DOO-WON CHO*

VALUE-BASED STUDIES RELATING TO THE ICOMOS GUIDELINES ON FORTIFICATIONS AND MILITARY HERITAGE

1. Introduction: Research background and purpose

1.1. Research background

Fortifications are an important outcome of a crucial link in the historical development of human settlements, regions, and even nations. From the prehistoric era to modern times, fortifications have been an essential component of the self-defense of any human community. Fortifications were integrated in various ways linked to the setting and geography of each community and settlement. Defensive facilities included buildings, complexes, or territorial defense systems that continued to function defensively or ceased to serve their original purpose. Sometimes conflict of interest between different communities expanded from small-scale local battles to wars. Winning or losing depends on the possession of more potent weapons and the use of effective tactics and strategies. This critically influenced the existence of a community or a united community. Since fortifications are one of the representative results of the history of small-scale and large-scale war, the heritage community has generally recognized the values of those fortifications as military heritage, so that they have let them function within a multidisciplinary research process and appropriate protection measures.

The Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage adopted on 16 November 1972 in Paris (hereafter: 1972 World Heritage Convention) drew input from the international community with regard to the basis and feasibility of protecting various heritages. Relevant charters and conservation

* President of ICOFORT (International Scientific Committee on Fortifications and Military Heritage), adjunct professor at the Department of World Heritage Studies, Konkuk University, Board Member of ICOMOS, Vice President of ICOMOS Korea, ORCID: 0009-0007-3495-0070
DOI: 10.4467/23538724GS.24.001.19863

principles on each heritage sector based on the 1972 World Heritage Convention have been prepared through the efforts of multidisciplinary experts over a considerable period of time.[1] Heritage charters and conservation principles first influence the conservation and management of World Heritage in each sector. Furthermore, they influence each state party and its legal environment for World Heritage protection. In this context, ICOFORT (International Scientific Committee on Fortifications and Military Heritage), one of the international scientific committees under ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), an advisory body in the field of the cultural heritage of UNESCO World Heritage, developed a charter on protection, conservation, and interpretation relating to fortifications and military heritage from 2007 to 2021 (table 1). The charter was adopted during the ICOMOS General Assembly in 2021 under the title of "The ICOMOS Guidelines on Fortifications and Military Heritage," which provides orientation on how to identify the essential attributes of fortifications and military heritage and provides direction on how to define their value.

This article focuses on the applicability of the essential attributes of fortifications and military heritage presented in the ICOMOS Guidelines. It clarifies the value of fortifications and military heritage by analyzing and interpreting cultural- and world-heritage cases.

Table 1. The process of preparation for the ICOMOS Guidelines on Fortifications and Military Heritage

2007		Elvas, Portugal, a Draft ICOFORT Charter begun[2]
2017	Jul. 11–14	Siena, Italy, a Draft completed of the ICOFORT Charter Draft ICOFORT Charter on Fortifications and Related Heritage – Guidelines for Protection, Conservation, and Interpretation
	Jul.	Draft ICOFORT Charter translated into English and French, Review by ICOMOS National Committees around the world and convergence of supplementary items (1st review)
	Oct.	Draft ICOFORT Charter Review by ICOMOS National Committees around the world and convergence of supplementary items (secondary review)
	Dec.	The ICOMOS Advisory Committee (ICOMOS International Scientific Committees) approved the Draft ICOFORT Charter 2017/12_6-3-2

[1] ICOMOS, Charter, and other doctrinal texts: https://www.icomos.org/en/resources/charters-and-texts (accessed: 13.01.2024).

[2] ICOFORT, 2021, ICOMOS Guidelines on Fortifications and Military Heritage (posted to ICOMOS with the ICOFORT Charter on Fortifications and Military Heritage (Final) on 15 July 2020, https://www.icofort.org/fortificationsguidelines (accessed: 13.01.2024).

2018	Sep.	Draft ICOFORT Charter ICOMOS International Scientific Committee Review and Convergence of Supplements (3rd review)
	Dec.	The ICOMOS Advisory Committee (ICOMOS International Scientific Committees) approved the Draft ICOFORT Charter 2018/12_7-3
2019	Sep.	Draft ICOFORT Charter Circulation to ICOMOS members around the world, review, and convergence of supplementary items (4th review)
2020	Jul.15	Completion of the final draft of the ICOFORT Charter ICOFORT Charter on Fortifications and Military Heritage (Draft) – Guidelines for Protection, Conservation, and Interpretation
	Dec. 7	2020 ICOMOS General Assembly Decision: Review of the French translation of the draft ICOMOS Guidelines and recommendations for supplementation. Charter in English and French – 2021 ICOMOS International Scientific Committee Advisory Committee (ADCOMSC) – Reexamination & Recommendation
2021	Dec.	ICOMOS Guidelines on Fortifications and Military Heritage, ICOMOS International Scientific Committee Advisory Committee (ADCOMSC) 2021 finally adopted by ICOMOS General Assembly 2021 (hereinafter: ICOMOS Guidelines 2021)

Source: Author's own elaboration.

1.2. Research purpose

Recently, the movement to inscribe fortifications and military heritage on the World Heritage list has been gathering momentum. Although the inscription of fortifications and military heritage as a World Heritage site is not necessarily the goal, efforts to establish clear values, preserve, and manage fortifications and military heritage that reflect a region's historical identity are intensifying, and consequently conservation management issues relating to fortifications and military heritage are constantly under discussion. The ICOMOS Guidelines 2021, which are analyzed and discussed in this paper, are expected to provide a helpful direction for defining the outstanding universal value of fortifications and military heritage for World Heritage. In the World Heritage nomination process, it is necessary to identify the heritage attributes that express these values. These ICOMOS Guidelines 2021 can propose assistance in establishing the value of fortifications and military heritage categories. The ICOMOS Guidelines 2021 refer to eight proposed value classifications: architectural/technical value, territorial/geographical value, cultural landscape value, strategic value, human/anthropological value, memory/identity/educational value, historical value, and social/economic value. These are integrated

with functional attributes such as barriers and protection, command, depth, flanking, and deterrence. As the main attributes that convey the characteristics of value, they are expected to guide stakeholders, mostly site managers, on how to research, protect, utilize, and efficiently interpret fortifications and military heritage.

2. Contents and interpretation of the ICOMOS Guidelines on Fortifications and Military Heritage

2.1. Definition of attributes

The ICOMOS Guidelines 2021 identify the characteristics of fortifications built from prehistoric times to modern times, and recommend proper protection, conservation, and interpretation, taking into account their influence on and relationship to society. In other words, the functional attributes of fortifications and military heritage serve as important elements that express their authenticity and integrity. Therefore, the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021 are very important to those who are from the field of research, conservation, and utilization of fortifications and military heritage. The relevant attributes are identified as follows:

2.1.1. Barrier and protection

The primary attribute [is] to protect human activity and settlement against any external threats with the ability to resist attack (art. 2 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021).

When there was a movement from cold weapons such as bows and spears and gunpowder weapons such as matchlocks and cannons were introduced into the battlefield, the height of the observation towers located in fortifications was lowered, and the walls of fortifications were transformed from earthenware to stone walls to withstand artillery attacks effectively. A stone wall in a fortress wall takes two different forms. In the first, only one side facing the enemy camp was composed of stone walls, and its inside consisted of a covered way and an earthen rampart. In the other both sides of fortress walls are piled with stone, the inside and outside being constructed with stone walls. The inside between stone walls was filled with earth, gravel, and lime to strengthen its waterproofing function. When constructing fortifications, overlapping or added defensive elements were sometimes used to block the enemy's approaches as much as possible, and they were sometimes installed to attack the enemy preemptively. A fortification system as an independent stronghold was developed by clearly setting the boundary on both sides and by placing natural or artificial rivers and the use of a coastline, including cliffs and, indeed, an entire island.

2.1.2. Command

The ability to monitor the area surrounding the defended zone as far as possible and prevent the attacker from approaching (art. 2 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021).

No matter how well-established fortifications are, a command system is necessary if they are to perform their function correctly. Such a communication system connects the inside and outside of the fortifications. A command system directs communication between each military facility, and it organizes a system of dispatches for communication or it indirectly employs signals, etc. The operation of the command post that oversees the whole military facility is an essential element in fortifications.

2.1.3. Depth

A military strategy that seeks to delay rather than prevent the advance of an attacker by yielding space to buy time; this tactic allows for the creation of successive defensive lines.

Typical shielding facilities such as detached front work, moats, trenches, and foxholes were installed to prevent the enemy from rushing up to the fortress walls and gates, and a drawbridge intermittently connected the inner and outer walls of the castle. A gate tower on the drawbridge and a sentry tower were installed on both sides of the drawbridge, etc. for the function of defense. They are regarded as fundamental elements of a fortification system, regardless of whether the fortifications are in the East or the West.

2.1.4. Flanking

A strategy that aims to delete blind spots, commonly applied with above-ground structures (e.g., rampart, towers, or bastions) (art. 2 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021).

An observation tower was installed to observe the enemy's movements. A protruded lookout from the wall was placed to defend the blind spot that was difficult to observe from the top of the fortress wall, and thus a gap in the defensive system was filled. A detached fort or some scattered military facilities can form an efficient defense zone for the main fortress. An auxiliary gate was installed to enable secret entry and exit for ambush and reconnaissance by positioning troops outside the fortress. The auxiliary gate also performs functions such as making possible the secret supply of materials and food when the fortress gate is normally closed.

2.1.5. Deterrence

Deterrence: a defensive strategy used to deter the enemy from attacking by instilling doubt or fear of the consequences. This strategy can include a range of tactics, including constructing a majestic enclosure and its defensive attributes (e.g., multiple openings for shooting, the scale of gates and towers, and decoration of walls and entrances) (art. 2 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021).

A wooden palisade installed near the fortress, parapets running inside and outside the top of the fortress wall, anti-tank obstacles permanently installed on the front line, and laying mines and barbed wire on enemy approach routes are crucial deterrents in modern and contemporary warfare, all of which can be observed on battlefields. Moreover, a trap fort is expected to confuse the enemy's lines of movement and disrupt their power while luring the enemy onwards and forcing them into a dead-end space.

Overall, the above attributes reveal essential characteristics of configuring military landscapes (art. 2 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021).[3] Now case studies are set out showing on how the functional attributes of fortifications and military heritage presented in the ICOMOS guidelines can be applied.

The installation of 53 *Dondae* (墩臺, Observation post) evenly along the coast of Ganghwa Island in Korea in the eighteenth century can be seen as a case of creating a more densely fortified landscape as well as being an attempt to further strengthen the depth of defense and deterrence in order to completely block enemies trying to approach Hanyang (the former name of Seoul) at the mouth of the Han River, which flows into the Yellow Sea. In particular, the Ganghwa Fortress and *Dondae* distributed to the north and south centered on *the Gapgotdon* (甲串墩) observation post, which was installed in the *Yeomha* (鹽河) Ganghwa Straits, and the Munsusanseong Fortress located in Gimpo, across from Ganghwa Island, make fortified landscapes that constitute a thorough defense network.

Among the fortifications of Vauban[4] in France, Citadel Blaye, Fort Paté, and Fort Médoc form a strategically built defense system at the mouth of the Gironde River, which flows into the Atlantic. Citadel Blaye and Fort Médoc were established on both sides of the mouth of the Gironde River, and Fort Paté was built on Paté Island located in the middle of the river. This is an example of reducing the vulnerable area of the defense network through developing natural and artificial functions. It provides a continuous combination for border defense. This is one of the representative examples of fortified landscapes, showing their development in Europe in the seventeenth century, covering the functional attributes of barrier and protection, command, depth, flanking, and deterrence. Citadel Blaye, Fort Paté,

[3] Military cultural landscapes include but are not limited to territorial or coastal defense installations and earthworks and have values similar to other heritage buildings and sites, but also possess unique values that need to be carefully studied, analyzed, and preserved.

[4] There are 12 ensembles of fortifications of Vauban along the eastern, western, and northern borders of France. Vauban's fortifications which were inscribed on the World Heritage list as serial properties in 2008, are the most outstanding military facility of Sébastien Le Prestre, Marquis de Vauban (1633–1707), a military engineer trusted by King Louis XIV. They had a great impact on several continents. Vauban thoroughly analyzed previous military strategy theories and analyzed the natural environment of the border area in France. In this way he was able to produce an actual rational fortification system.

and Fort Médoc were organically linked to serve as defenses, boundaries, and gateways. They were the first defense network to block enemy forces approaching the mouth of the Gironde River from the Atlantic. If this defense network collapsed, the city of Bordeaux, which was a central city for the Bourbon dynasty in the seventeenth century, would be in a precarious state. The Gironde River itself and the military system designed for artillery use in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries made it possible to achieve the functions of barrier and protection, and flanking. A command-and-control system was established centered on Citadel Blaye. The oval-shaped Fort Paté, built on the northwest side of Paté Island, which is located in the middle of the Gironde River, monitored all directions and provided fire support to further strengthen the flank defenses of Fort Médoc and Citadel Blaye, and to prevent access to the land from the sea through the river.[5] It performed the function of effectively suppressing and blocking the enemy's routes. As regards Fort Médoc, located on the far left of this defense system, it served as an outpost of Citadel Blaye to provide defense against enemies approaching by land from the Atlantic.

2.2. Defining value

ICOMOS, the advisory body in the cultural heritage field of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, prepares charters, principles, guidelines, and declarations for cultural heritage conservation in different categories and disseminates them to the world. In this way, it guides the stakeholders from the World Heritage Site and the cultural heritage site to be inscribed on the World Heritage list to identify values, to systematize their attributes, and to list their values in order to conserve, manage, and sustainably utilize cultural heritage. Among them, the ICOMOS guidelines on fortifications and military heritage present eight directions on how to establish the value of fortifications and military heritage. This chapter provides an interpretation of the value-based definition of fortifications and military heritage. In addition, it is expected that stakeholders understand from it the efforts to identify World Heritage values and to conserve their properties with the help of existing cases such as sites included on the World Heritage list and the World Heritage tentative list, and related fortifications and military heritage in Korea, Asia, and other regions.

2.2.1. Architectural/technical value

The specific typology of the fortifications responds to a specific warfare technology. Assessing the technical value requires a deep understanding of the evolution of weapons and warfare so that

[5] Ch. Corvisier, I. Warmoës, "L'art de fortifier de Vauban, Vauban, architecte de la modernité" [in:] *Vauban, architecte de la modernité?*, eds. T. Martin, M. Virol, series: *Les Cahiers de la MSHE Ledoux* 11, Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, Besançon 2008, pp. 124–126.

innovative advances in response to changes in military science and engineering can be identified and tested (art. 4 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021, *Values*).

Humans have built fortifications of various complex designs over thousands of years. The forms range from the primitive method of setting the boundaries of a settlement by placing fences to setting the boundaries of a settlement according to the hierarchy of power and governance within it. They include *Hwanho chwirak* (環濠聚落) settlements with defensive facilities created by digging ditches around the community area,[6] as well as earthen ramparts, and large-scale stone fortresses that used a range of gunpowder weapons.

While developing these attributes of fortifications, a tactical and strategic system was established, and most of all, factors such as command, troop movement, and weapon operation were essential. In particular, a fortification system was repeatedly improved and developed through direct and indirect experience of weapon operation on the battlefield. Furthermore, the development of a fortifications system, which enabled effective attack and defense by appropriately deploying weapons and troops, went in parallel with the above.

Vietnam's World Heritage Hue Monument Complex is an example of utilizing symbolic elements essential to *feng shui*, such as rivers and mountains. The Hue Monument Complex is an example designed according to ancient Eastern philosophy and Vietnamese tradition. It was the administrative center of Southern Vietnam in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It served as the capital from 1802 to 1945 because of its geographical location in the center of Vietnam and its access to and from the sea. The capital consists of the administrative building protection facility, the imperial palace, the shrine protection facility, the imperial residence protection facility, and the bastions and ramparts built as additional fortifications at the northeast corner of the capital to control the river. The Tran Hai Thanh Fort was built additionally as a shelter for defense against future sea attacks.[7] Also, Hue Fort is well known as an example of integrating Eastern and Western architecture; it was constructed in the style of the Vauban Fortifications, the first representative example of European star-shaped fortifications in Southeast Asia.[8] Such a design is

[6] *Hwanhochwirak* (環濠 聚落) means settlements with defensive facilities achieved by digging ditches around the community.

[7] S. Ota, "The Characteristics and values of the Asian city walls (Thang Long and other city walls) as World heritage" [in:] *Traditional Urban Planning Principles and City walls in Asian Capital*, eds. S. Kim, Y. Shin, H. Lee, H. Park, J. Seo, *Hanyangdoseong Haksulchongseo i chaek* 한양도성 학술총서 2책 [Seoul City Wall Studies Series 2], *Hanyangdoseong dogam* 한양도성도감 [Seoul City Wall division], *Yemaek* 예맥 [Yemac Design Company], Seoul 2014, pp. 97–101.

[8] "Complex of Hué Monuments", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/678 (accessed: 13.01.2024).

seen as a representative example of using cannon to suit each terrain and maximize defensive functions.

Hikone-Castle bears testimony to the governance system of the Tokugawa period in Japan and has architectural and technical value. It reveals how the technology for the construction of fortifications from the early seventeenth century to the nineteenth century developed and was applied to the *daimyo*,[9] the governance system of Japan. This castle consists of two hierarchically based blocks. This covers the entire form of the castle, including its defensive sections and the lord's residential area. An inner block with a hill faces Lake Biwa at its center and is surrounded by a moat and an outer block that surrounds this inner block. The defensive sections and the lord's residence are built within the inner block, making good use of the natural land formation of the hill. The height of the castle wall and the depth of the moat bear testimony to the civil engineering of that period. Houses of upper-class samurai are found in the outer block. A moat also surrounds this outer block. Beyond this moat is the *joka-machi* consisting of a residential district for ordinary people and a commercial district.[10] To build this castle, water channels were diverted, a special building site was created, and the governance-based hierarchy and double and triple moat structures for effective defense and protection of material supply reflect architectural and technical values.

2.2.2. Territorial/geographical

The value of fortifications as a territorial organization is an essential component of the significance of defense systems. While some fortified structures may be independently standing isolated elements, others may form part of a more extensive system of non-adjacent components that shape the surrounding cultural landscapes and require evaluation in a broader context. In these cases, the system's value is greater than the specific value of each part, all requiring the same protection regardless of how modest they seem. The identification of these values may also take into consideration, among other things, the strategic advantages of location, and how the design responds to the spatial distribution of weaponry, the type of siege or attack intended, the reach of the defensive range, and the topography and ecosystems of the territory to defend (art. 4 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021, *Values*).

Inscribed in the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1988, the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications in Sri Lanka make up a fortified city built by Europeans. It is

[9] *Daimyo* governments played an important role in the governance system. *Daimyo* were deployed by the shogun's government in local provinces or domains, and their positions were guaranteed as long as they dedicated themselves to the duties of governing their domains. *Daimyo* collected senior vassals to live together within the castle complex, instead of deploying them to separate places throughout the domain territory.

[10] Hikone-Jo (Castle) was enlisted on the World Heritage Tentative list in 1992. See: "Hikone-Jo (Castle)", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/374/ (accessed: 20.04.2024).

an outstanding example of the interchange between European architectural styles and South Asian traditions from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. The most striking feature of the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications is the application of European models to Sri Lanka's geopolitics, climatology, and historical and cultural conditions. In the early sixteenth century, two years before the construction of Colombo, Portuguese navigators settled here. They built fortifications to defend the northern peninsula. In the mid-seventeenth century, when the Dutch occupied it, they surrounded the whole area with fortified walls and made it an impregnable fortress.[11]

There were two major capital defense strategies in the Korean peninsula, which is marked by mountainous terrain and islands. The first was the strategy of clearing land settlements, evacuating them to mountain fortresses,[12] and the second strategy (implemented only in an emergency) involved landing on the island from the sea. This shows that fortresses' functions and construction methods vary according to each location and topography.

In particular, during the Goryeo Dynasty (918–1392 CE)[13] of Korea, in which there was a conflict with Mongolia, a mountain fortress protection officer was sent to build a mountain fortress to evacuate people and implemented the *Haedoipbo*,[14] which was a strategy of relocating the capital to Ganghwa Island.[15] This island is located at the point where the lower part of the Han River of Korea meets the Yellow Sea. It was fortified as a base for the thirteenth-century rebellion against Mongolia and continued to function as a fortress until the eighteenth century. By reclamation of the sterile marine environment, a military farmland *(Doonjeon)* was developed in order to supply food, and the Ganghwa strait *(Yeomha)*[16] area was recognized as an important strategic point and was densely fortified. This Ganghwa maritime fortification site is of unique territorial and geographical value. It is a maritime fortified landscape, and it embodies the climax of a fierce history of

---

[11] „Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/451 (accessed: 13.01.2024).

[12] "*Chengyaipbo* (清野入保)" tactics mean "clear the field and fight from the mountain fortress."

[13] The Goryeo Dynasty is also spelled Koryŏ Dynasty. See: "Goryeo dynasty", *Britannica*, 15.05.2024, https://www.britannica.com/topic/Koryo-dynasty (accessed: 18.05.2024).

[14] "*Haedoipbo* (海島入保)" strategy means resettlements on the island often used during the Goryeo dynasty (918–1392) of Korea.

[15] J. Kang, *Daemongjeonjaenggi ganghwacheondoui oigyojeok baegyeonggwa gyeonggido gwonyeokui gunsanjeok daeeung* (대몽전쟁기 강화천도의 외교적 배경과 경기도 권역의 군사적 대응 [Diplomatic Intentions behind the Decision to Relocate the Goryeo Government, to the Gang hwa-do Island during the Mongol invasion, and Military responses staged in the Gyeonggi-do province], *Hangukyeoksayeonguhoi* 한국역사연구회 [Korean History Society], pp. 105–145, https://koreanhistory.jams.or.kr/po/volisse/sjPubsArtiPopView.kci?soceId=INS000001510&artiId=SJ00000001325&sereId=SER000000001&submCnt=1 (accessed: 1.06.2024).

[16] Ganghwa strait · Yeomha (江華海峽・鹽河).

constantly encountering, clashing with, and resisting world powers on the Korean Peninsula.[17]

When establishing a defense strategy, the Koreans built defense facilities using the topography as much as possible because of pressure from the enemy. These facilities took the form of mountain fortresses, coastal fortresses, and fortified islands. Their function ranged from that of an administrative unit to that of a nation, depending on the nature of the emergency.

2.2.3. Cultural landscape value

The value of the cultural landscape allows better understanding of the material and functional context of fortifications, and takes into account, among other elements, respect for its enclave, the role of military construction for defensive purposes, its dominance position, visual and physical in relation to the surrounding territory (art. 4 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021, *Values*).

UNESCO World Heritage Namhansanseong is a good example of a fortress using natural topography. It is a military cultural landscape in which various fortress elements were brought together, built, and differentiated in the course of time. For example, the surrounding peaks called Beolbong Peak (505 m) to the east of Namhansanseong and Geomdan Mountain (480 m) to the south can be used to attack the main fortress of Namhansanseong. After the construction of Jujangseong fortress (the old name of the main fortress wall of Namhansanseong) in 672, these surrounding peaks were occupied during the Chinese Invasion of Joseon in 1636,[18] and the Qing troops besieged the entire main fortress because of a lack of fortifications. This experience led to measures to place reinforced external fortresses on Geomdan Mountain to the south and on Beolbong Peak to the east.

In particular, the Bongam extended defensive wall, built to the right of Namhansanseong's main fortress, and the Hanbong extended defensive wall, built along the mountain ridge from the 15th Auxiliary Gate located to the south of Bongam extended defensive wall, experienced occupation by the enemy. As a result, it was judged to be a tactically weak area, so more defensive facilities such as several batteries and bastions were placed in this area. As a similar case, there is the midgate of Bukhansanseong mountain fortress located in the north of Seoul, which is

[17] G. Lee, "Ganghwaeui gojido, nangongbullageui yosaeseomeum damanaeda" 강화의 고지도, 난공불락의 요새섬을 담아내다 [in:] *Gojidoe banyeongdoin ganghwahaeyanggwanbangyujeok* 고지도에 반영된 강화해양관방유적, eds. R. Kim, H. Jeong, H. Ahn, I. Hong, *Ganghwahaeyanggwanbangyujeok Haksulchongseo Je i gip* 강화해양관방유적 학술총서 제2집 [The Series of Scholarship Ganghwa & Goryeo History Foundation vol. 2], Ganghwa goyreo yeoksajaedan 강화고려역사재단 [Ganghwa & Goyreo History Foundation], Jindijain 진디자인, Suwon, 2016, pp. 17–35, https://iharchive.ifac.or.kr/archives/item/view?pageNum=1&searchData=%ED%95%99%EC%88%A0%EC%B4%9D%EC%84%9C&categoryLargeGroupCode=0005&searchType=TITLE&rowCount=8&search=N&iidx=727 (accessed: 6.06.2024).

[18] It broke out in the Byeongja year of 1636. That is why it was named "Byeongja horan (丙子胡亂)."

a more developed example of overcoming the weakness of the Western fortress. A bulwark like a traverse element in European fortifications was placed to prevent the enemy from entering beyond the fortress wall.

An east observation post and a west observation post were included inside the Sinnamseong outer wall at the top of Geomdan Mountain.[19] Furthermore, the Bongamseong extended defensive wall connected to the main fortress of Namhansanseong can be seen as a fortified landscape created through experience drawn from actual conflict. If one analyzes this place more closely, one can see that all weapon operation systems were systematically introduced there, from cold weapons such as bows and spears to gunpowder weapons such as matchlocks and cannons. It is reckoned that the range of the Hongyipao[20] cannon operated during the Chinese invasion of Korea in 1636 stretched up to 1.6–1.9 km from Beolbong Peak in the east and Geomdan Mountain in the south to the center of Namhansanseong. These surrounding peaks could attack a primary element such as the Namhansanseong Haenggung emergency palace, where the king stayed. In order to occupy these surrounding peaks in advance, the Shinnamseong outer wall (East – and West Observation posts) was constructed, which performed the function of detecting enemy invasion from the surrounding area in advance and responding to it immediately. Since the defense zone of Geomdan Mountain in the south of Namhansanseong was very wide, a second line of defense was built behind the Sinnamseong outer wall, and three separate outworks (*Ongseong*)[21] were installed to defend the entire area between Geomdan Mountain and the southern fortress area of Namhansanseong. The first southern outwork defended the right-side slope of Geomdan Mountain; the second southern outwork covered the center, left, and right sides of Geomdan Mountain; and the third southern outwork covered the left ridge of Geomdan Mountain. The distance between the main fortress wall in the south and Geomdan Mountain was covered by the range of the *Cheonja Chongtong*[22]

---

19 The top of the mountain has two peaks, like the back of a Bactrian camel, and an observation post is installed on each peak.

20 *Hongyipao* (紅夷炮) was the Chinese name for European-style muzzle-loading culverins introduced to China and Korea from the Portuguese colony of Macau and by the Hendrick Hamel expedition to Joseon in the early seventeenth century.

21 *Ongseong* is an outwork installed at the main gate of the fortresses constructed on the flat land to enhance defensive power. However, in the case of Namhansanseong, Ongseong was on the ridge of the mountain, where there was a crucial zone.

22 The *Cheonja Chongtong* gun is named after the Chinese character "cheon" (天) inscribed on its body. "天" is the first character of *Qianziwen* (Thousand Character Classic) and indicates that this gun was the first produced in the Joseon Period. According to the inscription on the barrel, it was produced in 1555 (the tenth year of King Myeongjong's reign). It is considered an important cultural heritage as it is the largest gun made during the Joseon Period and the oldest one containing a legible inscription. "*Cheonja Chongtong* Gun", National Museum of Korea, https://www.museum.go.kr/site/eng/relic/represent/view?relicId=4635 (accessed: 8.05.2024).

gun.[23] All fortification elements are integrated to reveal the value of a military cultural landscape.

In addition, each outwork built along the main ridge extending from the main fortress is directly monitored and defended from the main fortress to prevent enemy incursion. The range between the battery built at the end of each southern outwork and the main fortress wall at the rear is included within the effective range of the matchlock. The entire system operating these weapons belongs to a property zone that most clearly reflects the characteristics of military heritage, and the natural landscape surrounding this zone belongs to the buffer zone of World Heritage Namhansanseong.[24] For communications inside and outside the fortress, command posts were installed in four places in the east, west, south, and north of the fortress to enable signal transmission without any obstacles along a visual axis. In particular, Dongjangdae (東將臺) east command post directly and uninterruptedly communicated with Oedongjangdae (外東將臺) external east command post. From this, it can be seen that people at that time analyzed the natural topography very carefully and adapted it flawlessly to perform military functions.

2.2.4. Strategic value

Fortification is a symbol of the fusion of multiple types of knowledge. The strategic value of a fortification is more significant than its territorial or geographical value, since it reflects the power of decision and the depth of knowledge, as well as the social cohesion of the ruling group (art. 4 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021, *Values*).

In the history of the development of fortification systems in Korea, there are many cases in which the country's capital was built strategically with a mountain fortress located separately behind the capital. There was a tradition of building a mountain fortress behind the capital wall to compensate for the weakness of the flat terrain and to utilize a river for defense. That means constructing a double fortifications system that makes it possible to clear the plains when enemies invade, to evacuate people, and to protect people inside a mountain fortress. In other words, the mountain fortress served as a refuge and base for attack. This military strategy was called the *Cheongya Ipbo*.[25] It was applied to the Janganseong capital wall and Daeseongsanseong mountain fortress in Pyeongyang[26] at the time of the Goguryeo Kingdom (Koguryŏ Kingdom, 37 BCE–669). Other examples include the Naseong capital

[23] The maximum range is estimated to be about 960 m, and the effective casualty radius of the Chongtongryu is estimated to be about 200–500 m when compared to weapons at the time.

[24] UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "Namhansanseong", Documents – 2014 Nomination file, pp. 169–170, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1439/documents/ (accessed: 27.05.2024).

[25] This means clearing the field and fighting from the mountain fortress.

[26] Evidence the tactic and this tradition. Pyeongyang is the current capital of North Korea.

wall and Busosanseong mountain fortress of the Baekje Kingdom[27], the Wolseong capital wall and Myeonghwalsanseong mountain fortress of the Silla Kingdom[28], and the Gaegyeong capital fortifications[29] and Daeheungsanseong mountain fortress in the Goryeo Dynasty.[30]

In the Joseon Dynasty, the combination of the capital wall and mountain fortress made a unique fortified landscape that combined the Hanyangdoseong capital city wall, the Tangchundaeseong defense wall, and the Bukhansanseong mountain fortress into a single defense system as the capital fortifications of Hanyang.[31] In peacetime, the Tangchundaeseong defense wall and the Bukhansanseong mountain fortress played an essential role in defense against the northern enemy approaches. Furthermore, the Bukhansanseong mountain fortress was a refuge for the capital in times of emergency or war.[32]

The other example indicating strategic value is that of the Coastal Fortifications along the Konkan coast of Maharashtra in India. The history of these forts along the Konkan coast reveals the shifting balance of regional and international powers and, the changing territories of control between the ninth century to the nineteenth century CE, from the earlier dynasties of the Satvahanas, Rashtrakutas, Chalukyas, Yadavas, Shilaharas to the later period with the Bahamanis and, finally the Portuguese in the north, and the Siddhis, the Dutch, the British, and the Marathas along the southern coast.[33] They are the largest concentration of western coastal fortifications along the Konkan coast in Maharashtra; they stretch up to approximately 740 km on the Indian Ocean side. They are also a testimony to the historical

---

27 The Baekje Kingdom is also spelled Paekche Kingdom (18BCE-660). Naseong capital wall and Busosanseong mountain fortress in Buyeo are major elements of the World Heritage "Baekje Historic areas" of the Republic of Korea. See: "Baekje, ancient kingdom, Korea", *Britannica*, 27.03.2024, https://www.britannica.com/place/Paekche (accessed: 13.04.2024).

28 Silla Kingdom (57 BCE–668). The Korean Peninsula consists of Gogureo, Baekje, and Silla, unified by Silla in 668. The Unified Silla lasted from 668–935. Wolseong capital wall and Myeonghwalsanseong mountain fortress in Gyeongju are major elements of the World Heritage "Gyeongju historic areas" of the Republic of Korea. See: "Silla, ancient kingdom, Korea", *Britannica*, https://www.britannica.com/place/Silla (accessed: 13.04.2024).

29 It is an important element of the World Heritage "Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong" of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

30 UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "Namhansanseong…", pp. 174–176.

31 Capital Fortifications of Hanyang: Hangyangdoseong Capital City Wall, Bukhansanseong Mountain Fortress, and Tangchundaeseong Defense Wall, UNESCO," https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/6652/ (accessed: 20.04.2024).

32 "Capital Fortifications of Hanyang: Hangyangdoseong Capital City Wall, Bukhansanseong Mountain Fortress and Tangchundaeseong Defense Wall", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/6652/ (accessed: 27.05.2024).

33 "Coastal Fortifications along the Konkan coast of Maharashtra", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/6703/ (accessed: 20.04.2024).

development of global maritime trade and commerce. These coastal fortifications shaped military strategy, contemporary military and political affairs, and the cultural landscape of the region.

2.2.5. Human/anthropological values

Fortifications were built to protect one human group from another. Therefore, they can be associated with sites of conflict. Sometimes Fortifications are connected with brutal and devastating battles and wars that resulted in one group being victorious over another defeated group. They can also be associated with their role in the performance of nation-building and can be used to play a role in nation-building. Both fortification structures and cultural landscapes may also contain archaeological information, which is essential to understanding them and can provide information about the past use of these places that is not available from historical sources (art. 4 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021, *Values*).

The Great Wall of China has been recognized as a historically and strategically important wall, as well as an outstanding architectural monument, and was inscribed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 1987. In 220 BCE, the first emperor of China, Qin Shi Huang (259 BC–210 BCE), decided to build integrated defense fortifications in preparation for an invasion by northern nomadic folks. Construction of the Great Wall continued until the Ming Dynasty (1368–1644 CE). It has become the world's largest military facility. The Great Wall of China is a complex and diachronic cultural heritage and a special example of military heritage maintained solely for strategic purposes for 2,000 years. However, the history of wall construction shows continued development in defense technology and the changing political situation. The hardships of the Chinese people involved in the construction process can be found in important works in Chinese literary history. This is shown in works such as the novels of the Ming Dynasty, which adds a humanist dimension to the fortification.

The Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) on the Korean Peninsula is a system of military facilities that have faced each other for over seventy years following the Korean War armistice, and the natural environment there, including the human environment and an ecosystem that has been free from human exploitation and development for some time, is well preserved, adding to its value as a piece of natural heritage. In terms of international history, it is a result of the Cold War. The Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) on the Korean Peninsula is 4km wide with southern and northern boundaries set at 2km to the north and south of the 248km Military Demarcation Line from the mouth of the Imjin River to Goseong County on the east coast.[34]

[34] Munhwajaecheong·Gyeonggido·Gangwondo 문화재청·경기도·강원도 [Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea, Gyeonggi Province Gangwon Province], *Hanbando Bimujangjidae 2020–2021 Siltaejosa Bogoseo* (한반도 비무장지대 2020–2021 실태조사 보고서, [Actual condition survey report of the demilitarized zone on the Korean Peninsula 2020–2021], Gungnip

The DMZ on the Korean Peninsula is a defense system with forward outposts and general outposts continuously deployed from east to west. The main operational area setting concept is to minimize approach blind spots by deploying multiple lines of barbed wire and various weapons to increase defense capabilities. In other words, it is the product of a military culture that maximizes the efficiency of protection, flanking, and command and control by utilizing the natural terrain to deploy forward outposts at regular intervals between the Military Demarcation Line and the Southern Limit Line and by installing general outposts situated behind the Southern Limit Line (more than twice the number of forward outposts). The concept shapes the fortified landscape. To embody the spirit of peace and reconciliation of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, a dialogue channel between the state parties to the dispute and a bilateral or multilateral interpretation of this military heritage in human history are needed.

2.2.6. Memory/identity/educational value

Fortifications can play an essential role in the memory of society. They illustrate the conflict directly, allowing an intense, often personal, learning experience from events that can be part of the shared history of communities. They belong to the collective memory concerning the cultural landscape they set. Fortifications have educational value because they can provide a stimulating and nurturing environment related to the cultural experience of military heritage (art. 4 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021, *Values*).

Belgium and France submitted a World Heritage nomination dossier of Funerary and Memory sites of the First World War (The Western Front) in 2017. The site is a transboundary space with 139 sites spread across northern Belgium and eastern France. This area is where battles with Germany took place between 1914 and 1918, and the proposed heritage site includes very large and very small sites and covers various types of cemeteries.[35]

These sites were placed on the UNESCO World Heritage list in 2023, as they meet criteria iii, iv, and vi; however, in 2018 and 2023, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee identified the property as a serial property and assessed that the integrity, authenticity, and justification criteria needed to be revised.[36]

Munhwayusan yeonguwon 국립문화유산연구원 [National Research Institute of Cultural Heritage], Baehyosang Print square 베효상프린트스케어, Daejeon 2022, pp. 14–15, https://www.heritage.go.kr/heri/cul/linkSelectEbookDetail.do? (accessed: 27.05.2024).

[35] Decision 42 COM 8B.24 Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front) (Belgium, France), adopted during the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Manama, 2018), https://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/7137 (accessed: 13.01.2024).

[36] UNESCO World Heritage Centre – Decision – 18 EXT.COM 4., https://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/8046/ (accessed: 27.05.2024). Urbanization, energy, and transport infrastructure (wind power and roads with heavy traffic) were cited as the main risk factors for many components. Due to

Where there are different perceptions of Sites of Memory (where there is a disputed place, where there are different views on its significance or history), the interpretation of the site can present complex problems. However, a careful and inclusive interpretation process can also be an excellent opportunity to unite communities with different perspectives.[37]

The 45th UNESCO World Heritage Committee in 2023 adopted the following Guiding Principles concerning interpretation, education, and information and reconciliation; these will apply to sites of memory associated with recent conflicts. An "Interpretation strategy" is formulated as follows: bearing in mind potential differing views and narratives, the interpretation strategy shall be multi-dimensional to present accurately the full meaning of the site and to support an understanding of its full history. "Education and information programs" will include evidence of educational and information programs meeting the same high ethical and scholarly standards of the UNESCO Global Citizenship Education program, such as the inclusion of multiple narratives based on sound research and comparative analysis using documentary and archival sources, testimonies, and material evidence. A reconciliation process not interrupting the process of dialogue is recommended.[38]

In particular, most war-related sites are probably a heritage of wounds that have scarred a country; they may also derive from a period when a country enjoyed a period of glory in its history. For example, the place where Vasco da Gama started his voyage in Portugal during the Age of Discovery is a symbolic national monument reflecting Portugal's national identity. In addition, Vasco da Gama's pioneering of the Indian Sea route has great significance in opening sea routes between the West and the East. It brought many changes to European society through the spice trade.[39] The major ports used for navigation were elaborately fortified so that future fleets

---

the inappropriate property boundaries, it is necessary to reset the boundaries of the property zone and the buffer zone, and the legal protection system related to this is also inappropriate for all components, so the need for improvement is recommended. In particular, one of the most critical issues of this property was how to define the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the site, which is linked to the memory of the recent conflict that is nominated under criterion (vi), preferably in conjunction with other criteria and thus can be shared by humanity. In the case of global events, such as World War I and World War II, the principal members of the World Heritage Committee discussed how to reflect the memory of all countries involved.

37 J. Luxen, "Result of the study on Interpretation of Sites of Memory" [in:] *Materials on the International Seminar on the 30th Anniversary of Korea's Accession to the UNESCO World Heritage Convention*, Korean National Commission for UNESCO, 2018, pp. 168, https://unesco.or.kr/assets/data/report/dk6JjIJPXGTrQJShGpGzg3ltafJTWI_1525237321_2.pdf (accessed: 27.05.2024).

38 UNESCO World Heritage Centre – Decision – 18 EXT.COM 4…

39 Y. Choi, "Vasco da gamaeui saengeae gwanhan yeongu" 바스코 다 가마의 생애에 관한 연구 [A Study on the Life of Vasco da Gama], *Jungnammi yeongu* 중남미연구 [Latin American and Caribbean Studies] 2004, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 46–68, https://www.dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE06221320 (accessed: 5.06.2024).

that served significant commercial and military functions could be protected and anchored there. In particular, in terms of military heritage, such a site recalls the Age of Exploration, the identity of a specific region, and encapsulates the historical and educational value of heritage. However, the history of conquest and exploitation by Western countries such as England and the Netherlands, a process that started with Portugal, is seen negatively by Eastern countries. The positive and negative sides differ depending on the party concerned.

2.2.7. Historical value

Fortifications and military heritage embody attitudes and world views specific to their development and use periods. These attitudes may be understood through studying and interpreting the military sites and their relationships with contemporary societies (art. 4 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021, *Values*).

In the case of the World Heritage Hwaseong fortress, its value was seen by Silhak as a collection of Eastern and Western fortress technologies.[40] Hwaseong fortress was not only an expression of filial piety toward a father,[41] but also was created as the center of political planning to reconstruct the country devastated by the two major wars on the Korean Peninsula during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and to strengthen royal authority. It was designed by Jeong Yak-Yong, a civil servant and Silhak scholar of the royal library (*Gyujanggak*), drawing on technical books from East and West. The construction of Hwaseong fortress began in January 1794 and was completed in September 1796. Its total length is 5.744 m, and it covers an area of 130 ha. The eastern terrain of Hwaseong fortress is flat, and the western side is on Paldal Mountain; so it combines a flatland fortress and a mountain fortress.[42]

---

[40] Silhak was a Korean Confucian social reform movement in the late Joseon Dynasty. 'Sil' means 'actual' or 'practical,' and 'hak' means 'studies' or 'learning.'

[41] Crown Prince Jangheon (also known as Crown Prince Sado), King Yeongjo's son and King Jeongjo's father, was put to death under his father's wrath as a victim of a power struggle among the factions. He died from being confined in a wooden rice chest. Grieving, King Jeongjo moved the tomb of his father, Crown Prince Sado, from Yangju County, Gyeonggi Province, to southern Suwon-bu County and frequently paid homage to the tomb. He renamed Suwon-bu Hwaseong and built the fortress there to sanctify the region. "A History of Korea", http://contents.history.go.kr/mobile/kh/main.do (accessed: 5.06.2024).

[42] Hwaseong fortress, UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/817 (accessed: 13.01.2024). The facilities of the fortress are four Main Gates (*Mullu*), 2 Water sluices (*Sumun*), 3 Observation posts with transit space (*Gongsimdon*), 2 Command Posts (*Jangdae*), 2 Archery platforms (*Nodae*), 5 Sentry towers (*Poru*), 5 Bastions (*Poru*), 4 Corner pavilion (*Gangnu*), 5 Auxiliary Gates (*Ammun*), 1 Beacon tower (*Bongdon*), 4 Flanking towers (*Jeokdae*), nine lookouts (*Chiseong*), two hidden waterways (*Eungu*), Etc. In total, it consists of f 48 facilities, and many facilities such as Hwaseong Haenggung temporary Palace, Mid-alarm tower (*Jungposa*), Inner Alarm tower (Naeposa), and Altar for State deities of earth and grain (*Sajikdan*) were built as annexed facilities within the

Hwaseong fortress is clear evidence of an exchange of science and technology between East and West. At that time, new construction machines such as cranes were devised and used to move and lift heavy stones. These results were based on the tradition of constructing fortress walls in Korea. In particular, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, most of the emergency capital, the temporary palace, and the major fortifications distributed near the capital city were rebuilt; there was a stone masonry tradition of constructing fortress walls. The methods of fixing stone masonry (45 × 45 cm size stone materials) applied in the construction of Namhansanseong were also applied to Bukhansanseong mountain fortress (1711) and Tangchundaeseong defense wall (1716); the latter connects Bukhansanseong and Hanyangdoseong (Hanyang capital wall, currently Seoul city wall). These models later influenced the construction of the Hwaseong fortress (1796).[43] Therefore, this site offers clear evidence of the history of the development of fortress construction techniques in Korea.

Hwaseong Seongyeok Uigwe,[44] published in 1801 after the construction of Hwaseong fortress in Suwon, contains not only the construction plan, system, and principles underlying the defenses, but also information about personnel involved, the source and use of materials, budget and wage calculations, construction machinery, material production methods, and a daily record of construction, etc. All these are documented in detail. This book proves that the Hwaseong fortress has left a remarkable footprint in the history of architecture, especially in the construction of fortresses. At the same time, it has great historical value and is currently listed in the UNESCO Memory of the World. These royal protocols of the construction of the Hwaseong fortress were collected by Collin de Plancy,[45] a French ambassador in Korea, and donated to the Oriental Language School in Paris[46] and the National Library of France. Later, Henri Chevalier, who was later appointed Consul General of Japan, translated the Hwaseong Seongyeok Uigwe into French with the help of Jong-Woo Hong, who was the first Korean to study in France at the Oriental

---

fortress. All four main gates have outworks (*Ongseong*), but the direction of entry and exit differs. Janganmun North gate and Paldalmun South gate have closed semicircular lookouts outside the gate, and Hwaseomun West gate and Changnyongmun East gate have semi-open lookouts.

[43] Y. Shin, "Chukseongsuleul tonghae bon bukhansanseongeui yusanjachi" 축성술을 통해 본 북한산성의 유산가치 [The Wall Construction Method of Bukhansanseong Fortress & It's Outstanding Universal Value], *Paeksan Hakbo* 백산학보 [The Paek-San Society] 2019, vol. 115, p. 20, http://paeksan.com/subList/32000000526 (accessed: 27.05.2024).

[44] The *Uigwe* (의궤), a unique record born from a culture of preserving tradition, was listed as a UNESCO Memory of the World in 2007. Hwaseong Seongyeok Uigwe means royal protocol for the construction of the Hwaseong fortress.

[45] He worked for almost a decade from 1884 as French Minister to Joseon (1390–1910), which was a dynastic kingdom of Korea. He was the first French Minister and published „Joseon Seoji (朝鮮 書誌)" while working in Joseon.

[46] Institut Nationale des Langues et Civilisation Orientales à Paris.

Language School. *Cérémonial de l'achèvement des travaux de Hoa-Syeng*[47] was published in an abridged version in 1898. Hwaseong fortress was inscribed in the UNESCO World Heritage list in 1997, with an emphasis on its fortress walls. However, at this point, it is necessary to reinterpret related heritages that reflect phases of the times when the fortress was built. In particular, military landscapes such as the Doksanseong mountain fortress, which was built during the reorganization of the capital defense system in the late Joseon Dynasty, and the irrigation facility and *doongeon* (屯田) garrison farmland (established because of severe drought in the year following the beginning of the Hwaseong fortress in 1793), provided a formative basis for the construction of Hwaseong fortress. The construction should be reexamined from various perspectives, such as the relocation of the tomb of Crown Prince Sado and facilities related to King Jeongjo's Royal Parade. In addition, the Hwaseong Museum in Suwon, the Hwaseong Fortress Administration Office, the Suwon History Museum, and the Suwon Cultural Foundation can be cited as the agents of reinterpretation or in-depth research on the value of the above heritage sites. With regard to the Hwaseong fortress, these organizations have established a mid-to-long-term comprehensive maintenance plan for the relevant cultural property and operate a multidisciplinary conservation management system. An example of the preservation and transmission of intangible heritage is the Suwon Hwaseong Cultural Festival, centered on the royal funeral procession of King Jeongjo. Numerous local governments and regional organizations consisting of local communities support and collaborate on the reappearance of King Jeongjo's procession, and there are autonomous districts in Seoul, Siheung City, Anyang City, Uiwang City, Suwon City, and Hwaseong City in Gyeonggi province of Korea that focus on preservation, transmission, and utilization centered on each local community. A variety of activities take place there.

2.2.8. Social/economic value

The recognition of the social value of fortifications, through appropriate enhancement actions, must activate a stimulus effect giving economic benefit to the communities and activating the recognition of new values and knowledge (art. 4 of the ICOMOS Guidelines 2021, *Values*).

Fortifications and military heritage retain values and meanings that are both tangible and intangible, material and spiritual. However, quantitative research should be actively carried out by focusing on the resources invested in heritage conservation and utilization. Through this, it is necessary to establish the feasibility of conservation and management of heritage, to win over various stakeholders including the communities living inside and outside the region throughout which the heritage is

[47] H. Chevalier, "華城城役儀軌, Hoa Syeng Syeng Yek Eui Kouei, Cérémonial de l'achèvement Des Travaux de Hoa Syeng (Corée) (1800)", *T'oung Pao* 1898, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 384–396, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4525362 (accessed: 27.05.2024).

distributed, and to consider ways to generate socio-economic effects such as job creation through heritage conservation and utilization. In other words, it is necessary to visualize the value of heritage quantitatively, and it is necessary to build up the capacity of a site manager by expanding the budget for heritage conservation and utilization and by developing an expertise in managing human resources, which is a prerequisite for sustainable heritage conservation. The economic ripple effects of heritage conservation and the total value of the heritage involved must be evaluated, and a feedback process must be instituted to secure conservation management costs appropriate to the value of the heritage. In addition, a systematic education system needs to be established to expand the expertise of heritage management personnel, who are among the main stakeholders of heritage conservation and utilization. Ultimately, a multidisciplinary review of sustainable economic, environmental, and social development approaches should be undertaken periodically, as well as establishing an integrated strategy for sustainable development in the spirit of the 1972 World Heritage Convention.

Because of the different historical backgrounds of each country, positive and negative views on military heritage coexist. Since Namhansanseong was inscribed in the World Heritage list in 2014, it has been able to improve its image as an emergency capital of Joseon and a treasurehouse of the history of fortress development through a reinterpretation of history, breaking away from the negative image of Namhansanseong Prison and food tourism in pursuit of chicken stews. To further enhance the value of military sites and prove the validity of sustainable protection, business agreements have been signed with eight local universities near the sites, the Namhansanseong History and Culture Center has been established, and various collaborations with residents have taken place. Those activities are an excellent example of the project of raising awareness on the site's value carried out by the Gyeonggi-do Namhansanseong World Heritage Center, a body dedicated to integrated conservation management.

3. Conclusions

Many movements to inscribe fortifications and military heritage on the UNESCO World Heritage list can be observed. Further, one of the results of the international community's efforts to achieve adequate protection and management of the UNESCO World Heritage is the enactment and revision of charters and rules, which can be subdivided into various forms of preparing laws, principles, rules, guidelines, action plans, etc. Most of all, such activities contain recommendations that conservation of the original form of cultural heritage is a prerequisite, and efforts to preserve a site's original form and historic state make up an extensive part of discourse on heritage research, protection, and utilization.

ICOMOS, the advisory body in the cultural heritage field of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, prepares the charters, principles, guidelines, and declarations for cultural heritage conservation in different categories and disseminates them to the world. Among them, the ICOMOS guidelines on fortifications and military heritage adopted by ICOMOS in 2021 present eight directions to establish the value of fortifications and military heritage. This article has focused on a discussion of the value-based definition of fortifications and military heritage. In addition, this paper has stressed how important it is for stakeholders to understand efforts to identify World Heritage values and to conserve their properties. It does so by discussing existing cases from the World Heritage list, the World Heritage tentative list, and the related fortifications and military heritage in Korea, Asia, and other regions. In the process of World Heritage nomination, it is necessary to identify the heritage value and to establish what the attributes are that convey the heritage authenticity and integrity. Those attributes related to fortifications and military heritage can be derived based on "barrier and protection," "command," "depth," "flanking," and "deterrence," which are presented in ICOMOS Guidelines. When defining the value of fortifications and military heritage, it is important to refer to the eight defined value classifications of architectural and technical value, territorial and geographical value, cultural landscape value, strategic value, human and anthropological value, memory, identity educational value, historical value, and social and economic value. Furthermore, the establishment of appropriate and sustainable conservation management policies and preparation of a comprehensive plan for the attributes conveying the value of fortifications and military heritage should go hand in hand with the above. Conservation management should be established with multidisciplinary experts, including site managers whose skills must be developed appropriately. Next, it is necessary to prepare an appropriate communication system to expand the understanding of the defined value to the various stakeholders related to fortifications and military heritage. These efforts can lead to benefits for many communities, including those living near the heritage. Furthermore, these efforts again generate social and economic effects providing legitimacy for heritage conservation and management.

References

"A History of Korea", http://contents.history.go.kr/mobile/kh/main.do (accessed: 5.06.2024)

"Baekje, ancient kingdom, Korea", *Britannica*, 27.03.2024, https://www.britannica.com/place/Paekche (accessed: 13.04.2024)

"Capital Fortifications of Hanyang: Hangyangdoseong Capital City Wall, Bukhansanseong Mountain Fortress and Tangchundaeseong Defense Wall", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/6652/ (accessed: 27.05.2024)

"*Cheonja Chongtong* Gun", National Museum of Korea, https://www.museum.go.kr/site/eng/relic/represent/view?relicId=4635 (accessed: 8.05.2024)

Chevalier H., "華城城役儀軌, Hoa Syeng Syeng Yek Eui Kouei, Cérémonial de l'achèvement Des Travaux de Hoa Syeng (Corée) (1800)", *T'oung Pao* 1898, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 384–396, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4525362 (accessed: 27.05.2024)

Choi Y., "Vasco da gamaeui saengeae gwanhan yeongu" 바스코 다 가마의 생애에 관한 연구 [A Study on the Life of Vasco da Gama], *Jungnammi yeongu* 중남미연구 [Latin American and Caribbean Studies] 2004, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 46–68, https://www.dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE06221320 (accessed: 5.06.2024)

"Coastal Fortifications along the Konkan coast of Maharashtra", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/6703/(accessed: 20.04.2024)

"Complex of Hué Monuments", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/678 (accessed: 13.01.2024)

Corvisier C., Warmoës I., "L'art de fortifier de Vauban, Vauban, architecte de la modernité" [in:] *Vauban, architecte de la modernité?* eds. T. Martin, M. Virol, series: *Les Cahiers de la MSHE Ledoux* 11, Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, Besançon 2008, pp. 101–134.

"Goryeo dynasty", *Britannica*, 15.05.2024, https://www.britannica.com/topic/Koryo-dynasty (accessed: 18.05.2024)

"Hikone-Jo (Castle)", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/374 (accessed: 20.04.2024)

"Hwaseong fortress", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/817 (accessed: 13.01.2024)

Kang J., *Daemongjeonjaenggi ganghwacheondoui oigyojeok baegyeonggwa gyeonggido gwonyeokui gunsanjeok daeeung* 대몽전쟁기 강화천도의 외교적 배경과 경기도 권역의 군사적 대응 [Diplomatic Intentions behind the Decision to Relocate the Goryeo Government, to the Gang hwa-do Island during the Mongol invasion, and Military responses staged in the Gyeonggi-do province], *Hangukyeoksayeonguhoi* 한국역사연구회 [Korean History Society], pp. 105–145, https://koreanhistory.jams.or.kr/po/volisse/sjPubsArtiPopView.kci?soceId=INS000001510&artiId=SJ0000001325&sereId=SER000000001&submCnt=1 (accessed: 1.06.2024)

Lee G., "Ganghwaeui gojido, nangongbullageui yosaeseomeum damanaeda" 강화의 고지도, 난공불락의 요새섬을 담아내다 [in:] *Gojidoe banyeongdoin ganghwahaeyanggwanbangyujeok* 고지도에 반영된 강화해양관방유적, eds. R. Kim, H. Jeong, H. Ahn, I. Hong, *Ganghwahaeyanggwanbangyujeok Haksulchongseo Je i gip* (강화해양관방유적 학술총서 제2집 [The Series of Scholarship Ganghwa & Goryeo History Foundation vol. 2], Ganghwa goyreo yeoksajaedan (강화고려역사재단 [Ganghwa & Goyreo History Foundation], *Jindijain* 진디자인, Suwon 2016, pp. 17–35, https://iharchive.ifac.or.kr/archives/item/view?pageNum=1&searchData=%ED%95%99%EC%88%A0%EC%B4%9D%EC%84%9C&categoryLargeGroupCode=0005&searchType=TITLE&rowCount=8&search=N&iidx=727 (accessed: 6.06.2024)

Luxen J., "Result of the study on Interpretation of Sites of Memory" [in:] *Materials on the International Seminar on the 30th Anniversary of Korea's Accession to the UNESCO World Heritage Convention,* Korean National Commission for UNESCO, 2018, pp. 162–168, https://unesco.or.kr/assets/data/report/dk6JjIJPXGTrQJShGpGzg3ltafJTWI_1525237321_2.pdf (accessed: 27.05.2024)

Munhwajaecheong·Gyeonggido·Gangwondo 문화재청·경기도·강원도 [Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea, Gyeonggi Province Gangwon Province], *Hanbando Bimujangjidae 2020–2021 Siltaejosa Bogoseo* 한반도 비무장지대 2020–2021 실태조사 보고서 [Actual

condition survey report of the demilitarized zone on the Korean Peninsula 2020–2021], *Gungnip Munhwayusan yeonguwon* 국립문화유산연구원 [National Research Institute of Cultural Heritage], Baehyosang Print square 베효상프린트스케어, Daejeon 2022, https://www.heritage.go.kr/heri/cul/linkSelectEbookDetail.do? (accessed: 27.05.2024)

"Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications", UNESCO, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/451 (accessed: 13.01.2024)

Ota S., "The Characteristics and values of the Asian city walls (Thang Long and other city walls) as World heritage" [in:] *Traditional Urban Planning Principles and City walls in Asian Capital*, eds. S. Kim, Y. Shin, H. Lee, H. Park, J. Seo, *Hanyangdoseong Haksulchongseo i chaek* 한양도성 학술총서 2책 [Seoul City Wall Studies Series 2], *Hanyangdoseong dogam* 한양도성도감 [Seoul City Wall division], *Yemaek* 예맥 [Yemac Design Company], Seoul 2014, pp. 80–111

Shin Y., "Chukseongsuleul tonghae bon bukhansanseongeui yusanjachi" 축성술을 통해 본 북한산성의 유산가치 [The Wall Construction Method of Bukhansanseong Fortress & It's Outstanding Universal Value], *Paeksan Hakbo* 백산학보 [The Paek-San Society] 2019, vol. 115, pp. 5–37, http://paeksan.com/subList/32000000526 (accessed: 27.05.2024)

"Silla, ancient kingdom, Korea", *Britannica*, https://www.britannica.com/place/Silla (accessed: 13.04.2024)

UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "Namhansanseong. Documents – 2014 Nomination file", https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1439/documents/ (accessed: 27.05.2024)

UNESCO World Heritage Centre – Decision – 18 EXT.COM 4, https://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/8046/ (accessed: 27.05.2024)

SUMMARY

Doo-Won Cho

VALUE-BASED STUDIES RELATING TO THE ICOMOS GUIDELINES ON FORTIFICATIONS AND MILITARY HERITAGE

Fortifications are the outcome of the historical development of human settlements, regions, and even nations. From the prehistoric era to modern times, fortifications have been an essential component of the self-defense of any human community. Fortifications were integrated with their settings in various ways.

ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), an advisory body in the field of cultural heritage of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, prepares charters, principles, guidelines, and declarations to effectively establish, conserve, and utilize various categories of cultural heritage, and promotes them to the world. ICOFORT (International Scientific Committee on Fortifications and Military Heritage), one of the international scientific committees under ICOMOS developed a charter on the protection, conservation, and interpretation of fortifications and military heritage from 2007 to 2021. This charter was officially adopted during the ICOMOS General Assembly in 2021 under the title of "the ICOMOS Guidelines on Fortifications and Military Heritage." ICOMOS Guidelines set out how to identify the basic attributes of fortifications and military heritage indicating their value. In this paper, the aim is to provide directions for stakeholders, mainly site

managers in specific fields of fortifications and military heritage, on how to identify, disseminate a fortification's value, conserve its attributes embodying the value, and utilize its heritage through a value-based approach. It considers and offers an interpretation of the attribute system that reflects the functional authenticity of the fortifications and military heritage.

Keywords: ICOMOS Guidelines, value, fortifications, military heritage, world heritage

STRESZCZENIE

Doo-Won Cho

BADANIA OPARTE NA WARTOŚCIACH ODNOSZĄCE SIĘ DO WYTYCZNYCH ICOMOS W SPRAWIE FORTYFIKACJI I DZIEDZICTWA WOJSKOWEGO

Fortyfikacje są wynikiem historycznego rozwoju ludzkich osad, regionów, a nawet narodów. Od czasów prehistorycznych po czasy współczesne fortyfikacje były istotnym elementem samoobrony każdej ludzkiej społeczności. Były one zintegrowane z otoczeniem na różne sposoby.

ICOMOS (Międzynarodowa Rada Ochrony Zabytków i Miejsc Historycznych), organ doradczy w dziedzinie dziedzictwa kultury Komitetu Światowego Dziedzictwa UNESCO, przygotowuje karty, zasady, wytyczne i deklaracje w celu skutecznego ustanowienia, ochrony i wykorzystania różnych kategorii dziedzictwa kultury oraz promuje je na świecie. ICOFORT (Międzynarodowy Komitet Naukowy ds. Fortyfikacji i Dziedzictwa Wojskowego), jeden z międzynarodowych komitetów naukowych w ramach ICOMOS, opracował kartę ochrony, konserwacji i interpretacji fortyfikacji i dziedzictwa wojskowego na lata 2007–2021. Karta ta została oficjalnie przyjęta podczas Zgromadzenia Ogólnego ICOMOS w 2021 r. pt. „Wytyczne ICOMOS w sprawie fortyfikacji i dziedzictwa wojskowego". Wytyczne te określają sposób identyfikacji podstawowych atrybutów fortyfikacji i dziedzictwa militarnego, wskazujących na ich wartość. Celem niniejszego dokumentu jest dostarczenie wskazówek dla zainteresowanych stron, głównie zarządców obiektów w określonych dziedzinach fortyfikacji i dziedzictwa wojskowego, w jaki sposób identyfikować, rozpowszechniać wartość fortyfikacji, chronić jej atrybuty ucieleśniające wartość i wykorzystywać jej dziedzictwo poprzez podejście oparte na wartościach. W Wytycznych ICOMOS przedstawiono i omówiono zbiór atrybutów, które odzwierciedlają funkcjonalną autentyczność fortyfikacji i dziedzictwa wojskowego.

Słowa kluczowe: Wytyczne ICOMOS, wartość, fortyfikacje, dziedzictwo wojskowe, dziedzictwo światowe