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ABSTRACT — Berlin is the city with varied and appealing landscape and cultural spaces: the castles, gardens, and avenues along with the unique cultural landscape make it especially attractive and unforgettable for the tourists and visitors from all over the world. As a cultural construct in which our sense of place and memories inhere, cultural landscape of Berlin is undergoing fundamental and rapid changes. This paper examines the interaction of natural and cultural geographic factors as well as political dynamics that produced these changes. After describing a natural base, which forms the Berlin’s landscape, paper details the main historical facts that emerged in Berlin until the twentieth century and especially after World War II and have continued in post-unification Berlin. It shows how structural changes and the new politics of globalisation mutually shaped or “co-produced” an urban space in cultural landscape under locally specific conditions of Berlin. This paper argues, that knowledge about past and current cultural landscape patterns, processes, and dynamics are fundamental for understanding creation of modern cultural landscape. It also provides guidance for developing visions to support the sustainable development of this city and achieve better social conditions for current and future living in this landscape.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Hardly a German landscape is well known in the world as the cultural landscape of Berlin and for good reason. What do we think of when we hear the words “Berlin’s cultural landscape”? The first thought might involve Berlin’s Branderburg Gate (Branderburger Tor), the Reichstag Building, The Fernsehturm (TV tower), Berlin Wall. It might involve also Pergamon Museum and the Old National Gallery, Rotes Rathaus (“City Hall”). Therefore, it is no wonder that year by year numerous tourists travel to this city full of enthusiasm. There are very few places in Berlin that can truly claim to have been untouched by the influence of visitors. Yet what they see is – as in many other instances – only the showy side, to a considerable degree the half-truth, while the other side – that is the real living conditions of the local people – remains largely concealed. To disperse this apparent contradiction we must concern ourselves with the interaction of natural and cultural geographic factors under the changing conditions over time, especially among globalisation and urging towards sustainable development. Landscape research seeks to draw connections among people, between people and places, and between societies and their
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environments (ESF, 2010; Plieninger et al., 2015). Worldwide research on cultural landscape has made substantial progress in recent years and the concept of cultural landscape has received broad attention since the adoption of the European Landscape Convention (CE, 2000). Landscape approaches have found substantial resonance (Angelstam et al., 2013; Czepczynski, 2012; Olwig, 2007; Plieninger and Bieling, 2012; Robertson and Richards, 2003; Taylor, 1998; Wylie, 2007), including the region of Berlin, especially the assessment of its ecosystem services (Kabisch and Haase, 2014; Kabisch, 2015), analysis of climate change impacts on Berlin’s cultural landscapes (Lotze-Campen et al., 2007), study of Berlin’s environmental politics in the twentieth century (Lachmund, 2013). Nevertheless, at the same time the changing cultural landscapes of Berlin, their interactions with political history, land-use patterns and their effects on environment have not yet received not enough attention. There are several publications of the Senate Administration for Urban Development of Berlin, devoted to the regional development of cultural landscapes in Berlin-Brandenburg (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, 2007) and problems of landscape planning (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, 2014), as well as reports of Ministry of Infrastructure and Development. Since the most of them are published in German, they are inaccessible to non-German readers.

Set against this background, our paper has a special focus on dynamics, actors, and cultural values around Berlin’s landscapes. It is dedicated to the study of Berlin’s landscapes and their role for urban sustainable development. One of the key goals of this paper is to discuss the geographical conditions (natural base of created landscape), main aspects of historical development of the city, including political changes, human activities, its dynamic in the context of economic and social transformations after the reunification of Germany. Particular attention is given to the broad definition of the term “cultural landscape”, analyzing this phenomenon from its origin to the modern scientific discourse and main concepts. This complex approach to the assessment of cultural landscape dynamic under the globalisation allows us to better understand the interactions between Berlin’s landscape and its different actors such as citizens, governmental institutions, and private companies. Inhabitants and economic actors shape on the one hand this landscape, and on the other hand are influenced by these transformations.

The paper draws on previous analytical studies as well as annual statistical reports. Our analysis based on international and national reports and reviews on the economic, social and environmental status of Berlin, e.g. publications of Senate’s Department of Urban Development in Berlin, The Office for Statistics of Berlin-Brandenburg, The Administration for health, environment and consumer protection, statistical data and fundamental scientific papers. The part of research was conducted in the framework of the project “Landscape and human well-being: analysis, assessment and communication in the field of landscape services” (AbgH 2014-2015) supported by grant from the Study Foundation of the Berlin House of Representatives.

2. LANDSCAPE AS PHENOMEN AND TYPE OF REPRESENTATION

The term “landscape” has deep roots particularly in English and other European languages with origins in Anglo-German language dating back to c.500AD in Europe. From its beginnings, landscape has meant a man-made artefact with associated cultural process values. According to Wylie (2007) and Olwig (2007), “...landscape is a way of seeing – its morphology resulting from the interplay between cultural values, customs and land-use practices (an active scene of practice)”. But what is ‘landscape’? It is not (only) portion of the earth’s surface that can be comprehended at a glance. J. B. Jackson (1984, p. 8) defines landscape as “...a rich and beautiful book [that] is always open before us. We have but to learn to read it.” Landscape is not looks on
as simply a pretty picture or as a static text: rather it is the expression of landscape as cultural process” (Robertson and Richards, 2003), by which identities are formed (Mitchell, 1994). This connection between landscape and identity is of a great importance to understanding of interaction between human and cultural landscape, which results in the human sense of place. As Meinig (1979) mentioned, landscape is defined “… by our vision and interpreted by our minds: We see and make landscapes as a result of our shared system of beliefs and ideologies”. Hence, landscape has been seen as a cultural construct, which reflects our history.

It is important to note the special scientific approach where nature and culture were separated from each other – the concept of natural and cultural landscape, which was particularly linked to the construct of wilderness or wild nature and associated with the work of Nash (1967). According to this concept, people were not part of nature and landscape was not seen as a cultural construct (so-called objective scientific meaning, which could be still observed in some scientific schools). However, later, predicated on revaluing nature (Russell, 1993), it was postulated that wilderness like all ideas of landscape, is a cultural construct, a product of the mind framed by ideologies and experience. In this sense, we consider that all landscapes are cultural landscapes.

The 1990s saw a growing of interest in, and understanding of, cultural landscapes, including the notion that places or landscapes reflecting everyday ways of life, the ideologies that stimulate people to create places, are significant (Jacques, 1995; Taylor, 1998). Here the cultural landscape tell the story of people, events and places through time, offering a sense of continuity.

Cultural geographers also followed the American geographer Carl Sauer who, in the 1920s, argued: “…the cultural landscape is fashioned out of a natural landscape by a culture group.” (1925, 25). Significant here is to read the landscape as a document of human history with its fascinating sense of time and layers replete with cultural values, which inform the genius of the place.

Powerful in raising awareness among scientists, policymakers, and the public for the cultural, ecological, environmental, and social values of landscapes is the definition of European Landscape Convention: “Landscape is an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of action and interaction of natural and/or human factors” (CE, 2000, 3). The convention has influenced landscape research substantially in the past 10 years, in particular through expanding its scope to include all dimensions and types of landscapes.

Summarizing the modern scientific discourse on the landscape research, we emphasize four main concepts derived from Angelstam et al. (2013): (1) landscape as purely natural phenomenon, i.e., a biophysical interpretation, (2) landscape as nature with human artifacts, i.e., anthropogenic interpretation, (3) landscape as cognitive representation of a space, i.e., intangible interpretation, and (4) landscape as totality including both material natural and cultural dimensions, i.e., coupled social-ecological interpretation. In that way landscape research is interdisciplinary in nature and can be applied for studying the mutual relations between human activities, social structures, and physical features concerned with land (Plieninger et al., 2015). A particularly important aspect of this theme is research on society-ecosystem interactions in the context of globalisation and sustainability.

3. GEOGRAPHICAL CHARACTERISTICS

As the capital of Germany and one of its 16 states, Berlin has today a population of 3.4 million and is the largest German city (Destatis, 2014). Located in northeastern Germany on the River Spree, it is the center of the Berlin-Brandenburg Metropolitan Region with about 4.3 million residents from over 180 nations (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, 2014) (Figure 2).
Figure 1. Berlin on the map of Germany and Europe (from worldatlasbook.com)

The Table 1 and Figure 2-5 provide an overview of socio-economic characteristics of the capital city Berlin-Brandenburg in comparison to the German average. Berlin is characterized by high population density in its central and west parts. The centre of Berlin is obviously shows the highest decrease rate while the population of city suburbs increases. At the same time, the centre of Berlin demonstrates one the highest unemployment rate. For the whole city of Berlin unemployment rate is about two times higher than German average. GDP per capita lies significantly under the German level.

**Table1.** Main socio-economic characteristics of the city Berlin, 2014 (Destatis – Federal Statistical Office of Germany, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Berlin</th>
<th>City Berlin and its hinterland (Big Berlin)</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population, mln.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>81.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area, sq. km</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>357,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of population per sq.km</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP, Euro per capita</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>47,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate, %</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Berlin attracts the national and international attention as the federal capital and opens up major economic perspectives: it is the seat of the Federal President, the Federal Parliament, the Federal Council and the Federal Government, and hosts many institutions and associations connected with these functions (Berlin-Brandenburg, 2015). In the same time Berlin is the city in which the functions of the capital are extended through the potential of urban creativity and the cultural landscape.
Traditional economic activities were greatly reduced by World War II; however, they have been revived throughout Greater Berlin. These include the production of textiles, metals, clothing, porcelain, bicycles, and machinery. Electronics became a principal post-war industry. The production of food, chemicals, cigarettes, and confectionery continues. As Germany’s largest industrial town and a major centre of trade and technological development, Berlin is a home for many companies, which maintain facilities in the city (Hemmer and Uphues, 2008).

**Figure 2-5.** Population density and dynamics, GDP per capita and unemployment rate in the capital region Berlin-Brandenburg (Amt für Statistik Berlin-Brandenburg, 2015; Berlin Buro for Statistics)

Berlin is international, intercultural and multilingual metropole region with a long history of immigration. Traditionally Berlin has benefited from the ideas of immigrants; the city has
cultivated its arts, science and economy in a primarily tolerant, open atmosphere. Berlin’s universities, academies and research institutes attract people from all over the world; significant number of them are young people from Central and Eastern Europe (Falk and Lehmann, 2001). The share of foreigners in Berlin is above 10%, more than in other cities of Berlin-Brandenburg region (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Percentage of foreigners in the capital region Berlin-Brandenburg (Amt für Statistik Berlin-Brandenburg, 2015; Berlin Buro for Statistics)

Berlin is located in northeastern Germany in an area of low-lying marshy woodlands with a mainly flat topography. It is part of the vast Northern European Plain, which stretches from northern France to western Russia. Two large rivers cross the Berlin area – Spree and Havel. The course of the Havel is more like a chain of lakes, the largest being the Tegeler See and Großer Wannsee. (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, 2007).

Substantial parts of present-day Berlin extend onto the low plateaus on both sides of the Spree Valley. Large parts of the modern Berlin districts (German “Bezirk”), Reinickendorf and Pankow lie on the Barnim Plateau, while most of the other – Charlottenburg-Wilmersdorf, Steglitz-Zehlendorf, Tempelhof-Schöneberg, and Neukölln – lie on the Teltow Plateau (Falk and Lehmann, 2001).

The highest elevations in Berlin are the Teufelsberg and the Müggelberge in the city's hinterland, and the Kreuzberg is the highest elevation in the centre (about 115 m above sea level). The latter measures 66 m above sea level. The Teufelsberg is actually an artificial hill composed of a pile of rubble from the ruins of World War II (Hemmer and Uphues, 2008).

Berlin has a temperate seasonal climate because it is located on the European Plain. Its climate is called “humid continental”, according to the Köppen climate classification system. The average high temperatures of summer is 22–25°C and lows of 12–14°C, and winter -3°C and lows of -2°C to 0°C respectively (Falk and Lehmann, 2001). The Berlin’s microclimate created by its buildings
is characterized by so-called heat islands. The temperature difference between city and the surrounding areas is about 4°C (Kabisch and Haase, 2014). Berlin is famous for moderate rainfall during the whole year and rare snowfall from December through to March (the annual precipitation of 570 millimetres).

During its whole history, Berlin has always been a green city, with luxuriant trees softening the effect of the stone apartment blocks in many streets. Today Berlin area consists to one third of forests, parks, gardens, rivers and lakes. (Hemmer and Uphues, 2008). Berlin is surrounded by the state of Brandenburg, and together they form capital region Berlin-Brandenburg.

4. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF BERLIN

The diversity of Berlin’s cultural landscapes is determined by historical features. Its understanding is not simple; it is subject of historical development. The history of Berlin goes to the original twin towns of Berlin and Cölln (Kölln) on Spree River in the early 13th century. From the end of the 15th century, Berlin became the capital of the electoral princes of Brandenburg (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, 2007).

In the late 17th and early 18th centuries, the electors of Brandenburg (kings of Prussia from 1701) gained political power in Europe. Berlin has grown and Baroque buildings (for example, Charlottenburg Palace) shaped its landscape. The expanded centre of the city was formed by broad avenues, beautiful squares, and impressive stone buildings. This area was characterized by broad north-south avenues, such as Wilhelmstrasse and Friedrichstrasse as well as its typical east-west road axis of Unter den Linden. The main axis was supplemented by several exit roads (now important traffic arteries). In the late 19th century, the suburbs surrounded these arteries. The city was significantly destructed during the World War II, so afterwards many modern apartments and office buildings were constructed by national and international architects (e.g. Hansa Quartier) (Stöver, 2013).

After the World War II, the city has been soon transformed into East and West Berlin, belonging not only to two different states GDR and FRG, but also to different economic and political systems. Whereas FRG was a market based economy and parliament democracy, GDR was characterised by state based socialist planned economy governed by a single party. In 1961-1989 the city was divided by the Berlin Wall built by GDR (MacDonogh, 1999). Parts of the Wall and its crossing points such as Checkpoint Charlie on Friedrichstrasse remained as historical landscapes of Berlin.

Physical, economic and political divisions of Berlin have strongly influenced its cultural landscape, first of all urban planning. The central district concentrated administrative, commercial, and cultural functions of the East Berlin. The West Berlin had to develop a new central area in district of Charlottenburg around the Kurfürstendamm and Zoo railway station concentrating commercial and entertainment facilities since the late 19th century (Stöver, 2013). The counterpart of Kurfürstendamm in East Berlin was the avenue Karl Marx Allee.

Both East and West Berlin became new modern architecture such as Soviet Embassy, Palace of Republic in GDR and Television tower as well as Europe Centre and House of the world cultures or Philharmonic Hall in FRG. But also some historical buildings damaged during the World War II were rebuilt, e.g. famous St. Nicholas Quarter in East Berlin or Reichstag building in West Berlin (Figure 7). Another example of modern and tradition building mix is the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church (Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche) with ruins of bell tower from 19th century and glass-and-concrete church from middle 20th century (MacDonogh, 1999).
Berlin’s cultural landscape today attract tourists by a wide range of historical buildings in the centre of modern city such as churches Marienkirche and Berliner Dom, museums on the Museum Island as well as Town Hall (Rotes Rathaus). The combination of old historical and cultural as well as new functional buildings is one of the main characteristic of Berlin’s cultural landscape today. Therefore, the avenue of Unter den Linden is a place for old buildings of Arsenal (Zeughaus), New Guardhouse (Neue Wache), Berlin Palace (formerly the Crown Prince’s Palace), Princesses’ Palace (Prinzessinnenpalais), Opera House, Berlin State Library, Kaiser Wilhelm Palace, and Humboldt University, The Brandenburg Gate and the new hotels, shops and restaurants. The most recent change is a building of Berlin Palace, combining of reconstructed historical facade and modern functional interior spaces. The historical area of the Gendarme Market with its restored German and French cathedrals and the Konzerthaus and modern business buildings of Potsdamer Platz are the different faces of the same city.

Berlin’s architecture reflects different historic epochs: styles of the Baroque, Classicism, Romanticism, Gründerjahre (1871–90), and the Wilhelminian era, of Art Nouveau, Bauhaus, postwar Modernism, and Postmodernism, socialist realism. As an example of different architecture, styles in Berlin’s cultural landscape can be mentioned Charlottenburg Palace from the late 17th century (Baroque), avenue Karl Marx Allee (socialist realism) and the New National Gallery of modern art (Neue Nationalgalerie) in Bauhaus style.

The modern Berlin’s cultural landscape is formed first of all by the extensive reconstruction programs of national governments based in Berlin – the 1871 German Empire, the Weimar Republic, Nazi Germany, East Germany, and now the reunified Germany, adding its specific architecture. Since Berlin was ruined during World War II, many of the buildings were...
demolished in the 1950s and 1960s, in both West and East part of the city to build for residential or industrial purposes as well as roads.

Not only historical landscapes, but also living territories are shaped by different national governments. The socialist planned economy allowed the Eastern German government to realize several completely planned governmental owned prefabricated panel-housing districts such as Marzahn, including apartments and the residential facilities e.g. shops, kindergartens and schools. Whereas the West Berlin living areas was predominated by the private owned old buildings and small private shops.

5. STRUCTURAL CHANGES, MODERN DEVELOPMENT AND ITS PROBLEMS

According to Röhring and Gailing (2005), cultural landscape has different functions, which provide different types of goods and services:

- socio-economic function (e.g. use by agricultural production, forestry, housing and production activity – private goods);
- ecological function (biodiversity, groundwater recharge, air purification – common pool resources);
- aesthetic function as public good (e.g. beautiful landscapes serving to encourage regional identity, sense of place, small-home feeling etc.).

These different functions are integrated with one another, it means, that actors cannot reduce their activities without consequences for other functions (Röhring and Gailing, 2005).

We analyse changes of each of these functions, which can be observed during the historical development of Berlin’s cultural landscape.

The German political development of the 20th century was reflected in unique Berlin’s culture landscape. Its architecture was used partly as a symbolic medium of different political powers.

The city reflected the national division – East Berlin became the capital of East Germany and West Berlin a Land (state) of FRG. West Berlin’s isolation reinforced by the Berlin Wall force it to concentrate on confrontation between the Eastern and Western powers as well as on a symbol of Western lifestyle for many years. In 1990 Berlin returned its status of all-German capital, the city was concepted as one of the 16 German states with its prominent historic position in European culture and commerce.

The modern Berlin cultural landscape is characterized by territorial fragmentation, but a broad range of different museums. The ruined city cultural landscape at the end of World War II required first of all the rebuilding of essential houses and human services. But, by the 1960s the cultural services also received the governmental attention. Post-war West Germany boomed in museum building. One of the reason was a political situation in the divided Berlin. The new cultural landscape of Kulturforum with different museums such as Neue Nationalgalerie was constructed in West Berlin as a counterpart to the symbolic power of the historic Museumsinsel in the East. First of all the West Berlin tried to form its own cultural landscape with new museum and other buildings, replacing those stayed in the Eastern Berlin. These museums were situated in Dahlem and were also planned in the centre of West Berlin, but realized after 1990 (e.g. Jewish Museum Berlin or the Gemäldegalerie in Kulturforum).

In should be mentioned here, that the East and West Berlin’s counterparts are typical for the cultural landscape of united Berlin since it was situated in two different states for a long time. Therefore, the GDR designed its Tierpark as an equivalent to the West Berlin’s zoo.
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The city is now getting a renewed symbolic cultural landscape for a united Berlin and Germany but with preserved the already existed different cultural landscapes of East and West Berlin.

The reconstruction of Berlin’s cultural landscape (e.g. Museumsinsel) after the 1990 are financed on the state and national level (Wedel 2002, p. 8) under a special provision of the 1990 Unification Treaty ensure funding for the New Berlin (Lotz 2004, p. 33). The symbolim of united Berlin have to be reflected in the Berlin’s architecture (Wedel 2002, p. 9, Lotz 2004, p. 32) in the way museum buildings in the 19th century represented Prussian hegemony as well as the new German nation in its new capital.

Since 1990, Berlin has unified museum collections and their administration, its historical landscape is undergoing restoration. On the one hand the extensive investment in this cultural project can be seen as a risk for social dimension of sustainability, since Berlin is poor and unemployment is high (International Institute for Administrative Sciences website www.iiasberlin2005.de). On the other hand, the renewed historical and cultural objects (museums, architecture) attract national and international tourist flows contributing to the prosperity of the city and its sustainability.

Changes in socio-economic functions under globalisation

In the face of globalisation, cultural landscapes of Berlin are currently rediscovered as a key issue of regional development (Röhring and Gailing, 2005). Thus, implementation of classical instruments of the landscape protection following a command-and-control approach, initiated by international legal rules and conventions, focus on integrative management strategies of cultural landscape (CE, 2000). European landscape convention initiated by Council of Europe requires the recognition of landscape in law as a basic component of human surroundings and a foundation of their identity (CE, 2000).

The modern Berlin’s economy is represented by high-tech, pharmacy, biotechnology, environmental and information technology with a shift to tertiary sector. The service firms are located in the center of the city and the industrial enterprises are mostly situated along or outside the suburban railway ring (S-Bahn-Ring). That is why the cultural landscape of the center is characterized by the multiple use buildings in comparison to the suburb distinction between housing and business sites (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, 2007).

The consequences of long city division was resulted in separated highway and public transportation planning. The suddenly end of GDR caused significant unemployment in East part of Berlin since its governmental institutions and factories were liquidated in the united Germany. Today Berlin is facing issues associated with its increasing role at the national and international level such as housing shortage and immigrants.

The economic changes transformed the cultural landscape of Potsdamer Platz into High-rise commercial buildings structure; Friedrichstrasse has its new hotel and retail stores. The infrastructural projects allowed to unite Berlin’s divided transport system.

Since the 1990s, Berlin cultural landscapes are facing strong influence of globalisation (increase of international interactions of society, culture, politics and economics) (Kulke, 2008). Changing urban landscapes, these processes force the city actors to foster their attempts in finding new solution of development problems. Historically Berlin has never been a location for the transnational corporations as the main globalisation actors because of the city division. However, the change in corporate and production systems in Germany caused relocation of most of its non-high-tech industries such as clothing abroad. That is why the production sites in Berlin were closed, first in the West Berlin followed by the East Berlin after the reunification, living these abandoned places for decades out of use.
City and property owners have to cope with the two different issues: preservation of the old industrial locations as a historical memory and making them economically and socially acceptable city spaces. During the last decades some different solution approaches have been found, transforming these abandoned places to office buildings such as Backfabrik (former bakery factory), shopping malls such as Bikini Berlin in Bikini-Haus (former clothing factory) or high quality living blocks such as lofts in Alte Schokoladenfabrik (former confectionery factory).

The creation of the global production networks in the process of globalisation resulted in production of wide range of different consumer goods abroad at lower costs and followed import to the headquarter country. Consequently, Berlin became a place of great retail cultural landscapes around new shopping centres. The shopping malls as a location of large international or national retail chains put the small local shops and snack bars under the competition pressure. These traditional stores cannot reduce their costs such as big market players do and disappear from the city landscape. The specific regional atmosphere as a part of Berlin identity is being replaced by the so-called McDonaldization.

On the other hand, the shopping malls in Berlin are attractive places for the local district population, compensating for the lack of free time as another phenomenon of globalisation in Berlin. The shopping centres allow combining different activities from hairdresser services, visiting restaurant to buying food in supermarkets at the same place. In this way, the centres are location advantage and to some extent prevent inhabitants leaving the less attractive districts, so the local cultural landscapes do not decay and continue to exist.

Another problem directly connected to the globalisation is a result of improvement in international infrastructure and transition of political framework. Not only tourists are attracted to Berlin because of beardless and real time information exchange and easy travelling, the city is a place for migrants from all over the world. Newcomers from high-qualified labour force to the war refugees require creation of new and different living landscapes. As a solution of flat shortage we can see the renovation or even rebuilding of long time decaying Plattenbau buildings in the East Berlin, making them attractive not only for foreigners (Figure 8).

![Figure 8. New look of Plattenbau buildings in East Berlin (Lichtenberg District)](http://momentum-magazin.de/de/files/2013/08/ansicht-gesamt.jpg)
The so-called multiculturalty of Berlin is being strengthened even more by the mentioned globalisation trend of international migration flows. The specialized cultural landscapes created by each nationality in Berlin are ranging from cultural events such as German-Russian days in Berlin-Karshor or Italian film festival, national food restaurants or supermarkets to public facilities such as kindergartens and schools. Continuing to preserve their own traditions these single culture cluster landscapes are interacting with each other because of their neighbourhood, producing knowledge spillovers.

Furthermore, it is to mention that now Berlin is facing in the process of globalisation strong shift to the internet-based economy, the German Silicon Valley is possible to be established. Berlin lifestyle with its multiculturalism and openness to foreigners, low property rents and low costs of living combined with highly-qualified labour force, universities and research institutions and international it-events such IFA but also a wide range of cultural facilities are the factors to attract firms and creative talents from different countries. National and international entrepreneurs create Berlin’s internet start-up community. Together they profit from cluster effects such as knowledge spillovers. The establishment of internet based innovative small, middle-sized firms and the strong young intercultural landscape surrounding them supposed to be Berlin’s chance for innovative dynamic development towards strengthen regional competitiveness, prosperity, and growth since it lacks other industries and large transnational corporations after the unification.

Changes in ecological functions

Modern cultural landscape of Berlin is the result of human forms of land use over centuries. There are several ecological problems caused by land use changes of the city’s fast growth, especially at the beginning of the 20th century. What are the driving forces of such changes in ecological functions to cultural landscape of Berlin?

The significant ecological problems of Berlin were, and predominantly still are, related to urban life. Of most importance are problems of housing, transport, urban restructuring, clean air, waste disposal, protection of parks and green areas. There were relatively few industries in the city, which were supposed to cause major environmental problems. All together, they contribute to air and water pollution, land degradation. As a result, big part of its citizens was suffer from very high levels of chronical diseases (e.g. respiratory organs, cardio-vascular pathologies etc.) and increased rates of child mortality. In 1960s, with the initiation of the Berlin Wall, the vast areas of former urban fabric built prior to WWII were transformed into devastated border zones. With the fall of the Wall in 1989 a new and exciting era of economic, cultural, and social change has begun. To solve environmental problems in Berlin a variety of measures were implemented such as recycling rates, waste incineration and an increase in public transportation. According to statistical data, the recycling rate in Berlin, depending on the waste compound, is between 70 percent and 95 percent (construction waste) (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, 2014).

Berlin’s fuel-mix for energy production (for energy-use of households and businesses of the tertiary sector) is based on non-renewable resources. According to statistical data, the share of renewable resources is less than one percent (Destatis, 2014). A change in fuel-mix composition is a crucial step in decreasing the energy’s EF, additional to a reduction in energy use in public buildings (advertisement lighting, night lighting) and private households.

Other ecologic problem is caused by enormous pressure from private traffic. On the one hand, the well developed road system offers citizens the ability to reach any destination by car, on the other hand inner-city constructions (narrow roads with adjacent high-rise buildings) challenges environmental and public health issues. In addition, the public local transport infrastructure is well
developed, but increased ticket prices make it not so competitive. Traffic problems are projected to increase due to sub-urbanisation, a movement in "garden cities", general isolated from public transport systems and economic infrastructure (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, 2014). To improve the situation with traffic impact, in 2008 Berlin’s city centre has had a designated environmental zone in which only vehicles that meet certain emission standards are allowed be driven. These vehicles must have a sticker that identifies its pollutant group (green and yellow). According to this, only cars with the green sticker are allowed to drive in the environmental zone. The problem of traffic is connected with the enormous pressure from private vehicles and lack of public space. However, still now the enhancement and widening of roads as well as the further development of the public transport system are not enough for significant improving of situation.

The lack of green spaces was during the last century one of the major Berlin’s ecological problems, which had also hygienic meaning. Considering this, the planning architects Martin Wagner and Bruno Taut have developed, based on the English Garden Cities, the ring-like system of the Volkspark in all districts of Berlin. The further developing of this concept has produced a high quality and availability of various open public spaces of today’s Berlin (Figure 9). Today, the city’s green public spaces are found everywhere, both as large planned parks and informal public spaces scattered across the urban fabric. Not all of Berlin’s green spaces, however, are the product of innovative city planning, but rather the result of war, destruction and division.

Figure 9. Park by Scharlottenburg Palace (https://pixabay.com/ru)

To solve these problems wide-ranging planning systems and well-defined legal regulations including variety of protection measures were developed, professional planning institutions to develop new urban concepts and strategies were organized. However, as Röhring and Gailing (2005) mentioned, in fact the high level of regulations are not comparable to the unsustainable landscape use. The environment politics was considered through the 1979 law for Nature
Protection and the 1994 developed Landscape program (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, 2007). In the beginning of twenty-one century, the Federal Environmental Agency in Berlin hopes to promote the efficient use of energy, to close substance cycles, and reverse land depletion trends. The Berlin Solar Campaign also hopes to bring solar energy, which can be used without creating harmful emissions, into widespread use. At the same time, environmental protection is not only a technological option or a pure political question, but also a personal task for each citizen, which is connected with selective consumption, conscious living, education and participation in environmental issues. Such environmental organizations and movements in Berlin are already exist (B90/Die Grünen – the Green party, NABU Berlin – local section of broad and large national environmental group, Grüne Liga – an East German environmental network, Greenpeace as well as Deutscher Naturschutzzring (DNR) und Tierschutzverein Berlin – local animal protection groups). They aim to create the demand of environmental implementations in the political landscape and economy.

**Aesthetic functions and identity**

Landscape change in its aesthetic function caused by accessibility, urbanization and globalization (Röhring and Gailing, 2005). Whilst urbanization and globalization were already discussed above, here we draw some conclusions about aesthetic function of Berlin cultural landscape and identity.

Following the German landscape architect Werner Nohl (2001), aesthetic functions and their individual perception are dominated by informal institutions of actor’s behaviours (traditions, customs, and identity). Today it is hard to find general aesthetic standards. It is also true for the case of Berlin. The city of Belin was divided into East and West Berlin until 1989, and the governments of both GDR and FRG Berlins have transformed their cities according to their respective ideologies: socialist city in East and capitalism and democracy in West. This historical fact has influence on the cultural landscape and its citizens of New Berlin until now. Reunified Berlin reflects today an unusually rich and multifaceted cultural variety. Today the role of the landscape has come out from its aesthetic and cultural dimension as well as its socio-economic context. The landscape is now part of the identity coherent definition, which also include environmental issues by incorporating human society into sustainable landscape development. Here, it embraces not only simple “gardening” operations or bureaucratic actions, which only involves systems of protection. The identity dimension and a sense of place are also associated with both globalisation process and inequalities that the globalisation has caused. In spite of the fact, that this process is connected with modern development models, people will fill any nostalgic moments in the landscape as a cultural construct with account taken of its natural and historical components. West and East Berlins are different concerning landscape perception and especially its memory and nostalgia aspects. While West Berlin citizens are more open to the modern changes in landscape, East Berlin inhabitants prefer the original east-German landscape to be conserved as memory of the passed socialist values.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The interface of culture and nature during its rich history in the Berlin’s cultural landscape offers a deeper understanding of its complexity and development.

Modern environmental issues are being actively solved by wide-ranging planning systems and well-defined legal regulations including variety of protection measures, programs and strategies towards sustainable development. Moreover, citizens and environmental organizations are actively taking part in protection of Berlin landscape, including selective consumption, conscious living, education and participation in environmental issues.

The changes caused by globalisation can be seen on the one hand as a threat for sustainable
development of Berlin’s cultural landscape. Its main functions can be disrupted since the specific features of local level are typically neglected in favour of international division of labour aims for more profit. Relocation of traditional industries abroad and unemployment, growing environmental pressure of international migration flows on city ecosystems as well as loss of more aesthetic historical architecture for internationally standardized buildings are the examples of negative influence of globalisation on sustainable development. On the other hand, globalisation challenges can be a stepping-stone to the sustainable cultural landscape as we have shown in our analysis. The new specialization on IT strengthens economic growth, renovation of housing buildings and new use of industrial sites ensure social and environmental dimension of sustainability.

It is clear from the evidence in this paper that historical trends in creating positive cultural landscapes through the construction of iconic buildings have been repeated over the last 200 years in Germany, despite vast political upheaval and economic ruin. The fact that such diverse political powers at different levels of government, including everything from royal dynasties to Fascist and Communist, from Catholic Conservative to Green and Social Democrat, have all seen the value of using iconic architecture both to create and to symbolize a positive cultural landscape, is truly striking.

The cultural landscape of today’s Berlin represents a bridge between its history and present development and at the same time acts as a symbol of economic and cultural power on national and international levels.
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