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THESIS

ABSTRACT
The Thesis is a major component of my overall PhD project (the Project), which includes the associated Exegesis: Negotiation in Process. The Project is an interdisciplinary and cross-cultural investigation of shared management of landscapes that considers the integration of cultural and natural heritage management. The aim of the research is to propose a management model to address failures in the sustainability and effectiveness of shared management partnerships, manifest in damage to both the heritage and historic fabric. The Thesis case studies are the Australian World Heritage sites of Uluru-Kata Tjuṯa National Park, Purnululu National Park and Reserve, and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.

The research reveals that within Australia, the approach to managing the relationship of culture and nature within a landscape is dominated by the outmoded Western dualist model that manifests in the separation of the management of cultural and natural heritage, whilst simultaneously separating historic fabric and heritage management. This model is in stark contrast to the Australian traditional Aboriginal partners approach of managing landscapes as ‘Country’, which recognizes the symbiosis and integration of culture and nature.

The Thesis provides evidence for a new landscape management model integrating the management of Culture, Nature and Art (CNA) focused on the intangible of heritage as the primary driver of policy development and management delivery. In engaging with CNA simultaneously the Western dualist model is shifted closer to the holistic traditional Aboriginal perspective of ‘Country’.
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Chapter One: Introduction

The Thesis is a component of my overall PhD research project (the Project), which includes the associated visual practice research *Exegesis: Negotiation in Process*. The Project involves the investigation and review of the process of landscape governance and management within the field of cross cultural and interdisciplinary research. The research methodology is conducted through the investigation of theoretical landscape management concepts and applying them to the management of culture and nature at the case study sites. The scene of the Thesis research is set predominantly in large Australian landscapes where the primary shared management stakeholders are Australian governments and the local traditional Aboriginal culture. The Thesis case studies, which include large remote areas, are the Australian World Heritage landscapes of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Purnululu National Park & Reserve, and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.

Case Study Locations

![Map of Australia showing case study sites](image)

Figure 1.1: Geoscience Australia (2007). Australia Report Map
### Table 1.1 Key Case Study Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park</th>
<th>Purnululu National Park and Reserve</th>
<th>Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Inscription</td>
<td>1987: Natural Criteria (v), (vi), 1994 Cultural Criteria (vii), (viii)</td>
<td>2002: Natural Criteria (vii), (viii)</td>
<td>1982: Natural Criteria (iii), (iv), (vi) and Cultural Criteria (vii), (viii), (ix), (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Federal Legislation</td>
<td>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth) (provides a mechanism for State and Federal governments to work collaboratively across jurisdictions (refer section Legislation and Governance)).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary State and Territory Legislation</td>
<td><em>Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976 (NT)</em></td>
<td><em>CALM Act 1984 (WA)</em></td>
<td><em>National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 (Tas)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Central Australia Region of the Northern Territory.</th>
<th>Kimberley Region of Western Australia</th>
<th>Western Region of Tasmania.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (approx.)</td>
<td>132,550 hectares</td>
<td>240,000 hectares</td>
<td>1,584,000 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest major regional centre</td>
<td>Alice Springs (450km)</td>
<td>Halls Creek (110 km)</td>
<td>Less than 100km from capital of Hobart.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project engages with qualitative and quantitative research including national and international literatures reviews, interviews and visual practice. The approach to my research is also informed by personal experience in the shared management of culture and nature within the cross-cultural landscapes of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and Purnululu National Park & Reserve (Table 1.2).

Table 1.2 Candidate’s Employment at Case Study Locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Executive Officer, Nyangatjatjara Aboriginal Corporation, Alice Springs and Yulara, Northern Territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>Executive Manager (Cultural Heritage), Ayers Rock Resort, Yulara, Northern Territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>Board Secretariat, Board of Management Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Mutitjulu, Northern Territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Executive Officer (World Heritage), Purnululu National Park, Kununurra, Western Australia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the case studies the Project also considers the associated PhD field research (Table 1.3) that was conducted at other Australian landscapes including: the
Indigenous Protected Area of Nantawarrina, in South Australia; Bush Heritage Australian’s Scottsdale Reserve in New South Wales; pastoral landscape of Gundaroo in New South Wales; Kimberley region of Western Australia in addition to Purnululu National Park; and the Hobart region of Tasmania including Wellington Park and the Derwent Estuary.

Table 1.3 PhD Field Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Bush Heritage Head Office, Melbourne, Victoria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Scottsdale Reserve (Bush Heritage Australian), New South Wales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Uluru Kata Tjuṯa National Park, Northern Territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Indigenous Protected Area of Nantawarrina, South Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Purnululu National Park and surrounds, Kimberley region, Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-17</td>
<td>Tasmania, including Wellington Park, the Derwent Estuary and Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The goal of the Project research is to investigate shared landscape management that embraces cultural diversity, in a manner that delivers equity between traditional Aboriginal and Western landscape management practices. The sustainability of shared management is, for the purpose of the research, related to the ongoing resilience and functionality of the stakeholder relationship. This is distinct from perceptions of environmental sustainability, which are considered in the research to be consequential to sound policy development and management process. In the context of the Project’s shared management research the concept of sustainable management refers to the
capacity of a management process, as both policy and delivery, to maintain an effective, transparent and equitable cross cultural negotiation environment.

The point of entry into the investigation is the acknowledgement that there exists a fundamental, dynamic, co-dependence relationship between culture and nature within a landscape and between a location’s heritage and historic fabric, which requires innovative and evolving management practice. In taking this position the research opens consideration of comparisons between the holistic Aboriginal management of Country (refer to section Country of Chapter One: Introduction) and the Western dualist model of human vs nature that manages culture and nature within landscapes as separate but linked processes. My position also recognizes the vital application, within traditional Aboriginal management of Country, of artistic practice and the potential of art practice in shared management.

The term ‘heritage’, as discussed in the section Heritage of Chapter One: Introduction, considers all heritage as intangible with the term ‘historic fabric’ relating to the physicality of places, structures, objects and generally replacing the term ‘tangible heritage’. Another concept that requires clarification within the research is the term ‘management of culture and nature within a landscape’, which can be compressed into the management of Country as discussed in the section Country. The challenge of adopting the progressive terminologies of ‘heritage and historic fabric’ and ‘Country’ is that discourse within the field of landscape management, particularly related to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage inscriptions, still holds to the established terminologies of culture and nature within landscapes and heritage as intangible and tangible. The approach taken is to use the progressive terminology generally throughout the Thesis except where referencing specific documentation or presenting a particular philosophic position, which may be couched in the established terminologies. The objective of using the terminology of ‘managing culture and nature of a landscapes’ rather than ‘managing Country’ in the title of the Thesis is to provide a referencing point within the established World Heritage system.

A factor in the selection of Uluṟu-Kata Tjuṯa National Park, Purnululu National Park and Reserve, and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area as case studies was
the presence of local traditional Aboriginal cultures that are involved, to varying degrees, with shared management with Australian governments. In these locations the synergies and conflicts between the Aboriginal and Western landscape management models are investigated. The Aboriginal landscape management model, based in traditional Aboriginal cultural practice and law, is considered along with the associated practice and laws underpinning state and federal Australian government landscape management models, which are reinforced by a Western approach based in legislation, under the Australian Constitution. The interaction and potential conflict of Australian governments and Australian Aboriginal traditional laws can be demonstrated by the fundamental difference in how the landscape is mapped. James (2008) notes the different cultural approaches in the statement: *(ibid: 109)*:

> The Australian Landscape is mapped by two laws. The songlines of her Aboriginal peoples move deep beneath the surface following the dips and curves of the land itself, while the borders imposed by more recent settlers are straight lines cutting the surface of the land.

The Aboriginal approach is that of interconnection with intangible culture whilst the other approach is that of the Western scientific division for ownership. The use of the term ownership has dual meaning within the Project. When referenced to the Australian legislative system it relates to tangible property being owned and potentially sold by an individual or entity. However, when referenced to owner or ownership related to traditional Aboriginal owners of Country, there is an implication of a deep cultural sense of place connection that is intangible and outside the Australian Legislative system.

The Thesis research into landscape management broadly covers the period commencing in the early 1970s with reference to earlier colonial endeavors. The significant international event linked to the 1970s period that informs the research of governance of culture and nature within a landscape is the establishment of the 1972 *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*
In the Australian context the significant pivotal historic events include:

- **Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park**
  - The Australian declaration of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta (Ayers Rock - Mt Olga) National Park in 1977 (Director of National Parks 2010a: 14).
  - ‘Handback’ in 1985 and the subsequent leasing of the Park, by the traditional owners, to the Australian Parks and Wildlife Service for a term of 99 years. World Heritage Committee recognition of its outstanding universal values under Cultural criteria in 1994 and Natural criteria in 1987. (ibid)

- **Purnululu National Park and Conservation Reserve**
  - Park and Reserve ‘were gazetted on 6 March 1987.’ (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995: 5), followed by World Heritage Committee recognition of its outstanding universal values under Natural criteria in 2003 (UNESCO World Heritage Committee 2003b).

- **Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area**
  - The Black Wars and the associated Black Line operation of the 1820-30s (Clements 2014)
  - World heritage inscription in 1982 under multiple Natural and Cultural criteria.
  - Initially, World Heritage inscription was under the title name Western Tasmanian Wilderness National Parks (UNESCO 1982) which was subsequently altered to

---


3. The term ‘Handback’ refers to the Australian Governor-General formally granting title of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park to the traditional Aboriginal owners through the Uluru–Kata Tjuta Aboriginal Land Trust, on 26 October 1985.
The principle aspect of the Thesis research is the investigation of the symbiotic relationship, in contemporary Western management terms, of intangible and tangible heritage and how its recognition within policies, structures and processes can contribute to cultural diversity, conservation and sustainable development. A proposition of the research is that a focus on intangible cultural heritage (or heritage in comparison to historic fabric), through an interpretation of place and sense of place, held by the different shared management partners, can be utilized as an equitable driver of shared landscape management (or the management of Country). The critical issue that emerged within the research is that the management of culture and nature within a landscape, which involves shared management between Aboriginal and European settler societies, is the identification of the associated priorities placed on cultural heritage maintenance, shared management and development.

The use of the term Aboriginal, rather than Indigenous, to describe the original traditional land owners is of particular importance, since in the Australian context references to Indigenous can be interpreted as a general term referring to both Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures. The term Aboriginal rather than Indigenous is consequently used extensively throughout the research where specific locations (Country) relate to local traditional Aboriginal cultural areas rather than Torres Strait Islander traditional cultural locations. However, the term Indigenous is utilized within the research when related to the inclusive assemblage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures or when referring to specific documentation.

A factor that continually emerges within the research of the management of natural and cultural values within landscapes is the conflict between the valorization of the tangible asset and the associated intangible value held by a multiplicity of

---

4 Sustainable development is...’Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.’ (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987)
stakeholders. Such valorization can be driven by cultural, nationalistic, political, ideological, opportunistic and economic potentials and is reflected in a diversity of natural and cultural heritage management models across the Australian landscape. It is demonstrated through the complex array of cultural, individual, communal and public landscape ownership and authority, which interact with and influence shared management of landscapes with mixed cultural and natural values. The idea to consider such mixed shared landscapes in a more integrated and holistic manner has developed progressively since the introduction in 1992 of three World Heritage categories of Cultural Landscapes. These three Cultural Landscape categories, as discussed in section Cultural Landscapes, represent the combined work of people, culture and nature and are defined as: a clearly defined landscape; an organically evolved landscape; and an associative cultural landscape (UNESCO 1994). The expansiveness of Cultural Landscapes as discussed by Fowler (2003) includes not just the physical sites but the meaning and significance of place. (Fowler 2003: 19)

The concept of ‘cultural landscapes’ as World Heritage sites, then, embraces ideas of belonging, outstanding, significance, locality, meaning, value and singularity of place

The complexity of tangible and intangible aspects of Cultural Landscapes is further examined by Roe and Taylor (2014b), who discuss Cultural Landscapes as ‘living landscapes that reflect a range of relationships between humans and natural cycles’ (Roe & Taylor 2014b: 3). The building of a holistic understanding of the interaction of culture and nature within landscapes is an important element within the research to develop a shared management model across cultures with Aboriginal people, who consider culture and nature within landscape as Country and alive, as discussed in the section Country.

The concept of bringing cultural and natural heritage together in one document was initially achieved in 1972 with the creation of World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1972). Nevertheless, culture and nature were separate in the sense of being defined in two separate Articles (Article 1 and Article 2 respectively) (ibid) and the criteria for evaluating these were separate until 2005 (UNESCO 2005) when they were combined into one set of ten criteria. A further indication of the movement to bring cultural and
natural heritage management closer together is the *Australian ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (Burra Charter) and its evolution from 1979 to 2013. This Charter identifies both the tangible and intangible of place and can be applied to ‘natural, Indigenous and historic places with cultural values’ (Australia ICOMOS 2013).

The discourse on Cultural Landscapes, over several decades, has promoted consideration of people as a critical component of landscape management. Plachter and Rossler (1995) noted a Western understanding of the mankind and nature relationship and positioned them as counterpoints, a terminology that defines the participants as different but linked: (ibid: 15)

> Cultural landscapes reflect the interactions between people and their natural environment over space and time. Nature, in this context, is the counterpart to human society;

The concept of Cultural Landscapes has significantly added to a greater understanding of the need to consider the tangible and intangible of cultural and natural heritage together within a landscape. Taylor (2017) discusses how Cultural Landscapes extended heritage conservation thinking, related to landscapes, to embrace both associative values and physical fabric.

Taylor (2017: 7)

> The inception of the three World Heritage categories of cultural landscapes… extended existing emerging concepts and international cultural heritage conservation thinking and practice which embraced associative values rather than a sole focus on tangible, physical fabric.

My research presents the relationship of people and nature beyond counterpoints and considers an integration, where the distinction between the management of culture and nature within landscape dissolves. As referenced and discussed in *Chapter Two: Positioning the Research*, in the Western management construct, nature (environment) and culture (people) are consistently identified as separate components of the whole rather than an integrated whole. The research approach to shared
management is introduced in the section *Shared Management*. In the section *Culture and Nature Management within Landscapes* the terminology of landscapes is discussed and expanded to include the holistic singularity of the Australian Aboriginal concept of Country. The concept of Country subsequently is juxtaposed against the broadly Western landscape management model that separates components into tangible, intangible, culture and nature.

In the section *Place and Sense of Place* of Chapter Three: *Place and Sense of Place* the research questions are introduced and discussed within the proposition that the Western landscape management model has potential to be more sustainable and equitable when aligned to an integrated Aboriginal approach of managing culture and nature as Country. An extension of this proposition is introduced, in the section *Heritage of Chapter One*, where cultural and natural heritage are considered as fundamentally intangible in construct and interpretation, leading to the recognition of the value of the intangible of artistic expression as a critical interpretive management tool.

The Project’s engagement with the process of artistic expression is focused on my visual practice of photography, drawing, painting and sculpture, which expresses sense of place as a process to identify and inform policy and management priorities. The identification and utilization of artistic expression as an interpretive management tool is presented in the section *Culture Nature Arts of Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place*. It is complemented by the visual arts research of the associated *Exegesis: Negotiation in Process* that provides a practice led component to the research, focused on visual arts as an investigative methodology. I propose the performance of heritage, as an intangible, creates and defines heritage values and has the potential to provide insight into management priorities and deliver more resilient and equitable shared management of culture and nature within landscapes.

**Shared Management**

Shared management within the research relates to landscapes with mixed cultural and natural heritage and is identified as a broad concept where parties with an affiliation
to the location have an involvement in its management. The shared involvement in management decisions being dependent on the authority of private, communal and public stakeholders to influence Australian government legislation and its subsequent interpretation into mixed landscape policy and management processes.

The shared management process is considered to exist within a liminal space, in-between separate cultures, requiring a collaborative articulation that allows the voice of all parties to be heard, sometimes jointly and sometimes separately. The use of the terminology of the liminal space as a descriptor of the process of management between shared parties expands the foundational anthropological analysis of ritual and the rights of passage theorized by van Gennep (1960) in *Rites of Passage* and Victor Turner (1987) in *Betwixt and Between: The Liminal period in Rites of Passage*. Liminality and liminal space, as management process and negotiation, are investigated in the section *Liminality (the process)* of *Chapter Two: Positioning the Research*, in terms of consulting, artistic practice, media theory and tourism. The aim is to inform a new shared landscape model where the management of the intangible space of negotiation is recognized and used in the integration of the management of culture and nature.

The shared management of the World Heritage locations of Uluṟu-Kata Tjuṯa National Park, Purnululu National Park and Reserve, and Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area are described within my research as operating in a liminal space, which involves negotiations between traditional Aboriginal owners, Australian governments (State and Federal) and general Australian business and society. The affiliation held by the parties to the landscapes varies from the holistic local traditional Aboriginal cultural relationship to that held by non-local Aboriginal individuals or groups who may have had little or no direct physical or cultural interaction with the World Heritage sites.

A significant factor in the degree of Aboriginal authority, as a shared management partner, is that only through government recognition under the Australian constitution can Aboriginal cultural authority be legally recognized. The traditional Aboriginal cultural authority associated with a location or region is considered separate to the legally recognized authority bestowed by Australian governments legislation, land
rights, land tenure or Ministerial policy within Australian Constitutional boundaries. An important consideration within the shared management models investigated is the recognition of local traditional Aboriginal owners as participants in the management of their Country. This is distinct from the diversity of Australian Aboriginal people from other areas who can be considered distant parties promoting their own separate political, economic and cultural agendas. Recognition of the Aboriginal cultural diversity across Australia is noted by the Australian Museum ‘Indigenous Australians are not one group: Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders throughout Australia have different thoughts, ideas and beliefs.’ (Australian Museum 2015)

When considering the negotiation of different shared management parties, such as between local traditional Aboriginal and other cultures the intercourse, is considered to take place in-between cultures, in an environment or space where each party is required to acknowledge the other’s cultural difference and achieve outcomes through negotiation and compromise. In a practical management sense however I argue that the most dominant authority, within a shared management process, may force decisions to the offense and detriment of the other party. A demonstration of such inequitable actions is discussed in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park case study in relation to climbing Uluru. Here the dominant authority of the Australian Government, requires a continuation of the tourist climb of Uluru in opposition to the local traditional Aboriginal Owners (Director of National Parks 2010a).

The general tone, rhetoric and negotiation stance of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Plan of Management 2010-2020, approved by the Minister (ibid), commits to working together as shared management partners with the local traditional Aboriginal people and respecting their cultural heritage. However, there still exists an imposed requirement allowing tourists to continue climbing Uluru in opposition to the local traditional Aboriginal owners wishes. Imposition of this requirement is supported by the authority of the Australian Government and the compliance of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Board of Management, which has a majority of local traditional Aboriginal owners as voting members. The disparity between apparent divergent local Aboriginal positions is analyzed in the case study and shown to be influenced by the disproportionate dominance of authority by the Australian Government and questionable governance processes in the Board of Management.
The shared management of culture and nature within landscapes operates between stakeholders’ cultures as an intangible negotiation process or space that is continually evolving, shifting and balancing whilst being driven by a multivalent environment of cultural, political and economic priorities. As discussed in Chapter Two: Positioning the Research, this space involves an initial liminal threshold stage of transition between cultures followed by the liminality of negotiation, where dialogue is continually shifting and balancing between the different cultural understandings of human existence within the environment.

**Cultural and Natural Heritage Management within Landscapes**

The investigation of the management of mixed cultural and natural heritage within landscapes considers the relationship of people to their physical and cultural environment. This terminology is directly related to UNESCO and the operation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1972) and is discussed in the section UNESCO and World Heritage of Chapter Two: Positioning the Research. Such terminology is based in European cultural concepts associated with religious,
philosophical, cultural and sociological bias that links but separates the culture of humanity from the natural world. An alternative to the European standpoint that considers the mixed heritage management is the traditional Australian Aboriginal cultural perspective associated with the concept of Country where the Western boundaries around nature and culture, tangible and intangible dissolve.

The relationship of Aboriginal people to Country is illustrated by Rose (1996) in the publication *Nourishing Terrain: Australian Aboriginal Views of Landscape and Wilderness*. Rose presents an understanding that there exists a two-way interaction between Aboriginal and Country as living entities. (Rose 1996: 7)

People talk about country in the same way that they would talk about a person: they speak to country, sing to country, visit country, worry about country, feel sorry for country, and long for country. People say that country knows, hears, smells, takes notice, takes care, is sorry or happy.

A challenge in a shared management of Country is understanding and accepting the validity of cultural difference and building cross-cultural frameworks that jointly manage cultural and natural heritage. The Aboriginal approach, through the concept of Country, potentially provides greater sustainability as it recognises a reciprocity between people and the holistic environment. Consequently, to damage the environment is to damage culture and people.

**Country**

The use of the term Country within my research is an engagement with the concept rather than the Indigenous cultural matter, which I contend should remain under the cultural authority of the people to which it ethically belongs.

Country is a means of describing the holistic environment, holding the Western concepts of landscape and the separate but linked elements of nature and culture depicted as the tangible and intangible. The holistic concept of Country integrates the expansive environment and its range of inhabitants and history. McGaw and Tootell (2015) in an online article describes Country as: (McGaw & Tootell 2015)
inclusive of earth, water, and sky, as well as the plants and animals they support. Country is further organised around a kinship system that includes both living relatives and ancestral creator beings. Unlike terra firma, “Country” is always understood in holistic, relational terms across time.

The use of the term Country has been reconfigured by Indigenous Australians ‘from a common noun to a proper noun’ (Rose 2008: 110). Country also articulates an integrated Indigenous Australian cultural understanding as referenced by Hunt, Altman and May (Hunt, et al. 2009:1)

Indigenous people have a holistic meaning for ‘country’, which encompasses land and landforms, water and marine resources, the plants, trees, animals, and other species which the land and sea support, and cultural heritage sites. The whole cultural landscape and the interrelationships within the ecosystem are encompassed in the term ‘Country’, and these relate to landowners under customary law in diverse ways.

To some degree the use of the terms Country, landscape and environment will cross over throughout the research documentation. The reason for this cross over is that the process of investigation is cross cultural: it requires an acceptance of the difference between traditional Aboriginal culture and the Western paradigm reflected in the more general Australian society and government. The term Country, as used by Indigenous Australians to describe an integrated environment, is perhaps the most appropriate term to encompass culture, nature, people, environment plus emotion and spirituality. However rather than abandoning the terms ‘landscape’ and ‘environment’ my approach is to embrace their European heritage roots and intersperse the use, in a holistic context, with Country. One reason for this approach is that I wish to respect the Indigenous development and use of the term Country and not attempt to appropriate their cultural perspective but rather reference it to inform a new management approach.
Heritage

The understanding of heritage within the research, whether cultural or natural, follows the philosophical perspective that all heritage is fundamentally intangible with its interpretation continually evolving within its associated societies. References to this concept are sited in the publications ‘Intangible Heritage’ (Smith and Akagawa 2009) and ‘Uses of Heritage’ (Smith 2006). The consideration of heritage as intangible and a cultural process of performance is expanded in Chapter Two: Positioning the Research and Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place and lays the foundation for the new redesigned management model in Chapter Five: Conclusion, which includes the interpretation of sense of place through artistic expression and design as an interpretive tool critical to sustainable share management.

Place and Sense of Place

The management of heritage related to place is significant within the research as the case studies involve World Heritage places that are layered with different cultural interpretations of sense of place. These interpretations are investigated in relation to the created conflicts, which are influenced by development, political and philosophical priorities that exist between local traditional Aboriginal culture and Australian governments at State, Territory and Federal levels.

In Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place, the terms place and sense of place are investigated in conjunction with making of place, through the perspective that each term carries a continually changing intangible heritage process of interpretation. The implications of managing place and sense of place within Australian landscapes is considered with particular reference to the PhD Project case studies and is linked to place making related to the early and contemporary colonial management perspective that tends to over-lay and obscure Aboriginal place and sense of place.

Propositions and Questions

The research questions and proposition presented in the Project were developed over several iterations. They were initially presented as three questions in my initial Thesis Review Proposal and in Chapter 2 of the publication New Cultural Landscapes (Roe M and Taylor K eds 2014). The first two questions remain as Thesis Questions One
and Two as presented below. The initial third question related to how intangible cultural heritage, expressed through the art process, can provide direction for the governance and management of shared landscapes has been rephrased as the Proposition.

The decision to remove the third question and replace it with a proposition was informed by analyzing the initial research investigations. These investigations revealed that the Australian Aboriginal concept of Country and its management represents an existing model that integrates the management of culture and nature and considered intangible and tangible heritage as symbiotic. It was also revealed that artistic expression through dance, painting, song, music, sculpture and other mediums was a fundamental educational and management element in the Aboriginal process of managing Country, including its intangible cultural heritage. A consequence of this early research is recognition of the concept of Aboriginal management of Country, which involves the experience of art as a process of managing culture and nature within landscapes. The issue of how the art process can inform governance and management is addressed by the addition to the Project of the visual practice Exegesis component, with its associate research question:

How can the process of visual practice be engaged to reveal the integration of culture and nature within landscapes, with the aim of informing governance and management decisions?

**Project Proposition**

The management of Country based at the nexus of culture, nature and arts provides an integrated model for the management of culture and nature within landscapes.

The inclusion of Art⁵ as a component of landscape management is directed at identifying and utilizing a process that is an expression of culture and our sense of

---

⁵ Art is considered throughout the PhD Project as human expression and is not limited by style, medium, movement or perceived quality. Art is investigated as a means of connecting sense of place to management decisions.
place in the environment. It is postulated that for sustainable, shared management of culture and nature within landscapes, it is essential to have an expansive understanding of the intangible interrelationships of people and their environment. A particular expression of this relationship is in the intangible process, interpretation, meaning and statements of artistic expression that are manifested across mediums including dance and song, visual arts, music, story telling and digital media. The inclusion of artistic practice as a management element within the Project evolved from the need to identify a process that engages directly with the continual change of the intangible of heritage. This is in contrast to creating and analyzing tangible evidence, which fixes heritage within a particular period and is quickly divorced from the continual change of the intangible. The PhD Project’s Exegesis investigates the artistic practice element of the research as a collaborative component that examines a sense of place within landscapes that has potential to inform management issues and priorities.

Individual and community expressions of place relay narratives of past, present and future interaction with landscapes and are investigated in Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place. They are discussed, within the Thesis, in regard to use in Western and Aboriginal cultures to maintain, encourage, promote, emphasize and politicize the policies and management practices of managing the culture and nature within landscapes (Country).

**Thesis Question One: Governance**

What are the governance structures and processes that can lead international practice in the integrated management of culture and nature within landscape?

The first question initially focuses on governance structures that can be applied to the management of culture and nature when they are considered as integrated, such as in the concept of Country. Implied in this context is the consideration of multivalent governance, policy and management that overlay the delivery of management practice. The analysis of World Heritage sites such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu
and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area demonstrate that in many situations, particularly where large government and corporate bureaucracies are operating, there is often a vast chasm between the drivers for policy development and drivers of the management delivery cycle for day-to-day on the ground activities.

**Thesis Question Two: Management**

How can the recognition of the symbiotic relationship of intangible and tangible heritage, within management policy and process contribute to continued cultural diversity, sustainable development and conservation and biodiversity?

The second question focuses on the relationship between tangible and intangible heritage, and enquires how both components, when seen as symbiotic, can still be interpreted within a predominantly Western construct of landscape management. The question’s phrasing recognizes that the cultural interpretation of how tangible and intangible are interrelated is different for traditional Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal shared management parties. It also recognizes that to implement change, the question needs to be couched in terminology that is easily accessible for the dominant authority of Australian governments, whilst still respecting the Aboriginal cultural authority.

Sustainable management as a concept, within the research, relates to the present and future requirements to maintain cultural and environmental priorities that support the ongoing resilience, equity and functionality of the stakeholder relationships. Linked into this is the understanding of sustainable development, which has been suggested to be ‘a moral precept as well as a scientific concept. It is closely linked to peace, human rights and equity as much as to ecology or global warming’ (Matsuura 2005: 1). The vision for sustainable management as described in the publication *UNESCO and Sustainable Development* and notes the requirement of meeting the needs of the present without compromising the future: (Perrot-Lanaud 2005: 2)

A vision of development that encompasses populations, animal and plant species, ecosystems, natural resources – water, air, energy – and that integrates concerns such as the fight against poverty, gender equality, human rights, education for all, health, human security, intercultural
dialogue, etc.

Research Design and Process

The design of the research is structured around the investigation of theories and methodologies applied to the shared management of landscapes by Australian governments and local traditional Aboriginal cultures. Analysis of the investigation is targeted at developing new management theory, adapted through the recognition of the Australian Aboriginal concept of managing Country, that integrates the management of culture and nature within landscapes.

The strategy employed for the research process is to investigate an initial case study that would inform selection of comparable case studies and build an understanding of management methodologies in order to inform new theory. The first case study chosen is Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, followed by Purnululu National Park and Reserve and then Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. Each case study has comparable characteristics of size, remoteness, Aboriginal cultural presence and government management. Field research investigations were conducted at each of the case study properties and literature reviews were performed as a continuing process throughout the Project, to reveal the associated management history, processes and strategies. Concurrently, literature reviews were conducted on associated international conventions and organisation that influence the management at the case studies.

An additional component of the research process, which was withdrawn as a research methodology was interviews and meetings conducted with a range of group and individual stakeholders, including the Uluru-Kata Tjuta Board of Management. The reason for withdrawing this research methodology was that the literature review analysis evidenced significant governance and management short-comings in the shared management arrangements, at each of the case study sites. As a consequence, I made the decision not to continue with or include interviews as part of the research evidence, due to the ethical concerns regarding potentially compromising informants.
Following the literature reviews the next stage of the research process was to analyse the underlying philosophies of landscape management. Case study analysis revealed the entrenched Western philosophy of human vs nature and the theory of linking but separately managing culture and nature within the landscape, which is in stark contrast to the traditional Aboriginal partners’ landscape management’s process. Analysis of the literature reviews of the World Heritage inscription process and the management dichotomy of ICOMOS and IUCN provided evidence that a new management theory of integration is needed in order to build a shared cross cultural understanding of how to manage culture and nature together in the landscape. A further Western management theory analysed was the propensity to separate the tangible of historic fabric from the intangible of heritage, which again is in stark contrast to the traditional Aboriginal partners’ process of managing Country.

The evidence from the literature reviews identified the need for a new landscape management theory that integrates the management of culture and nature and considered the relationship of tangible to intangible as symbiotic. However, the Western landscape management processes, implemented at the case study properties, does not incorporate an intangible management process as a core management component. Consequently, to develop a new theory that could be utilized by Western and Aboriginal partners I identified a need to explore an additional research methodology. The concept of sense of place was consequently investigated as an informative procedure for both policy and management delivery. The shift in the research process toward a focus on the management of intangible heritage and engaging sense of place led to identifying a research methodology that entails intangible interpretation. The research methodology chosen was practice led research through the visual arts, presented as an Exegesis, with the objective to investigate the interpretation of sense of place as a management informant, utilizing the process of developing and testing knowledge through creative art practice.

The conclusive stage of the research design, informed by the research data, is to develop guidelines for associated policy and management delivery that will aid the implementation of an integrated landscape management model.
Chapter Two: Positioning the Research - Theory and Practice

The theme of this Chapter is to position the research within the contemporary approach to the management of culture and nature embodied within the concept of landscape (Country), focusing on the Australian context with reference to the international arena. The emphasis is on the separation of nature from culture within the Western approach to landscape management and the shift towards reducing this separation through recognizing the intense interconnected relationship of people within the landscape. The aim is to investigate an understanding of current processes to inform the construct of a progressive direction in the management of Country, that responds to the research questions of integrated heritage, governance and management.

A component of the Western social and cultural construct impacting the management of landscapes is the early perception that nature is ‘the other’ and an advisory for human existence needing to be tamed and guarded against. (Plachter & Rossler 1995: 15)

At least since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the first half of the nineteenth century, nature and culture have often been conceived of as extreme opposites in Western thought. Nature was not seen as a counterpart, but above all as an enemy to be controlled and dominated with the assistance of technology.

Contemporary landscape management, as a reflection of the separation of culture and nature, produces discrete bureaucratic administration institutions (which I describe as silos) focused on either the management of culture or nature. Although these bureaucracies interact with each other they have diverse structures and often-conflicting priorities. A demonstration of the problem of such silo operation is the interdisciplinary conflict between biological and social sciences. David Harmon (2007) identifies the rift between biological and social sciences in the article ‘A Bridge over the Chasm: Finding Ways to Achieve Integrated Natural and Cultural Heritage Conservation’ (ibid: 380).
The long standing rift between biological and social sciences has done much to shape how nature conservation and the conservation of cultural heritage are practiced today. In the field of protected areas, fundamental differences in outlook have contributed to an unproductive atmosphere in which seemingly endless rounds of criticism are traded among disciplines.

Harmon’s statement (ibid) reflects an underlying approach to the research, in that it demonstrates the need for a reduction in the separation of nature conservation and cultural heritage management, which are fundamental components in the shared management of culture and nature within landscapes.

In pursuing the Chapter theme an array of organizations, conventions and concepts that are influencing the underlying approach to the mixed management of culture and nature within landscapes are reviewed. Particular regard is given to the impact of the Western philosophical and organizational approach of separating cultural heritage and natural heritage management. This is in contrast to the Aboriginal Australian approach, which is identified as managing Country in an integrated manner without the creation of management silos. The implementation of Western separation is identified through the direct management practice of government bureaucracies and conservation organizations and, indirectly through the consideration of UNESCO World Heritage activities, plus a range of international conventions, the concept of cultural landscapes, plus specific Australian legislation and management related to the concepts of wilderness and national parks.

The activities and influence of UNESCO, as a primary driver of World Heritage property management through the World Heritage Committee, are analyzed along with associated World Heritage advisory organizations of ICOMOS and the IUCN. In the international context four significant associated aspects considered are the:

- Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972);
- Man and the Biosphere Programme;
• Cultural Landscapes; and
• Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003).

The Australian management context is examined with consideration of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth) (EPBC Act) and through reference to the case study research at Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu National Parks and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.

The assessment of these organizations, conventions and programs investigates the proposal that contemporary mixed management of culture and nature within a landscape is severely impacted by the Western philosophy of separating people from nature. It is further proposed that this separation can impede the management of biodiversity and cultural diversity, conservation and ethical cultural maintenance. This is particularly pertinent when considering conflicted Australian share management models involving different management approaches to the relationship of culture and nature within a landscape (Country) by local traditional Aboriginal cultures and Australian governments.
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**Figure 2.1:** Francis, K. (2016) Nature Culture overlay: digital composition

**Figure 2.2:** Francis, K, (2016) Nature Culture integration: digital composition

Figures 2.1 and 2.2 provide a visual interpretation of the philosophical approach of Western management of mixed cultural and natural management (Figure 2.1) and Aboriginal management of Country (Figure 2.2), with particular reference to the mixed site case studies of Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness.
World Heritage Area. The Western approach separates the management of culture and nature within a landscape into interlinked arenas of existence, with zones of interaction that overlap and continually change in reaction to Western cultural, political and economic priorities. The Western process too often fails to recognize the holistic blend of nature and culture as practiced by traditional Aboriginal cultures in the management of Country. The Aboriginal approach is illustrated in Figure 2.2 by a ball intertwining cultural and natural as indistinguishable threads.

A significant difference between the concept of Country and the Western concept of ‘landscape’ lies in the Western propensity to recognize an interrelationship of culture and nature whilst splitting the management of landscape into cultural and natural heritage. An example of this Western propensity is the *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)*, which puts culture and nature in the same document but relies on separate advice on natural heritage from IUCN and cultural heritage from ICOMOS (UNESCO 1972). In the Aboriginal management of Country cultural and natural management are integrated, as noted in the definition of Country (Hunt *et al.* 2009: 1) and indicated on the Mungo National Park web site that considers Country as including everything. ‘Country takes in everything within the landscape ..including.. cultural connection to the land, which is based in each community’s distinct culture, traditions and laws.’ (Office of Environmental Heritage 2015). Another significant difference in the Western and Aboriginal approach to landscape management, as investigated in *Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place*, is the continued Western concept of separating the management of meaning of place (the intangible) from the management of its historic fabric (the tangible), which is in contrast to the holistic traditional Aboriginal management of Country. This is demonstrated in *Chapter Four: Case Studies* and particularly in relation to Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Purnululu National Parks, where the investigations reveal the geological features of Uluru and the Bungle Bungle Range are, as the result of management decisions, being degraded and damaged in contradiction to the intangible of traditional Aboriginal meaning of place and the associated World Heritage Outstanding Universal Values.
Liminality (the process)

The purpose of investigating the liminal space as a conceptualization of cross-cultural management and negotiation is to identify a terminology and theoretical framework that directly interacts with the intangible related to the shared management process, whilst considering stakeholder engagement as an evolving process transitioning between distinctly different cultural paradigms and prejudices. Liminality is described by Bjorn Thomassen in the publication *Liminality and the Modern: living through the in-between* (Thomassen 2014: 1)

Liminality refers to moment or periods of transition during which the normal limits of thought, self-understanding and behaviour are relaxed. Opening the way to novelty and imagination construction and demonstration

The use of the term ‘transition’ relates to a framework of two distinct aspects of the process of cross cultural negotiation. The first being negotiation within a specific culture on how to interact with others, and the action of taking the step outside of that cultural paradigm, whilst the second transition relates the potential for change through negotiation in a space between cultures. The beginning act of moving into a negotiation space is described as taking a step across a liminal threshold whilst the environment of negotiation is described as a liminal space or liminality.

In developing a new shared landscape model integrating the management of culture and nature, I contend that a framework is needed to recognize the symbiotic relationship of intangible and tangible heritage and the consideration that all heritage is conceptually intangible. The process of my proposed management model progresses through three transition stages, related to stakeholder consultation and negotiation then into potentially sustainable outcomes. The process commences within each stakeholder’s specific cultural paradigm and their associated prejudices and world views. It then secondly moves into a space of negotiation and thirdly eventually toward resolution with a more informed cross-cultural management position. Whether the negotiation space, as in the case of the contentious climb of Uluru (noted in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta case study), is just and equitable will depend on
the equity of the authority and integrity of the stakeholder relationship. Underpinning the three proposed negotiation stages of the management model are:

Stage 1: recognition and respect of each stakeholder’s initial cultural perspective on landscape (Country) management and their legal or law systems;
Stage 2: consultation, negotiation and compromise between parties as an evolution of management priorities through an aggregation of knowledge; and
Stage 3: agreed collaborative policy development and management delivery.

A demonstration of these stages is in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park case study where the process of cross-cultural shared management and negotiation involves:

• the initial perspectives of the Australian government legislative system and the local traditional owners’ system of Anangu Tjukurpa;
• the governance and management processes of consultation and negotiation through the Board of Management; and
• eventually Park policy and management delivery.

The analysis of the case studies of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Purnululu National Park and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area illustrates the Stage 1 process. Here the traditional Aboriginal owner groups and the associated Australian governments take a cultural position that considers the landscape as owned or cared for primarily by each party separately and through joint agreements. It is in-between these separate cultural positions, in the cross-cultural negotiation of Stage 2 that I propose the liminal space exists as a process of continual change, offering the opportunity to transition management and cultural priorities to include a new hybrid understanding of meaning of place. Recognition and engagement with this new understanding consequently informs a revised cross-cultural approach to managing the integration of cultural and natural heritage.

To move into a negotiation stage, each of the shared management partners crosses a liminal threshold out of their cultural norms and prejudices into a transition stage informed by a blend of their different cultural paradigms. The concept of separate states within transition includes an original position, an evolving state and a new

---

6 Tjukurpa is the ‘Pitjantjatjara word for Law – history, knowledge, religion and morality – that forms the basis of Anangu values and how Anangu conduct their lives and look after their country, plan, story, message (Director of National Parks 2010a: 176)
informed position. An analogy of the liminal and transitional aspects of shared management aligns with the work of van Gennep (1960) and the rites of passage, which as analyzed by Allison Wright (2016) on the Chicago School of Media Theory web site, consists of the three stages:

- the separation or detachment of a subject from its stabilized environment;
- the margin, which is an ambiguous state from its stabilized environment; and
- the aggregation, in which the passage has completed and the subject has crossed the threshold into a new fixed, stable state.

In referencing the management and negotiation process at the mixed cultural and natural heritage sites of Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, I propose van Gennep’s stages of the rites of passage are analogous to the three stages of negotiating the management of Country between cultures. The first stage of transition being the parties enveloped by their individual cultural paradigms, the second stage can be described as a transitional or liminal state of negotiations in-between the different cultural understandings of managing Country (landscapes). The process of liminality is considered to embrace the intangible cross-cultural heritage dialogue of the different shared management parties in a hybrid cultural context, linked to but in-between the different cultural paradigms. The final stage is where the shared management parties emerge from the process and reengage with their own cultures with an altered understanding of the other party’s priorities and motivations.

To investigate the usefulness of conceptualizing the process of negotiation and management in terms of liminality and the liminal space, the concepts are examined in relation to consulting, artistic practice, media theory, tourism and travel writing. The aim of this examination is to inform the development of an appropriate shared landscape management model, whilst coupling to the underlying research questions of the management of culture/nature and tangible/intangible.
Czarniawska and Mazza (2003) in the article ‘Consulting as a liminal space’, view management consulting ‘as a liminal space for both consultants and their clients’ (ibid: 267). The consideration of the liminal space of consulting as a management process opens the potential to link the work of Czarniawska and Mazza to the shared management process at the Project case study landscapes, where effective and equitable cross-cultural consultation and negotiation demands a willingness to understand different cultural processes whilst targeting the common goal of caring for Country. At Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, this is demonstrated in the consistent rhetoric within the Plan of Management to develop and use an integrated process of stockholders managing together. The Plan of Management promotes working together in the statement: ‘Anangu’ and Piranpa will work as equals, exchanging knowledge about our different cultural values and processes and their application’. (Director of National Parks 2010a: i)

In addition to the negotiation space within the shared management process, liminal terminology is linked to the tourism experience of the journey in-between locations and the negotiation and interpretation of the experience of cultures. The tourism experience is an essential component of the development and management of World Heritage parks as is demonstrated throughout plans of management and strategic tourism publications related to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Director of National Parks 2010a) (Director of National Parks 2010b), Purnululu National Park (Department of Parks and Wildlife 2013a) and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (DPIPWE 2016) (EC3 Global et al. 2014). The management understanding of the tourist experience and what drives visitors from specific markets to leave their homes and journey to visit distant locations is of significant importance (Tourism Australia 2016) to the mixed management of culture and nature within landscapes, particularly where tourism is a primary industry.

An aspect to managing tourism is the promotion of the location through diverse media, including travel writing that can be described as a process of creating liminal

---

7 Anangu: ‘An Aboriginal person or people generally (and more specially those Aboriginal people with traditional a affiliations with this region).’ (Director of National Parks 2010a: 175)
8 Piranpa: ‘Literally ‘white’ but now used to mean non-Aboriginal people’. (ibid)
landscapes. Patricia Johnson (2010) in the article ‘Writing Liminal Landscapes: The Cosmopolitan Gaze’, positions liminality as a tool to ‘authorize discourse and characterize landscape through articulations of the gaze’ (Johnson 2010: 505). Ryan in the article ‘Tourism is the edge- An Essay in Margins and Liminality’ describes the tourist experience of travel and places tourists in an intangible dynamic position separate from their norm and potentially in-between cultures. (Ryan 2002: 1)

not only is tourism a psychologically liminal space, but often the sites of tourism are themselves spatially or physical marginal…travel away from home is travel to new spaces that possess a temporal and spatial liminality that is contrary to the norm that is represented by the normal place of residence.

The utilization, by Johnson and Ryan, of the concept of the liminal and liminality, related to the cross-cultural experience of tourism, reveals an acknowledgement that the process of tourism entails the ambiguity of continual negotiation. By engaging with the process of liminality, as an elucidation of the negotiation process, my approach offers an alternative management philosophy. This philosophy embraces a move away from the Australian Government’s approach, as identified in the case studies, which tackles cultural and natural management negotiations as a means to achieve defined tourism outcomes or political objectives. The proposed approach to negotiation transits towards a more holistic concept that shifts emphasis depending on the location’s cultural, political and social circumstances. This is particularly relevant to the research when related to the shared management negotiation of landscape in-between cultures of local traditional Aboriginal landowners and Australian Governments. The process of negotiation, operating in a liminal space, can be described as an evolving performance where the proponents enact differing cultural understandings as to how the landscape should be governed and its relationship to society. The evolving character of shared management is demonstrated in the unfolding development of the cultural authority of local Anangu traditional Aboriginal owners of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park from unwanted tenants to freehold property owners of the national park.

In the instance of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park I contend the sphere of negotiation
between government and Anangu operates as liminal in process. The evolution of this relationship is apparent within government policy and management practice reflected in the progression of the five continually evolving plans of management for Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. One aspect of this continual change is each successive plan increases the use of the term intangible cultural heritage, the Aboriginal Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara language and the authoritative term of ‘Nguraritja’,

which is mentioned on 72 of the 187 pages of the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* (Director National Parks 2010a). The Plans of Management are also evolving to increase the recognition of the importance of integrating traditional management knowledge, particularly regarding the use of fire. For example, in the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* traditional fire management is regarded as essential in maintaining the World Heritage values and integral to the Anangu meeting their traditional cultural obligations (Director of National Parks 2010a: 77). The changing recognition, in the Park’s plans of management, of Anangu authority over landscape management demonstrates a shift into a progressive space of negotiation, recognition and reconciliation. I contend the negotiation with Aboriginal people, away from a colonial relationship is a non-fixed space, a liminal space, that will continue to change and evolve to create a hybrid cultural understanding of Country, in-between the cultures of Anangu traditional law Tjukurpa and Australian Westminster based system.

On a broader scale the process of continual change of shared management in Australia can be aligned to the evolution of Aboriginal land rights and the dialogue associated with the potential introduction of Australian Constitutional recognition of Indigenous Australians (Reconciliation Australia 2014). The negotiation between Aboriginal Australians and Australian governments operates in-between their separate cultures and philosophies in a continual change environment (or space). The shared management negotiation process at the case study sites has a dynamic nature with

---

9 At Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park the local traditional Aboriginal term Nguraritja means ‘the traditional Aboriginal owners of the park’ (Director of National Parks 2010a, 23)

10 At Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park the local traditional Aboriginal term Tjukurpa is defined as ‘The Pitjantjatjara word for Law – history, knowledge, religion and morality – that forms the basis of Anangu values and how Anangu conduct their lives and look after their country, plan, story, message’ (Director of National Parks 2010a, 175)

Keven Francis: Thesis
continual change occurring within shared management partnerships and government policy development. Engagement with the experience of negotiation as a liminality also recognizes the experiential of the process, which informs governance and the management decisions.

At all of the research case study locations the Aboriginal culture and its traditional law interacts with the Australian Government legal system. The process of negotiation between these different legal systems is an ever changing and dynamic space that engages education, innovation, cross-cultural dialogue and an acceptance that the process is flexible and to a limited degree inclusive. It is also highly volatile when discussed in relation to Aboriginal land rights and changing legislation. In effect the process reflects a transition of the stakeholders across a threshold out of the separate legal systems into the negotiation of an ambiguous cross-cultural legal space, leading to more informed hybrid cross cultural interactions.

A demonstration of the continually evolving legislative change regarding the rights of traditional Aboriginal owners is revealed in relation to Purnululu National Park, with an investigation of the Western Australian government’s changes, in 2012, to the Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 (WA) (the CALM Act). The change provides access for Aboriginal people to reserves and lands\(^\text{11}\) under the CALM Act for ‘Customary Purpose’ (Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 (WA) 08-c0-01), which includes hunting, gathering, camping, lighting fires and ceremony. This change is highly significant in relation to Purnululu National Park and Reserve as previously access was a discretionary privilege bestowed by government managers. The result of the changing of the CALM Act was that a new hybrid understanding of cultural process emerged as a compromise in-between the Western and Aboriginal understandings. Each side has to build into their understanding the perspective of the other.

The outcomes of cross-cultural negotiations resulted in cultural compromise and changing of cultural perspectives: a third space of cultural hybridity emerges. This is identified in the postcolonial research of Homi Bhabha as a ‘position of liminality in

\(^{11}\) The use of the term Lands includes both land and water scapes.
the productive space of the constriction of cultural difference’ (Rutherford 1990: 209). The hybridity as noted by Rutherford (1990) ‘displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through the received wisdom’ (ibid: 211). Although Bhabha’s postcolonial theories are largely based in the British colonization of India, rather than the British colonization of Australia, the point drawn from his statements is that each of the different cultural parties operates in a negotiation space separate from their original cultural paradigms yet connected through human interaction.

The *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* (Director National Parks 2010a) recognizes the need to create a hybrid way of managing between cultures, which can be created through the process of education or learning from each other that aggregates the negotiation process. At Uluru joint management is described as ‘learning from each other, respecting each other’s cultures and finding innovative ways to bring together different ways of seeing and interpreting the landscape and its people’ (Director National Parks 2010a: ii). Joint management at Uluru also requires the partners to ‘learn together, learn from each other, respect each other’s culture and bring together the different approaches’ (Director National Parks 2010a: 37).

The space of interaction, within shared management, is exclusive to neither party and is outside of each separate cultural paradigm, requiring recognition of difference, a commitment to negotiation and a strong adherence to the maintenance of intangible cultural values. In effect the parties are allowing difference to occupy the same space through working in-between their divergent cultures in a process of compromise that is separate from individual cultural norms. This is a process or journey of interaction, a period of liminality, where preconceived ideas of how to manage a combination of culture and nature are subdued to allow new innovative cross-cultural approaches to emerge. The important aspect of this approach to the process of negotiation is that neither the traditional owners nor the government has the right to enforce a totalitarian view on shared management, however both parties have the right to their own cultural perspectives being respected in negotiations and applied within their own cultural societies.
The major aspect to considering the negotiation space as a liminality is that it embraces negotiation as an intangible and ephemeral process rather than a prescribed set of negotiation steps leading to predefined outcomes. The negotiation of the shared management of the cultural and natural heritage of landscapes consequently encourages the development of processes that pivot around the intangible performance of human interaction and expression. The process of prioritizing management of the intangible is investigated in the section *Culture Nature Arts* in *Chapter three: Place and Sense of Place*, where the potential experiential mechanism manifest in artistic practice interacts with the cultural and natural heritage landscape.

In the arts, the potential of the liminal and liminality has been exploited as a means of expressing the ambiguity, innovation and change within the process. This makes the link between a transition of the intangible of thought and perception to the physical historic fabric of locations and objects. Marshall (2007) provides some insight into the engagement with the liminal state and ambiguity in an interview by Thomson in ‘The Liminal Object’ (*ibid*: 35)

> The Liminal state is characterised by ambiguity, openness and indeterminacy. Liminality is a period of transition, during which usual boundaries of thought, self-understanding and behaviour shift, opening the way to something new.

In ‘Liminal mind, creative consciousness: From the artist’s vantage point’, Payne (2011) articulates the potential of working in a space where outcomes are not defined but resultant of the process. Payne states: ‘One must be free from the anticipation of any known outcome to allow for the potential arrival of the unexpected. It is risky to invite the unexpected’ (*ibid*: 190). The relevant significance of Marshall and Paynes’ comments, in regard to shared management negotiations, is they articulate artistic practice as a means of achieving understanding through embracing the potential of the unexpected, change, ambiguity and innovation. I propose a process of negotiation that embraces such potential, creates improved opportunity to manage the challenges of difference within the cross-cultural space.
Embracing the intangible concept of the liminal as a process of change and transition across landscape management, tourism and the arts provides a framework for understanding the dynamism and complexity of the management of cross cultural negotiations. The potential of a framework that embraces the intangible is that it challenges the propensity of Western landscape system to separate the management of tangible from intangible within the landscape. It also confronts the contemporary management of World Heritage parks, as investigated in the case studies, that have a priority on promotion and policy of tangible geological structures such as the mount of Uluru or the ‘Domes’ of the Bungle Bungle Range, or Tasmanian Wilderness, rather than the cultural heritage (intangible) of the locations.

**International Conventions and Programs**

**UNESCO and World Heritage Convention**

The current international approach to the management of cultural and natural values in significant landscapes and particularly World Heritage landscape is influenced by the direction, policies and guidelines of the *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)* (UNESCO 1972), known as *World Heritage Convention* (the Convention). The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) during its 17th session in 1972 and came into force in August 1974. (Department of the Environment 2014a)

The responsibility for implementing the Convention is vested in the World Heritage Committee (the Committee), which is supported in its activities by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee consisting of a Chairperson, five Vice-Chairpersons, and a Rapporteur. The power and influence of the Committee is demonstrated through its authority, under the Convention, to have restrictions and controls placed on States Parties in regard to their ongoing management of inscribed properties. The Committee: (UNESCO 2015b)

defines the use of the World Heritage Fund and allocates financial assistance upon requests from States Parties. It has the final say on whether a property is inscribed on the World Heritage List… It examines
reports on the state of conservation of inscribed properties and asks States Parties to take action when properties are not being properly managed.

The implementation of the process within the World Heritage Committee, for World Heritage inscription, set the scene for what I postulate to be an international political club of associated State Parties. This process operates under a model developed within a European context, which provides its members internationally sanctioned authority over the particular World Heritage, recognition and support in the protection of the particular world cultural and natural heritage, a platform for their political ideology and the potential of political, economic and prestige advantage. In coming to decisions on World Heritage property applications the Committee’s Rules and Procedures (UNESCO 2013a: article 8.3), recognize the advisory status of three particular organizations: the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM); the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS); the World Conservation Union, formerly International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN); and others as appropriately added. (UNESCO 2013b)

The Convention’s most significant feature is the concept of linking natural conservation and cultural preservation together in one document (UNESCO 2012). Although the shift in moving the management of culture and nature closer together into one international convention is significant, it falls short on integrating the management of nature and culture within landscapes, such as the case studies where Aboriginal cultures manage landscape as Country. The European roots and philosophies related to managing culture and nature within the landscape are reflected in the operation of the separate bureaucracies of ICOMOS and IUCN, each with a separate advisory priority towards either cultural or natural inscription. In the contemporary environment ICOMOS and IUCN do work closer together and submit joint assessments, however the organizations have different fundamental priorities to either natural or cultural heritage. This is demonstrated and discussed further in the section Cultural Landscapes of this Chapter.

The roles of both ICOMOS and IUCN as stated in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2013b) are identical.
apart from the difference of its focus on culture or nature. The ICOMOS roles state: 
(ibid: 9)

evaluation of properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural properties, reviewing requests for International Assistance submitted by States Parties, and providing input and support for capacity building activities.

The only change in the IUCN roles is the replacement of the word culture with nature (ibid 2013b: 10). The focus and underlying foundation of ICOMOS and IUCN, as described on their web sites, are as separate organizations with separate priorities of cultural heritage or natural heritage.

- ICOMOS (ICOMOS 2015a):
  o is focused on ‘conservation and protection of cultural heritage places’;
  o ‘is dedicated to promoting the application, theory, methodology, and scientific techniques to the conservation of the architectural and archaeological heritage’; and
  o has its ‘work based on the principles enshrined in the 1964 International Charter on the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter).’

- IUCN (IUCN 2015a):
  o is focused on ‘valuing and conserving nature’;
  o ‘deploying nature-based solutions to global challenges in climate, food and development’; and
  o is the world’s oldest and largest global environmental organization

With the building of separate bureaucracies of ICOMOS and IUCN, which I describe as silos, the understanding of culture and nature within landscapes is
fixed to the Western dualist model where cultural and natural are separated with the philosophical consideration that humans are connected but separate to nature. The appraisal of World Heritage properties by IUCN and ICOMOS bureaucracies can be considered as problematic in their separation of cultural and natural management related to the Aboriginal management of Country. However, ICOMOS and IUCN are gradually building more coherent collaborations in their approach to Cultural Landscapes and Protected Landscape as discussed in the following section *IUCN Protected Areas*.

In consideration of the focus and foundations of ICOMOS and IUCN (noting their recent move to work together) the challenge in contributing to advice of the management of Country is that models and knowledge based in the Western cultural paradigm do not embrace the Aboriginal integrated management approach. This is a cultural clash that has emerged and continues to permeate the research as a pivotal cross cultural factor in shared management, which is often recognized but not effectively resolved in sites such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.

**Man and the Biosphere Program**

A further UNESCO program targeted at managing culture and nature within landscapes in a more integrated manner is the Man and the Biosphere Programme (MAB) and its associated network of World Network of Biosphere Reserves (WNBR). This programme endeavors to foster the ‘harmonious integration of people and nature for sustainable development’ (UNESCO 2008: 8). It aims ‘to establish a scientific basis for the improvement of relationships between people and their environments. ‘ (UNESCO 2015c). The MAB and its associated network of WNBR can be seen as a move to provide a mechanism to consider both nature and culture together in a more integrated manner. A development of MAB was the *Madrid Action Plan for Biosphere Reserves (2008–2013)* (UNESCO 2008), which looks in part at the well-being of both human populations and the environment.

---

5 The term Western in this context relates to European based societies including the United States of America.
The MAB goals are primarily linked to research, education and sustainable human development however it does mention cultural well-being of human communities within the first goal (UNESCO 2008:5). The mission of the WNBR states its aimed is to ‘ensure environmental, economic, social (including cultural and spiritual) sustainability’ (UNESCO 2008: 8). The efforts of WNBR to position its activities within a sphere that considers people and nature as integrated is significant as it demonstrates an attempt to bring them together and deliver sustainable development. Although Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage aim at the same goal of sustainability, the basis on which to manage landscapes is manifest into ‘two different approaches designed to address the opposable challenges of resource extraction and conservation.’ (Salem B & Ghabbour S 2013: 28). It should be noted that Biosphere Reserves are not designed to restrict particular activities even if such activities cause environmental damages (ibid: 30).

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park is a demonstration of a World Heritage landscape overlaid as a Biosphere Reserve. The potential in having joint Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage, as in the instance of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, is that the full array of people, cultural practice, nature conservation and economic development can be integrated into management decisions. Unfortunately, a consequence of overlaying World Heritage and Biospheres is the imposition of a complex entanglement of policies and management practice addressing different priorities, authority and bureaucratic processes.

**Cultural Landscapes**

A further international concept for consideration is the Cultural Landscape category of World Heritage, linking the management of nature and culture more closely. The shift in Western management thinking toward more integration of cultural and natural heritage management can be observed in the World Heritage Committee’s recognition and protection of Cultural Landscapes, which provides a platform on which to investigate the mixed landscape management of culture and nature. (UNESCO 2009b). The culture/nature dichotomy as described by Lilley (2013) is in part addressed by the UNESCO category of Cultural Landscape. Lilley states: ‘UNESCO recognized ‘cultural landscapes’ as a category of World Heritage, specially to
overcome obvious conceptual and practical difficulties with the cultural/natural dichotomy recognized in the original World Heritage Convention’ (ibid: 16).

In 1992 the World Heritage Committee adopted the World Heritage category of Cultural Landscapes for the Tongariro National Park in 1993, which was the first property inscribed on the World Heritage List, under the description of Cultural Landscape. In recognizing Cultural Landscapes, the ‘World Heritage Committee became the first international legal instrument to recognize and protect cultural landscapes’ (UNESCO 2015a). Cultural Landscapes were to represent the combined works of nature and mankind and ‘reveal and sustain the great diversity of the interactions between humans and their environment’ (ibid). By 2015, 88 properties including Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park had been included as cultural landscapes (ibid).

The purpose of the Cultural Landscape program is to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of landscapes that are defined as World Heritage listed by the Committee (Mitchell et al. 2009: 33). Cultural landscapes that are inscribed as World Heritage only exist provided they have components that are sanctioned by the World Heritage Committee as having Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), integrity, authenticity and can demonstrate ‘adequate long-term legislative, regulatory, institutional and/or traditional protection and management to ensure their safeguarding.’ (UNESCO 2013b: 25)

The concept of Cultural Landscapes consists of three categories as defined in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention: (UNESCO 2013b: 88).

i. 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. Organically evolved landscape (a relict (or fossil) and continuing 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; and

iii. Associative cultural landscape. The inscription 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.

The three Cultural Landscape categories progress from: category (i), an imposed aesthetic designed and constructed into gardens and parklands often associated with religion or monuments; to category (ii) an association and response to nature, driven by an initial social, economic, administrative and/or religious imperative; to category (iii) an association of religion, art and culture with nature, rather than material cultural evidence (UNESCO 2013b). The World Heritage Committee’s definition of Cultural Landscapes mentions: interactions between humankind and nature, a spiritual relation to nature, sustainable land use and traditional cultural landscapes (ibid). This identifies a connection between the society of people (culture) and the natural environment, but maintains the principals of a contrived separation and perpetuates Western dualism and the culture/nature dichotomy.

The Associative Cultural Landscape category is of specific interest to the research as the case studies of Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area are all large landscapes nominated by the Australian Government for World Heritage inscription under criteria related to their cultural and natural Outstanding Universal Values. In addition, the case studies have the similarity that they involve local traditional Aboriginal cultural attachment to place associated with religion, art, culture and environment. As examined in Chapter Four: Case Studies, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area were granted World Heritage inscription under cultural and natural criteria, but Purnululu unfortunately, is only inscribed under natural criteria with the cultural criteria inscription deferred.

The World Heritage Committee establishment of Cultural Landscapes as a category is recognized as an attempt ‘to address major considerations by expert groups and the
World Heritage Committee in bringing nature and culture closer together in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention’ (Bandarin 2009: 3). The Cultural Landscapes principles, associated with management, are offered in the *UNESCO World Heritage Paper 26* (Mitchell *et al.* 2009: 35). They recognize the importance of governance, society and a focus on relationships, and are presented within the confines of the Western concept of ‘stewardship’, putting people as managing the environment rather than being integrated with the environment, which is in contrast to the concept of managing Country, related to large landscapes with mixed culture and natural values. The Cultural Landscape principles: (Mitchell *et al.* 2009: 35)

1: People associated with the cultural landscape are the primary stakeholders for stewardship.
2: Successful management is inclusive and transparent, and governance is shaped through dialogue and agreement among key stakeholders.
3: The value of the cultural landscape is based on the interaction between people and their environment; and the focus of management is on this relationship.
4: The focus of management is on guiding change to retain the values of the cultural landscape.
5: Management of cultural landscapes is integrated into a larger landscape context.
6: Successful management contributes to a sustainable society.

The process of stewardship is utilized to some degree within UNESCO and particularly in the acclaimed success of the *Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation* (COMPACT) initiative (Brown *et al.* 2014). Whilst this initiative is successful, an analysis the *World heritage paper 40, Engaging Local Communities in Stewardship of World Heritage* (*ibid*) indicates a COMPACT focus on natural World Heritage sites with little reference to cultural heritage and a process of managing the landscape through manipulation and dominance. This is in contradiction, and I propose in conflict, to the Australian Aboriginal management of Country and the imposition of government land acquisition utilization for mining, tourism, agriculture and other purposes.
Plachter and Rossler (1995) in the publication *Cultural Landscapes of Universal Value – Components of a Global Strategy* describes Cultural Landscapes as reflecting ‘interactions between people and their natural environment over space and time … a complex phenomenon with tangible and intangible identity … Cultural Landscapes mirror the cultures that create them’ (*ibid:* 15). In the Aboriginal integrated concept of managing Country there is reciprocity between culture and nature with each element creating and evolving the other. This concept of reciprocity is demonstrated in the statement: (Rose 2008: 110)

> People speak to Country, sing Country, visit Country, worry about Country, feel for Country, and long for Country. People say that Country knows hears, smells, takes notice, takes care, is sorry or happy. Country is a living entity with a yesterday, today and tomorrow, with a consciousness, and a will toward life.’

A comparison of Rose’s statement and the description of Cultural Landscape by Plachter and Rossler demonstrates the similarities and at the same time, differences in the Western and Aboriginal perspectives on the relationship between nature and culture. Each recognizes the fundamental interaction and reciprocity between people and nature. However, the Aboriginal perspective presented by Rose takes reciprocity between culture and natural a step further than an interchange or reflection by considering Country as a living entity with intergenerational characteristics. The recognition of Cultural Landscapes moves some way to reducing the separation of cultural and natural management, however the concept needs further development. (Taylor and Francis 2014: 37)

> A more informed understanding is emerging that recognizes the need to address the artificial separation of culture from nature and intangible from tangible heritage. As yet, the reduction of these separations is more akin to straddling the problem rather than reducing the chasm of division.

In considering the ICOMOS and IUCN separate priorities I have apprehensions regarding the underlying construct of the World Heritage Committee’s pursuit of
Cultural Landscapes within the structure of conflicting bureaucracies. My concern is whether the concept of Cultural Landscapes, as a recognized innovative direction in considering cultural and natural heritage together, is potentially restricted by the underlying philosophy of human vs nature reflected in a culture/nature management dichotomy. The primary point to this concern relates to the use of the separate bureaucracies of ICOMOS and IUCN reporting to the World Heritage Committee, with advice on cultural or natural values related to properties similar to the Project case studies. Although ICOMOS and IUCN advice is often presented together the bias of each organizations’ separate priorities still exists.

The difficulties inherent in separate bureaucracies trying to work collaboratively, after an extended period of separate development and focus, is that they have to build substantial bureaucratic rules for interaction to define ways of positioning and advantaging themselves in the discussion with other parties. This is demonstrated in the extensive rules of engagement, as defined in the 2013 Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2013b). The entanglement of authority and responsibilities between ICOMOS and IUCN are often complex, with carefully crafted policy statements attempting to bridge the gap between cultural and natural assessment within landscapes.

A specific demonstration of the cross over in objectives, authority and operation of ICOMOS and IUCN is in the interrelationship of Cultural Landscapes and the Protected Areas category v, as discussed by Finke (2013) in the article ‘Cultural landscapes and protected areas: Unfolding synergies’. Finke argues ‘IUNC protected area categories are centrally concerned with cultural values, as well as natural conservation, and the services that ecosystems provide to people’ (Finke 2013: 21). Finke also states: ‘National Authorities should seek to link both conservation instruments – World Heritage cultural landscapes and protected areas’ (ibid: 25). The argument by Finke to link potentially synergized conservation instruments emphasizes the historic propensity of international bodies including UNESCO to divide the management of cultural and natural heritage. The consideration that the diverse focuses of ICOMOS (culture) and IUCN (nature) can be superimposed on the same landscapes is an issue that I find difficult to resolve when related to the case studies. Particularly when the two historically separate bureaucracies with
fundamentally different agendas seek to collaborate on concepts that aim at integrating culture/nature and tangible/intangible.

The persistent move to reduce the separation of cultural and natural World Heritage assessment and management is underpinned by the establishment of the World Heritage Convention, over 40 years ago, to move the management of culture and nature into one instrument. The recognition of Outstanding Universal Value is required as a prerequisite for inscription of a property on the World Heritage list. Cultural and natural criteria were separate until 2005, when they were amalgamated into one list of ten criteria (i-x) as set out in the 2005 *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, which stated: ‘the 6th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee decided to merge the ten criteria (Decision 6 EXT.COM 5.1)’ (UNESCO 2005: 19). The positioning of culture and nature in one instrument (the World Heritage Convention) and the merging of Outstanding Universal Value criteria demonstrates a developing recognition of the need to manage natural and cultural heritage more closely, but falls short in the World Heritage assessment process because of the priorities of the separate bureaucracies of ICOMOS and IUCN in evaluating mixed cultural and natural sites.

In relation to the World Heritage Convention ICOMOS and IUCN have a general role in the ‘evaluation of properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List’ (UNESCO 2013b: 10). However their separate roles are clearly distinguished in that ICOMOS is to monitor ‘the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural properties’ *(ibid: 10)*, whilst IUCN is to monitor ‘the state of conservation of World Heritage natural properties’ *(ibid: 10)*. The identification of specific roles of ICOMOS and IUCN demonstrates that even when working collaboratively on cultural landscapes they are still locked into the Western construct and philosophy of separation, through each organization having separate priorities.

In relation to the Cultural Landscape concept there has been progress along the path of reducing the culture/nature management divide, which effectively edges closer to the integration of the management of culture and nature. However, as described by Lilley (2013), in the publication ‘Nature and culture in World Heritage management: A view from the Asia-Pacific’ there continues to be a separation of cultural and
natural heritage management. ‘The gulf between natural and cultural World Heritage management in the Asia-Pacific region – and indeed right around the world – remains wide.’ (Lilley 2013: 13)

Whilst progressive dialogue and concepts such as MAB and Cultural Landscapes promote cultural and natural management that is integrated or combined they are still locked within the Western separation model of having separate organizations such as ICOMOS and IUCN focusing on either natural or cultural heritage. This is in contradiction to the holistic concept of Country as embraced by traditional Indigenous people. The World Heritage system, as identified in the Connecting Practice Project describes the separation of ICOMOS and IUCN: (IUCN 2015b: 14)

As the World Heritage system currently works, official joint IUCN and ICOMOS missions to nominated or existing World Heritage properties follow the same timetable and programme but they have different objectives and terms of reference, and they create different reports.

Although IUCN and ICOMOS work jointly I propose they are fundamentally locked into a dichotomy, as the management of ICOMOS and IUCN have different priorities. These priorities noticeably cross over within the same landscapes when it is defined as both a Protected Area and a Cultural Landscape. The cross over of the management regulations over the same landscapes, by ICOMOS and IUCN, is particularly evident at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park where the management of the Park operates under the multiple protocols of a World Heritage, Cultural Landscape and a Protected Area. Although IUCN and ICOMOS have worked together it was not until the Connecting Practice Project was launched in 2013 (IUCN 2015b) that they jointly managed a project, with the Project’s report noting: (ibid: 17)

This (remarkably) is the first project that IUCN and ICOMOS have jointly managed in the history of their work on the World Heritage Convention. The process has enabled a small but real foundation in IUCN and ICOMOS to be built.

My contention is the World Heritage Western based approaches to the shared
management of cross-cultural mixed World Heritage sites such as the PhD case studies, will continue to move closer and closer to the Aboriginal perspective of managing Country as an integrated management of culture and nature. However, the current World Heritage system will continue to be challenged until ICOMOS and IUCN reporting as separate bureaucracies is put aside and the Western philosophy of the relationship of people and nature is reinterpreted.

**IUCN Protected Areas**

In the international arena IUCN is a demonstration of a nature conservation organization promoting a greater recognition of landscapes with combined cultural and natural heritage, whist moving away from a strict wilderness construct that removes people (particularly Indigenous people) from the environment in order to conserve biodiversity. This is highlighted in their Protected Areas Program that ranks Protected Areas in their relationships to human activity and includes natural and cultural landscapes/seascapes.

IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) defines its Protected Areas as:

(IUCN 2013: 8)

A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values

IUCN’s activities are targeted at nature conservation with a clear nature-focused approach to managing landscapes, as indicated by their objectives: (IUCN 2012: 2)

to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.

The Protected Area Categories are (IUCN 2013: 14):

- **Category Ia** Strict nature reserve: strictly protected areas set aside to protect biodiversity and also possibly geological/geomorphological features, where
human visitation, use and impacts are strictly controlled and limited to ensure protection of the conservation values. Such protected areas can serve as indispensable reference areas for scientific research and monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ib</td>
<td>Wilderness Area: usually large unmodified or slightly modified areas, retaining their natural character and influence, without permanent or significant human habitation, which are protected and managed so as to preserve their natural condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>National park: large natural or near natural areas set aside to protect large-scale ecological processes, along with the complement of species and ecosystems characteristic of the area, which also provide a foundation for environmentally and culturally compatible spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational and visitor opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>National monument or feature: set aside to protect a specific natural monument, which can be a landform, sea mount, submarine cavern, geological feature such as a cave or even a living feature such as an ancient grove. They are generally quite small protected areas and often have high visitor value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Habitat/species management area: aim to protect particular species or habitats and management reflects this priority. Many category IV protected areas will need regular, active interventions to address the requirements of particular species or to maintain habitats, but this is not a requirement of the category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Protected landscape/seascape: where the interaction of people and nature over time has produced an area of distinct character with significant ecological, biological, cultural and scenic value: and where safeguarding the integrity of this interaction is vital to protecting and sustaining the area and its associated nature conservation and other values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Protected area with sustainable use of ecosystems and habitats, together with associated cultural values and traditional natural values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
natural resources resource management systems. They are generally large, with most of the area in a natural condition, where a proportion is under sustainable natural resource management and where low-level non-industrial use of natural resources compatible with nature conservation is seen as one of the main aims of the area.

The Protected Areas Program and categories are an indication of the organization’s contemporary attempts to more closely consider people and environment in combined management of nature and culture within landscape: noting that ‘few if any areas of the land, inland waters and coastal seas remain completely unaffected by direct human activity’ (IUCN 2013: 10). A demonstration of the basis from which IUCN approaches Protected Areas can be observed in each of its categories ranging from: category Ia and Ib, which exclude human habitation, perpetuates the concept of wilderness and aims at preservation of natural condition; to category VI where exploitation or use of natural resources by humans is accepted but focuses on natural conservation. The Protected Area Management category of particular interest to the research of shared management is Category II (National Parks). The case study landscape of Ułuṟu-Kata Tjuṯa National Park is recognized as a Cultural Landscape by UNESCO (UNESCO 2015a) and is identified by IUCN as a Category II Protected Areas (IUCN and UNEP-WCMC 2014).

Brown, Mitchell and Beresford (2005), in the publication The Protected Landscape Approach Linking Nature, Culture and Community present an approach to protected areas that ‘links conservation of nature and culture, and fosters stewardship by people living in the landscape’ (Brown et al. 2005b: 3). This approach also binds Protected Areas to Cultural Landscapes through interdisciplinary research and the mix of cultural/natural and tangible and intangible heritage when they propose: (ibid: 3)

Protected Landscapes and cultural landscapes that have co-evolved with the human societies inhabiting them. They are protected areas based on the interactions of people and nature over time. Living examples of cultural heritage, these landscapes are rich in biological diversity and
other natural values not in spite of but rather because of the presence of people.

and

The cultural and natural values of these landscapes are bound together...It is this complex mix of cultural and natural values, of tangible and intangible heritage, that makes protection of landscapes so vital, and at the same time so challenging. It requires an approach that is interdisciplinary, inclusive, and that engages people and communities.

The consideration of Protected Landscapes as Cultural Landscapes provides a demonstration of the complexity and overlapping of the two concepts and the challenge of separate ICOMOS and IUCN considerations of applicable sites. My contention is that when considering shared management of World Heritage landscapes, with Aboriginal stakeholders, the IUNC Protected Areas still struggle with integrating the management of culture and nature within a landscape. The issue being that whilst natural environmental conservation is recognized as being, in some situations, closely linked to cultural heritage there still exists a fundamental philosophical duality of human and the environment supported by a cultural and natural management dichotomy.

At Uluṟu-Kata Tjuṯa National Park the overlaying of landscape identifications provides an ambiguity in how to strategize the management of landscape, whether to prioritize cultural heritage or nature. The traditional Aboriginal approach is integration rather than conflicted priorities. In considering the Aboriginal approach and the movement of ICOMOS and IUCN to both consider culture and nature within the landscape I propose an investigation is required to consider establishing a World Heritage assessment process detached from the often contradictory focuses of ICOMOS and IUCN. Such a management investigation is outside the constraints of my PhD research and may potentially require amendments to the World Heritage Convention.

Australian Landscapes
Legislation and Governance
The management of mixed World Heritage sites within Australia such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area is subject to Australian State and Federal legislation. Protection under legislation is identified as an essential element in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.* (UNESCO 2013b: 25)

All properties inscribed on the World Heritage List must have adequate long-term legislative, regulatory, institutional and/or traditional protection and management to ensure their safeguarding.

A significant piece of Australian federal legislation designed to enable states and territories to work collaboratively with the federal government is the *EPBC Act* (EPBC Act 1999 (Cth)). It is described as a mechanism that enables the Australian federal and state or territory governments to work together to deliver environment and heritage protection and biodiversity conservation, with the federal government focused on national significance and the other parties focused on local significance (Department of the Environment 2014b). The *EPBC Act* ‘provides a legal framework to protect and manage nationally and internationally important flora, fauna, ecological communities and heritage places defined in the Act as matters of national environmental significance.’ (Department of the Environment 2013: 1). There is also an array of other federal legislation involved in the management of Australian World Heritage and national parks that targets cultural heritage separately. These include the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984 (Cth)* and the *Australian Heritage Council Act 1975 (Cth).*

The implementation of the EPBC Act is complicated and highly political as it relies on collaboration between the jurisdictions of the Australian Federal Government and Australian state and territory governments. While the EPBC Act is implemented across all Australian national and World Heritage properties the management of parks and reserves is split between federal and state governments. The Director of National Parks, which is a Commonwealth corporation entity established under the EPBC Act, oversees Parks Australia in the management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park whilst Purnululu National Park is managed by the Western Australia Government Department of Parks and Wildlife and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage
Area is managed by the Tasmanian Government Department of Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service.

The combination of federal and state or territory government departments, that are involved in the management of mixed World Heritage landscapes such as the PhD Project case studies, delivers a plethora of interacting and often conflicting political agendas across the state and federal levels of government. The consequence is a multivalent and complicated governance regime of separate but connected governments, which compounds the effect of separating culture and nature management. A demonstration is the management of Purnululu National Park where separate heritage, conservation and Aboriginal departments and agencies interact with the Park’s management, across state and federal jurisdictions. The Western Australian government’s environmental, Aboriginal, heritage and other departments and agencies operate over the same landscape with the Australian government through national environmental, heritage and Indigenous departments and legislation. Compounding the separate departments and agencies operations at Purnululu National Parks is the different social, economic and political priorities and of the two levels of state and federal governance. The Purnululu case study identifies a fundamental difference in management approach between the levels of government, where the Western Australian state government’s priority is the benefit of Western Australians and the Australian Government’s priority is for all Australian citizens. The Western Australian Government legislation associated with Purnululu National Park involves a further complex array of state legislation targeted separately at environment, heritage, conservation, and Aboriginal affairs. The most prominent Western Australian legislation being the CALM Act (as discussed in the Purnululu case study), which interacts with other state legislation including the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950 (WA)*, *the Fire Arms Act 1973 (WA)* and the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA)*.

The issues associated with multiple governance layers over a landscape, supported by state and federal legislation, is revealed as problematic through the investigation of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area and the Gordon Below Franklin Dam campaign. The Tasmanian State Government wanted a dam built in the region but this was resisted by the Australian Government and resolved in the favor of the Australian Government through legal action and the Australian High Court decision.
(Commonwealth v Tasmania (1983) 158 CLR 1). The decision had implications for the power relationship between the Australian Commonwealth and States. (Blow 2015)

The implications of this case extended far beyond the stopping of the dam. It represented a major shift of power to the Commonwealth Government at the expense of the States.

A further demonstration of the issues associated with multiple layers of governance and legislation is revealed in the case study of the management of Uluru-Kata Tjuṯa National Park. The Australian Federal Government and the Northern Territory Government were initially conflicted in regard to how the Park should be governed and managed. This resulted in the Northern Territory Government initially refusing to be part of the Board of Management of Uluru-Kata Tjuṯa National Park (Keyes 1998).

The translation of legislation into policy and then management process requires a governance structure that is sustainable and robust enough in the face of conflicted priorities between shared management parties such as governments, local Indigenous traditional owners, pastoralists, tourist operators and other stakeholders. When considering governance in the Australia public sector, which is the situation with national parks managed by government, the difference between governance and management is identified as (Edwards & Clough 2005:3):

Broadly, governance involves the systems and processes in place that shape, enable and oversee management of an organisation. Management is concerned with doing – with co-ordinating and managing the day-to-day operations of the business.

The governance for landscape management, within Australia’s national parks, is guided by a range of state, territory and federal government legislation. These are interpreted into public management policy and process by the governments both separately and jointly, depending on their political ideologies and priorities. The legislations are enacted through the establishment of sprawling government departments, created around nature conservation, separate but connected to heritage and Aboriginal or Indigenous affairs. These separate government departments, both at
a federal and state or territory level develop specific policies, processes and funding for natural resource management and cultural heritage. The consequence of a mix of state, territory and federal legislation, in the shared management of landscapes, is that policies and underlying political agendas may differ and potentially cause conflict between different Australian governments.

Particular reference is often made to Aboriginal governance in relation to shared or joint management that separates Aboriginal people for special consideration and scrutiny. Research discussing this topic has been published in a range of formats including: research by Smith (2010); the Centre of Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR) at the Australian National University (Martin 2003); and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) (Sullivan 2006). The common thread with each of these publications is an acceptance that the traditional communal governance of Country, as employed by Indigenous traditional owners, is significantly different from the governance structures and processes operating under the Western construct of Australian governments. With this understanding of cultural difference, effective governance within a shared management environment needs to be innovative and flexible to encompass the different cultural decision processes of all parties and deliver sustainable management practice. The governance framework therefore needs to be based on local Aboriginal traditional cultural as well as the legislative framework of Australian governments.

The Project case studies provide a comparative dialogue of state verses federal governance and the management of the cultural and natural aspects of landscape (Country). The case studies also include an investigation of the associated legislative authority bestowed on the local Aboriginal traditional owners and how this influences landscape policy and management practice.

**Wilderness**

The concept of wilderness used widely across Australian landscapes can be identified in the mid 1800s through the work of North American philosophers such as Emerson and Thoreau (Mackey et al. 1998: 7) and within the United States of America’s National Wilderness Preservation System established with the *Wilderness Act 1964.*
This Act promotes humans as a visitor or tourist and typifies the wilderness concept that separates culture from nature, providing a justification for challenging Indigenous occupation and defines wilderness as: (Wilderness Act 1964: 891)

A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain.

In the Australian context the concept of wilderness was built on the North American model that involved its promotion and acceptance through artistic expression including literature, painting and notably photography. A demonstration of Australia’s embrace of this model was the artist’s camp, conducted in the 1870s in New South Wales (NSW) to capture the wilderness vista (Bonyhady 1995). Through the ensuing years wilderness became entrenched as a description of landscapes used in government legislation such as the NSW Wilderness Act 1987 (NSW) and the South Australian Wilderness Protection Act 1992 (SA). The concept of wilderness was taken up by government, conservation organizations such as the Wilderness Society, and artists as a means of creating a connection to place through a sense of place that sought the pristine, with limited or no human development impact. An investigation of the terms ‘place’, ‘sense of place’ and ‘place making’, related to shared landscape management, is presented in Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place, where each is presented as a continual process of engagement heritage interpretation.

The management case study of Purnululu National Park, in the Western Australian Kimberley region, demonstrates the continuance of wilderness as a major component of remote national park management in Australia. The Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2005 describes the visitor experience of an ‘unspoilt wilderness remote in place and time’ (Department Conservation and Land Management, 1995:2). The Purnululu National Park case study investigation demonstrates the term unspoilt is incorrect and bordering on being misleading and deceptive, as the impact of human endeavour on the environment is manifestly overt. This is reflected in the damage inflicted on the region by the pastoral industry since at
least 1902, which includes the landscape of the Park and Reserve prior to the Parks declaration in 1987. The pastoral impact contributed to significant environmental changes through reduced local species, substantial weed infestations and erosion across Purnululu National Park and Associated Reserve. (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1992)

The Western Australian government however continues to use wilderness throughout its park management literature, as demonstrated in its Strategic Directions 2014-17 (Department of Parks and Wildlife 2014a), which refers to the wilderness parks across the Kimberley. The Strategic Directions 2014-17 document, produced by the Western Australian Government, states that the State Government has an ‘initiative to protect Australia’s last great natural wilderness’ (ibid: 3). Perhaps such statements are beneficial to tourism promotion but my analysis reveals they are substantially misleading. The continued embracing of the term wilderness, by the Western Australian Government presents a striking difference in policy and management between the state management of Purnululu and the federal government management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. The term wilderness does not appear in any of the five Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Plans of Management and in 2015 it is difficult to find any official Australian Government descriptions that use wilderness as a descriptor. However, it is a term used in limited tourism visitor experiences promotions such as the luxury tented wilderness experience of Longitude 131 at Ayers Rock Resort, adjacent to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. (Baillie Lodges 2015)

The Aboriginal integration approach to sustainably manage Country differs from the European colonial adversarial approach pursued through the philosophy of human vs nature. Demonstrations of this difference are discussed by Gammage (Gammage 2005) (Gammage 2011) and Power (Power 2002). In Gammage’s article ‘Gardens without fences? Landscape in Aboriginal Australia’ (Gammage 2005) he demonstrates the concept of wilderness is irrelevant in the Australian context, when considering the extensive land use impact created by thousands of years of Aboriginal use and manipulation. Gammage also makes the assertion that there is a variation in the intensity of Aboriginal management of the landscape but there was no wilderness (ibid). In Gammage’s subsequent publication in 2011 The Biggest Greatest Estate on
Earth: How Aborigines made Australia the notion of an Australian wilderness is systematically dismantled. The evidence in part is structured around the Aboriginal peoples’ use of fire to manage Country, historic texts and artwork that demonstrate the Australian landscape was extensively colonized and manipulated by Aboriginal cultures over thousands of years. Gammage’s research reveals that the Australian landscape at British colonization in 1788 had been physically altered by Aboriginal cultures in the pursuit of resources including fishing, agriculture and animal stewardship by the implementation of the major landscape management process of controlled fire burns.

The significance of Aboriginal traditional use of fire, in managing culture and nature within the landscape, is also been identified by Langton: (Langton 2000: 3)

Fire has played a significant role in the shaping of the Australian landmass and its biota. It is an ancient elemental force, constructed as a powerful cultural and religious symbol by Aboriginal peoples in Australia, and a key tool for the reproduction of landscapes, particularly in northern Australia.

In considering the use of fire as a management tool across Australia the Aboriginal relationship to the concept of wilderness can consequently be considered as that of the outsider to an alien Western philosophy. (Gammage 2011: 2)

There was no wilderness. The Law (traditional Aboriginal Law)– an ecological philosophy enforced by religious sanctions – compelled people to care for all their country. People lived and died to ensure this’. A further indication of the Australian Aboriginal relationship of the imposed Western mantra of wilderness was captured by Power in a 2002 edition of the Environmental and Planning Law Journal, which discusses joint management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. Power states: (Power 2002: 285).

National Parks arose from intellectual understandings of ‘wilderness’ which marginalised and then excluded indigenous people. As a result, in
the past a declaration of conservation status over Aboriginal land has been viewed suspiciously by traditional owners.

A demonstration of the inappropriate use, conflicting with the Aboriginal perspective, of the term wilderness in describing landscapes, is in the naming of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA). The TWWHA is the only cultural and natural World Heritage inscribed site that uses the term wilderness in its title. The use of the term wilderness is challenged by Tasmanian Aboriginal people and is specifically addressed in the *Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) Management Plan 2016* (DPIPWE 2016). The TWWHA Management Plan 2016 notes the notion of wilderness is problematic for some Tasmanian Aboriginal people. It also notes that some Aboriginal people find objection to the use of the term ‘wilderness’ to describe their Country and state they: *(ibid: 103)*

believe the term wrongly implies that the TWWHA is a landscape empty of human culture and that its use, in this way, lends weight to a denial of the full extent of Aboriginal occupation and survival in the TWWHA, and of contemporary Aboriginal rights.

The challenge created by ‘wilderness’ in the shared management of culture and nature within a landscape, particularly national parks within Australia, is that the underlying basis to their development and management has been linked to Western philosophy and concept of wilderness, which is disassociated from traditional Aboriginal land management practice for Country. Whilst traditional Aboriginal approaches to land management, which consider a holistic and integrated approach to Country, are regularly acknowledged within park management documents they tend to be, as demonstrated in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area situation and in the investigations of Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Purnulu, peripheral and only utilized in conjunction with dominant Western landscape management techniques.

The use of wilderness as a concept for managing Australian landscapes has expanded beyond national parks to include community and not for profit conservation associations. Wilderness has become an organizational brand and rallying call for
many environmental and conservation groups that seek to protect the natural world. The two specific organizations selected for investigation are the Wilderness Society, a professed non-political organization and the Bob Brown Foundation, which is politicized and campaigns to Defend Tasmania’s Wilderness World Heritage (Bob Brown Foundation 2015). Whilst other examples exist throughout Australia these two organizations are linked to groundbreaking environment advocacy in the 1980’s, that prevented the flooding of South West Tasmania’s Franklin River, which would have resulted from the construction of the Gordon-below-Franklin Dam (*ibid*).

The Wilderness Society and the Tasmanian based Bob Brown Foundation actively engage with wilderness conservation. A link between these organizations is the work of Bob Brown who leads the Bob Brown Foundation and ‘helped establish the Wilderness Society, which organized the blockade of the dam works on Tasmania's Franklin River in 1982–3, and acted as a Director for five years.’ (Brown 2015a). My research of the organizations reveals that a major component of their media campaigns is the use of the arts including literature, visual arts, photography, painting, performance and drawing to create images and perceptions of a constructed pristine wilderness with a sense of awe and wonder at raw, untouched, wild nature linked to the historic wilderness construct, usually devoid of people. The use of artistic expression in the establishment and management of national parks and nature conservation is discussed in detail in *Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place*, where the new landscape management approach emerging from my research is deliberated in relation to integrating culture, nature and arts into a single management model.

Although the Wilderness Society and the Bob Brown Foundation (the Organizations) still cling to wilderness as an image, concept, brand and catch cry they have adapted to recognize and include Indigenous Australians as part of an ethical component of sustainable landscape management. (Bob Brown Foundation 2015) (Wilderness Society 2015). The Wilderness Society’s *Annual Review: Protecting, promoting and restoring wilderness 2014-15* states that its vision is: ‘An Australian society that protects and respects the natural world to create a vibrant, healthy continent with positive connections between land, water, people and wildlife’ (*ibid*: 11). The focus of the Wilderness Society is on nature and conservation with often obscure references to culture through an indication of Indigenous Australian people as managers of natural
resources. This is in contrast to referencing the Indigenous wider landscape management role that integrates the management of culture and nature. The activities and vision of the Wilderness Society create significant potential to engage with an integrated cultural and natural approach, with the potential for shared management. However, I contend this is hampered by their restrictive historic roots within the Western perspective that separates nature from culture under the potential colonial impost of wilderness.

In the exchange between the Bob Brown Foundation and Emma Lee, related to wilderness and Aboriginal dispossession, Lee made the statement that ‘Wilderness is sometimes just another name for dispossession and exclusion for Australian Aboriginal people and cultural practices.’ (Lee 2015). The response to Lee’s concern, from Bob Brown, was to argue that Lee’s statement on Aboriginal understanding of Country in Tasmania was misleading as it ‘echoes some mainland viewpoints and is untrue. (Brown 2015b). This response demonstrates the different approach to landscape management between the Organizations previously discussed, as rather than embracing Aboriginal concerns and opinion they are ridiculed and dismissed. There appears to be a strong correlation between the concept of wilderness, which excludes people, particularly Aboriginal people and the response to the concerns of Emma Lee, a Tasmanian Aboriginal person. An assessment of the use of wilderness as a concept and management approach espoused by the Wilderness Society and the Bob Brown Foundation is that it is still Western in construct. It separates the environment from people and seeks to create place and sense of place that reflects the Western pursuit of the sublime and awe-inspiring natural wonders with their associated vistas.

A challenge to shared management presented by the use of the concept of wilderness of landscapes such as national parks and protected areas is the divisive characteristic of misrepresentative wilderness images, devoid of local culture or its influence on the landscape, which marginalize local Aboriginal participants causing mistrust and conflict. To meet this challenge I propose, in Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place, a process that recognizes the philosophical differences between Western and Aboriginal landscape priorities and is manifest through the different cultures’ use of artistic expression as a component of management. In considering wilderness versus
Country the wilderness imagery targets the natural environment and the Country imagery is an integration of culture and nature. The use of artistic expression, in its many forms, as a tool for share management is expanded in *Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place* and presented as a complementary philosophical approach to cross cultural dialogue. Entwined in the different understandings and interpretations of Western and Aboriginal philosophical approaches to humans and the environment is the notion of validity and authenticity. These notions are expressed in the World Heritage Committee’s decisions on Outstanding Universal Values through the concepts of authenticity and integrity of heritage claimed by varying stakeholders, including local traditional Aboriginal and settler cultures.

**Authenticity and Integrity**

The *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* 2013 describe the use of the test of authenticity and/or integrity as: (UNESCO 2013b: 21)

> To be deemed of Outstanding Universal Value, a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding.

The manner in which the terms authenticity and integrity are utilized within the World Heritage Convention, in relation to conditions needed for World Heritage nomination and inscription, highlights a complex separation and overlap of cultural and natural heritage management. A demonstration of this is observed in the definitions of authenticity and integrity and how they apply to mixed sites. The *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (UNESCO 2013b) defines that authenticity conditions must be met by all properties nominated to World Heritage inscription under the cultural criteria (i) to (vi) (UNESCO 2013b: 21). To meet the authenticity conditions, the property nomination must demonstrate that ‘their cultural values are truthfully and credibly expressed’ (*ibid*: 22). The *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* also define that conditions of integrity must be met by all properties nominated under all cultural and natural criteria (i) to (x) (*ibid*: 23). Integrity being a measurement of ‘the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes’
In the case study of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, which has achieved World Heritage inscription under cultural criteria (v) and (vi) plus natural criteria (vii) and (viii) (Director of National Parks 2010a), the Australian Government’s management presents a complex assessment of authenticity and integrity. However, the management of the Country of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, by Nguraritja within Tjukurpa, does not operate under the Western cultural/natural management dichotomy. The divergence of Western and Aboriginal approaches to management presents a shared management dilemma. Although the Australian Government has the legal authority over the management of culture and nature within the landscape, which party has the cultural authority to investigate and define authenticity or integrity over Tjukurpa and Country? The shared management dilemma described at Uluru-Kata Tjuta also applies to the other case studies of Purnululu National Park and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, as these areas also are managed under arrangements with the traditional Aboriginal owners and demand verification of authenticity and integrity in Western terms.

The development and implementation of shared management policy and processes that integrate the management of culture and nature within a landscape are challenging. A particular challenge to management under World Heritage criteria is the contradictions set up by terminology that mixes fundamentally intangible cultural concepts of aesthetics and beauty within natural criterion (vii) (UNESCO 2013b), which is assessed by the natural heritage focused IUCN rather than the cultural heritage focused ICOMOS. The issue with this challenge is receiving separate heritage advice on authenticity and/or integrity from IUCN and ICOMOS related to the same heritage of the same Country.

The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2013b) fundamentally separates the management of culture and nature, which is in contrast to the Aboriginal Australian approach to Country. The use of complex assessment of authenticity and/or integrity at mixed sites such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area demonstrates a fundamental challenge to combining the cultural and natural criteria.
into a sequence of ten criteria. I contend that this move perpetuates cultural and
natural World Heritage as separate but related concepts. The following discussion
investigates the application of authenticity within the Western heritage management
construct. It assesses the contemporary Western position of heritage as separated into
tangible and intangible and extends into the concept of attempting to quantify the
authenticity and integrity of intangible heritage.

The consideration and understanding of authenticity has been explored in a range of
international forums with a seminal document being the *Nara Document on
Authenticity*, which is mentioned in the Convention’s Operating Guidelines
(UNESCO 2013b). However, the *Nara Document of Authenticity* recognizes that
authenticity cannot be judged on fixed criteria as it is related to the particular cultural
context. (ICOMOS 1994: para 11). The Nara Document on Authenticity states:

>(ICOMOS 1994: para 7):

> All cultures and societies are rooted in the particular forms and means of
tangible and intangible expression which constitute their heritage, and
these should be respected.

In considering the authenticity of cultural and natural heritage in locations such as
Uluṟu-Kata Tjuṯa, Purnululu and the the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area,
I propose that the separation of the management of tangible from intangible detaches
the cultural meaning of place or sense of place from the physicality of a landscape’s
human or natural components. This approach recognizes but still separates the
management of the intangible from its physicality. In relation to the culture/nature
divide in the shared management of mixed landscapes, the intangible, which is the
ephemeral experience of culture is separated from the tangible of the natural world.
My contention is that the management separation of culture and nature as reflected in
the management separation of intangible from tangible fails in cross cultural equity
and inhibits management sustainability and cultural integrity, due to the conflicted
positions of Aboriginal and Western approaches.

**Intangible Cultural Heritage**
The UNESCO engagement with intangible heritage management produced the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention) (UNESCO 2003a), which was adopted by the General Assembly of UNESCO in 2003. It came into force in 2006 and superseded the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity: Proclamations (UNESCO 2006). An organ of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention is the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. This instrument is answerable to the UNESCO General Assembly and consists of State Parties. Among its seven defined functions is the responsibility to examine and recommend to the General Assembly State requests for inscription (UNESCO 2003). The Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention recognizes the connection between intangible and tangible in its definition of intangible heritage when it refers to objects, artefacts and cultural spaces. The Convention notes (UNESCO 2003:1)

> the importance of the intangible cultural heritage as a mainspring of cultural diversity and a guarantee of sustainable development….the deep-seated interdependence between the intangible cultural heritage and the tangible cultural and natural heritage

The implementation of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention unfortunately has the potential to perpetuate a separation of a location’s intangible heritage from its tangible, whilst promoting its commodification for academic, political and commercial purposes. The intangible can be made into fixed tangible heritage through its documentation and the consequential creation as a tangible product. Once heritage is documented in a fixed form, such as text, audio recording or film, it becomes a tangible product that has potential for exploitation in the market economy. At this stage the authenticity of heritage is disrupted, as the authentic intangible, which needs to continually change over time becomes dislocated from its documented tangible product.

The process of locking down the dynamism of heritage by making it tangible devalues the culture’s heritage as it restricts its freedom to shift and evolve whilst failing to recognize the intangible experiential quality of heritage, as it is practiced and
interpreted by people. However, suspending intangible heritage in a snap shot of time, as a fixed object, feature or commodity has advantages for marketing, product development, academic research, political influence and appropriation, as the heritage can be more easily disseminated, controlled, compartmentalized and commodified. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention also has the potential to undermine intangible cultural heritage, particularly of Indigenous cultures as its implementation may unintentionally infringe their human rights (Logan 2009: 14). The consideration of the holistic aspect of intangible cultural heritage, which includes the tangible, is a concern of many scholars, including Richard Kurin who in his critical appraisal of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, notes that (Kurin, 2004: 74):

The convention tends to reduce intangible cultural heritage to a list of largely expressive traditions, atomistically recognized and conceived. The actions it proposes miss the larger, holistic aspect of culture – the very characteristic that makes a culture intangible

At an Australian level the term ‘intangible cultural heritage’ generally does not appear in national park plans of management prior to the year 2000 such as the *Purnululu National Plan of Management 1995-2005* (Department of Conservation and Land Management, 1995) and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan 1999 (Parks and Wildlife Service (Tasmania) 1999). However, intangible cultural heritage is used in more recent plans of management such as the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Plan of Management 2010-2020* (Director of National Parks, 2010a) and the *Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) Management Plan 2016* (DPIPWE 2016).

The Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention does consider the existence of an essential connection between tangible and intangible heritage by the statement that there is a ‘deep-seated interdependence between the intangible cultural heritage and the tangible cultural and natural heritage’ (UNESCO, 2003:1). In relation to mixed heritage sites such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention falls short in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, as its terminology and construct is based in the Western separation philosophy. This philosophy has the potential to lead to
separation of the heritage management of intangible from tangible and culture from nature. The separation of the management of intangible from tangible heritage is evident in the Convention’s title, whilst the separation of the management of culture and nature is demonstrated through the perceived need to establish an intangible cultural heritage convention.

In analyzing the focus of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention it can be presented that the holistic aspect of intangible heritage, which links people, places and the intangible together, is not appropriately addressed within the document when related to the shared management of mixed natural and cultural heritage sites such as the Project case studies. Consequently, the use of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention is not helpful in managing the symbiotic relationship of tangible and intangible heritage within cross-cultural mixed landscapes such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.

**Intellectual Property**

An extension of the investigation of the management of intangible cultural heritage and its authenticity and/or integrity is the concept of intellectual property, which provides legal property rights for the creator or owners to benefit and invest in a creation (WIPO 2011a). The concept and legislation regarding intellectual property and its resultant impact on heritage management is highly relevant to the research, particularly in the sensitive arena of cross cultural shared management of cultural and natural heritage. It can be utilized as a tool for the recognition of authenticity and/or integrity when defining equitable management authority.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) established in 1967 aims ‘to promote the intellectual property… and ensure administrative cooperation’ (WIPO 2014). The WIPO provides a brief definition for intellectual property:

- Intellectual property, very broadly, means the legal rights, which result from intellectual activity in the industrial, scientific, literary and artistic fields… It is traditionally divided into two branches, ‘industrial property’ and ‘copyright.’ (WIPO 2004: 3)
• Intellectual property (IP) refers to creations of the mind, such as inventions; literary and artistic works; designs; and symbols, names and images used in commerce (WIPO 2016).

Intellectual property, which developed from the Western consideration of property ownership and commerce requires that tangible evidence of the property is necessary for legal recourse against misuse. A particular aspect of intellectual property is its relation to Indigenous traditional knowledge and management of Country. Intellectual property may be used for verification of authenticity of individual and community claims to authority over cultural intangible knowledge. This has ramifications regarding the potential financial benefit or loss from the use of traditional knowledge and its control or appropriation.

A significant issue in the management of Country is the collection of intangible heritage knowledge and the propensity of collecting institutions, such as galleries, libraries, academic institutions, governments and museums to appropriate the intangible by converting it into tangible assets for exploitation as objects, images, publications or recordings of research for public viewing and other activities. The concern by Indigenous people is noted in the Mataatua Declaration (Commission of Human Rights 1993) regarding access and authority over such cultural heritage and the associated appropriateness, possession and ownership of Cultural Objects that comprise of historic fabric and heritage. The Mataatua Declaration recommends:

2.12 All human remains and burial objects of indigenous peoples held by museums and other institutions must be returned to their traditional areas in a culturally appropriate manner.
2.13 Museums and other institutions must provide, to the country and indigenous peoples concerned, an inventory of any indigenous cultural objects still held in their possession.
2.14 Indigenous cultural objects held in museums and other institutions must be offered back to their traditional owners.

In May 2011 WIPO signed a memorandum of understanding with the International Council of Museums (ICOM), which recognized intellectual properties link to
heritage. It was noted the memorandum ‘reflects the many linkages between cultural heritage, including traditional knowledge, traditional cultural expressions as well as other indigenous cultural materials, and intellectual property in general.’ (WIPO 2011b)

In the cross cultural environment of the shared management of culture and nature within landscapes the concept of intellectual property has begun to be modified into Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property. This concept challenges the Western approach and acknowledges intangible heritage without the creation of tangible representations. The first major Australian report on Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property was funded by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) and published in 1998 under the title Our Culture Our Future: Report on Australian Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (Janke 1998). Terri Janke who researched and wrote the report under contract to the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) (ibid: 1) was engaged as Solicitor and Principal Consultant at Michael Frankel & Company, Solicitors. Terri Janke, currently the Solicitor General of Terri Janke and Associates, Lawyers and Consultants, has investigated and written on intellectual Property and Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property, particularly in regard to Indigenous Australian’s rights for over two decades. Janke may be considered a leading international authority on Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property and describes it as (Janke 2011: 14):

Indigenous peoples’ rights to their heritage. Heritage includes the tangible and intangible heritage that is passed on through generation to generation pertaining to Indigenous peoples, and is all part of expression of their identity.

The Arts Law Centre of Australia’s submission (Ayres and Everard 2012) to the Australian government authority ‘IP Australia’ related to reform of Intellectual Property legislation presented a case for sui generis legislation stating Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (ibid: 2)
• covers a broader range of creative and intellectual and cultural concepts than those protected under the existing copyright, designs and patent laws. It should be dealt with in one piece of legislation and any attempt to deal with it solely in the context of, say, copyright will be artificial and incomplete;

• is fundamentally different from traditional legal constructs of intellectual property in that it is a communal not individual right albeit with individual custodians;

• is an intergenerational right which does not lend itself to traditional approaches involving set periods of time;

• evolves and develops over time unlike traditional Intellectual property rights which focus on fixing a point in time at which the property which is protected is defined;

• is not concerned with individual originality or novelty which is the basis for all existing intellectual property rights, whether copyright, design or patents;

• stands beside existing intellectual property rights - it is not an extension of them.

The challenges facing the acceptance of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property, in the shared cultural and natural management arena, is that it is contradictory to the general Western approach of managing tangible and intangible heritage and converting the intangible into the tangible through documentation as text, sound or images. As noted in regard to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, the commodification of the intangible into a fixed tangible form interrupts the evolution of intangible heritage and converts heritage into market products or political levers. The shared management of Indigenous heritage, specifically cultural heritage, is primarily the management of the intangible. Consequently, recognizing Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property is crucial in the process of cross-cultural negotiation, the strategic maintenance of authentic cultural heritage and pursuit of sustainable shared management.
The propensity to produce documentation of the intangible creates numerous challenges in addition to commodification and the separation of evolving intangible heritage from its tangible manifestation. The main challenge relates to ownership and possession of objects and documentation of the associated intellectual property and rights to its access and use. The World Intellectual Property Organization specifically addressed this issue in its 2010 publication *Intellectual Property and the Safeguarding of Traditional Cultures* (Torsen & Anderson 2010), which identifies the challenges faced particularly by collecting institution such as museums, libraries and archives. A demonstration of the challenges related to intellectual property, as noted by Torsen & Anderson (2010), is where recordings of the Djalambu (Hollow Log) ceremony from Arnhem Land in Australia’s Northern Territory were recorded by a husband and wife team. The wife’s copyright ownership proved difficult as she had ‘total control over the material… fastidiously pursues any unauthorized use… and was .reluctant to let communities reuse the material’ (Torsen & Anderson: 10). In this demonstration the intangible heritage of the ceremony and its performance is separated from the tangible bearers of the heritage and appropriated into a tangible product (the film) that extricated it from its cultural place. Whether the issue is appropriating cultural heritage or separating the tangible from the intangible the consequence of separation was ‘an acrimonious atmosphere in relations with indigenous communities as well as with the institution that holds the original films and recordings.’ (ibid: 10)

An illustration of shared management significance of intellectual property and Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property is the conflict at Purnululu National Park. The conflict relates to identifying the authenticity of Aboriginal traditional claims regarding Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property over the Park, which would establish the authority to negotiate and influence government management. The issue of authority to ‘speak for Country’, which is a phrase linking the traditional authority to use specific Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property, is at the core of the dispute as to the ‘identity of the primary traditional owners responsible for Country’ (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995: i). The lack of clarity regarding cultural intellectual property and authority prevented traditional owner participation in the final stages of the development of the Park’s *Purnululu National Plan of Management 1995-2005* (Department of Conservation and Land Management, 1995) (ibid). The continuing dispute between local traditional
Aboriginal groups was also a factor that prevented World Heritage inscription under cultural criteria (ICOMOS 2003). The core of the dispute at Purnululu is the conflicted opinions on cultural authority by the Kija and Jaru language groups, which is examined in section *Purnululu National Park and Reserve* of Chapter Four: Case Studies.

In considering the concept of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property to be broader than Intellectual Property and more inclusive of creative intellectual and cultural concepts there is justification for its use to inform policy development and management delivery in shared cross-cultural landscapes. Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property provides a platform to incorporate the symbiotic relationship of tangible and intangible heritage into shared management and the importance of the intangible non-historic fabric of heritage in building sustainable stakeholder relationships.

**Synopsis**

The contemporary international movement toward closer collaboration of natural and cultural heritage conservation and management is demonstrated through the UNESCO moves to jointly consider natural and cultural World Heritage criteria including: the engagement with the Man and the Biosphere program; the partial shift to move away from the historic wilderness model that excluded humans in order to conserve natural beauty and environment; and the contemporary vibrant and progressive movements of Cultural Landscape and Protected Areas within ICOMOS and IUCN.

The concept of Cultural Landscape, is a particular illustration of the current approach to the management of culture and nature within landscapes, which attempts to draw together the management of the experience of sense of place and historic fabric related to cultural and natural heritage. The connection of culture and sense of place to Cultural Landscapes is noted by Mitchell & Buggey as a process that ‘explores how sense of place, cultural identity, and connections to the past can become touchstones for deepening and broadening the impact and relevance of conservation.’ (Mitchell & Buggey 2000: 45). The concept of Protected Areas is also connected to culture but with more of an emphasis on conservation strategies, as it ‘recognizes an ecosystem approach and the importance of working with people, their knowledge of
the local ecology, and their cultural traditions in developing conservation strategies’ \textit{(ibid: 45)}.

A reduction of bureaucratic boundaries related to working across IUCN and ICOMOS has the potential to bring together the fragmented elements of the nature/cultural dichotomy and deliver shared management of Country. However, it is unfortunate that two separate bureaucratic systems of ICOMS and IUCN have to be overlaid and occasionally contradictory.

The case study of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park reveals the movement toward greater collaboration between cultural and natural heritage management, particularly through the shared management process with the local traditional Aboriginal culture, which manages the Park holistically as Country. However, the dominant Western philosophy of the man/nature duality continues to fragment Uluru-Kata Tjuta management onto a culture/nature dichotomy supported by: World Heritage inscription under separate cultural and natural criteria; the Cultural Landscape program supported by World Heritage inscription; the separate IUCN recognition as a Protected Area under category II (national park); plus, a plethora of separate heritage and conservations bureaucracies developing policy for the Australian Government.

An aspect that influences the investigated national and international conventions and programs related to the management of culture and nature within a landscape is the assessment of authenticity and integrity, and the appointment of the individuals who sit in judgment on advisory groups or committees. The task of sitting in judgment and the appropriateness of those appointed to judge is always open to contention over cultural bias and conflict of interest. This is particularly relevant to cross-cultural research involved in the research case studies, in relation to the claims and aspirations presented by local traditional Aboriginal cultures that have been subjected to continued colonization. In the case of authenticity, the assessment of World Heritage nominated sites and the claims of Aboriginal authority are considered for their truthfulness and genuineness \textit{(Mitchell \textit{et al.} 2009: 25)}. The consequence, in relation to Aboriginal claims, is the appointed judges are interpreting the validity of a specific culture’s understanding of cultural expression potentially without the participatory knowledge of specific local traditional cultural experience, attainable from within the
The issue of judging another culture is confronted through the development of an Indigenous Cultural Intellectual Property concept, where proof of authenticity and integrity is the domain of the local traditional culture and does not require tangible evidence. This issue opposes a Western construct of separating culture and nature through defining tangible and intangible heritage into elements that are linked to heritage (intangible) and physical environment elements that are scientifically defined and can be compartmentalized for protection or exploitation.

In the Australian shared management context, as stated by Peter Yu, a senior Yawuru man from the Kimberley region of Western Australia ‘cultural and natural management practices must be brought together - Aboriginal people must be heard as well as seen’ (Yu 2000: 2). Yu’s statement echoes the previous discussion on the need to manage cultural and natural heritage together and typifies the evolving discourse that is willing to engage with the advice of Aboriginal Australians on how to develop more sustainable management of shared landscapes (Country). In considering the analysis of the landscape conventions, concepts and moves to bridge the culture/nature dichotomy, it is revealed that landscape management practice by state, and federal Australian governments continues to perpetuate the separation of cultural heritage management and natural heritage conservation, and the separation of tangible and intangible heritage management. In a shared management context, a cultural clash exists where separation is encased in a deep Western societal view of the human / nature divide, which is contradictory if not adversarial to the Aboriginal traditional approach to the governance and management of Country.

An outcome of this Chapter’s investigation is the recognition of the extensive contemporary separation of natural/cultural and intangible/tangible heritage within the Western approach to managing Country. In the Australian context, related to the case studies of Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, such separations are revealed as having a negative impact on cross-cultural governance and management practice. Analysis of the case study sites also indicates that the major factors sustaining the separation of heritage management include the imposition of the: Western philosophy of separating human and nature; use of the
The concept of ‘wilderness’; and the endorsement of the structures and processes of international bodies such as UNESCO, ICOMOS and IUCN along with their associated charters and conventions. The imposition of these factors over Country and the local traditional Aboriginal cultures is demonstrated, within the case studies, to be a reflection of the historic and continuing contemporary colonization of Australia.

I propose that a step forward in the discourse of integrated heritage management is to shift the understandings from the Western colonial paradigm toward the holistic management of Country as related to Australian Aboriginal practice of culture and nature as not separate components but a singular understanding. Similarly, with the consideration of the relationship of tangible to intangible cultural heritage, the Western construct is about a dyad that needs to shift toward the Aboriginal management approach reflecting a single symbiotic heritage relationship. The suggested alternative to the established landscape management paradigm that separates culture/nature and tangible/intangible is not necessarily an abrasive and confrontational campaign. Rather it can be considered as the implementation of an informed process of clearly recognizing the Western philosophical drivers of landscape management and how these can be realigned more closely with Aboriginal shared management partner understandings of integrating culture and nature in governance, policy and process. The research questions of the governance over the integrated management of culture and nature and the management of intangible and tangible heritage as symbiotic, are partially addressed by the choice to embrace a shift toward the Aboriginal Country model. This progressive management direction away from the Western model is further considered in Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place through the investigation of place and sense of place, related to the mixture of culture and nature within landscapes, as concepts that carry integrated tangible and intangible values.

A proposition that emerged from the Project research is the consideration of moving toward a more integrated assessment by IUCN and ICOMOS of cultural and natural heritage values at properties similar to the case studies. One measure would be to create a separate international organization to assess outstanding universal cultural and natural values as integrated phenomena within landscapes. However, creating a separate organisation is a concept significantly restricted by politics, resources, vested
interests and cultural disposition. Another alterative is to continue expanding and formalizing the practice of IUCN and ICOMOS assessors working in collaboration at properties such as the case studies where local traditional Aboriginal culture is a component of the landscape. Unfortunately, although ICOMOS and IUCN do work together, there exists an institutional conflict of interest related to the difference in each organization’s policy priorities. A risk mitigation for this ICOMOS and IUCN conflict of interest is potentially to form either a permanent or temporary merged unit that engages cultural and natural assessors together. The host organization for such a unit would need close consideration. The creation of a merged ICOMOS/IUCN assessment unit may provide some autonomy and promote a conjoint purpose when advising of properties such as the case studies.
Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place

In this Chapter the concepts of place and sense of place, along with the associated heritage meanings attached by people, are investigated as significant tools to provide insight into the sustainable and equitable governance and management of cultural and natural heritage. The research considers the concepts of heritage and sense of place as continuing intangible processes that involve the interaction of people with culture and nature within landscapes.

Malpas (2008) in the publication *Making Sense of Place* brings together the importance of human connection to place and shifts the emphasis of ownership and control, which has been revealed to haunt cross-cultural negotiations at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area and Purnululu National Park. Malpas presents the concept that sense of place is not linked to ownership, but rather to the intangibility of humanity being part of the environment. (Malpas 2008: 331)

When we fail to understand the real nature of our connection to place, and refuse to understand that connection other than in terms of ownership and control, then not only have we misunderstood ourselves, but we have also lost any real sense of place as such. To have a sense of place is not to own, but rather to be owned by the places we inhabit: it is to ‘own up’ to the complexity and mutuality of both place and human being.

The reflection of cultural or societal values of a landscape or place may be perceived through its heritage, whether termed cultural, natural or a combination of interpretations. The term ‘place’ as argued within this Chapter can be considered as more than simply a physical construct but rather an intangible and ephemeral human interpretation of physical features that is given meaning through a particular cultural paradigm. As noted simply by Clark 2008, ‘Place is space with meaning added’ (Clark 2008: 165). In considering heritage as intangible, the research aligns with
Smith and Akagawa (2009), who consider heritage as fundamentally an intangible construct, where the concept of tangible heritage only exists through the intangible sense of place as perceived through cultural or social acuities. (Smith and Akagawa 2009: 6)

Heritage only becomes ‘heritage’ when it becomes recognizable within a particular set of cultural or social values, which are themselves ‘intangible’

In relation to Cultural Landscapes the consideration of sense of place links to how people understand particular locations or place (Mitchel and Buggay 2000). In a shared management context, how the different parties perceive landscape value and the importance of place either personally or collectively is considered to underpin informed priorities of cultural and natural heritage management within landscape (Country). The concept of sense of place, utilized within the research, recognizes the description of sense of place as ‘an act of creation’ as stated by Greg Lehman (a descendent from the Tawulwuy people of north-east Tasmania) (Lehman 2008: 106)

A sense of place occurs when we are involved in an action of creation – through the processes of art, poetry, philosophical speculation and engagement with the relational aspects of the universe – not just at a local level but a much broader and deeper state.

Lehman’s definition, through his recognition of process underpinning sense of place, provides a confirmation for the research to pursue sense of place and consequently its meaning to individuals as fundamentally experiential. Taking the viewpoint that sense of place is experiential, intangible and continually changing also aligns with the understanding of Smith that ‘heritage’ is intangible and continually evolving. (Smith 2006)

The terminology of sense of place and meaning of place to some degree overlap as they are created by intangible human interpretations of interactions with landscapes, whether urban or rural. In broad terms meaning of place will be considered, within the Project research, as an understanding of where a location fits into a contemporary
human perception of environment. A sense of place on the other hand is discussed as relating to the personal experience of a location, whether gained by immersion in the physical environment or engagement from a distance. To clarify the multivalent interrelationship of sense and meaning of place I take the position that sense of place is a process that encompasses the meaning of place. The reason for this, in addition to improving clarity, is that both are continually changing and consequently ephemeral expressions of human emotions and feelings about a particular landscape or Country.

In considering the experience that builds sense of place there needs to be a recognition that it can be created separately to a particular location, through the interaction with a range of physical and digital creations. However, to gain an informed sense of place that interacts with the local traditional Aboriginal culture, as shared management partners, it is paramount to physically experience being with them on their Country. The need to physically experience the landscape (Country) is emphasized throughout the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* and is echoed in the invitation by Anangu to visit and experience the Park (Director of National Parks 2010a). The necessity of being on Country is revealed by the statement describing the unifying aspects of Tjukurpa and harmonious living with the natural environment: (*ibid*: 3)

*Tjukurpa* unites Anangu with each other and with the landscape. It embodies the principles of religion, philosophy and human behaviour that are to be observed in order to live harmoniously with one another and with the natural landscape. Humans and every aspect of the landscape are inextricably one.

A demonstration of the importance put on being in place (on Country), observed in the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020*, is its constant emphasis the importance of place within Tjukurpa and shared management. This importance is illustrated in the painting by Jennifer Taylor titled ‘Working Together’ that definitively positions decision-making and shared management within the Park’s environment (Director of National Park’s 2010a: vi). A further demonstration of the importance to be on Country is revealed in the management and operation of the Garma Festival held at Gulkula in Arnhem Land, Northern Australia and managed by
the Yolngu peoples of Arnhem Land (Yothu Yindi Foundation 2017). The event is a celebration of Aboriginal Yolngu culture promoted as the most significant Indigenous event in Australia. It started in 1998 and continues to draw politicians (including Australian Prime Ministers), bureaucrats, researchers and business people for discussions on Indigenous policy by sharing knowledge and traditional culture (*ibid*). By being on Country the participants are engaged in the experiential process of culture related to place, which provides authority to the Aboriginal people within negotiations.

A strategy to more fully engage stakeholders in negotiations regarding a particular place is for government officers, managers and policy makers to meet Aboriginal people on Country. Such a meeting, in ‘place’, is by its nature experiential and provides the opportunity for an ‘act of creation’ to identify a sense of place, that involves different stakeholders’ heritage bias. The outcome of identifying the divergence and commonalities of different stakeholder’s sense of place, when the parties are experiencing a place together at the same time, provides an understanding of the locations multivalent heritage. It also provides the opportunity to negotiate the management of Cultural Landscape or Country within an informed and evolving environment, where different heritage understandings and individual’s sense of place and heritage are recognized for a particular location. The importance of revealing the divergence of sense of place between stakeholders is that it allows difference to occupy the same space.

Heritage has been identified as being used to define a sense of place (Smith and Akagawa 2009: 7), however the reverse is also possible where a sense of place is presumed and used to define heritage. The perception of sense of place disjoint from place occurs where individuals create an understanding about place through an interpretation from a distance, influenced by their separate lived experiences. In the situation of Purnululu National Park this disjunction is evident where the dislocated sense of place, based on presumptions within a European paradigm, is built on colonial intangible heritage of wilderness and displaced from the physical reality of the Park and the associated Aboriginal sense of Country. The counterpoints of traditional Aboriginal owners and settlers, related to the intangible of sense of place,
provides an indication of the contemporary shared heritage management conflicts and challenges in the management of culture and nature within Australian landscapes.

A broad definition of heritage is something inherited or bequeathed by ancestors, with contemporary decisions made as to its value and whether it is discarded or retained. It can be considered through perspectives of place and sense of place and include wilderness qualities, religious belief, Aboriginal cultural practice or through its intangible interpretations of physical constructs, historic relics or its natural components. Each element elevated to importance through a cultural process of valuation of human interaction with place and interpretation of a sense of place, either as an observer of the process or a participant. The consideration of heritage as a cultural process related to the present was a conclusion of David Harvey (2001) in the essay ‘Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies’. Harvey advocates that heritage is a contemporary process rather than a physical object and recognized that this stance: (Harvey 2001: 336):

challenges the popular convention of understanding heritage simply as a physical artefact or record, by advocating an approach which treats heritage as a cultural process…. heritage is a present-centred cultural practice and an instrument of cultural power.

Smith in the publication Uses of Heritage (Smith 2006) refers to the experience of heritage as a social and cultural performance and as something with which people actively engage. In considering that heritage is an intangible and a continually evolving human activity, I advocate that the development of heritage management policy and process needs to consider heritage through the experience of process in the present. In respect to managing Country (landscape) including World Heritage areas such as Uluru-Kata Tjuṯa, Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, heritage can be considered a psychological, oral, listening or physical activity or performance creating the intangible of memory in the present, as an ephemeral experience.

In the shared management arena heritage as performance presents the dilemma as to which cultures’ heritage performance creation will carry the most authority within a
shared management model, between Aboriginal and Western cultures. In terms of the Western cultural dominance in landscape management within Australia, the consideration of heritage as performance moves it within the canon of Western artistic expression and opens the issue of curatorial, choreographic and editorial authority in the creation and interpretation of that heritage. This statement is not meant to negate the rights of Aboriginal people and their authority over heritage expression but to promote investigation around the current dominant authority over landscapes in Australia, which is demonstrated within the case studies as held by Australian governments.

As revealed in the section Authenticity and Integrity in Chapter Two: Positioning the Research - Theory and Practice the assessment of authenticity and integrity of proposed Outstanding Universal Values requires consideration by the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2013b) linked to its cultural authority to enact the intangible performance. Performance as used in this context refers to the act of creation, across the vast plethora of human expression from visual art, performance, literature, film, stories and other means of transmitting intergenerational cultural heritage and knowledge. Whilst considering heritage performance in an intergenerational perspective it also needs to be recognized that some heritage is so new that its intergenerational aspects are yet to be validated. Also some heritage fails to continue to be intergenerational as is demonstrated in the loss of some traditional Australian Aboriginal languages, but I contend it can still be referred to as heritage.

A significant aspect to the consideration of heritage as performance is the accompanying authorization to orchestrate a manifestation of particular intangible cultural heritage, which in essence involves curatorial, choreographic and/or editorial decisions. This can be highly controversial, as its validity will depend on social, religious, spiritual, traditional, political, cultural and ideological dynamics active within a specific location. The understanding of heritage as an intangible performance aligns with the argument that heritage, as a process, can be understood as a verb rather than a noun. (Harvey 2001)

The performance of creating or recreating heritage has been enacted in locations such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area,
resulting in diverse and often conflicted Aboriginal and settler heritages. These performances have influenced the landscape management by considering different heritage through different interpretation and priorities. A demonstration of the performance of heritage driven by different intangible performance is the act of tourists climbing Uluru as a national icon and Anangu Nguraritja\textsuperscript{13} performing Inma\textsuperscript{14} at Uluru as traditional maintenance of Country. This often conflicted interaction of tourists and Anangu is analyzed in the investigation of shared management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and specifically in relation to closure of the climb for cultural reasons, which is conflicted with tourists wanting to climb the national icon.

In considering performance of cultural heritage, which has been identified as intangible, I propose that performance (visual practice, song, dance, story telling …) is a signifier and communicator of how and why shared management negotiations are mismanaged or managed more equitably and sustainably.

In considering the performance of heritage at a mixed heritage site my investigation encompasses the visual arts through artistic expression or design that reveals an interpretation of place and sense of place within the shared landscapes of Country. The reason for considering specifically visual arts is that an expansive analysis across the myriad of creative arts forms is beyond the time constraints of this Thesis, but potentially lays the foundation of postdoctoral research. Heritage created through performance may range from a contrived pseudo heritage driven by market promotion or political advantage, to a spiritual experiential performance reflecting a human interaction with a location, based on cultural and personal knowledge. The evidence of the performance of intangible heritage through art is prolific and revealed in the use of Aboriginal painting as a traditional cultural practice, which facilitates the interpretation and interaction with cultural practice and the environment.

In comparing the management documentation of Purnululu National Park, the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park the use of artistic expression highlights a degree of success in the shared management of culture and nature within the landscape. The painting by Malya Teamay, reproduced

\textsuperscript{13} Nguraritja means the traditional Aboriginal owners of the park, (Director of National Parks 2010a, 23)

\textsuperscript{14} Inma is an Anangu term for a ‘ceremony involving singing and dancing which celebrates, recounts, sustains and teaches Tjukurpa’ (Director of National Parks 2010a: 175)
on the cover of the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* (Director of National Parks 2010a), demonstrates the use of art as a communication tool to create and maintain a cultural sense of place. It depicts traditional stories of Uluru and embraces ancestral beings, Aboriginal people and the environment (Director of National Parks 2010). In contrast to the Uluru-Kata Tjuta Plan the *Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2005* has no Aboriginal art depicting the management of Country and relies on an environmental photograph devoid of human interaction. (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995). The Purnululu Plan’s cover image produces a sense of place linked to wilderness without reference to either pastoralist or Aboriginal heritage. The visual emphasis of the cover image correlates with the degree of authority balance between the government’s management of natural and cultural heritage and engagement with the local traditional Aboriginal owners. This correlation is examined in the Purnululu case study and highlighted in *Chapter Four: case studies* where the new management model is presented.

My argument for the recognition and proactive management of heritage expression through artistic performance is pursued throughout *Chapter Four* and follows the position of heritage being intangible. Consequently, to manage heritage an intangible management process is needed. The process selected is the engagement with the expression of sense of place, as a fundamental building block to inform policy development. To engage with these concepts within the Australian landscape management context, reference is made to the research case studies and contemporary landscape management models including the *Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (Burra Charter) and the Wilderness concept.

**Early Australian Landscapes**

To explore the use of heritage performance as a management tool I recognize that there is a vast array of performance types available, however my focus is on the visual arts, particularly photography, painting and drawing. A demonstration of art creating meaning and value for landscapes is the historic Australian colonial paintings discussed by Bill Gammage in his publication *The Biggest Estate on Earth* (Gammage 2011). Gammage presents a controversial and confrontational account of
the interpretation of paintings, depicting the early Australian colony. The early Australian paintings and drawings present a European aesthetic that appeared to overwrite and appropriate the landscape whilst providing a familiar sense of place for the colonist and their European patrons. Gammage presents a compelling argument that the landscapes of the Australian colony, as perceived by many early European painters, were not just a liberal artistic interpretation constructed to match a European aesthetic and create a comfortable colonial sense of place. He contends the paintings are often highly representational and presented a manipulation, by many Aboriginal generations, of the environment orchestrated by human landscape management.

Australia’s first European colonists had presumed the environment of the new land (Australia) was a space that needed meaning within the European paradigm, which ignored and denigrated its Indigenous people. Bill Gammage, has illuminated this through his research and publication *The Biggest Estate on Earth* (Gammage 2011), which is discussed in the section *Cultural landscapes* of Chapter Two. He assessed that the early Australian landscape, as observed and painted by many Europeans, echoed the environment of a constructed European gentleman’s park, in that it consisted of a mixture of woodlands, open grass fields and water features. The appearance of a significant manipulation of the landscape was evident on the early colonial paintings, however the connection that it was the human hand of the Aboriginal cultural practice and landscape management eluded the early settlers and is a contemporary point of debate. Gammage’s comments on this issue state (*ibid*: 17):

> It might seem a small jump to think them man-made as in Europe. In fact the leap was so vast that almost no-one made it. Almost all thought no land in Australia private, and parks natural. To think otherwise required them to see Aborigines as gentry, not shiftless wanderers. That seemed preposterous.

Henry Reynolds in the forward of *The Biggest Estate on Earth* makes the comment regarding the colonial presumption that the Aboriginal people were incapable of managing their Country; ‘Bill’s evidence must be the final blow to the comforting colonial conceit that the Aborigines made no use of their land’ (Reynolds 2011: xxiii).
Gammage observes (Gammage 2011) that the manipulation and use of the land was not a collection of random acts but effective landscape management practice that provided pasture for game and line of sight for hunting. The landscape of Australia, described by Gammage, was and still is a cultural place that evokes a sense of place within the Aboriginal cultures through their performance of culture and land management practices. However, the colonizers blinded by their sense of superiority began to create a new sense of place that could be understood by their colonial cultural practices of dominance over the land’s flora and fauna of which Aboriginal people were classified as part of. In the situation described by Gammage the making of place by settlers was not just an assimilation process for authority but a process that could not comprehend that the subjugated Aboriginal people were capable of such wide ranging, sustainable and resilient landscape management. The consequence was that the highly successful and well established cultural and natural land management practices of the Aboriginal people were not effectively acknowledged or utilized.

The style of early Australian landscape paintings and drawings was a powerful tool to acquire dominance over the land and its people, with the images of landscape creating a place for the ‘Australian colony’ that over ran the Aboriginal sense of place for Country. The tangible familiar physicality of the landscape, recognized in the early paintings, had been used to create a new intangible heritage and sense of place for the settler, couched in their terminology and imagery. Australian colonial heritage, and its relationship to the vista of early colonial bushland, was born and I contend cast a long shadow over the philosophies and practices of contemporary landscape management by Australian governments. My contention is that the early colonial process of appropriation and manipulation, which imposed Western meaning on the early Australian landscapes, is as virulent in today’s contemporary Australian society as it was in the 18th century. The intangible values of today’s national parks are now manipulated to create places and a sense of place for the Australian national or state good rather than in the context of the British Empire. Promotional images of landscapes such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnulu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area are creating a new Australian national understanding of these places and their cultural and natural heritage.
The moral validity of creating a new sense of place for a landscape is a philosophical question that is not about the need to protect, maintain or support but about whose philosophy has the right of dominance over the manner in which landscape (Country) management, policy and practice is carried out by local, state, territory or federal governments. Whether it’s a group of local traditional owners or a group or family of pastoralists, the creation of national parks and reserves impacts on their relationship with Country, or rather their sense of place on Country and their heritage.

**Burra Charter**

*The Australian ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (Burra Charter) was first adopted by Australia ICOMOS in 1979, with revisions and changes leading to the 2013 version (Australia ICOMOS 2013). The Executive Committee of the Australian National Committee of ICOMOS (Australia ICOMOS), as stated in the covering text of the Burra Charter, ‘is responsible for carrying out national programs and participating in decisions of ICOMOS as an international organisation … It provides expert advice as required by ICOMOS, especially in its relationship with the World Heritage Committee.’ *(ibid)*

The investigation of the Burra Charter is aimed at addressing both of the research questions of governance and management, through identifying the extent to which the Burra Charter model is applicable to the joint management of culture and nature under a philosophy integrating culture with nature and tangible with intangible heritage. A point of entry into this investigation is the Burra Charter’s recognition that places of cultural significance may include tangible and intangible dimensions *(ibid: 2)* as well as cultural and natural elements, which ‘can be applied to all types of places of cultural significance including natural, Indigenous and historic places with cultural values’.

*(ibid: 1)*

The Burra Charter establishes standards for cultural heritage and conservation management practices in the statement: ‘The Charter sets a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places of cultural significance, including owners, managers and custodians’ *(ibid: 1)*. It is recognized by the Australian National University as ‘the best practice standard for cultural heritage management in Australia and internationally’ *(Australian National...*
However, the Burra Charter’s recognition is not referenced in the Plans of Management for the World Heritage landscapes of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000) (Director of National Parks 2010a) or Purnululu National Park and Reserve (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995). However, the Burra Charter is mentioned in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area’s 1999 Management Plan (Parks and Wildlife Service (Tasmania) 1999) and the TWWHA Management Plan 2016 (DPIPWE 2016).

The reasons for the non referencing anomaly in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Purnululu management plans are not apparent, however my supposition, based on experience of working as a government employee at both national parks, is that the government agencies authorizing the plans of management either misunderstand the application of the Burra Charter or question its relevance. Regardless of the different government reasons for the exclusion of the Burra Charter as a reference I consider it as a significant and crucial guiding document for the management of places of cultural significance. Recognition, within the Burra Charter, of the importance of cultural significance of place in policy development is presented in the statement, ‘Policy for managing a place must be based on an understanding of its cultural significance.’ (Australian ICOMOS 2013: 4). The process of policy development promoted by the Burra Charter is defined in its Articles 6.1, which emphasizes a priority to consider cultural significance of place prior to policy development and management implementation. (Australian ICOMOS 2013: 4):

The cultural significance of a place and other issues affecting its future are best understood by a sequence of collecting and analysing information before making decisions. Understanding cultural significance comes first, then development of policy and finally management of the place in accordance with the policy. This is the Burra Charter Process.

Within the Burra Charter process, the definition of place can be considered as a pivotal element, as it indicates what significant heritage is applicable to the process. In the 1979 Burra Charter the definition of ‘Place’ it was referenced as a tangible feature: (Australia ICOMOS 1979)
Place means site, area, building or other work, group of buildings or other works of cultural significance together with pertinent contents and surroundings. This includes structures, ruins and archaeological sites and areas.

Following amendments to the Burra Charter definition of ‘Place’ in 1982 and 1988, reference to ‘structures, ruins and archaeological sites and areas’ was removed.

1981 definition (Australia ICOMOS 1981: Article 1.1)
Place means site, area, building or other work, group of buildings or other works together with pertinent contents and surroundings

1988 definition (Australia ICOMOS 1988: Article 1.1)
Place means site, area, building or other work, group of buildings or other works together with contents and surroundings

1999 definition (Australia ICOMOS 1999: Article 1.1)
Place means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views.

In 1999 the definition of ‘Place’ expanded significantly to include landscapes and for the first time the intangible of ‘view’ was included along with a note stating that: ‘Meanings generally relate to intangible aspects such as symbolic qualities and memories’ (ibid). The revised 2013 Burra Charter definition of place embraced a significant change in that specific reference to buildings was deleted with place defined as a geological area, with associated elements. Also the intangible of place was included as a dimension of a ‘geographically defined area’. (Australia ICOMOS 2013: 2)

Place means a geographically defined area. It may include elements, objects, spaces and views. Place may have tangible and intangible dimensions.
The evolution of the Burra Charter from primarily defining place as simply a tangible object, area or construct, to place as a potential combination of tangible and intangible is significant to the research as it demonstrates a shift in thinking that has moved towards an approach of management that considers tangible and intangible heritage as symbiotic. A major issue in the context of the integrated management of Country related to Uluru Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, is that the Burra Charter considers place as primarily a tangible ‘geologically defined area’ (Australia ICOMOS 2013: 2) with associated elements of cultural significance, which may be intangible and may be added at the discretion of heritage professionals. My contention is that once intangible heritage is perceived, within the dualist system, as separable from its historic fabric the place is vulnerable to colonisation and commodification with its associated sense of place being overwritten.

Article 5. Values, of the Burra Charter appears to challenge the Western dualism roots, that separate natural and cultural heritage management: (Australia ICOMOS 2013: 4)

Conservation of a place should identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others… and it does recognize that… In some cultures, natural and cultural values are indivisible.’

However, the conservation of places with natural significance is referenced for explanation, externally from the Burra Charter, (Australia ICOMOS 2013: 4) to the Australian Natural Heritage Charter: for the conservation of places of natural heritage significance (Australian Natural Heritage Charter) (Australian Heritage Commission. & Australian Committee for IUCN 2002). The separate referrals by the Burra Charter to ‘Places of Cultural Significance’ and the Australian Natural Heritage, to ‘Places of Natural Heritage Significance’, provides direct support to the argument that the Burra Charter operates within a broad dualist model that separates
the landscape management into a cultural and natural dichotomy. When a landscape is identified as both culturally and naturally significant both the Burra Charter (influenced by ICOMOS) and the Australian Natural Heritage Charter (influenced by IUCN) overlap, presenting a complexity of management priorities.

Although the Burra Charter applies a concerted effort to close the culture/nature gap it is still informed by the ICOMOS focus on cultural heritage, whilst the development of the Australian Natural Heritage Charter involved representatives of the Australian Committee for IUCN (World Conservation Union) and focuses on natural heritage (ibid: 2). The situation that these separate Charters exist and interact in the same mixed cultural and natural sites demonstrates an entrenched Western philosophical approach of separating cultural and natural heritage management. It also highlights the management difficulty in accepting the integrated Aboriginal management of Country, which is in opposition to the separated IUCN or ICOMOS management processes implemented over the same landscape. A challenge therefore facing the use of the Burra Charter as a tool for integrated landscape management, lays in the conflict of interest created by the attachment with ICOMOS and the identified separation of cultural and natural management.

The investigation of the Burra Charter guidance to managing culturally significant places recognizes that the intangible of place is of primary importance in management, it states: ‘Understanding cultural significance comes first, then development of policy and finally management of the place in accordance with the policy’ (Australia ICOMOS 2013: 4). However, analysis of the Burra Charter text demonstrates that it does not identify the need to manage cultural and natural values as integrated and does not recognize the symbiotic relationship of tangible and intangible heritage at mixed cross cultural locations. Consequently, the Burra Charter would require revision for it to be applicable to a cross cultural approach that integrates the management of culture and nature within landscape, at properties such as Uluru-Kata Tjuṯa, Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.
Place Making and Managing Country

Place making has emerged, within the research, as a significant shared management issue in relation to managing the maintenance, authenticity and integrity of the heritage of Country. It is manifest in the overlaying of different understandings of place and sense of place by Australian Governments and tourism at locations such as Uluru, where the Anangu sense of place under Tjukurpa is overlaid with a nationalist understanding of the mount of Uluru as a tourism attraction and national icon. At Purnululu National Park and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area the traditional understanding held by the Aboriginal traditional owners is overlaid with concepts such as wilderness, providing a new sense of place for Western consumption.

An issue to consider when developing policies and processes to manage Country related to place is the ‘making of place’ and the intent of the act of creation. Place making as a Western concept is described by Vanclay (Vanclay 2008: 4) as ‘the process of transforming ‘space’ (that is, no-place) into ‘place’ and can occur at individual and institutional levels.’. The concept of ‘no-place’ needing transformation into place can deny or oppress the existence of a location’s cultural heritage and is demonstrated in the colonization of landscapes within Australia, where colonial names and meaning usurp traditional Aboriginal understanding. A further consideration to the process of making place is that it can be approached from the perspective of changing people’s sense of place, which can include positive or negative feelings. Consequently, place-making ‘is also the process of transforming good places out of bad places, of changing the way people feel about place. (Vanclay 2008: 4). My concern with the perspective of transforming the way people feel about a place, when related to the shared management of Country, is the subsequent conflicted authority as to who decides good and bad: the traditional owners, or the colonizer.

A particular example of overlaying place and sense of place is the historic Australian use of the term ‘terra nullius’15, an assertion that obfuscated the Indigenous heritage
and rights to Country and validity of their culture. Terra nullius can be interpreted as defining the Country as a space empty of ownership (no-place) and available to be created in the image of a British perspective of the landscape. The assertion of terra nullius has now fallen into disrepute and the contemporary assumptions under Australian legislation acknowledge the embedded Indigenous cultural sense of place, through various constructs including: native title and customary rights; the Australian Department of Environment; the Australia Council for the Arts. In accepting the need for Australian government legislative recognition of Indigenous heritage and rights to Country it is also recognized that Indigenous cultural sense of place has no Australian legal right of place unless judged so by Australian governments. This fact is an unfortunate consequence of colonization with its associated installation of Western government structure and authority over traditional Indigenous lands and cultures.

The colonial making or overlaying of existing sense of place of Country, as identified in Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu National Parks and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area case studies, continues in the contemporary Australian landscape. In addition to tourism and government over writing place and sense of place international conventions such as the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention) perpetuates a similar process. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention creates a list of heritage, defined by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention as a ‘Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity’ (UNESCO 2003a: 7). The Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention’s only reference to place is related to the endeavor of

15 The colonisers (the British) acknowledged the presence of Indigenous people but justified their land acquisition policies by saying the Aborigines were too primitive to be actual owners and sovereigns and that they had no readily identifiable hierarchy or political order which the British Government could recognize or negotiate with. (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation 2000)

16 Native title is the recognition by Australian law that some Indigenous people have rights and interests to their land that come from their traditional laws and customs. (National Native Title Tribunal, 2013)

17 Places that hold great meaning and significance to Indigenous people include (Department of the Environment 2013):

- places associated with Dreaming stories depicting the laws of the land and how people should behave
- places that are associated with their spirituality
- places where other cultures came into contact with Indigenous people

18 We acknowledge and respect the essential connection between the arts, culture, heritage, land, sea and (customary) law in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander society. From the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Arts Policy (Australian Council 2004:5)
state parties to ‘promote education for the protection of natural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing the intangible cultural heritage’ (UNESCO 2003a: 7). However, the consequence of creating a list of intangible heritage can itself over-write meaning of place and its values. This is noted by Smith and Akagawa as: (Smith and Akagawa 2009: 4)

the very act of creating a list is not only a act of exclusion, it is also performance of meaning making…. This process inevitably recreates or over-writes new meaning and values onto the heritage in question

Considering the previously examined concept of wilderness and colonial bias in the creation of national parks in Australia, the making of a new place can be considered as a continuance of colonisation through appropriation and assimilation. The intangible heritage of both Aboriginal people and settlers is turned into a new national understanding of landscape as place. Whilst overwriting the intangible heritage of meaning of place related to Country can be attributed in part to governments and tourism it should be recognized that traditional Aboriginal people themselves are involved in the evolution of a sense of place of their Country, as intangible heritage is continually evolving. This evolution is influenced by colonial interaction but managed within Aboriginal cultural protocols. A major controversial aspect to Aboriginal Australian people remaking place and sense of place over Country is that the perpetrators may not be part of the local Aboriginal cultural. Consequently, they contribute to altering and influencing the local traditional sense of place. The issue being that whether an individual is Aboriginal Australian or not, if they are not part of the local traditional culture they are outsiders to the interpretation, by local traditional people, of their intangible heritage.

As identified in the Uluru-Kata Tjuṯa case study, non Anangu (local) Indigenous Australians are increasingly engaged in tourism related to Uluru-Kata Tjuṯa’s cultural and natural heritage. An example, as identified in the Uluru-Kata Tjuṯa case study, is that Australian Indigenous people from other Indigenous Australian cultures are working at Yulara under programs established by Ayers Rock Resort and promoted by the national Indigenous Land Corporation. In this contemporary act of engagement, the non local Anangu people can be considered to some degree as
influencing the original local traditional performance of heritage by contributing their own cultural interpretations, in a manner not unsimilar to the workers from Western backgrounds.

One of my interests in place making is related to the imposition of a sense of place onto an existing or developing place. Knowledge of the imposition can aid in the identification of management priorities and strategies to mitigate potential heritage degradation. In the case of national parks in Australia, place and a sense of place are generally already in existence as values associated with local Aboriginal culture and/or colonial heritage. In the context of the Project case studies, place making on top of existing culture and heritage is the supplanting of one place and its meaning for that of the publicists, conservationist, activist, entrepreneur, settlers, bureaucrat or politician. In considering that a place has an existing meaning, held by its local traditional Aboriginal people, the making of place over that understanding is a remaking or overlaying of an existing sense of place. Such remaking can be multivalent between and within cultures as is demonstrated at Purnululu National Park (reference section Purnululu case study in Chapter Four), where traditional Aboriginal Country was remade into pastoral rangelands for cattle, then into a tourism wilderness, and then overlaid as a conservation landscape. A further complexity, at Purnululu, is the remaking of place and meaning of place by the competing local traditional Aboriginal owner language groups, who each have a different sense of place and are conflicted as to authority, naming and stories within the park and surrounds.

In making or rather remaking ‘place’ European settlers and non local Australian Indigenous people have a propensity to create a sense of place through their different experiential encounter with Country. The relevance of this sense of place has the capacity to highlight the parties associated management priorities, whether breeding cattle, nature conservation, cultural manipulation or holistic Country management. I propose that an experiential understanding of place is important, as it is highly relevant in revealing and developing policy and management processes. Measham (2003) identifies the relevance of an experiential understanding to place: *(ibid: 5)*
Implicit in the relevance of place is that the concept is fundamentally linked to experiential understandings.

When considering place theory and maintenance related to Aboriginal Australians, Memmott and Long (2002) notes that from a phenomenological viewpoint there is not a need for people and environment to be mutually exclusive as they can overlap and interact. Relph (2008) identifies ephemeral experiential relationships with place as the foundation of sense of place. The interaction of people with a particular location or place can consequently be considered as creating a sense of place, which aligns with that of Lehman (2008) as discussed previously. The expansiveness of sense of place as experiential is expressed in the definition by Relph, who incorporates into the definition an array of sensory processes that are intangible and experiential: (Relph 2008: 314).

Sense of place is a synaesthesia faculty that combines sight, hearing, smell, movement, touch, imagination, purpose and anticipation. It is both an individual and an intersubjective attribute, closely connected to community as well as to personal memory and self. It is variable.

The connection of place and sense of place to phenomenology was identified at the Sense of Place conference held in Hobart Tasmania in April 2006. An outcome of the conference was the edited publication Making Sense of Place in which Vanclay notes the connection of phenomenology to place and sense of place: (Vanclay 2008: 9)

Place and sense of place are broad overarching, multifaceted concepts that are inherently phenomenological in nature. This means that they are about the personal connections individual people have with where they live, work and play.

Whether related to the environment or artistic expression, as an active performer or observer, the interaction with Country involves a phenomenological aspect related to the performance of the experiences of sense of place. Phenomenology, as discussed by Williams (Williams 2014), is linked to early work on the meaning of place within the discipline of geography, through the recognition of human interactional acts of
living. Williams notes that: ‘phenomenology has been popular within architecture and the planning fields as a way to reveal the authentic experience or character (or spirit) of a place’ (Williams 2014: 77). The consequence of considering phenomenology as part of the policy development process is that policy staff may be required to spend time at the management site, interacting with place to experience a sense of place linked to its cultural landscape. In this context a sense of place is a dynamic response to the phenomenon of the interaction between the intangible human experiences and the tangible manifestations (historic fabric) of the reality in which they exist. Considering the experience of place and sense of place as phenomenological is an important element in the investigation of how to manage intangible cultural heritage and its interrelationship with the physical properties of place. It reinforces the experiences of Country as intangible and continually evolving with personal life experience, the evolution of a particular location and the associated cultural interpretation. Such interpretation will vary significantly between parties in a shared management environment, depending on the individual’s cultural background and physical or cultural relationship with the location.

A demonstration of the creation of place and a new sense of place held by individuals and society is the creation of the national parks of Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Purnululu and the multiple tenure landscapes of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. These World Heritage estates have been contrived as new places of state, national and international significance, with the outcomes of newly constructed sense of place targeted at tourism, conservation and national pride that is superimposed on the Aboriginal sense of place developed over thousands of years. The redefined places and sense of place of these World Heritage sites are entwined with Australian national pride, patriotism and authority, which are promoted through text and artistic expression across a wide range of media. The place and sense of place created for national and World Heritage status, conservation and tourism are a far cry from the local traditional owners (Anangu of Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Kija/Jaru of Purnululu) sense of place created experientially over millennia through cultural, personal and community interaction with Country.

A difference between Aboriginal and settler approaches to landscape management and their sense of place is demonstrated through an understanding of how the
landscapes were formed, what influenced its creation and the philosophy of how to manage Country (landscape). The Aboriginal management position relates to ancestral creatures and a holistic approach, whilst the Western model is based in the separation of human and nature, where science relates to geomorphology and natural forces with minimal human influence. This difference is illustrated in the statement: (Memmott & Long 2002: 3)

In the Aboriginal explanation, the country was shaped by people; in the Western one, by nature … Aboriginal groups also believe that they can influence the weather and the reproductivity of plants and animals with special songs and actions at places - whereas Western science provides explanations which, again, do not involve the human influence.

Sense of place can manifest between people and a location and involve superficial or deeply spiritual encounters. Roe and Taylor (2014) identify sense of place as about human reaction and/or interaction with a location. (ibid: 16)

Sense of place indicates some kind of reaction and/or interaction with a particular place or landscape: this can be something quite benign that grows through a connection with a landscape over a long time, or it may be a sense that is gained over a short exposure to landscape never previously visited or known.

In the twenty-first century the experience of landscapes through mass media and the internet, may involve simply sitting in front of a digital screen whilst located thousands of kilometres from the physical landscapes. In this situation sense of place is manifest through the senses as described by Relph (2008) although based within an environment dislocated from the physical landscape. A problem with this process in regard to place, meaning of place and sense of place is that it is not informed by the experience of being on Country and can be misinformed by viewing the landscape through the lens of mass media companies. Media promotion companies are contracted, with potentially never being on Country, to illustrate their clients, shareholders and financiers objectives and promote a sense of place through creating and editing sounds, images and materials. The issue with having no personal
experience of a landscape is that sense of place is simply a manifestation of a media company marketing program, which as identified in the case studies, can be detrimental to the shared management of culture and nature between governments and local traditional Aboriginal cultures.

I propose that the contrived remaking of place, particularly at national and World Heritage sites, when targeted at the promotion of tourism, conservation, political ideology or nationalism can fundamentally impact on the delivery of sustainable, ethical and equitable management practice. This is demonstrated through the conflicts with local traditional Aboriginal owners, as particularly discussed in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Purnulu case studies. In such circumstances the original place and sense of place are challenged, distorted and potentially extinguished, with the result being a new or changed sense of place advantaging the creator’s society, with the existing meaning of Country and its intangible cultural heritage appropriated, altered or expunged. The Australian nationalistic sense of place remade the place of Uluru as ‘the heart of the nation’ overlaying the Anangu traditional owner sense of place.

A more individual and particularly brutal process of claiming place and imposition of sense of place over traditional Aboriginal Country is the deliberate desecration of rock art and associated galleries by overwriting with symbols and text or simply damaging the work. The problem with acts of vandalism on rock art is demonstrated in the concerns and strategies enacted at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park as mentioned in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 (Director of National Parks 2010) and the discussion paper ‘Between a Rock and a Data Base: Cultural site managements system for rock painting of Uluru’ (Ogleby et al. 2003).

Oglebay, MacLaren and Starkey (2003) demonstrate that the ‘separation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage is not appropriate at Uluru’ (ibid: 2). The value, in relation to the Aboriginal cultural heritage of Uluru, of the physical rock paintings and intangible heritage is demonstrated in the statement ‘There are songs, dances, stories and behaviours that form part of the Uluru story. The separation of song and dance from the rock paintings and the fauna is however a Eurocentric (sic) concept, they cannot be separated as they are all part of the bigger picture.’ (ibid: 2).
The consequence of damaging the historic fabric of rock art paintings, etchings and drawings is that it imposes a new intangible dimension to the heritage, therefore affecting the intangible sense of place and the World Heritage values of the Park. The significance of rock art damage, whether through human hand, wind, water, insects, collapse, fire or dust demonstrates the important contribution that artistic practice has on management practice at the Project’s case study sites. Rock art galleries carrying the place and sense of place of intangible heritage are consequently entitled to priority management beyond consideration as simply a physical manifestation. The sense of place enveloping rock art galleries integrates into the broader cultural theatre of heritage performance, which as revealed in the case studies, is critical to the maintenance of traditional Aboriginal heritage and the sustainability of shared management relationships.

**Culture Nature Arts**

The arena of culture, nature and arts is investigated, within this section, as a potential management process within the liminality of negotiation. The arena provides a bridge between the physicality of landscape, objects, geography and environment and the intangible of the experiential. The performance of art making and the interaction with artistic expression in the management of culture and nature within landscapes, is explored in relation to the Western philosophy of the separation of human and nature and the Indigenous Australian approach of the holistic integration of culture and nature.

When considering the negotiation between landscape management stakeholders operating within a continually changing and evolving space there is consequently a requirement to engage extensively with the intangibles of heritage. Liminality or the liminal space can be utilized as a way of conceptualizing the framework of shared management of Country through a flexible intangible process that sits in-between the participants’ different understandings of how to manage the relationship between culture and nature within the landscape. In recognition of the intangibles of cultural and natural heritage and the negotiation space between different cultures, the research has revealed a management methodology embracing culture, nature and arts within an integrated structure. This methodology acknowledges the continual use of the intangible of artistic and cultural expression (traditional and contemporary). It
embraces art, sociology, science and management to consider outcomes from the process of negotiation itself rather than predefined policy and management dictates.

In Western landscape management there is an association with intangible heritage through the performance of expression and observation. This is demonstrated in the Convention for Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO 2003), which identifies artistic expression within intangible heritage domains including oral expression, performing arts, practices, rituals, festivals and craftmanship. In the Australian context an example of the utilization of culture, nature and art in a contemporary context can be demonstration in Aboriginal management of Country and observed through the Association of Northern, Kimberley & Arnhem Aboriginal Artists (ANKKKA). ANKKKA is a peak Aboriginal advocacy agency established in 1987 and based in Darwin, Australian’s Northern Territory, it articulates the inclusion of art within the interwoven and inseparable mesh of culture and nature operating in the Australian Indigenous approach to maintaining culture and caring for Country. (ANKKKA, 2016). The organisation’s primary core mission and flag statement is ‘Working together to keep art, culture and country strong’ (ibid). A further demonstration of the Aboriginal embracement of art as an integral component of management is discussed by Langton (2000) in relation to artistic depictions of controlled traditional fire management of Country (landscape). (Langton 2000: 7)

Several Aboriginal people, writing from their place in traditional Aboriginal cultures, have tried to communicate the profound and fundamental place of fire in Aboriginal constructions of landscape, the physical and the spiritual replenishment that occurs when they use fire, according to their traditions, in their homelands…

Fire is sacred, and its sacredness can be partially apprehended in the many artistic depictions of fire in Aboriginal art. These visual references are often cryptic, as often befits the Aboriginal law of masking sacredness in its public forms. Fire is sacred and yet familiar; it is dangerous and yet a companion.

Working within interdisciplinary arenas that embrace artistic expression, as an integral management component, is considered necessary given the holistic construct
created by the concept of Country as it provides a lens across tangible market products, to the dynamism of the intangible cultural heritage and its ephemerality. The vibrancy, authority and experience of Aboriginal Australian art, particularly when produced by traditional cultures to depict authentic traditional management of Country, carries the intent of the artists and the experiential observation and participation in traditional culture through artistic expression (Morphy 2008), (Director of National Parks 2010a), (Scott 2011), (Biddle 2012).

At Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park a component of Anangu traditional cultural practice involves traditional Inma, which is an expression of cultural management of Country. A description of Inma in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010 – 2020 states that: ‘Inma is an Anangu term for a ‘ceremony involving singing and dancing which celebrates, recounts, sustains and teaches Tjukurpa’, (Director of National Parks 2010a: 175). The performance of Inma is conducted in a range of circumstances including public performances to celebrate events and projects often associated with the management of Country in collaboration with the Western approach, managing the cultural and natural values in the landscapes. My personal observation of Inma on Country includes an array of open public performances and on occasions performances restricted for the general public viewing, due to cultural protocols. A consideration of such artistic expression and interaction as a separate practice to that of landscape management would appear counter intuitive when considering the activity of Inma and its direct link to traditional landscape management, intertwined and essential to Country.

The overlap of artistic expression and the management of Country can be further observed in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plans 2002 and 2010 – 2020 (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2002), (Director of National Parks 2010), which uses literature, illustrations, landscape photographs and paintings to present a vision and promote its tourism as well as its cultural and natural protection credentials. The reproductions of attributed Aboriginal paintings, in both management plans provide a bridge between cultures that uses visual language rather than text.

19. Tjukurpa is the ‘Pitjantjatjara word for Law – history, knowledge, religion and morality – that forms the basis of Anangu values and how Anangu conduct their lives and look after their country, plan, story, message (Director of National Parks 2010a: 176)
Consequently, the paintings are interpreted in an intangible sense by different cultures, so providing a cross-cultural dialogue tool. The important aspect being that English literacy is not a barrier to engaging with the paintings and their message. The particular paintings included in the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* (Director of National Parks 2010a) are:

- ‘Tjukurpa of Uluru’ by Malya Teamay (cover image)  
  (depicting Tjukurpa stories of Uluru)
- ‘Working Together’ by Jennifer Taylor  
  (depicting shared management through the Board of Management, page vi)
- ‘Looking After Uluru’ by Malya Teamay  
  (depicting the Plan of Managements’ main features, page 18)

A further indication of the integral relationship of art within traditional Aboriginal land management is their conjuncture in the creation and use of the Yirrkala Bark Petitions, which were presented to Australian Prime Ministers and parliament in 1968, 1988, 1998, and 2008 (Australian Government 2009). A significant aspect to the Yolngu Bark Petitions is that they were the first to incorporate traditional Aboriginal visual art and English text as a cross cultural dialogue for managing Country. *(ibid* 2009). The involvement of Aboriginal art in a range of mediums used to educate and inform the importance and management of Country is further demonstrated with the Yiwarra Kuju: The Canning Stock Route Project and exhibition, which involved paintings, stories, photographs, artifacts, film and interactive media (Biddle 2012). The Yiwarra Kuju: The Canning Stock Route Project, through the engagement and presentation of art, addresses the European land management of the stock route including the oppression of Aboriginal people and the impact on their cultural and natural heritage. ‘It revealed the vital significance of Indigenous oral history, artworks, photographs and films in presenting stories that, until now, have not been properly acknowledged within written historical accounts.’ *(Scott 2011: 289)*

In the Western management model for landscape such as used in the Project case studies, visual and performing arts are utilized extensively in relation to tourism, landscape management, nature conservation, cultural heritage and nationalism. An
indication of the depth of the involvement of the arts in landscape management is: the use of photography in establishing national parks and building nationalist ideologies; the engagement of visual, performing and digital arts in promoting tourism, cultural and natural heritage maintenance and conservation; and the use of the arts in its varied forms to educate and seek support for locations and specific projects. The reliance of various forms of art practice to promote and manage landscapes is demonstrated in the use of landscape photography, which followed painting as a major tool in developing national parks and defining their value. A demonstration of the use of photographic images is in the development of the national park system in the United States of America (USA). In the publication ‘Wilderness to Wasteland in the Photography of the America West’, Rod Giblett (2009) identifies John Muir as a notable North American photographer of wilderness and a major conservation figure. He notes Muir’s recognition as ‘the father of American national parks’ (ibid: 44).

The North American wilderness photographers, Muirs and Adam, are referred to by Giblett (2009) as being part of the development and management of North American national parks. Their images were interpreted as validating national park creation and promoting a nationalistic perspective that enticed visitors and development. Giblett (2009) also makes comment about the underpinning of the North American national parks as strongly linked to promotion of nationalism, patriotism and corporations, with a reference to the landscape photography of Ansel Adams: (ibid: 45)

Nature, nation and corporation meet in the national park. …With Adams’ photographs, and its national parks, and wilderness, America could have its conservationist cake and eat its nature cake as well. In other words, it could conserve ‘vast tracts of wilderness’ whilst ruthlessly exploiting nature everywhere else.

In Australia the relationship of the arts to landscape management reflects that of the USA early experience, to the extent that artists’ camps were organised in the New South Wales Grose Valley in 1875 to ‘show that it was at least the equal of Yosemite Valley in California which had become a State park a decade before, partly through the agency of art’ (Bonyhady 1995: 224). Australia’s first national park was Point Hacking in New South Wales, which was the second to be established in the world,
followed in the tradition of Yellowstone National Park in the USA (Mackey et al. 1998: 8). Notably, in Tim Bonyhady’s article ‘Artists and Axes’ (1995) the creation of the photographic image of the grand vista of picturesque landscape, which is aligned to the wilderness, often involved the process of damaging the environment by clearing trees and cutting tracks through the bush to achieve the desired perspective for obtaining a view of the horizon that portrayed the sense of wilderness.

Apart from the use of photography, painting and drawing in creating the wilderness vision and images of nature, contemporary art is used to promote landscapes and cultural heritage. A demonstration is the use of Wunala Dreaming design, created by Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal artists. The design was digitized, magnified and painted on the fuselage of a Boeing 747-400 Qantas aircraft as a corporate and Australian destination promotion (QANTAS 2014). The contemporary combination of photography and digital media can produce a powerful tool to project a location’s: cultural heritage and natural values; wilderness qualities; nationalistic agenda; and corporate influence.

By engaging in the combined arena of culture, nature and art the research presents a management model that opens avenues to consider beyond just what physical elements are important to the management of national parks. It presents the opportunity to interweave management practice and terminology that represent the joint, shared and separate understandings of Country, held by local traditional Aboriginal and other cultures. My contention is that culture, nature and arts are continually linked to landscape (Country) management by Aboriginal people, governments, business and individuals. The associated art works can be created and engaged with through a broad array of contexts, from an experiential involvement on Country to manipulation of place and the sense of place from a distance. A significant management issue related to sustainable cross cultural shared management is that the intent and purpose of the artistic process is paramount. In the situation of climbing Uluru some images have a purpose of promoting the climb whilst others dissuade climbing. The challenge for government management is to balance political advantage against heritage integrity.
Synopsis

In the Australian World Heritage site context from both an historic and contemporary perspective, governments, environmental lobbies, business groups, political parties and individuals have sought and continue to gain influence over the process of managing culture and nature within landscapes. This has been achieved by imposing, controlling or manipulating the understanding of place through the imposition of a contrived sense of place. A mechanism utilized to gain influence is to separate the historic fabric of a geological feature from its original heritage and re-create it under a new heritage, often of the coloniser. Such an endeavour can be highly effective, as is demonstrated in the creation of a new intangible heritage of a national icon at the World Heritage location of Uluru, which now involves a multitude of conflicting intangible heritage factors driven by cultural, political and economic difference. The imposition of national iconic heritage status and its associated new sense of place, changed Uluru from its Anangu place to a place also belonging to the Commonwealth of Australia and the international community. As revealed in the case studies, places such as the monolith Uluru in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, the Bungle Bungle Range in the Purnululu National Park and the forests of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area have different meanings for many different individuals and communities with an associated multitude of understandings of sense of place. The creation of a new place with a newly devised sense of place, that obfuscates the traditional Aboriginal owner perspective requires sound ethical justification based in equity and justice as the new creations will overlay the original cultural heritage.

My research indicates that to engage in best practice management of Country the separation, in large shared management landscapes, of the physical (tangible historic fabric) environment and its features from the sense of place held by its local inhabitants, undermines the inhabitants’ sense of place and consequently their heritage. My position is similar to Kaufman in the statement: ‘The regrettable split between tangible and intangible heritage specialisations should be brought to an end.’ (Kaufman 2013: 20). The local inhabitants who have their intangible heritage overridden may include the local traditional Aboriginal culture or the settlers who have over generations developed a sense of place related to their history. In each of these situations, whether Aboriginal culture or colonial history, the imposition of a
new overlaying of intangible heritage is problematic.

The imposition of a new orchestrated sense of place to a location (place), which overrides the original local traditional Aboriginal cultural sense of place, is also not exclusively the realm of the Western colonizer. In the case of Uluru, individuals and societies of Aboriginal traditional owners not part of the Anangu local traditional culture have differing cultural sense of place related to Uluru as their interpretation of Country is through their own culture. Even within the Anangu a different sense of place can manifest through different gender, age, responsibilities or the degree to which an individual is recognized as having responsibility and knowledge gained through local cultural practice. In considering the personal experiential context of creating sense of place I contend there is no universal sense of place at the case study landscapes, as it is related to phenomenological experience through an individual who interprets their intangible interaction differently to others. This does not preclude a communal understanding of place and a general coherence in the cultural sense of place held within a culture but recognizes that individuals carry individual interpretations.

The expression of place and sense of place over the same landscape by many different individuals, even within a specific culture, is not necessarily a negative management issue as it engages with the evolution of intangible heritage over generations and demonstrates the potential value of diversity. In considering the intangible and phenomenological context of heritage, individual understandings of place are essentially different for each person. Rather than being necessarily problematic such difference is only an issue when it impacts adversely in relation to sustainability, integrity, authenticity and heritage maintenance, or where Western separation of tangible from intangible and culture from nature is in conflict with the Aboriginal holistic management of Country and culture.

A more informed understanding of the diversity of place and sense of place within policy development and management process has the potential to alter the reliance of the contemporary Australian landscape management approach of separation and provide knowledge of the impact of creating place and sense of place. Such knowledge can identify the priorities related to maintaining heritage values through
risk management analysis and building multiple and hybrid understandings of place and an associated sense of place. Collating and analyzing such knowledge is a double-edged sword as the information could be used for Aboriginal cultural maintenance or its assimilation and degradation. The willingness of the governments of the day to make policy and program changes that are equitable and just for Aboriginal people will depend on its political, economic and religious ideology.

The expression of sense of place is considered within the research as a process that recognizes the experiential relationship of people with landscape as reflected in phenomenological encounters with Country and the performance (cross artistic medium) of heritage. Managing place and sense of place, within the restrictions of bureaucratic silos has emerged as a significant challenge to cross-cultural shared management at the case study sites. The Project research indicates that addressing this challenge requires a new integrated management model and the consideration of a redesigned bureaucracy to managing culture and nature within the landscape.
Chapter Four: Case Studies

The Project case studies investigated within the Thesis are the World Heritage landscapes of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Purnululu National Park and Reserve and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. The case study properties are directly managed by either an Australian state or federal government. Common aspects of the case studies include: large expanses of remote landscape with relatively limited development; significant tourism activity; and the consideration of the landscape as traditional Country for Aboriginal cultural practice. The analysis of the case study and general research has revealed that Western based approaches to the shared management of culture and nature within World Heritage sites such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu and Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, continue to move closer to the Aboriginal perspective of looking after Country.

The research questions the management sustainability at these sites and proposes the Western philosophy of humanity vs nature needs to be put aside or reinterpreted and more closely aligned to the Aboriginal holistic approach to managing Country. The milieu of shared management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Purnululu National Parks and Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, with their cross-cultural amphitheater of participants, has demonstrated that a fundamental divergence exists in how Australian governments and Aboriginal people aspire to manage the national parks. This divergence has been discussed and recognized by national and international bodies and is the subject of numerable dissertations, however acting on this knowledge in a cross-cultural environment has been impaired, as it involves challenging deep-rooted Western cultural understandings of the relationship between humans and nature. Identifying, articulating and acting on the divergence of Aboriginal and Western management approaches to landscape is crucial to informed cross-cultural negotiations as it provides a potential avenue for performing a new more equitable model of shared management. It also takes the controversial step of recognizing the limitations of the separation of human and nature in cross-cultural dialogue involving the management of nature and culture in remote heritage landscapes that have been nurtured over millennium by local traditional Aboriginal Australian cultures.
Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park


Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (the Park) is an Australian mixed cultural and natural World Heritage property located in central Australia in the Northern Territory, a territory of the Commonwealth of Australia. It contains the Australian iconic feature of Uluru (Ayers Rock) and is a freehold property owned by the Anangu and managed under a lease and joint management agreements with the Australian Government. The Anangu local Aboriginal traditional owners of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park are the Nguraritja (Director of National Parks 2010a: ii). Throughout this text the word Anangu is used when referring to Anangu persons generally and Nguraritja when related to local specific traditional authority for the Park and surrounds. The relationship of the Nguraritja to the Country related to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and surrounds is expressed in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 as a looking after process, where they: (ibid: ii)

---

20 ‘Anangu: An Aboriginal person or people generally (and more specifically those Aboriginal people with traditional affiliations with this region)’ (Director of National Parks 2010a: 175)
31 ‘Nguraritja means the traditional Aboriginal owners of the park’ (Director of National Parks 2010a, 23)
have looked after, and in turn been looked after by, the land for over one thousand generations. Aboriginal use of the land over that time is reflected throughout the Uluru-Kata Tjuta landscape, which is recognized as a World Heritage area of outstanding universal value.

The title for the Park that is used throughout this text, when not related to specific quotes or previous Park names, is Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park as defined in the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* (ibid). The Park’s boundaries contain within them: the prominent heritage features of the mount of Uluru (Ayers Rock); the range of Kata Tjuta (the Olgas); tourism and management infrastructure; plus the permanent Aboriginal community town of Mutitjulu. The physical volume, within the boundaries of the Park includes an area of approximately 132,550 hectares, to a subsoil depth of 1000m. (Director of National Parks 2010a: 14). A highly promoted tourism feature of the Park is the mount Uluru (also known as Ayers Rock), a monolith rising 348m above the red sand dune plains, located at datum Latitude -25° 20' S (Decimal degrees -25.3415), Longitude 131° 02' E (Decimal degrees 131.0354). The other dominant feature is Kata Tjuta (also known as the Olgas), comprising 36 rock domes of varying sizes, composed of conglomerate and sedimentary rock. The tallest of the domes rising approximately 500 metres from the surrounding plain. (Director of National Parks 2010a).

The decision to include the shared management Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and surrounds as a component to the research was informed by two elements:

1. the personal and professional experience of living and working inside the Park and in the surrounding region, and

2. the Park’s profile as:
   a. an international World Heritage landscape;
   b. a shared management environment with Aboriginal culture; and
   c. the location of the created national icon of Uluru.

My personal experience of the region involves living, with my wife and sons, in the tourist town Yulara (28 km by road from Uluru) and Aboriginal community of Mutitjulu (700m from the base of Uluru). My professional experience in the region involved engagement on separate occasions with the three major regional
stakeholders of Anangu, tourism and government. These roles were: Executive Officer, Nyangatjaţara Aboriginal Corporation; the Executive Manager, Cultural Heritage, Ayers Rock Resort; and Board Secretariat, Board of Management Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. The process of working within these three separate policy paradigms with their associated management cultures has provided an appreciation of the different priorities and motivations that influence these shared management partners. Each party strives to meet their own priorities and is still engaged or endeavors to be seen to engage in shared management of the Park and surrounds. Each party, including the traditional Aboriginal owners, utilize their own terminologies and underlying cultural believes related to what elements of Aboriginal and colonial, natural and cultural heritage can be obscured or revealed in the pursuit of tourism and economic development. The experience as a shared management participant across these three stakeholders, has provided a practical and multivalent foundation on which to investigate, interpret and analyze the research material.

**Park Development**

The shared history and subsequently the joint management of today’s Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and surrounds began the day the first European viewed and interpreted, in a Western cultural context, the geological formations of Mt Olga and Ayers Rock. In this complex act of viewing, followed by naming, a British cultural valorization and objectification was imposed on the landscape, signaling the march of colonization supported by an act of cultural interpretation and appropriation.

In 1872 when William Ernest Giles first saw Kata Tjuta, at a distance, from across Pantu (Lake Amadeus), he named the largest dome 'Mount Olga'. In 1873 William Christie Gosse reached Uluru and climbed the mount (Australian Parks and Wildlife Service 1982: 70). He named it 'Ayers Rock' after Sir Henry Ayers, the then Chief Secretary of South Australia (Department of the Environment 2015a). The explorers Gosse and Giles had placed their own cultural intangible values on the region in the terms infused with in European cultural meaning. The pastoral industry of the region was subsequently established soon after Gosse and Giles discoveries. By the late 1880s enterprises such as Tempe Downs and Eridunda stations were established but many pastoral enterprises did not last long, due to isolation and climatic conditions.
However, Curtin Springs Station, as an exception, was established in 1941 (Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service, 1982: 70) and was observed by myself still operating in 2016.

The shared history of Anangu and Europeans became entrenched with the introduction of: Christianity; pastoral protection activities; non-traditional Aboriginal foods; and tourism. The *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Knowledge Handbook, 2012* notes these introductions: (Director of National Parks 2012: 22)

1. The missionary EE Kramer, guided by ‘Tiger’ Tjalkalyiri, gave a Christian service south of Uluru.’ in 1928;
2. Anangu participation in dingo scalping, with ‘doggers’ introducing European foods and ways in the 1930s; ‘the park officially named in 1950’;
3. Jack Cotterill developing tourism interest by establishing the first track into Kata Tjuta and the Kings Canyon Tours company’ in the 1950s; and
4. First motel leases granted. (Airstrip built on the northeast side of Uluru).

Whilst each of these introductions and developments can be interpreted as shared history of Anangu and Europeans, the issue in regard to heritage management is that European colonizers began influencing the intangible cultural heritage of Anangu. This was achieved by promoting a European view of cultural heritage through religion and introducing foreign foods, which impacted on Anangu nutrition and constructed European styled facilities on traditional Anangu cultural property (their Country). The advancement of this new hybrid history and the impact on cultural heritage and environment is demonstrated through the increase in tourist visitation to 5,462 tourists visiting Uluru in 1962 (Director of National Parks 2012: 23). The impact on the environment included construction of roads, a functional air strip and associated infrastructure. The clash of tourism and Anangu culture is illustrated in the 1960’s when some tourist operators began lobbying governments to remove Anangu from the park. (*ibid*)
In addition to the desire to remove Anangu from the Park for tourism related reasons, the attempted removal also reflected the Australian alignment with the North American national park model (The Wilderness Act (USA) 1964). This model considered people as visitors to the landscape and consequently provided an imprimatur to exclude Aboriginal people to achieve a sense of wilderness and nature that was appealing to the European romanticism of unspoilt landscapes. However, the tourism attempt to remove Anangu from the Uluru area was dealt a blow in 1966 with the Wave Hill walkoff\(^{22}\), which resulted in many Anangu leaving employment on stations and moving closer to Mutitjulu (Director of National Parks 2012: 23). Anangu continued to live near Uluru, close to the location of the current community of Mutitjulu.

Following a steady increase in tourism and in recognition of its national and international significance, the Uluru (Ayers Rock-Mount Olga) National Park was proclaimed under the *National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1975 (Cth)* on 24 May 1977. (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982: Forward). The defining of the landscape as a National Park provides a demonstration of the overlay of the European legal system onto the Nguraritja Tjukurpa. The government constructed boundary lines defining inclusion and exclusion on a map. However, such boundaries are only colonial property constructions when considering the Anangu cultural expansiveness of Country across the regional landscape.

By 1982 the first Park plan of management, *Uluru (Ayers Rock-Mount Olga) National Park Plan of Management* had been established with consideration that it would cease in 1987, unless revoked sooner (Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982). The plan of management was a document about order and control as illustrated in its stated purpose that: ‘enables management to proceed in an orderly way; helps to reconcile competing interests; identifies priorities for the allocation of the available resources and facilitates public understanding and comment’ (ibid: 7). The priority of the 1982 plan of management, as discussed by Lennon (2005), was particularly

---

\(^{22}\) In August 1966, Vincent Lingiari, a Gurindji spokesman, led a walk-off of 200 Aboriginal stockmen, house servants, and their families from Wave Hill as a protest against the work and pay conditions. As noted in The Wave Hill ‘walk off – Fact sheet 224 on web site (National Archives of Australia 2014)
natural conservation focused toward biodiversity and environmental protection (Lennon 2005). Whilst the 1982 plan does not have the 2010-20 plan of management’s emphasis on local traditional Aboriginal cultural maintenance its inclusion in section 23.2, titled ‘Aboriginal Significance’ (Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982: 64) reveals a recognition of the traditional owner perspectives, including cultural obligations and rights to Country. The 1982 plan of management was a ‘classical Australian protected area plan based on bio-centric international models’ (Lennon 2005: 209). It can be considered a colonial Eurocentric model of nature management enforced predominantly over the Aboriginal culture. I contend the 1982 plan of management was about dominant Western management, not shared management. It provides a demonstration of the creation of a colonial intangible heritage overlaying the Anangu heritage, by the use of written English text, Western imagery and a Eurocentric management structure and priorities.

A defining event in the development of the Park’s plans of management occurred on 26th October 1985 when Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, as it is now known today, was granted as a free hold property to the Uluru-Katatjuta Aboriginal Land Trust (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000: xx) by deed of grant under the Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976 (NT). This event is commonly known as ‘Handback’ and was a pivotal moment in the history of shared management of national parks, between Aboriginales and settlers, as it heralded the introduction of contemporary ‘Joint Management’. A progressive component of Handback was the entrenchment of a joint management process involving a Board of Management, with a majority of Anangu representatives, as an advisory group of stakeholders. The Uluru-Kata Tjuta Board of Management was first established in 1985 (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000: xxi).

At the Handback ceremony and directly after signing the transfer of the free hold ownership of the Park to Uluru-Katatjuta Aboriginal Land Trust, the Trust leased the Park back to the Director of National Parks and Wildlife to be managed by a Commonwealth government department under a 99-year lease. Whilst the Handover ceremony can be described as one of the most significant acts in the Australian Aboriginal land-rights movement, the Anangu had direct autonomous control of the management of their traditional lands for only several minutes (Department of the
Environment 2015b), at which time they signed over management to the Commonwealth Government for 99-years. The compromise of granting freehold title but preserving control by the Australian Commonwealth Government demonstrates the overarching construct of colonisation within Australia. Whilst the act of granting freehold title was supportive and respectful of Anangu culture the associated legal recognition would not have existed but for the grace and benevolence of the Australian Government, operating within its legislative system. The point to this statement, which can be considered as highly controversial, is that it positions Anangu as subservient to the dominant authority of the Australian Government, as the Anangu do not have sovereignty over their lands, which are a part, albeit highly valued, property of the society of broader Australia.

Following on from Handback were revised plans of management in the 1986, 1991 and 2000 (Australian Parks and Wildlife Service 1986) (Australian Parks and Wildlife Service 1991) (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000), which progressively increased the recognition, protection and maintenance of Tjukurpa. This progress led eventually to the Australian national parks model for the shared or joint management of culture and nature values of landscape and is reflected in the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* (Director of National Parks 2010a). The description of joint management as stated in the 2010-2020 plan of management attempts to link Anangu cultural law (Tjukurpa) and Australian Government legal system through respecting cultural diversity. It states joint management: (Director of National Parks 2010a: ii)

> brings together cultural and scientific knowledge and experience, different governance processes, and interweaves two law systems – Piranpa\(^{23}\) law and Tjukurpa. Working together means learning from each other, respecting each other’s cultures and finding innovative ways to bring together different ways of seeing and interpreting the landscape and its people.  

*Nguraritja and Parks Australia share decision-making for the*  

\(^{23}\) The term Piranpa is defined in the 2010-2020 Uluru-Kata Tjuta Management Plan as: *Literally ‘white’ but now used to mean non-Aboriginal people* (Director of National Parks 2010, 175).
management of Uluru–Kata Tjuta National Park.

Under the joint management definition defined in the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* there appears to be a vital and inclusive process operating between the Tjukurpa and the Australian Legal system. However, the on the ground impact of joint management is fundamentally linked to the degree of authority held by the Australian Government as the dominant partner in the decision making process. Within the joint management process at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park the Australian Government Minister responsible to the EPBC Act and consequently the Australian judicial system, holds an elevated senior authority position over the Park, with the Nguraritja defined as advisors (EPBC Act 1999 (Cth)). A consequence of the joint management process is a non-traditional owner cultural bias reinforced through a dominant government authority within the Park. This results in conflict between the two law systems and philosophies of the Australian Constitution and Tjukurpa\(^{24}\) and can be considered just an extension of the colonization process as the Minister has a legal responsibility to the Australian Constitution and not Tjukurpa. The Minister and consequently the Australian legislative system, must approve all Nguraritja and others who have been nominated for the Board of Management (EPBC Act 1999 (Cth)). The Minister, as an elected Minister of the Crown, also has the authority to override Board decisions as well as directly influence policy and operational management through the public servants employed to manage the Park.

The *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* highlights and promotes joint management as a process of cooperation between the Australian Government and Nguraritja. It states in the cover page ‘Tjukurpa above all else or Tjukurpa our primary responsibility’ (Director of National Parks 2010a, 176). However, there is little governance transparency related to the Nguraritja’s lack of authority to enforce policy or management operations within the Park. The most prominent demonstration of this lack of transparency, expanded in the case study section *Policy and Governance*, is related to the Anangu inability and lack of

---

\(^{24}\) The term Tjukurpa is defined in the 2010-2020 Uluru-Kata Tjuta Management Plan as: (Director of National Parks 2010, 176) The Pitjantjatjara word for Law – history, knowledge, religion and morality – that forms the basis of Anangu values and how Anangu conduct their lives and look after their country, plan, story, message
authority to stop the tourist climb of Uluru, in apparent contradiction to the public requests from the Nguraritja.

World Heritage Inscriptions

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park is inscribed under a range of international and national criteria including:

- UNESCO World Heritage list as a mixed site under cultural criteria (v) and (vi) and natural criteria (vii) and (viii): (Director of National Parks 2010a: appendix B)
- Australian National Heritage criteria A, B, C, D, E, G, H and I. (ibid: appendix C)
- Australian Commonwealth Heritage official values criteria of A, B and D (ibid: appendix D)

The World Heritage recognition of the Park in 1987 initially involved only natural heritage inscription. This was in spite of the fact that Australia nominated the Park as a mixed site thereby recognizing Aboriginal association. The lack of inscription of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta’s Outstanding Universal Values of cultural heritage was rectified in 1994 by extended inscription as a cultural landscape recognizing Aboriginal cultural values. The justifications for natural inscription were related to geologic, beauty and non-human species habitat (IUCN 1987), while the recommendations for cultural inscription were related to human adaptation, landscape management, culture and traditional belief systems. Investigation of the World Heritage inscriptions contributes to the research argument regarding a need for reform of the Western and consequently Australian Government model for the shared management of World Heritage properties such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. The proposition is that the incongruity, which operates between Western separation management and the Aboriginal management of Country as integrated, detracts from sustainable shared management relationships between the stakeholders.

The World Heritage criteria under which Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park is inscribed (UNESCO 2013b: 20-21) are:
Natural Criteria

(vii) to contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;
(viii) to be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;

Cultural criteria

(v) to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;
(vi) to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);

The World Heritage Convention brings nature and culture together in one document and presents them together as a single list of Outstanding Universal Values, as noted in section 77 of its 2015 *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (UNESCO 2015d). However, in section 45 of these Operational Guidelines the separation of cultural and natural heritage is still evident as they are split into Article 1 for cultural heritage and Article 2 for natural heritage. In effect the move to bring cultural and natural management closer together within the World Heritage Committee is constrained by an entrenched cultural and natural heritage management separation in the process of assessing World Heritage inscription.

In relation to the shared management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park it is revealed that the separation of cultural and natural heritage management creates a mismatch between the fundamentals of the Aboriginal management of Country as integrated and the Australian Government’s approach with its historic and contemporary foundations in separation. This mismatch is to some degree recognized (Director of National Parks 2010a) (Director of National Parks 2010b) (Reconciliation Australia 2010) in the
analysis of the Park’s management plans, which acknowledge the value of Aboriginal management. However, the separation approach is dominant, as illustrated by the enforced authority of the Australian Government to continuing the Uluru climb.

In addition to the demonstrated foundation of separation, the World Heritage inscription process contains anomalies in regard to what criteria are considered as natural or cultural. A demonstration is the use of the terms beauty and aesthetics within the natural criteria. These two concepts are intangible and reliant on personal interpretation through a particular cultural bias. The point being that the terms are informed by the different cultural paradigm of each shared management partner and only exist as a human interpretation of a landscape or Country. In considering the cultural clash and ambiguity created by separation I argue that at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park the sustainability of the shared management negotiation process, under the current Western model, is tenuous.

Dual Naming

The name of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park has varied greatly since its establishment as noted within both Northern Territory and Commonwealth governments’ documentation. The name variations include European and Anangu names and spelling and the use of underscores and hyphens. In Australian Commonwealth Government documents, the name varied from Uluru (Ayers Rock–Mount Olga) National Park, in the 1982 plan of management (Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982), to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park in the Parks 2010-2020 management plan (Director of National Parks 2010a).

The amendments, away from the European names of Ayers Rock and Mount Olga demonstrates a change in emphasis in recognition of Anangu intangible cultural heritage embedded in the Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara language. The issue of incorporating the Anangu language can be considered an attempt to protect and manage the intangible heritage of the Anangu and challenge the tensions created by tourism and colonization initiated by the early European explorers. It also challenges the management of the tangible geological structures as they are redefined in Tjukurpa terminology and meaning of place. The Northern Territory Government, in
1993, officially named the Park as Ayers Rock / Uluru. This was changed in 2002, following the regional Tourism Association request and the order of names was reversed to Uluru / Ayers Rock (Northern Territory Government: Place Name Register, 2016b). However, this approved dual naming could be reversed or separated, with the names being used either together or separately. The same dual naming applies for Kata Tjuta / Olgas. The Place Name Register for the Northern Territory Government states in relation to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park: ‘The name as approved and registered should be shown on and in official documents and publication, however in unofficial documents and publications either name can be used.’ (Northern Territory Government: Place Name Register, 2016b).

Policy and Governance

The investigation of the governance structures and processes within shared management of the Park is essential to both of the thesis questions and particularly to the first research question regarding governance and how structures and processes operate to manage culture and nature within the landscape. The governance of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park operates broadly within the functional framework that includes: the Park’s Memorandum of Lease; Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act); Commonwealth Minister for the Environment; Director of National Parks; Northern Territory Government; and the joint Board of Management, which includes representatives from industry and stakeholders and carries a majority of Anangu representatives (Director of National Parks 2010a).

The governance partnerships under the Parks Memorandum of Lease (Northern Territory of Australia 1994) between the Park’s lessee (Australian Government through the Director of National Parks and Wildlife) and the lessor (Uluru-Katatjuta Aboriginal Land Trust) are investigated in terms of partner equity and authority within the governance framework. A particular focus of my investigation into the management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park is whether the current governance framework provides sufficient resilience and functionality for the sustainability and effectiveness of the associated relationships.
The process of shared history and authority over the region surrounding Uluru and Kata Tjuta, between Anangu and settlers, has continued to evolve from the colonial appropriation through the Giles and Gosses’ discoveries, to Handback, the use of the Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara language and shared or joint management of Country. This evolution progressively acknowledges the local traditional Aboriginal perspective on the Park’s governance process, giving more authority to the guidance and advice to Anangu through the Board of Management. However, the senior authority on policy and the day-to-day management of the Park, is vested in the Australian Government through its instrument, the Director of National Parks and Parks Australia North rather than in the hands of Anangu.

The following section Governance Structure investigates the five official management plans for Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, which were devised by successive Australian Federal governments in consultation with Anangu and other stakeholders. This evolving consultative approach demonstrates a movement toward recognition of the value of Anangu cultural knowledge and governance of the region linked to the Aboriginal integrated concept of Country. A component of this recognition is the use of traditional Anangu Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara language, an intangible cultural heritage of Anangu. A further component is the recognition of the role of Anangu art in informing the management of Country and the process of shared management. The Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010–2020 (Director of National Parks 2010a) incorporates: extensive language statements and uses the term Nguraritja rather than traditional owner, which was a blunt English language interpretation of an Anangu term; and reproductions of Anangu paintings by Malya Teamay (ibid: cover) and Jennifer Taylor (ibid: vi), which present Tjukurpa and the associated governance place, in relation to the Park, of the Park’s Board of Management (ibid).

Governance Structure

A component of Handback and subsequently joint management of the Park is the instigation of a representative Uluru-Kata Tjuta Board of Management (the Board). The Board is structured to provide a level of governance that includes: Nguraritja (traditional owners); Commonwealth and Territory government; tourism, scientific,
conservation interests; and other stakeholders. The multivalent relationship between the joint management partners can be considered complex and highly political as each party is subject to internal and external lobbying by separate interest groups. The intent guiding these stakeholder relationships and consequently the sustainability and quality of the Park’s joint management is articulated in the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020*, as being achieved when ‘Anangu and Piranpa will work together as equals, exchanging knowledge about our different cultural values and processes and their application.’ (Director National Parks 2010a: i)

The Uluru-Kata Tjuta Board of Management operates as an Australian Government Board under the EPBC Act. Its funding was defined in the Lease of Memorandum as being provided by the Lessee, for the ‘administration of the Board’ (Northern Territory of Australia 1994: 12). Nominations for Board membership are presented for consideration to the Minister of the day who is responsible for administering the EPBC Act (Director of National Parks 2010a: 23) (the Minister). A common misconception is that the Anangu nominations to the Board are automatically appointed. This is not the case, they are only nominated by Anangu and their participation is at the discretion of the Minister as defined in section 379, Subdivision F of Chapter 5, Volume 2 of the EBPC Act (EPBC Act 1999 (Cth)). In addition, the Minister’s approval was essential in finalizing the Park’s plan of management and is essential for future plans of management plan under s.370 of the EPBC Act.

Piranpa Law and Tjukurpa

The shared challenge for Anangu, the Australian government and other management partners is to pursue what they consider as their joint and separate entitlements to influence and manage the Parks and surrounds. The pursuit of these entitlements is often-conflicted between the Australian legal system and Tjukurpa. The interaction between Piranpa law (Australian system) and Tjukurpa law is assisted through the process of mediation and consultation by the Central Land Council (CLC)\(^\text{25}\), which

\(^{25}\) The CLC is a Commonwealth statutory body that consults with Aboriginal landowners on mining activity, land management, tourism, employment and other development proposals for their land. (Central Land Council 2013:6)
has a role under the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976 (NT)* to represent the interests of the traditional owners in negotiations and consultations regarding their lands.

The CLC has been a major stakeholder and partner in all five official plans of management commencing with the 1982 plan of management (*Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982*). The extent of the CLC’s legal authority and position in the Parks governance processes is demonstrated in the Memorandum of Lease, signed between the Uluṟu – KataTjuta²⁶ Aboriginal Land Trust (the Owner) and the Director of National Parks and Wildlife (the Tenant) in 1994 (Northern Territory of Australia 1994). The CLC is mentioned extensively through the Memorandum of Lease with designated roles, in addition to mediation and consultation the roles include receiving rent payments on behalf of the Owner. The initial rent was set at $150,000 in advance (*ibid*: 4). The 2010-2020 management plan further indicates the pivotal role of the CLC by stating: (Director of National Parks 2010a: 38)

> Under the EPBC Act and the Lease the Director is required to consult the Central Land Council about park management generally and in relation to preparation of management plans in particular.

The legal authority of the CLC, in relation to the Park, is primarily that of governance advice rather than management delivery and can be considered as a position of the senior gatekeeper between Tjukurpa and Pīankanpa laws. This gatekeeper role is enforced through the Director of National Parks being linked under the Memorandum of Lease ‘to consult with relevant Aboriginals only through the Land Council and where appropriate the relevant Aboriginal Association’ (Northern Territory of Australia 1994: 9). A demonstration of the conflicts that have emerged between the Pīankanpa and Tjukurpa laws is the continuance of the climb of Uluṟu, which is restricted under Tjukurpa but condoned under Australian law (Director of National Parks 2010). A further demonstration is related to the sensitive arena of authority and control of the Anangu intangible cultural heritage associated with Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property, which is not recognized under Australian law and is

---

²⁶ The spelling of Uluru – KataTjuta is just another variation of Uluru-Kata Tjuta
described by the Arts Law Centre of Australia as a communal concept referring to: (Arts Law Centre of Australia 2015).

Indigenous peoples’ interests in their cultural heritage. This includes songs, music, dances, stories, ceremonies, symbols, languages and designs.

In the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* the *Anangu* have officially expressed two specific concerns about the control, management and use of their Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (ICIP): (Director National Parks 2010a: 52)

The first is:

being able to control and manage use of ICIP through:

- being able to say ‘no’ to inappropriate use of cultural material and images protecting sacred secret material
- protecting important ceremonies
- protecting the cultural integrity of important stories and knowledge transferring information in accordance with customary beliefs.

The second concern is wanting:

to have appropriate control over how ICIP is used, including: recognizing *Anangu* as the owners; *Anangu* sharing in the benefits (monetary and non-monetary) from use of ICIP; and to have the capacity to monitor use.

Of particularly relevance to the research, as an interdisciplinary investigation, is the articulated importance of ICIP and its transmission and consequent linkage to artistic expression through ‘songs, music, dances, stories, ceremonies, symbols, languages and designs’ (Arts Law Centre of Australia 2015). I contend that recognition of ICIP positions art practice in its many forms as an integral component of Aboriginal cultural maintenance and the associated process that links culture, nature and art in the management of Country. The understanding of the use of art as a tool and process of the governance and management of Country, from a Western and Aboriginal perspective, was further investigated in *Chapter Three: Place and Sense of Place*. 

Keven Francis: Thesis
Recognition of the coexistence of two different legal systems operating within Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and surrounds has progressed from the Park’s first management plan in 1982 (Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982) and throughout each of the successive plan. The Park’s plans of management 2000 (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000) and 2010 (Director of National Parks 2010) were significant in relation to the coexistence of Piranpa law and Tjukurpa within the management of the Park as they introduced the new era of protection driven by the EPBC Act (EPBC Act 1999 (Cth)) replacing the National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1975 (Cth) (Director of National Parks 2010a: 14). The 2000 plan of management was written just prior to the introduction of the EPBC Act and contains reference to the proposed new EPBC Act. A notable aspect to both the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2000 and the 2010-2020 is the extensive sections of text written in the Pitjantjatjara language and the emphasis of the term Nguraritja rather than Aboriginal Traditional owners. The Plans also use the Anangu term Piranpa in statements identifying the different laws of Anangu Tjukurpa and Australian Government:

All the people and organisations involved in looking after the Park have obligations to consider Anangu and Piranpa Law and interests. (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000: xxi)

Joint management brings together cultural and scientific knowledge and experience, different governance processes, and interweaves two law systems – Piranpa law and Tjukurpa (Director National Parks 2012: ii)

A notable progression between the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Plan of Management 2000 (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000) and the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2000 2010-2020 (Director of National Parks 2010a) is the description of the interaction of Piranpa law and Tjukurpa. The 2010-2020 management plan refers to an interweaving of the two laws (Director of National Parks 2010a: ii), rather than in the 2000 plan of management where the laws’ interactions are positioned as separate constructs that have to work together, with no mention of interweaving. Although the authority to govern the Park is held by the Northern Territory and the Australian governments under the Australian legislative
system the recognition of a potential intertwining with Tjukurpa demonstrates a symbolic shift to a more equitable engagement with Nguraritja and their traditional management of Country under Tjukurpa.

Board of Management

The Board of Management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park ‘makes high level policy and strategic decisions about park management’ (Director of National Parks 2010a: 37). Its functions are (ibid: 37):

- to make decisions relating to the management of the park that are consistent with the management plan in operation for the park
- in conjunction with the Director, to:
  - prepare management plans for the park
  - monitor the management of the park
  - advise the Minister on all aspects of the future development of the park

A major stakeholder in the policy and strategic direction of the Park’s management is the Northern Territory Government as the Park lies within its territorial boarders. Unfortunately, the Northern Territory Government has had an extensive dispute over the Park’s management and initially opposed the Handback principle and process, as noted in the Australian Parliamentary research paper by David Lawrence in 1996 (Lawrence 1996: 18)

Aboriginal traditional owners rejected Northern Territory freehold title and a joint management agreement covering the park, and lobbied successive governments for Commonwealth freehold title. The early 1980s was a period of open hostility between the Northern Territory and Commonwealth Governments and the conflict was conducted on many fronts the most important being Aboriginal land rights and Commonwealth control of national parks.

Lawrence (1996) also presents that the conflict between the Commonwealth and the
Northern Territory government was fundamentally around control of the management of national parks within the Northern Territory’s jurisdiction. ‘The Northern Territory Government continues to press for control of all national parks within the Northern Territory and maintains its opposition to Commonwealth control of national parks’ (Lawrence 1996: 21). The Northern Territory government was so angered by the handover that it withdrew from the management arrangements (Department of the Environment 2015b). The lack of official Northern Territory Government governance representation on the Park’s Board of Management continued until the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Plan of Management 2000* (the 2000 Plan of Management) where the Board of Management’s ten members still did not have a Northern Territory Government representative. The Board of Management composition at the commencement of the 2000 Plan of Management was: (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000: 44)

- six Aboriginal people nominated by traditional owners,
- the Director of National Parks and Wildlife,
- a representative of the Minister for the Environment,
- a representative of the Minister for Tourism,
- a scientist experienced in arid land ecology and management.

During the period of the 2000 Plan of Management the governance structures and mechanism of the Board of Management underwent substantial review. This was reflected in the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020* with: the inclusion of the Northern Territory Government representative on the Board; an increase to 12 Board members; a radical revision of the Joint Management structure; and an omission of the Board composition from the Management Plan document. The current Board Members comprises: (Director of National Parks 2012: 43)

- Eight Aboriginal members nominated by the Anangu traditional owners
- One member is nominated by the federal minister responsible for tourism and approved by Anangu
- One member is nominated by the federal minister responsible for the environment and approved by Anangu
• One member is nominated by the Northern Territory Government and approved by Anangu
• One member is the Director of National Parks.

The governance changes between the 2000 Plan of Management and the 2010-2020 Plan of Management are illustrated in Figure 4.2 related to the 2000 plan of management and Figure 4.3 related to the 2010-2020 Plan of Management. The 2000 Plan of Management schematic (Figure 4.2) is visually complex and a challenge to read in a cross-cultural environment as its format is dominated by English text with little pictorial content that could be read cross culturally. Although the Figure 4.2 schematic may be considered a poor cross cultural tool it did provide some transparency of the governance process and its complexity, which included the pivotal role of the Office of Joint Management and the Minister. The schematic demonstrated the dominant authority of the Minister over the Director of National Parks, the delivery of Parks services and the appointment of the Park’s Board members. In contrast the Park’s 2010-2020 plan of management does not contain management structural or governance schematics in its content. The associated cut down version of the joint management arrangements (Figure 4.3), available on the Department of the Environment’s web site, may be argued as a simplification of a complex system. I contend the omission of a governance schematic within the 2010-2020 plan of management and the omission of the role of the Minister in the associated governance schematic inhibits governance transparency related to the influence and authority of the: Northern Territory Government; the Federal Minister responsible for tourism; and the Federal Minister responsible for the environment who has the right of veto over any Board decisions and to whom the Director of National Parks provides direct advice.
The Structure and Entities Involved in the Joint Management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park as at 1 November 2001
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Figure 4.2: Joint Management Structure. (Sovereign Health Care Australia 2001)

Figure 4.3: Joint Management Structure, (Department of the Environment 2016a)
An analysis of the Park’s 2000 plan against the 2010-2020 plan of management reveals more than just a change of membership or transparency but a fundamental change in the operation of the Board and how it receives governance and management advice. The operation of the 2000 plan of management involved the Office of Joint Management, which was dissolved under the current process. The role of the Office for Joint Management was to facilitate ‘consultation and communication between the joint management partners and provides secretariat support for the Board of Management.’ (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000: 10). The abolition of the Office of Joint Management was supported by the report Sovereign Health Care Australia, Report of the evaluation of the Community Liaison Function at Uluru–Kata Tjuta National Park, (SHCA Report) commissioned by Parks Australia North. Recommendation 9 of the SHCA Report suggested that the Office of Joint Management be abolished (Sovereign Health Care Australia 2001: 8) and the SHCA Report’s conclusion stated that it had identified substantial dysfunction in operations and relationships (Sovereign Health Care Australia 2001: 78). In an analysis of the SHCA Report, Power (2002) in the article ‘Joint Management at Uluru–Kata Tjuta National Park’, challenges the promoted idea of a harmonious and effective joint management in the statement: (Power 2002: 290)

The Report paints a picture far different from the praise heaped on joint management of the Park by international and domestic observers. The main premise of the Report is that whilst the Park may represent a leading example of indigenous and western partnership in land management, the practical workings of joint management in the Park are seriously impeded by inadequacies in structure, process and personal relationships.

Loss of the Office of Joint Management, which was based at Mutitjulu Community and not controlled by government park management, facilitated a radical change in the manner in which the Board of Management received governance advice. The numerous staff and resources of the Office of Joint Management, which provided independent advice and consultation with Mutitjulu Community, were dismissed. Part of the new structure, replacing the Office of Joint Management was the establishment of the Joint Management Partnership, which is not independent and designed ‘to help progress successful joint management of the park and discuss relevant Mutitjulu
Community issues’ (Director of National Parks 2010a: 39). The Joint Management Partnership involves a Community Liaisons Officer for Mutitjulu, a representative of the CLC and a position of Board Secretariat, an employee of Parks Australia North. Recommendation 8 of the SHCA Report suggested that the Board Secretariat be independent and directed by the Board Chairperson. (Sovereign Health Care Australia 2001: 8). However, the position of Board Secretariat is not established as an independent position directed by the Board Chairperson but as a government position reporting to the Park Manager under control of Parks Australia North. In 2002 I was engaged as a government employee in the Board Secretariat position within the Joint Management Partnership, reporting to the Park Manager under direction of the Director of National Parks.

Whether the replacement of the Office of Joint Management by the Joint Management structure was driven by an informed decision to improve governance, for political expediency or to increasing the government influence and authority over the Nguraritja through the Director of National Park’s will remain a contentious issue. My inquiry indicates that the changes to governance emerged as a significant issue in regard to transparency and conflict of interest within the governance processes of the Board of Management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. In a shared management context, the analysis of the change of governance structure is that it reduced the independence of advice and support to the Anangu Board members, reducing their ability to influence the governance and processes that manage their freehold property of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. The lingering governance matter challenging the Board of Management is the continued allowance of the climb of Uluru. Although the Anangu Board members consistently oppose (outside the Board) the climb on cultural grounds, the influence exerted by conflicted parties within the Board of Management appears to override this position therefore presenting a compromised relationship between Piranpa law and Tjukurpa. The pressing governance issue, which continues to arise is the question over the influences resulting in the majority of Anangu Board members not being able to stop the climb. This issue is extremely controversial as it brings into question the integrity of all of the Board Members and potential conflicts of interest within the Board of Management structure that influence governance decisions.
Management

The Director of National Parks, established under the EPBC Act, has the function of managing Commonwealth reserves and the Park’s Board of Management, which is a government appointed Board established under the EPBC Act. The Director of National Parks is assisted in the day to day operational management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park by the staff of Parks Australia a division of the Department of Environment (previously the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities) and is responsible for: (Director of National Parks 2010a: 15)

- the administration, management and control of Commonwealth reserves and conservation zones;
- the protection, conservation and management of biodiversity and heritage in Commonwealth reserves and conservation zones;
- the protection, conservation and management of biodiversity and heritage in areas outside Commonwealth reserves and conservation zones;
- consulting and cooperating with other countries with regard to matters relating to the establishment and management of national parks and nature reserves in those countries;
- the provision of training in the knowledge and skills relevant to the establishment and management of national parks and nature reserves;
- research and investigation relevant to the establishment and management of Commonwealth reserves; making recommendations to the Australian Government Minister for the Environment; and,
- administration of the Australian National Parks Fund.

The joint management process and structure have evolved to embrace an increasing recognition of Anangu intangible heritage and cultural sensitivities. The Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 states on the publications cover the guiding principle of ‘Tjukurpa Katuṭja Ngarantja’, which translates to ‘Tjukurpa
above all else or Tjukurpa our primary responsibility’ (Director of National Parks 2010a: 175). The shared or joint management that follows Tjukurpa Katutja Ngarantja consequently enshrines in the policies and structures the promotion of traditional culture as the paramount driver to landscape management, however anomalies such as Uluru still being climbed by tourists continue.

The articulation of Tjukurpa as the basis for the management structure of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park is an indication of the strength of commitment of the Anangu to their cultural heritage and continued effects of many individuals across the Director of National Parks and Parks Australia. However, the research indicates that the implementation of joint management operational process does not match the rhetoric of the Parks promotional material or Tjukurpa Katutja Ngarantja. The authority of Tjukurpa is fundamentally compromised by the controls placed on appointments to the Board of Management and the veto on Board resolutions held by the Federal Minister responsible for the environment, who is acting on behalf of the Australian people and driven by political expediency and commercial opportunism of the past and present colonization. The investigation of the shared management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park has identified some significant failings and some positive achievements of shared management at Uluru. The general shared management structure at the Park creates a difficult environment, influenced heavily by changing political government ideologies and the commercial interests of the tourism industry. I contend the joint management governance structure at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park compromises the authority of the Anangu Board of Management members and the implementation of the principle of Tjukurpa Katutja Ngarantja.

In considering the region of Uluru, Kata Tjuta and surrounds, the research reveals that Anangu have consistently and sustainably managed their Country in a holistic manner for many generations. The Anangu management is recognized in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020, in a reciprocity statement related to the Park and Anangu: ‘The Aboriginal traditional owners of Uluru–Kata Tjuta National Park (Ngurariija)27 have looked after, and in turn been looked after by, the land for over one thousand generations’ (Director of National Parks 2010a: ii). This

27 Ngurariija means the traditional Aboriginal owners of the park, (Director of National Parks 2010, 23)
statement can be construed as intent, within the management plan, to recognize Anangu management and indicate the possibility of a two-way relationship between the Anangu and the Park as Country, within a joint management model. I contend that the reciprocal use of the term ‘looked after’ in this context, is an indication of a European approach to a two-way relationship, which separates or sets apart cultural and natural heritage management. It presents an English language translation of the Anangu management of Country as a reciprocal rather than integrated relationship. Placed at the beginning of the ‘Forward’ in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 (Director of National Parks 2010a: ii) the reciprocity statement sets the tone for much of the document where the intention to recognize and respect the Nguraritja is prominent, but interpreted and presented within a Western management context of the human/nature duality.

The hurdles for the shared management between Anangu and Piranpa28, particularly related to managing culture and nature together, are also demonstrated in the government’s formal designation of the Park’s boundary. For the Anangu, management of Country extends far beyond the artificial boundaries of the Park as stated in the 1986 Uluru (Ayers Rock-Mount Olga) National Park Plan of Management (1986 Plan of Management). (Australian National Parks and Wildlife Services 1986: 11)

State borders and boundaries of reserve areas have always been made in terms of Western administrative convenience and political necessity. Anangu assert, however, that they have been part of a single culture from the beginning of time. Western administrative borders artificially divide the land from people and the people from one another…

The Nguraritja who have traditional cultural authority and responsibility for areas associated with the Park and surrounds do not necessarily permanently live in the area. Some live in towns and communities hundreds of kilometres from the Park

---

28 Piranpa means ‘Literally ‘white’ but now used to mean non-Aboriginal people’ (Director of National Parks 2010, 175)
including, but not exclusively, the: South Australian towns of Fregon, Erelabella (Pukatja) and Amata; the Western Australian towns of Wingellina (Irrunytu); and the Northern Territory towns of Mutitjulu, Imanpa, Docker River (Kaltukatjara) and Areyonga (Utju). During my employment as the Board Secretariat at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park I visited Nguraritja in a number of these towns and communities, for the purpose of providing information and receiving direction from Board of Management members related to the management of the Park and surrounds. The 2012 Knowledge Handbook (Director National Parks 2012) produced as an educational tool for tour guides, articulates the interdependence of people and the environment. It describes Uluru and its surrounds as a living cultural landscape that is reliant on primarily caring for people and their cultural practice conducted on Country (ibid).

In considering management policies and processes of the Park it is essential to understand that the physical boundaries of the Park are only Western constructs and provide little reflection of the complexity, depth and extent of the landscape management required to sustain the cultural and natural heritage. The Park boundaries are Western imposed property borders not Anangu cultural boundaries. However, creating borders is essential in the Western context, when managing and promoting the Park and working within the existing government and market framework. Management of infrastructure also falls within this Western context of boundaries as funding and resources are directed at specific projects and/or locations. The investigation of the infrastructure within the boundaries of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park indicates that it generally consists of three basic elements: the Aboriginal Community of Mutitjulu positioned approximately 700m from the base of Uluru; the tourist and cultural facilities at the Cultural Centre; and the Australian Government (through Parks Australia North) tourist, administrative, and workshop facilities; and roads and walking tracks (Director of National Parks 2010a). The research reveals the most dynamic interaction of the three basic infrastructure elements within Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park is between the Mutitjulu Community and the Australian government, in regard to residential and tourist accommodation within the Park’s World Heritage boundaries and adjacent region. The vicinity of Mutitjulu has been occupied and visited by Anangu for millennia, however Mutitjulu as a contemporary settlement has only existed since the 1970s (Taylor 2001).
In regard to the resident accommodation, the usually present population of Mutitjulu had grown from 140 in 1986 to 385 in 2000 (Taylor 2001: vi). The township had become ‘an ever-present attraction to Anangu from across the region who are seeking to make temporary use of urban facilities’ (ibid: 4). The Australian Bureau of Statistics web site states that the 2011 Census indicates that the population of Mutitjulu was 283 people, comprising of 69 families with 72 occupied and 17 unoccupied private dwellings (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2011). The right of relevant Aboriginal people to reside in the vicinity of Mutitjulu is enshrined in the Memorandum of Lease under the section ‘Reservation of Aboriginal Rights to Use and Occupy’, which states: (Northern Territory of Australia 1994: 3)

the right to reside in the Park in the vicinity of the present Mutitjulu Community or at such other locations as may be specified in the Plan of Management together with rights of access and residence for their employees, staff, invitees and agents.

Mutitjulu Community is a fully functioning community with associated housing and infrastructure. The housing includes accommodation for Anangu residents, visitors, Park’s staff, medical staff, contractors and others. The infrastructure at Mutitjulu includes roads, sewage, community buildings, police station, medical centre, operational depots, landfill rubbish site, high temperature waste incinerator, power generation and grid, water storage tanks, school, daycare and businesses. Whilst I was living at Mutitjulu with my family we were housed in a largely staff zone slightly separate from the main town in what was colloquially termed as Rangerville.

In consideration of the location, history and my personal observations of life in Mutitjulu I have categorized the impact of the Mutitjulu on Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park into three particular management issue spheres of: logistics; environmental impact; and social and wellbeing.

1. logistics: maintaining and upgrading facilities, which has struggled for funding from Commonwealth and Northern Territory authorities.
2. environmental impact: potentially negative consequences of an increasing population and associated facilities; and
3. social and wellbeing issues of community members: this is the most sensitive management sphere with a consequential array negative aspects impacting on the Park and tourism operations more generally. Mutitjulu has been described over many years as a dysfunctional community and was one of the focus communities for the 2007 Northern Territory Emergency Response (the Emergency Response) intervention, which was an Australian Government response to ‘the national emergency confronting the welfare of Aboriginal children in the Northern Territory and identified as the very first recommendation of the Little Children are Sacred report into the protection of Aboriginal children from child abuse in the Northern Territory’ (Brough 2007)

Figure 4.4: Francis, K. (2003). Landfill at Mutitjulu: digital photo.

The plethora of challenges associated with Mutitjulu being located within the Park include: stakeholder management with the Community Council and residence; management of waste and rubbish as a normal consequence of habitation; maintenance of the Community infrastructure; presence of domestic pets, particularly dogs; fire management; social disorder and dysfunction in the community; and sustainability of the natural environment impacted by an increasing resident and transient population. My personal observations from my family home at Mutitjulu in 2002-2003, prior to the Northern Territory Emergency Response, were images of

disorder, violence, theft, despair, packs of 50 to 80 dogs ripping each other apart and aggressive petrol sniffing youth roaming the sand dunes. In 2015 and after the Emergency Response the Community is much more stable and safer. (Langmaid 2015). Whilst considerable discussion on the plight of Mutitjulu and the Aboriginal residents is available I have chosen not to expand on the topic other then in reference to tourism infrastructure, as to investigate the societal challenges at Mutitjulu is beyond the scope of my current research.

Tourism

Tourism at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park arose from European appropriation and domination over the landscape and its Aboriginal inhabitants, which is illustrated initially by the European naming or in terms of the Anangu, re-naming of Uluru and Kata Tjuta as Ayers Rock and Mount Olga. In the 1970s tourist infrastructure (Taylor 2001) was based within the Park in the vicinity of Mutitjulu, however it was moved to Yulara (outside the Park boundaries) with the aim of reducing tourist impact on the environmental conditions near Uluru (Commonwealth of Australia 1977). The perpetuation of the status of tourism, as a significant regional industry with potential to influence or damage Anangu culture, is discussed below with references across the five plans of management for Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (1982 to 2010-2020) and in relation to the associated Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Tourism Direction: Stage 1 (Director National Parks 2010b)

A major factor in the impact of tourism at the Park is the volume of visitors and the expansion of associated infrastructure, both within the Park and at Yulara. The tourist visitations to Uluru have increased consistently from the 1940’s, as noted throughout the first plan of management (Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982), rising to 5462 tourists visit in 1962 (Director of National Parks 2012: 23). The annual number of visitors to the Park continued to increase to 105,970 in 1983/4 then 396,456 in 2000-2001 (Australian Government 2002). However, the average tourist visitation over the 4th plan of management period from 2000 to 2010 decreased to 350,000. (Director of National Parks 2010a: 83). A quantified account of the decline in tourism to Uluru and surrounds was noted in the Tourism NT Regional Report: Uluru and Surrounds (Tourism NT 2014), which stated that at 2014 ‘The long term
trend of visitation to the region has been one of decline, a trend consistent over the past 8 years’ (*ibid*: 2). The report also indicated that between 2000 and June 2014 there was an average annual decrease of 2.9% in sale of permits into Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, to 261,000 visitors (*ibid*: 6). The reduction to 261,000 visitations to some degree is a positive for the management of the Park’s cultural and natural values as it reduces the potential for damage from a previously rapidly increasing tourist visitation.

The potential of negative impact from tourism on the Anangu heritage at the sites of Uluru and Kata Tjuta was recognized as early as 1982 in the first plan of management with the statement: (Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982: 22)

> Aboriginal contact with Europeans in the Uluru region resulted, as elsewhere in Australia, in the breakdown and dispersal of local descent groups, particularly under the influence of the cattle stations and the missions. Furthermore, a policy of assimilation exacerbated this breakdown while at the same time fostering the development of tourism at places like Ayers Rock

My investigation of subsequent Park plans of management indicates that the editorial direction progressively reduce reference to the negative impact of tourism by shifting emphasis away from discussing the Anangu as impacted by colonisation to Anangu being joint partners in a tourism enterprise. This can be to some degree seen as a reflection of changed relationship between the Australian Government and Anangu resulting from Lands Rights determinations, free hold ownership of the Park, increasing Anangu influence in Park management, a business growth imperative and the decline of tourist visitation. The current Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 (Director National Parks 2010a) has little reference to tourism damaging Anangu culture other than in relation to the historic fabric of cultural heritage places and materials.

The contradiction between the management of tourism development and heritage management is revealed in the comparison of descriptions of Uluru-Kata Tjuta, as stated in Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020
The Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 states: (Director of National Parks 2010a: 2)

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park is part of an extensive Aboriginal cultural landscape that stretches across the Australian continent. The park represents the work of Anangu and nature during thousands of years. Its landscape has been managed using traditional Anangu methods governed by Tjukurpa, Anangu Law.

The Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Tourism Directions: Stage 1 states: (Director of National Parks 2010b: 3)

The Uluru brand is one of the most powerful in Australia and is recognized internationally. The park has been recently nominated as one of the seven natural wonders of the world. Uluru sits alongside the Opera House and Great Barrier Reef as one of the three most instantly recognizable symbols of Australia.

Balancing heritage under the concept of Country and tourism through market branding, is a complexity providing a continuing challenge for the Park’s Board of Management and highlights the underlying cultural difference between traditional Aboriginal Country and Western landscape managements. The shared management challenge associated with this complexity is a function of the Board of Management having to represent the importance of the holistic management of Country under the heritage of Tjukurpa and the alternative Western tendency to separate culture and nature within the landscape as marketable products. In an
attempt to meet this challenge, the *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park: Tourism Directions: Stage 1 in 2010* (Director National Parks 2010b), which focuses on marketing ‘Brand Uluru’ and tourism development opportunities, also promotes an incorporation of Anangu culture into the marketing initiative by stating: (Director of National Parks 2010b: 1)

Tourism Directions: Stage 1 represents a turning point for tourism in the park. It shows that we Anangu are developing pathways for our children to have a strong future. And above all, it demonstrates that Tjukurpa will be heard in all aspects of tourism and that our culture will be promoted to the next generation visiting our country.

The contrasts between the 2010-2020 management plan’s heritage focus and Tourism Directions 2010 marketing focus does not necessarily indicate a conflict. However, it demonstrates the Board of Management governance processes are required to be robust and balanced enough to maintain Anangu cultural heritage integrity against the pressure to develop new tourist products and synergies with potential tourism markets.

**Mutitjulu - Removal of tourist infrastructure**

Tourism facilities at Mutitjulu and the surrounding area inside Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park have been significantly adjusted since the 1970’s when they were well established in the form of an airstrip, motels and other tourist facilities (Commonwealth of Australia 1977). In response to the negative impact of the tourist facilities combined with an increasing visitation to the Park the Commonwealth Government recommended to move the tourism accommodation and associated infrastructure out of the Park to Yulara (Commonwealth of Australia 1977: 21). The recommendation came from the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation (the Standing Committee), titled *The Management of Ayers Rock – Mt Olga National Park* (Commonwealth of Australia 1977: 21) that:

the existing village (*Mutitjulu*) and airstrip be resited outside the
present National Park boundaries to minimise adverse environmental and aesthetic effects adjacent to Ayers Rock.

The Standing Committee also noted and accepted that there would be a delay of seven to eight years in moving the village (Mutitjulu) (tourist infrastructure) out of the Park (ibid: 13). The infrastructure was gradually demolished and relocated to the resort area of Ayers Rock Resort in the town of Yulara between 1983 and 1986. By 1986, ‘all the motels in the park had been demolished and the Mutitjulu community was formally established around what remained of the tourist site’ (Taylor 2001: 3). My analysis of the abandonment of tourist infrastructure at Mutitjulu, within the Park’s boundary, reveals an alignment with the history of national park development within Australia and the foundation of wilderness protection, which separates and removes people from the landscape. The wilderness model sought to reinvent the naïve and mistaken notion that before European settlement the landscape was a natural phenomenon untouched by human hand that existed as ‘terra nullius’. The decision to move the tourist accommodation infrastructure out of the Park is considered within my research to be in part a reflection of protecting nature under the wilderness model. However, I propose the decision did not provide significant risk mitigation to protect the natural environment, consequently contributing to Park damage such as the tourist climb scar. The removal of tourist infrastructure did reduce pressure from factors including roads, sewage, operational depots, landfill rubbish site, power generation and grid, and water storage tanks. However, although the tourism accommodation infrastructure was removed from the Park the occupation by Anangu and others continued under the Park’s Memorandum of Lease (Northern Territory of Australia 1994) and the infrastructure of the community of Mutitjulu developed rapidly.

Whilst a case has been made for the removal of the tourist accommodation from the Park the consequence is that the potential for tourism economic returns is substantially diminished for the Anangu living at Mutitjulu and delivered to the tourist accommodation monopoly held by the owners of Ayers Rock Resort at Yulara. As revealed in the following section Ayers Rock Resort the ownership of Ayers Rock Resort has changed several times, with evidence to support the assertion that disadvantage to Anangu, resulting from denial of tourist accommodation at Mutitjulu in the 1970’s, has continued over the decades to include the current owners.
My analysis of removing tourism accommodation from Mutitjulu is that it disenfranchised the Anangu and undermined their authority and ability to equitably profit from the tourism industry associated with their culture and traditional lands. The opportunity for the Anangu to receive equitable remuneration from the exploitation of the cultural and natural heritage creates a situation of conflict between the Park’s shared management partners.

Ayers Rock Resort

In 1980 the construction of the Ayers Rock Resort began and by 1982 the campground opened and hotels were operating under different companies including Sheraton and Four Seasons (Ernst & Young 2003). A major change occurred to the management of the Ayers Rock Resort in 1997 when it was sold to the General Property Trust to be managed by Voyages Hotels and Resorts. (Ernst & Young 2003: 90).

In December 1997, General Property Trust purchased Ayers Rock Resort for a combined cost of $220 million. Ayers Rock Resort Company Limited (now Voyages Hotels & Resorts Pty Ltd) assumed management of operations for the resort

Improvements of access to Ayers Rock Resort and the Park developed along with tourism and the area is now available via road and air. The main highway access is a four hour, 450km road trip from Alice Springs via a sealed highway. The tourist infrastructure relocation from Mutitjulu to Yulara, included the airstrip from the base of Uluru, which was moved to the current Cornelian airport location, near Yulara. The current air service is delivered by commercial jets and light aircraft, utilizing the Ayers Rock (Connellan) Airport. There are daily commercial jet services to Connellan Airport and at various times, a direct flight service scheduled to some Australian capital cities. The airport is located approximately six kilometres by road from Yulara. (Voyages Indigenous Tourism Australia 2013)

My research reveals that there effectively exists a tourist accommodation monopoly, held by Ayers Rock Resort that expands to approximately a 100km radius from
Uluṟu. My assertion of a monopoly is based on: research of hotels and motels, other than at Ayers Rock resort in the region; the centralization of tourism accommodation and associated infrastructure away from Mutitjulu to Yulara; and the purchase of Ayers Rock Resort and all its hotels and tourist accommodation by General Property Trust, which on-sold the facilities to the Indigenous Land Corporation. The nearest hotel or motel from Uluṟu other than those owned by Ayers Rock Resort is at Curtin Springs Station approximately 100km to the east of Uluṟu. In addition to owning accommodation and other facilities at Yulara the only airport suitable for commercial jet operation is Cornelian Airport, owned by Ayers Rock Resort. The consequence of developing Yulara as a tourist town, overwhelmingly controlled by Ayers Rock Resort and relegating Mutitjulu to an Aboriginal community with no tourism accommodation infrastructure, delivered two separate economies and privileged non Anangu with regard to commercial gains from tourism.

In 2010 the Indigenous Land Corporation, an independent statutory authority of the Australian Government entered into an agreement with General Property Trust (GPT) to acquire the Ayers Rock Resort (ARR). The acquisition was completed on 23 May 2011. The assets comprising the ARR that were acquired included the following (McGrathNicol 2013: 15):

- The 104,000 hectares of freehold land on which the resort is situated;
- Lease and operation of Ayers Rock (Connellan) airport;
- The plant and equipment including computer equipment and motor vehicles;
- The Voyages management and booking office and the Voyages platform assets;
- The intellectual property of the ARR and Voyages;
- The township of Yulara including staff accommodation, retail shopping centre, petrol station, visitor information centre, conference centre and recreational facilities; and
- Other assets such as trading stock, interests in contracts and rights relating to the operation of the ARR businesses.
In 2013 the independent financial and acquisition report *Ayers Rock Resort Review-Final Report* (McGrathnicol 2013), prepared for the Indigenous Land Corporation, on the advice of the Federal Indigenous Affairs Minister, criticized the Indigenous Land Corporation purchase of Ayers Rock Resort. The Ayers Rock Resort asset-worth in 2015 was estimated at $225 million compared to its purchase price of $317 million (Martin 2015). Whilst the problems of corporate business failings are not uncommon, the impact of instability of such an influential operation as Ayers Rock Resort carries a management risk. This risk is related to: the management operations of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park; potential restriction to tourist visitations; and support for joint cultural and natural heritage management. In addition to the issue of instability of management of Ayers Rock Resort the Indigenous Land Corporation created a dilemma related to the maintenance of Anangu cultural heritage (Tjukurpa), through expansion of non-Anangu Aboriginal or Torres Strait employment at Ayers Rock Resort. The Indigenous Land Corporation claims on its web site to: (Indigenous Land Corporation 2015):

- provide jobs for 200 Indigenous people; and
- have graduated hundreds of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people from its academy at Ayers Rock Resort.

However, the percentage of Anangu people, associated with the local traditional Aboriginal culture, employed or trainee graduates has not been released publically but is anecdotally minimal. My contention is that increasing the number of Indigenous people working at Ayers Rock Resort, from locations and cultural paradigms different to Tjukurpa, does not address the issue of delivering a management model that maintains the integrity of the region’s intangible heritage. The underlying issue that remains is Indigenous people from other cultures across Australia, although providing valuable contributions, have different cultural understandings related to their particular Country. Consequently, their increased participation and authority, as with European workers, can be considered as yet another colonization of the region that impacts on the intangible meaning of place at Uluru. The point to making this statement is that colonization can occur as one Australian Indigenous group influencing and potentially dispossessing another of their sense of place. The
positioning of non Anangu people as potential colonisers is controversial and perhaps can be tagged as politically incorrect, however not all Australian Indigenous people have the same cultural, political or social understandings. A demonstration of non local Anangu cultural values attempting to impose on Nguraritja heritage is the call from the Northern Territory Chief Minister, who is recognized as being of New South Wales Aboriginal decent (Nicole 2013), for Nguraritja to rethink their cultural heritage opposition to climbing Uluru (Parliament of the Northern Territory, Legislative Assembly, 2016).

The importance of the success of Ayers Rock Resort is referenced through its’ acknowledgement in the array of tourism, government and private documents noted previously, plus the financial investment of the Indigenous Land Corporation. The impact of Ayers Rock Resort on the cultural and natural heritage of Uluru-Kata Tjuta has received little attention apart from references to the historic shift of infrastructure ownership and the potential for Aboriginal employment and economic opportunities related to tourism. A potential key to the problems of Ayers Rock Resort not delivering on the financial hopes of the Anangu was expressed by Professor Mick Dodson with comments that go to the heart of the issue of managing Country in a manner that links culture and conservation whilst protecting the Indigenous heritage of place. In an article by Davidson (2015) Dodson was quoted as stating: (Davidson 2015)

> The Indigenous Land Corporation should set a timetable to divest the Ayers Rock Resort to the Aboriginal traditional owners, to provide them with long-awaited opportunity and economic development.

Climbing Uluru

The climbing of Uluru is permitted by the Park’s management through: the Australian Government; the Director of National Parks; the Board of Management; and the operational manager Parks Australia North (Director of National Parks 2010a). However, in contradiction to the Park’s governance and management permission for tourists to climb Uluru the local traditional Aboriginal owners do not want tourists to climb Uluru and this sentiment is stated in the: *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park*
Management Plan 2010-2020 (Director of National Parks 2010a); Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Tourism Directions: Stage 1 (Director of National Parks 2011a), Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park: Knowledge Handbook (Director of National Parks 2012); and on signage at the base of the climb. The contradictory message given to tourists, that they can climb at their own discretion, can be seen as confusing and ambiguous as the two major joint management partners, the Australian Government and Anangu, have distinctly conflicting positions. The tourist confusion is noted by Sarah James (2007) in the article ‘Constructing the Climb: Visitor Decision-making at Uluru’ where she notes, ‘that the Climb remains open presents a confusing and ambiguous message to the visitor in regards to what they should do in this site.’ (James S 2007: 406)

The issue of the climbing of Uluru, from a culture and nature perspective, can be considered as the holistic Aboriginal management of Country juxtaposed against the Western colonial approach of separating the landscapes tangible (historic fabric) from its intangible (heritage). The Uluru climb has developed into a tension between Aboriginal management of Country and the various Australian governments management of landscapes dominated by tourism. The tensions in relation to the climb of Uluru were noted by du Cos and Johnston: (du Cos H and Johnston, 2002: 41)

Tensions between global and local, tourism and heritage management, as well as colonial and post colonial philosophies and values are apparent at Uluru. There is also the tension between measures for the protection of tangible as against intangible heritage

The challenge of continuing to allow mass tourism to climb Uluru, from a governance perspective, is that it highlights the structural shortcomings of the Park’s Board of Management under both the 4th and 5th management plans (Director of National Parks and Wildlife 2000) (Director National Parks 2010a) and the inability of the Anangu majority Board to close the tourist climb to the summit of Uluru. This is in the face of many years of continued Anangu opposition to the climb and a proclamation in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 from a senior Nguraritja (now deceased) Tony Tjamiwa stating emphatically that people should not
climb Uluru (Director National Parks 2010a: 89). A closure of the tourist climb of Uluru can be argued against in the ground that it would be a disincentive for tourist visitations. However, research noted in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 demonstrates that climbing is not a major factor in attracting Park visitations (ibid: 90):

Research was undertaken over a three-year period to assess visitors’ motivation for climbing Uluru, or choosing not to climb. The results showed that just over one-third of all visitors to the park chose to climb, a high percentage of these being children. The review found that overall not being able to climb would not affect the decision to visit the park for the vast majority of visitors (98 per cent).

A deceptive victory in the goal of closing the climb was achieved in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 where closure is identified as possible under specific conditions. However, the conditions are directly related to tourism numbers and alternative tourist products, not the will of the majority Anangu or the World Heritage cultural and natural universal values. The conditions to permanently close the climb are stated in the section 6.3.3 (c) of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 are: (ibid: 92)

1. the Board, in consultation with the tourism industry, is satisfied that adequate new visitor experiences have been successfully established,
2. the proportion of visitors climbing falls below 20 per cent, or
3. the cultural and natural experiences on offer are the critical factors when visitors make their decision to visit the park.

Whilst the focus on the decision to not climb is generally based around Aboriginal cultural perspectives another major issue is the physical damage to the geological structure of Uluru and the consequent negative impact on the ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ of the monolith. The path of the climb, traveled by hundreds of thousands of feet has created a depression into the rock, which I initially observed in 2003 and more recently in 2012 during my PhD research field trip. My observation of this depression snaking up Uluru is that it can be observed up to 5 Km from the mount and
is evident in many images of Uluru, unless it has been airbrushed or digitally removed. My research has not been successful in accessing any information or public reports on pedestrian erosion of Uluru along its climbing track, however I propose that the fact that hundreds of thousands of feet have trodden the track over many years presents a logical conclusion of damage that supports my observations.

A perplexing twist to the continuance of the Uluru climb emerged in 2015 when the climb was closed due to a protester cutting several sections out of the chain used to support climbers (La Canna & Carter 2015). This act was applauded by the Chairman of the Central Land Council and others including an Aboriginal elder from the Mutitjulu Community (ibid). In a statement provided to the Australian Broadcast Commission (ABC) and reported on 28 October 2015, Parks Australia indicated that they would ‘discuss the way forward with the park's board of management’ (La Canna & Carter 2015). However, approximately one week later on the 7 November 2015 the ABC reported that Parks Australia described the cutting of the chain as vandalism and that the traditional owners had agreed to the repairs of the chain and reopening of the climb (Kirschner 2015). By April 2016 the climb had been reopened for mass tourism and the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, Adam Giles was calling on the Aboriginal custodians of Uluru to reconsider their opposition to the climb, which had been based on cultural considerations. (Parliament of the Northern Territory, Legislative Assembly, 2016)

In considering the extensive lengths that Anangu had gone to prevent tourists from climbing Uluru the decision to reopen the climb presents a confounding problem. The crux to this problem, from a governance perspective, hinges around the transparency and integrity of the operation of the Board of Management, which as presented previously consists of a majority of Anangu as voting members. An interpretation of the complex issue of tourists climbing Uluru was presented by James (2007) with a statement: ‘It is perhaps not a site of either division or reconciliation, but a site of continuing dynamic complex negotiations of post-colonial relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians in relation to place’ (James S 2007: 406).

The vexed question of tourists climbing Uluru, as demonstrated by my research, is entwined in a highly complex process of politics, business, governance and
persuasion within the Board of Management. The conflicted governance process at Uluru has delivered a separation of Anangu cultural heritage from the historic fabric of Uluru. An Australian nationalist heritage has been overlaid on the place and its historic fabric permanently damaged. In order to address the question of the climb I propose the solution is to enhance the governance processes and increase transparency of Park governance. In addition, I propose that the Board of Management, with particular reference to non Anangu, consider cultural and natural heritage management as integrated thereby reducing the pressures to undermine cultural integrity by focusing on historic fabric and commercial outcomes. When the management of culture and nature is considered as integrated and consequently interdependent, the conservation of the environment can be directly linked to the maintenance of culture.

Synopsis

The shared management success or failure at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park can be measured in its governance process, the sustainability of its stockholder relationships and the effectiveness of its day-to-day operations. The current day to day management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, under its Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Management Plan 2010-2020 (Director of National Parks 2010a) and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Tourism Directions: Stage 1 (Director of National Parks 2010b), appears to be operating relatively effectively considering the fundamentally contrary understandings of management under Tjukurpa and the Australian Government. Unfortunately, the failure of the Board of Management to confront challenges such as tourism, Australian nationalism and other vested interests and close the climb of Uluru indicates a fundamental flaw in the governance process and a challenge to stakeholder relationships. Noting that the majority of Board of Management are Nguraritja representatives, who have expressed opposition to the climb on cultural heritage grounds.

A further significant challenge to the shared management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park is the presence of Mutitjulu Community within the Park boundaries and only 700m from the base of Uluru. This issue is extremely complex as many Anangu including Nguraritja live in the community with their families, as permitted under the
Park’s *Memorandum of Lease* (Northern Territory of Australia 1994). The continual expansion and maintenance of Mutitjulu infrastructure, with the associated fluctuating antisocial behaviour and waste (commercial and domestic) burdens the day-to-day Park management and distracts resources from cultural and natural heritage management.

Whatever the achievements of the Board of Management or day-to-day management, the underlying foundation of policy and delivery process is still challenged by a colonial impost on Nguraritja and their Country. To meet this challenge requires strategies that embrace both Tjukurpa and Piranpa Law as equitable partners. I propose governance and management focus on strategies that target place and sense of place rather than historic fabric and Park infrastructure. This approach elevates the intangible of cultural heritage as of principle importance in the pursuit of sustainability of the Park’s World Heritage Values.
Purnululu National Park and Reserve

Figure 4.5: Francis, K. (2013). Purnululu National Park: Walk. Purnululu National Park: digital photo

The investigation of Purnululu National Park and Reserve (the Park) is aimed at providing an insight into the management of the Park’s: cultural and natural heritage; tourism development; World Heritage listing; environmental conservation; traditional Aboriginal authority; and contemporary management challenges. Particular reference is made to its conflicted authority between different local traditional Aboriginal cultural groups and how this has been utilized as a justification for withholding World Heritage inscription under cultural criteria and suppress cross-cultural equity of authority over Country.

Purnululu National Park is an Australian mixed, cultural and natural heritage property located in the North West Kimberley region of the state of Western Australia in the Commonwealth of Australia. It was initially inscribed as a World Heritage site under natural criteria with its cultural inscription nomination being deferred. (UNESCO 2003b). The ICOMOS recommendation to defer the Purnululu National Park nomination for inscription under cultural criteria is discussed further in the section World Heritage Inscriptions of this case study. The Purnululu National Park and adjacent Conservation Reserve includes the traditional territories of the
Kija, Jaru\textsuperscript{30} and Malingin language groups as identified in the \textit{Cultural Connection: Purnululu National Park –World Heritage Area Report} (Levitus 2008: 3). A determination of Native title had not been made over the Park and Reserve up until 2017.

The traditional Aboriginal languages associated with Purnululu, as described in the the \textit{Nomination of Purnululu National Park by the Government of Australia for Inscription on the World Heritage List} (Environment Australia 2002) fall into two distinct families of Pama-Nyungan, which includes Kija and Miriwoong and Jarrakan, which includes Malngin and Jaru (\textit{ibid}). These family groups are associated with particular areas of the Park but also overlap. (\textit{ibid}:19)

Pama-Nyungan language family connected to the eastern and southern parts of the Park. Pama-Nyungan languages flank the southern and eastern margins of the Kimberley and are spoken by people throughout the adjacent desert regions including the Anangu of Uluṟu-Kata Tjuṯa.

The Park, which is an Australian World Heritage property inscribed under natural criteria, is managed by the Western Australian Government through its Minister for the environment. The landscape of Purnululu National Park is titled ‘Purnululu’ by Kija people and ‘Billingjul’ by many Jaru people. Throughout the PhD Project the term Purnululu rather than Billingjul is used to identify the Park and surround, simply because the name is used in the Australian Government nomination (Environment Australia 2002) for World Heritage inscription and is the registered title within the World Heritage Inscription (UNESCO 2003b). The identification as to which local traditional Aboriginal language group has authority over any or all of the Park and Reserve is extremely complex, as is evident by the conflict between the groups around naming and more importantly around traditional authority in regard to governance, which led to a deferral of the Parks World Heritage cultural nomination.

In taking the position of using the title of Purnululu I wish to respectfully recognize both Kija and Jaru people and request that my use of the term Purnululu not be taken

\textsuperscript{30} The spelling of the traditional owner name Kija is also recorded as Gidja and the spelling of Jaru is recorded as Djaru. The spelling of these name within the Thesis, with the exception of direct references, will presented as Kija and Jaru, which is consistent with the Kimberley Land Council 2014 Annual Report (Kimberley Land Council 2014)
The location of Purnululu National Park is in a remote northern region of Western Australia. The region is described as the ‘East Kimberley Region of north Western Australia, in the Drainage basin of, and some 400 km south of, Joseph Bonaparte Gulf’ (ICOMOS 2003: 1). The major geological feature within the Purnululu National Park’s almost 240,000 hectares is the Bungle Bungle Range, which includes dome shaped Devonian-age quartz sandstone with banded horizontal makings, described as: (IUCN 2003: 94)

beehive-shaped towers or cones, whose steeply sloping surfaces are distinctly marked by regular horizontal bands of dark-grey cyanobacterial crust (single-celled photosynthetic organisms).

The surface slopes of the dome bee-hive structures are covered in a fragile skin, coloured in horizontal bands, with a generally white coloured sandstone underneath (Department of Conservation and Environment 1986). The domes’ unique characteristics are described in the *Bungle Bungle Working Group: Final Report to the Environmental Authority* (*ibid* 1986: 10):

The friable nature of the slopes and the importance of the thin surface skins in protecting them are key factors in the conservation of this landscape.
These skins also constitute one of the more striking features of this landscape, the horizontal orange and black bands, which are, respectively, silica and algal skins.

The domes’ fragile formations are susceptible to excessive heat damage from occasional wild-fires. The wild-fire damage is a significant management issue, which is examined later in the section *Management* as an illustration of the detrimental impact of the contemporary approach to managing culture and nature within a landscape. Purnululu National Park and Reserve proved to be a valuable case study as its management, by the Western Australian Government, provides demonstrations of
the challenges in managing culture and nature within landscapes separately and the pitfalls of focusing on the concept of wilderness for the development of the Park and its tourism.

My decision to include the shared management Purnululu National Park and Reserve and surrounds as a major component to the research is informed by two elements:

1. the personal and professional experience of living and working across the Kimberley and specifically working within Purnululu National Park; and
2. Purnululu National Park’s profile as:
   a. a national and World Heritage landscape,
   b. a shared management environment with Aboriginal culture, and
   c. the remote location of the Bungle Bungle Range and its highly promoted banded domes.

Park Development

The shared history of Purnululu National Park region, as described in the publication *A Survey of the Wildlife and Vegetation of Purnululu (Bungle Bungle) National Park and Adjacent Area* (1992) (the *Survey*) (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1992) commenced with the arrival of European colonists in the Ord River region in the mid 1880s. The colonists quickly recognized the potential for a pastoral industry and mining. In 1885 gold was discovered in the region and by 1884, 4,000 cattle had been mustered into the region. By 1902 the number of cattle in the area had risen to an estimated 47,000 head (*ibid*).

The impact of this massive influx of imported heavy footed herbivores, including cattle and donkeys was manifested in extensive over-grazing, massive landscape erosion, followed by a diminishment of natural food resources. This natural heritage degradation is evident in the landscape with reduced local species, significant weed infestations and erosion as noted in the *Survey* (*ibid*). The 1992 Survey made specific note of the severe degradation of the Bungle Bungle area, which occurred over a 100-year period of excessively high numbers of livestock and feral animals. (*ibid*: ix). In an attempt to address the environmental degradation across the region re-vegetation
and destocking were commenced in the 1960s. The Western Australian Government, through the *Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2005* stated its commitment to addressing the degradation of the Park’s natural environment in the statement: (Department Conservation and Land Management, 1995: 4)

In 1967 a large area of the Ord River catchment - including the lands which are now the National Park and Conservation Reserve - was resumed for the purposes of stabilising and regenerating vegetation on lands degraded by previous pastoral practices.

The brutal and prolonged damage to the environment was mirrored in the subjugation and harm dealt out to the traditional Aboriginal people. Their ‘population declined, and traditional activities were disrupted, following pastoral expansion at the end of the last (19th) century.’ (Department Conservation and Land Management 1992: 3). The cultural impact from environmental damage is mentioned in the 2003 ICOMOS report to the World Heritage Committee (ICOMOS 2003: 3)

Control of stock and re-vegetation programmes were put in place and the 1968 Pastoral Award stopped the abuse of Aboriginal labour. However, in moving people out of the cattle stations, the measures helped create new living sites – ‘humpies’ – which came to be characterised by social deprivation.

In considering the environmental damage and social deprivation it is revealed that the cultural and natural elements of the Bungle Bungle Range and surrounds had sustained significant and prolonged damage resulting from colonization. The colonial approach to managing the landscape was to separate Aboriginal people from the environment. This approach saw the historic fabric of natural features defined in the colonizers’ terms and the Aboriginal intangible heritage superimposed with a European concept of wilderness. A poignant statement articulated in the *Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2000* exposes the plight of the Purnululu Aboriginal people and their Country: (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995: 38)
‘Aboriginal people describe with sadness the changes to the land and the rivers since the arrival of Europeans in the Kimberley. The principal changes have resulted from overgrazing and subsequent soil erosion where once large and abundant water holes are ‘covered up’ and have little or no water in them. Places they remember as big, deep waters filled with fish - bream, rock cod, perch, barramundi, catfish - and crocodiles, water goannas and turtles, are now stagnant shallows with few fish or other creatures in them.

Whilst attempts to address the environmental damage to the region continued from the 1960’s it was not until the 1980’s, initially sparked by the media interest in the geological structure of the Bungle Bungle Range, that progress towards establishing a National Park and official protection for natural and cultural values commenced. The Australian nomination to the World Heritage Committee for inscription noted the media attention and tourist visitation in the 1980’s: ‘In 1983, a television program and some popular print media articles alerted Australians and international tourists to the ‘previously unknown’ Bungle Bungle Range. By 1986, 2350 people visited the area by vehicle.’ (Environment Australia 2002: 40). The value of the physical (tangible) geological formations, which are identified as historic fabric, were inappropriately cast as a wilderness that could be valued within the market economy. The entrenchment of the Western dualism of human vs nature set the stage for a new wave of heritage damage that conflicted with the Aboriginal understanding of holistic management of Country. This heritage damage moved beyond the tangible overuse and misuse of the environment to colonization through overlaying a new intangible heritage built on Western concepts.

In reaction to the increased public interest the Western Australian Government established the Bungle Bungle Working Committee in 1983 to investigate the status of the Bungle Bungle Range. The uniqueness and beauty of the Bungle Bungle massif had been discovered for potential exploitation by the Western tourism market. In March 1985 the Australian Parliamentary House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation produced a report titled Protection of the Bungle Bungle was released (Commonwealth of Australia 1985). The Standing Committee considered that a national park should be established to manage both
cultural and natural elements of the area. It recommended ‘the establishment of a National Park which would cater for the combined needs of conservation and tourism, soil and vegetation rehabilitation, Aboriginal interests and mineral exploration. The Working Group emphasised however, that the Bungle Bungle massif should be excluded from mineral exploration.’ (ibid: 4).

On the 27th of March 1987 the Western Australian Government created the reserves of Purnululu National Park covering 208 723 ha (including the Bungle Bungle massif which covers 45,000 ha) and the Purnululu Conservation Reserve, which was to be managed as a buffer zone, as identified in the World Heritage Committee nomination. (Environment Australia 2002). The Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2002 notes that the Purnululu Conservation Reserve adjoins the Park to the West and North and covers 45,000 ha and was establish at the same time as the National Park (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995). The government intention was that the Reserve and Park areas would eventually all become part of a single national park reserve. The initial decision to create two reserves with different status was influenced by the existence of mining leases over parts of the Conservation Reserve (Department of Conservation and Land Management, 1992).

Following the surge in public, commercial and political interest in the potential of tourism opportunities at the Bungle Bungle Range the Park grew rapidly as a place of interest for scientific and sociological research. This interest manifested in the eventual Australian World Heritage nomination for Purnululu National Park, as a cultural and natural mixed site in 2002. Unfortunately, the entrenched Western separationist approach to landscape management resulted in Purnululu National Park only inscribed under natural Outstanding Universal Values, re-enforcing the Western cultural/natural management dichotomy

World Heritage Inscriptions

(ii) and (iii) and cultural criteria (iii), (v) and (vi) (ibid: 7). The assessment of the Australian nomination for Purnululu National Park was considered by the World Heritage Committee, in conjunction with the assessment reports and recommendations from ICOMOS regarding the cultural criteria and IUCN regarding the natural criteria. The Australian nomination also recognized the traditional Aboriginal owners and the potential granting them of freehold title over the Park. (Environment Australia 2002: 48).

Amendments to the Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 are currently under negotiation to allow Purnululu National Park and Purnululu Conservation Reserve to be vested with a Prescribed Body Corporate. This legal entity could hold native title on behalf of traditional owners. It would then allow for the conversion of the Park to conditional freehold. A perpetual or term lease could then be granted back to CALM to manage the property on behalf of the Purnululu Park Council, a body made up of representatives of the traditional owners and CALM.

The IUCN Recommendation was to inscribe the Park under only natural criteria (i) and (iii) as it considered the Park did not meet criteria (ii) (IUCN 2003: 101)\(^\text{31}\). It described the natural values as comprising of four ecosystems (ibid 2003: 94)

- The deeply dissected Bungle Bungle Range composed of Devonian-age quartz sandstone eroded over a period of 20 million years into a series of beehive-shaped towers or cones, whose steeply sloping surfaces are distinctly marked by regular horizontal bands of dark-grey cyanobacterial crust (single-celled photosynthetic organisms)…
- The grassy Ord River valley system on the eastern and southern border regions of the park, draining two tributaries from the south and three from the north of the uplands.
- The broad sand plains extending between the uplands and the river, composed of infertile black soils with open woodland and grasses.

\(^{31}\)The numbering of the World Heritage criteria was altered in 2005 to combine the natural and cultural criteria into one set of criteria for the purpose of defining Outstanding Universal Value.
• The more extensively wooded limestone ridges to the west, and neighbouring Osmond Range to the north.

The World Heritage Committee’s decision to inscribe the Park under natural criteria noted (UNESCO 2003: 105):

Criterion (i): The Bungle Bungles are, by far, the most outstanding example of cone karst in sandstone anywhere in the world and owe their existence and uniqueness to several interacting geological, biological, erosional and climatic phenomena….

Criterion (iii): Although Purnululu National Park has been widely known in Australia only during the past 20 years and it remains relatively inaccessible, it has become recognized internationally for its exceptional natural beauty…

The ICOMOS assessment of the Australian nomination of Purnululu National Park (ICOMOS 2003) regarding the cultural criteria nomination focused on the intangible heritage of the local tradition Aboriginal people and noted that the natural and cultural qualities were inseparable and the site should be inscribed only as a mixed site. It identified Purnululu National Park’s key tangible cultural qualities as archaeological and rock art and its intangible qualities included Aboriginal cosmology, land use, language and knowledge (ibid 2003). An important aspect to the evaluation by ICOMOS, as presented to the World Heritage Committee, was its recognition of the inseparable qualities of the cultural and natural values at Purnululu National Park. This was articulated in the ICOMOS statement (ibid: 7)

In assessing this nomination, ICOMOS formed the view that the cultural and natural qualities of the site are so intrinsically linked as to be inseparable. It hence advises that, in order to recognize and sustain the complex interaction between the natural and cultural values of the site, consideration should be given to inscribing Purnululu only as a mixed site.
However, in spite of ICOMOS recognition of the importance of inscribing Purnululu National Park as a mixed site the ICOMOS Recommendation was to defer the nomination for inscription under cultural criteria, citing the issues of (ibid: 7):

What is not clear however is whether the aim is to re-establish settlements in the park to allow traditional practices over a wide areas of the park to be re-established, or whether the spirit of a hunting and gathering economy is to be kept going through ceremonial and social associations with the area, rather than economic ones. … There is no discussion in the papers as to how this capacity will be evaluated or managed.

and

How to sustain this knowledge (Aboriginal traditional knowledge) and how to monitor success or otherwise with this process are not addressed in detail.

In recommending deferral ICOMOS also requested the State Party (Australia) to improve management by providing: (ibid: 7)

- An updated Management Plan;
- Clearer arrangements for the governance of the nominated site, particularly in relation to sustaining traditional Aboriginal communities in the Park;
- An approach to ways of sustaining intangible qualities;
- An appraisal of approaches to ethnographic, sociological and oral recording of intangible and tangible cultural traditions.

The World Heritage Committee’s final decision was to support both the IUNC and ICOMOS Recommendations, which meant Purnululu National Park was inscribed only in relation to its Outstanding Universal Values related to the natural elements of the landscape. In making its decisions the World Heritage Committee also requested that the State Party (the Australian Government) ensure (UNESCO 2003b: 106):

- the highest standard in regard to mining;
- prioritize the incorporation of the Purnululu Conservation Reserve into the Park;
• significantly increase funding and staffing for the Park; and
• update the Parks management plan including governance, sustaining intangible qualities and appraisal of recordings of intangible and tangible traditions.

In the act of deferring the assessment of the value of the cultural landscape of Purnululu National Park the World Heritage Committee resigned the traditional Aboriginal owners and their cultures to a state of limbo, reliant for its authentication on the benevolence of Australian and UNESCO bureaucrats to fulfill compliance criteria. My contention is that, as Purnululu National Park was not inscribed as a mixed site the management of culture and nature was profoundly separated as the natural values were elevated to the status of Outstanding Universal Value and the cultural values were not. The deferral by ICOMOS, which created the separation, was in direct contrast to its assessment statement: ‘ICOMOS has formed the view that the cultural and natural qualities of the site are so intrinsically linked as to be inseparable.’ (ICOMOS 2003:7) The result was an immediate lionization of the natural criteria over the intangible cultural heritage and of nature over culture, reinforcing the early 1980s valorization of the Park’s geological features as a tourist product subject to the market economy. Following the World Heritage inscription and the promotion of iconic images of the Purnululu Bee-hive dome formations, tourism focusing on nature has expanded under the misguided wilderness banner, which continues to be exploited for tourism, political purposes and other commercial activities.

The lack of effective engagement with the traditional owners regarding the governance and management of Purnululu National Park and Reserve, as stated in the Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2000, remains unresolved. Although the traditional owners were initially engaged with the development of the Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2000 through the Purnululu Aboriginal Corporation they withdrew due to a dispute relating to the primary Aboriginal traditional responsibilities, and the final stage of the Plan’s development was conducted without their participation (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995: i). Rationales of economics, climate, colonisation and isolation can be articulated to justify the Western Australian and Commonwealth Government
inaction in resolving the traditional owner dispute. However, my analysis is that the main factor for the lack of progress in the unresolved dispute over cultural authority between different Aboriginal groups can be attributed to the imposition of colonial rules of governance that separate the cultural values from the natural values. In considering the disputes and the continuing colonization, the sustainability of the shared management relationships between different traditional owner groups and between the Western Australian Government at Purnululu National Park is questionable.

**Dual Naming**

A complication to the naming of Purnululu National Park is the claim by some Jaru people that in their language the title is ‘Billingjul’. The *Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2000* noted that the Billingjul Aboriginal Corporation (BAC) was in conflict with the Purnululu Aboriginal Corporation (PAC). (Department Conservation and Land Management, 1995: 11). BAC ‘represents the interests of traditional owners associated predominantly with the Jaru language group.’ (*ibid*: 14) and PAC ‘represents the interests of Aboriginal traditional owners associated predominantly with the Kija language group, (*ibid*: 14)

The title Purnululu National Park (WA) is now verified as ‘official’ (Geoscience Australia 2015), however ‘When the Park and Reserve were declared they were not officially named, although they were commonly referred to after the major feature of the area, the Bungle Bungle massif’ (Department Conservation and Land Management, 1995: 4). The conflicted Aboriginal position on naming can be considered as a reflection of the broader dispute between Kija and Jaru regarding authenticity of tradition cultural authority. The Journal of Sustainable Tourism article, *Indigenous involvement and benefits from tourism in protected areas: a study of Purnululu National Park and Warman Community, Australia* (2012) (Strickland-Munro and Moore 2012) discussed the Kija and Jaru claims of traditional authority over the Purnululu area and notes the tension between the groups is related to ‘who can rightly claim traditional ownership.’ (*ibid*: 30)
Policy and Governance

The management of culture, nature and tourism at Purnululu National Park is conducted within the policy framework of federal and state parliamentary acts and associated government department policies. The governance structure and processes for Purnululu National Park are primarily those of the Western Australian Government, delivered under the State’s Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 (the CALM Act). The Park’s management plan is developed by the Conservation and Parks Commission (previously the Conservation Commission of Western Australia), which is a (Conservation and Parks Commission 2016: 5):

- body corporate under the CALM Act comprised of seven members appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister for Environment. As part of its functions, the Commission has vested in it the following: -
  (i) State forest, timber reserves and marine reserves;
  (ii) unless section CALM Act 8B(2)(f) applies, national parks, conservation parks and nature reserves, either solely or jointly with an Aboriginal body corporate;
  (iii) relevant land referred to in CALM Act section 5(1)(g).

The Australian Government authority over Purnululu National Park in part relates to the Park being included on the Australian National Heritage List in 2007 under the national heritage criteria a, c and e, but not under cultural heritage criteria (Commonwealth of Australia, 2007:2). As a world and national heritage location Purnululu National Park is protected for its natural values, under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (the EPBC Act) (Commonwealth of Australia, 2010: Amendment). The cultural values are not on the Australian National Heritage list and the EPBC Act is limited in its cultural heritage protection for Purnululu National Park.

The EPBC Act does not limit its authority to specific boundaries, rather to the impact of actual and potential activities that may impact of the listed values. In effect the EPBC Act provides a buffer zone around the Park boundaries, providing protection
against activities that will or may impact on the listed environmental values of world and national heritage criteria. Extension of EPBC authority is noted in the Australian nomination of Purnululu National Park to the World Heritage Committee in 2002. (Environment Australia, 2002: 49)

Under the EPBC Act, any action, whether taken inside or outside the boundaries of a declared World Heritage property, which may have a significant impact on the World Heritage values of the property are prohibited.

Although not included under the Australian Heritage List or the World Heritage List for cultural values Purnululu National Park is noted in a range of government documents for its cultural values including the ICOMOS assessments as presented previously and the Australian Heritage Database website, which states ‘Purnululu National Park has outstanding universal natural and cultural values’ (Department of the Environment, 2016b).

Management Plan and Advisory Committee

The *Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2005* (1995) is notable as it is the first management plan for the Park and has not been updated: (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995: 2)

The first management plan for the conservation estate of Western Australia to provide a formal management structure for the participation of Aboriginal traditional owners.

It is regrettable that the last stages of the Purnululu National Park Management Plan’s development were completed without official involvement of the associated traditional Aboriginal owners. The lack of involvement by traditional owners followed a dispute between the local Aboriginal language groups of the Kija represented by the Purnululu Aboriginal Corporation (PAC) and Jaru represented by the Billingjul Aboriginal Corporation (BAC). The dispute related to the identity of the primary traditional owners responsible for Country within the boundaries of the
Purnululu National Park and Purnululu Conservation Reserve (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995: 11). As a consequence of the dispute between traditional Aboriginal owner groups the operation of the Purnululu Park Council was affected and subsequently ceased operation. In October 2015 the dispute between Kija and Jaru had not been resolved and the *Purnululu National Park Plan of Management 1995 – 2005* had not been updated for 19 years.

In addition to governance related to parliamentary Acts and government departmental protocols, the traditional Aboriginal owners of the Purnululu National Park and Reserve were to be represented by a Park advisory committee titled the Purnululu Park Council, which is described as a ‘forum for the development of policy on relation to Aboriginal interests in the Park’ (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995: 13). The Purnululu Park Council, which was a Ministerial Committee, was formed in 2005 and included representatives of the Department of Conservation and Land Management and the Purnululu Aboriginal Corporation (Kija people). (Conservation Commission of Western Australia 2009). The reasoning behind only including the Purnululu Aboriginal Council (PAC) and not other bodies representing different Aboriginal people of the region, was that PAC was the only group that had a registered native title claim over the Park (*ibid*: 6). In a practical sense the meaningful inclusion of the traditional owners within the governance process is controlled by the Western Australia government. Considering the complex dispute of traditional Aboriginal authority over the Purnululu Country the Government selection of only one traditional owner group as the advisory body representing local traditional Aboriginal was significantly problematic. I contend the non-inclusive and inhibitive bias of selecting one local traditional owner group over another produced a highly flawed governance process.

Recognition of the Western Australian Government failings in regard to managing Purnululu National Park were articulated in the *Conservation Commission National Park Management Plan Performance Assessment* (Conservation Commission of Western Australia 2009). The Performance Assessment presented negative cultural and natural heritage management findings. It concluded that the involvement of traditional owners had not met expectations and the lack of an advisory council limited community participation. The assessment also noted the *Purnululu National
Park Management Plan 1995-2005 had limited strategic direction in regard to nature conservation: *(ibid: 30)*

In general the management plan provides limited strategic direction in relation to biodiversity management issues and there is a lack of strategic direction in the plan relating to nature conservation strategies for the park.

Analysis of the governance at Purnululu National Park shows that it poses a significant risk to the sustainability of the Park, as the ability of both federal and state governments to adequately manage the cultural and natural values of Purnululu National Park is compromised. My assertion is based on the evidence related to the:

- 2009 Performance Assessment *(ibid)* findings of limited governance and management input from the traditional Aboriginal owners, particularly on cultural heritage;
- continued use of a 20 year old, non revised, out of date Plan of Management that is deficient in natural heritage conservation strategy;
- tardiness to establish a new Park Council, which was eventually restructured and emerged as the Purnululu World Heritage Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) at its inaugural meeting on 18 August 2015 (Department of Parks and Wildlife 2015); and
- inability to provide the management improvements requested by ICOMOS *(ICOMOS 2003: 7)*.

A government strategy implemented, with the support of the federal and state governments, was to establish a new Advisory Committee and subsequently review the management plan. Part of this process involved engaging an Executive Officer to support the Advisory Committee and oversee World Heritage projects. The position was supported by a funding grant from the Australian Government and in-kind and financial support by the Western Australian Government. I accepted the Executive Officer position in 2013, with defined roles that included establishing relationships with traditional owners, research, liaison with external stakeholder and management
of World Heritage projects (Department of Environment and Conservation 2012b). The first role defined in the position’s official Job Description was: (ibid)

Takes the lead role in the establishment and function of the new World Heritage Advisory Committee for Purnululu National Park, including providing high quality executive, administrative and logistical support to the committee.

I contend that a significant problem with a lack of representative traditional owner input into governance of the culture and nature within the Purnululu landscape is that the governance process is not inclusive or transparent. The management failure of not resolving the traditional Aboriginal authority over the Purnululu National Park creates the governance situation that it is unclear as to which local Aboriginal Group should be approached to approve development within the Park and Reserve. Unfortunately, this governance situation results in an environment that can force the Western Australian Government Park management to make decisions of traditional Aboriginal authority and potentially ‘cherry pick’ advice to match Government priorities. In addition, the failure to identify Aboriginal authority establishes an imbalance between cultural and natural heritage management with a bias toward natural heritage management due to the lack, or distortion, of cultural heritage information. The consequence of the governance failure is that the Aboriginal perspective of an integrated management of Country is shrouded by the Western management propensity of separating human and environment and tangible from intangible heritage, which elevates the natural environment as a supposed wilderness and the focuses on historic fabric to the determent of heritage.

Customary Purpose

In 2010 there was a significant policy shift in the Western Australia Government approach to working collaboratively with traditional Aboriginal land owners, related to the shared management of Country and access to their traditional lands. Alterations were implemented to the Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 (CALM Act) and the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950 through the Conservation Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 (WA). The CALM Act was further amended again in March
2012 (Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 (WA) 08-c0-01). The 2012 amendments permitted Aboriginal people to conduct particular activities related to ‘Customary Purposes’ on reserves and other lands, which included Purnululu National Park and Reserve. Customary Aboriginal purpose is defined as: (CALM Act 1984: Version 08-d0 02: 126)32

(a) preparing or consuming food customarily eaten by Aboriginal persons; or
(b) preparing or using medicine customarily used by Aboriginal persons; or
(c) engaging in artistic, ceremonial or other cultural activities customarily engaged in by Aboriginal persons; or
(d) engaging in activities incidental to a purpose stated in paragraph (a), (b) or (c);

By introducing Customary Purpose under legislation the governance process of how to manage the culture and nature of landscape changed. Policies governing activities within Purnululu National Park and Reserve now included enhanced authority of Aboriginal people to operate with some autonomy from the Government Park management staff. The term ‘customary activities’ refers ‘to the cultural activities that Aboriginal people are allowed to do under legislation for customary purposes.’ (Department of Parks and Wildlife 2014b: 1). Under customary purpose Aboriginal people are entitled to conduct, with some restrictions, cultural activities including: camping outside prescribed areas; using fire arms; taking dogs into the Park’s World Heritage area; taking a vehicle off-road from unsealed roads; hunting and gathering protected species; collecting fire wood and lighting fires; and taking flowers, plants and animals, which are protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950 (WA). The governance around the cultural activities is placed with the Aboriginal people to define ceremonial activities and consequently what Aboriginal governance they would implement. The new governance and management resulting from the amendments to the CALM Act, gives a degree of new authority to the Aboriginal

people, which creates a government sanctioned Aboriginal governance authority that overlays the previous Purnululu National Park management processes.

An analysis of the introduction of ‘customary purpose’, created from amending the CALM Act, reveals two significant specific governance short comings, compounded by the conflicted governance arena between Jaru and Kija. The first is that it creates uncertainty through giving authority to Aboriginal people to circumvent the official management priorities of Purnululu National Park’s landscape management. The second is it compounds the conflicted governance advice from Kija and Jaru in defining what artistic, ceremonial or other cultural activities are appropriate. Whilst the introduction of ‘customary purpose’ may be hailed as a partial victory for self determination I contend it reduces the governance transparency and integrity of Purnululu National Park and Reserve. The integrity of the public sector governance and management processes at Purnululu National Park are critical as they set the agenda for the Western Australian Government management of the Park and influence operational management choices, including allocation of staff and financial resources on a day-to-day basis. Edward and Clough in their 2005 Issues Paper discusses the relationship between day to day management and governance in the public sector: (Edwards and Clough 2005: 3):

> it is important to understand that governing is not the same as managing. Broadly, governance involves the systems and processes in place that shape, enable and oversee management of an organisation. Management is concerned with doing – with co-ordinating and managing the day-to-day operations of the business.

A further issue, emerging from the research that impacts on Purnululu National Park related to the amendments to the CALM ACT, is its loose and vague definition of an ‘Aboriginal person’, which is not based on race, culture or place. The CALM Act states: ‘Aboriginal person means a person wholly or partly descended from the original inhabitants of Australia.’ (CALM Act 1984 Part I, section 3, Page 2) Consequently an Aboriginal person, from any culture or language group, from any part of Australia is given rights of customary purpose at Purnululu National Park and Reserve, under the CALM Act. In relation to ‘customary activities’ the CALM Act, as
explained by the Department of Parks and Wildlife is: (Department of Parks and Wildlife 2014b: 8)

Aboriginal people may go on to Parks and Wildlife managed lands and waters and undertake customary activities such as hunting, fishing, camping and ceremonies. However, when the Parks and Wildlife managed lands or waters are part of an Aboriginal group’s exclusive native title land, then other Aboriginal people must have the permission of the native title holders to undertake traditional activities on those lands or waters.

Whilst exclusive native title is noted as a mechanism to provide authority for local traditional Aboriginal owners to refuse permission to exercise custom, such authority is not recognized for the traditional Aboriginal owners at Purnululu National Park and Reserves. The local Aboriginal traditional owners have not been granted exclusive native title or freehold title over Purnululu National Park and Reserve. Analysis of the introduction of ‘customary purpose’ demonstrates that it gives local traditional Aboriginal owners of the Park improved access for ceremonial activities, however their traditional rights of authority to maintain their intangible heritage are reduced. This is a consequence of access to Purnululu National Park and Reserve for ‘customary purpose’ being bestowed on other non local Australian Aboriginal cultures, who have no traditional authority or connection to Purnululu National Park and Reserve and have different cultural traditions, protocols and beliefs. I contend that the introduction of ‘customary purpose’ follows an entrenched Western management practice that does not adequately address the relationship of cultural and natural heritage and simultaneously demotes historic fabric to the status of real-estate, separating it from it heritage. Consequently, analysis reveals the shared management of Purnululu National Park and Reserve is based on an unsustainable shared management partnership.

Management

The day-to-day management of the Purnululu National Park and Conservation Reserve is challenged by the remoteness, extreme weather and road access to the site.
However, as noted in the *Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1995-2005*: ‘Much of the appeal of Purnululu National Park and Purnululu Conservation Reserve can be attributed to its remoteness and difficulty of access’ (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995: 1). The appeal of remoteness and difficult access is not transferable as a positive aspect to the operational management of the Park as it presents challenges in relation to human resource, logistics and financial expenditure. The management operations of Purnululu National Park and Reserve are coordinated from the regional head quarters of the Western Australian Government’s Department of Parks and Wildlife depot based in Kununurra. Day to day operational facilities are located inside the Park boundaries adjacent to the ranger station and visitor centre. The Park’s field staff who are located, on roster, within the Park include rangers, camp coordination volunteers and visitor centre personnel. In the role as Executive Office I was based in the Kununurra office and utilized the facilities whilst on location in Purnululu National Park.

![Figure 4.6: Entrance to Spring Creek Track](digital photo)

The road access into the Park is via the sealed bitumen Great Western Highway combined with the unsealed Spring Creek track. The road distance is approximately 250 km along the Great Western Highway from Kununurra or 110 km along the Great Western Highway from Halls Creek to the South, then along the unsealed Spring Creek Track. The journey along the Spring Creek Track, from the Highway turn off to the Park ranger station, consists of approximately 53 km of gravel and includes numerous creek crossings and heavy sand (Hoatson 2004). When open to the public
the journey along the Spring Creek Track, which I experienced on several occasions, has a duration of between 1.5 to 3 hours and possibly much longer, depending on road and weather conditions. The Department of Parks and Wildlife web site, in 2013, noted that the Park was open to the public between April 1 and December 15 (weather permitting). However, visitors are advised to check the dates with the Department’s Kununurra office before attempting to drive into the Park.

Due to heavy rain and flooding from November to March, the Spring Creek Track may be impassable for weeks at a time (Hoatson 2004). Road access along the Spring Creek track into Purnululu National Park is largely confined to the Northern Australian Dry season. It is the only official general access road for tourism into the Purnululu National Park. Non four-wheel drive access is actively discouraged in Park literature. The poor condition of the Spring Creek Track has been an ongoing factor the limiting the number of tourists visiting the Park by road. The Plan of Management 1995-2005 noted that: (Department of Environment and Conservation, 1995: 2)

The level of visitor use of the Park is kept relatively low due to the four wheel drive standard of the access road, recognizing that most visitors to the Park arrive by road. The benefits of this include minimizing impacts of vehicle traffic on the Park - particularly erosion - and the preservation of the remote experience expressed by visitors to be of great significance.

Maintaining the Spring Creek Track as a difficult four-wheel drive tourist experience provides a management mechanism to reduce visitor impact. It can also be interpreted as providing a sense of adventure and challenge promoting a pseudo tourist wilderness experience. However, a consequence of the poor condition of the Spring Creek Track is that it also effects road access to the Parks for operations management by traditional owners. To compound the impact and restrictions of the rough conditions, the Spring Creek Track traverses and is controlled in one section by the pastoral lease of Mabel Downs Station. The impact of access through private property was demonstrated in 2011 when Mable Downs management, exercised its authority to deny or close access and charge road fees or tolls. In July 2011 Mr. Burton the manager of Mabel Downs, part of the Yeeda Pastoral Company, blocked off the gates across the Spring Creek Track near the highway turn off and imposed a toll termed a
Wilderness Road Fee. A statement of the reason for the closure was reported by the *Sydney Morning Herald* as: (Harvey 2011)

Mr Burton said he started imposing the fee because the trade ban meant he could not afford to pay for the road's upkeep.

In an article by Lana Reed on the ABC Kimberley Radio it was revealed the toll fees were $20 for a standard 4WD, $10 for an off road trailer, $50 for a truck carrying 10 passengers or less and $100 for a tour bus. (Reed 2011b). In a subsequent interview by Lana Reed aired on ABC Rural, Mr. Daryl Moncrieff from the Department of Environment and Conservation stated that feedback from tourist indicated ‘They think it’s (the toll) excessive and they think their paying twice for the same thing’ (Reed 2011a). The imposition of a toll and restriction to the Spring Creek Track by a private company had the potential to restrict cultural practice, damage tourism and create a ripple effect of concern to tourist enterprises. This is particularly concerning as the road-toll, restrictions or closure is totally at the digression of the lease holder.

In considering the state and local government authority and ownership of the Spring Creek Track, I propose that there are three potential options that could resolve the situation and provide confidence of access to the World Heritage Purnululu National Park:

- the Western Australian government purchasing the road and easement;
- the local Shire of Halls Creek taking over control of the track;
- creation of a binding contract with penalties if the road access was disrupted;
- or compulsory government acquisition.

In considering the continuance of the lack of guaranteed access to a major Australian World Heritage site my deduction is that the Western Australian State Government is failing their responsibility to effectively manage Purnululu National Park. By perpetuation of the status quo, of a private company controlling access to an Australian and World Heritage national park, there is a risk of damage to tourism and
hindrance of the ability to sustainably manage culture and nature within the landscape.

Compounding the issue of restricted road access are the seasonal conditions, which entail extreme heat, humidity, wild fires and flooding, and are significant factors in the management that limit the capacity of staff to conduct activities and provide tourism access. Purnululu National Park is generally closed to tourists during the peak of the Wet season, from approximately November to March, when ranger staff may be withdrawn and the tourism operators close up their enterprises and withdraw staff.

A demonstration of fire damage was the wild fire event over 24th to 30th October 2013, which closed the Park before the scheduled wet season closure. The 2013 fire damage was described in a Parks and Wildlife news release Closure of Purnululu National Park due to fire damage published on 11th November 2013 (the news release) (Department of Parks and Wildlife 2013e). In the news release the department provided an image of the fire damage and a statement from the East Kimberley District Manager describing the fire as causing ‘significant damage to visitor facilities, including important trail markers and toilets’ (ibid). A particular site of fire damage, depicted in the news release photograph, was at the dome bee-hive structures which were subjected to severe heat damage and blackening to a height of 3 metres. At the centre of the damage the fragile skin of the domes had been destroyed, leaving bare the underlying sandstone.

Fire management is a significant component of the operational management from both an Aboriginal traditional and Western contemporary practice perspective and is consistently referred to as a major and vital component of Purnululu National Park management. Although local traditional Aboriginal owners are consulted, the responsibility and authority of fire management is entrusted to the Purnululu National Park management through the Western Australian Government, which conduct aerial and ground burning programs. The value of prescribed burning and its potential to protect cultural heritage is demonstrated in the ground burning conducted in 2013. In a news release from the Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPaW), titled Prescribed burning helps protect Bungle Bungle rock art, published 10th February 2014, Bill Dempsey, the Purnululu World Heritage Manager noted the collaboration with
Aboriginal owners in protecting cultural sites from fire damage. (Department of Parks and Wildlife 2014c):

A report prepared for DPaW in 2013 identified fire as a significant threat to rock art in Purnululu National Park, so we decided to take some action through prescribed burning to help protect the art and the park’s World Heritage values …

We collaborated closely with traditional owners and our Aboriginal rangers from the local Djaru and Kija language groups and they have identified the most significant sites and participated in the burning

Tourism

Tourist, infrastructure and operational access to the Park have expanded over time to provide fly over experiences from fixed and rotary aircraft in addition to car, truck and bus access. Visitors who only fly over the Park by helicopter or plane and did not land were estimated at approximately 21,000 in 2004. The number of visitors who set foot on the park had steadily increased from approximately 13,000 in 1995 to 24,500 in 2007 (Conservation Commission, 2009: 18). The Department of Parks and Wildlife noted on its web site that tourist visitations to Purnululu National Park had grown in 2011-2012 to approximately 27000 (Department of Parks and Wildlife 2013f). Although funding and development had been supported for tourism, by December 2015 the Western Australian Government had not delivered a replacement for the 20-year-old Purnululu National Park Management Plan 1994-2005 or incorporated the Purnululu Conservation Reserve into the park.

Tourism at Purnululu National Park is particularly focused on the Bunge Bungle Range and its associated bee-hive structures and gorges. The visitor experience is widely prompted within a natural World Heritage landscape, with some reference to local Aboriginal people and their culture. Analysis of this process provides an argument for the imperative to change, not simply the management model but the philosophy of shared management of culture and nature within landscape that operates within the Western Australian Government. I propose there needs to be a shift away from the outmoded National Park Wilderness model, which is enforced
within the Park’s management plan and is reinforced by the statement: (Department of Conservation and Land Management, 1995)

The overall aim of management for this Park should be to maintain the remote wilderness-adventure type of experience which is gained from exploring the unusual landscape.

Synopsis

The experience of working as the Executive Officer for World Heritage at Purnululu National Park provided an insight into its policy, governance, management culture and delivery processes. From my experience of working at Purnululu I wish to acknowledge the professionalism, integrity, innovation and dedication of the Park’s staff, who actively engage with and seek advice in the management of culture and nature from local traditional Aboriginal owners, in spite of the governance shortfalls discussed.

The shared management of culture and nature within the landscape of Purnululu National Park and Reserve, as with Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, can be measured in the success or failure of its governance and the engagement with the local traditional Aboriginal owners. My analysis of the governance challenges at Purnululu National Park is in contrast to achievements of particular projects within the Park that are successful within the key performance criteria determined by government. In considering the Western Australian Government’s continued inability to meet the ICOMOS governance recommendations (ICOMOS 2003), failure to update the 1995 Plan of Management or clarify the governance arrangements, I present that the shared management governance has not been successful and the management process is unsustainable. The reasons for these failures are illustrated to be the responsibility of both the Western Australian Government and the local traditional Aboriginal custodians. Both parties may cite mitigating circumstances but both have failed to resolve local traditional Aboriginal authority within the Purnululu National Park and Reserve, which has impacted on World Heritage values and Aboriginal cultural recognition and authority.
The analysis of the unresolved governance and shared management at Purnululu National Park reveals the following challenges:

- native title determination;
- Aboriginal authority;
- World Heritage cultural status;
- road access restrictions;
- customary purpose ambiguities; and
- the Park’s naming.

These challenges reveal the shared management bias is toward natural heritage management over cultural heritage management, which is illustrated in the continued tourist and government promotion of Purnululu and the Bungle Bungle Range as a supposed wilderness experience. The management of Purnululu National Park has definitively separated cultural and natural heritage management and overlaid the local traditional Aboriginal custodians’ management of Country with the conflicting intangible heritage of outmoded colonial wilderness.
The Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) is an Australian mixed cultural and heritage site located in the Australian State of Tasmania. It was inscribed under World Heritage cultural and natural criteria in 1982 (UNESCO 1982). The World Heritage inscriptions are under the criteria (iii), (iv), (vi), (vii), (viii), (ix) and (x) (DPIPWE 2016). Tasmania is a large island separated from the mainland of Australian by Bass Strait, which is ‘notorious for its boisterous weather. Shallow, and exposed to the fury of the southern trade winds, its waves are steep and the currents unpredictable.’ (Bass Strait Marine Centre 2016). The passage from the Australian mainland across Bass Strait, by car carrying ferry, takes approximately 9 to 12 hours (TT-Line Company Pty Ltd 2016). The TWWHA area, in 2015, was a 1,584,459 hectare property, which is approximately 20 per cent of the State of Tasmania’s land mass (Commonwealth of Australia 2015).

The colonial history of Tasmania involves a massive reduction in the Tasmanian Aboriginal population and significant disruption to their cultural practice. Particular events that reflect the Tasmanian Aboriginal struggle against the British colonialists were the Black Wars and the associated Black Line operation. In the publication *The Black Wars: Fear, Sex and Resistance in Tasmanian*, Clements (2014) reveals the
violence and death suffered by the colonists and Tasmanian Aboriginal peoples (ibid: 1)

Eastern Tasmania was the scene of horrific violence between 1824 and 1831. The Black Wars, as it became known, claimed the lives of well over 200 colonists, and all but annihilated the island’s remaining Aborigines.

The Black Line operation, which hastened the end of the Black Wars, consisted of three separate lines of soldiers and colonists walking in line sweeping through the Tasmanian landscape to drive Aboriginal Tasmanians from their Country. Ryan in the journal article The Black Line in Van Dieman’s Land: success or Failure (Ryan 2013) describes the purpose of the Black Line operation and the scale of its operation. (Ryan 2013: 3)

The Black Line in 1830 in Van Diemen’s Land (as the colony of Tasmania was then known) was the largest force ever assembled against Aborigines anywhere in Australia. Comprising more than two thousand soldiers and civilians…its purpose was to drive four of the nine Tasmanian Aboriginal nations from their homelands.

The brutal and prolonged suppression and removal of Aboriginal people from the Tasmanian landscape impacted heavily on the degree of shared management authority between Tasmanian Aboriginal people and the Tasmanian Government in relation to todays TWWHA. An indication of the contemporary impact of colonisation is revealed in the statement by the Tasmanian Government in the 1979 Proposal for a Wild River National Park: The Franklin – Lower Gordon Rivers (now part of the TWWHA) (Director of National Parks and Wildlife Service Tasmania 1979), which considered Aboriginal cultural connection to the Park as very limited (ibid: 44):

Much of the history – particularly of the association of the Tasmanian Aborigines with the Gordon and Lower Franklin Rivers – is lost and what is recorded is often sketchy.

In addition to the continuing negative historic fabric and heritage impact of
colonization the terminology of wilderness, which is part of the TWWHA’s name, is a persistent point of continuing contention between Tasmanian Aboriginal people and settler peoples. The TWWHA is the only World Heritage inscription area that uses the term Wilderness in its title. The conflicted views of the use of the term wilderness is noted in the Draft Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan (TWWHA) 2014 as ‘problematic for Aboriginal people. They believe the term wrongly implies that the TWWHA is a landscape empty of human culture’ (DPIPWE 2014: 9). The wilderness issue was recognized and partially addressed in the statement: ‘As a measure of respect for the perspective of Tasmanian Aboriginal people, the Wilderness Zone in the previous plan has been renamed the Remote Recreation Zone’ (DPIPWE 2014: 159). However, the final Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan (TWWHA) 2016 (DPIPWE 2016) maintained the terminology ‘Wilderness Zone’.

In spite of substantial population loss and cultural damage the remaining Tasmanian Aboriginal peoples are reconnecting to their traditional Country and have emerged as recognized stakeholders in the management of TWWHA. A demonstration of the Tasmanian Aboriginal desire to work with the Tasmanian Government is the statement from the Tasmanian Aboriginal Elder Aunty Patsy: (DPIPWE 2016: v)

The challenge for us, as Aboriginal people, is to reconnect to Country in the TWWHA and to exercise, as individuals and as families, the opportunities this Management Plan presents to us. This Management Plan contains the keys for protecting our Country - good, strong governance made possible by improving our relationships with others tasked with managing the TWWHA and by respectfully working together and building a strong future for all generations. The TWWHA may be remote in geography, but it is close to our cultural hearts.

The priorities in the Tasmanian Government’s management of the TWWHA under a colonial Western dualism and the dichotomist cultural/natural management is illustrated in the Vision and Objectives statements in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan (TWWHA) 2016. This is in stark contrast to the Uluru-Kata Tjuta model where the Aboriginal Tjukurpa (section: Uluru-Kata
Tjuta National Park) is identified as a primary element of park management. The Vision and Objectives of the TWWHA Management Plan 2016 are: (DPIPWE 2016: 34-35)

- **Vision**
  To identify, protect, conserve and present the World Heritage, National Heritage and other natural and cultural values of the TWWHA and to transmit that heritage to future generations in as good or better condition than at present.

- **Objectives**

  **The Cultural Values**
  To develop and implement a joint management arrangement that ensures that the strategies and actions for identification, protection, conservation and presentation of the World Heritage and other values of the TWWHA are developed in partnership with Tasmanian Aboriginal people.
  To understand the TWWHA as an Aboriginal cultural landscape, reflecting its long occupation, as a foundation for the management of its cultural values.
  To identify, protect, conserve and restore cultural values in the TWWHA.

  **The Natural Values**
  To identify, protect, conserve and restore natural biological and geological diversity and processes in the TWWHA.
  To protect and conserve the natural landscapes of the TWWHA, particularly in areas of exceptional natural beauty, and aesthetic and cultural importance.

  **Presentation**
  To provide a diversity of visitor experiences in a manner that is consistent with the conservation of natural and cultural values.

  **Community Engagement**
  To promote and facilitate the role of the TWWHA as an integral and valued component of the social, environmental and economic wellbeing of the international, national and Tasmanian communities, and to involve these communities in its management.
Monitoring and Evaluation

To support the delivery of an informed, effective and transparent adaptive management regime for the TWWHA.

A complexity to the management of TWWHA is the division of the landscape into separate jurisdictions and tenures that are encompassed within the World Heritage area. The vast majority of the 1,584,459 hectare landscape is managed under the *Nature Conservation Act 2002 (Tas)* by the Director of National Parks and Wildlife, which is the managing authority of the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service of the Tasmanian DPIPWE. The remainder of 42,500 hectares is tenured as: (DPIPWE 2016)

- Aboriginal Land Council of Tasmania
- The Tasmanian Land Conservancy freehold
- Bush Heritage Australia freehold
- Hydro Tasmania
- Tas Networks
- Crown Land

The decision to include TWWHA as a third case study was informed by the process of investigating the Uluru and Purnululu management models and the realization that the inclusion of a more complex tenure model would provide scope for a greater application of the research outcomes. TWWHA, as with Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Purnululu National Parks, is inscribed on the World Heritage list and encompasses isolated and remote landscapes. TWWHA consists of over 1 million hectares, greater than Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Purnululu National Parks combined, with multiple management tenures and shared management arrangements with a traditional Tasmanian Aboriginal cultures.

**Park Development**

The initial public reserves in the region of the now TWWHA were proclaimed in 1908 over the lower Gordon and Kings Rivers (Department of Parks, Wildlife and Heritage, Tasmania 1991). In addition to the colonial history of Aboriginal wars,
dispossession and violence there is controversy over land usage and development within the registered TWWHA. This was noted as early as 1879 with claims of overcutting of Huon Pine (Lagarostrobos franklinii). The development of the TWWHA has been influenced by many of the diverse uses claimed within its landscape. As a consequence, by the year 2015 the TWWHA comprised of a complex array of different reserve types and classifications related to land status and tenure. The current proclaimed reserve classifications within TWWHA are: (DPIPWE 2016: 31)

- National Park
- State Reserve
- Game Reserve
- Conservation Reserve
- Natural Recreation Reserve
- Historic Site

The development of the contemporary TWWHA is reflected largely in the outcomes of landscape usage conflicts between: the Tasmanian Government and the Australian Commonwealth Government; and the Tasmanian Government and the UNESCO World Heritage Committee. The Australian Commonwealth conflict was in regard to the Franklin River Blockage and the historic Franklin River Blockade, which was crucial in stopping the construction of the proposed Gordon-below-Franklin dam and subsequent flooding of the Franklin River. Construction of the dam was halted following a ruling from the Australian High Court in 1983 (Department of Parks Wildlife and Heritage, Tasmania 1991). The UNESCO conflict was in regard to the failed 2014 attempt to facilitate logging in the TWWHA, which is discussed in the following section, World Heritage Inscription.

The success of the Franklin River Blockage, which was championed by Bob Brown and the Tasmanian Wilderness Society,33 enhanced the perspective of the landscape as wilderness and influenced the management of the TWWHA. The Wilderness

33 The Tasmanian Wilderness Society Inc. changed its name to The Wilderness Society Inc. in 1984 and then to The Wilderness Society Ltd in 2016 (The Wilderness Society Ltd 2016)
Society Ltd account of the Franklin River campaign, on its web page *History of Franklin River Campaign 1976-83*, only references the presence of Aboriginal people in terms of ‘remains of campfires, stone tools and animal bones’ (Wilderness Society 2016b). My contention is that the victory for environmental conservation by wilderness advocates came at the cost of further entrenching the inappropriate wilderness approach to managing the TWWHA, which consequently propagated the Western dualism of man as observer and steward of nature. The campaign to prevent a reduction of the TWWHA in 2014 presents a further outstanding demonstration of conservation victory over the Tasmanian Government, however the role played by the Wilderness Society was still focused on wilderness with little reference to Aboriginal cultural practice. The following section *World Heritage Inscriptions* further examines the Franklin Blockade and the full property preservation of the TWWHA.

**World Heritage Inscription**

In 1982 the UNESCO World Heritage Committee accepted the Australian nomination of the *Western Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area* as recommended by IUCN and ICOMOS (UNESCO 1982: 5). The size of the nominated area accepted was 769,355 Acres (311,347 hectares) (Department of Parks Wildlife and Heritage (Tasmania) 1991: 7). The word Western was removed for the properties title in an Australian Government’s 1989 UNESCO extension nomination, creating the current property title of *Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area* (Government of Australia 1989). The TWWHA was successively increased to its current size of approximately 1.5 million hectares and has maintained its seven World Heritage criteria inscriptions of: Cultural Criteria (iii), (iv), (vi), (vii); and Natural Criteria (viii), (ix), (x).

Whilst confirming World Heritage inscription in 1982 the World Heritage Committee took a proactive step of also stating its concerns regarding potential damage to the Area’s Outstanding Universal Values posed by dam construction and subsequent flooding. (UNESCO 1982: 6):

> The Committee is seriously concerned at the likely effect of dam construction in the area on these natural and cultural characteristics which
make the property of outstanding universal value. In particular, it considers that flooding of parts of the river valleys would destroy a number of cultural and natural features of great significance, as identified in the ICOMOS and IUCN reports…. The Committee suggests that the Australian authorities should place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the question of dam construction is resolved.

The issue raised by the World Heritage Committee was addressed through the success of the Franklin River Blockade campaign in preventing construction of the Gordon-below-Franklin dam and associated flooding of the Franklin River.

The propensity of the Tasmanian Government to be in substantial conflict with the World Heritage Committee over the management of the TWWHA was further demonstrated in 2014 with the proposal, submitted through the Australian Government, to remove parts of the TWWHA to allow logging. The Government request was for ‘a reduction in the geographic extent of the property of 4.7%’ (Australian Government 2014: 3). The modification was designed to remove a number of areas approved for inclusion in the TWWHA by the World Heritage Committee in 2013 (ibid). The World Heritage Committee Decision 38 COM 8B.47 at its Doha Meeting in 2014 refused the proposal by Australia to remove the 74,039 hectares from the World Heritage boundaries and requested Australia to: (UNESCO 2014: 249)

a) Undertake further study and consultation with the Tasmanian Aboriginal community in order to provide more detailed information on the cultural value of the property and how these relate to the Outstanding Universal value,

b) Provide detailed information on the legal provisions for the protection of cultural heritage in the extended property,

c) Provide detailed information on the management arrangements for cultural heritage and in particular for the control of access to archaeological sites and sites of cultural significance.
The World Heritage Committee’s Decision to refuse the reduction of the World Heritage area reinforced the protection of both the natural and cultural Outstanding Universal Values within the TWWHA. Significantly the World Heritage Committee highlighted, in its request to Australia, the need for greater engagement with Tasmanian Aboriginal cultural heritage. An analysis of the Australian Government request for boundary modification and the corresponding World Heritage decision highlights the TWWHA management authorities (Australian and Tasmanian) propensity to consider tangible assets (timber) over the intangible of heritage and conjointly illustrates the entrenched separation of natural resources management from cultural heritage management.

A consequence of the defeats of the Tasmanian Government, related to the Franklin Blockade and the proposed reduction of the TWWHA meant the management of the TWWHA had been forced to adjust its approach and reconsider the governance of culture and nature within the landscapes as more closely associated and the relationship of intangible and tangible heritage as codependent. A particular catalyst for this reconsidered management approach is the enhanced recognition of Tasmanian Aboriginal peoples’ cultural connection to Country beyond tangible archeological sites and objects. The World Heritage Committee’s 2014 requests (UNESCO 2014) to Australia, focused on cultural heritage and the Tasmanian Aboriginal community as the process to inform the management of historic fabric such as forests, objects and locations. A suggested focus on heritage, as well as the environment, moves toward addressing my PhD Project questions as it provides a developing process that may support the need for cultural and natural management within Country to be more closely aligned and suggests placing a greater emphasis on heritage.

**Policy and Governance**

The governance structure for the TWWHA involves the operation of the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council (NPWAC), which advises the relevant Tasmanian State Minister, under Part 2, section 14 of the *National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002* (Tasmanian Government 2002):
(a) to advise the Minister on the administration of this Act, including on matters referred to it by the Minister;
(b) to provide a forum for consultation on policy issues of State significance that are related to this Act;
(c) to maintain an overview of the relevance of the Director’s role and achievements relative to public expectations;
(d) to promote understanding and acceptance of the Director’s role and associated programs;
(e) to encourage, and act as a focal point for, community support for projects carried out and services provided under this Act;
(f) to review management plans.

The role within the TWWHA governance structure of reporting and advising on the Commonwealth Government was, until 2012, conducted by the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Consultative Committee (TWWHACC), at which time its responsibilities and functions were absorbed by the NPWAC (Parks and Wildlife Service 2013). Under the National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002, NPWAC reports to the relevant Tasmanian State Government Minister without reference to reporting to the Commonwealth Government (Tasmanian Government 2002). The Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage (TWWHA) Management Plan 2016 makes little reference to the Commonwealth’s authority in managing TWWHA, but does note that the ‘The Management Plan has been drafted to also meet the requirements of the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, set out in the associated Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000’ (DPIPWE 2016: 7). The effect of shifting the monitoring and consequent reporting on the TWWHA into a centralized state body can be interpreted as a demonstration of state / commonwealth politics, where the State of Tasmania is seeking to exercise greater governance authority over its landscape jurisdiction. The issue of governance authority between the state and federal governments has a confrontational history. This is illustrated by the High Court of Australia case of the Commonwealth verse the State of Tasmania in 1983, which determined in favour of the Commonwealth and halted the construction of the Gordon-below-Franklin power development (Department of Parks Wildlife and Heritage 1999).
The participation of Tasmanian Aboriginal people in the governance process and shared management of TWWHA has undergone a significant advancement from the 20th to 21st century. In the section Aboriginal Management of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan 1999 (Parks and Wildlife Service (Tasmania) 1999:100-103) reference is made to the changing attitude of the Tasmanian Governments to Aboriginal heritage, from the primarily archeological values in the previous TWWHA Management Plan 1992. An evaluation of the management effectiveness of the TWWHA in the 2004 State of Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area: An evaluation of management effectiveness, conducted under the TWWHA Management Plan 1999, stated that: ‘the overall state of protection and conservation of Aboriginal heritage in the TWWHA was less than satisfactory’ (Parks and Wildlife Service 2004: 17).

The Tasmanian Government’s evolving acceptance of Tasmanian Aboriginal heritage and rights to be involved in the governance and management is identified in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) Management Plan 2016, where Aboriginal culture is recognized as a living cultural and natural heritage that is entitled to recognition and management participation (DPIPWE 2016). The Tasmanian Government position is in stark contrast to the colonial perspective of considering Aboriginal heritage as simply historic fabric with no heritage34 value.

The need to consult extensively with the Tasmanian Aboriginal community in relation to Aboriginal heritage was expressed in the TWWHA management plan 1999. However, it was not until the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan (TWWHA) 2016 that a specific TWWHA advisory structure for Aboriginal governance and advice was recommended through the establishment of the cultural management group. The role of the group is to (DPIPWE 2016: 9):

oversee implementation of cultural values management. In particular, it will establish links between the natural and cultural heritage aspects of Aboriginal interests, provide advice on matters pertaining to Aboriginal

34 Note: As discussed in the Chapter One of the Thesis, heritage is considered as fundamentally intangible, which may relate to the physical world as historic fabric.
values in the TWWHA, oversee project and policy development and work closely with Aboriginal people and their organisations

Progress has occurred in relation to sharing and integrating the cultural and natural management of TWWHA, particularly in relation to Aboriginal partners. However, the overall contemporary process of managing the TWWHA is still locked into the Western culture/nature management dichotomy. This is demonstrated through the terminology and structures under which the TWWHA develops its policies and a variety of government legislation targeting either natural or cultural values. The processes of governance and management of the TWWHA, under the 2016 management plan, are complicated by the diversity of land use and the array of government Acts that require consideration at both governance and management levels. These government Acts include but are not limited to: National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 (Tas), Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (Tas); and Aboriginal Relics Act 1975 (Tas).

To develop effective policy across the extensive diversity of legislation, interests, landscapes and waterscapes of the TWWHA the Tasmanian Government has developed a two elements system of Management Zones and Management Overlays. The Management Zones consist of the management elements of Visitor Services, Recreation, Self-Reliant Recreation, and Wilderness, and are designed ‘to control, manage and facilitate usage to ensure that the area’s values are protected and management objectives are achieved’ (DPIPWE 2016: 59). The use of the concept of wilderness is unfortunately a persistent element in the management of TWWHA. In the face of Aboriginal objection to the use of wilderness, one of the Management Zones is titled Wilderness rather than Remote Recreation, which was its title in the 2014 Draft of the TWWHA Management Plan.

A component of the implementation of these management Zones is the contemporary shared management perspective that Aborigines of Tasmania have an authority to conduct their cultural practice across the Management Zones. The acknowledgement of Aboriginal people is presented in the statement: (DPIPWE 2016: 59)

The Management Plan acknowledges that the entire TWWHA is of cultural significance to Tasmanian Aboriginal people. The Management
Zones are not intended to preclude Tasmanian Aboriginal people’s access to Country or conduct of cultural practices.

The Management Overlays of the 2016 TWWHA Management Plan provide a mechanism to provide more targeted management responses to local conditions. The Overlays are depicted as being designed to ‘refine management within particular areas. … The overlay system is a more flexible management tool that allows for an appropriate response to possible changes in circumstances’ (ibid: 59). The Management Overlays are: (ibid)

- Motorised Vessel - to allow for mechanised boating access;
- Hunting - to allow the enjoyment of hunting;
- Hunting Access - creates an access corridor to areas that are subject to a Hunting Overlay;
- Biosecurity; allows application of biosecurity measures that are additional to those that may be applied across the whole TWWHA;
- Karst Management - identifies areas where management needs to take ongoing account of karst values;
- Forestry Research - existing long-term studies are permitted to continue, including the potential for harvesting of forest;
- Water Supply - to manage the collection and supply of water, and to protect drinking water quality;
- Special Management - a restricted area to which the public does not have a general right of access; and
- Remote Area Management - areas where the provision and maintenance of vital infrastructure in otherwise remote settings is required.

The process of governance and policy development across such a huge and diverse land and waterscape such as TWWHA requires a structure that provides both an overview of the entire area plus the capacity to address local issues. However, the effectiveness of the governance structure in the 2016 management plan, with its Management Zones and Overlays plus a ‘cultural management group’ has not been
substantiated through implementation, monitoring, evaluation or analysis. My analysis of the governance of the TWWHA is that it is still tightly bound to the Western outmoded wilderness park model of separating culture/nature and tangible/ intangible, which also separates and limits the authority of Aboriginal cultural practice. The Tasmanian Government’s attempted removal from the TWWHA of 74,039 hectares in 2014 and the associated devaluing of World Heritage cultural and natural values does indicate concerns with the TWWHA governance process, particularly in relation to the influence on policy development from forestry lobby groups who seek access to lumber.

Management


A precursor to the 2016 Management Plan was the *State of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area – an evaluation of management effectiveness, Report No. 1* (Parks and Wildlife Service (Tasmania) 2004). The 2004 Evaluation made an overall assessment that TWWHA Management Plan 1999 was a success in the statement: ‘the 1992 management plan delivered major achievements and that sound progress was made against all the management objectives’ (*ibid*: 18). However, in regard to managing cultural heritage there were significant failings as noted that the ‘overall state protection and conservation of Aboriginal heritage in the TWWHA was less than satisfactory’ (*ibid*: 17). In addition to the cultural heritage issues, related to the TWWHA operation, there are significant illegal activities occurring in the World Heritage area that presented a risk to the natural heritage of the TWWHA. (*ibid*: 10)
Illegal activities continue to cause unacceptable losses and degradation of the natural heritage in parts of the TWWHA. In some cases, these activities posed a serious risk of major ecological impact in the TWWHA…Main illegal activity: ‘poaching (theft) of Huon Pine, King Billy Pine and other valuable timbers’

In considering the cultural and natural damage as indicated in the 2004 Evaluation, the objectives of the TWWHA Management Plan 1999, although delivering some achievements and progress, still fell considerably short in providing an effective structure to protect the World Heritage cultural and natural values of the TWWHA. In addition to illegal activities within the TWWHA, its management needs to address the control of introduced mammals, birds and fish species as well as biosecurity issues such as Amphibian chytrid fungus, Devil facial tumour disease, Phytophthora cinnamomi and Myrtle rust (Puccinia psidii). (Commonwealth of Australia 2015) (Parks and Wildlife Service (Tasmania) 1999) (DPIPWE 2016).

Management within the often extreme environment of TWWHA involves preparedness of staff and tourists to reduce the risk of hypothermia resulting from working, walking and camping in remote cold climate conditions. The Parks and Wildlife Service provides a bushwalking guide and trip planner that provides survival and planning, noting that multiday bush walks may be along coastlines, glaciated highlands, rainforests or rims of sea cliffs (Parks and Wildlife Service (Tasmania) 2008). Walkers are advised to be ‘self-reliant and well-equipped, with the right gear to keep you out of trouble in the first place – and the skills to cope with problems if they do arise’ (ibid: 3).

A further challenge is the management of controlled burns and wild fires within the TWWHA, which is identified in the State Party Report: on the state of conservation of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (Australia) as ‘a key environmental process and management tool in the Tasmanian property’ (Commonwealth of Australia 2015). However, there are significant risks associated with fire within the TWWHA including damage to the historic fabric and heritage, the diverse inhabitant species, soils, TWWHA staff, tourists and the Tasmanian
community. When recognizing the symbiosis of tangible and intangible heritage, significant damage resulting from fire has the potential to influence the meaning of place and its associated cultural heritage interpretation and values.

**Tourism**

Tourism in the TWWHA is extensive and diverse, ranging from land and water based activities that cater for limited small party wilderness expeditions to mass tourism with buses of people converging on specific locations. In many of the locations throughout the TWWHA consideration of extreme cold weather condition is necessary with the Parks and Wildlife Service providing specific bushwalking advice stating: ‘deep snow can make walking difficult. Be prepared to be holed up during blizzards, sometimes for days’ (Parks and Wildlife Service (Tasmania) 2008: 9). Bushwalking is a major tourist attraction for the TWWHA and across Tasmania with the peak season in summer (December - February) whilst in the winter period (June – August) is off peak season with colder conditions and shorter days (*ibid*). The importance of bushwalking as a tourism attraction is demonstrated in Tourism Tasmania’s visitor surveys stating that bushwalking attracted 508,840 participants across Tasmania in the period July 2015 to June 2016 (44% of the total 1,167,921 Tasmanian tourist visitors) (Tourism Tasmanian 2016).

One of the major tourist locations within the TWWHA is the Cradle Mountain-Lake St Clair National Park, particularly Cradle Mountain, which is noted in the Parks and Wildlife Services website as including ‘ancient rainforest and alpine heathlands, buttongrass and stands of colourful deciduous beech provide a range of environments to explore. Icy streams cascading out of rugged mountains, stands of ancient pines mirrored in the still waters of glacial lakes’ (Parks and Wildlife Service 2016a). Cradle Mountain’s significance as a tourist destination is recognized in the publication *Reimagining the Visitor Experience of Tasmania's Wilderness World Heritage Area*, which notes its recognition as an international visitor location and its relationship to TWWHA tourism generally; (EC3 Global *et al.* 2014: 18).
Cradle Mountain and its surrounds are internationally recognized as a walking destination, as well as being a significant site for other forms of nature-based tourism …

Cradle Mountain is a primary gateway to the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area and more specifically, to one of Australia’s most famous national parks.

The management of culture and nature within the landscapes of TWWHA including its tourism is currently under review with: the development of a new overall management plan to replace the TWWHA Management Plan 1999 (Parks and Wildlife Service (Tasmania) 1999); plus recognition of the need for an overall Tourist Master Plan for tourism within the TWWHA, as noted in the *TWWHA Management Plan 2016*: (DPIPWE 2016: 11)

A strategic framework is needed to ensure a consistent and coherent approach to providing diverse presentation opportunities to the full spectrum of users, and potential users, of the TWWHA. This framework, formulated as a Tourism Master Plan, will include the following key themes:

- a coherent marketing strategy that integrates the TWWHA’s promotion and values with statewide and regional strategies;
- current and future visitor expectations, including demand analysis;
- Aboriginal cultural presentation;
- natural values presentation and conservation partnerships;
- historic heritage;
- prioritisation of investment in facilities and experiences;
- social inclusion;
- sustainable use;
- interpretation;

The first key theme of the proposed Tourism Master Plan is related to the strategic marketing, which is aimed at ‘a coherent marketing strategy that
integrates the TWWHA’s promotion and values with statewide and regional strategies’ (ibid: 12). In regard to the impact of tourist on the TWWHA landscape I propose a Tourism Master Plan is an essential missing tool for the governance and sustainable management of the TWWHA.

**Synopsis**

Analysis of the development of the TWWHA indicates that its management has been predominantly driven by the Western philosophical concept of wilderness and a pursuit of the Western view of pristine bush untrammeled by humans. Tasmanian Aboriginal people have been a constant consideration in this development, although such consideration has evolved over time from Aboriginal people as trespasses to tentative shared partners in the 21st century.

The TWWHA has evolved as a complex management environment that has to deal with multiple tenure types and a wide range of industry including tourism, fishing, forestry, bee-keeping, hydro-power generation, water supply, hunting, mountain bike activities and mining. In this environment the management of both cultural and natural historic fabric and heritage has been emphasised in the TWWHA Management Plan 1999 (Parks and Wildlife Service (Tasmania) 1999) and the TWWHA Management Plan 2016 (DPIPWE 2016). However, the diversity of landscapes and waterscapes combined with the diversity of tourist products, industry activities and land tenures occurring inside the TWWHA presents significant risk to the coherence and consistency of the ongoing coordinated management of the cultural and natural World Heritage values.

A demonstration of the potential risk to consistent cultural heritage management across the TWWHA, is where cultural heritage management relates to tenures that are not subject to the TWWHA Management Plan 2016. The tenures not subject to the Management Plan are, as stated in the *State Party Report: on the state of conservation of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (Australia)*:(Commonwealth of Australia 2016: 32-34).

- Crown Land
Future Potential Production Forest Land comprises approximately 26,300 hectares and is a category of Crown land administered by Crown Land Services

- Tasmanian Land Conservancy
  Comprising 1,742 hectares, the Tasmanian Land Conservancy (TLC) owns and manages the Skullbone Plains Reserve, Gordonvale Reserve and Liffey Reserve, within the property

- Bush Heritage Australia
  Bush Heritage Australia (BHA) owns and manages two reserves within the property, Liffey River Reserve and Coal Mine Creek Reserve, comprising 125.5 hectares

- Hydro Tasmania
  Hydro Tasmania owns and manages approximately 13,500 hectares of land within the property. This area includes 1,720 hectares of water storage or lake area. A number of Hydro Tasmania assets, such as dams, water conveysances and tunnels are also located on public land within the property.

- Tas Networks
  Tas Networks has a Memorandum of Understanding with Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service, which provides high-level guidance on how to manage activities within the property and establishes expectations for routine maintenance activities associated with their assets within the property

- Aboriginal Land
  Aboriginal land is land that has been vested in the Aboriginal Land Council of Tasmania in trust for Aboriginal persons in perpetuity under the *Aboriginal Lands Act* (Tas) 1995.

The contemporary Tasmanian Aboriginal connection to the TWWHA involves a continuity of cultural connection to Country and a reinvigoration of language and cultural practice that had been interrupted, lost or suppressed through colonial oppression. The shared management aspect of the TWWHA, in relation to Tasmanian Aboriginal people, is demonstrated to be less than satisfactory, although positive
developments are proposed but not currently implemented. To provide a sustainable share management process for TWWHA, future policy and management needs to deliver a more cohesive and comprehensive process to regulate and control cultural and natural heritage management across all the multiple tenures. I propose that the full implementation of the TWWHA Management Plan 2016 and the development of a Tourism Master Plan are overdue and will only be effective with full, timely and equitable implementation.
Chapter Five: Conclusion

An outcome from my research is the recognition that there is a rapidly evolving approach, within Western base structures, towards greater integration of the shared management of culture and nature within landscapes. This evolving approach is evidenced through the analysis of the conventions and programs of UNESCO, ICOMOS and IUCN and the investigation of the shared management cross-cultural partnerships at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Purnululu National Park and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. The evolving Western approach of developing a closer relationship between cultural and natural heritage management is demonstrated to be sincere in its attempt to break down the management silos created by the culture/nature management dichotomy. However, it is also revealed to be systematically constrained by its Western philosophic perspective of human/nature dualism. In contrast the Australian Aboriginal approach to the management of Country, consisting of the same cultural and natural elements, is demonstrated to already operate in an integrated holistic manner. The potential solution to this cross cultural management conundrum, between shared management partners, is to reduce the influence of the cultural and natural management silos established by the Western approach and establish a coalesced structure that manages cultural and natural heritage synchronously.

The investigations of the Project’s Proposition and Research Questions have identified the profound need for philosophical change related to the governance and management structures, processes and policies that manage culture and nature within landscapes such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Purnululu National Park and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. The philosophical change required has been expressed in a number of contemporary publications that discuss the advantages of integrating the management of culture and nature within a landscape. Taylor and Francis in the chapter Culture-nature Dilemmas: Confronting the challenges of the integration of culture and nature of the publication New Cultural Landscapes (Taylor & Francis 2014) recognize the case to implement a philosophical change related to how UNESCO and its World Heritage processes identify and manage the interrelationship of culture/nature and intangible/tangible. ‘To implement a
philosophical change there needs to be a movement beyond the debate of whether there is validity in the integration of culture/nature and intangible/tangible within landscape management’ (ibid: 37). A further reference to the contemporary movement to seek closer collaborations between the management of cultural and natural heritage is the discussion by Harmon (Harmon 2007) emphasizing the need to reduce the management plurality of contemporary cultural and natural heritage management.

The analysis of the Project case studies exposes the fundamentally divergent philosophical approaches taken by traditional Aboriginal and Australian Government stakeholders in the management of mixed cultural and natural locations. The traditional Aboriginal Australian approach is to manage the locations holistically as Country, whilst the Australian governments’ approach is to manage the locations as associated cultural and natural elements that reflect the Western human/nature duality. The separation of culture and nature into a management dichotomy as identified within the research, also embeds a separation of tangible and intangible heritage management, which is particularly noted in relation to the Aboriginal heritage (intangible) and its associated historic fabric (tangible). The disjuncture between the management approaches of the different stakeholders is demonstrated in the cultural manner each stakeholder perceives the relationship between nature and culture and the associated connection between the tangible of historic fabric and the intangible of heritage. Analysis of the contemporary stakeholder approaches, investigated through the Project case studies, suggests that traditional Aboriginal Australians and Australian Governments are currently engaged with varying success in seeking compromise that can potentially link both the settler and Indigenous management perspectives.

The philosophy supporting the UNESCO World Heritage programs and the Australian governments’ processes for the management of mixed cultural and natural areas is revealed to be enveloped within a Western duality that links but separates humans from nature and consequently separates the management of cultural heritage from natural heritage. Although UNESCO and Australian government processes through programs such as Cultural Landscape and Protected Areas recognize the management of culture and nature as closely interrelated, they still operate landscape management as a conflicted dichotomy supported by separate management silos. My
research suggests a new interdisciplinary approach is needed that moves beyond the demonstrated endemic management separation of nature and culture and bias to natural conservation, particularly in Australian national park landscapes involving local Indigenous traditional owners. At an international level the continued theoretical development of the concept of Culture Landscapes and Protected Areas is providing initial progress on how to combine the management of cultural and natural heritage, but consistently fails to move beyond Western dualism.

The need for a new approach to shared management is evidenced throughout the research, which illustrates the shared landscape governance failures that are typified by:

- the governance shortcomings of the Board of Management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, revealed in the continuance of the tourist climb of the mount of Uluru in 2017;
- the lack of governance transparency in consultations with local traditional Aboriginal owners at Purnululu National Park, revealed in the outdated Park Plan of Management (1995) and the unresolved identification and recognition of traditional Aboriginal owners’ cultural authority in 2017; and
- the conflicted management of Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area between the priorities of the Tasmanian State Government and the priorities of the World Heritage Committee and the traditional Tasmanian Aboriginal owners in 2017.

The current government management processes implemented at the case study landscapes are demonstrated to be highly problematic and follow the Western model in considering the natural environment separate but linked to its cultural values. This is evident in the:

- 20-year-old Purnululu Plan (Department of Conservation and Land Management 1995) where separate sections are dedicated to natural resource and cultural resources;
• Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Plan of Management (Director of National Parks 2010a) where the culture/nature separation is diminished through the implementation of the concept of cultural landscape, but still supported throughout the text of the document; and

• the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area through the western concept of wilderness, which values nature over culture.

To address the conflicted cross-cultural perspectives within the current landscape management process I have identified an approach to shared management comprising three foundations (the Foundations) for implementation in both policy development and management delivery. The Foundations are in addition to Public Sector protocols provided by governments and reflect an integration of management components and are considered critical for the long-term sustainable shared management of culture and nature within landscapes (Country). In relation to the case studies, the overarching negotiation philosophy underpinning the application of the Foundations are:

• informed consultation and equitable representation;
• reciprocal respect and recognition between shared management partners, involving both local traditional Aboriginal and other cultures; and
• recognition of the local traditional Aboriginal authority over their cultural intellectual property.

The Foundations are:

• integrate the management of culture and nature
• manage tangible and intangible heritage as a symbiotic relationship; and
• utilize sense of place within the landscape to inform management priorities

The three Foundations are directly linked to the research Proposition and Questions and challenge the contemporary Western landscape management construct of separation, particularly the dualism philosophy of human and nature. Further, these Foundations challenge the cultural/natural management dichotomy of ICOMOS and
IUCN, which has been identified within the research as underpinning the international and Australian contemporary landscape management in mixed cultural and natural heritage sites. An important aspect to the development of the Foundations is the recognition that all heritage is intangible (Smith L and Akagawa N 2009) (Smith 2006). The new management model identifies a path to sustainability through focusing management on intangible heritage and its relationship to historic fabric rather than the exploitation and objectification of tangible geological features, artifacts, species and environments.

I propose management needs to move beyond an approach that is principally informed by Western philosophy, aesthetic and cultural values, which tend to focus on ownership that is validated by tangible text and physical evidence. A step to move beyond the Western approach is to build an equitable and sustainable shared management model that acknowledges and is engaged with the local traditional Aboriginal holistic understanding of Country. The research indicates it would also be advantageous to move away from the contemporary Western approach of managing remote or isolated national parks within the colonial ‘wilderness’ paradigm. I propose a focus on an integrated holistic approach to landscape management has potential to deliver more resilient and equitable partnerships between local Aboriginal and other cultures. However, engagement with an integrated management approach requires a repositioning of the priorities of cultural and natural heritage, to raise the intangible of cultural and natural heritage in relation to the tangible of historic fabric.

The integrated approach to the shared management of culture and nature within landscapes moves closer to the Aboriginal concept of managing Country, whilst still utilizing Western terminology. It embraces the expression of heritage that purveys the intangible within landscapes at the nexus of ‘Culture’, ‘Nature’ and ‘Arts’, which can be interpreted as a link to the Aboriginal context of ‘Art, Culture and Country’. The primary focus of this approach is to expand the effectiveness of cross cultural negotiation through considering management as operating more closely with the intangible of meaning or sense of place. Sense of place that informs management negotiations and decisions is conceptualized as a liminal space, continually evolving through an ephemeral process of stakeholders’ participation across cultures and across Western scientific and sociological disciplines.
To address the two Thesis questions of integrating the management of culture and nature and recognizing the symbiotic relationship of intangible and tangible heritage the research reveals the need for a better understanding and utilization by management, of the sense of place held by each of the shared management partners. The concept is to create a more equitable and interwoven management collaboration between the traditional Aboriginal management of Country and the contemporary Australian government, plus conservation organizations, by not prioritizing historic fabric over cultural and natural heritage. Taking this position can be interpreted as highly confronting to conservation movements and societies. However, it is not intended to diminish the imperative to conserve species and environment or ignore some failings of cultural practice but rather create a more balanced approach to the complexities of shared cross cultural management of culture and nature within the landscapes.

The new approach to managing Country is targeted at landscapes with similar characteristics to the case studies of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Purnululu National Park and Reserve and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. These landscapes consist of a mix of both cultural and natural heritage and are dependent on cross-cultural shared management, primarily between local traditional Aboriginal Australians and Australian governments. In addition, the landscapes are in remote and isolated locations, are over 100,000 hectares in size and subject to the logistical management constraints of isolation and extreme weather.

To address the Project Proposition and the Research Questions the redesigned model to the shared management of Country (culture and nature of landscapes) expands upon the three governance Foundations, with five associated policy and management guidelines. It is proposed that the implementation of each of the guidelines be across all stages of management, commencing with political engagement with a location through to a location’s national and international heritage inscription and then into policy development, management strategies and on the ground delivery.

Policy and Management Guidelines
1. Prioritize the intangible of cultural and natural heritage;
2. Reduce the bureaucratic silos that separate the management of
   - cultural and natural heritage and
   - tangible and intangible heritage
3. Dispense with wilderness as a management concept and strategy;
4. Implement interdisciplinary management strategies combining culture, nature and arts; and
5. Foster open shared management negotiations without the imposition of prescribed outcomes.

1. Prioritize the intangible of cultural and natural heritage.

In a Western construct it may appear this guideline puts nature conservation as secondary, although highly important. However, in an integrated management model all culture and nature within a landscape are fundamentally interconnected and consequently, damaging one impacts on the other. The management of the historic fabric or natural environment cannot be separated from its heritage. To implement this guideline, it is proposed to:
   - Consider, prior to the implementation of any management policy or process, the historic fabric of the landscape and the potential positive and negative impacts on heritage.
   - Elevate heritage value above the separation and commodification of historic fabric.
   - Recognize that cultural and natural heritage exists as a continually evolving experiential process incorporating people and the holistic environment. This is in contrast to considering landscape and culture as fixed commodities within the political domain or market economy.

2. Reduce the bureaucratic silos.

Separate cultural and natural management bureaucracies, at an international and national level, have been shown to have often conflicting processes, policies, and priorities. Such conflicts pose a conundrum when separate bureaucracies are forced to work with each other to assess and analyze the interaction of cultural and natural values within landscapes. Each bureaucracy brings separate policy agendas and prescribed outcomes, which prejudice the analysis of
collaborative research. My contention is that to manage combined components of culture and nature within a landscape, separate bureaucracies need a shared management approach with analogous policy priorities.

A proposal for the reduction of bureaucracies in the international arena is to reduce the ICOMOS and IUCN culture/nature management dichotomy. The reduction approach is implemented through advocating and pursuing a UNESCO process that integrates the examination, assessment and monitoring of World Heritage mixed cultural and natural sites. The initial step is to stipulate that ICOMOS and IUCN assessors, working on cross-cultural cultural and natural heritage sites, are required to operate under an integrated shared management approach. Such an approach is to be targeted at breaking down the UNESCO culture/nature dichotomy and working at arms length from the respective ICOMOS and IUCN silos. In order to provide a conjoint purpose, when advising on properties such as the case studies, one proposal is to investigate a process that engages assessors of cultural and natural Outstanding Universal Values to work together within discrete permanent or temporary collaborative units.

3 **Dispense with the use of wilderness concept as a strategy.**

Wilderness, through the support of tourism and government, unfortunately continues to be a significant component of the management process of many national parks and conservation areas within Australia. The case studies of Purnululu National Park, the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Parks indicate wilderness is utilized as a banner to describe the landscapes and promote a Western aesthetic, particularly in the case of Purnululu and the Tasmanian Wilderness and to a lesser extent Uluru-Kata Tjuta. The Western separation model and the wilderness concept have been demonstrated to be cross-culturally divisive, as they are a colonial impost and fundamentally contradictory to the Aboriginal understanding and process of managing Country.

4 **Implement an interdisciplinary management strategy combining culture, nature and arts**
An interdisciplinary approach is a vital component of the proposed shared landscape model integrating the management of culture and nature. It combines artistic process, informed by sense of place, and entwines the personal intangible experience and interpretation within a landscape to the governance and the practical functionality of site specific management processes. Interlacing artistic practice within management delivers a mechanism that informs policy through directly engaging with the intangible of place. The innovation in this process, as stated in the Exegesis, is the establishment of a priority focused on the intangible of heritage, rather than the physical historic fabric such as constructed structures, geological features, artifacts, flora or fauna (Chapter One, Exegesis). The process of creating art work, across the multitude of mediums, is not fixated on the particular visual, performance, text or multimedia creation, but on the qualitative knowledge revealed through the expression of sense of place and how this informs management understandings and priorities.

To administer the integration of the management of culture, nature and arts (CNA), governance and management frameworks are required to guide policy and management staff to engage in a process of interpretation and reflection of the cultures and nature they are managing. This would require employment position descriptions for individuals to encourage staff to engage in at least one form of artistic expression. This could include but not be limited to drawing, photography, writing, keeping a journal, poetry, music, discussion or performance. The particular selection of any of the vast array of artistic practice is not to be prescribed; rather the importance is the engagement of the officer in a personal intangible experience of their interaction with Country. Consequently, it is important that policy staff commit to a dedicated period of time working within the specific landscape and interacting with the traditional owners.

Foster open shared management negotiations without the imposition of prescribed outcomes.
Engaging in cross-cultural negotiation as a process that operates without defined responses or outcomes provides the opportunity to participate in more equitable
and open discussions of differing experiential understanding of landscape (Country). An understanding of each parties’ sense of place and subsequently their heritage, can then be revealed, providing a more informed negotiation environment of differing perspectives from the shared management partners. A further benefit of not prescribing outcomes is that contrived ideological, political or commercial objectives presented by partners are not considered as primarily drivers of negotiation, which provides potential for more equitable, collaborative and innovative shared management decisions.

The conceptualization of the new integration model involves the notion and terminology of the liminal threshold and liminality related to cross-cultural and interdisciplinary negotiation within the shared management of culture and nature within landscapes. Introducing liminal as a landscape management terminology is designed to provide a distinctive focus on the process of negotiations as innovative, evolving and collaborative, rather than a process of reaching prescribed outcomes. The terminology, as a distinctive and unusual way of describing shared cultural and natural management negotiations, is important in that it stands apart from general contemporary descriptions of landscape management. However, in practical terms liminal may initially be too unusual a term for some managers. Consequently, an emphasis on its concept related to negotiation as a continually changing process should be promoted with the possibility of new terminology acceptance emerging.

A critical component in implementing the new management model is the engagement with continuing change, informed by cross-cultural research, evaluation and negotiation. At a specific location each of the model’s policy and management guidelines must be investigated to provide a holistic view that can inform the integration of culture and nature within the landscape and the symbiotic relationship of its tangible and intangible components. The governance sustainability of the process relies on management negotiation, predicated on primarily engaging the local traditional Aboriginal owners, individual politicians, bureaucrats, researchers and field staff in the philosophy of integration. This will be extremely challenging in the Australian context as often governments and non-government organizations have management processes based on the Western cultural philosophy of separation.
The structures required for governance oversight of Country, as in the case studies, will differ between locations and require equitable consultation and representation of share management partners at the specific locations. The case study of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park demonstrates a governance structure that potentially could support the new landscape model as it: resists the wilderness concept; provides potential equity to traditional owners through freehold title and majority voting membership of the Board of Management processes; recognizes cultural authority over Country; and activity that engages with traditional management processes including the use of traditional fire management and art practice. However, lack of governance transparency, the dominance of the Western culture/nature management dichotomy plus the political and commercial dominance over heritage and historic fabric management would need to be addressed for effective implementation of the new model.

The utilization of the link between arenas of culture, nature and art in the integrated management of culture and nature within landscapes is a mechanism that recognizes the symbiotic relationship of intangible and tangible heritage. Culture, nature and arts each have their individual and often overlapping historic fabric of objects, geography, descriptions, depictions and structures, however each is also imbied with multivalent cultural intangible interpretations. The symbiotic relationship of the tangible and intangible is demonstrated throughout the research to be operating, although often conflicted, in both Indigenous and Western understandings of landscapes. Managing the symbiosis of intangible and tangible heritage can be addressed by delivering education programs that target the links between place and its interpretation as a means of identifying cultural diversity, sustainable development, conservation and biodiversity. It is the recognition and negotiation of these interpretations, related to landscapes and place, that the new model targets and stimulates through a cross cultural place-based pedagogy, which teaches landscape partners to manage culture and nature as an integrated whole.

An outcome of the research is that the answers to the research questions are so intertwined as to consider answering them separately would be incongruous to the research findings, since they epitomize a holistic approach to management.
Consequently, I address both questions simultaneously by presenting Foundations and Guidelines that when combined, deliver a new approach to shared management of culture and nature within landscapes. To encourage easy access by institutions such as UNESCO, Australian governments and conservation organization the guidelines utilize both the Aboriginal terminology of Country and the Western terminologies of heritage, landscape and intangible-heritage. The new model’s policy and management guidelines are generally targeted at specific landscapes with similarities to the research case studies of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Purnululu National Park and Reserve and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. However, application of the new shared management model and its Foundations has the potential to be utilized more widely across a broad range of landscapes, where the management of culture and nature is shared between different cultural understandings. In relation to Australia there is a demonstrated plethora of bureaucratic organizational and departmental silos separately prioritizing either cultural or natural management over the same landscape. My proposal is to promote the creation of discrete federal, state and territory government units that consider heritage and the environment in an integrated manner. Overcoming specific discipline prejudice will be a challenge, however this may be addressed through continued research and appropriate training and mentoring.

The Project research presents a shared landscape model that integrates the management of culture and nature and potentially provides a sustainability platform for equitable cross-cultural negotiation, based on a more informed and accepting understanding of the multivalent interpretations of sense of place that exist within the landscape. It is my hope that to some degree the new shared landscape model provides a step toward reconciliation between Aboriginal and settler cultures within Australia and bridges the gap between their separate understanding of a sense of place in the Australian landscape.
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