cultural landscape has increasingly been understood not merely as something to be protected, but also detected as a force to promote identity-based cooperative regional development (cf. Fürst et al. 2008). If this approach will consequently be implemented it is not sufficient to valorise only particular historical elements of cultural landscape. The value of a cultural landscape is not only the summation of their elements, often the object of the special interests of historical geographers, heritage or nature protection. It is necessary to recognise the potentials of cultural landscapes for identity-based region-building processes. Therefore a holistic understanding of cultural landscape combined with social science approaches of institutional theory can contribute.

From a holistic perspective every European landscape is man-made and can be called in this sense a cultural landscape, independent of its quality or other normative considerations. Cultural landscapes are not only formed by people, they also provide identity formation services and influence the dealing with the landscape in this way. Accordingly cultural landscapes possess not only physical dimensions. It is a social construction being based on the landscape perception. Cultural landscapes have the potential to integrate (cf. Gailing & Röhring 2008):

- Disciplinary or sectoral understandings of cultural landscapes
- Utilisation (agriculture, silviculture, settlement activities) and protection (nature conservation, heritage conservation) and the prevailing policy fields
- Urban, suburban and rural areas
- Diverse regional actors, projects and networks

Because of the diverse geo-biophysical conditions of the natural environment, the different historical developments and traditions, the existing land-use regimes and the socio-cultural activities, regions can be distinguished by different cultural landscapes with various qualities shaping the identity and the image of a region. To activate the region-building potentials of these cultural landscapes for regional development cultural landscapes can be constituted as action arenas (cf. Fürst et al. 2008 and Gailing & Röhring 2008). They are characterised by

- an Identity-based approach on cultural landscape
- Long term governance structures with broad involvement of regional actors
- Region-building processes and the definition of cultural landscape boundaries
- Project-oriented development of cultural landscape potentials (identity-establishing projects, regional products, tourist development).

To understand the potentials and limitations for the constitution and development of cultural landscapes as action arenas the specific institutional dimensions of cultural landscapes have to be considered (cf. Röhring & Gailing 2005). According to institutional theory (cf. Young 2002, 5) human behaviour is influenced by a wide range of formal (e.g. sets of rules and regulations) and informal (e.g. traditions, regional identity, images, customs and ecological or social values) centralised or decentralised, sectoral or regional institutions<sup>2</sup>.

In face of their variety and heterogeneity cultural landscapes are influenced by different institutional systems with different goals and logics of actions. Cultural landscapes can not be developed intentionally as a whole and because of the given functional interdependencies problems of interplay (Young 2002, 23) can occur. Cultural landscapes are more or less a by-product of sectoral policies and diverse human activities and in that sense a common good (cf. Röhring 2006). Due to the different goals of institutional regimes the behaviour of actors in using the given scope of institutions and identifying institutional windows of opportunity is essentially influenced by informal institutions. Gailing & Kilper (2008) detected,

---

<sup>2</sup> Institutions in that respect must not be confused with organisations, which are themselves actors only influenced by institutions. It is important to recognise, however, that especially formal institutions do not simply provide orientation for actors; they are themselves subject to (re-)shaping by actors (Scharpf 1997).

that “the following forms of informal institutions are particularly relevant for cultural landscapes as a common good:

- sectoral standards of value, concepts and patterns of behaviour,
- culturally defined representations and images of landscapes and
- specific characteristics of regional identities.“ (ibid., 24)

Current tendencies expanding the ranges of sectoral rules and regulations in the sense of multifunctionality as a political concept (cf. OECD 2001) lead not only to increasing institutional interactions but also to the constitution of action arenas to manage particular goals (e.g. rural development, nature protection). Thus problems of spatial fit<sup>3</sup> between these different action arenas, cultural landscapes or administrative areas can occur.

Compared with the concepts of regionalism and region-building the action arena approach to cultural landscape can be interpreted as a modified form of regionalism shaped especially by an identity-based region-building combined with governance structures. The following key issues for the constitution of cultural landscapes as action arenas (which will be exemplified by case studies in section 4) can be derived:

- Region-building and Institutionalisation
- Identity and image formation
- Dealing with problems of fit and interplay

### 3. Institutional framework

The holistic approach and the understanding that cultural landscapes are not only something to be protected but also a force to promote cooperative regional development has increasingly been integrated in regulations and policy concepts at the European, German Federal and State level (cf. Gailing & Röhring 2008).

At the European level, there are two formal institutions concerned with these requirements: the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) of the European Union (European Commission 1999) and the European Landscape Convention (ELC) of the Council of Europe (Council of Europe 2000), operative from 2004<sup>4</sup>. The ESDP and the ELC include socio-cultural aspects in the term “landscape” because “cultural landscapes contribute through their originality to local and regional identity” (ESDP, Art. 151) and “to the formation of local cultures” (ELC, Preamble). The ELC also highlights the innovative aspect of landscape perception in extension of traditional approaches and states that “‘Landscape’ means an area, as perceived by people” (Art. 1a). Both regulations cover the total spectrum of landscapes: “urban areas and in the countryside, (...) degraded areas as well as (...) areas of high quality, (...) areas recognised as being of outstanding beauty as well as everyday areas” (ELC Preamble) or “towns and cities, their hinterland and rural areas” (ESDP, Art. 134).

Because of the heterogeneous driving forces of cultural landscape change according to the ELC it is necessary “to integrate landscape into (the) regional and town planning policies and in (the) cultural, environmental, agricultural, social and economic policies, as well as in any other policies with possible direct or indirect impact on landscape” (Art. 5d). The ESDP aims at the “enhancement of the value of cultural landscapes within the framework of integrated spatial development strategies,” (Art. 155).

The ELC also includes measures to influence informal institutions concerned with landscape, such as the increasing of “awareness among the civil society, private organisations, and public authorities of the value of landscapes, their role and changes to them” (Art. 6). Another aspect is the establishment of “procedures for the participation of the general public, local and regional authorities, and other parties with an interest in the definition and implementation of the landscape policies” (Art. 5c).

Against the background of these European regulations the Concepts and Strategies for Spatial Development in Germany adopted by the Standing Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning on 30 June 2006, include in concept 3 the guideline: “Conservation of resources; shaping of cultural landscapes”. Cultural landscapes are viewed as a “an important addition in qualitative terms to traditional

---

<sup>3</sup> Derived from Young (2002, 20) understanding “problems of fit” as institutional fit between institutions and the requirements of the resource.

<sup>4</sup> Not signed by the German Federal State but effective as an informal institution.

spatial development policy” and as “distinctive areas that can be experienced and serve to promote the regional identification of the local population with their surroundings” (BMVBS 2006, 25). The German States follow different strategies to implement these guidelines.

In the new State Development Plan for Berlin and Brandenburg the strategic understanding of cultural landscapes as action arenas is reflected. “The plan proposes to consider cultural landscapes as action arenas for cooperative regional development and to actively shape these arenas. (...) The diversity of its cultural landscapes is an asset of the joint planning region of Berlin-Brandenburg. Tapping this resource, however, requires specific solutions and approaches that can be found and implemented most effectively at the regional level” (MIR & SenStadt 2007, 25). The State Development Plan includes a proposal for the constitution of action arenas in the whole State which can be adapted or modified by the regional actors. In the recent past Berlin and Brandenburg have acquired valuable experiences with regional parks as project-oriented instruments of landscape management in city regions, but also with large-scale reserves, regional parks and other action arenas (cf. Kühn & Gailing 2008 and Gailing & Röhring 2009).

In North Rhine-Westphalia the cultural landscape approach has been elaborated by an expertise of the Rhineland Regional Council (LVR) and the Regional Association of Westphalia-Lippe (LWL) as a contribution to future revision of the state development plan (LVR & LWL 2007). This concept aims at the “preservative development of cultural landscape” and is in face of the dynamic of landscape change in the large urbanised area of North Rhine-Westphalia oriented at the protection of cultural heritage. In the expertise important cultural landscapes were identified and spatially defined. In connection with the regional structural programme for the Cologne/Bonn region “Regionale 2010” and the “Masterplan geen” (cf. Regionale 2010 Agentur 2007) the cultural landscape approach has been exemplarily implemented by the constitution of identity-based action arenas in several initial projects (see section 4).

Although integrated in the formal regulations of state development planning the innovative action arena approach on cultural landscape of Berlin-Brandenburg needs to be supported by sectoral policies because they possess institutional resources and the possibilities to fund bottom up activities. In North Rhine-Westphalia the integrated concept of the regional structural programme “Regionale 2010” has offered the opportunity for pilot projects combining the approach of preservative development of cultural landscape, although not yet formalised, with the constitution of action arenas.

#### 4. Examples of cultural landscapes as action arenas

During the past years, a variety of action arenas and regional networks e.g. regional parks, large-scale reserves, regions of rural development, tourism regions as well as inter-municipal networks of cooperation have been constituted. They are rooted in different cultural landscape approaches, they deal with specific landscape potentials and they pursue diverse goals of regional development. In the following section the constitution of action arenas in cultural landscapes will be analysed on the basis of case studies in the Capital region Berlin-Brandenburg and the Rhineland (part of North Rhine-Westphalia) realised in recent years:<sup>5</sup>

- *Water-Quintet*: Action arena of rural development and part of the structure programme “Regionale 2010” in North Rhine-Westphalia aiming at the valorisation of five impoundment dams in the low mountain range Bergisches Land.
- *Homburger Ländchen*: Action arena of the cultural landscape association “Homburger Ländchen” initiated by the structure programme “Regionale 2010” in North Rhine-Westphalia aiming at the preservation of historical land use patterns in the low mountain range Bergisches Land.
- *Indeland*: Action arena of mining-affected municipalities initiated by the structure programme “EuRegionale 2008” in North Rhine-Westphalia aiming at the structural change and future development of the area around the active open-cast lignite mine at the small river Inde.
- *International Building Exhibition (IBA) Fürst-Pückler-Land*: Network aiming at a qualitative development of exemplary and innovative projects of the regional structural change in the Lower Lusatian open-cast lignite mining area in Brandenburg.

---

<sup>5</sup> The following case studies have been examined within research projects of the Leibniz Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning (IRS). The case studies Eifel, Spreewald and Barnim were carried out by Ludger Gailing. The sources of the examined case studies used in the whole section are indicated in the following overview.

- *Spreewald (Spree Forest)*: Multiple action arenas (biosphere reserve, tourism region, economic region and LEADER-region) in the Lower Lusatia in Brandenburg aiming at the preservation of a unique historical cultural landscape with traditional settlements and an specific irrigation system in the wetlands (inland delta) of the river Spree. (Gailing 2010a)
- *Eifel*: Multiple action arenas (national park, nature parks, geo parks, tourism region, LEADER-regions) in the low mountain range Eifel in North Rhine-Westphalia and Rhineland-Palatinate cross-border to Belgium and Luxembourg aiming at several, coordinated goals of cultural landscape based regional development. (Gailing 2010b)
- *Barnim*: Action arenas (nature park, regional park, tourism region) aiming at different cultural landscape strategies in the heterogeneous suburban and agricultural landscape with forests areas at the Barnim Plateau on the outskirts of Berlin cross-border to Brandenburg with efforts to identity formation. (Gailing & Keim 2006; Röhring & Gailing 2006 and 2011)
- *Oderbruch*: Weakly institutionalised civil society networks aiming at the cultural valorisation and sustainable multifunctional development of the historically reclaimed and colonised polder landscape of the river Oder in Brandenburg. (Röhring 2006; Röhring & Gailing 2006 and 2011)

These case studies will be analysed regarding three key issues of action arenas: region-building and institutionalisation, identity and image formation and the dealing with problems of fit and interplay. More detailed and systematic information about the analysed action arenas will be presented in the table at the end of the section.

### **Region-building and institutionalisation**

The examined action arenas have been institutionalised in different ways and possess a broad spectrum of governance structures largely institutionally embedded and financially supported. High institutionalised with multiple action arenas are *Eifel* and *Spreewald*. The former economically underdeveloped *Eifel* has been sub-spatially institutionalised by four LEADER-regions, three nature parks, one national park, one geopark and two Volcano Parks. They are focussed on the valorisation of specific cultural and natural landscape potentials (e.g. former volcanoes, impoundment dams, forest areas, cultural landscape development) partly by intersectoral concepts. The “Future Initiative Eifel” with a broad spectrum of regional rooted innovative projects of future development as well as the Tourism region cover the whole landscape Eifel. A highly sophisticated construction is the Regional Brand EIFEL with broad public and private stakeholder participation.

The institutionalisation of the *Spreewald* with several regional and sectoral initiated action arenas is based on the unique identity and image shaping landscape structures: the biosphere reserve spatial oriented on the landscape region, the LEADER-region (rural development) and the tourism region extending the landscape Spreewald widely. The long-term established Spreewald Association with broad stakeholder participation act as LEADER-manager and agency for the regional brand “Spreewald” and the Protected Geographical Indication of gherkins and horseradish as typical products of the Spreewald region. In addition to that the Spreewald foundation aims at financing of traditional land uses to preserve the unique cultural landscape, which can not be provided by European agricultural funds.

The *Water-Quintet* and the *Homburger Ländchen* are projects of the structure programme Regionale 2010 with different institutional backgrounds. Whereas the *Water Quintet* has been constituted by four municipalities in cooperation with the water association as an action arena of rural development with a temporary regional management, the *Homburger Ländchen* has no further institutional embedding. It is based on the initiative of the district as well as the nature park Bergisches Land and three municipalities with broad stakeholder participation. The region has been defined by a combination of boundaries (historical county, landscape, municipalities). The key actor is the Cultural Landscape Association “Homburger Ländchen” managed by the Bio Station Oberberg, an actor of nature protection with a broader project-oriented approach to cultural landscape.

The *IBA Fürst-Pückler-Land* was established in 2000 for 10 years as a network organisation by four districts and the city of Cottbus in the Lusatia-Spreewald planning region. The network of 30 projects aiming at the recultivation of open-cast lignite mining and the regional structural change has been managed by the IBA association. The projects are carried out by different actors and financed mainly by the budget of the public-sector recultivation mining company LMBV. One of the projects, the Lusatian Lakeland has been developed to an action arena of tourism. Whereas the *IBA* was a network of projects the *Indeland*

has been constituted as an action arena by the district of Düren and seven municipalities affected by the open-cast lignite mine Inden and its recultivation. The project has been involved in the structure programme EuRegionale 2008. The electricity producer RWE Power AG has to finance the recultivation of the open-cast lignite mine. The management of the action arena has been established at the district of Düren and cooperates with the private Aachen foundation to develop scenarios for the future development.

The cultural landscape *Barnim* is institutionalised mainly by two spatial complementing action arenas: the nature park Barnim based on the involvement of local actors of nature protection and supported by the environment administrations of the federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg and the Regional park Barnimer Feldmark based on an offer by the Joint State Development Programme for Berlin and Brandenburg – two very different modes of organisation regarding its stability, management and financial support.

Among the analysed case studies the *Oderbruch* is the cultural landscape with the clearest spatial boundaries of the former river polder shaped by the historical reclamation and colonisation but also with the weakest institutionalisation as action arena. One of the reasons for this is the lack of institutional support for this kind of everyday landscape without valuable natural resources or potentialities justifying it e.g. a large scale reserve. It is based mainly on civil society networks and initiatives such as the Forum Oderbruch, a network of engaged inhabitants or activities of the Oderbruchpavillon, an internet based platform of landscape communication supplemented by diverse cultural landscape projects aiming at identity formation.

### **Identity and image formation**

The examined cultural landscapes possess different stages of identity and image formation as well as attempts to change them. The highly institutionalised cultural landscapes *Spreewald* and *Eifel* are shaped by considerable differences regarding the relationship between institutionalisation and identity or image formation. In the *Spreewald* a distinctive identity and an image rooted in the unique landscape has existed since decades. They have been a precondition for the institutionalisation of the action arenas, culminating in the establishment of the regional brand and the Protected Geographical Indication to avoid free-riding of producers outside of the region. Contrary to this relationship for the institutionalisation of action arenas in the *Eifel* identity and image formation were one of the most important challenges. The establishment of a regional brand was a milestone for the former underdeveloped peripheral region.

Both action arenas in the low mountain range Bergisches Land, *Homburger Ländchen* and *Water Quintet*, follow different identity and image formation strategies. Whereas the action arena *Homburger Ländchen* deals with a traditional identity rooted in a historical county with typical land use patterns the *Water Quintet* aims at a new formation of identity and image. Five impoundment dams of the river Wupper will be used not only by their recreational potentials in a more sustainable manner but also be developed as symbols for the formation of identity and image of the region promoted by cultural events.

In the Lusatian and Rhenish open-cast lignite mining areas of the *IBA Fürst-Pückler-Land* and *Indeland* the change and new formation of identity and image are part of the regional structural change promoted e.g. by the creation of landmarks, the reinterpretation of former mining infrastructures (esp. IBA), tourism development or cultural events. Whereas the IBA has to deal with competing images of the grown Lower Lusatian cultural landscape and the unique Spreewald landscape, the *Indeland* is surrounded by a fertile agricultural landscape with a low potential of identity formation.

In the *Barnim* the identity and image formation of the heterogeneous cultural landscape is one of the most important but competing goals of the established action arenas. The loss of the landscape term “Barnim” in the collective memory during the time of GDR is alongside the heterogeneity and the change of the suburban landscape one of the most important difficulties regional actors have to deal with.

The *Oderbruch* is a very characteristic cultural landscape with a distinctive identity rooted in historical development. It has been shaped as an agricultural production landscape formerly called the “vegetable garden of Berlin”. But in contrast to the *Spreewald* there is not only a lack of formalised structures for the branding of the vegetables but also a lack of trust into the marketing effects of the cultural landscape image.

## Dealing with problems of fit and interplay

The established cultural landscape based action arenas have to deal not only with different problems of fit and interplay between them but also with other action arenas at a larger spatial scale as well with overlapping administrative districts.

Problems of fit and interplay between the multiple action arenas (nature parks, national parks, geo parks) of the *Eifel* are caused not only by the diversity of landscape structures but also by the diversity of administrative districts as well as state and national borders. Two cross-border nature parks to Belgium and Luxemburg correspond to the transboundary constellation of the *Eifel*. A multilevel governance constellation to solve problems of fit and interplay has been constituted by the Future Initiative Eifel and the Tourism region Eifel. They aim at the integration of the existing multiple action arenas at the higher regional level of the large low mountain range Eifel by identity formation processes, innovative cluster oriented regional development projects, tourism and regional marketing supported by the regional brand "Eifel".

The *Spreewald* is shaped by overlapping action arenas and administrative districts. The region is historically divided by the boundaries of presently four administrative districts inducing problems of interplay. Further Spreewald action arenas (tourism region and economic region including regional brand) exceed the identity-forming landscape of the biosphere reserve considerably and overlap other cultural landscapes of the Lower Lusatia. The reason for the resulting problems of spatial fit is not only the economic interest to participate at the Spreewald image but also the limitation for the traditional production inside of the biosphere reserve. The Spreewald Association is in addition to the administration of the biosphere reserve and the tourism region a stable regional actor to deal with the resulting problems.

The Regionale 2010 projects and action arenas *Water-Quintet* and *Homburger Ländchen* are situated within the administrative district Oberbergischer Kreis, part of the large tourism region Naturarena, which supports the action arenas by tourism marketing and of the large nature park Bergisches Land as a kind of cultural landscape roof organisation providing advice for project funding especially for the *Homburger Ländchen*. Both action arenas have especially to deal with problems of interplay between cultural landscape requirements and sectoral logics of actions of water management respectively agriculture as the main fields of cultural landscape development.

The *IBA Fürst-Pückler-Land* as a network of projects, thematically combined on so called landscape islands, overlaps with other action arenas especially Lower Lusatia nature parks, LEADER-regions but also the tourism and economic region of the Spreewald. The consequence was the necessity to interact and cooperate with all these actors including cross border cooperation to Saxony to establish the new tourism oriented action arena Lusatian Lakeland. In contrast to the network approach of the IBA, cross-linking several former open-cast mining landscapes, the *Indeland* has been focussed at the area of one open-cast mine in a region where further action arenas do not exist. Solely in the south of *Indeland* action arenas of the *Eifel* overlap a smaller area. The challenge for both action arenas is to solve problems of interplay with the long term oriented and highly formalised logics of action of the recultivation process to adapt the landscape transformation to new cultural landscape requirements.

In the cultural landscape *Barnim* problems of fit between the established action arenas result from the landscape heterogeneity, the partly uncoordinated constitution of action arenas and the dealing with different Barnim images. The civil society actors of the weakly institutionalised cultural landscape *Oderbruch* have to deal with powerful actors of agriculture and water management. Situated within the district Märkisch-Oderland it is part of the large LEADER-region Oderland and the tourism region Seenland Oder-Spree.

## Examples for cultural landscapes as identity-based action arenas

	<b>Water-Quintet</b>	<b>Homburger Ländchen</b>	<b>Indeland</b>	<b>IBA Fürst-Pückler-Land</b>	<b>Eifel</b>	<b>Spreewald</b>	<b>Barnim</b>	<b>Oderbruch</b>
<b>Physical Landscape character</b>	Low mountain range	Traditional mosaic landscape in low mountain range	Open-cast mining and recultivation landscape	Open-cast mining and recultivation landscapes	Low mountain range	Wetlands of Spree river inland delta	Suburban and agricultural plateau landscape	Agricultural river polder landscape
<b>Cultural landscape policy and problems</b>	Identity and Image formation, tourism development, utilization conflicts	Conservation and revaluation of traditional land use regime	Structural and landscape change, identity and image change	Structural and landscape change, identity and image change	Identity and image formation, regional branding, future sustainability	Protection of historical cultural landscape	Image and identity formation, utilization conflicts, coordination of action arenas	Constitution of action arena and definition of cultural landscape strategy
<b>Image and identity anchors</b>	Five impoundment dams of Wupper river	Mosaic landscape, Homburg castle	Landmark Indeman, river Inde, future mining lake	Mining artefacts, landmarks, mining lakes, wilderness areas	Volcanos, rugged mountains, deep forests, impoundment dams	Historical cultural landscape; Slavic traditions of Sorbs	Fragmented everyday landscape	Historical settlements and drainage landscape, River Oder, vegetable garden of Berlin,
<b>Action arenas and governance structures</b>	Water Quintet (Region of integrated rural development), regional management (temporary)	Cultural landscape Homburger Ländchen Cultural Landscape Association	Indeland, Regional development agency	Network of landscape islands with thematic projects	4 nature parks, national park, geopark, 2 Volcano Parks, 4 LEADER-regions, Future Initiative Eifel, tourism region	Biosphere reserve, tourism association, economic area, LEADER-region, Spreewald Association	Nature park Barnim; regional park Barnimer Feldmark	Civil society networks and initiatives (Forum Oderbruch, Oderbruchpavillon)
<b>Boundaries of action arenas</b>	Area of participating municipalities	Historical county, landscape, municipality based boundaries	Area of participating municipalities	Former mining area (without formal boundaries)	Multiple landscape or municipality based boundaries	Multiple landscape or municipality based boundaries	Multiple landscape based boundaries	River polder boundaries
<b>Structure of initial actors</b>	4 municipalities and Water Association	1 district, 3 municipalities	1 district, 7 municipalities, 1 foundation, mining enterprise	4 districts, city of Cottbus, regional planning association	Public actors with participation of private actors	Nature protection, municipal and private actors	Actors of nature protection, municipal and private actors	Civil society actors
<b>Funds/ programmes</b>	Regionale 2010, integrated rural development	Regionale 2010, diverse funding sources	EuRegionale 2008, recultivation budget	Recultivation budget, diverse funding sources	Nature protection funds, diverse funding sources	Nature protection and agricultural funds, Spreewald foundation	Nature protection funds, Job creation schemes	
<b>Regional branding</b>	Tourism and cultural label (not formalised)	Tourism and cultural label (not formalised)	Label indeland	IBA-Logo see (not formalised)	Regional brand EIFEL	Regional brand Spreewald and Protected Geographical Indication		Oderbruch vegetable (not formalised)
<b>State</b>	North Rhine-Westphalia	North Rhine-Westphalia	North Rhine-Westphalia	Brandenburg	North Rhine-Westphalia/Rhineland-Palatinate	Brandenburg	Brandenburg/ Berlin	Brandenburg



## 5. Conclusions

The three approaches presented in the paper have their own roots, problem constellations and strategic goals but they possess conceptual similarities and could be qualified by analysing their strengths and weaknesses. The action arena concept of cultural landscape can complement the economically oriented concept of regionalism by offering an identity-based approach that includes potentials of identity formation and landscape consciousness especially in city and metropolitan areas. It can also enrich the region-building concept and the understanding of regions e.g. by Paasi (2002b: 137) “as historically contingent structures whose institutionalisation is based on their territorial, symbolic and institutional shaping” by a governance approach. Insights from the regionalism concept can be drawn regarding organisational structures to constitute city-regions as action arenas. Finally the relationships between region-building processes and regional identity could be useful for the further development of the action arena concept. To sum up the development of cultural landscapes as action arenas can be interpreted as a special form of regionalism with identity-based region-building processes.

The understanding of cultural landscapes as a force to promote cooperative regional development has been integrated in regulations and policy concepts at the European (ESDP, ELC), German Federal (Concepts and Strategies for Spatial Development in Germany) and State level. But because of the diversity of institutions affecting cultural landscapes and their complexity, formal institutions can only build a framework for dealing with cultural landscapes. Therefore informal institutions like identity or landscape awareness as well as governance structures integrating different sectoral approaches on cultural landscape are of high importance. The new state development plan for Berlin and Brandenburg therefore aims at the constitution of cultural landscapes as action arenas at the regional level using their identity-based region-building potentials. In North Rhine-Westphalia within of the regional structural programme “Regionale 2010” the concept of the “preservative development of cultural landscape” has been shown by the exemplarily constitution of identity-based action arenas in several initial projects.

Deduced from the theoretical considerations and policy approaches case studies in Berlin-Brandenburg and the Rhineland in North Rhine-Westphalia have been analysed regarding the region-building processes, the institutionalisation of action arenas and the established governance structures, the potentials of identity and image formation as well as occurring problems of fit and interplay between different action arenas established with different institutional backgrounds and goals of cultural landscape development.

Region-building processes and the institutionalisation by the establishment of governance structures is one of the key issues for a sustainable constitution of cultural landscapes as action arenas. Municipalities and districts are often key actors of region-building processes initiated by funding programmes. But cultural landscapes as action arenas cannot only be managed by administrative authorities. They need governance structures characterised by project orientation, cooperative arrangements and the participation of local stakeholders. Large scale reserves (e.g. Nature Parks) are often more incorporated in administrative structures of the state authority (e.g. Brandenburg) or the district authorities (e.g. North Rhine-Westphalia) than LEADER-regions, characterised by governance structures being based on the partnership between public and private actors. Because of the heterogeneity of actors dealing with cultural landscape structures an unequal distribution of power especially by a lack of financial resources often can often be detected. Especially self-organisation processes of civil society actors possess often only a limited scope and need institutional and financial support.

The constitution of the examined cultural landscapes as action arenas is being based on an existing but more or less distinctive identity and image. They are often the result of the long-term development of a region and can further be developed. But especially in regions shaped by structural change like former mining areas identity and image have partly to be reshaped. But as an informal institution identity cannot be managed directly. Identity and image are characterised by high inertia, often independent of changes in the real structures between traditions and innovations. These processes have to deal with path-dependencies of cultural landscapes. Persistent elements can often be rediscovered or reinterpreted as remarkable historical highlights and developed as symbols shaping identity and image.

Action arenas dealing with cultural landscapes are often initiated sectoral following different logics of action but each of them with an increasing holistic and multifunctional approach e.g. large scale reserves, regions of rural development or tourist regions. The consequence is not only an overlapping of these diverse action arenas with arising problems of spatial fit but also the need for the solution of problems of interplay. Region-building processes, if aiming at identity-based action arenas, have to deal with the prob-

lem that boundaries of cultural landscapes can not be defined exactly. Alternatively, municipal boundaries often will be used, especially if municipalities are key actors of region-building processes (e.g. Waterquintet). Other action arenas are constituted following other region-building aspects generally and to some extent there is a mis-fit between these regions and cultural landscape-related identities. Paasi (2002a: 807) noticed that “boundaries are a terrain of mixing and blurring, where material, symbolic and power relations become fused”. All the separately analysed dimensions of cultural landscapes as action arenas are temporally, spatially and functionally closely inter-linked.

## 6. References

- Allen, J.; Massey, D. and Cochrane, A. 1998: Rethinking the region. London: Routledge.
- Blatter, J. 2006: Die Vielfalt des "New Regionalism". *Communitarian, Civic and Creative Governance-Ansätze in den U.S.-amerikanischen Metropolregionen*. *disP*, 167, 4/2006, 5-24.
- BMVBS [Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs] 2006: Concepts and Strategies for Spatial Development in Germany. Adopted by the Standing Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning on 30 June 2006.  
<http://www.bmvbs.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/30678/publicationFile/3592/concepts-and-strategies-of-spatial-development-in-germany.pdf>
- Brenner, N. 2002: Decoding the Newest 'Metropolitan Regionalism' in the USA: A Critical Overview. *Cities*, Vol. 19, Issue 1, 3-21.
- Council of Europe 2000: European Landscape Convention (ELC). Florence.
- European Commission 1999: European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP). Luxemburg.
- Fürst, D.; Gailing, L.; Pollermann, K.; Röhring, A. (Eds.) 2008: Kulturlandschaft als Handlungsraum. Institutionen und Governance im Umgang mit dem regionalen Gemeinschaftsgut Kulturlandschaft. Dortmund.
- Gailing, L. 2010a: Kulturlandschaften als regionale Identitätsräume: Die wechselseitige Strukturierung von Governance und Raum. In: Kilper, H. (Hrsg.): *Governance und Raum*. Baden-Baden, 49-72.
- Gailing, L.; Hasenöhr, U. and Röhring, A. (2010b): Handlungsräumliche Ansätze zur Lösung von Kulturlandschaftsproblemen. Presentation at the Workshop “Gemeinschaftsgüter für die Regionalentwicklung – Der Umgang mit Wasserinfrastrukturen und Kulturlandschaften im Rheinland in Geschichte und Gegenwart“, 2 July 2010 in Cologne.  
[http://www.irs-net.de/profil/forschungsabteilungen/forschungsabteilung-2/Workshop-Rheinland/WS\\_Rheinland\\_Gailing\\_Hasenoehrl\\_Roehring.pdf](http://www.irs-net.de/profil/forschungsabteilungen/forschungsabteilung-2/Workshop-Rheinland/WS_Rheinland_Gailing_Hasenoehrl_Roehring.pdf)
- Gailing, L.; Keim, K.-D. together with A. Röhring 2006: Analyse von informellen und dezentralen Institutionen und Public Governance mit kulturlandschaftlichem Hintergrund in der Beispielregion Barnim. Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Materialien der Interdisziplinären Arbeitsgruppe Zukunftsorientierte Nutzung ländlicher Räume, Nr. 6, Berlin.  
<http://www.bbaw.de/bbaw/Forschung/Forschungsprojekte/Land/de/bilder/arbeitspapier6.pdf>
- Gailing, L.; Kilper, H. 2009: Shaping Cultural Landscapes through Regional Governance. In: Strubelt, W. (Ed.): *Guiding Principles for Spatial Development in Germany*. (German Annual of Spatial Research and Policy), Berlin/Heidelberg, 113-123.
- Gailing, L.; Röhring, A. 2008: Kulturlandschaften als Handlungsräume der Regionalentwicklung. Implikationen des neuen Leitbildes zur Kulturlandschaftsgestaltung. In: *RaumPlanung* 136, 5-10.  
<http://www.irs-net.de/download/GailingRoehringKulturlandschaft.pdf>
- Gailing, L.; Röhring, A. 2009: Kulturlandschaften als regionale Entwicklungspotentiale - integriertes Handeln und sektorale Gemeinwohlziele. In: Bernhardt, Ch.; Kilper, H.; Moss, T. (Ed.): *Im Interesse des Gemeinwohls. Regionale Gemeinschaftsgüter in Geschichte, Politik und Planung*, Frankfurt am Main/New York (NY), 181-222.
- Hamin, E. M.; Daniel J. M. 2008: Ad hoc rural regionalism. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Volume 24, Issue 4, 467-477.

- Kühn, M.; Gailing, L. (2008): From Green Belts to Regional Parks: History and Challenges of Suburban Landscape Planning in Berlin. In: Amati, M. (Ed.): Urban Green Belts in the Twenty-first Century (Urban Planning and Environment), Aldershot/Burlington (VT), 185-202.
- LWL/LVR [Regional Association of Westphalia-Lippe, Rhineland Regional Council] (Hg.) 2007: Erhaltende Kulturlandschaftsentwicklung in Nordrhein-Westfalen. Grundlagen und Empfehlungen für die Landesplanung. Münster/Köln.  
<http://www.lvr.de/kultur/kulturlandschaft/zusammenfassung.pdf>
- Marsden, T. 1998: New rural territories: Regulating the differentiated rural spaces. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14(1), 107-117.
- MIR/SenStadt [Ministerium für Infrastruktur und Raumordnung ; Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung] (Hrsg.) 2007: Kulturlandschaften. Chancen für die regionale Entwicklung in Berlin und Brandenburg. Potsdam.  
<http://gl.berlin-brandenburg.de/imperia/md/content/bb-gl/publikationen/kulturlandschaften.pdf>
- OECD [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development] 2001: Multifunctionality. Towards an analytical framework. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. Paris.
- Paasi, A. 1991: Deconstructing regions: notes on the scales of spatial life. *Environment and Planning A* 23(2), 239-256.
- Paasi, A. 2002a: Place and region: regional worlds and words *Progress in Human Geography* December 26(6), 802-811.
- Paasi, A. 2002b: Bounded spaces in the mobile world: Deconstructing 'regional identity'. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 93, 137-148.
- Regionale 2010 Agentur (Ed.) 2007: Zukunft gemeinsam gestalten – das Kulturlandschaftsnetzwerk der Region Köln/Bonn, masterplan :grün Version 2.0. Köln.
- Röhring, A. 2006: The common good aspects and institutional problems of cultural landscape – an analysis of regional development issues using institutional theory approaches. Paper presented at the IASCP Europe Regional Meeting "Building the European Commons: from Open Field to Open Source", Brescia, Italy, March 23-25. <http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/handle/10535/2126>
- Röhring, A.; Gailing, L. 2005: Institutional problems and management aspects of shared cultural landscapes : Conflicts and possible solutions concerning a common good from a social science perspective. Working Paper, Leibniz-Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning, Erkner.  
<http://www.irs-net.de/download/shared-landscape.pdf>
- Röhring, A.; Gailing, L. 2006: Cultural landscapes as a potential force for regional development – theoretical approaches and case studies in East German suburban and rural regions. In: Komornicki, T.; Czapiewski, K. Ł. (Ed.): Regional Periphery in Central and Eastern Europe, EUROPA XXI, 15, Polish Academy of Sciences, Polish Geographical Society. Warszawa, 13-28.  
[http://bibliotekacyfrowa.pan.pl/Content/139/EUROPA\\_+XXI\\_2006\\_15-internet.pdf#page=13](http://bibliotekacyfrowa.pan.pl/Content/139/EUROPA_+XXI_2006_15-internet.pdf#page=13)
- Röhring, A.; Gailing, L. 2011: Path Dependency and Resilience - The Example of Landscape Regions. In: Müller, B. (Ed.): Urban Regional Resilience: How Do Cities and Regions Deal with Change? (German Annual of Spatial Research and Policy 2010), Berlin/Heidelberg, 79-88.
- Scharpf, F.W. 1997: Games Real Actors Play. Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research. Boulder (CO)/Oxford.
- Young, O. 2002: The Institutional Dimensions of Environmental Change – Fit, Interplay, and Scale. Cambridge (MA)/London.