

GUADALUPE MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ

Geographer

Territory and landscape in the management of archaeological heritage. Scopes from the experience of the territorial diagnosis of the archaeological heritage in the Lambayeque Region, Peru

The recognition of the historical construction process of the heritage values inherent to each landscape carries some weaknesses, which emanate from the objectual conception of heritage, specifically from the archaeological one. This results in an understanding of protection and management from the individualization of the monument, detached from the evolution of the territories.

The intense changes in Peruvian territory have a high soil consumption, being from large productive or extractive projects, or being from informality in urban expansion, forest, agricultural and mining exploitation, mainly. This causes rapid changes in the landscape that decontextualizes and affects archaeological sites strongly.

This is no stranger to the Lambayeque Region in northern Peru, whose landscape has been - and continues to be - shaped by major water projects since pre-colonial times. However, the current progress of the agricultural frontier and urban expansion threatens and affects its heritage integrity, among which is one of the greatest archaeological discoveries of the world in the 20th century, the Lord of Sipan.

This situation prompted the Ministry of Culture of Peru-Executing Unit 005 Naylamp Lambayeque, to require the preparation of a territorial diagnosis of the archaeological heritage of this region in 2014, to know its real scope.

The territorial dynamics in Peru place the protection and management of its archaeological heritage face to an enormous challenge that requires expanding concepts and methods, and where the management of archaeologi-

cal heritage necessarily goes through its articulation with territorial management.

However, neither territorial management nor archaeological heritage management face favourable scenarios. On the one hand, there are legal limitations and institutional gaps in land-use planning processes. Thus, the approval of Law 30230, Law that establishes tax measures, simplification of procedures and permits for the promotion and dynamism of investment in the country, of July 2014 (art. 22. Land use planning), meant that land use planning in Peru would lose its binding character, to be a guide for land use in the territory. This is connected to a scarce tradition of territorial planning of the Peruvian State, with stewardship in the matter fragmented between various sectors of the State and a minimum level of compliance. The competent areas are regional and local governments, where no regional government has a territorial planning instrument and scarcely 12% of the municipalities have territorial plans (Ministry of Housing, Construction and Sanitation, 2017).

The regulations on land use and urban planning establish few connections with the archaeological heritage, which is qualified as Monumental Zone. The limits of this area are adequate to the physical evidence or to the official delimitation, which is meagre, in the case of archaeological sites declared Cultural Heritage of the Nation, without compatibility and adaptations with neighbouring uses.

On the other hand, the management of archaeological heritage has limitations to apply protection figures beyond the visible evidence or the presumption of the

evidence. In the General Law of Cultural Heritage of the Nation, Law No. 28296 of July 2004, an objectual vision of heritage property prevails, with a shy reference to its landscape environment, a concept that has been truncated in its scope and possibilities for management (Chap. I-art. 1 °).

The reference to the landscape environment allows the concept of landscape to be brought closer to the management of archaeological heritage. Taking into consideration the landscape of which the archaeological property is a part, facilitates the understanding of the historical context, its values, but above all, understanding it as part of current plots and its relationship with the rest of the landscape elements. Under this scope, heritage management and territorial management will have greater and better argumentative elements to overcome a constant in many of the archaeological monuments, their marginal position, if not invisible in the territories. Therefore, the concept of landscape that is promoted to address the protection of archaeological heritage is devoid of adjectives such as “cultural” or “archaeological”, since that corresponds to specific categories, limited to certain monuments and landscapes, whose comments would exceed the scope of this article.

From these pages, a broad landscape concept is advocated, in its territorial and perceptual understanding, which involves all the landscapes of which archaeological assets are part. This makes it easy to apprehend the good in its past fullness and its present reality. However, it is here, in the conjugation of these time scales over the same space, where the greatest dystrophies in public management are evident, traditionally led from sectorial visions. This is evidenced because the damages to archaeological assets, to a large extent, come from a lack of dialogue and compatibility between their needs for protection and conservation and neighbouring uses. In other words, it is urgent to understand that the management of archaeological heritage is also the management of the territory.

In this way, the management of archaeological heritage would no longer be projected as “islands” in the territory, apart from dynamics and trends of occupation that change physiognomies vertiginously, and to which it is difficult to adapt perception in such short periods. At this juncture, the evidence shows that isolating the heritage is not a solution. To the decontextualization of the physical evidence is added the intention of minimizing it spatially, leaving it constrained against uses that are struggling to spread. Recognizing archaeological sites as an essential part of the landscape is an opportunity to visualize and

understand heritage and territory in a common management process and not the product of differentiated, if not antagonistic, efforts.

It is evident the absence of the concept of landscape - devoid of the cultural adjective - in the regulations regarding territorial ordering and patrimonial management in Peru. But the figure of landscape environment of the patrimonial legislation makes it possible to appeal to the landscape, from its more territorial meaning. This facilitates the operation of the concept in the territorial and sectoral planning instruments, in such specific and key aspects as the management of the compatibility of use, the scope of the boundaries and the contribution of heritage to the quality and character of the landscape, to quote some.

In the territorial diagnosis of the archaeological heritage in Lambayeque, the landscapes of the Lambayeque region were identified, as part of a conception of the protection and management of archaeological heritage of territorial scope. It is methodologically inspired by the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) (Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage, 2002) and the Spanish experiences of the “Atlas of the Landscapes of the Community of Madrid” (2011) and the “Management Plan for the Field of Criptana” (2008), both directed by Mata Olmo.

The identification of landscapes combines two moments: the identification of the structural components of the landscape, that is, the natural and cultural elements that make up its physiognomic support; and, on the other hand, the diversity of landscapes, that is, the identification of the landscape units, where the historical aspects and their vestiges, expressed in the abundant existing archaeological heritage, acquire a core value in the definition of these units.

A landscape unit is understood as that combination of elements that make one part of the territory different from another. Landscape units are addressed taking cultural heritage as the axis, but also emphasizing the morphological and functional aspects of the landscape.

The scale used for the identification of landscape units, for reasons of the temporal scope of the diagnosis and the availability of information, has been 1: 250,000. Although this scale requires a level of generalization, it allows us to cover the objective of linking the heritage with its landscape environment, to promote its understanding and protection. There are twelve (12) landscape units that express the historical, patrimonial, and geographic diversity of the Lambayecan territories.

For each landscape unit, the detail of the constituent elements mentioned above, physiographic, historical

elements, land uses and feeling of belonging, has been collected and transferred to an organizing file. Likewise, there is a brief interpretation of the landscape character, which makes it unique compared to the other identified landscapes. Finally, the characterization of each landscape unit includes the determination of the visual basin and the visibility zones, within the limitations that the scale imposes. The points referenced by unit have been geographical landmarks and archaeological sites most reviewed by the population, with adequate visibility conditions.

Characterized the landscape units, they are analysed and valued as part of the landscape environment of the archaeological heritage. In this sense, for each landscape unit, we proceed to:

- Analyse the dynamics and territorial trends and contrast them with the rights of use identified in the Lambayeque region.
- Analyse the current and potential effects on the landscape and the state of the archaeological heritage of territorial trends, in the understanding that the landscape, as an indicator of the quality of life of the territories, is also an indicator of the state of protection, conservation and heritage valuation.
- Identify categories of territorial problems of the archaeological heritage and assess their state of affectation in each and by landscape unit.
- Identify, quantify, and value conflicts with heritage, both existing and latent.
- Determine the fragility conditions per landscape unit, linked to physiographic aspects, concentration and visibility of the archaeological heritage and frequentation of the landscape. In this way, the visual aspects also become an element to consider in the application of protection, conservation and negotiation measures with the different actors involved in the field of the monument. The visual aspects help, among other things, to establish the buffer spaces between the monument and the uses that are in the environment, a very limited aspect in current Peruvian cultural heritage legislation.

In Lambayeque, the design of the agrarian forms, the marks on the hills or the pyramids that are drawn on the horizon, are a fundamental part of various landscapes. The identification of the landscape units translates this diversity. Its assessment from the dynamics and territorial trends, the territorial problems of the archaeological heritage and the fragility of each unit, allows giving

methodological support to the definition of landscape environment, in force in the legislation on cultural heritage in Peru, and providing it with content for its real application.

In general terms, different behaviours have been observed in the landscape environment concerning the heritage that will merit equally adequate responses to specificities. Making a tight synthesis, a clear contrast between the landscapes of the north of the region, markedly deserted, of the most meagre hydrographic basins of the Cascajal and Olmos rivers, stands out against the lush landscape of the La Leche valley, especially in the spaces protected from the middle and upper basin. The deep transformations in the valleys of Chancay and Zaña stand out, with flatter landscapes, as a result of a level of chromatic homogenization and diversity of elements imposed by cane plantations in the lower parts of the basin, and of rice and other products for export in the middle and upper parts. Detached from the economic and social dynamics of the coastal territories, the Andean foothills, on the north-eastern edge of the region, treasure spaces where the morphological structure and traditional practices of occupation, characterize landscapes whose beauty becomes more due to the isolation to which they remain subject.

This brief general situation of the archaeological heritage, in terms of actual and potential effects, contrasts with the development of various archaeological projects in the Lambayeque region, which are benchmarks in Peruvian archaeology. Like the Royal Tombs Museum, built in 2002 in the city of Lambayeque to house the collection of the Lord of Sipán. It soon became the regional benchmark for museums, with a frequency of sustained visits since its inauguration that encouraged the appearance of new museums, in a kind of link between archaeological research-archaeological findings-museum.

Archaeological discoveries and museums made up part of the raw material for the design of a tourist route, the Moche Route. The influx to museums is one of the indicators of the variations in the positioning of the Moche route as a tourist product and Lambayeque as a tourist destination, in a bid to diversify the regional economy. But the task of museums does not end as part of a tourist offer, nor should it be their main motivation.

Museums and their distribution in the Lambayecan region are important milestones in the positioning of heritage in society. Despite the efforts made by museums, friction remains to be resolved in the social, economic, and territorial interaction with heritage. This is accounted for a meagre number of archaeological monu-

ments that enjoy a concrete condition of protection and conservation.

Museums respond to an action framework whose axis is the investigated heritage that promoted its construction. The challenge will be to broaden their vision to the landscape environment and to reconcile museological discourses, more focused on collections, with a focus on landscape and territorial development. Museums can become territorial referents of the landscape units in which they are located. They can, from a heritage perspective, manage these landscape units, specify the operational na-

ture of these units. This challenge implies, therefore, that, given the weakness of territorial and urban planning policies, from the management of archaeological heritage, it can help to safeguard Lambayecan landscapes, assuming the protection will not freeze the landscape and heritage, but to accompany its evolution, preserving its memory.

In short, the approach from the landscape allows to visualize differentiated situations of heritage and to establish measures of interaction with other public policies. The future of the archaeological heritage goes through a necessary articulation to the management of the territory.