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Abstract

The 1992 adoption of ‘cultural landscape’ as an additional type of recognition on the World Heritage List was supposed to be a ground-breaking moment for heritage management in Australia and New Zealand, as both countries had pushed for the recognition of continuing and associative landscapes to change the perceptions and practices of heritage. Yet fast-forward to 2015, and one might be left wondering what happened? While there is no longer a need to convince people of the value of cultural landscapes for heritage management, the incorporation of cultural landscape ideas and practices into our property-based ‘heritage frame’ with its preoccupation with land use and development controls appears to have stalled. At the same time, a growing community of heritage studies scholars are critical of heritage practice, and position cultural landscapes as an initiative that the World Heritage system was ‘forced’ to adopt in order ‘to incorporate a broader range of values around heritage’ (Harrison 2013: 115). This critique of the under-theorised heritage field has had some stimulating effects, but falls short of providing guidance for practitioners. To consider the aspirations and directions for the future for cultural landscapes within heritage practices, this paper suggests that we need to look at heritage theory and practice together, focussing on innovation wherever we find it, and develop further theorisation through our experiences. We suggest that innovation can come from local settings away from more formalised heritage processes, where communities, practitioners, managers and researchers are trying new things as a result of their encounters with cultural landscapes, and where they are learning and ‘knowing-by-doing’.

Introduction

In the context of the broad and globalised field of heritage management, there are multiple futures for cultural landscapes – for cultural landscape concepts, for cultural landscape debates, and for the peopled landscapes themselves. In this paper, we consider the possibilities for a new future for cultural landscapes, and we argue that a future focus is necessary to build and adapt systems in the present. After twenty years of successful awareness-raising about the possibilities for incorporating cultural landscapes into heritage management, there is now an opportunity to re-cast the agenda and focus on new priorities. In this paper, we draw on our experiences of encountering the heritage work of communities in landscapes, as well as the developing dialogue about the theoretical underpinnings of the emerging inter-disciplinary field of heritage studies. To be clear in our discussions of the cultural landscapes achievements so far, and the gaps and potential futures, we distinguish between several interrelated perspectives that will inform an improved utility. ‘Cultural landscapes for heritage management’ is an overarching descriptor for the processes of how the thinking about cultural landscapes has
been translated into the practical realm of heritage management. It encompasses ‘cultural landscape ideas’ which are developed for engagement with the ‘heritage frame’ – or, the well-established professionalised systems of assessment, protection and management in place for heritage conservation. These ideas can include concepts which are embedded (consciously or unconsciously) in theory drawn from a range of disciplines in the social and natural sciences, and they provide the basis for ‘cultural landscape practices’. These practices involve the application and/or the performance of the ‘cultural landscape ideas’ and are usually determined by the heritage frame in which they are employed. We also identify ‘cultural landscape purposes’ which are informed by social context and power relations, and are therefore always political and contested.

We have selected two case studies to help illustrate our suggested directions for the future of cultural landscapes for heritage management. Yet before we move onto the detail of the case studies, we will first locate ourselves theoretically, and then we will take stock of the achievements and challenges that cultural landscapes for heritage management have faced to date.

**How heritage theory can assist us with imagining a new future for cultural landscapes**

Academics in the field of heritage studies, particularly those working within ‘critical heritage studies’ are arguing for a greater attention to theory in order to make sense of what heritage encompasses, and how it is being employed in the twenty-first century (Baird 2013, Harrison 2013, 2015; Smith, L 2000, 2006, 2008, 2013; Tunbridge et al. 2013; Waterton 2014; Waterton, Smith & Campbell 2006). We do not resist this call, although we additionally seek to move away from a theory/practice duality, in order to promote a new future for cultural landscapes that comes from approaches that join up theory and practice through ‘knowing-by-doing and practical forms of intelligence’ which are ‘lightly flecked with insights from theory’ (Merriman et al. 2008: 197). Like us, Emma Waterton and Steve Watson (2013) are imagining a new future – for them, it is a ‘critical imagination in heritage theory’. Waterton and Watson want to use a broader range of theory to rework the field of heritage studies in a way that:

advances not only the study of heritage, but the very nature of that enquiry itself, by reformulating our scope, looking beyond our field of study and reinvigorating our methods. This will give us an agenda and the forward momentum we need to explore the meanings of heritage in its encounters and its moments of engagement, and to map its intensities in a wider cultural world. (Waterton & Watson 2013: 558)

In explaining how to build their ‘critical imagination in heritage studies’, Waterton and Watson contend that there have been ‘theories in’, ‘theories of’, and ‘theories for heritage’ (Waterton & Watson 2013: 548-51 authors’ emphasis). In this paper, we explore how Waterton and Watson’s three types of theories can be used to assist us in determining how cultural landscapes for heritage management have been understood and employed, and to help project how cultural landscapes for heritage management might be employed in the future.

- **Theories in heritage** incorporate conceptions of ‘best practices’ in relation to caring for and managing the ‘objects’ of heritage. Here, the emphasis is often on caring for tangible characteristics (or attributes), and can include assumptions around the intrinsic values of these objects/artefacts. This kind of theorisation has informed what we have termed the ‘cultural landscape ideas’ and ‘cultural landscape practices’, both of which are influenced by a narrow ‘heritage frame’.

- **Theories of heritage** are to do with heritage as an industry or cultural phenomenon, which has moved our thinking about heritage away from a focus on objects towards social and cultural contexts and significances. In our scheme, this type of theorisation can open up ‘cultural landscape ideas’ to generate broader ‘cultural landscape practices’ which take into account ‘cultural landscape purposes’. This theorisation reinvestigates taken-for-granted meanings of heritage in relation to changing social attitudes and is useful for examining the heritage frame itself.
• Theories for heritage examine what happens to people’s bodies, and involve a more self-reflexive consideration of personal heritage experiences. This perspective contends that there needs to be further investigation of people’s engagements with heritage that exceeds distinctions between heritage objects and cultures. This theorisation encourages further investigation into what ‘cultural landscape practices’ encompasses and it supports a deeper awareness that requires heritage theory and practice to work more intuitively together.

We suggest that Waterton and Watson’s ‘theories in’, ‘theories of’ and ‘theories for heritage’ are well documented across the wider history of ‘cultural landscape ideas’. Conceptualisations of cultural landscapes (mainly within the discipline of cultural geography) began as material transformation of the natural landscape (Hoskins 1955; Jackson, JB 1984; Sauer 1925). A ‘cultural turn’ shifted the focus to the inner dimensions of culture – the power, political and economic factors (Daniels & Cosgrove 1988; Jackson, P 1989; Mitchell 2000; Olwig 1993); and the current focus has moved to consider ways of thinking about cultural landscapes as embodied, dynamic relationships between people and their surroundings (Merriman et al. 2008; Waterton 2013, 2014; Wylie 2007, 2013). It is within this more recent arena – in the ‘theories for heritage’, where we believe further empirical studies are required, which can further inform theory. Canadian heritage thinker and practitioner, Julian Smith (2013: 49), contends that people can no longer be ‘objective observers’ of heritage, and instead they should be ‘engaged participants’. Smith (2013: 56) contends that ‘conservation of landscapes in this postmodern context requires an increasingly ecological approach... [that] not only embraces cultural as well as natural systems, but also puts the physical landscape within a larger cultural, social, economic and political landscape.’ Australians Denis Byrne, Sally Brockwell and Sue O’Connor (2013: 4) get closer to what this ecological ‘cultural landscape idea’ might mean for ‘cultural landscape practices’, by acknowledging that the habit of binary thinking in heritage management ‘makes it difficult to grasp and assimilate the notion of ecological relations and the dialectical entanglement of humans and non-humans in nature.’ They suggest that a ‘mediating’ step is required before we can achieve an ‘ecological approach’ for cultural landscapes for heritage management. These authors argue that the challenge for cultural heritage practitioners is to make culture ‘legible’ to those whose brief is nature conservation. They go onto suggest that it is not enough to simply get cultural heritage sites and contemporary human land use patterns mapped alongside soils, vegetation, and non-human species, but that culture needs to be represented as integral to the ecology of an area. Byrne, Brockwell and O’Connor (2013: 5) conclude that ‘such a mediating discourse might be described as mapping culture into landscape rather than onto it.’

It is at this point we need to emphasise that our ability to imagine a new future for cultural landscapes for heritage management – one which is directed by an ‘ecological approach’ and ideas which ‘map culture into landscape’, has been heavily informed by the considerable work that has already been undertaken within the realm of cultural landscapes for heritage management. It is therefore important to quickly acknowledge some of the cultural landscape achievements, as well as discussing the challenges encountered, which have informed our thinking to date.

Taking stock: recognising cultural landscape achievements

The introduction of cultural landscapes into the World Heritage field made people aware that sites are not isolated islands, but that they have to be seen in the ecological system and with their cultural linkages in time and space beyond single monuments and strict nature reserves. The concept is therefore exemplary for the evolution in protected area thinking and heritage conservation as a whole. (Rössler 2006: 340)

We locate the 1992 World Heritage Committee adoption of ‘cultural landscape’ as an additional avenue of World Heritage recognition as a milestone in the growing awareness and acceptance of cultural landscapes for heritage management. As others have observed, the World Heritage system has had multiple influences on the dissemination and acceptance of cultural landscape ideas (Alanen & Melnick 2000; Aplin 2007; Cameron & Rössler 2013; Fowler 2000; Gfeller
The three World Heritage categories of ‘designed’, ‘organically evolved’ and ‘associative’ landscapes have experienced widespread application in national heritage systems, including in Australia and in our region (Heritage Victoria 2015; Lennon 1997; McBryde 1997; Reeves & McConville 2011; Taylor 1994; Taylor & Tallents 1996). To an extent, this acceptance has been built on a consensus about the appeal of Carl Sauer’s conceptualisation of cultural landscapes. According to Sauer, to examine the ‘morphology of the landscape’ was to observe physical forms such as built structures, settlement and land-use patterns, with Sauer best known for his assessment that: ‘the cultural landscape is fashioned out of a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area the medium, the cultural landscape the result’ (Sauer 1925: 46). Sauer’s work is attractive, embraceable, and able to be incorporated into the heritage frame without challenging the frame’s scientific and positivist underpinnings.

In addition, there has been slow progress toward the bridging of nature and culture, particularly in relation to Indigenous heritage in settler societies, where the intangible dimensions of the World Heritage associative landscape category has provided space to acknowledge Indigenous connections and cultural perspectives, and to allow people to be in/be a part of the landscape in general (Andrews & Buggey 2012; Kawharu 2009; Krupnik, Mason & Buggey 2004; McBryde 2000; Prosper 2007). In many cases, Indigenous peoples have indicated that cultural landscapes are more compatible with their cultural perspectives and cosmologies, and in general, it seems that cultural landscapes ‘ideas’, ‘purposes’ and ‘practices’ are opening the way for more holistic and people-centred conceptions of heritage (Brown 2012; Head 2010). Cultural landscape ideas have created new spaces for representation and visibility, and they have allowed newer and more complex places to be considered as heritage.

Taking stock: the challenges for cultural landscapes ahead

Despite the recognition and the adoption of the concept of cultural landscapes in Australia, better management of the cultural values in natural areas has not resulted except for some Indigenous managed areas of which Uluru, recognised as having universal associative cultural values, is the international showcase. (Lennon 2005b: 18)

Acknowledging that there are continuing points of tension and uncertainty does not diminish the importance of the achievements that have been made. However, our observation is that the dialogue on cultural landscapes for heritage management is stuck and that the earlier momentum for innovation is waning. Discussion of the historical and theoretical development of cultural landscapes, the definitions, categories and key elements of the conceptual frameworks, and cases that extol the benefits of cultural landscapes for heritage management, are now commonplace. While this familiarity is a sign of achievement, we are wondering how to break into the next steps in this dialogue, how to find new ideas at the numerous cultural landscape themed symposia that we attend, instead of relying on what we already know as topic enough for discussion.

We consider that within the heritage discipline, we have been anchored to the evocative language and ideas initially proposed by Sauer in 1925, or revisiting the Berkeley School text of 1979 (Meinig 1979). As a consequence, heritage studies has lost pace when viewed alongside other disciplines such as cultural geography, environmental sciences, cultural studies and anthropology in their investigation and experimentations with landscape ideas. A further significant issue that we have identified, particularly for settler societies, is the struggle to incorporate broader cultural landscape ideas and practices into our property-based heritage
frames, which are preoccupied with land use and development controls, and therefore under-done in relation to intangible aspects.

To visualise what we mean by this ‘heritage frame’ and how it works, we have thought about the toys for young children, where different shaped objects can only be slotted into the correspondingly-shaped hole. Using this visual analogy, we consider that cultural landscapes can often be a complicated shape, and that no matter how hard we try, it is extremely difficult to force cultural landscapes ideas, practices and purposes into standardised heritage shapes.

Against the backdrop of these recognised achievements, it is also surprising to note that after setting the scene globally in the early 1990s, neither Australia nor New Zealand has achieved any further World Heritage inscriptions of cultural landscapes since Tongariro and Uluru-Kata Tjuta national parks were each re-inscribed as associative cultural landscapes (although there are current projects underway in Australia that could result in cultural landscape nominations).

We also add to the list of issues a disconnected heritage field, one where the ideal of multi-disciplinary (or inter-disciplinary) work is not always possible, where resources are increasingly skewed toward compliance-oriented impact assessments that precede new developments or changes of land use, one where practitioners increasingly feel disassociated from their academic peers. Our sense is that there may be a hesitancy to move away from the well-established cultural landscape ideas and practices as a result of these factors, and that this has slowed down the progress experienced in the 1990s. To assist us to recast the cultural landscapes agenda so that we can focus on new priorities such as the uptake of an ‘ecological approach’ and ideas which ‘map culture into landscape’ as we introduced earlier in this paper, we are promoting the mantra of ‘knowing-by-doing’.

‘Knowing-by-doing’

But sometimes the knowledge of the scholar is a bit hard to understand because it does not match up with our experience of things. In other words, knowledge and experience do not necessarily speak the same language. But isn’t the knowledge that comes from experience more valuable than the knowledge that doesn’t? It seems fairly obvious to some of us that a lot of scholars need to go outside and sniff around – walk through the grass, talk to the animals. That sort of thing. (Hoff 1982: 28-9)

Geographer, Hayden Lorimer, contends that those who actually encounter landscapes, the ones who are engaging with and paying attention to the ‘minute particulars’, are well placed to gain insights about the possibilities for future understanding and growth. This ‘make-do’ approach can generate fertile results, suggests Lorimer (in Merriman et al. 2008: 197-8), but at the same time it can also lack the rigour and agenda that is considered essential by theorists for advancing conceptual frameworks that can guide practice. We therefore emphasise the necessity for reflexivity, where we reconsider the ideas as we go about ‘knowing-by-doing’.

To illustrate what we mean, we have been collecting case studies where we believe reflexive learning is possible. We present two case studies here which illustrate innovation in local contexts. These examples are sometimes conducted under the banner of heritage, but they do not rely on it, and some do not explicitly use or apply the heritage frame at all. The case studies show that significant leadership and new direction can come from local solution-finding, and that neither the ‘top-down’ or ‘bottom-up’ ideas of innovation will suffice on their own.
Case study one: Ōhau River Loop Revitalisation, Te Hākari Dune Wetland and Manaaki Taha Moana, Horowhenua, New Zealand

The Horowhenua district is located on the lower west coast of New Zealand’s North Island. It is an area once known for its dense forests full of native birds, and waterways populated with fish and shellfish. Yet the close vicinity of the Horowhenua, to what became New Zealand’s capital city of Wellington, has put a strain on the environment. The coastal plains of the Horowhenua have been increasingly cleared for pastoralism, particularly dairying, and in more recent times, people are choosing to swap crowded Wellington city living for the space of sub-divided lifestyle blocks on the Horowhenua coast (Smith 2007).

A constant in all of this change has been the occupation of the Horowhenua coast by numerous Māori hapū and iwi (families and larger tribal groups), along with several Pākehā (non-Māori) families, who have owned and farmed land in the region for generations, and who have watched and lamented the declining health of their surroundings. The drainage of large dune lakes and wetland systems for more intensive farming has placed a particular strain on the land, with effluent polluting waterways and decimating the once abundant food resources (Smith pers comm 18/04/2013).

The discontent in relation to the degradation was such that by 2000 the hapū of Ngāti Tukorehe, along with the tribe’s farming enterprise Tahamata Incorporation, realised that while they could not turn back time, they could address some of the more negative consequences of the human transformation of their surrounds. Their first project was to tackle the issues around the Ōhau River Loop, which had its flow adjusted and controlled by farmers so that the water was no longer saline, but only fresh water for stock. Ngāti Tukorehe have worked to return the water-way to be open to the tidal flow from the sea, and have installed a fish friendly floodgate (Smith pers comm 18/04/2013).

The Te Hākari Dune Wetland Restoration Project is a connected initiative in the same area involving Ngāti Tukorehe hapu, a local nursery, and Nga Whenua Rahui – an arm of the New Zealand Department of Conservation (DOC), which exists to facilitate the voluntary protection of ecosystems on Māori-owned land throughout New Zealand (DOC nd-a). The Te Hākari project involved practical components – plantings, fence and weir building, while at the same time, the Te Iwi o Ngāti Tukorehe Trust worked to digitally archive oral histories of kaumātua (elders) about the biodiversity, their family histories and their connections to the area. The Te Hākari project created an extensive file of aerial photographs, worked to regenerate
native flaxes for weaving, restore eel populations, and to establish a training programme inclusive of hikoi (walks) on the land with kaumātua, young people and other interested community partners (DOC nd-b). The Te Hākari project took an overarching approach, looking at how Māori and non-Māori had known the land over generations, and how this knowledge might assist with lessening the current degradation. It was about revitalising the ecological, cultural and spiritual values of an area which is considered important to the community that lives there. This initiative also led to a covenant being placed over the dune wetland area under the Conservation Act 1987 (Smith pers comm 18/04/2013).

Both the Ōhau River Loop and Te Hākari projects have since spurred a larger collaborative research project, Manaaki Taha Moana, which is funded by New Zealand’s Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. It involves Taiao Raukawa which is the environmental team within Ngāti Tukorehe; Waka digital – a Māori-led spatial IT firm; Massey University School of People Environment and Planning; and the Cawthron Institute – a corporate research centre (see http://www.mtm.ac.nz/). Researchers from the different teams collaborate following an action research approach to undertake such activities as measuring the decline of shellfish populations and analysing how this has been impacting on iwi and hapū (Smith pers comm 18 April 2013).

Huhana Smith made the comment that all of these connected projects address the human and environmental well-being connections, and follow the belief that if there is enhanced mauri (life force) within waterways and within whenua (land), you have enhanced people (Smith pers comm 18 April 2013).

Points of Innovation

This is part of a growing number of case studies, where impressive innovation and outcomes are occurring through natural resource management programs that are working around the nature-culture binary. While this case study concerns three connected biodiversity research projects, each is also grounded in cultural landscapes for heritage management, in that the management issues take into account the importance of the land and water in terms of cultural identity, ancestral connections, and resource use rights. The projects all recognise that conservation of the environment involves more than looking after ‘nature’ in isolation. Here we see that the Ngāti Tukorehe approach is founded upon mapping people ‘into the landscape’ and ensuring that culture is recognised as being integral to the ecology of the area. Ngāti Tukorehe are leading the project, while keeping it open to interested communities, including farmers, who might also have deep connections with the landscape. Such programs can provide many useful perspectives, but for the purposes of this paper, they suggest that critical heritage studies and the heritage frame (based to an extent on the needs of the built environment) need to engage with sustainability and ecosystems approaches.

Case study two: The Landscape of Grand Pré, Nova Scotia, Canada

Grand Pré, meaning great meadow or great field, was named by French (Acadian) settlers to Canada in the 1680s (Rivet 2011). It is located on the shores of the Bay of Fundy in Nova Scotia, and is recognised for its extensive system of dykes and aboiteaux – sluice structures to allow fresh water to run off the salt marshes, while preventing salt water from entering at high tide (Rivet 2011: xv). The dykes and aboiteaux are organised across the marshlands to create arable farmland in an area of extreme tidal ranges. In addition to the sophisticated farming techniques, Grand Pré is commemorated as an ‘Acadian homeland’ (Rivet 2011; Surette-Draper pers comm 27/03/2013). The French Acadians are one of the first people of European descent to settle on the harsh North American Atlantic coastline, with the landscape of Grand Pré being ‘directly associated with the emergence of their new identity in this new land’ (Rivet 2011: x). Yet a territorial dispute erupted between the Acadians and a group of English Protestant settlers which led to numerous violent encounters and culminated in the forced removal and deportation of more than 14,000 Acadians from Grand Pré and surrounding areas between 1755-1762 (Rivet 2011: 41-2). Thereafter, the English Protestant settlers, known as the ‘New England Planters’, were attracted by the British government to take up the Grand Pré agricultural
district from 1760. The New England Planters took over the Acadian pattern of settlement and farming, expanding and collectively maintaining the dykelands established by the first Acadians (Rivet 2011). Acadians have since been returning to Grand Pré as a place of pilgrimage, with memorials and monuments being established over the years to mark the historic dislocation from their ‘homeland’.

Despite the economic, political, military, and social changes that have swept the region, Grand Pré retains the pattern of a linear, dispersed, and low-density settlement established by the first Acadians settlers in the 17th century (Rivet 2011: 14-5). Recognising the significance of their heritage, the contemporary communities of Grand Pré rallied together to seek World Heritage status in 2007. The bid for World Heritage was prepared over three years and it included the development of the ‘Grand Pré and Area Community Plan 2008’ which set out to ‘reflect the vision that the community has for its future in a landscape of great environmental, cultural, and historical significance’ (Municipality of the County of Kings 2011). What makes the community plan significant, is that it was compiled in the initial stages of the preparation of the World Heritage nomination, illustrating the essential stake that the local communities have in the recognition of the heritage values of Grand Pré. The central place of the community plan, alongside the more routine management plan, and commitment from government authorities for future protection of the area illustrates the key role of local communities in directing heritage processes.

The overarching coordination of the various Grand Pré public authorities, provincial groups and local residents has been impressive considering that these include: Parks Canada as manager of the Grand Pré National Historic Site of Canada; the Government of Nova Scotia; the Municipality of the County of Kings; the Kings Regional Development Agency; la Société Natonale de l’Acadie; the Grand Pré and Area Community Association; la Société Promotion Grand-Pré and the Grand Pré Marsh Body. ICOMOS noted as part of its technical evaluation report on the World Heritage nomination that it ‘considers that the property benefits from an exceptional level of involvement by local communities and the Acadian community in the property’s management and conservation’ (ICOMOS 2012: 196).

A tour with Susan Surette-Draper, from Les Amis de Grand Pré in March 2013, revealed that the various communities were able to work together because they all shared a common wish to conserve the Landscape of Grand Pré for the future. She suggested that the negative impacts of global warming were an issue that spurred community members to put aside their differences. This issue was also noted in the decision taken by the World Heritage Committee to inscribe Grand Pré on the World Heritage List, which noted concern around coastal instability and the possibility of wind farm projects being developed in the maritime and coastal environment that could adversely affect the Landscape of Grand Pré (UNESCO 2012).

The ‘Landscape of Grand Pré’ was successfully inscribed on the World Heritage List in July 2012.
as a cultural landscape on the basis of criteria (v) and (vi) in recognition of the dykes, aboiteaux and drainage network established by the Acadians in the 17th century and still in use today; and also the recognises Grand Pré as an iconic place of remembrance central to the Acadian diaspora (UNESCO 2012).

Since the World Heritage inscription, the Landscape of Grand Pré World Heritage Site Stewardship Board of the former Kings Regional Development Authority, the group responsible for bringing the many Grand Pré communities together, was replaced by the Landscape of Grand Pré Society in May 2013. The Society has a Board of Directors (The Stewardship Board) composed of organisations with jurisdiction and/or primary interest in some part of the Landscape of Grand Pré and it continues to facilitate information sharing and partnerships. The Stewardship Board has regular board meetings which are open to the public, and it sends out newsletters inviting the communities to be a part of initiatives undertaken to implement the World Heritage commitments for the Landscape of Grand Pré (Landscape of Grand Pré Society nd).

**Points of Innovation**

Grand Pré provides an example where cultural landscapes for heritage management have been developed through a focus on community history and identity. Although strategically orientated at international World Heritage recognition, local processes have sustained management of the landscape of Grand Pré set in place by the first Acadians in the 1680s. Clearly, the Acadian community sought to validate its own history and contemporary identity via the ‘heritage frame’ – in this case, World Heritage. The community and management plans developed for Grand Pré – through collaboration between community groups, Parks Canada and municipal government authorities are unusually well-articulated from a cultural landscape perspective, and provide a practical basis for addressing the complex pressures that affect the landscape, particularly in relation to coastal management issues. The Grand Pré communities have also used World Heritage status to unite their many voices and designs for future management under a shared vision.

**Conclusions**

Earlier in this paper we asserted that the momentum in the dialogue on cultural landscapes for heritage management has slowed, and that the conversation is becoming predictable because there is a tendency for cultural landscape ideas and practices to become too tightly framed within existing heritage management systems. The two case studies we have described are only two of many, but they demonstrate that communities are working things out for themselves (often with the support of heritage practitioners, land managers and government authorities), and they are experimenting and ‘knowing-by-doing’. In these local circumstances we find innovation, creativity and improved outcomes for heritage management. Transferring the learning from these locally-derived innovations into our regulated heritage frame will require some letting go, some looking around, and some listening.

It is our view that we need a heritage studies discipline that is centrally and almost unconsciously built around cultural landscape ‘ideas’, ‘practices’ and ‘purposes’, which are ‘built-in’ rather
than new points which require constant reinforcement and promotion. In other words, we are promoting a future where we no longer need to define, justify and illustrate the benefits of cultural landscapes because they are already entrenched in the ways that we consider heritage management. Because there are ever-expanding groups of relevant voices and practices, there cannot be a single road map or perfect recipe for a new future for cultural landscapes. Nevertheless, we are interested to identify the following three broad components as being necessary to recast the agenda on cultural landscapes for heritage management for the future:

1. **The drive towards standardising and codifying is not the way to go, template tools are not working, and the ‘heritage frame’ is not all-encompassing**

   We can keep trying to force cultural landscapes into the ‘heritage frame’ – the systems of classification, thresholds and decision making that have been developed, but there are diminishing returns. All of the issues that we have outlined which are currently challenging the incorporation of cultural landscapes into heritage management suggest that perhaps we should take an unconventional approach. In our view, part of the problem is the drive to create templates and consistent applications. Some systems of formal recognition of cultural landscapes for heritage management are needed, yet we do not need simplifying templates or strongly codified guidelines that are not open to diverse circumstances. We should not aim for formulaic outcomes to investigations of cultural landscapes for heritage management, and therefore prefer arrangements that both orient and open the possibilities. At this stage, we need both high-level commitment, and also a tolerance for some diversity in implementation.

2. **Reflexive practice is essential – and we need to find innovation wherever we can**

   Our recognition of the cultural landscape achievements to date, in addition to the two case studies that we have presented, can only hint at the breadth and depth of the initiatives that are occurring, where cultural landscapes for heritage management are being ‘built in’ to methodologies for cultural and natural heritage conservation. The Grand Pré case study is one where communities have selected and strategically used the ‘heritage frame’ in order to achieve desired outcomes; whereas the New Zealand case study demonstrates that some of the initiatives are happening outside of what we recognise to be the traditional heritage frame.

3. **We need to get past the growing gulf between heritage practice and theory**

   If we are serious about reinvigorating the way that heritage is managed, then we need to pay attention to what is happening around us, and work together – practitioners, academics, colleagues from other disciplines, and communities. Some of these groups might have to shift their positions to achieve this – for example, practitioners might need to be open to new ideas, and scholars might need to offer more constructive ways forward, rather than only critically describing the adverse outcomes of the heritage frames currently in place. Nevertheless, each of these groups needs to embrace the potential of joining up theory and practice through ‘knowing-by-doing, where theorisation is fed into practice, and from practice back into theory. A new future for cultural landscapes for heritage management that engages with theory and practice in such a manner will generate an intuitive dialogue that exists across binaries, and which is bold enough to reinvigorate our cultural landscape ‘ideas’, ‘practices’ and ‘purposes’, and provide us with a momentum to reformulate how we approach heritage management looking to the future.
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