Landscaping heritage: toward an operational cultural landscape approach for protected areas in New South Wales

STEVE BROWN

Eventually everything connects – the people, ideas, objects, etc ... the quality of the connections is the key to quality per se (Neuhart, Neuhart and Eames 1989:266).

This statement of design philosophy by American designers Charles and Ray Eames is relevant to current issues in the conceptualisation of historic heritage and the management of protected areas in New South Wales. Despite considerable Australian and international literature promoting the idea of cultural landscape as a management category, historic heritage within the NSW reserve system continues to focus on objects, sites and places rather than on broader landscapes. Consequently, historic heritage is often viewed as separate to, and disconnected from, nature and biodiversity conservation, as well as Aboriginal cultural heritage.

The paper will map out the initial work of a project being undertaken by the Department of Environment and Climate Change (NSW). At its heart, the project seeks to understand the context of historic heritage management within the NSW reserve system and to develop a cultural landscape-based conceptual framework for historic heritage conservation that sees all landscape as historic. Such a conceptual change is required if the integrity and 'legibility' of the material record contained within reserve landscapes is to be conserved.

INTRODUCTION

A cultural landscape perspective explicitly recognises the history of a place and its cultural traditions in addition to its ecological value … A landscape perspective also recognises the continuity between the past and with people living and working on the land today. (Mitchell and Buggy 2001:45)

This paper explores some of the extensive literature available on cultural landscape and on cultural heritage management, within which pre-contact and historical archaeology are situated. The first part of the paper examines the concept of a cultural landscape—what is it and what does it cover? The second part of the paper looks at the applications of cultural landscape concepts to heritage management and how they might be usefully applied to the management of the NSW conservation reserve system.[1]

The separation of natural from cultural heritage management, and in turn Aboriginal from historic heritage management, has deep roots in Australian heritage practice (Byrne 2002:136; Harrison 2004:3–4). The divisions continue to be reflected in legislation and Australian government structures (Johnston 2006:9). In this paper I am concerned primarily with historic heritage, a term I take to be inclusive of all aspects of human interaction with the environment after the arrival of non-indigenous people into Australia, in NSW this is from 1788. It includes the histories, archaeologies and attachments of Aboriginal and settler Australians.

A cultural landscape approach has application to the NSW protected area system because it can contribute to 'maintaining the legibility of the past in the landscape' (Fairclough 2006:62). Historical archaeology has the potential to contribute a great deal to this endeavour but must be prepared to encompass a broad view of landscape. In this paper I will argue that to do this, the discipline must widen its focus from understanding the past and the conservation management of fabric and place to actively contributing to the management of present and future landscape-scale change.

SITE-BASED APPROACHES

It is the landscapes themselves that ought to be considered heritage, rather than discrete and dispersed 'sites' within them. (Byrne and Nugent 2004:73)

Cultural heritage management has predominantly conceptualised cultural heritage as spatially discrete sites or objects. Heritage items, in this model, are thus recognised as the material traces of history (archaeology), comprising, for example, the homestead (usually with its associated garden), the whaling station, the stockyard, the bridge, the stamper battery, the timber mill or the scarred tree.

Archaeologists generally adopt a site-based approach in the identification of the material traces of history. Working within what are often extensive arrays of historically connected traces, they choose to record only discrete traces and concentrations within these. Legislation and the archaeological paradigm that underpins cultural heritage management and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), as well as heritage registers based on point-data, all serve to reinforce this approach.

That is, a site-based approach is an 'easy' concept for land managers, heritage practitioners and archaeologists, partly because it supports the separation of the natural and cultural for research and management purposes. It effects this separation by treating heritage as items contained within the natural environment rather than as traces of historical behaviour that have helped constitute the 'natural' environment.

A cultural landscape approach offers an opportunity to move away from a focus on objects and sites as ends in themselves, toward managing the material record in its

historical and broader landscape context. The approach also offers opportunities to better integrate natural and cultural heritage conservation.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE: ORIGINS

In *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes 1992–2002*, Peter Fowler notes:

> The conceptual origins of the term, but not the actual phrase, lie in the writings of German historians and French geographers in the mid/later 19th century. 'Cultural landscape' as a term … and a particular idea it embraced, were promoted by Professor Carl Sauer and the Berkeley School of human geographers in the USA in the 1920s and '30s. (Fowler 2003:18)[2]

In 1925, Carl Sauer introduced the term 'cultural landscape' in an essay on *The Morphology of Landscape* (Sauer 1925), believing that a cultural landscape gave expression to the ways of life in a place. He stated, 'the cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result' (Sauer 1925).

In discussing Sauer's work, Rodney Harrison observed that:

> … humans, through the medium of culture, were active agents of environmental transformation. This contrasted with the era's dominant view that humans were entirely the product of their environment. (Harrison 2004:10)

Winchester, Kong and Dunn (2003:15–22) critique the Berkeley School geographers (notably Carl Sauer) on three grounds. Firstly, in moving beyond environmental determinism, and by foregrounding the role of culture, it may be said that cultural determinism replaced environmental determinism. Secondly, the approach continued an empiricist fixation with the physical aspects of culture and the cataloguing of landscape artefacts, a fixation that Duncan (1990:11) describes as 'object fetishism'. Finally, they observe that 'old cultural geography' operated with too limited a definition of what constituted a cultural group.

Sauer's claim that 'the cultural landscape is fashioned out of a natural landscape' (Sauer 1925) exemplifies an 'explicit' perspective on landscape – distinguishing between the natural and the human or social dimensions of landscapes (Johnston 1998:57–60). More recently, landscape has been viewed as 'an entity that exists by virtue of its being perceived, experienced, and contextualised by people' (Knapp and Ashmore 1999:1).

> As opposed to the 'explicit' approach, this view has been termed 'inherent', because the people inhabiting and experiencing the landscape no longer stand outside it … they are just as much part of the landscape they live in as are the so-called 'natural' features (Johnston 1998:61–4) … an inherent approach refuses to think of landscape as a mere background of human action … In this perspective, the unity of natural and cultural features is emphasised and attention is focused on the ways in which a particular landscape has taken shape, which elements are significant in it, and which meanings and implications it contains for its inhabitants (cf. Coones 1992). (van Dommelen 1999:277–278)

'Newer' cultural geographies, emerging since the late 1980s (Cosgrove and Jackson 1987), have sought to investigate the multiplicity of meanings in the cultural landscape, the socially constructed nature of culture and the contested nature of landscape interpretation. A consequence of viewing culture as a dynamic 'way of life' is that cultural landscapes have been conceptualised as a process (Stratford 1999:5) in which everyday landscape features are used to reconstruct culture and identity.

In many ways, these changing geographical approaches were paralleled in archaeology: from a focus on the construction of cultural groups (1920s–1950s); to processual (New Archaeology) approaches (1960s–1970s); followed from the late 1980s by post-processual forms of archaeological theory based on a critique of positivist science. Theoretical developments in both geography and archaeology, it may be noted, relate more broadly to the 1980s climate of postmodern thought.

An important influence on the study of landscape has been the rise of cultural studies in Britain in the 1960s/70s as a cross-disciplinary research movement (Hall 1990:11–17). Cultural studies had as its initial empirical focus the ordinary and everyday. Within archaeology there has been a similar shift in landscape studies, a shift away from monuments and a growing attention to vernacular and non-monumental landscapes (van Dommelen 1999:284). This has led to the generally accepted view that every landscape has cultural meaning, no matter how ordinary it appears. In the words of Peter Fowler,

> Something will have happened there previously – in some sense there will be a history – and evidence of the 'something' may well be detectable, in the plant life quite as much as in archaeological evidence or documentation. (2003:56)

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE: MEANINGS

Landscapes are formed by natural systems and shaped by history and culture. The term 'cultural landscape' is most frequently utilised within the fields of human geography, anthropology and archaeology. A vast array of language has arisen in the area of landscape studies. Gosden and Head observed that:

> Landscape is a term which both invites and defies definition … it is the very fullness and ambiguity of the concept of landscape that makes it so useful and helps span the gaps that might otherwise exist between a number of disciplines. (1994:113–116)

The literature on cultural landscape emphasises the dynamic and evolving nature of human relationships and interactions with the environment, acting as a conceptual bridge between culture and nature, between tangible and intangible heritage, and across space and time. The concept emphasises the landscape-scale of history and the connectivity between people, places and heritage items. It recognises that the present landscape is the product of long-term and complex (inter)relationships between people and the environment.

While the meanings and uses of the terms 'landscape' and 'cultural landscape' are varied, they offer rich conceptual tools with which to recognise, understand and interpret our world and our ideas about heritage, including through archaeology. For the purposes of this paper, cultural landscapes are defined as:

> … those areas which clearly represent or reflect the patterns of settlement or use of the landscape over a long time, as well as the evolution of cultural values, norms and attitudes toward the land. (Context et al. 2002:9)

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE: PRINCIPLES

The application of a cultural landscape approach to the management of the NSW conservation reserve system might

usefully be based on a number of general principles. These include the following:

1. Landscape is a product of change, of dynamic patterns and evolving inter-relationships between past ecosystems, history and cultures.

2. The interactions between people and landscape are complex, multi-layered and are distinctive to each space and time.

   Distinctiveness is therefore a feature of the cultural landscapes of each conservation reserve, that is, each reserve should be understood for its own values and not necessarily by comparison with, and assessed against, other locations.

3. Multiple engagement and dialogue, where all peoples' values are noticed and respected, are characteristic of a cultural landscape mentality (Fairclough 2002a:3).

4. There is no part of Australia that does not have community connection and associated values and meanings.

   In order therefore to understand and document community connection and associated values and meanings, it is necessary to build relationships between conservation reserve managers and communities.

5. A key part of understanding cultural landscapes is through the continuity of past and present.

The general acceptance of these and/or other similar principles is central to, and will underpin, an operational approach to recognising, documenting and managing cultural landscapes for the NSW conservation reserve system.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE: ISSUES

Three issues related to the concept of cultural landscape are briefly considered here, the culture-nature binary, power and privilege, and boundaries.

Cultural and Natural: Separate yet Indivisible

All landscapes are cultural and even nature conservation is a cultural task. (Fowler 2003:81)

Our understanding of the history of human-environmental interactions is made problematic by definitions of landscape that try to distinguish between the cultural and the natural (Harrison 2004:12–13). The discourse surrounding the concept of 'wilderness' highlights this issue (Nash 1973; Valenti 1996; Rose 1996). As noted earlier, site-based approaches reinforce notions of culture and nature as spatially separate, and as they are separate can be managed independently. A cultural landscape approach offers ways of breaking down the division between the natural and the cultural as a way of seeing, interpreting and understanding the world, seeking to replace these with more complex and holistic meanings. Two approaches that serve to emphasise the indivisibility of nature and culture are environmental history and the 'living landscape' approach.

Environmental/ecological historical approaches support a holistic view of landscape, maintaining as they do that cultural and natural resources are closely related (Louter 2004:22). Historical ecology (Crumley 1994) or a landscape history approach (Tilley 1994; Ashmore and Knapp 1999), examines the 'past relationships between groups of people and their environments' (Lozny 2006:15) and is relevant to the way in which human-environmental interactions are constructed and interpreted. For example, the history of the introduction of exotic species into and across Australia, a legacy largely of European colonialism and expansion, can be viewed as one of the great ecological shifts of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The World Heritage concept of 'living landscapes' recognises past and future evolution of the landscape and interactions between humankind and the environment. This concept (also called 'lived-in landscapes') is relevant in the United Kingdom, France and the United States, for example, where landscape conservation is undertaken in part to accommodate change, while retaining landscape character, cultural traditions and landscape viability (Barrett and Taylor 2007; Brown, Mitchell and Tuxill 2003). Forestry and ranching are examples of cultural traditions accommodated within lived-in landscapes and stewardship approaches applied in the United States.

In NSW, most conservation reserves declared after the introduction of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act* in 1967 resulted in the permanent departure of past owners and workers, to some 'landscapes of loss', because of the primacy given to a particular construction of nature conservation, which required the exclusion of permanent human inhabitants. Even as 'non-lived in landscapes' in the physical sense (though not in the imaginations of those people with historical or custodial association), these conservation landscapes continue to reflect the cultural landscape imprint of a biodiversity conservation management regime (including ongoing activities around fire, pest species and weed management and revegetation).

Power and Privilege

Power and domination it entails is multivalent, ranging from open command and authority, to veiled control via persuasive strategies, that is, the exercise of hegemony … Power may be exercised by a range of groups, from states to capital to social groups such as gender, racial and religious groups. The role of landscapes is frequently integral to the exercise of power. (Winchester, Kong and Dunn 2003:66)

For the purposes of heritage management, a cultural landscape approach should seek to recognise and value all associations and meanings, both individual and collective. A challenge for a cultural landscape approach is to create spaces in which complex and conflicting meanings can be revealed and where different readings of the landscape are valued. The exercise of power can be an issue in the management of cultural landscapes, where meanings, histories and recent time (the remembered or familiar past) are privileged. That is, landscapes have the capacity to legitimise the powerful by affirming dominant ideologies.

The landscape or spatial histories of segregated Aboriginal reserves and Aboriginal housing in colonial Australia is an example of the use of power and privilege to impose a hierarchy of race (Goodall 1996; Heppell 1979). Laurajane Smith has explored how the practices and values of archaeology, through cultural heritage management, have been 'mobilised by public policy makers to help them 'govern' or regulate the expression of social and cultural identity' (Smith 2004:2). Examples of Australian studies that use historical archaeological methods to examine issues around power and privilege include Heather Burke's study on the concept of ideology and implicitly power, in the production of the physical and social landscape of the New England city of Armidale in NSW (Burke 1999) and Graham Connah's investigations of privilege and servitude at Lake Innes Estate (Connah 2001, 2007).

Extent and Boundaries

… unlike monuments and sites, landscape has no edges or boundaries. (Fairclough 2006:61)

A recurring issue in regard to cultural landscapes has been their extent and boundaries. A cultural landscape, unlike a single monument, is likely to cover a large physical area and may have multiple owners or stakeholders (Olivier 2003:101). However, some monuments do have multiple owners/stakeholders, for example, the convict-built Great North Road between Sydney and Newcastle, and therefore size and scale is the issue.

Cultural landscape does not equate to curtilage, as applied to historic sites (e.g. Pearson 2001:282). A better concept for defining extent may be setting, where setting of an area is defined as 'the immediate and extended environment that is part of, or contributes to, its significance and distinctive character' (ICOMOS 2005). The setting of heritage structures, sites and areas is the subject of the ICOMOS Xi'an Declaration. The document states that:

> … the setting includes interaction with the natural environment; past and present social or spiritual practices, customs, traditional knowledge, use or activities and other forms of intangible cultural heritage aspects that created and form the space as well as the current and dynamic cultural, social and economic context. (ICOMOS 2005)

The Declaration stresses the importance of planning tools in managing settings, including the use of assessment and monitoring mechanisms as well as the involvement of the different communities concerned.

In the case of conservation reserves in NSW, I would argue that cultural landscape boundaries are not a particular issue. From a pragmatic viewpoint, the 'edge' of the cultural landscape is the reserve boundary, though in some cases a cultural landscape may be a bounded area within a single reserve (Dean-Jones 2007). However, as stated earlier, the connection between landscape and history within reserves and the large scale mosaics of lands/seas outside of the reserve boundaries ('setting') needs to be considered in documenting artificially bounded cultural landscapes.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE APPROACHES

> Landscapes are not passive; they are actively involved in negotiating, and being negotiated by, the course of human histories (Gosden 1994). Landscapes are also contested spaces (Bender and Winer 2001), where conflict occurs over different understandings of place, and where maps and embodied experiences tell different spatial stories (de Certeau 1984). For this reason landscapes are … an important conceptual tool in the analysis of the relationship between people and places … (Harrison 2004:13)

Rodney Harrison's (2004) study of the archaeologies of attachment and the pastoral industry in NSW illustrates the landscape-scale of the relationships between past and present people, place and environment. Landscape and cultural landscape as conceptual tools have been widely used in archaeological research (Ashmore and Knapp 1999). However, seldom has the concept of cultural landscape been applied to cultural heritage management in an operational way, that is, for managing heritage rather than as a tool for heritage listing.

In general, different agencies utilise different approaches when applying cultural landscape concepts to heritage management. These approaches tend to reflect the specific operational contexts of the agencies. I will briefly touch on three such contexts.

Cultural Landscape: World Heritage Context

In December 1992, the World Heritage Committee recognised 'cultural landscapes' as a category of site within the 1972 World Heritage Convention's Operational Guidelines. It adopted three categories of World Heritage cultural landscapes: clearly defined, organically evolved (relict or continuing) and associative. In reality, most cultural landscapes have elements of each of the three categories and their separation becomes somewhat artificial.[3]

The specific context within which the World Heritage Committee applies the concept of cultural landscape is for the purposes of describing values and listing places on the World Heritage List. The concept is not applied to landscape management. However, even the application of the cultural landscape concept to the inscription of World Heritage sites has not in fact been fully realised. Firstly, the term is used narrowly and in practice is used by the World Heritage Committee to mean 'rural landscape' (Fowler 2003:57). Secondly, as a result of ambiguity in the administrative process of inscription of World Heritage cultural landscapes (Fowler 2003:45), there remains a conceptual polarisation of heritage places as either cultural or natural, with the advisory bodies themselves focussed accordingly (i.e. cultural ICOMOS, ICCROM; or natural IUCN).

Cultural Landscape: US National Park Service Context

> A cultural landscape is a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with an historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. (National Park Service 1998)

The evolution of cultural landscape preservation in the United States is outlined in Slaiby and Mitchell (2003:8–9) and Webb (1987). In 1988, landscapes were formally identified as a type of cultural resource in National Park Service (NPS) *Management Policies*, and with this a policy was developed to recognise and protect landscapes with significant historic, design, archaeological and ethnographic values. In 1994, the NPS expanded the Cultural Resource Management Guidelines, NPS–28, to include procedural guidance for managing cultural landscapes within the national park system. The typology currently used by the NPS for cultural landscapes comprises: historic site, historic designed landscape, historic vernacular landscape and ethnographic landscape.[4] These categories, though similar to World Heritage cultural landscape categories, are more easily separated as management categories. Again, there can be considerable overlap between NPS categories within any one landscape.

One might ask whether there is a need to categorise cultural landscapes at all, particularly in the context of the NSW conservation reserve system, where most landscapes will be simultaneously 'historic vernacular landscape' and 'ethnographic landscape'.

To assist managers of parks and historic properties in protecting and preserving their cultural landscape, the NPS established the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation in 1992. The Center works in partnership with national parks, universities, government agencies and non-profit organisations to provide technical assistance in cultural landscape research (e.g. Page, Gilbert and Dolan 1998), planning, stewardship and education. In 1998, the Conservation Study Institute (CSI) was established by the NPS to help the agency and its partners stay in touch with the evolving field of conservation and to develop more sophisticated partnerships and new tools and strategies. The CSI has produced a hand-

book for managers of landscapes with important natural values (Slaiby and Mitchell 2003). However, both the Olmsted Center and the CSI must work within a framework that still separates natural and cultural and it is hard to see how this division might be broken down.

Cultural Landscape: United Kingdom Contexts

Conservation effort in the UK has generally focussed on lived-in landscapes. The UK has more than half a century of experience of IUCN Category V protected areas and includes some of the best examples of lived-in landscapes where there is a strong social bias in planning and management.[5] These areas are characterised by the fact that most land is privately owned and 'traditional' farming is dominant. They are important for their traditional, less intensive land use patterns, biodiversity, history and archaeology, cultural significance and recreation (Phillips and Partington 2005; Barrett and Taylor 2007).

While the statutory purposes of English National Parks are conservation of natural and cultural heritage and the promotion of public understanding and enjoyment, the purposes of Scottish Parks, created in 2003, also include the promotion of sustainable social and economic development of the area's communities. Challenges therefore lie in achieving conservation action that is fully integrated with aspects of environmental, social and economic endeavour.

Since 1994, English Heritage, the national agency for protecting and promoting the historic environment of England, has been carrying out a program of historic landscape characterisation (HLC) throughout England, in partnership with individual county councils. HLC is a GIS map-based technique designed to produce a generalised understanding of the historic and archaeological dimension of the present-day landscape. A number of precepts guide the work. First, the whole landscape is historic, reflecting complex inter-relationships between people and the environment. Secondly, HLC assumes that the historic landscape is the product of change, an artefact of past land-use, social structures and political decisions (Fairclough, Lambrick and Hopkins 2002:69). Consequently, archaeologists have a role in landscape planning in England by applying skill-sets in documenting processes of change in the past to the study of current and future landscape change (Fairclough 2006).

Cultural Landscapes: Australia

Lennon (2005:29–34) outlined the early evolution of the cultural landscape concept in Australia. Australia ICOMOS hosted two conferences on the topic of cultural landscapes: in 1988 at Lanyon Homestead, ACT (*Historic Environment*, 1989, 7(2)) and in 1996 at Robertson, NSW (*Historic Environment* 1997, 13(3/4)).

The 1988 ICOMOS seminar examined the definitions and assessment of cultural landscapes, presented case studies and discussed methodologies. A feature of the meeting was its 'stress upon the need to bring a diversity of disciplines to bear on any true assessment of a cultural landscape' (Mulvaney 1989:2).

The 1996 conference 'was convened to reflect on the growth of interest in and methodological difficulties encountered with cultural landscape conservation, since … 1988' (Lennon 1997:3). The conference was largely a series of papers on work in progress with regard to applied approaches to cultural landscape, as well as issues in the application of the concept.

In many ways, there has been little take-up and application of the concept of cultural landscape in Australian cultural and natural heritage management since the 1996 conference (e.g. Coleman 2003). In the words of a recent State of the Environment report:

> While there has been increasing recognition of the cultural landscape concept as a tool for integrating and managing all heritage interests in a place, there are a variety of definitions in use across Australia in some local government planning scheme overlays and in public land plans of management, but there has been **very little actual on-ground management** (author's emphasis). (Lennon 2006)

The Port Arthur Historic Site Landscape Plan is a rare example of an application of a cultural landscape approach within Australia (Context et al. 2002). In terms of archaeological investigations there are a number of studies undertaken within a landscape context. These include, among others, Heather Burke's study of ideology (Burke 1999), Mary Casey's investigations of the Sydney Domain (Casey 2002, 2006), Rodney Harrison's and Alistair Paterson's examinations of pastoral landscapes (Harrison 2004; Paterson 2005, 2006), Michael Pearson's work in the Tinderry Ranges, NSW (Pearson 2001) and the work of the Bowen Basin Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Project (L'Oste-Brown, Godwin and Porter 1998). However, opportunities exist to further develop and implement cultural landscape approaches to the management of conservation reserves across Australasia.

Cultural Landscape: NSW Conservation Reserve Context

The idea of cultural landscapes as a conceptual tool for managing conservation reserves emerged within the New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) after about 1995. Despite a call for policy (Nethery 1996), possibly based on the application of a US National Park Service landscape character approach, as well as the preparation of cultural landscape management guidelines for the Australian Alps parks (Lennon and Mathews 1996), there was no take-up of the concept. More recently the NPWS 2000–2003 Corporate Plan re-invigorated the call for landscape conservation. For cultural heritage this meant a holistic approach that sought to integrate Aboriginal, historic and natural values of landscapes and to ensure the inclusion of social significance alongside archaeological, historical and architectural values (Byrne, Brayshaw and Ireland 2001) with regard to on-park heritage identification, assessment and management.

Research within the agency promoted such an approach, along with attempts to integrate cultural and natural landscape conservation through continued development of models for, and linkages between, the themes of history, the social, landscapes and culture-nature (NPWS 2002; DECC 2007). The research indicated that a cultural landscape framework suited to the NSW conservation reserve system might include:

- Understanding history (including shared history), and larger patterns of land use at a whole-of-landscape scale. That is, understanding the history represented in reserve landscapes within local, State and national contexts. For example, the documentation and analysis of the meta-landscapes of grazing (Harrison 2004) and recreation (Kijas 2006), linking places within and outside of the conservation reserve system.

- Documenting the histories of communities that have historic and contemporary attachments to the cultural landscapes of the NSW conservation reserves. This requires an understanding of the mobility of people across landscapes, the way in which people, places and land-

scapes are connected and the ways people have formed attachments to landscape (Veale 2001).

- An emphasis on the spatial aspects of cultural landscapes, including spatial patterns or connectivity that can be mapped (Byrne and Nugent 2004).

The adoption of a cultural landscape concept in reserve management has a number of clear advantages. Firstly, the NSW reserve system comprises large areas of land (some 8% of NSW) distributed across the state. It provides a unique context for the management of heritage because the reserve system comprises broad landscapes not just individual sites. Secondly, the concept of 'whole-of-landscape' management is well understood within the nature conservation discourse, a dominant discourse for NSW reserve establishment and management. This provides an existing basis for connecting historic heritage landscape concepts to processes of broader natural heritage management.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE APPROACHES: IMPLICATIONS FOR HISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGY

> The cultural landscape is greater than the sum of its parts, and the inter-relationships between the parts can be significant. For this reason, the details matter – significant loss of integrity and meaning can occur through the attrition of many small elements. (Context et al. 2002:9)

I am conscious in this paper that I have been referring in broad terms to cultural landscapes, cultural heritage management and the need for new approaches, which implicitly include historical archaeology, yet I make limited specific reference to the latter. In this section, I would like to make a few comments on some of the likely implications for archaeological research, management and interpretation of cultural landscape approaches, and specifically in regard to conservation reserves/protected areas.

More than the Material Traces of History

> The beauty of cultural landscape methodology is that it allows for a continual accretion of meaning, as the stratigraphy of physical and symbolic landscapes grows with each new layer of documentation, analysis, evaluation, and design … as with any story, the deeper the excavation, the more enlightening, the more profound the tale becomes. (Horton 2004:180)

Archaeology is the study of past human cultures, behaviour and activity through recording and analysis of the material traces of history. Thus the building blocks of archaeological inquiry are traditionally recognised to be physical evidence and its context, and include humanly-induced landscape modifications. This means that the field database is more than stratified deposits and surface scatters, and includes buildings, whether lived-in or abandoned, industrial or other structures and works (Heritage Office et al. 1996). Cultural landscape approaches would require that this traditional view of archaeology should be made explicit with regard to at least two additional and interrelated elements, time and connection with present communities.

While there may be legislative timeframes used to determine what may or may not be an archaeological heritage item,[6] a cultural landscape approach recognises there is continuity between past and present. For conservation reserves today, this means that all works within a park that will have a physical impact will also have an archaeological dimension

and a cumulative effect on the archaeological record. Historical archaeologists have a choice here—either to act as passive recorders of these physical impacts or, as I am advocating, becoming active in the processes of negotiating and managing change.

A further consequence of recognising the continuity between past and present is acknowledging the connections between the remembered past and contemporary communities (as well as treating prehistory and history as part of a continuum). This means community archaeology, not only in the sense of involving people in archaeological research design, investigation and revealing layers of historical memory but also in exploring the ways in which 'traces of the past become memorialised and incorporated into people's contemporary social worlds' (Harrison 2004:16 drawing on Bradley 2002 and Bradley and Williams 1998).

Participation through Cultural Landscape Approaches

There is a need to bring a diversity of disciplines and multiple sources of information to bear on the identification, assessment, management and interpretation of a cultural landscape. Archaeology has always had an interdisciplinary bent, working closely with botanists and geomorphologists, for example, to understand environmental dimensions, with chemists and physicists to obtain dates and identify residues, or with historians, anthropologists and psychologists to document evolution and histories and understand human behaviour.

The centrality of spatial approaches and knowledge of space in archaeology also strengthens opportunities for archaeological engagement with cultural landscape discourses. Similarly, the ability of archaeologists to work at different spatial scales, from the microscopic to the global; and temporal scales, from specific time periods to spans of time; can play a significant role in contributing to understanding connections between objects, meanings, people and landscapes and to understanding processes of change.

Archaeologists are therefore well positioned to actively participate in the recognition, understanding and, in particular, the **contemporary management** of cultural landscapes. An example of this is the way in which some archaeologists in Europe have engaged with the European Landscape Convention—seeing the convention as offering 'a new, robust framework for bringing landscape and its archaeological aspects into the mainstream of European heritage and social policy' (Fairclough 2002b:25).

Graham Fairclough has argued that archaeologists can analyse the cultural landscape and explain its significance in ways that can inform and influence decision-making, such as local and regional planning policy, agriculture, housing location and infrastructure creation (Fairclough 2002a:10). My perception, which may be wrong, is that this does not happen effectively in Australia. That is to say, some archaeologists do provide data on the values of landscapes, though most are concerned with site-level values, but usually do not take an active role in influencing decision-making around landscape-scale planning in the sense described by Fairclough.

There are opportunities, therefore, as well as challenges, in the context of contemporary 'Strategic Government' (Gallop 2007) to draw archaeological perspectives into broader objectives of government action through cultural landscape concepts and approaches. I want to touch on these challenges by contrasting what I see as the situation in two different landscapes: the urban centre of Parramatta and high-mountain country of Kosciuszko National Park.

In the case of the cultural landscape of Parramatta, there

exists an innovative management tool, Parramatta Archaeological Landscape Management Study (PHALMS), for decision-making about the archaeological resource (Godden, Mackay Logan 2000). However, there appears to be challenges in moving from investigating and documenting the individual archaeological sites or precincts within Parramatta to actively connecting archaeological explanations of historical landscape change to contemporary urban planning. In contrast, the management of Kosciuszko National Park may be an example of a situation where historical archaeology has been part of a long-term active interdisciplinary dialogue for managing the landscape character of this part of the Australian Alps (Scougall 1992; Lennon and Mathews 1996; NPWS 2004; DEC 2006; Godden, Mackay Logan 2007).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The paper has explored the concept of cultural landscape and its application to heritage management, with particular reference to the NSW conservation reserve system. The paper has also touched on relationships with historical archaeology.

I have drawn a conclusion in this paper that different agencies use different approaches when applying cultural landscapes to heritage management—the approaches are context specific. Part of my ongoing work with the DECC will involve the development of a cultural landscape approach specific to the management of conservation reserves in NSW. A key issue in adopting such an approach for the agency is that of better integrating historic heritage management, including historical archaeology, into all aspects of reserve management.

The development of a preferred cultural landscape approach is being undertaken through case studies at three national parks: Yuraygir NP, a coastal area with a history of recreation; Washpool NP, a mountain area with a history of forestry and some mining; and Culgoa, a semi-arid area with a history of pastoralism. By looking at a broad range of environments and dominant historical themes represented in the reserves, it is hoped that a cultural landscape guideline document can be produced that is practical and can be integrated into the daily work life of park staff.

A challenge in this work will be to ensure that all archaeological aspects of cultural landscapes, including the material remains/contexts themselves and the contemporary community meanings, are effectively incorporated into the guideline document. A further challenge will lie in making historical archaeology relevant to the present and future of the 783 reserve landscapes in NSW through effective engagement with processes of change management.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

CHD	Culture and Heritage Division (DECC)
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation (NSW)
DECC	Department of Environment and Climate Change (NSW)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
GIS	Geographic Information System
HLC	Historic Landscape Characterisation (English Heritage)
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
IUCN	World Conservation Union
NP	National Park
NPS	National Park Service (USA)
NPWS	National Parks and Wildlife Service (NSW)
NSW	New South Wales
PHALMS	Parramatta Historical Archaeological Landscape Management Study
UK	United Kingdom

ENDNOTES

1. This paper is part of a wider research project currently being undertaken by the Research Section, Culture and Heritage Division, Department of Environment and Climate Change (NSW). The project is titled *Cultural Landscapes: Connecting History, Heritage and Reserve Management*. For information see: http://www.national parks.nsw.gov.au/npws.nsf/Content/cultural+landscapes+ project. The NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change (DECC) has state-wide responsibilities for biodiversity conservation and Aboriginal cultural heritage management through the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*. The agencies responsibility for non-indigenous post-contact heritage management is confined to that eight per cent of the state that lies within parks, reserves and botanic gardens.

2. Lennon (2005:24) notes that 'Cultural landscape has been a fundamental concept for geographers since its first use in Germany in the 1890s when Friedrich Ratzel defined *Kulturlandschaft* as an area modified by human activity as opposed to the primeval natural landscape. The German school emphasised the material aspects of culture like buildings still visible in the landscape rather than the non-material aspects like customs and traditions (Livingstone, 1992:264–7). At the same time the French school of *géographie humaine* inquired into how people, environment and life style determine the face of the countryside (Aitchison, 1995:266–7). Vidal de la Blanche acknowledged that different regions, *le pays*, have their own characteristics as a result of human influences'.

3. Knapp and Ashmore (1999) have taken the World Heritage cultural landscape categories a step further and, by emphasising the socio-symbolic dimensions of landscape, have developed interpretive descriptors to distinguish between them. They recognise three categories of cultural landscapes: constructed, conceptualised and ideational landscapes, though as with the World Heritage categories, recognise that landscape is essentially all of these things at all times.

4. Ethnographic landscape means 'a landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources. Examples are contemporary settlements, sacred religious sites, and massive geological structures. Small plant communities, animals, subsistence and ceremonial grounds are often components'. Generally, this meaning equates to the

associative cultural landscape category of the World Heritage Convention or places with social and spiritual value in Burra Charter terms.

5. 289,000 people lived in the UK's National Parks according to 2001 figures and many more in other Category V protected areas. IUCN Category V Protected Landscape/seascape refers to: area of land, with coast and seas as appropriate, where the interaction of people and nature over time has produced an area of distinct character with significant aesthetic, cultural and/or ecological value, and often with high biological diversity. Safeguarding the integrity is vital to the protection, maintenance and evolution of such an area.

6. Under the NSW *Heritage Act 1977* non-Aboriginal 'relics' must be more than 50 years old; and the *National Parks and Wildlife (Land Management) Regulation 1995* recognises that heritage places and landscapes more than 25 years old may have cultural heritage values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ASHMORE, W. and A.B. KNAPP (eds) 1999 *Archaeologies of landscape: contemporary perspectives*, Blackwell, Massachusetts, Oxford.

BARRETT, B. and M. TAYLOR 2007 'Three models for managing living landscapes', *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 4(2):50–65.

BENDER, B. and M. WINER (eds) 2001 *Contested landscapes: movement, exile and place*, Berg, Oxford and New York.

BRADLEY, R. 2002 *The past in prehistoric societies*, Routledge, London and New York.

BRADLEY, R. and H. WILLIAMS 1998 'The past in the past: the re-use of ancient monuments', *World Archaeology* 30(1):13-22.

BROWN, J., N. MITCHELL, and J. TUXILL 2003 'Partnerships and lived-in landscapes: an evolving US system of parks and protected areas', *Parks* 13(2):31–41.

BURKE, H. 1999 *Meaning and Ideology in Historical Archaeology: style, social identity and capitalism in an Australian town*, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.

BYRNE, D. 2002 'An archaeology of attachment: cultural heritage and the post-contact', in R. Harrison and C. Williamson (eds) *After Captain Cook: the archaeology of the recent indigenous past in Australia*, Sydney University Archaeological Methods Series, No. 8. University of Sydney, pp. 135–146.

BYRNE, D., H. BRAYSHAW and T. IRELAND 2001 *Social Significance: a discussion paper*, Cultural Heritage Division, NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, Hurstville.

BYRNE, D. and M. NUGENT 2004 *Mapping attachment: a spatial approach to Aboriginal post-contact heritage*, Department of Environment and Conservation (NSW), Hurstville.

CASEY, M. 2002 'Remaking the government domain 1788–1821: landscape, archaeology and meaning', doctoral thesis, Department of Prehistoric and Historic Archaeology, University of Sydney.

CASEY, M. 2006 'Remaking Britain: establishing British identity and power at Sydney Cove', 1788–1821, *Australasian Historical Archaeology* 24:87–98.

COLEMAN, V. 2003 *Cultural landscapes charette background paper*. Available at: http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/06_subnav_06_1.htm. Accessed October 2007.

CONNAH, G. 2001 'The Lake Innes Estate: privilege and servitude in nineteenth-century Australia', *World Archaeology* 33(1):137–154.

CONNAH, G. 2007 *The same under a different sky? A country estate in nineteenth-century New South Wales*, British Archaeological Reports International Series S1625, Oxford.

CONTEXT PTY LTD, URBAN INITIATIVES PTY LTD and H. DOYLE 2002 *Port Arthur historic site landscape management plan*, prepared for Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, Tasmania. Available at: http://www.portarthur.org.au/pashow.php?ACTION=Public&menu_code=500.475. Accessed October 2007.

COONES, P. 1992 'The unity of landscape', in L. MacInnes and C. Wickham-Jones (eds) *All natural things: archaeology and the green debate*, Oxbow Monographs, 21, Oxford: Oxbow books, pp. 22–40.

COSGROVE, D. and P. JACKSON 1987 'New directions in cultural geography', *Area* 19:95–101.

CRUMLEY, C.L. (ed.) 1994 *Historical ecology: cultural knowledge and changing landscapes*, School of American Research Press, Santa Fee, New Mexico.

DEAN-JONES, P. 2007 Washpool forests cultural landscapes: understanding cumulative landscape transformation in grazed and logged forests in north east NSW, unpublished report to the Department of Environment and Climate Change (NSW) by Umwelt (Australia) P/L, Toronto, NSW.

DE CERTEAU, M. 1984 *The practice of everyday life*, translated by S. Rendall, University of California Press, Berkeley.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE (NSW) 2007 Cultural Heritage Research Agenda 2006–2010, unpublished report by Culture and Heritage Division, Department of Environment and Climate Change (NSW), Hurstville.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION (NSW) 2006 *Kosciuszko National Park plan of management*, Department of Environment and Conservation (NSW), South Sydney.

DUNCAN, J.S. 1990 *The city as text: the politics of landscape interpretation in the Kandyan Kingdom*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

FAIRCLOUGH, G.J. 2002a 'Europe's landscape: archaeology, sustainability and agriculture', in G. Fairclough and S. Rippon (eds) *Europe's cultural landscape: archaeologists and the management of change*, Europae Archaeologiae Consilium Occasional Paper 2, Belgium, pp. 1–12.

FAIRCLOUGH, G.J. 2002b 'Archaeologists and the European Landscape Convention', in G.J. Fairclough and S. Rippon (eds) *Europe's cultural landscape: archaeologists and the management of change*, Europae Archaeologiae Consilium, Occasional Paper 2, Belgium, pp. 25–37. Available at: http://www.pcl-eu.de/project/virt_lib/index.php. Accessed October 2007.

FAIRCLOUGH, G.L. 2006 'A new landscape for cultural heritage management: characterisation as a management tool', in L.R. Lozny (ed.) *Landscapes under pressure: theory and practice of cultural heritage research and preservation*, Springer Science+Business Media, United States of America, pp.55–74.

FAIRCLOUGH, G.J., G. LAMBRICK and D. HOPKINS 2002 'Historic landscape characterisation in England and

a Hampshire case study', in G.J. Fairclough and S.J. Rippon (eds) 2002 *Europe's cultural landscape: archaeologists and the management of change*, Europae Archaeologiae Consilium, Occasional Paper no 2, and English Heritage, Brussels and London, pp. 69–83.

FOWLER, P.J. 2003 *World Heritage cultural landscapes 1992–2002*, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris.

GALLOP, G. 2007 'Strategic planning: is it the new model?', *Public Administration Today* 10:28–33.

GODDEN, MACKAY LOGAN 2000 *Parramatta historical archaeological landscape management study*, prepared for NSW Heritage Office, Parramatta. Available at: http://www.timemap.net/epublications/2004_phalms/map/disk_PHALMS2004.html. Accessed October 2007.

GODDEN, MACKAY LOGAN 2007 *Kosciuszko National Park huts conservation strategy*, unpublished report prepared for NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, Hurstville.

GOODALL, H. 1996 *Invasion to embassy: land in Aboriginal politics in New South Wales 1770–1972*, Allen and Unwin/Black Books.

GOSDEN, C. 1994 *Social being and time*, Blackwell, Oxford.

GOSDEN, C. and L. HEAD 1994 'Landscape – a usefully ambiguous concept', *Archaeology in Oceania* 29: 113–116.

HALL, S. 1990 'The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis of the humanities', *October* 53:11–53.

HARRISON, R. 2004 *Shared landscapes: archaeologies of attachment and the pastoral industry in New South Wales*, Department of Environment and Conservation (NSW), Hurstville, and University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.

HEPPEL, M (ed.) 1979 *A black reality: Aboriginal camps and housing in remote Australia*, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra.

HERITAGE OFFICE AND DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND PLANNING 1996 'Heritage terms and abbreviations', Heritage Office and DUAP, Sydney.

HORTON, T. 2004 'Reading the cultural landscape at Dyea, Alaska', in D. Harmon, B.M. Kilgore and G.E. Vietzke (eds) *Protecting our diverse heritage: the role of parks, protected areas, and cultural sites*, Proceedings of the 2003 George Wright Society/National Park Service Joint Conference, Hancock, Michigan: The George Wright Society, pp. 177–181.

ICOMOS 2005 *Xi'an Declaration on the conservation of the setting of heritage structures, sites and areas*, adopted in Xi'an, China by the 15th General Assembly of ICOMOS. Available at: http://www.international.icomos.org/charters.htm. Accessed October 2007.

JOHNSTON, C. 2006 'An integrated approach to environment and heritage issues', paper prepared for the 2006 Australian State of the Environment Committee, Department of Environment and Heritage, Canberra. Available at: http://www.environment.gov.au/soe/2006/publications/integrative/heritage/index.html. Accessed October 2007.

JOHNSTON, R. 1998 'Approaches to the perception of landscape: philosophy, theory, methodology', *Archaeological Dialogues* 5:54–68.

KIJAS, J. 2006 Yuraygir National Park contextual history, unpublished report to Cultural Heritage Division, Department of Environment and Conservation (NSW), Hurstville.

KNAPP, A.B. and W. ASHMORE 1999 'Archaeological landscapes: constructed, conceptualised and ideational', in W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp (eds) *Archaeologies of landscape: contemporary perspectives*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, USA, pp. 1–30.

LENNON, J.L. 1997 'Editorial: cultural landscapes conference, Robertson NSW, 6–8 November 1996', *Historic Environment* 13(3&4):3–5.

LENNON, J.L. 2005 Reading between the lines: cultural landscape conservation in Australia, doctoral thesis, Deakin University, Melbourne.

LENNON, J.L. 2006 'Natural and cultural heritage', theme commentary prepared for the 2006 Australian State of the Environment Committee, Department of the Environment and Heritage, Canberra. Available at: http://www.deh.gov.au/soe/2006/publications/commentaries/heritage/index.html. Accessed October 2007.

LENNON, J. and S. MATHEWS 1996 'Cultural landscape management: guidelines for identifying, assessing and managing cultural landscapes in the Australian Alps national parks', unpublished report for the Cultural Heritage Working Group, Australian Alps Liaison Committee.

L'OSTE-BROWN, S., L. GODWIN and C. PORTER, 1998 *Towards an Indigenous social and cultural landscape of the Bowen Basin: Bowen Basin Aboriginal cultural heritage project*, Cultural Heritage Monograph Series, Volume 2, Queensland Department of Environment, Brisbane.

LOUTER, D. 2004 'On becoming relevant: environmental history and National Park management', in D. Harmon, B.M. Kilgore and G.E. Vietzke (eds) *Protecting our diverse heritage: the role of parks, protected areas, and cultural sites*, proceedings of the 2003 George Wright Society/National Park Service Joint Conference. Hancock, Michigan: The George Wright Society, pp. 19–23.

LOZNY, L.R. 2006 'Place, historical ecology and cultural landscape: new directions for culture resource management', in Lozny, L.R. (ed.) *Landscapes under pressure: theory and practice of cultural heritage research and preservation*. Springer Science+Business Media, United States of America, pp. 15–26.

MITCHELL, N. and S. BUGGEY 2001 'Category V protected landscapes in relation to World Heritage cultural landscapes: taking advantages of diverse approaches', in Conservation Study Institute *Landscape conservation: an international working session on the stewardship of protected areas*, Conservation and Stewardship Publication No. 1, IUCN – The World Conservation Union and QLF/Atlantic Centre for the Environment, Woodstock, Vermont, USA.

MULVANEY, D.J. 1989 'Foreword: reflections on the future of past cultural landscapes', *Historic Environment* 7(2):2.

NASH, R. 1973 *Wilderness and the American mind*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 1998 NPS–28: *Cultural resource management guideline*. Available at: http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/nps28/28contents.htm. Accessed October 2007.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (NSW) 2002 'Cultural heritage research plan 2002–2006', unpublished report prepared by the Cultural Heritage Division, NPWS, Hurstville.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (NSW) 2004 Independent scientific committee: an assessment of the values of Kosciuszko National Park. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Hurstville. Available at: http://www.nationalparks.nsw.gov.au/npws.nsf/Content/Kosciuszko NP_mgmtplan_ISCreport. Accessed October 2007.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 2007 'Defining landscape terminology', *Guidelines for the treatment of cultural landscapes*, National Park Service, US Department of the Interior. Available at: http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/hli/landscape_guidelines/terminology.htm. Accessed December 2007.

NETHERY, W.H. 1996 'Managing for public benefit: conservation, maintenance and preservation of historic cultural landscapes', unpublished report by Historic Heritage Division, Environmental Policy Division, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Hurstville.

NEUHART, J., M. NEUHART and R. EAMES 1989 *Eames design: the work of the office of Charles and Ray Eames*, Harry N. Abrams, New York.

OLIVIER, M. 2003 'Cultural landscape conservation experiences in Canada', in *Cultural landscapes: the challenges of conservation*, World Heritage Papers 7:101–103.

PAGE, R.R., C.A. GILBERT and S.A. DOLAN 1998 *Guide to cultural landscape reports: contents, process, and techniques*, U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

PATERSON, A.G. 2005 'Early pastoral landscapes and culture contact in central Australia', *Historical Archaeology* 39:28–48.

PATERSON A.G. 2006 'Towards a historical archaeology of Western Australia's northwest', *Australasian Historical Archaeology* 24:99–111.

PEARSON, M. 2001 'The landscape of the marginal land: cultural landscapes in the Tinderry Ranges, New South Wales', in M. Cotter, B. Boyd and J. Gardiner (eds) *Heritage landscapes: understanding place and communities*, Southern Cross University Press, Lismore.

PHILLIPS, A. and R. PARTINGTON 2005 'Protected landscapes in the United Kingdom', in J. Brown, N. Mitchell and M. Beresford (eds) *The protected landscape approach: linking nature, culture and community*, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK, pp. 119–130.

ROSE, D. Bird 1996 *Nourishing terrains: Australian Aboriginal views of landscape and wilderness*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra.

SAUER, C. 1925 'The morphology of landscape', *University of California Publications in Geography* 2(2):9–25.

SCOUGALL, B. (ed.) 1992 *Cultural heritage of the Australian Alps: proceedings of the 1991 symposium*, Australian Alps Liaison Committee, Canberra.

SLAIBY, B.E. and N.J. MITCHELL 2003 *A handbook for managers of cultural landscapes with natural resource values*. A web-based publication of the Conservation Study Institute and QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment. Conservation and Stewardship Publication No. 5.

SMITH, L. 2004 *Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage*, Routledge, London and New York.

STRATFORD, E. 1999 'Australian cultural geographies', in E. Stratford (ed.) *Australian cultural geographies*, Oxford University Press, South Melbourne, pp. 1–10.

TILLEY, C. 1994 *A phenomenology of landscape: places, paths and monuments*, Berg, Oxford.

VALENTI, P. *Reading the landscape: writing a world*, Harcourt Brace College Publishers, New York.

VAN DOMMELEN, P. 1999 'Exploring everyday places and cosmologies', in W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp (eds) *Archaeologies of landscape: contemporary perspectives*, Blackwell, USA and UK, pp. 277–285.

VEALE, S. 2001 *Remembering country: history and memories of Towarri National Park*, NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, Hurstville.

WEBB, M. 1987 'Cultural landscapes in the National Park Service', *The Public Historian* 9(2):77–90.

WINCHESTER, H.P.M., L. KONG and K. DUNN 2003 *Landscapes: ways of imagining the world*, Insights into Human Geography Series, Pearson Education Limited, United Kingdom.