

# Intercultural landscapes: towards an interpretation

César Augusto Velandia Silva

*Universidad de Ibagué. Ibagué, Tolima, Colombia*

Juan José Ospina-Tascón

*Universidad del Tolima, Ibagué, Tolima, Colombia.*

## Abstract

The purpose of the article is to establish theoretical bases for an interpretation of the concept of cultural landscape from an intercultural studies approach in the context of Latin America. To this end, the authors attempt to interpret the inherent complexity of cultural landscapes and highlight the need to rethink cultural landscapes from the concept of heritage as a mediator between conflicts and cultural differences.

The focus of the discussion also seeks to support an alternative proposal that provides a different perspective with a new set of tools for understanding cultural landscapes from an intercultural perspective. Therefore the article explores historically one of the greatest conflicts of the colonial world in Cartagena de Indias in the sixteenth century to delve into the origins of the inherited notion of heritage.

The reflections and references cited are contrasted with the current case of the Colombian Coffee Cultural Landscape and its positioning as an example of the evolution of the notion of heritage. Methodologically, the article is an epistemological construction based on intercultural studies to contribute to the discussion and better understanding of what the authors explore as intercultural landscapes.

*Keywords:* Cultural landscapes, intercultural studies, intercultural landscapes, Latin America.

## Background

The proposal emerges from the reflection on heritage as a mediator of social-spatial segregation conflicts in the case of Cartagena de Indias (Velandia, Ospina-Tascón, Ristic 2019). Since the sixteenth to the twentieth century, Cartagena resulted in processes of social and spatial segregation of gigantic proportions. The notion of Colombian heritage was inherited from this process, and in Colombian modernity, it was built on a multicultural idea. Today, positioned from an intercultural view, and empowered by the recognition of diversity and equity, we resort to conceptual tools that help us to understand, spread and work with communities the cases of the Cultural Landscapes in Latin America, which due to its complexity requires more elaborated comprehension levels to articulate and respond to the need for conservation of these sites, as well as to specify the response of its social groups to the adjustment of policies and strategies of management. Then using the intercultural studies for implementing and to innovate into solve discussions existed from the

management experience of Coffee Cultural Landscape of Colombia (CCLC), inscribed on UNESCO's World Heritage List in 2011<sup>1</sup>. (See Image 1)



Fig.1. Coffee Cultural Landscape of Colombia. Source: Juan Luis Isaza.

The interpretation of natural and cultural heritage has experienced an interesting evolution in recent times. The impulse to an integrating approach in which culture and nature are interlinked has their articulations and binding processes. An intercultural and participative vision heritage is undoubtedly the mediator between nature-culture manifestations. Also, its conceptualisation requires a vital link with communities. These elements, somewhat innovative in the region, support the beginning of a future path that can have important repercussions in local and regional development, as well as in the valorisation of heritage, can be an important catalyst in Peace, reconciliation and post-conflict processes as recently as in Colombia. (Moreira-Wachtel and Tréllez 2013). If communities are

<sup>1</sup> <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1121>

inserted into interpretative processes, will they be able to do so from their knowledge. That is, in this context, how is this approach applied to cultural landscapes?

The paper is structured in five parts. The first, an Introduction “A pluralistic notion of heritage” that is more a brief theoretical framework that closes with the second part: “Heritage as mediator” in which it is shown that the discussion on the modernity of cultural heritage becomes from seminal conflicts inherited from the Spanish conquest, based on the case of Cartagena de Indias and its territorial expansion. The third part, “Cultural landscape issues” presents the issues or research questions derived from the above. The fourth part, “Tools for understanding the intercultural nature of landscapes” proposes the answers to the questions or issues presented and fifth part are the Conclusions.

### **Introduction: a Pluralistic Notion of Heritage**

In the twenty-first century, the concept of heritage has evolved. During the twentieth century, its notion developed from Eurocentric and/or North American vision, melted into statism of monuments inherited from the past, and endowed with a universally valued and commonly evaluated through the lens of Western culture. (Isaza et al. 2014) On the contrary, a pluralistic notion of heritage has been adopted in Colombia, incorporating “natural sites, cultural landscapes and even innumerable intangible manifestations of the current culture of any people of the world, regardless of their degree of cultural, economic development, political or technological.” (Isaza et al. 2014: 2).

The diverse and participative vision of heritage corresponds to a notion initially defined by the Law of Culture in Colombia. To this end,

Heritage includes a set of goods and events covering a vast field of social life and is composed of a complex set of social values of a cultural nature (tangible and intangible), which give meaning and identity to a human group. (Republic of Colombia Congress, 2008)

According to García-Canclini (2004) heritage is closely related to the concept of culture by default which implies plural positions, values and meanings that coexist but overlap in latent conflicts. That is to say, in terms of García-Canclini, it deals with a conflict of actors (ethnicities, organisations, associations that in Colombia assert themselves as displaced or victims of a sixty years armed conflict that has regrouped peasants, workers, and indigenous reservations) coming from “differentiated trenches” in which tremendous divergences latent. These absolutely have an influence on the actors who have social power in the processes of creation, appropriation and even interpretation of heritage concepts and manifestations.

From this point of view, this intercultural conflict involves citizens and civil networks, social movements, grassroots organisations, community actions involved in democratic public consultation, but also the Government. In contrast to the prevailing idea that cultural policy is the responsibility of the Government, cultural heritage must also be valued through non-authoritarian and democratic processes that imply that the aforementioned actors can exercise their right to self-determination through their heritage projects.

García-Canclini (2004) also argues that heritage is not only cultural but also intercultural in that it embodies the fact of “difference”: represented in distinctive meanings, contradiction, and confrontation, as a result of intercultural hybridisation. Given that inequality in Latin America contains a cultural dimension, the difference is more than essential genetics or cultural traces (language and customs among others) in a composition of the differences that lie in the historical processes of social agreements. Pre-Hispanic or pre-colonial cultures share territory independently (most of them fierce rivals) but their cultural processes (crops development, food, medicines, cosmogony) are similar.

These elements emerge from the Precolonial past of each culture and share partial similarities with each other, as for these purposes they both symbolically and analogously develop how to cultivate the land, related to nature and organise themselves as individuals and families. Other beliefs, dances, festivals, and celebrations coincide because they were imposed during the colonisation by the Europeans or have survived by processes of syncretisation and transmission of knowledge. They also share the combination of traditional and modern resources to meet the needs of health, local, national and global communication, even for the more traditional tasks of cultivating the land or daily adaptation to cities. (García-Canclini 2004: 50)

Given this, an opportunity in Latin America lies in the appropriation of its interculturality, unlike Europe or the United States where segregation and racism is reinforced especially by the Government thanks to the false attribution of *inclusion* and *multiculturalism* (García-Canclini 2001, 2004) which translates into the segmentation of migrants of any origin (Central Americans, Mexicans, Venezuelans, Colombians, Sub-Saharan Africans, Syrians, Albanians, and so on) and their reduction in ghettos as it have occurred in the north-receiving countries.

### Heritage as Mediator

Consider, for example, the case of Cartagena de Indias. (Velandia, Ospina-Tascón, Ristic 2019) The afro-descendant culture of Colombia was unrecognised for a long time. Until the 1991 Constitution, national policies centered on multiculturalism and ethnic diversity.

The ethnic composition of Cartagena and its region population is characterised by a variety of socio-cultural origins, although it was supposed to be a symbiosis of races manifested in a *mestizo*, *zambo*, and *mulatto*, consequence of historical miscegenation. (Castaño 2002, Gallego 2004, Gruzinski 1999, Gruzinsky and Bernand 2000, Mörner 1969, Sánchez and Santos 2010). “No part of the world has witnessed such a gigantic crossroads of races as has occurred in Latin America and the Caribbean since 1492.” (Mörner 1969: 15)

*Mestizaje* (Gruzinski 1999) is a process of crossbreeding of descendants from American indigenous and European races. (Castaño 2002, Mörner 1969). Complex studies of miscegenation, social relations between casts and segregation also converged in to define it as *mulataje*. This term refers to as a crossing process of African and European races, and *zambaje* refers to the crossing process from African and American indigenous races. (Gruzinski 2000: 79)

Races belong to the lower social classes forced outside the fortress walls of Cartagena core, “sometimes replacing or displacing one race with another”. (Mörner 1969: 19) Cartagena de Indias

still can be considered a structural mixture between different population groups, which contains a spatial expression due to the mediation of heritage.

This panorama is totally different from the idea of a heritage fortified city that was valued and inscribed on UNESCO's World Heritage List in 1984<sup>2</sup>, following European urban and architectural models according to the cultural tastes of Cartagena's white elite. (Pizarro 2015) It interacts with another kind of city and space: the one outside extended on the sloughs margins, built by a variety of self-construction settlements and the use of the *bahareque* (braided indigenous reeds).

Cartagena's historical process transcended the city itself. Perhaps one of America's largest rural expansion processes occurred in the colonial space. During the seventeenth century, the displacement of the indigenous population from their villages to urban centre intensified due to its rapid growth and high demand for labour. Gallego (2004: 56) asserts that since the use of Indians in mining work was banned, "the massive use of African slaves became necessary to intensify mining and the strong emergence of the farming economy, and required a considerable introduction of slaves".

The slave trade made that Cartagena acquire an important commercial dynamism. Meanwhile, a great process of crossbreeding developed. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the concubinage of Spaniards with Indians and Blacks surpassed the growth outside the city. This practice was condemned by the Church because it was conceived in a relationship of sin. A large number of settlements emerged on the outskirts. Besides these inhabitants did not pay taxes and lived by smuggling with the Dutch, it is possible that these spontaneous foundations excluded from the Establishment extended its agricultural frontier, and gave rise to important cities in the Colombian Caribbean such as Magangué, Lorica, and Barranquilla. (Conde 1999; Sánchez and Santos 2010)

Sánchez and Santos (2010: 5-11) concludes that over time, Cartagena represented a great territorial hinterland, linked by the supply of labor, food (salt, agriculture, and livestock) and military strength of the number of African, *zambos* and *mulattos* men. "In 1620, most of the agricultural production came from slave farms and by the end of the century; the slave population in the province had surpassed the indigenous population". (Gallego 2004: 60) The process of crossbreeding, racial and cultural not only had with the indigenous world but also came into conflict with the African culture of black slaves, who for centuries not only mixed but began to dispute the ownership of land. Therefore there were also enclaves exclusive to blacks, such as the *Palenques*, who retained their oral traditions and musical expressions. For this reason, the Cultural Space of San Basilio de Palenque was inscribed in 2008 on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.<sup>3</sup>

During the eighteenth century, the participation of *mestizos* and *mulattos* in the militias of Cartagena granting them freedom rights opened a gate for them to stand up politically and take an active part in the policies outlined by the Spanish Crown, regarding the defense of the port of Cartagena against the attempts of British siege. (Sánchez and Santos, 2010) Also, the neighborhood policy of free rights was a maneuver of management on this great population fearing and preventing an uprising. This represented a developing coexistence around the historic centre due to a symbiotic

<sup>2</sup> Port, fortresses and group of monuments of Cartagena. UNESCO World Heritage Convention. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/285>

<sup>3</sup> Cultural space of Palenque de San Basilio. UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/cultural-space-of-palenque-de-san-basilio-00102?RL=00102>

relationship according to socio-economic and political interactions. Half a century later, long-time neighbors will fight in the war of independence. They received freedom by the Cartagena Board in 1810 and will establish 11 November 1811 as Independence Day as well as defend the city again under Pablo Morillo's siege in 1815.

In the twentieth century, a political awareness and global social trends emerged that led to the acknowledgment of the Caribbean identity and the strengthening of African ethnic groups, which was manifested in the Colombian heritage. (García and Coral 2004) However, so far, despite the development plans and yet uncommitted initiatives of the Special Management and Protection Plan of Cartagena, the ethnic and spatial dimensions of the city's social imbalances have not been recognised. Also, the objectives of the tourism industry continue to support the deepening of the segmentation patterns of Afro communities, in terms of accessibility, appropriation, and conservation of the historic center.

The challenge of Cartagena de Indias' heritage role lies to reverse the ancient conflict created over a double imaginary of its inequitable relations. Reinforced by a process of the reconquest of heritage spaces by Afro-Colombians, interculturality relations around heritage acquires potentiality and capacity to balance the hopes and needs of diverse groups.

Recently, heritage appropriation processes are contributing to mediating with people more comprehensively and democratically. It can be seen at Cartagena's Gold Museum <sup>4</sup> Recently, heritage appropriation processes are contributing to mediating with people more comprehensively and democratically. There, is presented a narrative about the history of the city and its tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Its contents are the outcome of evolution from traditional White and Catholic notions to a plural Afro-Colombian, indigenous, peasant, and pagan ones.

Heritage has mediated throughout the history of Cartagena de Indias and its social segregations through time as a symbiotic field, represented in the colonial architecture of its centre and in a vast system of cities precursors of its Colombian Caribbean region but evolved as an expansion of cultural displacement apart from the Cartagena inner core beyond the limits of its province configured as a defined structure of a particular mode of socio-economic production.

### **Cultural Landscape Issues**

The notion of heritage has also evolved in its representation as cultural landscapes. The CCLC (Isaza and Velandia 2018) is followed up by a management plan, and it has contributed to build a national policy considering by reinforcing, undertake and encourage actions to maintain its integrity and authenticity values. In Colombia, there is the possibility of new cultural landscapes, such as the Real de Minas de Falan (See Image 2) or the Wax Palms Forest of Cerro Machin Volcano among others (See Image 3). This opportunity is extraordinary to compare and learn about common components with cultural landscapes in the world. The values and attributes of some agricultural, archaeological and high biodiversity landscapes, has been able to contrast comprehensively with other landscapes such as Rice Terraces of Ifugao in the Philippines (See Image 4), and Siroyone

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.banrepcultural.org/cartagena/museo-del-oro-zenu>

Senmaida in Japan (See Image 5), even the Landscape of Himalayan Pre-Cordillera and Capitol of Chandigarh<sup>5</sup> (See Image 6).

Since 2011 the management experience of the CCLC has left us lessons learned. That, compared with indigenous landscapes concluded that patterns of authenticity and integrity share common values and threats. If coffee crops are relocated to higher altitudes, it also occurs with rice fields. Families living in landscapes heading by farmer parents are aged over 65 years old and their sons do not want to work in the land. International food prices are getting minor and fixed by global markets, causing low rentability and profitability of agriculture. Threats of volcanic, seismic, floods or fire risks are menacing the life environment of sites. And in some critical cases, flows of global tourism are transforming the heritage image with forms of Disneyfication, marketing it like a commercial brand.

The above refers to the hazards such as climate variability, the global markets, illegal or uncontrolled extractive activities; the risk of natural disasters; the generational change; the lack of heritage social appropriation and knowledge; changes in agricultural land use due to real estate pressures and unsustainable tourism activities are common to cultural landscapes around the world.



Fig.2. Real de Minas of Santa Ana, Falan, Tolima, Colombia. Source: Author.

<sup>5</sup> Contributions and lessons learned from Capacity Building Workshop on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation in Asia and the Pacific organised by UNESCO, ICOMOS, and ICCROM at the University of Tsukuba, Tokyo, September 2016 and Scientific Symposium of ICOMOS, New Delhi, December 2017.



Fig.3. Wax Palms Forest of Cerro Machin Volcano landscape. Toche, Ibagué, Tolima Source: Author.



Fig.4. Rice terraces landscape of Ifugao, Filipinas. Source: Marlon Martin.





Fig.5. Senmaida Wajima cultural landscape, Noto, Japan. Source: Author.



Fig.6. The Landscape of Himalayan Pre-Cordillera and Capitol of Chandigarh, Punjab, India. Source: Author.

Based on the foregoing and the plural concept of heritage, how does the notion of heritage in Colombia apply to the research questions inherent in the construction of knowledge about cultural landscapes and their heritage implications, formulated as follows:

- a) What is the cultural matter of the landscape?
- b) How to build a new narrative about their differences and singularities integrated into landscape-territory?
- c) How to build a scientific knowledge about intercultural landscape?
- d) What to do with culture vestiges and remains in the landscapes? Intercultural thinking helps to know what to do?

### **Tools for Understanding the Intercultural Nature of Landscapes**

To solve the questions, a proposal for the interpretation of the aforementioned phenomena, within the framework of cultural landscapes, deals with the development of “symbolic matter” in them. This is based on the inter-cultural significance of heritage-culture binomial, viewed as an objective-narrative since its object is the relationship of man with nature-culture and is structured from disciplines that build an epistemology of discourse such as archaeogeology, archaeogeography, biocultural studies, cultural geography, geoarchaeology, geoheritage, and landscape archaeology. Mentioned disciplines have in common the studies that address and recognise as García-Canclini (2004) argues the differences, trying to correct the inequalities and helping to connect with people majorities. They also identify the transition from a multicultural world (based on the distinction between ethnicities and diversity between groups) to an intercultural condition that refers to confrontation, transaction, and interweaving between cultures.

In these terms, culture notion is re-configured insofar as it covers the setting of social processes of meaning. That is “the social processes of production, circulation, and consumption of the meaning of social life”. (García-Canclini 2004: 34) Therefore answering the question about if cultural landscapes are inclined to the understanding and representation of inherited and social imaginary (symbolic) and how relationships are conceived and managed (though differences and inequalities) between actors and landscape-territory.

Cultural landscape as an object of investigation must explain how viewing methods allow the researcher to improve a new landscape perspective and to consider it as a fundamental process of knowledge. Schaff (1976: 65) stated

thus the process of scientific cognition and its products always have an objective-subjective character. Objective both due to its reference to the object which is in a given way reflected in cognition and to the relative universality of the value of this cognition.

It constitutes a particular relationship between the subject and the object that exist objectively, a relation therefore, that is subjective-objective. However, if the landscape is preliminarily defined as the aesthetic (subjective) representation of a portion of the defined space, its definition is transformed as it is integrated into the culture dimension.

García-Canclini (2004) resorts to the redefinition of culture notion: No longer proposed as an entity or package of features that differentiate one society from another, characterised by multiculturalism, developing a concept of the culture of interculturality. According to Appadurai (1992: 51) is defined from the cultural as a system of relations of meaning that identifies “differences, contrasts and comparisons”. For Jameson and Žižek (1998: 22) their view of culture is defined as the “vehicle or means by which the relationship between the groups is carried out.” So García-Canclini (2004: 37-38) tries to redefine the concept of Culture: He introduces in these debates it is not a question of the harmonic and consensual, nor of silencing different positions, it is a new way of living and surviving these conflicts, a democratic culture that is attentive to the diversity of positions that even exceed the famous multicultural museum. Thus, starting from this recognition of the latent conflict, of this simultaneity of meanings, we must begin by rooting and then finance, for example, public policies, education, the use of public space, the use of natural resources, legitimise and define who has social power over their environment. What role can cultural heritage play in opening up and allowing these possibilities?

But contrary to the general idea that cultural policy is considered as a direct descendant and is largely a responsibility of the Government, in a context of existing legal framework and developed from non-participatory processes, they are examples that help us to think that cultural heritage is also produced through a democratic processes, in which they also mediate as articulated in a non-authoritarian or exclusive way, which appeals to the notion of cultural democracy various non-government actors that have to guarantee the right to self-determination and legitimacy through heritage projects.

The major contribution of García-Canclini is contrasting former Latin American “hybrid cultures” as he called. Differences, contradictions, simultaneities, detachments, singularities, and collectivities as part of phenomena shapes (or build) a process of hybridisation (García-Canclini 2001), which contains a better conception of the erroneously called “cultural identity”, in which it has been reduced the traditional cultural studies presented by Western thought.

The landscape as a kind of tangible and intangible heritage will be the result and the mediator between nature and culture and as a cultural system structures and organises interactions between inhabitants and their environment. (Deetz 1990, Ingold 1993, Tuan 1977) At the same time, landscapes as a whole represent a world of cultural products. (Norton 1989) Cosgrove (1985) observes that landscapes represent the outside world mediated by man’s subjective experience. So landscapes are construction and composition of the man’s world.

The leading references refer to the premise of assuming the ways in which theories of difference must be articulated with other conceptions of intercultural relations: that is, those that understand interaction as inequality, connection/disconnection, inclusion/exclusion that deepen current situations of fragmentation and nomadism. In opposition to the multiculturalism we had experienced, interculturality relates diversity (Perceval 2010). Dietz (2017) classifies it typologically on three underlying scientific-social paradigms in interculturality: inequality, difference and diversity. He also identifies three inner dimensions: An “intercultural” dimension, centered on the visibility of cultural practices that respond to different cultural logics; an “interagent” dimension, which values and takes advantage of the patterns and channels of negotiation and mutual transfer of knowledge among a great diversity of actors; and an “interlinguistic” dimension, which makes possible the articulation and translation between diverse linguistic and cultural horizons. (Dietz 2009)

García-Canclini (2001) states that those models seem to have been exhausted at a time when we believed that each nation could combine a variety of cultures, in addition to those that were arriving, in a single “cauldron”, as the so-called “breeds melting pot”, as the political discourses on “cultural wealth” proclaim. (García-Canclini 2004: 14)

Both terms imply two modes of production of the social fact: multiculturalism implies acceptance of the heterogeneous; interculturalism implies that what is different is what it is in the relations of negotiation, conflict and reciprocal loan. (García-Canclini 2004: 14)

The concepts mentioned mark a complex path to understanding the transit of cultural landscapes towards their redefinition in “intercultural” terms. Also, cultural landscapes are committed to two fundamental challenges: on the one hand, within challenge of interpreting the notion of heritage linked to a territory (the cultural landscape) as an abstraction that implies the difficulty of materialising territorially a series of intangible manifestations (traditional knowledge by oral transmission) and tangible (represented by nature, architecture, urbanism, archaeology, art objects) which immediately leads to a reflection of heritage from the intricate processes of aesthetic perception to those of social appropriation. And on the other hand, the challenge of the development of the conditions of the material dimension recurrent to the geographical and environmental-biological reading of the heritage.

The Convention on World Cultural and Natural Heritage of 1972 created the World Heritage Committee, which approved in 1992 the category of Cultural Landscapes. The term cultural landscape “embraces a diversity of manifestations of the interactions between humanity and its natural environment.” According to established by

cultural landscapes should be selected on the basis of their Outstanding Universal Value and of their representativity in terms of a clearly defined geo-cultural region and also for their capacity to illustrate the essential and distinct cultural elements of such regions. (UNESCO 2017: 81)

According to Mata (2006: 10)

The convention correctly understands that the landscape constitutes a reality and a global perception of the territory, in which it is not possible to oppose, but rather to merge the natural and the human, without denying the different step that natural, rural, urban or any other type of elements have in each landscape. And also because of this, there is a potential for planning the landscape policy of the territory that finds its meaning and *raison d'être* as a public action that deals with the territory as a whole, and not as a mere scenario of sectoral policies.

The historical process of a cultural landscape is determined by the trinomial nature, social construction, and perception. Although the relationship between humanity and nature is already present in all the definitions and approaches of landscapes in general, the same cannot be said about

cultural landscapes and their perceptive and immaterial values that provide them identity and character.

Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen a deeper interpretation arranged from literary, artistic and scientific insights of its original communities. (Madrid City Council and ICOMOS 2014: 5) For this reason, there are difficulties in learning methodologies that recognise the deep dimension of cultural landscapes homogeneously and universally. (Madrid City Council and ICOMOS 2014: 6)

Definitions, in constant evolution due to changes in the landscape and the dynamic individual-collective mental representation, lead us back to the problem to be solved: its cultural connotation. Then, the Cultural subject of the landscape implies a process of “territorialisation” of the social transformation of the agro-productive space. The recognition of this process requires an epistemology to explain the space transformed by man. And also to rethink its reconstruction before the imminence of threats. The landscape is essentially incomprehensible seen as a scene in constant change, as opposed to the Eurocentric concept of heritage.

From Sauer’s legacy we understand the cultural landscape as a record of man on the territory; a text that can be written and interpreted; interpreting the territory as a human construction. We define the cultural landscape as a geographical area associated with an event, an activity or a historical character, which contains aesthetic and cultural values. Said in a less orthodox cultural landscape, but simpler and more beautiful, it is the trace of work in the territory, a monument to the unknown worker. (Sabaté 2010: 11)

### **The Archaeological Interpretation**

The answers on questions about how to construct a new narrative about their differences and singularities integrated into landscape-territory, and how to construct a scientific knowledge about intercultural landscape start, consequently, from the conceptualisation presented addressing up the definition of “cultural landscape” induced by archaeologists. Paradoxically, it is more precise than the ones given by specialists in the theory of culture and heritage.

The landscape must be understood from the comprehension of space as a physical environment or environmental matrix of human action; space as social environment or means constructed by the human being in which relations between individuals and groups are produced; space as symbolic or semi-thought environment that offers the bases for development and comprehension, the human appropriation of nature. (Criado-Boado 1996a: 17)

Anschuetz (2001) proposes a typology of landscapes based on social and cultural manifestations beyond the remains of material culture traditionally examined by archaeology, which can configure landscape types such as “ethnohistorical landscape”, “symbolic landscape”, and even “ritual landscape”, which, after examining the work of Criado-Boado is redundant, and there is the risk of a “disciplinary segmentation” of the object of study, as common in archaeology as in geography, in subjectivised specialties such as the “archaeology of perception”, the “geography of perception”, the “radical geography”, among others.

The methodology for the subjective analysis of the symbolic matter originates from the processual crisis of archaeology. (Binford 1972, Clarke 1977) It was exploited from the 1980s until the 1990s by the “post-processual” critique, animated by the so-called “Archaeology of Perception”. At that time, post-processual archaeology

seeks to do so on the assumption that the reproduction of the conditions of observation allows access to a meaning that is perhaps not essentially the original, but that the phenomenon considered [...] proposes a subjective and subjectivising approach. (Criado-Boado 1999: 7)

What tends to the subjective reconstruction of the perception of the world of the individuals studied -from the evidence of the material culture- taken out of context by the “subjectivising” vision of the perception of those who study it, since the vestiges of a culture by themselves are “not to say anything” and it is viable to subjectivise them from their own perspective.

In summary, landscape archaeology develops three basic environments that include the dimensions of the landscape:

a. The landscape as a physical medium: It corresponds to a matrix of human action in the environment or social archaeology.

b. The landscape as a social environment: It is the landscape represented by space as a social environment or means built by the human being; it corresponds to the social relations between individuals and their groups, or to the social landscape archaeology that serves to understand the human apprehension or appropriation of nature. (Criado-Boado 1993: 17)

c. The Landscape as a symbolic environment: Since Ingold (1993), it means the representation of space as an environment of thought or symbolic meaning, as a basis for human development understanding and appropriation of nature or by “an archaeology of the imaginary or symbolic landscape.” (Criado-Boado 1999: 55)

## Conclusions

The paper’s contribution focused on an epistemological construction on the notion of heritage as a mediator of interculturality in cultural landscapes. The processes of valorisation, significance, and authenticity in heritage sites can be managed, supported, and formulated more comprehensively from an intercultural strategy. In this way, undertaking processes related to management, conservation, and appropriation by communities can achieve greater reach and meaning.

Solving the proposed question: What to do with culture vestiges and remains in the landscapes? Intercultural thinking helps to know what to do may be possible by applying new tools of analysis. Deepening in the social and cultural relations that lie in the conflict: crossbreeding, hybridisation, segregation, inclusion, and exclusion provide us other codes identified throughout the historical context. The example of Cartagena de Indias revealed the relationships between dominant and power-dominated groups that helped us to understand the pluralistic concept of heritage from an intercultural perspective.

Digging into binding codes of the territory defined by social linkages, the symbolic features of culture objects and its attachments to nature-culture, leading by heritage values given by the people as constructors-users of the landscape can provide more clues on what to do with vestiges, memoirs, languages, through its participation in the identification of attributes and significances. In other words, to deepen the diversity of their intercultural relations, from which further processes of rooting and appropriation are derived.

The landscape of the territory was transformed by social and productive arrangements, as observed in the expansion of Cartagena de Indias and also in the CCLC experience. (Isaza and Velandia 2018) But the *leitmotiv* of this movement was intercultural conflict. That is the symbolic link between man and territory for the production of a new landscape in the midst of conflict and difficulty.

The construction of the concept of the intercultural landscape is the result of the study of the collective vision of the territory from the interrelation of the disciplinary reflection, through cultural geography and landscape archaeology. Thanks to the disciplinary crisis of the great sciences, it is possible to propose a model of interpretation for greater development of the materialistic reflection of the landscape as a social representation.

Then, the landscape-cultural territory is related to preeminent social strategies. It contains manifestations of a deep structural relation of the appropriation of individual and collective heritage since it reveals an organisation that can be interpreted, as it was proposed, from the geometric strategies of nature.

To abound in its symbolic matter it is suggested to solve the intercultural subject (of the landscape) as an epistemological function. This is determined by the production and contribution of knowledge of human appropriation of nature, starting from the decomposition of the cultural subject as the development of (anthropological) knowledge of nature by man, from the dissection of the roots of nature and culture linkages. (Lévi-Strauss 1973)

The landscape becomes intercultural. The Cultural subject is induced by epistemological construction. Therefore, it is feasible to find the connection of the geographical interpretation of nature supported from the perspective of the communities (the builder-users) of the landscape that comprises the cultural-human feature recognised as a collective effort.

Intercultural thinking improves the researcher focus, which who seems to be as the *bricoleur* of Lévi-Strauss (1973). Then the researcher becomes a geographer, capable of developing an archaeography of the natural and cultural scene, breaking down its interculturalities. That is to say, a recogniser of patterns, layers, symbolic spaces, which allow him the structuring and binding codes of the territory.

## References

- Anshuetz, K., et al. 2001. An Archaeology of Landscapes: Perspectives and Directions. *Journal of Archaeological Research*, 9 (2), 157-211.
- Appadurai, A., 1992. Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for Transnational Anthropology. In: R. Fox, ed. *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 191-210.
- Binford, L., 1972. *An Archaeological Perspective*. New York: Seminar Press.
- Castaño, P., 2002. Three Approaches to Crossbreeding in Colonial Latin America. *Historia Crítica*, 23, 115-134.
- Clarke, D., 1977. *Spatial Archaeology*. London and New York: Academic Press.
- Conde, J., 1999. *Espacio, Sociedad y Conflictos en la Provincia de Cartagena, 1740-1815*. Barranquilla: Universidad del Atlántico.
- Republic of Colombia Congress (RCC), 2008. Law 1185.  
[http://www.secretariassenado.gov.co/senado/basedoc/ley\\_1185\\_2008.html](http://www.secretariassenado.gov.co/senado/basedoc/ley_1185_2008.html) Accessed: 25 March 2019
- Cosgrove, D., 1985. Prospect, Perspective and the Evolution of the Landscape Idea. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 10 (1), 45-62.
- Criado-Boado, F., 1993. Límites y Posibilidades de la Arqueología del Paisaje. *Revista de Prehistoria y Arqueología SPAL*, 2, 9-55.
- Criado-Boado, F., 1996a. Hacia un Modelo Integrado de Investigación y Gestión del Patrimonio Histórico: la Cadena Interpretativa como Propuesta. *Boletín del Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico PH*, 4 (16), 73-78.
- Criado-Boado, F., 1999. Del Terreno al Espacio: Planteamientos y Perspectivas para la Arqueología del Paisaje. *Criterios y Convenciones en Arqueología del Paisaje CAPA*, 6; Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.
- Deetz, J., 1990. Landscapes as Cultural Statements. In: W. Kelso and R. Most, eds. *Earth Patterns: Essays in Landscape Archaeology*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1-4.
- Dietz, G., et al. 2009. Estudios Interculturales: Una Propuesta de Investigación desde la Diversidad Latinoamericana. *Sociedad y Discurso*, 16, 57-67. DOI: 10.5278/ojs.v0i16.862
- Dietz, G., 2017. Interculturalidad: Una Aproximación Antropológica. *Perfiles Educativos*, 39 (156), 192-207.
- Gallego, J., 2004. Zambaje y Conflicto en la Provincia de Cartagena, 1602-1640. *Anuario de Historia Regional y de las Fronteras*, 9, 48-79.
- García-Canclini, N., 2001. *Culturas Híbridas: Estrategias para Entrar y Salir de la Modernidad*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- García-Canclini, N., 2004. *Diferentes, Desiguales y Desconectados. Mapas de la Interculturalidad*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Gruzinski, S., and Bernard, C., 1999. *Historia del Nuevo Mundo. Los Mestizajes, 1550-1640*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Gruzinski, S., 2000. *El Pensamiento Mestizo*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Ingold, T., 1993. The Temporality of Landscape. *World Archaeology*, 25, 152-174.
- Isaza, J., et al. 2014. Presentación. In: J. Isaza, ed. *Patrimonio Cultural y Academia en Colombia*. Bogotá: Universidad de Los Andes, 1-10.



- Isaza, J., and Velandia, C., 2018. Sustainable Development and Nature-Culture Linkages in the Coffee Cultural Landscape of Colombia. In: P. Larsen and W. Logan, eds. *World Heritage and Sustainable Development: New Directions in World Heritage Management. Key Issues in Cultural Heritage Series*. London and New York: Routledge, 226-239.
- Jameson, F., and Žižek, S., 1998. *Estudios Culturales. Reflexiones sobre el Multiculturalismo*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Lévi-Strauss, C., 1973. *Antropología Estructural*. Buenos Aires: EUDEBA.
- Madrid City Council (MCC) and ICOMOS, 2014. *Conclusiones Finales del Congreso Internacional sobre Paisajes Culturales y Patrimonio Mundial. Working Paper*. Madrid.
- Mata, R., 2006. *El Paisaje y la Gestión del Territorio. Criterios Paisajísticos en la Ordenación del Territorio y el Urbanismo*. Diputación Provincial de Barcelona: Barcelona.
- Moreira-Wachtel, S., and Tréllez, E., 2013. *La Interpretación del Patrimonio Natural y Cultural. Una Visión Intercultural y Participativa*. Lima: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)-Ministerio del Ambiente del Perú.
- Mörner, M., 1969. *La Mezcla de Razas en la Historia de América Latina*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Norton, W., 1989. *Explorations in the Understanding of Landscape: A Cultural Geography*. Nueva York: Praeger.
- Perceval, J., 2010. Retos de los Estudios Interculturales en Comunicación a Comienzos del Siglo XXI. *Anàlisi*, 40, 69-84.
- Sabaté, J., 2010. De la Preservación del Patrimonio a la Ordenación del Paisaje: Intervenciones en Paisajes Culturales (Europa-Latinoamérica). *Labor & Engenho*, (4) 1, 10-25.
- Sánchez, H., and Santos, A., 2010. La Presencia de Indios, Negros, Mulatos y Zambos en la Historiografía sobre la Independencia del Caribe Colombiano, 1770-1830. *Historia y Espacio*, 34, 1-23.
- Schaff, A., 1976. *History and Truth*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Tuan, Y., 1977. *Space and Place: the Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- UNESCO, 2017. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris: World Heritage Centre.
- Velandia, C., Ospina-Tascón, J., Ristic, M., 2019. Heritage as a Mediator of Socio-Spatial Segregation: Cartagena de Indias, Colombia. In: M. Ristic and S. Frank, eds. *Urban Heritage in Divided Cities: Contested Pasts. Key Issues in Cultural Heritage Series*. London and New York: Routledge, 162-172.