

# **THE MONUMENT AND MEMORIAL LANDSCAPE OF THE CONCENTRATION CAMPS AT MAUTHAUSEN/ GUSEN**

## **Topography and system of Nazi terror in the region of Mauthausen /Gusen and St. Georgen (Austria)**

### **Notes on the methodology of the basic research, presentation and maintenance for a monument and memorial landscape (relict landscape) of European significance**

Hans Peter Jeschke  
Head of the UNESCO Forum-WG "Memorial Landscape" and ICOMOS Austria  
[hans.peter.jeschke@liwest.at](mailto:hans.peter.jeschke@liwest.at)

**Paper Presented at the Forum UNESCO University and Heritage  
10th International Seminar  
“Cultural Landscapes in the 21st Century”  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 11-16 April 2005**

## **Summary**

UNESCO has placed the remnants of the concentration/death camp on the World Cultural Heritage List as a monument region of outstanding significance, thereby according one of the main sites of Nazi terror protection status as an internationally-significant memorial site.

Using the monument and memorial landscape of the concentration camps at Mauthausen /Gusen--part of the system of 23 *Hauptlager* (main camps) in Europe--new methods for inventarisation of a cultural heritage landscape, for a visitor-oriented visualisation in the exhibition in the newly-built Visitors' Centre at the *Gedenkstätte* (memorial site) of the former Mauthausen concentration camp and for a concept for stewardship, including a maintenance system and presentation, of the cultural heritage landscape are outlined.

Frequently set within limited spatial boundaries, memorial sites in Europe usually have only a few structural remnants which make access to the unimaginable horrors of the Holocaust and consequently an understanding of the whole Nazi terror system difficult, if not very limited. Together with UNESCO's scientific concept of a cultural landscape (relict landscape and their associative significance), historic spatial sciences and the European Landscape Convention, the Mauthausen / Gusen region was entirely documented. Subsequently an exhibition with new 3-D GIS technology (a geographic information system with 3-D modelling) was installed, and a concept for the protection and maintenance (Cultural Landscape Stewardship Programme) for the future management of the region's heritage of modern history was developed.

## **1. International as well as the European framework for the contextualization and significance of memorial landscapes: the example of the historic site Mauthausen / Gusen**

- **Auschwitz is cultural heritage of world significance**

UNESCO has placed the remains of the concentration/extermination camp on the World Cultural Heritage List as a monument region of outstanding significance, thereby according one of the main sites of Nazi terror protection status as an internationally-significant memorial site (see Fig. 1).

*The area of the former KZ-Hauptlager (main concentration camp) at Mauthausen is a Cultural Heritage Landscape/Relict Landscape as well as a memorial landscape of European significance.*

The area surrounding the main concentration camp at Mauthausen as well as its twin camp at Gusen is among the top-ranking sites because of its significant dominating historical function in Europe as a Main Camp within the Nazi system of genocide. As part of the "Topography of Terror in Europe" it is therefore particularly suitable for documenting the Europe-wide mechanism of Nazi terror as well as illustrating its efficacy (see Fig. 2).

## **2. Memorial Sites versus Memorial Landscapes**

- **Conceptual Development and Alteration of Memorial Sites**

Without going into detail of the conceptual history of the design of memorial sites, it can, however, be stated that early design initiatives were largely limited to cemeteries and monuments, and only later extended to the establishment of museums which in turn effected a retroactive securing and display of the exterior sites. These were followed by museums using techniques for outdoor exhibits, sometimes with staged displays. Nonetheless, the commemorative aspect and its presentation still dominate any other characteristics of the memorial site. Furthermore, for a long time memorial sites were judged more on their appearance and less by their historic significance<sup>1</sup>. Thus, for example, the "memorial site at Mauthausen was long virtually the only site in remembrance of the Nazi crimes; its de facto monopoly status any perception of the monstrosities at the camp at Gusen just a few kilometers away from Mauthausen, in which more people were killed than at the Mauthausen camp, was deflected and thereby falsified."<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, the largest part of the historic area (in particular the Gusen Concentration Camp and the underground armament factory and the DEST-Administration in St. Georgen) reverted to private enterprise-oriented spatial usage after the War.

### **Authenticity?<sup>3</sup> Changes of the setting in the landscape structure and the surroundings of memorial sites and/or their entire historic settings**

Over the course of time, the alterations to the surroundings have effected a different appearance and another perception of the historic remains: in contrast to the formerly-overcrowded barracks, now the beauties of nature appear to be charming, newly-grown trees alter the landscape and the delapidation of the buildings makes it hard to imagine how they must have looked 50 years ago<sup>4</sup>.

Further current alterations of the surroundings of the former concentration camp are exogenous as a result of the demands of new usage for the terrain itself (building land, transportation infrastructure, mineral extraction, etc.) and endogenous through the new exhibition and conference buildings, and particularly because of the numerous plans for "memorial landscaping." The ordinariness of the remains, their inability to transmit the baseness of the events at the historic site mislead many designers and architects with expansive projects for landscaping and architectural competitions to change, even falsify the surviving historic surroundings and structures of existing concentration camps—and thereby destroy them<sup>5</sup>. Among possible methods of revealing, or making traces of the past visible are new "designed axial concepts," i.e. using formative means such as landscaping, forestation and parks for creating a "new" setting.

Fig. 1: **Topography of the Nazi terror in Europe (concept and implantation © Dipl.-Ing. H.P. Jeschke)**

This graphic representation assembles various aspects of the Nazi terror system topographically

#### **a) Locations of the central administration and control for the holocaust in Europe (indicated in black lettering)**

1. Reichsführer SS and Chief of the German Police (Heinrich Himmler) with the Reichssicherheitshauptmann, Security Service of the SS Reichsführers and the Secret State Police (GESTAPO) in Berlin.
2. As the "model camp," Dachau was the first concentration camp, the first training centre 1933-42) (systemization of terror utilizing the concept of systemized camps and penal provisions, which in principle remained in place until the end of the war and was the first site for the *Inspektion der Konzentrationslager* (Administrative Head Office) 1933-42.
3. The concentration camp at Oranienburg/Sachsenhausen was responsible for the *Inspektion der Konzentrationslager* (Administrative Head Office) of Concentration Camps from 1942-45 and the Wirtschaftsverwaltungs-Hauptamt (Economic and Administrative Main Office) with the centralized administration

and control over the entire *Arbeitseinsatz* (forced labour system) of the inmates for the armament industry.

4. The Reichsministerium für Rüstung und Kriegsproduktion (Ministry for Armament and War Production under Reichsminister Albert Speer) in Berlin.
5. Wewelsburg/Paderborn was a concentration camp as well as the centre planned for the SS Weltanschauung.
6. The Wannsee Conference in Berlin on November 20, 1942.

**b) Locations of the extermination camps and KZ-Hauptlager (main concentration camps)**

1. **Extermination Camps** (indicated in blue lettering)

Apart from an SS-infrastructure and execution equipment, the eight sites also known as death or extermination camps or centres (H. Weinmann, 1990), were only equipped for short-term holding of "Häftlingssonderkommandos" (Special Inmate Units) or immediate killing of deportees and were therefore totally inadequate for accommodating large numbers of these inmates. These "special units of inmates" were "exchanged from time to time," i.e. they were murdered and replaced with other "Arbeitsfähige" "capable of labour" (G. Schwarz, 1996). Auschwitz/Birkenau was among the locations named as both an extermination camp and concentration camp, and is therefore listed along the Main Concentration Camps. Because of this historic genocidal function and extraordinary significance both as a memorial and associative site), UNESCO placed Auschwitz under the protective listing as a World Cultural Heritage Site within the framework of the international World Heritage Convention.

2. **KZ-Hauptlager (Main Concentration Camps) (location and lettering in red)**

The 23 camps (including Mauthausen) throughout Europe which were established after 1936 as large camps with their own administration with a total of ca. 1,202 satellite camps (G. Schwarz, 1996, p.179) were known as Main Concentration Camps.

3. **Explanatory notes on the total number of terror centres**

For graphic purposes, the descriptions have been based on the two categories. In all, in the area controlled by the Nazis between 1933 and 1945 there were 17 different categories of terror centres (concentration camps, sub- and satellite camps, Ghettos, prisons with execution sections, etc.), well as well over 10,000 camps. (G. Schwarz, 1996, p. 261).

The locations of the "Häftlingseinsatz" (prisoners used for **forced-labour units** for **SS-owned enterprises**, and armament factories are not noted in the simplified chart.

### **3. The main exhibit at memorial sites located on territory of former concentration camps is the site with its authentic testimony, and/or remnants of the historic landscape**

- **Notes on the presentation of the problem of perception: is the perception of the visitor to Mauthausen / Gusen and St. Georgen limited to central, clearly-visible architectural remnants within the confines of the memorial zone?**

The visitors to the memorial site at Mauthausen only perceive

- a massive, but relatively small structural core of the Mauthausen camp complex, a few remaining wooden barracks and a quarry (only part of which is owned by the Republic of Austria),
- nothing of the other functional areas of the concentration camp of Mauthausen, the abandoned camps Gusen I, II and III with the exception of some minimal remains
- nothing of the buildings of SS enterprises and armament works (at Gusen and St. Georgen)

and nothing of the numerous remnants in more distant surrounding of the Mauthausen memorial area (buildings, structures and ensembles of the historic districts) which all together create a “historic whole.”

How, then, to make that “historic whole” more tangible, to make the concentration camp, its infrastructure and appendant systems and the astonishing enormity of the entire area comprehensible? Is the explanation of the victims’ perspective in the narrow confines of the memorial’s boundaries and an exhibition themed on the Holocaust enough, or is not the principle of interlinking the place, the deed, the victim and the perpetrator necessary for an effective visualization of terror?

- **The leading exhibit of the memorial site work is the historic place with its authentic remains—explanation, interpretation and evaluation**

Undoubtedly the main exhibit at memorial sites located on territory of former concentration camps is the site with its architectural testimony, and whatever is left of the camp itself. The main task is to focus on this feature, as it especially requires explanation, interpretation and evaluation, whereas the memorial site’s buildings must be perceived as interpretive elements<sup>6</sup>.

However, in order to arrange them into a meaningful connection, an interpretive approach is imperative; it is necessary to imbed this into a historical context , as is a presentation which challenges the viewer to reflect. Only then will the meaning of the remains really become visible.

- **The Memory of Mauthausen**

In the newly-established Visitors' Centre at the Mauthausen Concentration Camp Memorial Site, different forms of memory are shown in four segments of an exhibition entitled "The Memory of Mauthausen." Manifestations of remembrance are revealed not only in the recollections of former inmates, in objects, artefacts, documents about the history, testimonies of survivors, but also in the region's historic surroundings, the whole historic area of the camp itself, the landscape. The Mauthausen Memorial will serve as a "Guarantee for Remembrance" (Hanna Arendt)<sup>7</sup> with this parallel documentation of the historic tracks of the multiple layers of recollection, its necessity but also to make visible its brittleness and ambiguity. In so doing it will also do justice to the primary and most important duty of the memorial sites, i.e. DO NOT LET THEM BE FORGOTTEN,<sup>8</sup> a duty to be fulfilled in trust for the surviving and murdered prisoners. This "Memory of Mauthausen" thus supports all the functions of a memorial site (monument, museum of historic remains) and a didactic place ("crystallization point of all education efforts").<sup>9</sup>

#### **4. Scientific models of historic spatial sciences in Europe and UNESCO for the identification of historic places with their authentic elements; memorial landscapes**

- **Cultural heritage landscape/relict landscape and its associative significance—UNESCO's model as a scientific framework**

UNESCO has developed a scientific model together with a protective and maintenance concept<sup>10</sup> for cultural heritage sites and cultural heritage landscapes world-wide. This can also be applied as a scientific framework for sites not on the UNESCO World Heritage List. This model also encompasses three categories of cultural landscapes, including the relict landscape type. In this category of cultural landscape, evolutive processes of formation are terminated by people. However, the most important characteristics in material form are still visible. The associative significance of a cultural landscape is described in the third category. Associative landscapes are those to which people connect particularly outstanding religious, artistic, cultural or historic implications. These implications are causatively connected with the landscape and do not even have to be visible (UNESCO, 2005). This provides the classification framework for the historic area of Mauthausen / Gusen as a cultural heritage landscape of the relict landscape type, a relict landscape with associative significance of great importance to Europe, which, together with the European Landscape Convention can be applied for this project from the perspective of historic geography.

In German usage, the terms "historic cultural landscape" or "partial monument landscape" are used in monuments preservation language (T. Breuer)<sup>11</sup>. For the exhibition, both the English expressions as well as the German "Denkmalandschaft" and, in regard to the associative significance, "Erinnerungslandschaft (memorial landscape)" were chosen.

- **The approach of Historical Geography/ the care and protection of cultural heritage by means of urban spatial planning**

From the perspective of urban planning or geography, a cultural landscape is historically organic and undergoes constant change. Applied Historic Geography<sup>12</sup> inventarises, analyses and evaluates historic structures and substance within their spatial/time components as well as the organic/historic cultural landscape as a unit.

The terms “structure” and “placement” are important expressions in the historic-genetic explanation of cultural landscape history. For example, a structure describes spatially-connected cultural landscape elements according to their construction and placement while taking into consideration their existing interrelationships and functional linkage as well as the processes of their formation. An interface or fitting-together could be used to describe a totality of interrelated cultural landscape elements and segments according to their shape and distribution as well as their spatial arrangement and alignment to each other.

## **5. Monument and Memorial Landscape of the Mauthausen / Gusen Concentration Camps as Witnesses of the System of Genocide in Europe**

### **5.1 Notes on the Topography of Nazi Terror in the Region of Mauthausen / Gusen and St. Georgen**

In order to understand the Nazi rule of terror in, it is necessary to describe not only its historic foundations and its implementation in the Mauthausen / Gusen region but also the concept of the “housing of violence” (Gehäuse des Gewalt), the system of the concentration camps and their evolution at the level of the German Reich (see Fig. 1) and the Reichsgau Alpen-Donau (Alps-Danube Administrative District). Therefore, for every decision-making level, topographically-oriented information is made available within the framework of the exhibition.

The area of the former concentration camp at Mauthausen is presented as the Mauthausen Cultural Heritage and Memorial Landscape, comprising of its surroundings as well as the area of the concentration camps Gusen I, II, III and the underground weapons plant in St. Georgen. The presentation includes brief comments on the important functional sections in and outside the camp complexes as well as the identification of all remaining “relics” in today’s landscape. Exhibits include modern (2001) colour photographs of the region and historic aerial reconnaissance pictures taken by the United States Air Force in 1944/45 (see Fig. 2).

**Fig. 2: Topography of the Nazi terror in the region: the local concentration camps, quarry and armament works (Mauthausen, Gusen I, II, III and St. Georgen).**

The illustration shows the demarcation of the Mauthausen Monument and Memorial Landscape (the section in the right part of the picture), the site of the former twin camps Gusen I and II (centre of the picture), of which few buildings (Gusen Monument Ensemble) survive and the underground armament works (B8 Bergkristal – Esche II / St. Georgen an der Gusen) with the extensive, still-extant tunnel system (section at the left of the photograph). The greatly-reduced image of the whole district is shown on the aerial reconnaissance photos taken by the United States Air Force in 1944/45 which were layered over the map of Austria (concept and analysis © Dipl. Ing. Dr. H.P. Jeschke. Modern History advisor Dr. H. Fiederer. GIS/3D maging: Dipl. Ing. H. Polly / created for the exhibition; Section IV of the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior, Vienna)

## **5.2 Notes on the individual areas**

### *a) KZ-Hauptlager Mauthausen / Mauthausen Main Concentration Camp*

The camp with the buildings of the SS-associated firms was built on land requisitioned by the Nazi regime; the complex is visible in its final state of construction in the aerial reconnaissance photographs taken by the U.S. Air Force in 1945. Red marginal notes mark the administrative district of the Mauthausen Concentration Camp in the Greater German Reich 1938-1945, and the actual concentration camp area extending beyond the markings (e.g. the “Wiener Graben” chain of SS posts to 1945)<sup>13</sup>.

Thus, the zone of the “Main Concentration Camp Mauthausen” monument and memorial landscape with its highly-important European associative significance is evident (cultural landscape / relict landscape and memorial landscape) and therefore defined as Cultural and Protected Property according to Guideline 2001 / 42 / EG of the European Parliament and the Council of Europe from 27.06.2001.

### *b) Gusen Concentration Camp I, II and III (Lungitz)*

On May 25, 1940 a concentration camp at Gusen, 4.5 km West of Mauthausen was established. Officially it was known as the *KZ Mauthausen / Unterkunft* (Mauthausen Concentration Camp/Housing), later as Gusen I. As in the case of Mauthausen, the existing granite quarries were decisive for the establishment of the camp. Also as at Mauthausen, from the Summer of 1942 there was increased expansion activity for building a factory for weapons; finishing work for various armament manufacturers was done in the completed assembly plant. Work for the Steyr plant went under the code name “Georgen Mill I, II, III and IV”- in this case, finishing parts for machine guns, rifles, assault weapons and aircraft engines.

On March 9, 1944 Camp Gusen II and on May 23<sup>rd</sup> the same year Gusen III were organized. From 1944 until Liberation on May 5, 1945 the forced labour of several thousand prisoners daily was at work for the Nazi armament industry.

On the territory requisitioned by the Nazis, the camp, the buildings of SS-enterprises and armament works were established which are marked on the aerial reconnaissance photographs taken by the U.S. Air Force in 1945<sup>14</sup>.

*c) B8 Bergkristall – Esche II / St. Georgen a.d. Gusen*

The central administration for the Mauthausen granite quarries of the Deutschen Erd- und Steinwerke GmbH (German Earth and Stone Works Co. Ltd.), an SS enterprise, was located in St. Georgen a.d. Gusen. Together with the geological structure of the landscape and the existing concentration camps (Mauthausen and Gusen I), a large underground weapons factory was established. Under the code name “B8 Bergkristall – Esche II,” in a vast subterranean assembly plant of over 50,000 m<sup>2</sup>, camp inmates produced the Me-262 jet fighter plane for the Messerschmidt Aircraft works.

On the territory requisitioned by the Nazis, the camp, the buildings of SS-enterprises and armament works as well as the other infrastructure were established which are identifiable on the aerial reconnaissance photographs taken by the U.S. Air Force in 1945.

## **6. The Exhibition “The Monument and Memorial Landscape at Mauthausen / Gusen – Visualisation of the “Housing for Violence”/ (Gehäuse des Gewalt) in Mauthausen, Gusen I, II and III (Lungitz) / St. Georgen**

### **6.1 Making historic places and their authentic traces “speak” - contextualizing and visualizing the authentic traces as seen in the example of the monument and memorial landscape Mauthausen / Gusen**

- **Making terror tangible in its spatial and functional dimension**

For the first time, the exhibition will implement the methodology of historic spatial sciences (using Geographic Information Systems, contextualizing of historic source materials as well as analysis of aerial photography) in a visualized overview to enable the visitor to get a more realistic experience. The area around the memorial site should thus be perceivably spatially and historically re-integrated in its surrounding context. The goals should be

- the visualization of the spatial and functional overall expanse of the Mauthausen / Gusen concentration camp and the armament works at St. Georgen,
- the visualization of the surviving historic elements and traces in their authentic substance and structure within the historic places in the abovementioned areas,

- the topographically-oriented visualization of daily life in the camp with eyewitness reports and visual documentation as well as
- the interlinking of various aspects of contemporary information with the and Europe-wide topography of Nazi terror.

Information on the historic aerial photographs in the exhibition with labels indicating the different functional areas and those for forced labour (see Fig. 2) powerfully underscore the horror and monstrosity of the extreme systemization and tight structure of the Nazi terror and destruction after 1936. For the first time the technical and infrastructural elements, including the surrounding area, the road and rail connections, historic routes of the forced marches, the perspective of the perpetrators (housing for the guards, officers and commanders of the concentration camps, buildings of SS-run enterprises) are integrated into the concept of visualization of the a practically industrialized tactic of systematic intimidation and annihilation. The comparison with modern aerial photographs (Orthophotos) reveals to the visitor the condition and even the existence of authentic remains.

- **Education at a memorial site**

- Assistance for a new didactic concept for visitors within and outside of the various camp complexes (e.g. making the various parts of the camp, any surviving remnants in the surrounding landscape, historic internee entrance gates, living quarters of the camp forces, etc.

Support for new spatially-oriented educational goals which can be transmitted by means of historic geography and its “space and time” approach. The curious visitor should

- + be aware that historic processes are taking place in living spaces
- + discover that every space developed historically
- + realize that spaces have been differently evaluated during different periods of time
- + evaluate which conditions applied at which times to affect an area’s estimation
- + reach the conclusion that it is not the space which determines the process of shaping, but that it is the intellectual strength, social currents and technical-economic frameworks can shape similar spaces in totally different ways<sup>15</sup>.

## **6.2 Contentual scheme for the visualization and charting at the historic site**

For the thematic arrangement and presentation and the historic geography charting of the historic elements in the region with a slant to historic geography, the following scheme was developed according to the themes briefly outlined above:

- concentration camp
- Arbeitseinsatz (forced labour of the prisoners)
- historic network of roads and paths
- SS guards and other security forces
- SS business enterprises and companies (selection)
- technical infrastructure (selection)
- important transportation links (road and rail)
- inhabitants in the surrounding area (selected eyewitness reports)
- graves and memorial sites

## **6.3 Historic and recent pictures and/or topographically-grouped eyewitness reports – visualization of the topography of the sites of terror**

Photographs of the entire complex reveal an interrelationship of the information of historic and recent pictures of the structural and other features which, with brief comments, are extremely useful for didactic purposes. This form of the “visualization of the horror” at the scene of the crime with historic materials, together with the tools of topographically-grouped eyewitness reports, enables a comprehensive and realistic reliving of the suffering in the camps as it was on a daily basis. Many questionnaires and documentation projects to date had concentrated on the evaluation of the lives and survival stories of the victims, but a survey based on the topography of terror in the concentration camp revealed itself “by chance” and was not usually a focus of scientific inquiry.

The role and significance of a personal witness can perhaps be underscored by a famous paradigm of remembrance – the diary of Anne Frank, about which Simon Wiesenthal<sup>16</sup> wrote in his memoirs that “it was more moving than the Nürnberg or even the Eichmann trials. For here, the average person could suddenly identify with an average victim and experience, feel the reality of something. After all, it is not so difficult to imagine how a young girl who is forced to hide in an attic feels, which is not the case with, for instance, the account of a prisoner who suffered the martyrdom of Auschwitz.”

Furthermore, for purposes of verification of an authentic place it will thus be necessary to confront the historic relicts by eyewitness accounts grouped by location in order to guarantee objectivity.

#### **6.4 Tools for the visualization of the topography of terror in the region – Geographic Information Systems and computer-supported 3-D landscape visualization as new media in the process of communication work at the memorial sites**

Within the framework of the exhibition, the visitor will be able to explore the entire area of the main concentration camp at Mauthausen, the concentration camps Gusen I, II and III (Lugnitz), the SS enterprises, armament firms and the weapons factories in St. Georgen using new computer technology, historic source materials and aerial photographs (U.S. Air Force aerial reconnaissance pictures and Orthophotos). Thus a new “mirror of the past” can be wiped clean with computer tools, thereby enabling all visitors, but especially those more recent generations to form their own opinions based on fresh material and media.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)<sup>17</sup> are useful assistants for managing, linking and analysing multiple (Geo) data. Thus, in comparison with traditional plans, drawings and models, GIS-based landscape visualisation affords a more complex variety of input to be incorporated. Furthermore, it offers a multitude of possibilities for visualising data even in Memorial Site work (output).

Since 3-D computer animation can effect an altered perception of contemporary spaces relevant to modern history, it has also been implemented at Mauthausen.

The combination of GIS, 3-D landscape animation and communication are decisive for the exhibition and future goals. The value of the new technological tools is measured by its usefulness for the memorial site’s education programme, communication and participation. The exhibition provides an additional value in its linking of communication and visualisation of the visible with those invisible aspects and elements of the cultural landscape. Furthermore, with the GIS it is possible to research the locations of the Nazi terror system at all levels and thereby gain an extensive overview from the perspectives of both victim and perpetrator.

### **7. Caring for a cultural heritage landscape – stewardship of the heritage of modern history for the future**

The protection and care of cultural heritage landscapes of extraordinary significance (World Heritage Convention or European Significance according to the Landscape Convention) is guaranteed by a programme of care and maintenance.

This programme includes overcoming the splintered administrative bureaucracy which govern cultural landscapes in federally-organised states throughout Europe: • protective and maintenance systems for the entire landscape surrounds with • a network of specialised protective and maintenance for individual cultural landscape elements (cultural landscape registry!) as well as pertinent • financial support system • specific methodology (as well as other spatially-relevant means) of cultural landscape care (historical spatial sciences, approaches to natural spatial potential, etc. • inventory of cultural sites and landscapes tied to funding for the pertinent area • organisational elements (office for coordination, concepts and monitoring) as well as • all decision-making levels united in a

trans-disciplinary management for securing the protective and maintenance goals (Jeschke, 2000, a,b)<sup>18</sup>.

Basic research and a methodological framework for the exhibition already form a substantial part of the compilation of the programme for care and maintenance described above.

## 8. Notes

- 1 Skriebeleit, J., **Aufsätze zur Neukonzeption der KZ-Gedenkstätte** (2002, p. 15):
- 2 Perz, B., "Die Rolle der KZ-Gedenkstätte Mauthausen in der Gedächtnislandschaft seit 1945," *Historische Sozialkunde* H. 4/2003. pp. 8 – 9
- 3 Petzet, M. "‘In the full richness of their authenticity’ – The Test of Authenticity and the New Cult of Monuments," **Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention, UNESCO, ICCROM & ICOMOS**, Nara (Japan), p. 89.
- 4 Lutz, T., "Gedenkstätten für die Opfer des NS-Regimes (Geschichte – Arbeitsweisen – Wirkungsmöglichkeiten)," Ehmann, A. et al., **Praxis der Gedenkstättenpädagogik** (Opladen, 1995), p. 44.
- 5 Leo, A., "Ein Denkmal für die Täter?" [symposium report] in **Gedenkstätten Rundbrief** Nr. 81/2/1998, Berlin, p. 25; Fibich, P., "Memoriale Landschaftsarchitektur," **Garten und Landschaft**, 4/1999, pp. 15-24.
- 6 See note 7, Morsch, G. (1994): op. cit., p. 89.
- 7 Quoted in Morsch, G. , "Überlegungen zur Ausstellungskonzeption in der Gedenkstätte Sachsenhausen," in Faulenbach, B. & Jelich, F. – J., eds., **Reaktio-näre Modernität und Völkermord. Probleme des Umgangs mit der NS-Zeit in Museen, Ausstellungen und Gedenkstätten**. Münster, Forschungsinstitut für Arbeiterbildung, 1994, pp. 89 – 97. see also Morsch, G. "Anmerkungen zu den jüngsten Diskussionen um das Mahnmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas und das „Haus der Erinnerung," *Gedenkstätten Rundbrief* Nr. 89/6/1999. Berlin, pp. 3 – 5; Morsch, G. "Authentische Orte von KZ-Verbrechen. Chancen und Risiken aus der Sicht der Besucherforschung," in Fuchs, E. Pingel, F. & Radkon, V., eds., *Holocaust und Nationalsozialismus*. Wien, 2002, pp. 42 – 47.
- 8 See note 7, Morsch, G. (1994): op. cit. p. 89.
- 9 Genger, A. "Überlegungen zur Gedenkstättenarbeit," **Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte (1999): Räume – Medien – Pädagogik (Kollegium zur Neugestaltung der KZ-Gedenkstätte Dachau**. Augsburg, Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kunst, 1999, p. 18 – 23.
- 10 Cleere, H., "Cultural Landscapes and the World Heritage List: Development, Definitions and Problems," In: Hajos, G. (ed.), **Denkmal-Ensemble – Kulturlandschaft am Beispiel Wachau**. Wien/Horn, 1999, pp. 17-24; Rössler, M. "Cultural Landscapes in the Framework of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage," *ibid*, pp. 25-32; Jokilehto, J.: **The World Heritage List**, ICOMOS, Paris. UNESCO (2005): **Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention**, Paris, 2005.

- 11 Breuer, T. (1997): "Landschaft, Kulturlandschaft, Denkmallandschaft als Gegenstand der Denkmalkunde," **Die Denkmalpflege** 1/1997, pp. 5-23; Breuer, T. (1999): "Denkmallandschaft – Entwicklung und Leistungsfähigkeit eines Begriffes," In: Hajos, op. cit, pp. 84-92.
- 12 Eidloth, V. & Goer, M., "Historische Kulturlandschaftselemente als Schutzgut," **Denkmalpflege in Baden-Württemberg** 25, (1996), pp. 148 – 157; Fehn, K. (1997), "Aufgaben der Denkmalpflege in der Kulturlandschaftspflege," **Denkmalpflege**, 1, Berlin, 1997, pp.31 – 17; Fehn, K. (1998), "Historische Geographie," **Geschichte. Ein Grundkurs**, ed. Hans-Jürgen Goetz, Hamburg, 1998, pp. 394 – 407. Schenk, W., "Kulturlandschaft in Zeiten verschärfter Nutzungskonkurrenz: Genese, Akteure, Szenarien," **Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung** (2001): a.a.O., pp. 30–44; Gunzelmann, T. (1996): "Historische Kulturdenkmalpflege im Spannungsfeld von Denkmalpflege, Naturschutz und Landesplanung," lecture held at the annual meeting of the Vereinigung der Landesdenkmalpfleger, June 12, 1996 in Kiel.
- 13 Hutterberger, H. (2003): *Historische Materialsammlung Mauthausen*, Mauthausen. Hutterberger, H. (2002): *Die Kommunikationspolitik der KZ-Gedenkstätte Mauthausen im Spannungsfeld gesellschaftlicher Veränderungen am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts*. Donau-Universität Krems.
- 14 Haunschmied, R.A. (2003): **Historische Materialiensammlung Gusen/St. Georgen**, St. Georgen. Malina, P. & Ofner, A. (2003): **Erinnerungsort: Mauthausen**. (Projekt „Erinnerungsberichte aus dem Konzentrationslager Mauthausen“ [translation: P. Benesz]), Vienna, Federal Ministry for the Interior.
- 15 Sperling, W. quoted in Fehn (1998), op. cit., see 23.
- 16 Wiesenthal, S. , *Recht, nicht Rache. Erinnerungen*. Frankfurt, 1992, pp. 411.
- 17 Basler & Hofmann AG, "GIS zur Verwaltung des Inventars der historischen Verkehrswege der Schweiz IVS," **Geomatique SUISSE**, 2004, pp. 146 – 147. "GEONOVA AG GEONOVA – 2D – GIS-DATEN in der dritten Dimension," **Geomatique SUISSE**, (2004), pp. 206 – 207.
- 18 Jeschke, H.P. *Austrian Cultural Landscapes – Methodological Aspects for an Inventory*," Droste, B. Plachter, H. & Rössler, M. (eds) **Cultural Landscapes of Universal Value**, UNESCO, (Stuttgart, 1995), pp. 324 – 332; Jeschke, H.P. (2001), "Vorschläge für ein europäisches Konzept 'Kulturlandschaft,' Ein Instrument der umfassenden Kulturlandschaftspflege aus der Sicht der Historischen Raumwissenschaften," Kommunalverband Großraum Hannover (ed). **Kulturlandschaften in Europa – Regionale und Internationale Konzepte zu Bestandserfassung und Management**. Hannover, 2001, pp.181 – 224; Jeschke, H.P. **Kulturlandschaftspflegewerke für Kulturerbelandschaften von herausragender Bedeutung in Europa – Grundsätze, Methoden, Instrumente und Modelle für „fortbestehende“ Kulturerbelandschaften („Continuing Cultural Heritage Landscapes“)**, Vienna, 2004; see also Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung, **Die Zukunft der Kulturlandschaft zwischen Verlust, Bewahren und Gestaltung**, ARL, Vol. 215, Hannover,2001; Jeschke, H.P. (2004), **Neue Strategien für die Erhaltung, Pflege und Entwicklung des baukulturellen Erbes in der Kulturlandschaft**. Viena, Federal Ministry for Economics and Labour, 2004.

## **9. Dipl. Ing. Dr. Hans Peter Jeschke**

Is active in the area of spatial planning and research, ecologically-oriented planning, development of non-urban areas, protection, and care of cultural landscapes and cultural heritage. He has designed methods and concepts of cultural landscape management (stewardship programmes) for UNESCO cultural heritage landscapes, for landscapes of European significance as well as environmental compliance tests (SUP/UP).

He is the Head of the national ICOMOS (International Council of Monuments and Sites) Working Group on Cultural Landscape, Urban and Regional Planning in Austria as well as having acted as official Austrian expert for the Council of Europe's campaign "Europe—Our Joint Heritage."

The Federal Ministry for Science and Research has awarded Dipl. Ing. Dr. Jeschke the medal for special services to Monuments Preservation; he has also received the Environment Prize of the Province of Upper Austria and the national Council of Europe Landscape Award (2002). He is the author of numerous publications, lectures and expertises in Austria and internationally.

He is also the Head of the UNESCO Forum/Working Group "Memorial Landscape" and would be pleased to make contact with other interested specialists at the following address:

Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Hans Peter Jeschke  
ICOMOS Austria  
Arbeitsgruppe „Kulturlandschaft, Städtebau und Landesplanung“  
Blütenstraße 13/1/40  
A-4040 Linz, Austria  
Tel./Fax: 0043(0)732 710107 or E-mail: [hans.peter.jeschke@liwest.at](mailto:hans.peter.jeschke@liwest.at)