Emerging professionals and the heritage of ‘conflict and compassion’
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Introduction

To mark the 25th anniversary of the *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter* in 2004, Joan Domicelj wrote; ‘the system is in place; the base work complete’, and she asked; ‘Can we now move on? … What skills must we add? How are we to nurture, more effectively, the cultural significance of this land?’ Joan ended her short article with a call to action; ‘New thoughts, beginning now’ (Domicelj 2004: 16). More than ten years later, Tracy Ireland and Sandy Blair’s (2015) introduction to a collection of papers from the Australia ICOMOS conference; *Imagined pasts…, imagined futures*, recommends that ‘the future for heritage practice’ needs a stronger focus on imagination, innovation and creativity. These are just two examples of articles published in *Historic Environment* that illustrate the continued impetus of Australia ICOMOS to challenge the status quo of cultural heritage management and to advocate for a version of ‘best practice’ that grows and adjusts with the organisation. This issue of *Historic Environment* aims to build upon this reflexive practice, while also shifting the spotlight a little, to include scholarship from a group of emerging professionals who will be doing the imagining, the innovating and the creating for Australia ICOMOS in the future.

To set the scene for an issue devoted to emerging professionals and the heritage concerns that they are facing, this introduction will begin by discussing some of the significant factors that are impacting upon those who decide to embark on careers in cultural heritage management in the second decade of the twenty-first century. Australia’s current demand-driven tertiary system is leading universities to produce many more graduates than there are jobs. The numbers of museum and heritage studies courses have grown exponentially over the past ten years with Australian universities including; Deakin, Queensland, Canberra, Sydney, Australian National University, Melbourne, the University of Western Australia, RMIT and La Trobe all offering heritage studies courses at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. While there is recourse to recognise the increase in the number of university courses as being positive and illustrating the growing recognition of cultural heritage as a serious discipline of study, any praise for the growing numbers of courses overlooks that Australia has a significant problem when it comes to sustainability in heritage trades—skills not generally taught in technical detail at universities (Clarke 2015; 2011 SOE; the recent 2015 Australia ICOMOS *Fabric* conference highlighted this issue). An associated issue is generated if we are to then recognise the current conceptual shift within the World Heritage system, from being directed by conservation specialists, to being directed by career diplomats (Meskell 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015; Winter 2014, 2015). Does an international shift of this kind suggest that Australia ICOMOS should be just as concerned about training up astute ‘heritage politicians’ as it should be about training ‘heritage practitioners’? Which then begs the question of whether the increasing politicisation of the World Heritage process indicates that we are sitting on the verge of a broader revolution in a resource-depleted heritage management field? If such a shift is a reality, then will Australia ICOMOS have a different or expanded role in the future?
The future of the field of cultural heritage management is uncertain. Yet what is certain—is that determining what the future holds for Australia ICOMOS is worth some serious thought—and it is worth thinking about from a variety of different angles. To date, much has been heard from the founding members and pioneers of Australia ICOMOS, and not so much from a newer cohort of professionals in relation to the heritage debates that are attracting their attention. This issue of Historic Environment entitled, ‘Conflict and Compassion’ opens up Australia’s heritage discourse to a generation of emerging professionals who are engaged in the study and practice of heritage management. Some are members of Australia ICOMOS, some have been through the Australia ICOMOS mentoring program, while some are not so well acquainted with the organisation—yet are interested to find out more. ‘Conflict and Compassion’ was chosen as a nod to Australia’s centennial commemorations of the Great War, and it was the theme of a symposium held on 27 May 2015 in Melbourne. The symposium was organised by students and sponsored by the National Trust of Australia (Victoria) and the Cultural Heritage and Museum Studies program at Deakin University, with a post-symposium event supported by Australia ICOMOS. The symposium generated a number of papers on the topic of ‘conflict and compassion’ that have been collated into this issue and they illustrate a wide spectrum of concerns across a growing field of cultural heritage management that encompasses—the centre and fringes of cities, the inside of museums, remote outback Australia and heritage sites on the other side of the world.

Who/what is a young/emerging professional?

The maintenance and support of a broad-based membership is one of the five key strategic directions of Australia ICOMOS (Australia ICOMOS 2015). As part of its membership efforts, Australia ICOMOS promotes that it is ‘particularly interested in involving young and early career professionals in its activities, working groups, International Scientific Committees and Executive Committee’ (Australia ICOMOS 2016b). The benefits of becoming involved with ICOMOS early in one’s career, include:

- Discounted membership fees (half price) for under 30s who qualify for full international membership;
- Associate membership for early career professionals who do not yet meet the experience requirements for full membership;
- Access and eligibility (for full members) to apply through Australia ICOMOS for the US ICOMOS Summer Internship Program;
- Access to the Young/Early Career Professionals Mentoring Program, a 6-month long program which links early career professionals with a highly experienced cultural heritage professionals;
- Annual social drinks, usually in conjunction with a conference or other event, for networking opportunities and a chance to chat with other ICOMOS members in a relaxed and casual environment;
- Eligibility to apply (full members–Young professional or otherwise) for the Australia ICOMOS Executive Committee or for membership of an International Scientific Committee.

(Australia ICOMOS 2016b)

The Australia ICOMOS website indicates that a young/early career professional is anyone ‘under 30s’ and a quick online investigation reveals that this appears to be the approximate age bracket for other industries. According to the source of knowledge on all things popular culture—Wikipedia notes:

The term young professional generally refers to young people in their 20s and 30s who are employed in a profession or white-collar occupation. The meaning may be ambiguous and has evolved from its original narrow meaning of a young person in a professional field. Although derivative of the term ‘yuppie’ [young upwardly-mobile professional], it has grown into its own set of meanings. (Wikipedia 2016)
Interestingly, Wikipedia (2016) also details under the ‘traits’ of a ‘young professional’—that they stereotypically ‘have an obsession with success’ and they can be ‘plagued with loneliness’. Perhaps this is then why there appears to be ‘two streams’ of young professional groups—the first being those that seek to catapult highly qualified young professionals into the ranks of prominent businesses and organisations. For example, the United Nations (UN) (2016) has a young professionals program, described as ‘a recruitment initiative for talented, highly qualified professionals to start a career as an international civil servant.’ The UN program consists of an entrance examination, professional development, and applicants must be 32 years or younger (UN 2016). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) also has a young professionals program, and analogous to the larger UN process, restricts its application to young people under 32 years of age (UNESCO n.d.). Another initiative, this time a private consultancy firm for engineering, architecture, planning and project management—GHD, is an Australian company that is operating across more than 200 offices around the world. Applications for GHD follow a scheduled recruitment drive that accepts applications from university graduates within certain timeframes determined by the state/location the graduate is applying to join (GHD n.d.). These examples also suggest that this stream of young professionals is highly mobile, cosmopolitan and connected into a global network.

The second stream of young professional groups has a more social mandate (perhaps to stave off the ‘plagues of loneliness’ referred to by Wikipedia). ‘Wellington Young Professionals’ in New Zealand, is a ‘not-for-profit, industry neutral organisation established to nurture personal and professional development for all young professionals in Wellington’ (WYP n.d.). The group is sponsored by a law firm, yet managed by a committee of young professionals, and it takes a more inclusive approach, involving ‘anyone in the first 15 years of their career who is living, working, or wanting to make connections in the Wellington region’ (WYP n.d.). The Wellington group fosters networking and promotes its focus as offering ‘a healthy balance of social and professional events, at little or no cost’ (WYP n.d.). ‘Young Professional Women Australia’ is another peer-to-peer networking community, this time ‘for like-minded professional women under the age of 40’ (YPWA n.d.). The group promotes its sphere of activity as being a way for ‘women to connect, collaborate, share knowledge and mentor each other as they support each other to pursue career goals in corporate sector’ (YPWA n.d.). In this instance, the age bracket of ‘young’ is broader, perhaps due to the recognition of the time that many women take out of their careers to have families, and the need to provide a supportive community when they re-enter the work force. A third group, the ‘GLAMR New Professionals’ is a networking collective for Melbourne new professionals in the gallery, library, museum, archive and records sectors (hence GLAMR). The group is an initiative of the Victorian Branch of the Australian Society of Archivists and its mission is to be ‘intersectional’ so that it engages with new professionals from across the museums and records sectors, in addition to concentrating on ‘issues that are relevant to those in the early stages of their career’ (GLAMR New Professionals 2015).

The trends across these two streams of young professional groups illustrate that the ‘Wellington Young Professionals’, ‘Young Professional Women Australia’ and ‘GLAMR New Professionals’ are created and managed by the target audience—for the target audience. The three groups are focussed on providing support and softening transitions—whether it be in supporting young women to drive culture change in the balance between genders in business, for example, or in assisting graduates to make the move from university life into working fulltime. The UN, UNESCO and GHD, in contrast, are more focussed on future-proofing by populating their organisations with a select grouping filled through a perpetual recruitment drive. While each of the two young professional streams offer benefits, there is scope for Australia ICOMOS to support an emerging professionals program that incorporates both stream components—the social networking, in conjunction with the aim of attracting the best university graduates and heritage trades trainees into the rank and file of the membership. To ensure the successful incorporation of a younger cohort of members into the Australia ICOMOS membership will involve making a deeper commitment to establishing a sustainable model that normalises a younger membership, rather than distinguishing young and early career professionals as a separate class of the organisation.
There are, however, complications with the usage of ‘young professional’ for an organisation such as Australia ICOMOS. It is not uncommon for people with established careers in other industries to make the shift to cultural heritage management later in their working life. There are also instances where researchers from other disciplines include cultural heritage as a central component of their research interests. This issue of *Historic Environment* chooses to work with the term ‘emerging professionals’ rather than ‘young professionals’ throughout, to acknowledge that while the majority of our authors are in their twenties, one or two are a little bit older. The use of ‘emerging professionals’ also recognises that out of a total of 629 Australia ICOMOS members in 2015, only eight were formally recorded in the organisation’s 2014-2015 annual report as being ‘young professional’—these are members 30 years of age and younger. This small figure overlooks that there will be a mix of emerging heritage professionals across the other areas of membership, including the 416 ‘Full Members’, the 113 ‘Associate Members’ and the 18 ‘Institutional Members’, which suggests that a broader consideration is a better approach (Australia ICOMOS 2016a). While ‘emerging professional’ is still not ideal, its usage aims to shift the focus away from age, and to identify those who are bringing fresh perspectives and a questioning of the status quo to the way that cultural heritage management is considered and practised.

**Emerging professionals, Australia ICOMOS and the management of cultural heritage**

The growing number of museum and heritage studies courses in Australian universities has enabled ICOMOS members to take up more academic teaching positions and adjunct professorships. The presence of Australia ICOMOS members in the country’s universities has had the added effect of generating a strong linkage with these educational institutions and it has helped to promote Australia ICOMOS membership as an option for new graduates. A mentoring program has developed out of this linkage that connects Australia ICOMOS mentors with ‘mentees’/students from universities. Initially launched back in 2009, by the Donald Horne Institute for Cultural Heritage at the University of Canberra and the Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage and the Arts at the Australian National University, the mentoring program has since shifted to Victorian universities in 2012 and New South Wales in 2015 (Australia ICOMOS 2016a; 2016c). Prospective ‘mentees’ are required to submit an ‘expression of interest’ and they are matched by a committee made up of representatives from the participating institutions. In 2015, Australia ICOMOS partnered with Victorian universities; Deakin, La Trobe and Melbourne; and in New South Wales, with the University of Sydney—to pair over 35 mentees with knowledgeable ICOMOS mentors. Two of the contributing authors in this issue, Sian Mitchell and Michelle Bashita, have both been a part of the Victorian program that ran between June and October in 2015. Sian explained that her mentorship with David Huxtable from LookEar involved catch-ups every couple of weeks to discuss interpretation for museums and heritage sites. She explained that she found added value in their discussions when she was designing an app as part of her Master of Cultural Heritage course at Deakin University, and the two were able to discuss the practicalities of devising a heritage walking tour that aimed to do more than simply recite information (S Mitchell 2016, pers. comm., 17 March).

Guidance from a mentor can make a world of difference for an emerging professional, with advice and little pushes in certain directions setting a path to a successful career in cultural heritage management. Yet it would be naive to think that the experience between a mentor and a mentee is a simple one-way process. While emerging professionals can be impatient for instant career results, what they lack in experience they make up for in enthusiasm and their wish to fix everything at once, which can be just as refreshing as it is frustrating for mentors (Newport 2012; Muther 2013). The real worth of an organisation such as Australia ICOMOS embracing a mentoring program is that more than simply ensuring sustainability in the populace of its membership, it ensures that there is also sustainability in the organisation’s ideals. Mentors pass on their learnings from years of carving out a career in cultural heritage management and inquisitive mentees can inspire mentors to re-examine deep-seated positions.
The interplay between old and new—across established and unconventional ways of thinking, management systems and theories, is a recurrent theme that is infused throughout the papers of this issue. Australia ICOMOS stalwart, Jane Lennon, begins the issue with reflection on her experiences as an emerging professional cutting her teeth in cultural heritage management. Working as the first female park planner in the Victorian National Park Service in 1973 (now Parks Victoria), Jane began her career around the time of the ‘new environmentalism’, which brought with it a growing concern for the loss of both natural and cultural heritage in Australia. Jane’s early career experiences feed into her reflections on what it means to be a mentor in the present. She returns to the archive of Historic Environment to show how the words of John Mulvaney that were captured in an article from 1989, continue to provide direction today. Far from presenting a one-directional mentoring approach, Jane pitches her short piece from a platform of multi-directional interaction that translates knowledge, skills and collegial support across and between ages, disciplines and cultures.

The paper that follows on from Jane’s scholarship is by Melbourne PhD researcher, James Lesh, whose work indicates that despite positive initiatives there is still much work to be done to ensure that Australia’s cultural heritage management knowledge is being passed on and not forgotten. James’ discussion of the drawn-out conflict around development at the Rialto precinct in Melbourne highlights an anomaly in the system, where heritage decisions of the past are not being taken into consideration in heritage decisions of the present. In his investigation of the proposal to construct a ‘wraparound’ in place of the historic Robb’s building at the base of the Rialto Towers on the corner of Collins and King Streets, James describes the conflict as representing the ‘inability of the present day heritage system to negotiate its own past.’ James brings out the stories of the developers, the heritage activists and the municipal and state governments that have been involved with the Rialto precinct since the 1980s, and illustrates how each of these groups rarely coalesce in the ways that they engage with historic heritage values.

James’s paper generates a wider questioning about cultural heritage management in growing, pulsating cities. In the Rialto conflict, James identified that there were multiple players with multiple perspectives, which suggests that cultural heritage management in urban areas is more complex than simply being about ‘heritage activists’ versus ‘developers’. The complexity of heritage in the city is beginning to be unpacked by the contemporary movement of Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL), which promotes making a more sophisticated heritage case that argues that people’s cultural values (these don’t necessarily need to be heritage fabric-centric), should be centralised within planning systems that regulates development in cities (Bandarin & van Oers 2015; Buckley, Cooke & Fayad 2016). Suffice to say that urban heritage management is one of the most pressing issues for emerging professionals right now, and it will continue to be as populations in cities continue to grow.

Conflict and compassion in museum and heritage studies

Australian universities are offering courses in cultural heritage management that examine both the inside of the museum and the cultural heritage that exists far beyond the museum’s four walls. As a result, emerging professionals are joining Australia ICOMOS equipped with a broad understanding of what cultural heritage encompasses. Consideration of museum and heritage studies together also reveals that much cultural heritage work has been directed towards examining the challenges of managing cultural diversity. Guidelines such as the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity—with its subsequent international ripple effect and the embrace of such concepts as ‘contact zones’ and ‘source communities’ in museums, illustrates that global heritage discourse has become increasingly tuned into the nuances of recognising appropriate cultural context (Clifford 1997; Phillips 2003; Logan 2004; Ang, 2005; Winter 2013). University of Sydney, PhD candidate, Vu Tuan Nguyen, opens the diversity debate up to the recognition of queer heritage at Australian museums and heritage places. Vu’s discussion of three museum exhibitions from 1982, 1994 and 1995 draws attention to the limited acknowledgement of queer heritage in Australia, a point he suggests has to do with queerness being at odds with
Australian ideals about good citizenship embodied in such constructs as ‘the ANZAC’ and the ‘Aussie Battler.’ In detailing the conflict that ensued the opening of each exhibition, Vu questions the role of museums in relation to Elaine Heumann Gurian’s (2006: 99) view that ‘museums should become safe spaces for unsafe ideas’.

Vu’s paper brings to the fore how the recognition and celebration of diversity can generate conflict. Recent heritage scholarship reminds us that heritage ‘is both enmeshed in, and constituted by, complex entangled and contradictory processes’ and it is therefore reasonable to expect a level of conflict with the recognition of diversity (Winter 2013: 536). Yet a significant issue facing emerging professionals who are perhaps more forward-looking and future-orientated, is that despite recognition of a certain level of contestability and diversity in ideas about cultural heritage, Australia’s heritage management systems continue to work through a legal framework of protection attached to the structures of the nation and the state that is generally based in the past tense (Byrne 2008; Ireland & Blair 2015). Practical heritage management in Australia requires certainty across such tools as ‘statements of significance’ which are adopted and applied through formal processes and are generally fixed for long periods without much room for change (Buckley, Cooke & Fayad 2016). And while statements of significance have become ever more inclusive, they are still part of a system that generally does not know how to manage contested heritage values (Bashta this issue).

Sian Mitchell is a Senior Lecturer in film at SAE Creative Media Institute and a recent graduate from Deakin University’s Master of Cultural Heritage course. Her paper combines her two areas of expertise by examining a history of Indigenous heritage in Australian film. Sian charts how Indigenous Australians were historically recognised through a European colonial lens as being objects of scientific and ethnographic inquiry and how this has changed in contemporary film exhibitions at the Australian Centre for the Moving Image (ACMI). The exhibitions at ACMI were developed by Indigenous filmmakers to investigate Indigenous media representation and its role in the shaping of Aboriginal cultural identity. Through a compassionate investigation of the power of film to move audiences and to challenge their value systems, Sian uses the exhibitions to delve into a discussion on memory, conflict and storytelling.

Sian locates her paper within the wider context of Indigenous heritage management, noting that there can be instances where non-Indigenous heritage managers restrict Indigenous heritage to an imaginary past without a contemporary compass. The issue of restricting Indigenous heritage into a compartment that is hermetically sealed off from non-Indigenous heritage is a situation that is advocated across Australia through the state and territory legislation that recognises Indigenous and non-Indigenous heritage under separate Acts of Parliament (see Bashta, this issue). The separation of Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultural heritage can be further demarcated from natural heritage (although Indigenous is frequently construed as sitting closer to nature than non-Indigenous), so that a three-way split is common between settler/Indigenous/natural heritage values (Wallace 2015). A demarcation of this kind can be challenging for emerging professionals to work with after making the shift from academia into practice, especially if they have been studying cultural landscapes or other topics that emphasise how interactions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultures have shaped the heritage values of each.

**Emerging professionals thinking beyond the heritage frame**

In the final panel discussion of the 2013 Australia ICOMOS conference *Imagined pasts…, imagined futures*, panel chair, Sharon Sullivan asked her panelists ‘Does the practice of heritage as we know it have a future?’ Panel member, Sharon Veale suggested that ‘we are ensnared in the system of heritage, rather than in understanding and unravelling the social processes of its making’ (quoted in Sullivan 2015: 114). A way of thinking about this system of heritage is to consider it as a ‘heritage frame’—the established professionalised system of assessment, protection and management in place for heritage conservation (Wallace & Buckley 2015). The heritage frame is fixed into position by demarcations such as settler/Indigenous/nature and international/national/state/local, in addition to the dichotomies of intangible/tangible;
heritage/development; heritage/planning; academic/practitioner. The challenge for heritage managers is that the real-life situations they are faced with are more complicated than the demarcations indicate, yet the compartments continue to persist (Wallace 2015). The question of how we crack open the heritage frame is an issue that will require the future-orientated thinking of emerging professionals working in close conjunction with the experienced wisdom of ICOMITES that have been working with and subverting the frame throughout their careers.

Ireland and Blair (2015) suggest that the recognition of multiple narratives and the intangible dimension to previously valorised monuments and sites is working to shift and even de-materialise the ‘heritage frame’—a point that is picked up on by emerging professional, Fiona Shanahan. Fiona’s honours dissertation in archaeology from La Trobe University investigated the management of heritage at Second World War aviation sites, and her paper in this issue considers the idea of ‘living history’ at Coomalie, an airbase in the Northern Territory. While a number of airstrips in the Northern Territory had their infrastructure repurposed for materials for the Stuart Highway, Coomalie managed to escape this fate and the 10,000 acre landscape was purchased in 1976 by a private owner who continues to manage it today.

Fiona details how the living history of Coomalie thrives due to the efforts of the private owner to open the airbase to veterans, their descendants and members of the public, in addition to the owner permitting the continued use of Coomalie as an Australian Defence Force training ground. Fiona’s discussion also generates questioning around the functioning of the heritage frame. World War II sites are generally the remit of national or state heritage programs, yet Coomalie has been overlooked by government and an individual has stepped in to ensure that the heritage values remain. At Coomalie, we see most clearly where the might of the national heritage management movement appears to be waning and its replacement by community, family and personal forms of heritage management where the conservation of fabric is not necessarily the primary focus (Harvey 2014).

Another Second World War site, this time located in the small rural town of Cowra in New South Wales, remembers the conflict of the mass escape of Japanese prisoners of war in August 1944. In a paper on the ‘Cowra Breakout’ and the Australian and Japanese cemeteries that remain, heritage practitioner and PhD candidate Alison Starr, examines the nuances of a landscape that combines both the heritage of the victor and the heritage of the vanquished. Alison draws attention to how the Breakout does not figure within the traditional Australian war experience widely promoted as part of the heritage of a nation on the side of the victor. She also suggests that the presence of the Japanese human remains buried in Australian soil has supported postwar reconciliation and diplomatic relations between the two countries.

**Emerging professionals and the future of cultural heritage management**

The papers in this issue demonstrate a common ease on the part of the authors to move between heritage ideas and management, with their papers not so much beginning with the problem of the need to maintain a tangible heritage object, but using the heritage fabric to inform their discussions on the wider issues that stand out to them as emerging professionals in the present. Mirjana Ristic is a graduate from the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Belgrade, Serbia, and she completed her PhD at the University of Melbourne in 2012, where she has been lecturing before taking up a Humboldt Postdoctoral Research Fellowship at the Technical University of Berlin in March 2016. Mirjana, like many of the authors in this issue, has worked and studied all around the world, and her scholarship is sensitive to the complex interplays that are taking place internationally as a result of the diasporic, transnational and cyber-cohesive twenty-first century (Fairclough et al. 2008). Mirjana’s paper in this issue examines Berlin, Germany—after the fall of the Wall. In particular, she investigates three urban sites to discuss how Berlin’s recent architecture and urban design in the vicinity of the ‘death strip’ reveals the Cold War history of the city. A key part of Mirjana’s discussion is her questioning around how Berlin should handle the trauma associated with whether to remember or to forget the atrocities experienced by all those caught attempting to cross from East to West Berlin between 1961 and 1989. Most significantly, she encourages the reader to
consider that the void where the Berlin Wall once stood is perhaps just as significant as the fragments of the wall that remain.

The final author, Michelle Bashta, is the lead organiser of the ‘Conflict and Compassion’ symposium, in addition to being the joint guest editor of this issue. Michelle recently completed a Master of Cultural Heritage at Deakin University and now works for Lovell Chen Architects and Heritage Consultants in Melbourne. After making this recent shift, Michelle was interested for this editorial to highlight just how different the workplace is from university. Michelle suggests that the difference is most apparent when a problem faced at university results in a trip to the library to find material to read up on. In contrast, a problem faced in the workplace of a heritage organisation or consultancy, is more-often-than-not under such time constraints that reading is a luxury and the way through the problem generally involves returning to an approach that worked in the past, and applying this template to the current issue. Is this approach limiting the ability of heritage professionals to innovate? And should it continue to be the way of the future?

We suggest that heritage management in Australia would benefit from robust and sustained partnerships between universities, heritage consultancies and heritage management organisations to support true collaborations. Collaboration needs to begin from the heritage issue, work through reporting and management planning, through testing in the practical realm, and it needs to return to the reporting to make any adjustments required from the learnings of the practical application. Michelle and I are not alone in our thinking—public consultation closed at the end of June 2016 for an Australian Research Council (ARC) Engagement and Impact Assessment Consultation Paper that is examining how Australian universities are translating their research into economic, social and other benefits, and how they are also collaborating with industry and other end-users of research (ARC 2016). We look forward to the release of this consultation paper and hope that its findings might support our recommendation for a more cyclical heritage management approach.

Michelle concludes this issue of Historic Environment with an urban heritage case study that provides evidence for why universities, heritage consultancies and heritage management organisations need to be joining forces to come up with solutions. The Sunbury Rings cultural landscape in the wider metropolitan Melbourne area contains a number of significant features that demonstrate the history of the Sunbury area and the relationship between people and the land. Yet Michelle argues that landscape protection is falling short in places like Sunbury, which are facing rapid urban expansion. As urbanisation occurs in formerly rural areas, the significance of cultural landscapes is being steadily eroded due to the lack of effective management tools. Michelle takes a more nuanced approach than simply painting ‘development’ as the negative factor, and instead suggests that the management tools are not yet sufficient to competently manage landscapes in relation to urban development. She details that the management of the Sunbury Rings poses many challenges associated with reconciling the tensions between management by the Traditional Owners, the ongoing use of the land for farming, and efforts to rehabilitate the wetlands. Michelle contends that effective landscape management should recognise these tensions, as well as their significant connections, and incorporate them into ongoing management of the Sunbury Rings. Michelle provides the example of the work that is currently being undertaken by the City of Ballarat to proactively manage their growing urban environment as a new direction for urban heritage management to move into.

**Conclusion and recommendations**

If we return again to the Australia ICOMOS 2013 conference, Imagined pasts..., imagined futures, the following questions were addressed:

> So what is ‘best practice’ in a changing world? How can new ideas come forward without losing the benefits of hard-won gains? One delegate expressed it as: ‘Retain the best of the ‘old school’ approach while moving into the future with new ideas and technologies and approaches which are attractive to the young.’ (Johnston 2015: 99)
This issue of *Historic Environment* does not seek to destabilise the significant achievements of Australia ICOMOS to date, nor the achievements of its more longstanding members. What the issue aims to do is to draw attention to the thoughts and opinions of a selection of emerging professionals and to use their scholarship to highlight the possibilities for heritage management in the futures that they will be a part of. This collection of papers by emerging professionals also draws attention to the current membership of Australia ICOMOS and explores ways of supporting the sustainability of the organisation. This editorial suggests (with the support of Lennon in this issue) that Australia ICOMOS will prosper as an organisation the more that emerging professionals engage with mentors and knowledgeable ICOMOS members through interactions that are multi-directional. For Australia ICOMOS to continue to foster its strategic direction to support a broad-based membership, it needs to ensure that there is an organisational willingness to continue to support initiatives such as the mentoring program, which entices emerging and more experienced professionals to engage in robust debates in a safe professional environment. Emerging professionals (especially those at university) can do with some encouragement to connect with mentors, they could also use support to network and they could benefit from opportunities to interact with their peers. A starting point for peer-to-peer networking for emerging professionals connected to Australia ICOMOS might involve joining the already established Facebook and Twitter community of GLAMR New Professionals. Rather than instigating our own emerging professionals online community, there is scope to see if ‘GLAMR’ is interested to grow into ‘GLAMHR’, which would support emerging museum and heritage professionals to network with others working across galleries, libraries, archives, and records sectors. The key for this and any future initiatives will be ensuring that the commitment of Australia ICOMOS to supporting emerging professionals is recognised as part of the organisation’s strategic plan. A centralised approach through the guiding documents of Australia ICOMOS is the most sustainable model for the future in conjunction with enabling emerging professional members of Australia ICOMOS to feel allowed/empowered to engage with the status quo of cultural heritage management so that Australia ICOMOS might retain the best of the ‘old school approach’ while moving into the future with new ideas and technologies.
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