



---

## **Heritage & Community Conference - 27-28 February 2001**

### **Forum 5: Open line – ask any question**

Convenor: Philippa Menses Topic: Open line - Ask any question

Posts: 74

Registered: Jan 2000

posted 27 February 2001 12:01 AM



Philippa Menses is an archaeologist who has applied her knowledge of cultural heritage and management in the diverse fields of heritage and environment conservation; planning; urban design; legislative review; property and business management; specialty tourism; public consultation and organisational change. She is a former Commissioner of the Australian Heritage Commission and is currently Executive Director of the National Trust of Queensland.

#### **Issues for discussion (discussion starter)**

OUTSIDE THE SQUARE – are we capable of finding new solutions? Do we need them?

I have been asked to provoke you into debate with a few key issues for discussion; those who participate will raise many others. On this page you are encouraged to say things that challenge us to find alternative approaches to the conservation of Heritage and involvement of Community.

The following come to mind (they are not necessarily my personal opinion!):

Is the heritage movement too divided – professional v volunteer, East Coast v the rest, government v community, – are there differences? How do we resolve differences?

The professional movement in heritage has cast the community out. Is this a good or bad thing?

Is there a correct answer every time when making decisions about conservation of heritage? Are we going about it the right way?

Listing Heritage is outmoded – are there better ways to protect places?

Saving heritage for tourism is more important than saving heritage for its own sake – why do we do it?

Who represents the community in heritage – The government? The National Trust? The Australian Heritage Commission? Local historical societies? Local residents associations? – Is there any other way?

Cultural heritage is not as important as Natural heritage – it can't be, we don't spend as much money on it! – Is economic rationalism the only way to demonstrate the value of heritage?

Have your say, help lift the debate and find solutions to the heritage issues of today and the future.

## **Discussion Summary**

### **General Comments**

This forum was designed to allow people to discuss any topic they wished that was not being covered in the other forums. Overall there were almost 20 major issues raised, some of which were dealt with in greater detail in other forums such as 'intangible heritage' and others which were new to the forum, such as developing a strategy for marketing heritage in Australia.

### **The Key Themes and Issues were:**

- How to ensure consultation with Indigenous Communities
- Models for funding heritage assessments to remove the conflict of interest by developers funding their own EIS
- Concerns regarding the changes in Federal Legislation for heritage
- Whether we can integrate all forms of heritage in our assessments or whether we must leave them in their separate categories.
- The importance of intangibles in heritage assessments and how we should deal with them
- How to save a heritage place in the face of economic imperatives - there are good examples of community action in relation to this plus examples of losses.
- Whether local heritage is of any lesser value than places of State or National Significance, whether these differentiation's should be made at all.
- Recognising the community right to have input and questioning the role of professionals in ensuring the consultation is genuine.
- Whether we put people off getting involved in heritage because we are always fighting / arguing in order to protect heritage
- Looking at alternative ways to seek protection of heritage such as demonstrating that heritage conservation and development are not mutually exclusive. Finding 'win win' outcomes
- Recognising that we are multicultural
- Recognising those different points of view can be enlightening when presenting a heritage place to the public.
- Recognising the value of archaeological evidence and seeking ways to ensure it is managed appropriately in relation to development

- Working more together within the profession, breaking down the current divisions and involving community more.
- Seeking to mobilise the community more on major issues. It was pointed out that it is relatively easy to do this for individual places, but what about the big issues that affect most of us - we sit back and let a few speak for us.
- Working together on a national marketing strategy for heritage
- Capacity building for organisations that find themselves with large heritage grants and don't know how to manage the project
- Different perceptions of what our heritage is and a tendency to disregard our heritage, or question that we have any at all, because it is not grand.
- Whether the professional view of heritage truly recognises community values.

### **Recommendations or other outcomes**

- That we look into alternative ways to fund/manage heritage studies such that those who have a commercial interest have less control over the outcome.
- That we properly debate whether local heritage is of lesser significance, does it need fewer controls, and are local communities satisfied with the current practices.
- That we consider alternative ways of saving our heritage such as better utilisation of the planning system and where heritage departments/branches should be placed in government so that heritage is taken seriously.
- That training programs be developed for heritage consultants in public consultation or they team up with experts in consultation.
- That as a profession we be more tolerant of the decisions we each make when choosing a management outcome for a place. There is no right answer we simply need to demonstrate that the outcome reflects the significance and circumstances of the place adequately.
- Having a focus on finding solutions, challenging perceptions and demonstrating that heritage is relevant to our economy, and our social well being, without always fighting a rearguard action.
- Working together on a national strategy to promote heritage utilising the feel good projects in order to raise awareness and generate more political clout for heritage conservation.

### **Issues worthy of further discussion in a forum.**

- Multicultural, Indigenous and Natural heritage received minimal discussion in this forum.
- We could also expand on all of the above recommendations and issues.
- Sporting heritage was raised but not pursued - it would be a wonderful theme as so many in the community idolise sport.

## Discussion: Did you get what you wanted?

### Philippa Menses

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 09:36 AM

Welcome to Forum 5 - IT IS NOW 7.15PM ON DAY 2 OF THE CONFERENCE AND 400 PEOPLE HAVE REGISTERED INCLUDING OVERSEAS PARTICIPANTS.

THIS FORUM CARRIES OVER TO A SECOND PAGE - CLICK ON 2 AT THE BOTTOM OF THIS PAGE TO GET THERE.

The discussion starter is copied below and I encourage you to ask / answer any topic you wish.

Looking forward to a great day.....

OUTSIDE THE SQUARE – are we capable of finding new solutions? Do we need them?

I have been asked to provoke you into debate with a few key issues for discussion; those who participate will raise many others. On this page you are encouraged to say things that challenge us to find alternative approaches to the conservation of Heritage and involvement of Community.

The following come to mind (they are not necessarily my personal opinion!):

Is the heritage movement too divided – professional v volunteer, East coast v the rest, government v community, – are there differences? How do we resolve differences?

The professional movement in heritage has cast the community out. Is this a good or bad thing?

Is there a correct answer every time when making decisions about conservation of heritage? Are we going about it the right way?

Listing Heritage is outmoded – are there better ways to protect places?

Saving heritage for tourism is more important than saving heritage for its own sake – why do we do it?

Who represents the community in heritage – The government? The National Trust? The Australian Heritage Commission? Local historical societies? Local residents associations? – Is there any other way?

Cultural heritage is not as important as Natural heritage – it can't be, we don't spend as much money on it! – Is economic rationalism the only way to demonstrate the value of heritage?

Have your say, help lift the debate and find solutions to the heritage issues of today and the future.

[This message has been edited by Philippa Menses (edited 28 February 2001).]

### kevin m

New Member

Posts: 1

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 10:52 AM

G'day Pip - greetings from Elanora. What involvement does the heritage management community have with indigenous Australians. Is there an opportunity for Aboriginals to be consulted on heritage matters?

**Philippa Menses**

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 11:11 AM

One would hope that in this day and age all heritage organisations are communicating with Indigenous communities. Some will have quite significant programs to ensure indigenous involvement in decisions about heritage. The most enlightened acknowledge that the indigenous community should be the decision-maker. Many heritage organisations would be undertaking projects involving local communities. For instance, the National Trust in WA includes an Aboriginal perspective in interpretation of its properties. In Queensland at Cooktown, the local community has ensured that the new James Cook Museum presents Aboriginal views with regard to local/regional heritage and history. I have just phoned Nicola Stairmand who will join the discussion with more information on this project soon.

The Australian Heritage Commission has a section of its department dedicated indigenous heritage and has a policy of consulting first and foremost. In each State/Territory however there are variations, in some responsibilities for indigenous heritage may be split from those related to historic places or natural areas, in others all heritage matters come under one umbrella.

Perhaps others could describe projects/provide details that are relevant to this.

**Peter Marquis-Kyle**

Member

Posts: 10

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 11:43 AM

Kevin m just asked about the 'opportunity for Aboriginals to be consulted on heritage matters'

Have a look at the Project Database on this web site. For example (and I am only suggesting this one because I know about it) try searching for 'Musgrave Park'.

**Marilyn Truscott**

Member

Posts: 18

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 12:33 PM

Hi! as others have said it is a requirement - sometimes statutory, sometimes only agency good practice to consult with indigenous communities on their heritage - most agencies have guidelines for this. At the Commonwealth level, draft Guidelines for the Protection, Management and Use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Places were developed in 11 rounds of extensive consultation with indigenous people throughout Australia. These guidelines were recommended by Justice Evatt in

1996 to be adopted by all levels of government in her review of the Commonwealth Aboriginal and TSi Heritage Protection Act 1984. These guidelines were acknowledged as national best practice in the Commonwealth Minister for Environment and Heritage National Heritage Places Strategy in April 1999.

A this stage a final version of these guidelines has not been published, but their 7 principles recognise indigenous views as central to any decisions about their heritage.

**Philippa Menses**

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 12:45 PM

Welcome to those who participated in the lunchtime debate. You will see that we have been concentrating upon consultation too.

I find that consultation leads to community ownership of the outcome, because the outcome reflects their point of view. Through ownership comes commitment and hopefully ongoing involvement.

On the other hand, not every one agrees with the outcome and we have every right to hold our individual views.

Imagine you are managing the design of a new display on the local history of an area and there is serious disagreement on how to go about this. Should the outcome accommodate many different views or just the majority view?

We recognise that cultural heritage values are based upon our/community perceptions of what is important. It would therefore be ridiculous to suggest that consultation / involvement is not necessary. Even the fact that we value the natural environment is a cultural act (hopefully based upon adequate research regarding the significance of that natural environment)

**linda barwick**

Member

Posts: 5

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 12:52 PM

I would like to raise the possibility of alternative models for funding cultural heritage studies - for example instead of consultants being paid by developers to talk to indigenous communities about cultural heritage matters, what about the indigenous communities themselves being funded by the developer to employ their own consultants - this model was used by the Agreement Implementation Committee which was awarded the permit to conduct cultural heritage studies for the PNG-Qld gas pipeline project and in my experience worked really well.

**Philippa Menses**

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 12:58 PM

Linda, It is largely recognised that the current system is flawed because the body funding the study has a conflict of interest. They usually want their development to

proceed. Your suggestion is therefore worth due consideration. How do you think the developer would respond in Australia? What about requiring the developer to form a steering committee made up of relevant stakeholders, perhaps with government representation for mediation purposes?

[This message has been edited by Philippa Menses (edited 27 February 2001).]

**Lesley Mearns**

Member

Posts: 5

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 01:02 PM

During the lunchtime debate Tom Perrigo mentioned the 'squeaking door' syndrome. I wondered if he had any advice on dealing with that particular problem.

**Sue Smalldon**

New Member

Posts: 1

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 01:11 PM

Question to Marilyn Truscott

Is there any moves lately in Env Aus to act on Justice Evatt's recommendations?

**Marilyn Truscott**

Member

Posts: 18

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 01:21 PM

Sue

in fact although EA is now administering that Act, the amended Bill is still waiting in the wings of Parliament, so any changes based on Evatt's recommendations have yet to come through - but I'm no expert, and have no role in this matter and I cannot speak for Environment Australia - best direct the question to them, probably best to Chrissy Grant, Director of the Indigenous Heritage Section, [chrissy.grant@ea.gov.au](mailto:chrissy.grant@ea.gov.au)

**Lorraine Cairnes**

New Member

Posts: 4

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 01:49 PM

Philippa asked in her provocative intro.:

Is there a correct answer every time when making decisions about conservation of heritage? Are we going about it the right way?

I'd be interested in views on the progress we are making with integrated approaches to places where there is more than one "type" of heritage value (natural - Indig. - historic).

Somehow, these scenarios usually result in winners and losers and hard feelings, or endless debate while the search is on for the perfect solution - which usually doesn't exist.

Having three compatible practice documents has helped (Burra Charter, Australian Natural Heritage Charter and draft Indigenous heritage guideline).

I wonder if the integrated approaches philosophy which showed such promise a couple of years ago is losing its momentum because it is too difficult in our segmented heritage world?

Or are governments reinforcing the heritage "divisions" with the way we legislate about heritage?

Or do practitioners just prefer the comfort zone of their own specialist area?

**sandy blair**

New Member

Posts: 4

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 02:04 PM

Hi, Gaye and panel. I had a small involvement in the project Helen has talked about and I think the East Gippsland community heritage plan is the best thing since sliced bread! (well, my kids actually eat it...)

Why it worked for me was that instead of a sometimes remote heritage agency doing the listing with limited consultation, in the East Gippsland case, there was a strong community ownership of the heritage information and places identified, and a sense of community support for conservation activities in the shire.

The locals who took on the paid coordinator roles did a huge amount of work and created lots of good will, and the network of heritage interests is very active.

There are opportunities to do this in other local government areas, especially where existing heritage data is plentiful, but hard for communities and planners to access.

Does anyone else have experience in this area?

The East Gippsland project was a case of REAL consultation for REAL gains.

**Philippa Menses**

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 02:08 PM

Lorraine,

People keep telling me that the way forward is through recognition of significant landscapes ie the integration approach.

It also seems that people have great difficulty in taking this approach because we are so compartmentalised. Someone from the heritage commission could probably tell us how many different pieces of heritage legislation there are in Australia.

What if we ignored the compartments, and considered how you would go about identifying significant landscapes. If we did that successfully, would we have covered/represented our heritage adequately?

**Cris\_Armstrong**

New Member

Posts: 3

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 02:11 PM

To add to the subject being "too divided" - how about the division between archaeological heritage and the built environment? Are they of equal value? Or does one hold more weight? Why? How to convince preservationists (who are typically concerned with the built environment) that the archaeological resources are valuable as well?

**Paul Maxwell**

Member

Posts: 11

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 02:16 PM

Power:

The ability to 'Protect our heritage' seems to come down to a power struggle between those who place value in heritage and those who simply do not. Places, such as Williamstown (Vic.), are seen as resources to exploit for direct profit and the weight of power favors those with money. What techniques work to redress the balance? How can we get an effective message to government (local, state, national)?

Can we more effectively pool our energies and resources? Are there ways for us to lobby effectively? How do we do this? Who do we contact? What techniques can we employ?

The first issue for me (a part-timer in heritage matters) is coming to grips with the monumental volume of information that surrounds any heritage protection, for instance: The Burra Charter

Local Government - neighbourhood character studies

Local Government - Local Conservation Studies

Local Government - Urban Planning departments

State Government - Good Design Guide/ResCode - (design and planning standards)

Law - Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal - VCAT (legal implementation of State and Local laws etc.)

National Government - Aust. Heritage Commission etc..

For instance:

I would like to understand more regarding the Burra Charter, and its role in the introduction of Modern Architecture. Developers have, successfully, argued at VCAT that the Burra Charter requires that the style of a 'place' should not be copied and hence modern architecture is 'more honest'. What exactly does the Burra Charter say in this regard, and should it be used in this way?

Local Government, in Victoria anyway, has had a traditional bias to speculation and/or development. Being a councillor was/is almost mandatory for many Real Estate agents for instance. The (so-called) planning departments have a planning horizon of barely a year if we are lucky, there is such a shortage of qualified staff that they move frequently, and conflicting 'strategy' documents emerge from them on a frequent basis. Add to this mixture the complexities of politics (eg. independents -v- established parties) and the most effective way to exploit this is for 'a quick buck' - certainly not very long-term heritage proposals.

We need tips, techniques, and templates to counteract the very powerful foes that wish to destroy our built heritage. We need facts and figures about cultural tourism, we need

ways to present this effectively. We need an understanding on how to conduct 'traffic surveys'. We need more concrete and practical assistance.

The rhetoric I read, here at this forum, at ICOMOS, at the Aust. Heritage Commission, the Victoria Heritage Register and elsewhere, is beautiful - but impractical in the battle ongoing.

Who can step forward to help? How do we do this on shoestring budgets? And with minimal time?

**sandy blair**

New Member

Posts: 4

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 02:18 PM

Sorry, I forgot to say my previous posting was a contribution to the lunchtime debate What makes consultation real.

I am wrestling with an issue related to heritage and community in my new job with the ACT government. How do we give recognition to places of local heritage significance that do not reach the threshold for listing on registers?

Community members often find it hard when places they care about are assessed as not significant enough to make it on to heritage registers. Should we be looking at other forms of recognition and lesser forms of protection and promotion? What is the experience of others?

We are looking at the pros and cons of a heritage inventory with a duty of care provision attached. Who has done this? What is the experience? Helppp....

**Peter Marquis-Kyle**

Member

Posts: 10

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 02:45 PM

Like Sandy, I am very keen to hear about ways to nurture places that DON'T involve listing and regulation.

From a seat on a state Heritage Council I see the resources applied to making a list and regulating what happens to places on it. Most Heritage Acts make those activities 'core business'. But relatively small resources are available for 'other ways'.

I'd like to see government agencies more involved in research, interpretation, publication, story-telling, community development and such like, to take heritage concerns outside the box of the 'cultural heritage regulation branch', or whatever it is called in your neighbourhood.

(Sandy: Please do write up your pro/con balance sheet for listing, and publish it!)

**joan croll**

New Member

Posts: 3

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 03:10 PM

Dear Paul,

Money is not everything - votes count - people noise counts.

Imagine 13 housewives from Hunters Hill (NSW) who decided that A V Jennings could not develop Kellys Bush with 25 luxury dwellings way back in the 70's. And they won. Admittedly they were ready to throw their kids under the bull dozers, but somehow, Bob Pringle, Jack Munday and others were lit by this never ending flame thrower of letters submissions and other public 'shame' stories and with a black ban on another A V Jennings development in Sydney, Jack conceived the idea of the World's first green ban in Hunters Hill. Never underestimate the voice of an ordinary group who make a lot of noise.

Next, let's make 'them' change the rules so that developers and estate agents and other related (insects comes to mind) professions have any active part in any council or other decisions-making body.

The power is with the people - work on it.

### **Meredith Walker**

Administrator

Posts: 23

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 03:40 PM

There are so many interesting threads to this conference and some mentioned here are being discussed in other forums.

Sandy and Peter's points about recognition - professionals should be helping communities express their interests/love of environment instead of expecting them to do things 'the bureaucratic way'.

In gneral terms, people keep places because they like them, not because they are listed! Perhaps the group of people how don't necessarily care about heritage (but might be convinced) is growing? The benefit of heritage (learning about ourselves, the past etc..) need to be more manifest and or the judgement of heritage systems needs to be more readily respected, rather than fought against.

How can heritage retain respect, in the face of development pressures?

### **Marilyn Truscott**

Member

Posts: 18

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 03:47 PM

Joan is right - Politicians listen to people - they vote. People make up communities - they sometimes feel disempowered - as said above it is our job to enable their voice to be heard - or step out of the way - to stop being gatekeepers - perhaps in some cases it is too late - perhaps all this talk of 'heritage' means that communities no longer trust themselves to know what it is about their place and their way of life that they want to protect, to keep, to love - so that it sustains them - but I don't really believe that

if communities can speak for themselves, what then is our role as heritage experts and what is the use of all our expertise?

### **Doug Williams**

Member

Posts: 5

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 03:56 PM

In relation to Phillipa's question of "is there a correct answer.....?"

In my experience conservation of heritage can be such a complex issue with such a diverse range of stakeholders that a 'correct answer' to a heritage problem can be a difficult thing to achieve. So the answer is simple. NO, there is no correct answer EVERY time. Some people will disagree with actions whichever way you jump.

One could equally ask "correct from whose point of view?" Some people might want a historic building restored to a particular period, some people might want it left as a ruin, some people might want the thing bulldozed because it is a safety hazard. Where is the 'correct' answer in this problem?

As an example, an issue which has created great division in the Indigenous community in far southwest NSW is the management of Lake Victoria. Some members view keeping the water level above that of the known graves to be a practical conservation measure (the water does not lap at the ground where burials are found disturbing graves). Other members of the Indigenous community view this management procedure as desecration of the highest order (the graves were never meant to be underwater or drowned). Where is the correct answer in this scenario?

As to the question Phillipa posed about whose views to include in a display on local history, my opinion is that the outcome SHOULD incorporate opposing views where they exist. Such a display would be much more informative on the community or issue about which it was written - and more 'truthful' in terms of its reflection of community opinion.

### **Philippa Menses**

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 03:59 PM

I have been thinking a lot about Paul's questions. Power is gained through respect for the views that you hold. If you demonstrate that you can take on board a whole raft of issues whilst ensuring heritage conservation then others will listen.

You also need to challenge people's preconceptions. Always using the same techniques in the battle for heritage eg last minute listings which might save that place, can cause seriously negative attitudes about listings by others.

We need to be more creative, more lateral in our approach. We also need to educate others about the role of heritage in our lives, the benefits for the environment, the economy and our society.

The best example I have of this is when we in the National Trust in South Australia decided to propose a development for a major block of the city. Our aim was to balance environmental, social and economic interests. Yes, the National Trust suggested a development, we were not objecting to development but showing how it could be done whilst retaining an archaeological site, retaining the heritage buildings of the East End Market and building residential developments to bring more people into the city, mixing this up with commercial developments, help reduce the demand for use of cars by bringing people closer to their jobs, and adding to the tourism attractions in the city.

Are there other good examples out there?

The proposal was put to the Premier with the backing of highly regarded architects and even the developers. It was used to call on the government to purchase the site and ensure that this type of development occurred there.

Of course the media were well briefed and the proposal was discussed widely.

While the final development was not exactly as we had hoped, we had achieved the seemingly impossible.

We need to be prepared to jump out of the box that others try to keep us in.

**Marilyn Truscott**

Member

Posts: 18

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 04:10 PM

Doug is right that the opposing views to be found within a community is often a difficult problem - I remember the differences within an indigenous community in WA - where the elders did not want any tourism, or in fact a training course for indigeous people that would help them integrate indigenous and non-indigenous site management processes

we facilitated a workshop for the community and they had a long barney about it all - ending up understanding each others' views a bit better and forming a heritage group of both elders and younger members to advise the local shire etc on the site [which was on the regional tourism map without any consultation with the indigenous community]

as for opposing interpretations - I'm sure Linda and others have much they could contribute on that - but I refer people to the different [as against opposing] interpretations presented at Kakadu National Park - both the archaeological and ecological scientific interpretations sit beside the cultural, spiritual cosmological explanations by the local indigenous communities - what is so fascinating is that they are not in conflict!

and as Pip points out with her Adelaide example, it is too easy to assume that heritage and development will be in oppositions, and so easy to start out consultations in combative corners - rather than assuming that there is a win-win somewhere within the issue.

**Alan Graham**

New Member

Posts: 1

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 04:46 PM

from Susan Marsden

In response to the discussion about Indigenous heritage and the new Commonwealth heritage legislation (amendment to the Environment Act): many of us are seriously concerned about how poorly these Bill deals with Indigenous heritage, let alone apply the Evatt or HERCON recommendations (and not to speak of other heritage issues, including little provision for public consultation or direct community involvement). In particular, I suggest you read submissions by ATSIC, Mulvaney and Sullivan, that can be seen (along with others, such as from the ACNT and Australia ICOMOS) on the Senate Committee's website at:

[www.aph.gov.au/senate/committee/ecita\\_ctte/hert2000/Sublist.htm](http://www.aph.gov.au/senate/committee/ecita_ctte/hert2000/Sublist.htm).

**roy hay**

New Member

Posts: 1

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 04:49 PM

This is not so much a reply to the huge number of points which have been made on this thread alone, but a request for information from anyone who has been involved in the issues of modern heritage and sporting sites in particular. Along with several colleagues I have been involved in the successful campaign for the heritage listing of Waverley Park in Melbourne, which began as a community movement, continued with scholarly and expert input, and achieved success, in terms of listing, despite formidable opposition. Yet we end up with a facility which is being allowed to decay, if not being internally vandalised, and rumours that a permit for its demolition is being sought. Probably the only thing which is saving Waverley at the moment is not its heritage listing but the uncertainty over the ownership of the electronic signal emanating from sports grounds which is the subject of multi-way battles between TV Stations, Football Authorities, Ground owners and others. The whole process has been highly controversial, as the stadium was in its lifetime, but that seems to me to be no reason for not considering this facility as part of our heritage. I'd be very keen to find out if anyone else knows about other processes, not necessarily listings, involving sporting sites and how these developed.

### **Hilary du Cros**

Member

Posts: 5

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 05:06 PM

I certainly hope that many bad situations can be saved by a 'win win' solution even when the support for heritage is not where you expect it! For instance, many of the indigenous villagers here in Hong Kong are so keen to become upwardly mobile and gain 'face' that any protest they make is directly connected to upping the price to the developer not anything else! But there are also those villagers that recognise the value of such heritage as providing an important link with the past in a place where so much is always changing.

Anyway, what I really wanted to comment upon was the interesting statement made by Lorraine Cairnes before I was able to catch up with you lot. The issue of integrating natural and cultural heritage in planning processes of various kinds is one that requires special methods of consultation within the heritage world and well as without. I suspect that much of the difficulty occurs through lack of knowledge about and empathy with the issues and practices common to the different area that make up 'heritage'. Anyone who has directed or been involved in a multidisciplinary EIA or heritage conservation team will know what I mean. Somehow a specialist must become a generalist to appreciate all that is going on and all that needs to happen.

Also, it would be good to address the participation of the community in heritage issue. In historical archaeology, it is becoming apparent that direct community involvement through volunteering on excavations is a popular way to do this and may even provide an legal outlet for those people who want disturb important sites for bottle collecting to hopefully forget their evil ways! What other outlets can we find for those with energy and enthusiasm for discovery but nowhere appropriate to vent it?

### **Gaye Nayton**

Member

Posts: 13

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 06:55 PM

Cris wrote How about the division between archaeological heritage and the built environment? Are they of equal value?

In WA judge for yourself. The act dealing with historic heritage is the only heritage act which does not include provisions for curating artifacts. They are all in my spare room.

Archaeology was not seen as relevant to heritage in WA when the act was written. it's more accepted now but still a tiny part of heritage, most conservation works, conservation plans and municipal inventories proceed without any archaeological input in WA.

As to what to do I'm working on it. Being involved in conservation plans does lead to consideration of the archaeological resource in management and therefore involvement in conservation works, monitoring etc further down the track but so many conservation plans do not include archaeology and therefore site management does not either.

It's a question of education of heritage managers and heritage professionals rather than the general public in this instance. I have written a little booklet explaining the role of archaeology to heritage managers which I am fine-tuning. I will try to distribute as widely as I can in WA but as I have to bear the costs myself there will be no mass mailout but rather a trickle which I hope will help turn the tide.

### **Philippa Menses**

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 07:18 PM

We once did a SWOT summary on archaeology in Australia at an Australian Society for Historical Archaeologists conference in Adelaide.

We asked the audience of archaeologists "how many of you have had someone say - I have always wanted to be an archaeologist" Every hand went up and thereby we found our strength. Popularity.

The weakness was that Australians think we don't have any significant period of history therefore there is no archaeology. Most forget to recognise the thousands of years of Aboriginal occupation.

Opportunity - to inform the community, involve them in the excavations as suggested above. The media are at last picking up on this interest and we need to capitalise upon it.

Threat - it is under the ground, unseen and easy to forget. You get the impression that developers fear the day that archaeology is mentioned, because it is usually at the last minute instead of at the beginning of the process when they start planning the development.

Perhaps others can add to the above list.

### **Jenny Noble**

New Member

Posts: 3

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 07:59 PM

I am not a heritage professional. I have learnt about heritage "protection" the hard way! I battled with our local council for over 2 years in an attempt to protect our "nationally" significant home and garden from being completely overwhelmed by a massive 2 storey development. I guess the lesson I learnt is that if you don't have the numbers, you lose.

**Meredith Walker**

Administrator

Posts: 23

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 08:05 PM

such an interesting discussion! whilst conflict over heritage issues has a certain emotional appeal to some people, the continual conflict that surrounds heritage is (I believe) putting people off heritage. the majority of the press (and the experience of many) is an experience of conflict, not an experience of revelation. Perhaps we could completely change the standard heritage briefs - and make heritage studies into heritage events, with an appreciation component the same size if not bigger than the survey component?

**Gaye Nayton**

Member

Posts: 13

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 08:33 PM

An appreciation component hmmm

I certainly think one problem with heritage in WA is that no one but heritage professionals know what has been done. The heritage act is 11 years old, we have a heritage list, biased as it is, we have municipal inventories incomplete as they often are. But Joe Public is not TOLD!!! and half the time unless you are working on a site heritage professionals don't know what others are doing either.

When I contrast it with maritime archaeology the difference is obvious. The maritimers understood from the start that Dutch shipwrecks with silver bullion was sexy. They used that relentlessly to woo the media, government and most importantly the public to their cause. And spread the cause to less sexy shipwrecks.

Every time a maritimer put a toe in the water the media was invited, they wrote books, professional articles, hundreds and hundreds of articles and booklets aimed at the general public. They SPREAD the information, made sure everyone and his dog knew they were out there doing things and those things were important. They still do in a quieter way, they have a much better record for publishing their research than other heritage disciplines except perhaps history.

A core problem with heritage and by extension historical archaeology is the lack of that kind of simulation of a grass roots support base that coming from writing and talking to the public, making sure that projects are noted in the media, in the local schools and historical societies. That sort of dissimulation should be written into every heritage brief and the authorities like Heritage Councils should earmark funds for dissimulation of research into public forums such as booklets.

**Philippa Menses**

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 08:39 PM

Jenny, you are right that having the numbers helps. What about heritage listing? Do you think that would have helped. We have had a lot of discussion about listing and whether that is the best way to protect heritage.

Meredith, you are so right. We need to lift the debate such that the value of heritage conservation is recognised. We need to offer solutions, not be seen as getting in the way of other peoples plans. When our input is recognised as constructive we will have given our heritage a much better chance.

### **Philippa Menses**

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 27 February 2001 09:10 PM

Thank you to everyone who has participated and observed today.

It seems that the major issue is trying to be noticed. Whether it is consultation with the Aboriginal community, trying to save your nationally significant home, getting archaeological sites recognised.

What we need is to forget where we come from - community / government - and work together on a marketing strategy for heritage. We need to register all the projects we are involved in and promote those that have good feel value. We need to help each other do this, utilising our various places in society to best advantage.

Lets talk tomorrow about who should help prepare the marketing strategy, how should we do this, what should be in it, what tools should we use to get the message out.

We would be removing the barriers that exist between heritage professional and community by working together on our one great love - promoting conservation of our heritage and demonstrating its importance to the well being of our society.

Good night. Thanks again. I look forward to your participation tomorrow.

### **Benjamin Briggs**

New Member

Posts: 3

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 28 February 2001 01:59 AM

Based on my belief that you can't always educate, but you can always raise awareness, I have tried to increase the awareness of heritage in my community here in North Carolina, USA. I was challenged by the fact that I was so excited about the importance of historic places despite the overall community hesitancy to embrace its built history. What did I see in historic places that everyone else missed? The stories, the styles, the legends, the events...

So, about 4 years ago I began a column, printed every other week in the local paper, that compared a before and after photo of some site in town, pointing out what was interesting, or what had changed. The column has been wildly successful, and I feel has certainly done much to raise awareness of history in the community. Since I started the

column we have not (knock on wood!) lost one historic site in the city. People are beginning to see and appreciate and cherish their own local history. I get lots of letters from people thanking me for remembering otherwise forgotten tales of history. I have written about everything from industry to Elvis to urban planning to historic landscapes.

I believe that marketing of heritage needs to be at a local level, and if someone in the AHC values a site, the reasoning or excitement of that needs to be passed on to the that level. And, the visa versa is true as well, the locals need to be encouraged to offer their advice concerning what are significant sites as well.

Getting long winded here, but yes marketing is the key, I think to be centered locally with "tons" (is it "heaps" there?) of support from state and national levels.

### **Philippa Menses**

Administrator

Posts: 15

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 28 February 2001 08:47 AM

Good Morning and welcome to today's discussion. Thank you Benjamin for your input on marketing in North Carolina.

If you are new to this today, have a read of the comments above. I ended the day with the suggestion we work together on a marketing strategy for heritage (see last 2 comments).

What do you think?

Of course you can continue the discussion on any other topic raised yesterday or introduce new issues today - it's your forum. Make the most of it.

[This message has been edited by Philippa Menses (edited 28 February 2001).]

[This message has been edited by Philippa Menses (edited 28 February 2001).]

### **Jenny Noble**

New Member

Posts: 3

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 28 February 2001 10:09 AM

I think Benjamin's advice is great and I'll certainly be exploring his suggestions. Community involvement and support is essential and the local newspaper is the best avenue. Historical Societies can play a major role in providing researched information to support the protection of "threatened" properties. Sometimes historical societies feel uncomfortable in this role and choose to stay out of local politics.

A Local Council (through its elected councillors) ultimately makes the decision whether or not to conserve/protect our heritage. They are the consent authority. The councillors need to know how much its community values its heritage. Some councils still do not have an LEP. These councils are operating under a planning instrument that does not give statutory protection to heritage properties. These councils may have Heritage Inventories, but they have no legal status.

In the event you do discover that your local council does not have an LEP with Heritage Provisions you will need to focus your energies into ensuring that Council does get one ASAP. Without this planning instrument, how can anyone successfully protect our heritage.

**Barry Jones**

Moderator

Posts: 16

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 28 February 2001 11:02 AM

BARRY JONES: As a former practising politician but with a consuming interest in Heritage issues, I am preoccupied with a paradox - that often it is easier to get a response from Government, MPs, bureaucrats about a narrow but very specific issue than for broader issues where there ought to be a greater level of community support. (On the issue of gun ownership, the passions of the gun owners - less than 10% - have generally had more political clout than the broad, but unspecific support of the 90% of non-gun owners. The 10%, in practice, might be more likely to change their vote, than the 90%). So - how does the community become involved other than at a very general (and often ineffective?) level. I can see that Aboriginal - or Maltese - heritage issues might have more impact than, say, saving the Victorian Heritage of Melbourne. Something that is everybody's concern (in theory) may turn out to be nobody's in practice.

**Marilyn Truscott**

Member

Posts: 18

Registered: Feb 2001

posted 28 February 2001 11:13 AM

Good morning all from Canberra - where the Canberra Times does a wonderful column on past heritage and stories of past lifestyles and places from local residents - which is great as it raises awareness in a town where a high proportion of residents come from somewhere else [something I believe is an issue for our heritage here].

This discussion on marketing - or perhaps awareness raising? - is similar to a point a made in Forum 4 with Laura Gray - that communities may not always believe their story is important OR may not always know it fully - I believe that practitioners can facilitate and heighten that knowledge and a pride in it on the part of the local community - in such a case I believe that the energy and involvement of a local group will be activated and go a long way to keep their heritage / inheritance alive

so thanks to Benjamin for his example and sending you a big hello [as do Jelli and Toby!!]

and I do encourage people in this Forum to look at the exciting ideas coming through in the others that are so relevant to this Debate and to participate in the Lunchtime Debate by watching the discussion [and then asking questions in this Forum - 5]