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Jane Lennon established a heritage consultancy based in Brisbane, Queensland, in 1993. She has a long involvement with heritage conservation in National Parks, forests, coasts, goldfields, inner urban areas and museums as a public servant (1973-93) and as a member of numerous professional and community associations. She has an M.A. (Hons) from the University of Melbourne.

She is currently an Australian Heritage Commissioner, a member of the Queensland Museum Board, and elected to the International Centre for Studies in Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property in Rome (ICCROM) in April 2000 as the Australian government representative. In addition, Deakin University appointed her adjunct professor in their Cultural Heritage Centre in 2000. She is a past president of the Board of Trustees of Newstead House, Queensland Historians Institute Inc. and of Australia ICOMOS Inc.

Jane has undertaken a range of conservation surveys and studies in all the eastern States and national projects including a study of the cultural landscapes of the Central Victorian Goldfields for the 1996 State of Environment report which led to her currently being on the World Heritage Centre expert group examining management guidelines for cultural landscapes. In conjunction with colleagues from the University of Canberra she prepared a report in 1999 for Australia ICOMOS on cultural values in natural areas.

In 1996 Australia ICOMOS obtained funding from the Australian Heritage Commission for the preparation of a discussion paper on the need for conserving cultural values expressed in natural areas such as forests and national parks. This arose from looking at the gaps in the distribution of our knowledge of cultural values in so called wilderness areas and other natural areas where indigenous people had lived prior to the arrival of Europeans, who in turn had occupied and then abandoned some of these lands. The study was also meant to assist those practitioners identifying cultural values in Regional Forest Assessment (RFA) area studies.

The paper was prepared by me in conjunction with three colleagues from the University of Canberra: Brian Egloff, Adrian Davey and Ken Taylor.

All too often cultural values are considered separately from natural values when conservation planning and management are undertaken. Forces are emerging which add urgency to the consideration of both values. As both the Federal and the State governments restrict the scope of their activities, government agencies consolidate and deal only with what they define as their core business. Increasingly, a multidisciplinary approach to heritage conservation by land management authorities is not considered to be part of that core business. On the other hand, there is a trend internationally towards an integrated approach to heritage identification, assessment and management. This is seen in the shift away from individual site or place management in isolation, towards landscape and regional conservation planning and management processes which are underpinned by multidisciplinary studies and community participation.

A review of natural areas listed on the Register of the National Estate indicates that a substantial number are places with cultural or social values mentioned in the statement of significance or within the nomination. Some of these places are highly valued by local communities. They represent scenes of hard-fought land use conflicts, yet they may be within management regimes which emphasize natural characteristics and values. This discussion paper raised the question as to how cultural places within areas which are recognized and managed for their natural qualities can be best identified, assessed and managed to conserve both cultural and natural values which at times may seem to conflict.

Conservationists have had the benefit of nearly two decades of using the Burra Charter and its guidelines in their work in the historic, built and cultural/social environment. This has resulted in a common terminology and understanding of a procedure for considering the range of issues to be addressed in planning conservation action. The newly formulated Natural Heritage Charter is aiming to address this need in respect of the natural environment, while a range of guidelines and the Malimup Communiqué offer advice from an indigenous heritage viewpoint (Australian Heritage Commission, 1998). The revisions to the Burra Charter to take greater account of the understanding which arises from associations and meanings connected with places. This is also relevant to the consideration of cultural values expressed in natural areas, especially those without historic structures, the traditional visible means of physical support.
The discussion paper illustrates the interrelationships between what is traditionally described as either cultural or natural values, and their relevance to different cultural groups in the community. Rather than reinforcing the division into separate categories, and accepting the partition of cultural and natural values as the basis for conservation actions whereby one set of values is emphasized over another, the concept of a spectrum of values is advocated as a starting point for planning. A holistic approach examining all values is a wise basis on which to proceed because it enables transparency in the evaluation process so as to arrive at a considered, if not mutually accepted, decision on management action.

Case studies have been selected to demonstrate the range of circumstances involved in conservation of cultural resources in areas which are renowned for their natural heritage values. Those selected emphasize:

- processes of increasing awareness on the part of managers of the need to integrate cultural and natural values in an inclusive framework so that an effective heritage conservation management procedure can be implemented
- problems arising from natural area managers ‘managing’ cultural evidence in isolation from its historic context and current community of interest, or in ‘tidying up’ the bush and destroying historic evidence ranging from timber or metal artefacts and structural remains to exotic vegetation, which are regarded as weeds because they have not been assessed in an inclusive and cultural framework, only a scientific one
- recognition of cultural heritage through a process which exemplifies our current professional position and refinement of heritage management tools.

The heritage case studies describe loose alliances between indigenous, natural and historical heritage groups representing communities, professionals and government agencies. The trend is towards integrated management structures which recognize the need to identify a broad spectrum of heritage resources and develop management regimes which enhance those values.

Another World Heritage area which is a case study is Uluru / Kata Tjuta National Park. By the time the first of the formal management plans had been promulgated for the park (Australian National Parks & Wildlife Service 1982), management emphasis had broadened to give much more priority to biodiversity and environmental protection. While cultural heritage was recognized, the first management plan is clearly recognisable as a “classical” Australian protected area management plan based mainly on biocentric international models and experience and with only secondary consideration of cultural heritage. As far as cultural heritage management was concerned, this phase of park management essentially had to do with protection of a few relatively small sites containing cultural artefacts (such as rock paintings) dotted within a “sea” of more-or-less traditional national park management concerns.
After the park area was “handed back” to the traditional owners and the Uluru/Kata Tjuta Board of Management established, the priority given in management arrangements to cultural heritage increased substantially. By the time of the second management plan in 1986, which was prepared after the park had been listed on the World Heritage List (for its natural values), the “manifesto” presented clearly articulated the enormous cultural importance to Aboriginal peoples of the landscapes within the park, as well as identifying more traditional national park values and programs.

The third management plan (Uluru/Kata Tjuta Board of Management 1991) contains an even more overt manifesto regarding the importance of cultural concerns. It was as if the implications of the earlier, subtle, statements had not resulted in appropriate adjustment in either management practice, or probably more importantly, behaviour of other stakeholders such as tour operators or visitors in general). The 1991 plan, therefore, while superficially structured like any other protected area management plan contained a major new section [2: Tjukurpa as a guide to management (pp. 11-26)] which was expressly designed to underpin all other management. Associated with this renewed explicit priority for cultural heritage as well as natural heritage, the park was also re-nominated for World Heritage listing under the cultural landscape criteria.

In 1994 Uluru/Kata Tjuta became the second national park in the world to be listed as a cultural landscape. This honour provides international recognition of Tjukurpa as a major religious philosophy linking the Anangu traditional owners to their environment and as a tool for caring for their country.

Acceptance of this additional cultural attribute at World Heritage level further legitimized the expression of altered priority being made at park level. This is reflected in the current plan of management (2000), which states that acknowledgement of the place as a cultural landscape is fundamental to the success of the joint management arrangement, and it details how traditional owners and the Australian government work as partners by combining Anangu natural and cultural management skills with conventional park practices.

It also explains the sets of values guiding park management and use:

- **Tjukurpa** As the Park is Aboriginal land, Tjukurpa is recognized as the fundamental value in guiding management so that any use of the park should be culturally sustainable and not adversely affect Anangu cultural aspirations.

- **Cultural and natural values: looking after country** Conservation of these values is the fundamental obligation and Anangu knowledge and best practice park management approaches will be applied to looking after country properly and any use will be ecologically sustainable and not effect biodiversity conservation.
Joint management values: These show reconciliation in progress demonstrating how Anangu and other Australians can work together, respect each other, and achieve mutual goals. Anangu economic and community development aspirations will be supported by joint management, as will Nguraritja Winkły (traditional owners) expectations of benefiting from their land being used as a national park (Uluru / Kata Tjuṯa Board of Management and Parks Australia, 1999: 8-9).

As this Uluru example illustrates, sometimes there is adjustment of an initial model in recognition that a wider range of values needs to be given protection than may have been implied when an original model was deployed. In addition, this plan is the first recognizing the primacy of cultural practice in land management by the traditional owners of the place and the bilingual presentation of the plan highlights the fundamental concern of ensuring joint management. The outcome appears to offer a satisfactory integration of cultural heritage concerns with natural heritage management. Monitoring this will prove whether it really is achieved.

Although this paper has not been published by Australia ICOMOS, it has had some impact at the World Heritage management level, along with my study of the cultural landscape of the Central Victorian Goldfields with its framework for monitoring. I would like to update you about the Management Guidelines for World Heritage Cultural Landscapes project which was established at the request of the World Heritage Committee.

Following a workshop in Banska Stiavnica, a World Heritage listed mining town in Slovakia in mid 1999, a group was established to prepare these guidelines for which I am the editor.

There are many guidelines available on managing national parks, archaeological sites, historic buildings, and the general landscape. There is over a century of excellent professional work in managing some of the world’s most outstanding scenic landscapes and historic monuments. However, there is no text specifically examining the issues involved in managing cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value.

Cultural landscapes by their very nature are about human interaction with the natural systems that have formed the landscape. These interactions arise from and cause cultural values to develop. Managing these values with their material (physical) evidence and non-material associations in the landscape as expressions of outstanding universal values is the challenge for World Heritage cultural landscape managers.

The guidelines deal with the following World Heritage categories of cultural landscapes and those already inscribed on the World Heritage List. [See Appendix 1 for these and the World Heritage Centre website.]
The main challenge for these guidelines is to present advice on management policies addressing a range of issues faced by site managers. Some of these policy challenges were raised in the context of the World Heritage Global Strategy for linking nature and culture held in Amsterdam in 1998. The following policies are being considered for the current guidelines:

1. **Tourism**
   See the new ICOMOS charter (1999).

2. **Continuing agriculture**
   Currently, the universality of modern technologies has resulted in uniform transformations of the landscape—through regulation of rivers and streams, building of dykes, large scale drainage, wind-farms, and mechanical soil erosion treatments.

   All over the world highly productive landscapes are quickly turned into “plastic landscapes”, which are already impoverished in terms of biodiversity potential for nature conservation. At the same time, mountain landscapes in Europe are changing their appearance because agriculture and seasonal grazing is no longer profitable there under the subsidy scheme imposed by the European Union. This is happening in Australia also, because such activities have been prohibited in national parks which occupy all the alpine zone, and where grazing has contributed to loss of soils and vegetation cover in major water-catchments of the continent.

   Plachter argues that sophisticated conservation management plans are drawn up to save the structural elements of these characteristic “mosaic landscapes”, but the processes initiated by these plans are completely different from traditional agricultural uses, and local culture is totally ignored. Therefore since the strict interaction between humans and nature is lost, such European landscapes are in danger of losing the attribute “cultural” (Plachter, 1999:107).

   But are there any alternatives? Given the clear trend towards a uniform “global culture” and that cultural landscapes in the past have reflected the culture of a given time period (and local adaptations to prevailing techniques), why should it be different today? Cultural landscapes have always been tied to certain land use patterns and any concept excluding production would therefore represent rupture of a continuous development that has persisted for millennia. Are US and Australian style national park landscapes of the twentieth century with their exclusion of European pastoral and agricultural uses “productive” in that they produce income from tourism?

   What are the limits of acceptable change in land use and agricultural production in listed cultural landscapes? For economic viability, dairying and cattle grazing are intensively undertaken in smaller-scale feed lots, and broad-acre farmland is transformed into high value horticultural, sylvicultural and viticultural landscapes, often shrouded in plastic. Is this valid in our concept of outstanding
universal values for an organically-evolving landscape? If the material evidence
of successive layers of landscape usage remains intact, what degree of
interference or stitching-in of new uses is permissible? Is this the current global
cultural response in the landscape interaction?

3. Landscape Restoration
The policy needs to address the following issues:
- Large scale restoration projects, like recreating the floor of Yosemite Valley to
  highlight the same species as in the first European paintings of it.
- Designed landscapes: with restoration of structural elements, as in Lednice-
  Valtice
- Designed landscapes: with insertion of new facilities, as in Kalwaria
  Zebrzydowska
- Using youth to restore structural components, as in the rice terraces in The
  Philippines, and mud brick walls in Sukur.
- Industrial landscapes: new uses within relict features.

4. Provision of Utility Services and Infrastructure
- Introduction of new utilities to enhance living standards of inhabitants and to
  allow commercial developments, e.g., electricity lines, telecommunication towers,
  pipelines, roads, ports and/or marinas.
- New infrastructure in or on edge of designated cultural landscape.
- Replacement of materials: terracotta tiles with aluminium, thatch with
  corrugated iron, timber with cladding.

5. Education and Training
There are World Heritage Convention requirements for site managers, and these
flow on to the general public/visitors.
- See also ICCROM role and its International Directory on Training in
  Conservation of Cultural Heritage.
- ICOMOS Guidelines on Education and Training in the Conservation of
  Monuments, Ensembles and Sites (Sri Lanka, 1993).

6. Social Support
There is a need for policies for maintaining associative cultural values, which
are often referred to as intangible values yet they are the underpinning of the
associative values as distinct from language and culture revitalization. Australia
ICOMOS hosted a meeting of Pacific countries on this issue in 1995. World
Heritage associative cultural landscapes have special needs for each site so as to
maintain the traditional associations which give that place its outstanding
universal values. A common need is to pass on rituals and traditional
knowledge to culturally ‘right’ people, i.e., those who have been initiated or are
next-of-kin by inheritance.

This applies inter-generationally, with similar pressures and problems evident
across the world: youth attracted to cities and new ways of life, unwilling to
undergo initiation and undertake prescribed obligations; or alternatively, remaining locally with no economic livelihood and falling prey to modern problems such as drugs and alcohol.

This is relevant to the World Heritage cultural landscapes of Uluru, Tongariro, Philippines rice terraces, Sukur.

Do we develop a policy regarding social support for maintaining these cultural associations, or just say they must be maintained to keep the cultural association alive, as detailed in the original World Heritage listing? If no young people are working or living traditionally, as revealed by monitoring reports, then is the cultural landscape be put on the World Heritage In-Danger List?

In conclusion, I want to focus back on our continent, and remind you that we are the only nation occupying a whole continent, which is both a privilege and a challenge. Cultural values in natural areas and our landscapes can be protected by a wide range of tools, including marketing. During discussion of the transmission of cultural values with an elder at Uluru, she asked for a quiet, non-confronting respect for their wishes. So now I show you the advertisement for respecting the Anungu wishes regarding dissuading, but not forbidding, visitors from climbing The Rock—the message was on my tee-shirt: *Ngalyulu parapitjapai Uluru-la or Walking around Uluru*. Numbers climbing The Rock have fallen 40% over the last three years. Understanding brings respect.
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APPENDIX 1

The three categories of World Heritage cultural landscapes

EXTRACT FROM PARAGRAPH 39 OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

i The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man. This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.

ii The second category is the organically evolved landscape. This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories:

relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form.

continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

iii The final category is the associative cultural landscape. The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.
## World Heritage cultural landscapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPE</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>DATE OF INSCRIPTION</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>DATE OF INSCRIPTION</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallstatt-Dachstein / Salzkammergut</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>ii,iii,vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinales Valley</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>iii, iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>i,ii,iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction of Saint-Emilion</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>France/Spain</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>iii, iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrinées-Mont Perdu</td>
<td>France/Spain</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>iv, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortobagy National Park</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>ii, iv, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Costiera Amalfitana</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>ii, iv, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tivueto)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>iii, iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clenzo and Vallo di Diano National Park with the Archeological sites of Paestum and Velia, and the Cornosa di Pudala</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>iii, iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qadisi Qasr (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab)</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1999/1993</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongariro National Park</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1999/1993</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>iii, vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukho Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>iii, iv, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilwa Kisiwani Archaeological site and the Kilwa Kisiwani Archaeological site and the Kilwa Kisiwani Archaeological site and the Kilwa Kisiwani Archaeological site</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>ii, iv, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wurmb, Germany</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New additions confirmed at the World Heritage Committee meeting in Cairns, November, 2000:

- Wachau, Austria – criteria ii, iv
- Palmeral of Elche, Spain –ii, v
- Agricultural landscape of Southern Åland, Sweden –iv, v
- Coffee Plantation Culture from South-east Cuba –iii, iv
- The Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wurmb, Germany –ii, iv
- Blaenavon Industrial Landscape, United Kingdom –iii, iv