

Zeitschrift: Tsantsa : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Ethnologischen Gesellschaft
= revue de la Société suisse d'ethnologie = rivista della Società svizzera
d'etnologia

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Ethnologische Gesellschaft

Band: 19 (2014)

Artikel: The intangible in cultural landscapes : two world heritage examples

Autor: Ishizawa, Maya

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1007198>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 14.09.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

THE INTANGIBLE IN CULTURAL LANDSCAPES: TWO WORLD HERITAGE EXAMPLES

The Archaeological Park of Ollantaytambo in Peru and
the National Park of Ordesa and Monte Perdido in Spain

Text: *Maya Ishizawa*

Abstract

Cultural landscapes have become a classification of cultural heritage of increasing use in the nominations to the World Heritage List. In spite of providing a framework for the integration of alternative understandings of heritage to Western tradition, the concept of cultural landscape itself originated from inside the frame of a naturalist ontology proper to Western philosophy. Even if cultural landscapes intend to integrate cultural and natural, tangible and intangible values, there is a lack of a model of protection designed for this integration. This paper examines two sites in mountain areas shaped by agropastoralist practices, but protected under two different models: the archaeological park and the national park. The purpose is to contrast the values «officially» assigned to these sites as cultural landscapes to the local values encountered in the field, in order to show the challenges for a comprehensive system of conservation that involves local communities.

Keywords: *Cultural landscapes; Conservation; local values; agropastoralism; local communities' involvement; intangible cultural heritage*

Introduction

Cultural landscapes have become a classification of cultural heritage of increasing use in the nominations to the World Heritage List. Due to its openness to integrating natural and cultural values, as well as the tangible and intangible heritage components in the statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of heritage properties, using the term «cultural landscape» allows the inscription of sites that do not necessarily possess monumental physical remains, but represent «outstanding» testimonies of the relationship between human communities and their environments (Rössler 2012: 27). Its increasing use conforms to the idea that it provides a framework for the integration of alternative understandings of heritage to Western tradition on the World Heritage List. Nevertheless, the concept of cultural landscape itself originated from inside the framework

of a naturalist ontology proper to Western philosophy (Descola 2001; Descola 2005). This ontology assumes an interpretation of heritage sites based on the division of nature and society. Furthermore, even if cultural landscapes intend to integrate the cultural and the natural tangible and intangible values of heritage there is a lack of a model of protection designed for this integration. The models used follow the same culture / nature divide, as well as the tangible / intangible dichotomy.

In this paper, two heritage sites from mountain areas are examined. The sites represent two asymmetric regions of the world that, while sharing past ties¹ as empire and colony, possess mountain regions shaped by similar agropastoralist practices that have evolved differently. The Ordesa and Monte Perdido National Park (PNOMP) in Spain is part of the transnational mixed cultural and natural heritage property on the World Her-

¹ The Viceroyalty of Peru was a colony of the Kingdom of Spain from 1542 to 1821.

itage List Pyrenees / Mont Perdu since 1997. The Archaeological Park of Ollantaytambo (PAO), neighbor to the Sanctuary of Machu Picchu in Peru, is included in the serial nomination file for the transnational property Qhapaq Ñan / Great Inca Trail currently on the Tentative List. These sites represent two models for protection: the first focuses on the conservation of nature and the second on the conservation of the past. Nevertheless, both sites have been nominated for the list as cultural landscapes, based on the presence of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) maintained by agropastoral communities inhabiting these areas. These examples help to address the question of how the safeguarding of ICH is considered in systems of protection for tangible heritage and how the patrimonialization of landscape is linked to the patrimonialization of traditions. The purpose of this paper is to contrast the values assigned to these sites as cultural landscapes with the local values encountered in the field.

Theory, material and methods

Heritage has been framed in the context of modern conservation practices from a Western approach that takes its roots in the Enlightenment philosophy. Smith (2006) characterized this «official» practice of heritage conservation, normalized by international agencies and naturalized by states and governments, as the Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD). This practice has focused on the preservation of tangible assets assumed to possess inherent values based on scientific and aesthetic criteria (Smith 2006). In the process of implementation of the World Heritage Convention, this «official» practice and its conceptualization of heritage have been questioned by non-Western states, heritage scholars, practitioners and local communities inhabiting heritage sites who contest the idea of inherent and universal values of objects and places. Instead, heritage is viewed as a process where different value systems are confronted (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995; Smith 2006; Harrison 2010). Here I use the term «patrimonialization» to refer to the «official» process of assigning national or universal values to objects, places and traditions.

Three key groups of actors influencing the process of conservation of cultural landscapes have been identified as holding different understandings of the concept: the state, local communities and visitors (Ishizawa n/d). In this article, I focus on the dissonances between how the sites are presented at an international level, based on experts' visions and state views, and how local agropastoralists, the local groups with a

higher and more direct impact on the landscape, live on these sites. A qualitative analysis focused on textual and discursive sources (documents and interviews) has been developed.

First, I present a diversity of approaches to the notion of landscape in order to analyze the definition of cultural landscapes set in the Operational Guidelines (OG) of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, clarifying that the concept is understood from different epistemological perspectives. I then examine the values that form the basis of the sites' classification as World Heritage cultural landscapes. The values that justify their inclusion rely on the ICH perspective held by people living in / next to the sites. However, there is an inherent contradiction between the models of protection and the continuity of the way of life that conserves this «intangible» heritage value. This is illustrated through testimonies of locals. Material has been collected during fieldwork periods in both sites in 2011, in an exploratory phase (10 days in the PAO at the end of the rainy season; 7 days in the summer in the PNOMP) and in 2012 (research and interviews during 8 weeks in the PAO at the beginning of the dry season, and 4 weeks in the PNOMP in the summer). Semi-structured / open-ended interviews were conducted with managers of the sites and the local population related to agropastoral traditions, and were complemented by the observation of events and of everyday life.

Cultural landscape as an object of protection in the World Heritage Convention

According to the French philosopher Jean Marc Besse (2009), five approaches (or «entrance doors») to landscape can be found². First, there is the approach of art historians that define landscape as a cultural and social representation with an aesthetic dimension [approach 1]. Second, there is the approach of human geographers, historians and archaeologists who view the landscape as a territory fabricated, inhabited and transformed by humans [approach 2]. Third, there is the approach of earth sciences such as geology and ecology that see landscape as a systemic complex that articulates natural and cultural elements in an objective whole [approach 3]. Fourth, there is the phenomenological approach that sees landscape as a subjective apprehension, as in anthropology and archaeology [approach 4]. Finally, the fifth approach defines the landscape as a site or a context for a project [approach 5]. This is the vision of landscape architects and planners.

² Reference taken from the seminar of Philippe Descola at the Collège de France, entitled «*Les formes du paysage*» (The shapes of the landscape) in <http://www.college-de-france.fr/site/philippe-descola>, accessed June 18, 2014.

In the context of modern conservation practices, landscape has been studied from several of these disciplinary perspectives in order to preserve its natural and cultural values. The division between the conservation of nature, that of «natural landscapes,» and the conservation of the past, the conservation of monuments, buildings and archaeological sites, has characterized the «official» practice of conservation.

The cultural landscape approach deepens the discussion of how to integrate these two lines of practice. Furthermore, the integration of ICH as an independent category in need of safeguarding, with the 2003 Convention (UNESCO 2003), reflects the concern for intangible values associated with tangible heritage such as landscapes. Traditional knowledge is now «officially» considered instrumental for the management of any heritage site (Rössler 2003; UNESCO 2006; UNESCO, ICOMOS 2006), and the main challenge has become to involve local communities in conservation.

Three categories

The introduction of cultural landscapes to the framework of the World Heritage Convention reinforces a distinction between natural landscapes as natural heritage and the landscapes in direct interaction with human communities as cultural heritage. Nevertheless, the concept of landscape itself implies a cultural notion (Mitchell, Rössler & Tricaud 2009: 17). In the definition of cultural landscapes in the OG (UNESCO, World Heritage Committee 2011: para. 47), this is backed up by the second and third approaches presented above. This conceptualization is informed by the work of geographer Carl O. Sauer, which describes the natural landscape as composed of geologic, climatic and vegetation factors producing a surface, and cultural landscape as resulting from the actions of a cultural group on the natural landscape (Sauer 1925).

In Annex 3 of the OG three categories of cultural landscapes are defined, wherein three of the five approaches described above are used. The first category illustrates approach 5. It applies to «clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man» whose value relies on aesthetics (UNESCO, World Heritage Committee 2011: para. 10, Annex 3). This understanding moves away from the geographical perspective and, based on this category, many sites already on the list may be interpreted as cultural landscapes. The second category resorts to approach 2, allowing the inclusion of productive landscapes. These sites are called «organically evolved landscapes» that may be relict (archaeological sites) or continuing (Ibid.). The third category, called «associative cultural landscape», reflects approach 4.

It values a «natural environment» according to the meaning that a certain group assigns to it through its beliefs. Material evidence is not required, and intangible values are prioritized (Ibid.). Hereafter a distinction between landscape, natural landscape and cultural landscape becomes ambiguous. Based on this definition, every «natural landscape» can be culturally related to a society.

These three categories broadly define the term of cultural landscape, and appear inclusive. As a result, the classification is imprecise, and remains open for a diversity of sites. This lack of precision may impact conservation when sites need to be managed differently, as in the cases studied here.

The value system: Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity

In order to be inscribed as cultural landscapes, sites need to fulfill at least one cultural criterion from the set established in the OG. The conservation of the past focuses on «*authenticity*» as an essential value of heritage objects, buildings and places. It has been defined as the «credibility or truthfulness of the surviving evidence and knowledge of the cultural heritage value of a place» (ICOMOS New Zealand 2010: 9). This term, used in international charters that normalize the practice of conservation of tangible cultural heritage, has become controversial. «*Authenticity*» has been denoted as Euro-centric due to its focus on material evidence. In the context of these international charters, the Nara Document on Authenticity of 1994, has contributed to including intangible values and the understanding that values may differ from culture to culture, and within the same culture (Lemaire and Stovel 1994: para. 11).

The conservation of nature, on the other hand, calls for a scientific and objective definition of values to conserve the «*integrity*» of a landscape. The focus lies on the number of species preserved, the population that a species retains or the presence of all required elements in an ecosystem. In the context of the 1972 Convention, «*integrity*» is now evaluated in relation to all these properties, and refers to the maintenance of the «wholeness of heritage» (UNESCO, World Heritage Committee 2011: para. 88).

These concepts are applied from a top-down approach, as carried out by the state. In the framework of the 1972 Convention, states are thus the official representatives, and this makes that the values of other actors are not necessarily considered, even though different value systems may be found at local levels.

Intangible values in two World Heritage cultural landscapes: Pyrenees / Mont Perdu and Qhapaq Ñan

A heritage site needs first to be protected by a state, which then nominates it for inclusion on the list. The sites included in the property Pyrenees / Mont Perdu are both protected under the model of the national park. The justification for their nominations as cultural landscapes is based on the presence of a continuing tradition: «The site is also a pastoral landscape reflecting an agricultural way of life that was once widespread in the upland regions of Europe but now survives only in this part of the Pyrenees» (UNESCO and World Heritage Committee 1998: 39). This statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) is based on the second approach to landscape. What were the criteria used for the inscription, given that both parks are being protected for their natural heritage?

Two natural and three cultural criteria were used when inscribing the Pyrenees / Mont Perdu property (see Table 1). Criterion (vii) refers to approach 1 to landscape, valuing

classic geological landforms, including deep canyons and spectacular cirque walls» (Ibid.). Criterion (iii) applies to sites that hold archaeological evidence, and thus refers to approach 2. Criterion (iv) is appropriate for sites that illustrate significant technological advances, referring to the second and fifth approach. Finally, criterion (v) is used for sites that represent traditional land use, referring to approach 2. These three criteria are justified with one sentence only: «The Pyrénées-Mont Perdu area between France and Spain is an outstanding cultural landscape which combines scenic beauty with a socio-economic structure that has its roots in the past and illustrates a mountain way of life that has become rare in Europe» (Ibid.).

This site corresponds to an organically evolved continuing landscape. However, how can cultural values be conserved by a management structure based on the conservation of nature?

In the case of the Archaeological Park of Ollantaytambo (PAO), the model of protection focuses on the maintenance of material remains of cultures that have consecutively inhabited

Table 1
Criteria used for the Statement of OUV of Pyrenees / Mont Perdu

| Criterion | Justification | Approach |
|-----------|--|----------|
| (iii) | «(...) has its roots in the past and illustrates a mountain way of life that has become rare in Europe.» [Testimony of disappearing cultural tradition] | [2] |
| (iv) | «(...) an agricultural way of life that was once widespread in the upland regions of Europe but now survives only in this part of the Pyrenees.» [Landscape illustrating significant stage in human history] | [2] [5] |
| (v) | «The site is also a pastoral landscape reflecting an agricultural way of life (...)» [Traditional land use] | [2] |
| (vii) | «It is an outstanding scenic landscape with meadows, lakes, caves and forests on mountain slopes.» [Exceptional natural beauty, aesthetic importance] | [1] |
| (viii) | «The calcareous massif of the Mount Perdu displays classic geological landforms, including deep canyons and spectacular cirque walls.» [Significant geomorphic or physiographic features] | [3] |

it from an aesthetic perspective (UNESCO, World Heritage Committee 2011: para. 77). In this case, «it is an outstanding scenic landscape with meadows, lakes, caves and forests on mountain slopes» (UNESCO and World Heritage Committee 1998: 39). Criterion (viii) corresponds to approach 3 to landscape: «the calcareous massif of the Mount Perdu displays

the place, emphasizing the value of Inca heritage. Nonetheless, the justification for including this site in the serial nomination of the Qhapaq Ñan relies on the presence of the traditional way of life of Andean communities in the Patacancha watershed. The continuity of the use of this road system and its significance nowadays is affirmed in the statement of OUV:

«The exceptional feature of this great engineering feat is that its legacy is still physically, functionally and symbolically relevant to Andean peoples today» (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5547>, accessed June 18, 2014).

Even if management focuses on archaeological heritage, the significance of this site as a cultural landscape relies on the ongoing traditions of the people living there:

«Currently, some Peruvian peoples continue to use the Qhapaq Ñan as a communication system, keeping it in service physically and functionally, with the use of Andean technology and traditions based on reciprocal and complementary systems characteristic of Inca society and the Andean world» (Ibid.).

Unlike Pyrenees / Mont Perdu, the six criteria justifying the OUV here are cultural (see Table 2). Criterion (i) corresponds to approach 5 to landscape. Value relies on the design of this ensemble, as a human intervention in a complex environment. Based on this, the site corresponds to the category of a cultural landscape designed and created intentionally by man. The next four criteria used – (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) – are related to the second and third approaches to landscape. The values are based on tangible heritage encountered in

the landscape as territory and ecosystem. From the use of these criteria, the site corresponds to the second category, the organically evolved relict landscape. Yet the criterion (vi) refers to approach 4 insofar as it alludes to the traditional knowledge associated to the road system and its continuous use by people living next to it (Ibid.). The property can be interpreted then also as an organically evolved continuing landscape, and an associative cultural landscape. This statement of OUV involves all the categories described in the OG. Furthermore, «authenticity» is justified by its continuous use, yet the regulations of the archaeological park limit the use of Inca structures.

In both sites the maintenance of characteristic agropastoral Andean and Pyrenean traditions legitimizes their OUV. However, are these agropastoral traditions actually «continuing»?

Disappearing agropastoral traditions

As described in the previous section, the sites have been evaluated by experts based on different epistemological perspectives on landscape. The value of the sites as cultural landscapes is grounded on the continuity of communities involved in the transformation of the landscape via their traditions. In these

Table 2

Criteria used for the Statement of OUV of the Qhapaq Ñan (Great Inca Trail)

| Criterion | Justification | Approach |
|-----------|---|----------|
| (i) | «The construction of this network represents the synthesis of cultural development in South America.» [masterpiece of human creative genius] | [5] |
| (ii) | «(...) reflects a dynamic exchange of values, the use of architectural elements and political structures existing in the pre-Inca and Inca eras (...)» [Historical interchange of human values] | [2] |
| (iii) | «[The Inca] very strict system of organization enabling the exchange of social, political and economic values among them in the pre-Inca and Inca eras.» [Testimony of disappearing cultural tradition] | [2] |
| (iv) | «The archaeological sites selected portray this magnificent infrastructure (...) showing how populations coexisted with their natural environment.» [Landscape illustrating significant stage in human history] | [2] [5] |
| (v) | «The road system reflects the interrelation of communities with their geographical and natural environment such as mountains, lakes and water.» [Traditional land use] | [2] [3] |
| (vi) | «It connects living communities which still use the Road and keep it in their memory.» | [4] |

two cases, the involvement of locals in conservation was essential. However, even if these traditions are valued, they are confronted with processes of change that may result in their loss. In this section, I present how the traditions valued from the point of view of experts are lived at the communities' level.

Irreversible loss?

There are two main components that determined the decision of experts to nominate Pyrenees/Mont Perdu as a cultural landscape: the impressive terraces (*bancals*) in the town of Bestue, Aragon - and the continuity in the tradition of the transhumance of cattle to France (*El Paso a Francia*). These two elements represent systems of adaptation to the mountain environment existing since the Middle Ages. Nevertheless, the terraces of Bestue and the transhumance route are not part of the World Heritage property. The committee, at the moment of the inscription, encouraged state representatives «to consider including the village of Bestue and its environs, including its spectacular flights of terraced fields» (UNESCO and World Heritage Committee 1998: 39). Yet, these remain outside the limits of the PNOMP.

I had the opportunity to attend the transhumance of cattle while accompanying Spanish stockbreeders, and to visit the terraces of Bestue to discuss their condition with the few locals still inhabiting the town. Even if some traditions have been maintained, they have undergone important changes: the current practices correspond to those of a stockbreeding industry more than to agropastoral practices.

During the 20th century, the tradition of agropastoralism underwent structural changes. The first impact was the loss of its «agro» component. The remains of the agricultural practice are the small orchards in some family houses. The terraces, as remembered by locals, were sown with wheat. When wheat became unprofitable, these terraces were used for growing hay to feed livestock. Progressively, fodder replaced hay. Now, only a few fields are still producing it. The invasion of brushes, *erizón* (*Echinopartum horridum*), and the forestation of the pastures is now the main phenomenon taking place in this area. While this change is the result of the abandonment of traditional practices, state policies have been the trigger of it.

Three interlinked processes contributed to the abandonment of traditional practices. First, industrialization drew young people to the cities, generating rapid depopulation of

the area. Second, the mechanization of agriculture required less human labor and this caused the reduction of family activities. Finally, the opening of the market reduced the need to produce food for the cattle as well as the practice of transhumance.

In parallel to these socio-economic processes, the site also shows several stages of patrimonialization. The state inaugurated the Ordesa National Park in 1918, covering only a small portion of its current size. Even if the place was appreciated as «natural» by mountaineers and authorities, local communities were fishing in the rivers, logging the forests, cultivating the slopes and grazing the meadows. Conservationists worried about the preservation of the forests criticized the local landscape management (Fernández & Pradas Regel 1996: 26). Since then, agropastoral activities have been regulated. Fishing and logging have been forbidden, and grazing pastures have been restricted to certain areas. The national park on the other hand promotes visits as a means to develop tourist services in order to compensate for the abandonment of traditional activities.

In 1982, the area of the park was extended in order to protect the valleys of Anisclo, Escuin and Pineta. A plan for the construction of a hydroelectric dam in the Anisclo canyon threatened its «integrity». Again, locals had to give up their traditional activities.

Currently, the surroundings are losing their «landscape capital» (Brookfield 2001) of terraces, fields and pastures due to the abandonment of traditional practices:

«No, nobody uses them [the terraces]... It has become very dirty, before, everybody cleaned, but now, nobody cleans»³ (Retired stockbreeder and Park ranger, 60).

The local understanding of conservation corresponds to a vision of «cleanness» of the mountains. The maintenance of the agropastoral landscape was a consequence of its use. However, the practices of «cleaning» the landscape have turned more costly as fodder is now delivered directly to ranches. The same local summarizes this change:

Stockbreeder [S]: «Here, in this town, they had to count on this [the hay in the fields] by then, now you can buy fodder but people did not buy fodder then... People had to do with what they could take from here. They had to maintain it... if someone had 50 sheep he had to maintain them with what they took... If he had 8 cows, well, with what he could take. Now,

³ All citations hereafter have been translated by the author from Spanish transcripts.

look, you can call by phone and [command] one order of fodder, one order of hay, one order of alfalfa, whatever is needed. But at that time, you couldn't. First, there were no roads, second, there were no means to bring it either. Each [stockbreeder] had to count on what they could take from their properties. By then, the animals themselves cleaned, people also cleaned the meadows, because they cut the grass, people would not leave weeds either. Now, these are not laboured... If you see a palm of orchard here, next to a house, it's something else. It's like that now. Interviewer: And in this town are there young people that are resuming stockbreeding? S: No, no. Here there's nobody.»

One of the main issues is the lack of continuity of the practices. A retired stockbreeder from the town of Tella, near Escuin Valley, confirms this:

«Stockbreeding around here is decreasing rapidly. Young people don't want to do it... some do, but they are very few. It's because this... it's very constrained. You have to be there everyday and... young people they don't want that» (Retired stockbreeder, 70).

For locals, seeing the agropastoral tradition and its cultural landscape in the process of disappearing is related to a loss of their habitat. The maintenance of landscape is compared to the maintenance of a house:

«It's like a house that you leave, you leave it, that it gets... it's destroyed and at the end, on the ground. The same» (Retired stockbreeder and park ranger, 60).

On the other hand, the transhumance of the cattle is carried out yearly. This tradition, which originated from in the Middle Ages, has traversed several periods of conflict. Now it has become a fraternal meeting between people from Gavarnie and Torla every summer. For locals, the value of the event is in the encounter and renewal of the relationship between the Spanish and French stockbreeders:

«I like a lot to go to France and that is because people there are like you, no? They are mountain people. Moreover, they have very much assumed this... that we are people from the Pyrenees [gente del Pirineo]... that we are neither French nor Spanish. That is the feeling here. In the French Pyrenees it is very well rooted» (Stockbreeder and Hunting Reserve employee, 28).

Identity is regenerated with this event: people on both sides of the Pyrenees recognize themselves as mountain people. However, the fluid passage between the two countries was only achieved after Spain entered the European Union

and the control of the borders was eliminated. Moreover, this «peaceful» encounter is not an inherent condition. It requires work and effort:

«But, all these things, like all the relationships, (...) the relationships with other people, friendships, you need to cultivate them, otherwise... if one of the two does not put in effort, well, at the end, it becomes cold, I don't know, it may be lost. And this is the same. And during one year and, in many meetings, and calls and stories, my father is the one who is in charge of maintaining the contact, it's because they are friends and [they] come and go, and during the year, they come for some party or we go skiing... or... [about] that many Spanish people are not aware you know? They think that this is like this, because, well, because it's something that seems to be institutional... you know? But the truth is not like that, it's... things that people do voluntarily, well, because there is a good relationship and that's it, but... but this might not exist one day, one good day, no?» (Ibid.).

This event, nevertheless, does not represent traditional transhumance. Now stockbreeders use cars and trucks to visit their cattle. Moreover, a process of folklorization is going on. The common saying is that now there are more people doing the transhumance. French tourists arrive at Bernatuara Lake waiting to see the cattle passing the border. The party celebrated on the French side, normally attended by stockbreeders and their guests, is starting to be frequented by tourists, threatening the continuity of the communal event funded by the stockbreeders' associations.

Even though the focus of the PNOMP regulations is the conservation of ecosystems and biodiversity (Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación 1995), the state, following EU policies, subsidizes the continuity of stockbreeding. Locals think that otherwise the practice is unsustainable:

«Well, I hope it [stockbreeding] is going to be protected and it has to receive aid because otherwise we can't compete. The price of fodder rises, all the prices rise, diesel fuel, the prices of everything that we buy rise, machinery, although the prices of cattle are the same today as thirty years ago. Then, we are depending on the aid that we have and I trust that it will continue, of course» (Stockbreeder, 60).

Yet the current practices neither involve the maintenance of the terraces, nor the practice of transhumance. The agropastoral landscape is changing, and this change may be irreversible:

«When the shepherd that takes care of the cattle dies, the cattle are gone. There is no generational changeover. That is the problem. Then, of course, if there is no generational change-

over, even if we hire shepherds, even if punctual solutions are given during a short period, and they do not fix the population in the territory, they do not give solutions for the stockbreeding load that has been clearly reduced. Then we have the formation of scrubland in the pasture zone. The forests appear in the scrubland zone. Then these changes entail the modification of the landscape, that is a reality. The famous Ordesa stockbreeding «*lañas*» are disappearing. But they are disappearing because there are no cattle» (Park employee, PNOMP).

Resilient traditions

Two characteristics of the PAO make it unique among the Archaeological Parks in the Inca Sacred Valley and among the sites selected for the *Qhapaq Ñan*. First, the village of Ollantaytambo is called the «living Inca town» (*Ciudad Inca viviente*) because of the continuous inhabitation of the archaeological remains. Second, in the harsh environment of the highlands of the park, peasant communities maintain the Andean worldview and a rural way of life belonging to agropastoralism.

Until the 1980s, Ollantaytambo was a small rural town, consisting of no more than 1,000 inhabitants. There were no electric lines, and the population was fully dedicated to agriculture and stockbreeding. Between the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1980s two events were highly influential to the agropastoral communities. First, the Agrarian Reform initiated in 1969. This reform granted the ownership of the land to the peasant workers of the estates previously held by landowners, inheritors of the colonial system. The second event was the emergence of two terrorist groups that destabilized the country for more than ten years. One of them, Shining Path (*Sendero Luminoso*), which operated in mountain regions, had a strong impact on the life of the peasant communities. The instability caused by terrorist groups in these rural areas delayed development that was resumed only after 1992, when the Shining Path leaders were imprisoned. Now there are around 3,000 inhabitants in the urban core of Ollantaytambo and growth continues mainly due to tourism.

The Andean agropastoral traditions constitute a subsistence-oriented way of life. When the systems were opened to processes of globalization and neo-liberalization, their products became commodities, entering in international markets and impacting on the socio-economic structure of the peasant communities. Over the last 20 years, tourism and the model of Western urban education have been the main factors dis-

turbing the traditional way of life. On the other hand, the geographical and centralized structural conditions of the country have impeded the mechanization of agriculture and the development of a stockbreeding industry, permitting the maintenance of traditional land use. However, the «living Inca town» is experiencing property conflicts:

«Now for example COFOPRI⁴ is giving [property] titles to everyone right? But in Ollantaytambo, they have only given titles to the rural plots, namely, the agricultural fields in the surroundings. Why not to the [urban] dwellings? Because it is already considered cultural heritage and it is [the] Archaeological Park of Ollantaytambo, it is protected by the Ministry of Culture, by law, they cannot give titles. And it is complicated by the issue of their titling, for the people that live in Qosqo Ayllu, no? They do not have possession» (Local, Municipality employee).

Archaeological structures where current inhabitants dwell can be neither possessed nor altered. The main problem then for the living Inca town is its impossible growth. Surrounded by protected archaeological remains and agricultural fields, it is illegal to build and expand. Nevertheless, the regulations do not halt inhabitants, motivated by social and economic interests, from transforming the Inca structures into hotels, restaurants or subdividing them in order to house more people.

«Then, the levels of welfare are expressed materially through the new constructions. Cement, brick, steel. This is going to disfigure [the urban landscape] and we know what is going to happen. We won't have a living Inca town anymore. We will have something totally different» (Park employee, PAO).

The disfigurement of the living Inca town however, is not the main concern of inhabitants, who seem not to perceive the Inca heritage as their identity. They are interested in the benefits they can get from it. Locals give value to the Inca structures as long as they are profitable:

«Because it is a protected zone, we have had that problem since the beginning, unfortunately, the *comuneros* that live in this part of Qosqo ayllu, no? We have problems to make housing here in Ollantaytambo. All our lives, we have had problems. We have been fined, sanctioned. Now that is more rigid, with the master plan, everything, then it is more rigid for the construction of housing here in Ollantaytambo. They are right about this. If we don't take care of what is ours, if we don't take care of the goose that lays the eggs, who is going to take

⁴ COFOPRI: Organization for the Formalization of Informal Property.

care of it? We should take care of our richness here in Ollantaytambo... that is our reality» (President of the Community Ollanta, farmer and stockbreeder, 50).

Locals assign a higher value to the train station that forces tourists to stop in the town on their way to Machu Picchu because it brings commercial movement:

«What is happening is that the station can't be moved from here, because people say, look, if you move the station, I lose my business. And there are 50 hotels, 100 restaurants, I don't know how many handicraft sellers, they are all established here, they have invested a life on this. You can't tell them, here I move the station, you [have to] come. We are going to give you a stand and we are going to give you a place, and you have to invest much more than you expected. (...) But for example here, the municipality, the mayor has been elected because he said: «we are not going to move the train station!» We are not going to move it, the station stays here. (...) I think that if you move it, then nobody would need to pass by the town. Then the buses, everything, you avoid all the transit. (...) But now we have 90% of the tourists that come to Ollantaytambo, they are not coming to Ollantaytambo. They are going to Machu Picchu. They pass by the town, they leave their dust, their contamination, their garbage and they take the train and come back and do the same. They don't enter in the town. And hence, Ollantaytambo is not a tourist attraction» (Local, farmer, hotel owner and manager, 33).

The proposal for the relocation of the train station in order to preserve the urban Inca planning is not accepted by the inhabitants. Tourism development wins over the conservation of the cultural landscape.

This lack of identification relates to a discontinuity marked by the years of colonization. Even if the Inca past has been used to construct Peruvian national identity, current Andean peasant communities are not seen as the inheritors of Inca traditions (Manrique 1999). Recently, highlanders of the PAO are assuming the idea of being heirs of the Incas (Di Salvia 2011: 22). Although peasant communities have been seen inside the National-Republican project as under-developed, precarious and outside the national community, the new discourse on ICH is now re-valORIZING indigenous knowledge at a national and international level. For instance, the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP 1993) has positioned peasant communities as central to the conservation of biodiversity.

Yet the practice of homestay tourism that is being promoted may affect communities when it objectifies the rural way of life, turning their traditions into folklore shows. Moreover, the value assigned by the «official» conservation practice to Andean traditions brings contradictory understandings. On the one hand, peasants are seen as under-developed, and on the other hand they are recognized as holders of significant knowledge in natural resources management. Nevertheless they are not truly participating in decision-making processes over their resources.

In recent years, evangelist groups have arrived at Patacancha to preach the gospel. This has led to a change from Catholic faith to evangelicalism for the majority of the population. This is leading to discontinuation in the celebration of religious feasts associated with Catholicism, which were syncretized with Andean traditions during the colonial period. These practices correspond to the ICH of the *wayruru* nation, although now, most of the members of the peasant communities of Huilloq, Patacancha and Rumira Sondormayo have become evangelicals. This generates a conflict between maintenance and cessation of practices that are not mentioned in the gospel:

«Of course, the elders, old people yes, they still do it [*pago a la tierra*]⁵. (...) Before we did [believe in sacred places], it was strong, that [belief], no? (...) [But now] Not anymore. For what would we do that? (...) Well, I also read the Bible. There, it does not exist. There are no other gods. Only one God. Only one, no? To praise, to make petitions... So that seems to be a lie [Andean customs], no? It's a custom only, the elders, the Incas, now, we don't do anything. (...) [The tourists] they come here because of our clothes, well our typical clothes, because of that it is, no? Customs also, no? But the customs are being lost already... Maybe little by little they will be totally lost, I don't know how that would be» (Comunero of the Peasant Community of Patacancha, farmer and stockbreeder, 40).

Andean religion is being replaced by the Bible:

«They used to believe, but now, not anymore. They are all evangelicals there [in the Patacancha watershed]. Me too. (...) This Bible is in Quechua. It's from Spanish to Quechua... Here, they say everything. We don't celebrate festivities. We only believe, we only celebrate, only a single God, nothing else. (...) Festivities... Christmas, eh... Easter. Those two only» (President of the Peasant Community of Patacancha, farmer and stockbreeder, 25).

⁵ Traditional Andean ritual performed at the beginning of the agricultural calendar (August).

Even if the religious practices are being lost, Andean traditional practices of *ayni* (communal support) and *faenas* (communal works) are still being carried out: «Interviewer: But do you still work with *ayni* and *faenas*? Comunero: Of course, nothing else.» The community structure is being maintained beyond religious differences. Moreover, some *comuneros* do not follow rigidly the evangelical faith, leaving a space for integration:

Interviewer: «Is everybody evangelical there now [in the *wayruro* communities]?» Comunero [C]: «Yes, the majority, although inside this, we have different ideologies, no?» I: «How?» C: «Well, I mean, I am evangelical but I am not, I mean... Some believe that for example to respect our customs is a sin... But from my point of view, it's not. I mean, I respect, no? Our living culture. The customs, all that...» (Comunero of the Peasant Community of Rumira Sondormayo, farmer and stockbreeder, 25).

Conclusions

In this article my aim has been to contrast experts' values with local values. The values assigned by experts correspond to external and diverse understandings of landscape, and refer to traditions facing processes that may be leading to their «extinction». For locals, the maintenance of cultural landscapes depends on practices that have become unprofitable. Whether it means «cleaning» the landscape in the PNOMP, or «preserving» Inca structures in the PAO, these practices cannot be economically sustainable. The intention to safeguard the ICH is unviable when socio-economic processes do not depend on conservation policies. Moreover, as in the PAO, an external agent such as a new religion can also modify traditions.

Even if intangible values are essential for the designation of these cultural landscapes, both models of protection give priority to the conservation of tangible heritage. For cultural landscapes, conservation implies the maintenance of holistic systems that depend on global processes that cannot be handled by these models. Furthermore, the models themselves have interrupted organic processes of development in both sites through protective measures that limit the autonomy of local communities.

Consequently, traditions are being transformed, adapted or are progressively disappearing. The current system of stockbreeding (large exploitations) has a different impact than the agropastoral system (small exploitations) that created the cultural landscape in the PNOMP. In the PAO, the most significant processes affecting the maintenance of Andean cultural land-

scape are tourism development and evangelicalism. The loss is then part of general processes of modernization. In addition to this, patrimonialization is serving as a mechanism of state appropriation of places and traditions when these have become profitable in the tourism market. This may be counterproductive for their safeguarding, contributing instead to their loss.

In the case of these heritage sites, the involvement of local communities should then imply more than capacity building. It should imply the respect of local autonomy in landscape management and the acknowledgement of local people's understandings and value systems. Only when conservation is anchored in the everyday life of local inhabitants can it become a sustainable practice. Nevertheless, this practice needs to integrate change.

REFERENCES

Besse Jean-Marc

2009. *Le goût du monde. Exercices de paysage*. Paris: Actes Sud / ENSP.

Brookfield Harold

2001. *Exploring Agrodiversity*. United States: Columbia University Press.

Descola Philippe

2001. Construyendo naturalezas. Ecología simbólica y práctica social. Philippe Descola & Gisli Palsson (eds.): *Naturaleza y Sociedad: Perspectivas antropológicas* Pp. 101-123. México D.F.: Siglo XXI.

2005. *Par-Delà Nature et Culture*. Paris: Gallimard.

Di Salvia Daniela

2011. Acerca de la autodeterminación territorial y socioeconómica: un estudio de caso en algunas comunidades campesinas del Cusco (Perú). *ETNIGEX. Revista de Estudios Etnográficos* (2): 19-32.

Fernández Joaquín & Rosa Pradas Regal

1996. *Los Parques Nacionales Españoles (Una aproximación histórica)*. Organismo Autónomo Parques Nacionales. Madrid: Ministry of Environment, Spain.

Harrison Rodney

2010. *Understanding the Politics of Heritage*. Manchester: Manchester University Press in association with the Open University.

ICOMOS New Zealand

2010. *ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value*. ICOMOS New Zealand.

Ishizawa Maya

n/d. About the Conservation of Cultural Landscapes: Sustainability or Unviability? A Comparative Study on the Emergent Landscape Management in Heritage Sites in Mountain Regions: The Andes and the Pyrenees. Ph.D. dissertation, Brandenburg Technical University, Germany.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett Barbara

1995. Theorizing Heritage. *Ethnomusicology* 39(3): 367-380.

Lemaire Raymond & Herb Stovel eds.

1994. *Nara Document on Authenticity*. ICOMOS.

Manrique Nelson

1999. *La Piel Y La Pluma: Escritos Sobre Literatura, Etnicidad Y Racismo*. Lima: SUR Casa de Estudios del Socialismo.

Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación

1995. *Plan Rector de Uso y Gestión del Parque de Ordesa y Monte Perdido*. Gobierno de España.

Mitchell Nora, Mechthild Rössler, Pierre-Marie Tricaud

2009. *World Heritage Heritage Papers 26. World Heritage Cultural Landscapes. A Handbook for Conservation and Management*. Paris: UNESCO.

Rössler Mechthild

2003. Enhancing Global Heritage Conservation: Links between the Tangible and Intangible. *World Heritage Review* (3): 64-67.

2012. Outstanding Universal Value and Criteria for the Inscription of World Heritage Cultural Landscapes. *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes* Pp. 25-34. Spain: Ayuntamiento de Elche.

Sauer Carl O.

1925. The Morphology of Landscape. *University of California Publications in Geography* 2(2): 19-53.

Smith Laurajane

2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London, New York: Routledge.

UNEP

1993. *Convention on Biological Diversity*. UN, UNEP.

UNESCO

2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*.

2006. Conserving Cultural and Biological Diversity: The Role of Sacred Natural Sites and Cultural Landscapes. Proceedings of the International Symposium, Tokyo 30 May to 2 June 2005. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO & World Heritage Committee

1998. WHC-97/CONF.208/17. UNESCO. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/2861>, accessed June 18, 2014.

UNESCO, ICOMOS ed.

2006. *Persepolis Proposal For Enhanced Management and Planning of World Heritage Cultural Landscape*. UNESCO.

UNESCO, World Heritage Committee

2011. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris: UNESCO.

AUTHOR

Maya Ishizawa is a Peruvian architect and Ph.D. candidate at the IGS Heritage Studies, BTU Cottbus-Senftenberg in Germany. Her research addresses the implications of the conservation of cultural landscapes. Her doctoral dissertation deals with the analysis of landscape management processes and alternatives for communities' involvement in the conservation practice. Focusing on mountain areas such as the Andes and the Pyrenees, her interest is to study the complexities of change, and their impact in settlements' development.

*Internationale Graduate School Heritage Studies, Brandenburgische Technische Universität
Platz der Deutschen Einheit 1, DE-03046 Cottbus
ishizawa.maya@gmail.com*