

**Judith Powell**

## **Expanding Horizons: Environmental and Cultural Values within Natural Boundaries**

Indigenous communities have much to teach heritage professionals about the identification and management of cultural heritage values. A holistic approach to cultural heritage has long been promoted by indigenous communities: recent discussions in the professional heritage world about social and aesthetic value and debates about cultural landscapes all have precursors in indigenous concepts of cultural heritage.

Since 1992, a number of states in Australia have been engaged in regional assessments of the environmental, heritage, social, and economic values of forests. These assessments aim at providing expert advice upon which decisions about the future use of these forests will be made. The inclusion of cultural heritage assessments as part of the overall resource assessment is notable. Regional resource studies such as the regional forest agreement (RFA) process (incorporating assessments of natural, cultural, social, and economic values) provide an opportunity to adopt a more "holistic" approach to cultural heritage management. In this as in other matters, indigenous communities appear to be leading the way, with the development of catchment resource management models and co-management strategies. As part of the RFA process

in Southeast Queensland, two projects have identified principles and protocols concerning the management of cultural heritage values in the forests.

### **Natural and Cultural Values in Protected Area Management**

Many years before I had any involvement in heritage issues, I spent a week walking the 129-km White Peak Way within Peak National Park in the United Kingdom. The park, declared in 1951, was the first area of Britain to be designated a national park, and the White Peak Way traverses some of its most beautiful parts. It also, much to my astonishment, passes working farms and towns and settlements. Indeed, the walk is planned to allow walkers to spend each night in a Youth Hostel and the published guide to the walk includes a pub tour! This all came as a shock to someone

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

raised in Australia, for whom the concept of a national park involved "natural" and "untouched" landscapes with natural features and examples of vegetation being interpreted for those traversing park tracks. By contrast, the symbolic feature of the White Peak was the patchwork of styles in farm fences, the "chequerboard of light-grey drystone walls" (Haslam 1982, 8). Although nature is celebrated in Peak National Park, people have a place there: they live and work within the park and no one in the U.K. is surprised by this. The "landscape" of the Peak District is a cultural one and continues to be so.

Australia has one of the oldest national parks systems in the world: the Royal National Park near Sydney was declared in 1879 as a place of recreation and for nature conservation, and was modelled more on the British urban park system than the American Yellowstone model (Frawley 1989, 17). In 1880 in Queensland, a similar reservation of land occurred at Mount Coot-tha close to the capital city of Brisbane. In all parts of Australia, it was the forests that were first considered for reservation, either because they were considered suitable areas for health and recreation, or because concerns were felt at their impending disappearance. Today, although only 5% of Australia's land is still forested, forests and woodlands account for 25% of the country's na-

tional parks and conservation reserves (Young 1996, 84).

**Southeast Queensland's Forests**

For thousands of years, the forests and woodlands of Southeast Queensland have been the home of indigenous peoples. Subtle landscape changes are clearly demonstrable over time and include, in particular, those relating to the use of fire. Two distinctive vegetation types are patterned in the landscape, both as a result of fire management. Hardwood (mostly eucalypti) forests are interspersed with softwood (native pine) and rainforest "scrubs." Regular burning by indigenous people encouraged the former and reduced the extent of the latter. In the process, more open forests were created with grassy groundcover attractive to kangaroos and other game.

In particular areas, the forests and trees were the focus of religious activity. In the Bunya Mountains and Blackall Range to the north and northwest of modern Brisbane, triennial festivals attracted Aboriginal groups from throughout the Southeast. The massive bunya pine trees (*Araucaria bidwilli*) belonged individually to Aboriginal groups, and only members of that group could climb the trees to harvest the pine cones that were an important source of food and feasting at the time of these festivals.

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

When the surveyor John Oxley entered the Brisbane River in 1823 investigating potential sites for a new convict settlement, he commented favourably on the stands of hoop pine (*Araucaria cunninghamii*) lining the banks of the river. Timber, whether for building or export, was one of the earliest commodities exploited in the new settlement of Moreton Bay, and the search for timber supplies influenced early exploration and expansion from the settlement. Cedar cutters had already opened up areas along the coast between Sydney and Brisbane; Andrew Petrie reported on the stands of bunya pine found on his exploratory trips with Aborigines north of Brisbane to Fraser Island and the Mary River. All along the coastal strip timber was rafted and floated eastwards down rivers to the Pacific for shipment south to milling centres in Brisbane and Sydney; it can be argued that the decentralised nature of Queensland's settlement reflects in part this pattern of early timber transportation.

Forests and timber have had a profound effect on the development of Queensland, influencing settlement patterns, transportation networks, building styles and aesthetic sensibilities. At the same time Queenslanders, like settlers in other areas of Australia, had a profound antipathy to the forests, often seeing them as "wastelands." Settlers followed timber getters, attracted by what they as-

sumed (often incorrectly) were rich soils beneath these stands of timber (Figure 1). Clearing and ringbarking (i.e., girdling the trees to kill them) were government-sponsored policies aimed at "taming" the forests and making the land "useable" for introduced forms of pastoralism and agriculture, and this decimation soon far exceeded the extent of forest destruction associated with the extraction of timber. The wastage of timber was particularly extreme when distance from rivers and coasts made the movement of logs to milling centres uneconomical.

Two conflicting strands in government policy are clear in Queensland. On the one hand, regulations on timber cutting began as early as 1839, prohibitions on the cutting of bunya pine were declared in 1842, and timber land began to be reserved in the 1880s. A conference on forest conservancy was called in 1873 and reported to Parliament in 1875. On the other hand, the government actively pursued a policy of expanded land settlement and selectors on resumed land were required to undertake "improvement" such as clearing. The creation, in 1900, of a Forestry Branch within the Department of Public Lands underlines this conflict, that is, those charged with preserving and managing the forests were working within a department whose primary aim was the expansion of agri-

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

culture and settlement, often at the expense of those same forests.

In 1906, the State Forests and National Parks Act created a situation unique in Australia, whereby pro-



**Figure 1. Clearing for settlement.** (DPI Forestry Library G1)

ductive forests (state forests and timber reserves) were administered by the same organisation that administered national parks. By 1930, when the National Parks Association was founded by Romeo Lahey and other conservationists and bushwalkers, over 330,000 acres of national park had been declared in the state (Figure 2). The early parks movement in Australia and Queensland was influenced by issues of public health, recreation, and enjoyment, and was often eager to “improve” on nature in much the way that the acclimatisation societies aimed to improve the quality and variety of Australia’s fauna and flora through the importation of ex-

otic species. By the late 1950s and 1960s, however, the concept of biodiversity was becoming more widely understood, and it was now recognised that an important function of national parks should be to “reserve permanently typical examples of all the main environments, including the less scenic” (Annual Report of Director of Forests 1963-64, 15).

What role did people play in national parks and state forests? The principle of “multiple-use,” espoused since the 1930s, allowed for a range of activities besides timber harvesting within state forests, including grazing, bee-keeping, recreational pursuits such as horse-riding, and other ac-

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

tivities. Although there may have been little recognition, or conservation, of cultural heritage, people were a common part of the landscape. National parks, on the other hand, were seen to be places for “retreat,” where “the greatest charm ... lay in their primitiveness.... [A]ny development of the Parks should be based on the principle that they must be preserved as far as possible in that simplicity and unspoilt beauty that make them unique” (Anonymous 1969).

It is now widely recognised, of course, that this “unspoilt” quality so desired in national parks was never “untouched.” The work of Pyne (1997) and others has clearly shown

the extent to which the landscape of Australia was shaped by humans, in particular by the fire management regimes developed as part of Aboriginal land management. Fire exclusion, however, was the foresters’ creed, and not until the 1960s did prescribed burning regimes come to be widely practised. It has taken time for a recognition that the country has been managed in some form or another for thousands of years, and that therefore “passive management of fauna and flora results in a decline in the conservation values of parks and reserves” (Baker and Mutitjulu Community 1996, 65).

After their separation from the



**Figure 2.** Field naturalists club, McPherson Range, 1918. (*Environmental Protection Agency 11/28*)

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

Department of Public Lands in 1957, state forests and national parks were the responsibility of the Queensland Forest Service until 1975 when the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service was established. For the first time since 1906, national parks and state forests were managed by separate authorities. In the mid-1990s, the Forest Service underwent a series of changes leading to a situation whereby the Department of Primary Industries became responsible for the commercial aspects of forestry (plantations and native hardwood), and the Department of Natural Resources became responsible for the non-commercial aspects of state forests. Three government departments are now, therefore, responsible for the management of public forests.

The bureaucratic separation of aspects of forest management in many ways reflects concerns that a conflict of interest might exist if the managers of productive forests were also responsible for the management of national parks. It also reflects a desire to separate economic values of forests from the conservation or recreational values. If the conservation and production values of forests were seen as divergent, with the potential for conflict, it is interesting to consider where the cultural values of forests might fit.

**Cultural Landscapes**

By the 1960s, a conflict between natural and cultural values had re-

sulted from "the dominance of ecological criteria in the assessment of environmental values, and the broadening of our historical perception of landscape from isolated sites to whole cultural patterns" (Griffiths 1991, 17). Deep ecology and "wilderness" movements stressed the natural over the cultural and were, in one sense, "misanthropic" (Griffiths 1991, 18). The idea of "cultural landscape" protection, however, threatened to become the vehicle by which special-interest groups could seek to promote exploitative and destructive land management practices (Frawley 1989; Russell 1993).

Although the idea of cultural landscapes is not new (see, for example, Ross 1996; Taylor and Tallents 1996; Lennon 1997) and derives from a long tradition of historical geography, the idea that cultural landscapes should be considered as part of cultural heritage management is a relatively recent phenomenon. Just as taxonomy and taxidermy gave way to dioramas and finally to the idea of community museums, and the study of individual species gave way to the investigation of complex ecosystems, site-specific heritage concerns have given way to the current recognition of the broader "landscape" within which heritage values reside. Characteristically, disciplines undergo such expansions of definition as levels of complexity and inter-connections with related disciplines are un-

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

covered, and cultural heritage management is no different.

The World Heritage Committee adopted the concept of "cultural landscape" in 1992, and the Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop on Associative Cultural Landscapes (Australia 1995) "recognised that the consideration of properties of outstanding universal value needs to be contextual (recognising a place in its broader intellectual and physical context) rather than specific (as in the limited approach to viewing heritage solely as monuments or wilderness)" (ICOMOS 1995). Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park in the Northern Territory is now included on the World Heritage List for its associative cultural values, in addition to its prior listing for natural values. The cultural landscape work undertaken in the Wingecarribee Shire located between Sydney and Canberra is a model for the identification, assessment, and management of historic cultural landscapes (Taylor and Tallents 1996).

The argument over cultural landscapes is by no means at an end, however. As recently as 1988, the Australian National Parks Council carried a resolution to "increase the awareness of, and provide a united opposition to, the continuing campaign by organisations promoting cultural heritage issues to incorporate into National Parks activities incompatible with the conservation of natural values" (cited in Griffiths 1988, 30).

Given that many past settler activities within the landscape were exploitative or destructive (e.g., pastoral activity on marginal lands), maintenance of such practices in the name of preserving cultural landscapes is seen by many commentators as questionable (Frawley 1989)

**The National Forest Policy  
Statement, Ecologically  
Sustainable Forest Management,  
and the Montreal Process**

Forests are the subject of intense debate. In Australia, three-quarters of the forest estate is on public land, so any controversy over the use of the forests has powerful political dimensions.

In 1992, Australia endorsed a series of principles and objectives articulated at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. Agreements at this conference related to biodiversity, climate change, deforestation, and forest management, and the succeeding Montreal Agreement established criteria and indicators against which forest practices could be measured in order to determine the extent to which forests were managed in a sustainable way. The Commonwealth, states, and territories jointly signed the National Forest Policy Statement in 1992 and since then a series of RFAs have been initiated in Tasmania, Western Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, and

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

Queensland (Department of Natural Resources et al. 1998).

In 1998, a framework of regional-level criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management covering national parks, state forests, Crown leasehold, and freehold land was developed and agreed to by the states participating in the RFA process (Commonwealth of Australia 1998). Three sets of indicators (the first immediately reportable, the other two requiring further research and development) will be used to report on the implementation of a national approach to sustainable forest management. Of the 37 indicators, 20 relate broadly to issues of biodiversity, water catchments, or ecosystem health. Six indicators relate to timber production and forest products, seven relate to socioeconomic forest values, and three relate to cultural values. Although 10% may not appear a representative number, the recognition of cultural values in overall resource management and planning is a key component of the process; indeed the Commonwealth is keen to stress that indigenous issues in particular are paramount. The current native title debate is recognised as relevant to this process and there is a recognition that "native title issues need to be addressed in implementing management strategies" (Commonwealth of Australia 1998, xii).

As part of the RFA process, Comprehensive Regional Assessments

(CRAs) of environment, heritage, and socioeconomic issues (theoretically across all tenures) are meant to provide the framework for political decisions concerning the development of conservation reserves and the use of forests. Criticisms of the process certainly abound. According to the pre-eminent forest historian, John Dargavel, time constraints have severely limited the assessment process, indigenous rights have generally been ignored, and community consultation has been poor. Private land has been largely ignored in the process and the Montreal indicators on sustainability will be difficult to apply to freehold tenure. Finally, while the assessment process has been a visible one, the decision-making process, he argues, is "opaque" and prone to criticisms that decisions are the result not of scientific assessment but of political trade-offs (Dargavel 1998a, 28, 29).

Nonetheless, the RFAs constitute "the largest environmental planning and management endeavour in Australia" (Dargavel 1998b, 24). In environmental terms, the fact that cultural heritage has been incorporated in the identification and assessment phase is significant. Whereas historical data can be used to illustrate disturbance history and other forest processes (Lennon 1998, 40), the full range of interdisciplinary projects has not yet been fully realised. Still, for the first time in Queensland, natural and cultural values are being identified in



**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

a regional survey as part of the same process.

**Comprehensive Regional  
Assessment—Cultural Heritage**

The cultural heritage component of the CRA of Southeast Queensland comprised a series of reports, targeted field work, community workshops and consultation, and the development of a set of management guidelines and protocols to cover indigenous and non-indigenous cultural heritage values (Table 1).

The non-indigenous projects were undertaken by staff in the Department of Environment and Heritage, along with external consultants (Forest Assessment Unit 1998a and 1998b; Powell 1998; Kerr 1998). Field work

in Southeast Queensland identified over 800 historic cultural heritage sites, of which 76 were considered of potential National Estate (NE) significance. Community workshops identified 455 places of social value, of which 25 were of potential NE significance (Figure 3). The study of places of aesthetic value considered 163 places, of which 47 were considered of potential NE significance.

The indigenous projects were managed by the three native title representative bodies responsible for areas within Southeast Queensland—namely, FAIRA (Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research Action), Gurang Land Council, and Goolburri Land Council. Indigenous

**Table 1. Heritage values in the CRA of Southeast Queensland**

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indigenous Cultural Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data audit of known places of cultural heritage value in Southeast Queensland</li> <li>• Management guidelines</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Non-Indigenous Cultural Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background contextual studies: Overview Thematic History, Travel Routes, Forest Towns and Settlements, Sawmills and Tramways</li> <li>• Studies of potential National Estate (NE) significance: places of historic value, social value, or aesthetic value</li> <li>• Management guidelines</li> </ul> |

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**



**Figure 3. Community workshop, Bundaber.** (Environmental Protection Agency)

groups were not desirous to identify places for a variety of reasons, most notably because of concerns about confidentiality. Many of the sites of significance in Southeast Queensland are sacred and secret places and knowledge of them is retained by traditional communities. What limited archaeological survey work has been undertaken in the region has not always been done with appropriate authorisation from traditional owners and has usually been undertaken as part of the EIS (Environmental Impact Study) development process. Although communities are keen for cultural surveys to be undertaken,

they want to ensure that appropriate protocols are applied.

**Management Guidelines  
(Non-indigenous and Indigenous)**

The guidelines for the management of non-indigenous cultural heritage were developed by an independent consultant (Lennon and Associates 1998). A workshop of land managers from the three government departments responsible for forest management provided input. The conclusions of the process highlighted the need for:

- Further studies to identify cultural heritage places and make land-

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

- scape assessments;
- A co-ordinated approach to heritage management; and
  - Improved training of field staff in identification, assessment, and management of cultural heritage places.

**Table 2. Specific principles outlined by indigenous communities during workshops**

- Recognition of the holistic and evolving nature of Aboriginal cultural heritage and indigenous cultural landscapes.
- Preservation of native title rights.
- Acknowledgment of Aboriginal associations with forested land, whether that association is traditional or historic.
- Guaranteed access to places of cultural importance.
- Ongoing direct involvement in planning and management of forests across all tenures.
- Traditional stories, knowledge, and management practices influencing how the land and forest resources are cared for (because “clean water, fauna and flora, medicine plants and other resources are cultural resources”).
- Expansion of plantation forestry in preference to logging native forests, especially if this can be done on cleared or degraded lands where cultural heritage will not be damaged.
- Management of cultural heritage places “as part of the whole forest landscape, and the spiritual, social, and economic environment in which they exist.”
- Cultural surveys under the supervision and control of traditional owners.
- Identification and protection of cultural heritage of the forests, with surveys as part of long-term land use decision-making.
- Cultural clearances (i.e., approval by traditional owners) for development activity.
- Involvement of the appropriate people from an area in negotiation and management.
- Importance of forests in educating children and others about Aboriginal cultural heritage.
- Employment of Aboriginal people as part of this process.

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

Guidelines for the development of protocols and principles concerning the management of indigenous cultural heritage interests were also developed by an independent consultant (Sullivan and Associates 1998). A total of 34 formal and informal community workshops were held with indigenous communities throughout the biogeographic region and management protocols and principles were developed (Figure 4). Many of the issues raised by indigenous communities (Table 2) parallel those raised in the social values (non-indigenous) community workshops. Some of the views expressed by both communities correspond to developments at the theoretical level concerning cultural landscapes, social value and other broad cultural heritage issues.

Indigenous communities make no distinction between types of land tenure or the government department responsible for decision-making. Nor does flora or fauna. Forests rely on water; land and sea are indivisible. It makes no difference whether geographic or responsibility demarcations between government instrumentalities or agencies exist or not—indigenous communities see these as irrelevant. The boundaries that indigenous communities do recognise are geographic and natural; many of these have determined traditional land ownership or use.

It is easy to highlight differences in the approaches taken by indigenous and non-indigenous communities to cultural heritage issues. Indigenous communities are concerned with confidentiality and ownership issues regarding traditional knowledge, and with how to identify traditional owners and the “right” people with whom to negotiate. Non-indigenous communities are, in general, keen to identify sites and places and are less concerned with the release of such information.

Far more useful, however, is to recognise areas of similarity. There are many of these, reflecting perhaps the concerns of the broader community as regards heritage conservation.

- **The need for a broad definition of cultural heritage.** At the non-indigenous community workshops, people identified “heritage” in its broadest sense (it was considered to be about “lifestyle,” “leaving some of yesterday for tomorrow,” “past and present,” “education”). Similarly, indigenous people stressed the “holistic” nature of cultural heritage (it was considered to be about “land,” “stories and oral history,” “teaching children,” as well as sites).
- **Ownership issues.** Heritage is seen as belonging to people; it is not separate or static. Indigenous communities see heritage as living; non-indigenous communities also

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

see cultural heritage as an on-going process ("keeping alive the old skills"; Forest Assessment Unit 1998b, 183). Cultural heritage places often are best preserved through use—as the non-indigenous guidelines plead, "Don't turn it into a museum ... if it's a building use it, get some one to occupy it and care for it" (Lennon and Associates 1998, 42). Ownership and context are connected.

- **Recognition of both expert and community knowledge.** Expert and specialist knowledge is welcome, but not when it is imposed from outside or is out of touch with community perceptions. This is not to suggest that expert opinion cannot influence communities—indeed this happens commonly. But the relationship needs to be a negotiated partnership.
- **Co-ordination.** Communities seldom take into account artificial or governmental boundaries, even when they fully understand them! There is broad community support for better co-ordination between government departments and communities.
- **The need for community involvement in management and planning.** This is commonly stressed at all levels.

**Other Regional Models of  
Cultural Heritage Management**

One of the aspects of the RFA process in Queensland that appears to provide the most useful prospect for future planning and management of land is the interdisciplinary nature of the environment assessment (including both natural and cultural values) and the regional approach involving a range of government departments. In both these instances, however, there is much to be learned from indigenous communities. Two recent examples in Southeast Queensland show how indigenous communities can provide excellent lessons in the co-ordination of natural and cultural heritage management.

**Quandamooka.** The area known as Quandamooka includes Moreton Bay, the islands of the bay, and everything within it. Aboriginal people of Quandamooka have lived and managed the sea and land resources there since the beginning of time. To the people of Quandamooka, cultural heritage is "the sustainable use of the resources of the land and waters that make up Quandamooka.... An impact on one element of Quandamooka adversely affects other components of the system.... Given that the management of food resources is a significant element of Quandamooka heritage, cultural heritage management therefore requires conservation of the catchments of that resource" (Ross and Members of the

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**



**Figure 4. Indigenous workshop, Landsborough.** (Environmental Protection Agency)

Quandamooka Aboriginal Community 1996, 1, 5). In 1998, the Quandamooka Land Council established the Quandamooka Land and Sea Management Agency. The key objectives of this agency are: maintenance of a clean and healthy environment, recognition of the Quandamooka community as indigenous custodians in a modern world, and maintenance of a unique lifestyle (QLSMA 1998).

The agency takes what it calls a “bottom-up” approach to resource management, and promotes the concept of collaborative management of all resources within an integrated catchment area. The guiding principles upon which the agency operates are almost exactly the same as those enunciated by indigenous communities during the RFA process—namely, native title, connectedness, self-determination, evolving process, future generations, partici-

pation, common ground, unity of purpose, negotiation, expertise, social and economic development, living culture, and respect for others.

Currently, members of the Quandamooka community are involved in environmental monitoring programmes with the Brisbane River Management Group. These include water quality monitoring and assessing how water quality affects seagrass levels and therefore dugong numbers. Community members are involved in the identification of endangered freshwater and marine creatures.

**Fitzroy Basin.** At the other end of Southeast Queensland, similar moves are underway to develop organisations that can monitor the heritage of the Fitzroy River catchment.

Over the last few years, the Queensland Mining Council, the Australian Heritage Commission, and the Department of Environment and Heritage have jointly sponsored the in-

**Archaeology and the National Park Idea:  
Challenges for Management and Interpretation**

volvement of Aboriginal groups within the Bowen Basin area in the identification and protection of cultural heritage sites (Brown, Godwin, and Porter 1998). The Bowen Basin is rich in mineral products and numerous development projects are either underway or planned. Previous archaeological work in the area, undertaken as part of Environmental Impact Assessments, had solicited little or no involvement from Aboriginal communities. Since the advent of native title, there is "a legal basis, founded in both common and statutory law, for involving Aborigines above and beyond other interest groups (e.g., conservation groups) in the planning process" (Brown, Godwin, and Porter 1998, 400).

In 1997 an Aboriginal Steering Committee was established to undertake a range of tasks relating to cultural heritage work, and in the course of this work it became clear that "there was a real need for a strong body of elders to continue the regional dialogue with other resource users about resource management problems" (Gummoowongara Newsletter 1998). The Fitzroy Basin Elders Committee has been the result. Their concern is "to make sure that the land, the rivers and all of the natural and cultural resources of the Fitzroy Basin are managed properly for all future generations" (Gummoowongara Newsletter 1998). The priorities of the Aboriginal commu-

nities within the Fitzroy Basin are no different from those articulated by the people of Quandamooka, or by the communities involved in the RFA process. They include:

- Involvement in key regional planning activities;
- Protection of cultural heritage;
- Keeping the waters and the environment healthy;
- Responding better to new developments;
- Resolving native title conflicts; and
- Improving social and economic conditions for the community.

**Conclusions**

The RFA processes underway throughout Australia are a response to political controversy at the International, National, and Regional levels. Despite the difficulties of reaching agreed solutions to the problems of forest use, some of the processes undertaken along the way may provide positive models for future land and resource management.

Indigenous communities have a holistic view of their environment and do not separate cultural, environmental, social, or economic issues. In many different places and through a number of different processes, indigenous communities are articulating this view and attempting to work across what they see as artifi-

### Archaeology and the National Park Idea: Challenges for Management and Interpretation

cial boundaries. The adoption of a "catchment" or "natural boundary" approach to resource management is one that the broader professional community could usefully adopt.

A regional resource approach that recognises and welcomes community input is the one most likely to succeed. Whether state forest or national park, management that includes local people will safeguard the broad cultural heritage values within those boundaries. Conflict will never be entirely removed from the management of protected areas, and differing views will always exist on the balance between cultural and natural values, whether they be on the question of indigenous hunting in national parks (Ross 1994), the presence of historically significant pastoral activity (Frawley 1989; Griffiths 1991), or the presence of exotic vegetation as-

sociated with important past activities. But without community involvement, any such conflict will be exacerbated.

Cultural heritage is, itself, a cultural construct and as such it should come as no surprise that changing concepts of our heritage parallel changes in other aspects of society and culture. Multiculturalism, reconciliation, and native title are just as likely to influence our understanding of cultural heritage as concepts of ecology and biodiversity will influence our understanding of natural values. Cultural and natural heritage practitioners are learning to expand their horizons and are developing broader concepts of the interface between nature and culture. Indigenous and many non-indigenous communities already know this.

#### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank friends and colleagues within the Environmental Protection Agency whose ideas and discussions have assisted in the writing of this paper. In particular, I want to thank Shane Coghill and David Cameron (Forest Assessment Unit), Jeff Bedford (Ecologically Sustainable Forest Management Unit), Penny Cook, Mike Rowland and Stewart Armstrong (Cultural Heritage Branch). Thanks also to Jane Lennon, heritage consultant. The input of all these people was invaluable. Any deficiencies I claim as my own.

*[Ed. note: A modified version of this paper is being prepared by the author for publication in the International Journal of Heritage Studies.]*

#### References

- Anonymous. 1969. Some notes on the early history of national parks in Queensland. Forestry File 1A:NR, 1/33. N.p.
- Baker, Woenne-Green, and Mutitjulu Community. 1996 (first published 1992). The role of Aboriginal ecological knowledge in ecosystem management. Pp. 65-73 in *Aboriginal Involvement in Parks and Protected Areas*, Jim Birckhead et al., eds. Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Report Series. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.



## Archaeology and the National Park Idea: Challenges for Management and Interpretation

- Commonwealth of Australia. 1998. *A Framework of Regional (Sub-National) Level Criteria and Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management in Australia*. Canberra: Pirie Printers Pty Ltd.
- Dargavel, John. 1998a. Replanning the forests. *Australian Journal of Environmental Management* 5, 24.
- . 1998b. Politics, policy and process in the forests. *Australian Journal of Environmental Management* 5, 25-30.
- Department of Forestry. 1964. *Annual Report of the Department of Forestry for the Year 1963-64*. N.p.
- Department of Natural Resources et al. 1998. Background to assessment of Queensland's ecologically sustainable forest management systems and processes. N.p.
- Forest Assessment Unit, Department of Environment. 1998a. National Estate: Place documentation—Aesthetic, historic and social values, A report for the Joint Commonwealth and Queensland RFA Steering Committee. Brisbane: Queensland Department of Environment.
- . 1998b. National Estate: Social values, A report for the Joint Commonwealth and Queensland RFA Steering Committee. Brisbane: Queensland Department of Environment.
- Frawley, Kevin J. 1989. 'Cultural landscapes' and national parks: Philosophical and planning issues. *Australian Parks and Recreation* 25(3), 16-23.
- Griffiths, Tom. 1991. History and natural history: Conservation movements in conflict. Pp. 16-32 in *Packaging the Past? Public Histories*. John Richard and Peter Spearritt, eds. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Gummoowongara Newsletter. 1998. *Gummoowongara Newsletter One Waater (One People)*, November.
- Haslam, Robert. 1982, *The White Peak Way: An 80 Mile Circular Walk in the Peak National Park*. Cumbria, U.K.: Cicerone Press.
- Kerr, J. 1998. Forest industry heritage places study: Sawmills and tramways, South East Queensland. A report for the Queensland Department of Environment. Brisbane: Queensland Department of Environment.
- L'Oste-Brown, Scott, Luke Godwin, and Carl Porter. 1998. *Towards an Indigenous Social and Cultural Landscape in the Bowen Basin*. Bowen Basin Aboriginal cultural heritage project, Cultural Heritage Monograph Series Vol. 2. Brisbane: Queensland Department of Environment.
- Lennon, Jane. 1997. *Case Study of the Cultural Landscapes of the Central Victorian Goldfields, Australia*. State of the Environment Technical Paper Series (Natural and Cultural Heritage). N.p.: Central Queensland University Publishing Unit, Commonwealth of Australia.
- . 1998. History, cultural heritage and the regional forest assessment process. *Australian Journal of Environmental Management* 5, 38-46.
- Lennon, Jane, and Associates. 1998. Protecting cultural heritage values and places in South East Queensland forests. A report for the Joint Commonwealth and Queensland RFA Steering Committee. N.p.
- Lennon, J., and M. Townley. 1998. National Estate: Aesthetic values. A report for the Joint Commonwealth and Queensland RFA Steering Committee. N.p.
- Powell, J. 1998. People and trees: A thematic history of South East Queensland with particular reference to forested areas, 1823-1997. A report for the Joint Commonwealth and Queensland RFA Steering Committee. N.p.
- Pyne, Stephen. 1997. Frontiers of fire. Pp. 19-34 in *Ecology and Empire: Environmental History of Settler Societies*, Tom Griffiths and Libby Robin, eds. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- QLSMA [Quandamooka Land and Sea Management Agency]. 1998. Brisbane River and Moreton Bay wastewater management study: Indigenous consultation program, a response. N.p.: QLSMA.
- Ross, Anne. 1994. Traditional hunting in national parks and the cultural heritage paradigm. *Ngulaig* 11, 1-19.
- . 1996. Landscape as heritage. *Tempus* 5, 9-17.
- Ross, Anne, and Quandamooka Aboriginal Land Council. 1996. Aboriginal approaches to cultural heritage management: A Quandamooka case study. *Tempus* 6, 107-112.
- Russell, Jim. 1993. Challenging history: An environmental perspective. *Public History Review* 2, 35-53.
- . 1997. Towards more inclusive, vital models of heritage: An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 3(2), 71-80.
- Sullivan, Kate, and Associates. 1998. RFA Cultural heritage project: Guiding principles for forest management for FAIRA, Gurang and Goolburri Land Councils. A report for the Joint Commonwealth and Queensland RFA Steering Committee. N.p.
- Taylor, Ken, and Carolyn Tallents. 1996. Cultural landscape protection in Australia: The Wingecarribee Shire Study. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 2(3), 133-144.
- UNESCO. 1995. The Asia-Pacific regional workshop on associative cultural landscapes. A report by Australia ICOMOS to the World Heritage Committee, 27-29 April. Web site: <<http://www.unesco.org/whc/archive/cullan95.htm>>.
- Young, Ann R.M. 1996. *Environmental Change in Australia Since 1788*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

**Judith Powell**, Biodiversity Planning Unit (Cultural Heritage), Environmental Protection Agency–Queensland, 160 Ann Street, Brisbane, Albert Street, Queensland 4002, Australia; [Judith.Powell@env.qld.gov.au](mailto:Judith.Powell@env.qld.gov.au)