2012

Conflict in Common: Heritage-making in Cape York

Nick Skilton
University of Wollongong

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/thsci>

University of Wollongong

Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

Recommended Citation

Skilton, Nick, Conflict in Common: Heritage-making in Cape York, Bachelor of Science (Honours), School of Earth & Environmental Science, University of Wollongong, 2012.
<https://ro.uow.edu.au/thsci/28>

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

Conflict in Common: Heritage-making in Cape York

Abstract

Cape York in Far North Queensland is a place of contradictions, where Aboriginal communities, pastoralists, miners and conservationists engage in decision-making over its future. Its abundance of rare ecosystems and undeveloped river systems has been noticed by global heritage experts since 1982, raising expectations of a future World Heritage listing. The Queensland state government is consulting Cape York communities about their aspirations for land and heritage management, and supported by the conservation sector, maintains a goal of submitting a World Heritage nomination by 2013. There are multiple competing visions over the contribution that World Heritage can make in Cape York. This thesis explores whether World Heritage is appropriate for Cape York, and what are the discursive structures of heritage-making that may empower or disempower those living in Cape York.

Members of key stakeholder organisations involved in World Heritage discussions were asked to provide their perspectives and contribution to World Heritage discussions through a process of semi-structured interviews. Using the conceptual frameworks of postcolonialism, social nature and „authorised heritage discourse“ in an analysis of the stakeholder perspectives reveals an understanding of the political landscape that enables ongoing conflict around economic development in the region. Findings suggest that World Heritage is *not* incompatible with Cape York, and that there are recognisable opportunities for cooperation in rich, diverse economies incorporating emergent industries like the conservation economy. However, certain ideological standpoints and individual biases are having a negative impact on the overall discussion. The lack of a coordinated long-term plan for the region, combined with poor infrastructure and difficulties with restrictive tenure criteria can also be identified as key problems. Furthermore, the evaluation of heritage by „expert“ panels has the potential to disempower local community ownership and representations of heritage. The implications of ongoing conflict are that an incomplete picture of the region's heritage may transpire, and certain industry sectors and communities may continue to be marginalised. This thesis can positively contribute to World Heritage discussions in Cape York through a description of opportunities for collaboration between stakeholder organisations, and by making conspicuous the potentially damaging relationships and objectives that key stakeholders may have.

Degree Type

Thesis

Degree Name

Bachelor of Science (Honours)

Department

School of Earth & Environmental Science

Advisor(s)

Michael Adams, Leah Gibbs

Keywords

Heritage, Cape York, World Heritage, Conservation economy, environmental governance, Aboriginal politics

Conflict in Common:

Heritage-making in Cape York

Nick Skilton
06/10/2012

This is submitted in full as a Bachelor of Science Honours Thesis from the University of Wollongong.

The information in this thesis is entirely the result of investigations conducted by the author, unless otherwise acknowledged, and has not been submitted in part, or otherwise, for any other degree or qualification.

Signed:

6th October 2012

ABSTRACT

Cape York in Far North Queensland is a place of contradictions, where Aboriginal communities, pastoralists, miners and conservationists engage in decision-making over its future. Its abundance of rare ecosystems and undeveloped river systems has been noticed by global heritage experts since 1982, raising expectations of a future World Heritage listing. The Queensland state government is consulting Cape York communities about their aspirations for land and heritage management, and supported by the conservation sector, maintains a goal of submitting a World Heritage nomination by 2013. There are multiple competing visions over the contribution that World Heritage can make in Cape York. This thesis explores whether World Heritage is appropriate for Cape York, and what are the discursive structures of heritage-making that may empower or disempower those living in Cape York.

Members of key stakeholder organisations involved in World Heritage discussions were asked to provide their perspectives and contribution to World Heritage discussions through a process of semi-structured interviews. Using the conceptual frameworks of postcolonialism, social nature and ‘authorised heritage discourse’ in an analysis of the stakeholder perspectives reveals an understanding of the political landscape that enables ongoing conflict around economic development in the region. Findings suggest that World Heritage is *not* incompatible with Cape York, and that there are recognisable opportunities for cooperation in rich, diverse economies incorporating emergent industries like the conservation economy. However, certain ideological standpoints and individual biases are having a negative impact on the overall discussion. The lack of a coordinated long-term plan for the region, combined with poor infrastructure and difficulties with restrictive tenure criteria can also be identified as key problems. Furthermore, the evaluation of heritage by ‘expert’ panels has the potential to disempower local community ownership and representations of heritage. The implications of ongoing conflict are that an incomplete picture of the region’s heritage may transpire, and certain industry sectors and communities may continue to be marginalised. This thesis can positively contribute to World Heritage discussions in Cape York through a description of opportunities for collaboration between stakeholder organisations, and by making conspicuous the potentially damaging relationships and objectives that key stakeholders may have.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like first and foremost to thank my mum Sally Burchett who has only ever been supportive of every endeavour in my life. When I returned to university after years in the doldrums, she provided as much material assistance as I needed to get the work done, and then a bit extra on top. I could not have made it here without her. Thanks also to my sister Rachel Burchett for being there along the way.

Second, I would like to thank my inspirational supervisors Michael Adams and Leah Gibbs. During my undergraduate degree they taught like they cared and proved that teaching is a profession that has the ability to inspire. Leah and Michael both subtly prompted my involvement in the honours program, and were my first choices to supervise this project. They motivated me when I needed motivation and their criticism was only ever helpful. I aspire to their professional integrity and academic excellence.

I thank all the people that agreed to take time out of their busy schedules and be interviewed for this project. There really wouldn't be a project without them, and their participation provided a wealth of knowledge that benefitted not just the research project, but my understanding of life and work in regional Australia. Also, thanks to all the people who have helped in the research side of this project in the last 9 months, and the support staff at the University of Wollongong.

I would like to thank my best friend Lachlan Vercoe for always being there, and helping me remember who I am, through the good times and bad. Also thanks to Dave Eden for being a character that walks the line between punk and academia, demonstrating to me when I was still adrift in the world that knowledge is both creative and powerful. Endless thanks to Nancy de Castro for her contribution of diligent proofreading and total moral support – these last months would have been unbearable without you. Much love to my long time animal companion Goose who helps me see the joy in simple things every day.

Finally, I would like to show my respect and acknowledge the Traditional Custodians and Elders of this great wide country both past and present. I sincerely hope that this research may somehow benefit you.

CAVEATS

The expression 'Traditional Owners' is used in this thesis interchangeably with 'Indigenous' and 'Aboriginal' since this term has become a general term and was often used in the interview process. The term is applicable whether or not Aboriginal people currently own the land. Use of a non-capitalised 'indigenous' will typically refer to non-Australian indigenous people except where used in citations from other sources and its use must therefore be viewed in its context.

I also acknowledge the diversity within Australian Aboriginal peoples; their languages, their cultures, their voices, their opinions, and aim to be as non-reductive as possible when discussing them. However, for the purposes of analysis and discussion, the Aboriginal peoples of Cape York may at times be reduced to a single culture. Within the scope of this project, it is difficult to expand upon the unique differences. Any discussion of ongoing relationships with Indigenous and settler Australians in other parts of the country is for comparative and discursive use only, and is not intended to be reductive of the differences of Aboriginal nations around the country.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
CAVEATS	5
TABLE OF CONTENTS	6
LIST OF FIGURES	9
LIST OF TABLES	9
LIST OF BOXES	9
LIST OF TERMS	10
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION: HISTORY, INDUSTRY AND RELATIONSHIPS	11
1.1 THE ROAD TO WORLD HERITAGE: KEY ORGANISATIONS AND ISSUES	14
1.1.1 Cape York Land Council, BALKANU and the Cape York Agenda	14
1.1.2 The Wilderness Society and Australian Conservation Foundation	15
1.1.3 Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007	16
1.1.4 State Government and The Wild Rivers Act	17
1.2 REGIONAL OVERVIEW	18
1.2.1 TENURE AND LAND USE	20
1.3 CONCLUSION	27
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	28
2.1 INTRODUCTION	28
2.2 POSITIONALITY	30
2.3 CONTEXT OF RESEARCH WITHIN HERITAGE DISCOURSE	32

2.4 METHODS	33
2.4.1 Written sources	33
2.4.2 Semi-structured Interviews	33
2.5 ETHICS	36
2.5.1 A Formal Ethics Process	37
2.5.2 Ethics and Fieldwork	38
2.6 LIMITATIONS	39
 CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW	 40
3.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	40
3.1.1 Authorised Heritage Discourse	40
3.1.2 Postcolonialism	41
3.1.3 Social Nature in Heritage Discourse	44
3.2 'VALUES' & HERITAGE MANAGEMENT	48
3.3 ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVES IN HERITAGE MANAGEMENT	50
The Economies of Cape York and Their Role in Heritage-Making	52
3.4 CONCLUSION	56
 CHAPTER FOUR: HERITAGE, 'OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUES' AND CAPE YORK	 58
4.1 WORLD HERITAGE	58
4.1.1 World Heritage in Australia	60
4.2 A CAPE YORK NOMINATION	60
4.2.1 Goals for World Heritage	63
4.2.2 Stakeholder Perspectives	64
 CHAPTER FIVE: RICH, DIVERSE ECONOMIES	 67
5.1 ECONOMIC VISIONS FOR CAPE YORK	68
5.1.1 Pastoralism	69
5.1.2 Mining	72
5.1.3 Tourism & The Conservation Economy	74
5.2 CONCLUSIONS	77

CHAPTER SIX: THE POLITICS OF HERITAGE	78
6.1 POWER, CONFLICT AND COMPROMISE	79
6.1.1 Governance	83
6.2 CONCLUSIONS	88
 CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS	 90
 REFERENCES	 96
FIGURE REFERENCES	105
Figure 1.2	105
Figure 1.3	105
Figure 1.4	105
Figure 1.5	105
Figure 3.1	105
Figure 4.1	106
Figure 5.1	106
Figure 6.1	106
 APPENDIX A: TABLE OF INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS	 107
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET	108
APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM	109
APPENDIX D: ETHICS APPROVAL	110
APPENDIX E: POSSIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LISTING SCENARIOS	111

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
Figure 1.1: Postcard/petition from The Wilderness Society to use public support to lobby Members of Parliament on World Heritage for Cape York.	16
Figure 1.2: Cape York Peninsula Map.	19
Figure 1.3: Cape York Peninsula land tenures in 1970.	22
Figure 1.4: Cape York Peninsula land tenures in 2010.	23
Figure 1.5: Road access availability in the Cape York Peninsula.	25
Figure 3.1: Images of 'natural' Cape York landscapes.	47
Figure 4.1: Governance structures for Australian World Heritage sites.	61
Figure 5.1: Pastoralism in Cape York	67
Figure 6.1: Cape York Aboriginal leaders Gina Castelain, David Claudie and Jimmy Richards lobbying in support of Wild Rivers.	78

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
Table 2.1: Interview participants' names, organisational position and office/interview location.	35

LIST OF BOXES

BOX	PAGE
Box 1.1: The World Heritage Convention.	12
Box 1.2: Tourism Statistics for Cape York.	26
Box 2.1: Strategies for Discourse Analysis.	29
Box 2.2: Positionality Statement.	31

LIST OF TERMS

ACF	Australian Conservation Foundation
AIATSIS	Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies
CAFNEC	Cairns and Far North Environment Centre
CYLC	Cape York Land Council
CYPAL	National Park (Cape York Peninsula Aboriginal Land)
CYSF	Cape York Sustainable Futures
CYTRIG	Cape York Tenure Resolution Implementation Group
DERM	QLD Department of Environment and Resource Management
<i>EPBC Act</i>	<i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth)</i>
HREC	Human Research Ethics Committee
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LNP	QLD Liberal National Party
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
QLD	Queensland
TWS	The Wilderness Society
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

The Cape York Peninsula (Cape York) boasts a spectacular landscape which many choose to call ‘wilderness’. Its lack of industrial development means that its rivers, catchments, and wetlands are free-flowing and unpolluted. In 2005, the Queensland (QLD) government passed the contentious *Wild Rivers Act 2005* (hereafter referred to as Wild Rivers) in order to protect these rivers from future development. These ‘wild’ places are not apolitical but are instead spaces of contestation between those who live in rural areas, and the policy-makers whose decisions ultimately affect the lives of those people. Wild Rivers is a textbook example of how politics, environmental issues, and social justice can become embroiled in messy public debates. The debate of Wild Rivers issues vociferously argued between Aboriginal leader Noel Pearson and The Wilderness Society amongst others that raged throughout the pages of *The Australian* broadsheet, is a powerful example of the role the media can play in environmental and Aboriginal politics. Although now inscribed into QLD common law, Wild Rivers continues to be a contentious topic, and seven years later, its legacy is impacting the potential World Heritage listing of Cape York in multiple and unforeseen ways that are only beginning to be expressed.

Cape York is Australia’s most northern point and the peninsula encompassing it is home to some of the “world’s healthiest natural river systems” (The Wilderness Society 2010), rare tropical savannah and rainforest ecological communities, and also a diverse range of people, some of whom have owned and occupied the area since time immemorial. Accordingly, Cape York is home to sites of rich cultural significance and cultural practices that existed prior to, and consistently since European settlement on the continent. An example is the image on the title page (Lachajczak 2011), where a young boy participates in customary Aboriginal dance, but the onlookers in the background illustrate the reality of modern Aboriginal and rural culture.

Cape York therefore has a long history and reputation as a contested landscape. The nomination of Cape York as a World Heritage site (see Box 1.1 for an introduction to World Heritage) was a policy platform committed to in the early 1990s by a Labor Federal Government, with the Labor State Government providing much of the groundwork in compiling heritage values and community consultation. The machinery of the nomination has continued in the intervening years with little in the way of tangible results. The current federal environment minister has clearly stated that no listing will go ahead without Traditional Owner consent.

In this thesis I consider two sets of questions for the specific case study of Cape York and its nomination for World Heritage that investigate the significance and appropriateness of this heritage regime for the area. The following section outlines the key questions that will be explored. The first set of questions concerns the appropriateness of World Heritage for the scale and diversity of Cape York. The second set of questions unpacks the discursive structures of heritage management and governance that empower or disempower communities.

Box 1.1 The World Heritage Convention

“World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located” (UNESCO n.d.-b).

The year 2012 marks the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention.

The World Heritage Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage is a global instrument of heritage protection administered by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO).

The World Heritage Convention was first applied in 1972 and aims to protect sites of ‘outstanding universal significance’ in perpetuity for the global community.

In recognising “the way in which people interact with nature, and the fundamental need to preserve the balance between the two” (UNESCO 2012), the World Heritage Convention embraced the premise that sites with universally important value exist that transcend the boundaries of individual nation-states (Hazen 2008).

World Heritage status affords ongoing legal protection, and definition and promotion of heritage values through appropriate tourism and recreation structures (Davis and Weiler 1992).

Nominations for new World Heritage sites are made by nation state governments to the World Heritage Commission, and must meet at least one of the ten natural or cultural criteria prescribed by the World Heritage Convention.

Nominated sites are then assessed by either the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in the case of cultural heritage, or the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) in the case of natural heritage. Sites can be nominated under both natural and cultural criteria in which case both bodies make assessments. ICOMOS and IUCN then make recommendations to the World Heritage Commission who determine the actual listing.

There are currently 962 World Heritage Sites. Of these, 745 are cultural, 188 are natural and 29 are mixed properties. There are currently 19 World Heritage Sites in Australia.

Conservation organisations and the QLD Department of Environment and Heritage have set February 2013 as the deadline to finalise a nomination.

1.) Is World Heritage appropriate for the scale and diversity of Cape York?

The geographic area of Cape York is large (approximately 13,720,000 hectares) and encompasses a diverse range of land tenures. There has been considerable change in land tenure in the 30 years preceding Wild Rivers, significantly from pastoral leases to national parks and the new jointly managed Cape York Peninsula Aboriginal Lands National Park tenure. Over this large area with complex tenure issues lie numerous governance structures, state and federal legislation, and land and sea management regimes.

How will the scale of Cape York affect its governance and economic development under World Heritage?

Much of the current push for World Heritage in Cape York has come from non-government organisations (NGOs), mainly conservation groups, who see it as a means of protecting Cape York from damaging development in sensitive areas, most notably mining. The most vocal conservation group in Cape York pushing for World Heritage has been The Wilderness Society. In response to critics who suggest that NGOs cater to middle-class urbanites or leftist activists removed from the complexities and difficulties of rural living, many conservation groups have adapted their conservation-only position to a more holistic approach, promoting the inclusion of economic development strategies for World Heritage sites.

2.) What are the discursive structures of heritage-making and governance that empower or disempower Cape York communities?

Neo-colonialism is evident throughout the regimes of power within government processes, scientific analysis and the conservation agenda. During the World Heritage nomination process the QLD government has advanced the community consultation process with an 'opt-in' approach for Aboriginal communities, whereby they participate in consultation only at a time of their choosing, and an ex-pastoralist has been employed to facilitate consultation with pastoralists. However, the saturation of consultation and academic studies in Cape York has led to consultation fatigue.

How do the political conditions in Cape York affect land management and heritage-making?

Many people living in the region or involved in the consultation process do not understand what World Heritage is, and how it will impact them. Much of the World Heritage process in Cape York is affected by the legacy of the Wet Tropics World Heritage area and Wild Rivers legislation. The powerlessness of local voices and Traditional Owners in the Wet Tropics Management Authority, whilst improving, is a visible reminder of how management of World Heritage sites can disempower people.

This thesis was undertaken through the considered use of academic texts, and original research utilising semi-structured interviews with members of organisations involved in the World Heritage nomination process.

1.1 THE ROAD TO WORLD HERITAGE: KEY ORGANISATIONS AND ISSUES

1.1.1 CAPE YORK LAND COUNCIL, BALKANU AND THE CAPE YORK AGENDA

The Cape York Land Council (CYLC) is an Aboriginal organisation and prescribed body corporate under the *Corporations (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders) Act 2006* (Cth). It represents the native title claims of the people of Cape York. CYLC has an associated development arm called Balkanu Cape York Development Corporation (hereafter referred to as Balkanu), which deals with economic and social responsibilities including the World Heritage process (Holmes 2012). These are the most financially and politically well-resourced and powerful Aboriginal organisations in the state. The CYLC and Balkanu are immersed in the traditionalist/developmentalist schism within Aboriginal politics on the Cape, and Balkanu is a forceful advocate of the developmentalist paradigm (Holmes 2012). For both groups, their relationship with the Aboriginal populations they represent is complex. According to Smith (2005: 7):

Many local Aborigines, including those involved with Balkanu-sponsored projects, remain critical of the political implications of these projects and the forms of knowledge on which they are based. Despite stated intentions to ensure that projects of this kind are community-based initiatives, which place an emphasis on local control and Aboriginal cultural values, many among the Peninsula's Aboriginal population continue to see them as the projects of outside agencies, in particular the Cairns-based organisations, despite claims by these organisations that they represent Aboriginal interests.

Despite the fact that Aboriginal communities supporting the Cape York Agenda sometimes lack consensus, the CYLC and Balkanu are major powerbrokers and their support for a World Heritage nomination and implementation (assuming Traditional Owners consent) will be crucial (Valentine 2006). The disunity stemming from the breakdown in the *Cape York Peninsula Heads of Agreement* and Wild Rivers pits Balkanu, who primarily deal with economic development issues, directly at odds with The Wilderness Society and the conservation movement in general. The next section describes The Wilderness Society and Australian Conservation Foundation positions and how they differ from that of Balkanu.

1.1.2 THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY AND AUSTRALIAN CONSERVATION FOUNDATION

According to Holmes (2012), the traditionalist/developmentalist schism is also affecting the strategies of non-Aboriginal organisations, particularly the conservation sector. Holmes (2011: 54) argues that it is:

[M]isleading to interpret contests as if solely between conventionally identifiable power groups, such as between miners, developers, pastoralists, Indigenous people and conservationists. Recent contests are characterised by flux in alliances and schisms between and among the two recently emergent and currently dominant contenders, Indigenous and conservationist.

Within this sector, the two major national conservation organisations, The Wilderness Society and the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) have taken divergent strategies in their recognition of Aboriginal interests.

The Wilderness Society is strongly pursuing a bioregional conservation campaign, with core elements including “an ambitious programme of National Park declarations, including completion of the continuous east coast ‘wilderness’ zone; alliances with native titleholders to preserve ‘wilderness’; opposition to any pastoral, agricultural or mining initiatives; vigorous support for recent Wild Rivers declarations; and support for inscription of the peninsula as a World Heritage property” (Holmes 2012: 262). This strategy has involved fostering alliances with traditionalist Aboriginal leaders who are resistant to the CYLC agenda, and mobilising their considerable membership base during electoral campaigns to vote for the QLD Greens (who typically direct electoral preferences to Labor in exchange for conservation programmes) (see Figure 1.1). On the other hand, the ACF has given primacy to overcoming Aboriginal disadvantage and endorsed the modernist agenda of the CYLC, sometimes foregoing “declarations on National Parks where in conflict with substantial Indigenous concerns” (Holmes 2012: 262).

The Wilderness Society honed its campaigning skills in Tasmania in the 1980s. In pursuit of a larger national presence, in 1995 TWS chose Cape York as its main campaign outside of Tasmania (Holmes 2011a). It has been influential “both locally among Indigenous traditional power circuits and also in State political arenas” (Holmes 2011a: 61). TWS are often accused of “prioritising iconic landscapes over other less visibly valuable environments”, and they maintain that they have the right to campaign for the protection of ‘wilderness’ and biodiversity even if local Aboriginal people are unsupportive (Pickerill 2009: 72). The ACF however began a long-term shift to become a bi-cultural (Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) organisation (Pickerill 2009). Activists from both organisations recognised that their organisations “suffered a form of institutional colonialism that would take many years to shift” (Pickerill 2009: 75). The ACF in response “developed a programme (rather than a campaign) that deliberately attempted to build a long-term partnership with different Aboriginal organisations and communities. (Pickerill 2009: 76).

Figure 1.1: Postcard/petition from The Wilderness Society to use public support to lobby Members of Parliament on World Heritage for Cape York. **SOURCE:** The Wilderness Society office in West End, Brisbane

1.1.3 CAPE YORK PENINSULA HERITAGE ACT 2007

In 1996, a landmark agreement known as the Cape York Land Use Heads of Agreement was signed by the cattle industry, Aboriginal groups, environmental NGOs (and later by the QLD government in 2001). This agreement has been highlighted as an example of a negotiated regional agreement that went beyond the minimum requirements for native title agreements. Explicit in the agreement was a commitment to assess and protect World Heritage values in Cape York. This agreement has largely failed due to a total lack of “procedure towards resolution” (Holmes 2011a: 61) and failure “to resolve the main substantive issues (Holmes 2012: 261) including security of tenure and consensus support for World Heritage (Pearson 2006). According to Homes (2012), the failure of the Heads of Agreement is not necessarily indicative of the divide between Indigenous and conservationist, but between traditionalist versus developmentalist “visions of Indigenous futures, with conservation organisations aligning policies towards these visions” (Holmes 2012: 259).

With the failed legacy of the Heads of Agreement firmly entrenched, the QLD government legislated the ‘omnibus’ *Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007* (Holmes 2011a). Its multifunctional agenda recognised Indigenous community-use areas, committed to designation of Areas of International Conservation Significance, maintained joint management of national parks as a priority, provided for 75-year terms on rural leases (subject to Indigenous Land Use Agreements), considered the impacts of lease tenure conversions on the grazing industry, and “required the creation of a special ministerial advisory committee ‘comprising all stakeholder interests on peninsula matters’” (Chester 2010; Holmes 2011a: 65). Importantly, the *Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act* was supported by the QLD Labor government and the Liberal and National Parties in both process and resources. The special ministerial advisory committees launched under the Act have played an important role in the World Heritage nomination process since the legislation passed.

1.1.4 STATE GOVERNMENT AND THE WILD RIVERS ACT

Prior to the enactment of the *Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act*, the failed Heads of Agreement was displaced by the *Wild Rivers Act 2005* (QLD). It was, according to Iles and Johns (2010: 74), “legislation proposed by conservation groups in return for political support to the Queensland Government.” It immediately came under criticism from Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike for its use of the word ‘wild’, which carried all the colonial associations ascribed to ‘wild’ places that have in fact been occupied and experienced by indigenous peoples (Neale 2011). According to the QLD government, these ‘wild’ rivers “are one of Queensland’s most valuable assets” that are “rich in heritage, and are a source of scenic beauty, recreational activity and even cultural significance” (Milner 2004). Iles (2010) argues that the argument for preserving rivers in Cape York could be applied to any river in Queensland, but the focus on Cape York was due to the low costs of conservation in the region. Iles (2010: 85) further argues that while Wild Rivers seek to “conserve Cape York’s river catchments for future generations, it ignores the economic and social well-being of these same future generations” which “makes the Act heavily restrictive.”

Since being legislated, Wild Rivers has set much of the tone for consultation and governance structures in Cape York. Often, the processes of World Heritage and Wild Rivers are conflated in the public eye so that the perception of what World Heritage is becomes flawed (Cairns DERM employee, 22nd May 2012). The QLD government took feedback about the Wild Rivers consultation on board when devising the World Heritage consultation and has attempted to address these concerns through the country-based planning process (Cairns DERM employee, 22nd May 2012). In June 2012, the QLD Department of Environment and Heritage (formerly Department of Environment and Resource Management) under the new QLD Liberal National Party released a scoping paper for a Cape York Peninsula Bioregion Management Plan to replace Wild Rivers’ declarations over Cape York rivers

(Department of Environment and Heritage 2012). The purpose of the Bioregion Management Plan and scoping paper will, according to the scoping paper (Ecosystem Outcomes 2012: 1):

[B]ring together a wide range of planning issues that support protection of Cape York's natural and cultural values, and aspirations for economic development. The scoping process will help identify what is included in the [Cape York] plan, and the right place to deal with other issues that are outside the scope of the [Cape York] plan...The [Cape York] plan will inform decision making about the Cape, and build on the government's commitment for a coordinated approach to conservation of our natural heritage and economic development.

1.2 REGIONAL OVERVIEW

Valentine (2006: v), in compiling a case for World Heritage for the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service, defines Cape York as “all land on the peninsula north of 16°S latitude, excluding land that is already listed as part of the Wet Tropics World Heritage property” (see Figure 1.2). It is home to a diverse range of Aboriginal communities and cultures, as well as settler communities based primarily around mining and pastoral interests. At the 2011 Census, Cape York was home to 15,421 people of which 8,566 identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, with settler Australians making up the remainder (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2012). The 2006 census showed that Cape York Aboriginal people were some of the most disadvantaged in the country (Altman 2010). The combined population of the largest towns in the region - Weipa and Cooktown - accommodate roughly 42% of the population of Cape York (Queensland Ambulance Service 2000).

Cape York is considered to be one of the world's great biodiversity 'hotspots' (Woinarski et al. 2007). There are thirty broadly defined vegetation types in Cape York, dominated by eucalypt and melaleuca woodlands and savannah grasslands (Environment Science & Services (NQ) 1995). The savannah is particularly significant since it has been globally identified as being relatively undisturbed and therefore significantly intact (Earth Tech 2005), and is one of the most often cited reasons for a World Heritage listing of Cape York.

Gill (2005: 42) argues that the consequences of the spatial imagining of frontier thinking have created “rigid social and spatial boundaries” over “pastoral leases, urban areas, Aboriginal reserves, and national parks”, all of which are present in Cape York.

Figure 1.2: Cape York Peninsula Map. **SOURCE:** adapted from Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Water (2007).

Challenges to the complete control of the Crown over land tenure began in the 1970s when the Aboriginal emancipatory movement was in full effect. In 1976, Aboriginal activism against Crown control led to the introduction of the *Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976* (Cth) which sought to transfer ownership of unalienable land to Aboriginal people in the Northern Territory. All other states and territories followed suit with similar legislation. Further changes occurred in the wake of the decision by the High Court of Australia to declare the legal fiction of *terra nullius* invalid in the Mabo and Wik High Court determinations, culminating in the *Native Title Act 1993* and *Native Title Amendment Act 1998*. These decisions were a reflection of the national goals of Aboriginal affairs at the time.

Cape York, more so than any other region in Australia, has experienced a striking change in land titles and property rights since the 1970s (Holmes 2011b). Between 1970 and 1990 during the conservative government of Premier Joh Bjelke-Peterson, the conservation land estate in Cape York increased from almost nothing to 11%, mostly at the expense of pastoral leases (Holmes 2011b). QLD Labor governments have, since the early 1990s, articulated a greater desire to endorse Aboriginal land rights, often in exchange for green preferences at the ballot. State-controlled Aboriginal reserves were increasingly shifted towards “secure, non-transferable, self-management tenures” under the *Aboriginal Land Act 1991* (QLD) (Holmes 2011b: 225). Memmott and Blackwood (2008) suggest that approximately 5% of Cape York has been granted as *Aboriginal Land Act* freehold, held by 19 land trusts (2008). Holmes (2012) cites 22%. It is unlikely that this difference is simply an effect of the different times of publication and may be a result of different methods of calculation.

The native title determinations of Mabo and Wik profoundly changed the land tenure environment in much of rural Australia. Native title is estimated to have survived over at least 87% of Cape York despite 200 years of settler attempts at extinguishment (Valentine 2006). The concept of ‘extinguishment’ is consistent with settler narratives that customary law and its corresponding geographies are inferior, so new Crown deeds “have simply ‘washed away’ the presence, connection and continuity of connection required to demonstrate persistent and pre-existing interests” (Gibson 1999; Howitt 2010: 3). In Cape York, much of the native title area available for claim is non-exclusive, existing simultaneously with other land tenures like pastoral holdings and conservation areas such as national park, creating a scenario where collaborative arrangements are necessary. Colchester (2004) claims that whilst co-management is often seen to be an acceptable compromise, these arrangements are only effective when coupled with a concerted effort to address land tenure issues.

In 2004 a Cape York Tenure Resolution Implementation Group (CYTRIG) was established by conservation NGOs, Aboriginal organisations and the QLD government in order to resolve uncertainty around conservation, economic development and native title issues. The CYTRIG parties negotiated an amendment to the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* (Qld) which created a new type of protected area called ‘National Park (Cape York Peninsula Aboriginal Land)’ (Holmes 2011b). The *Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act* was legislated to facilitate the work of CYTRIG. The CYTRIG process is only

partially complete and as a result land tenures in Cape York exist in various stages of dispute, revision and legislative resolution (Memmott and Blackwood 2008). Refer to Figures 1.3 and 1.4 to see the changes in land tenure since 1970.

Unresolved tenure issues are a significant obstacle to a World Heritage nomination of Cape York (Valentine 2006). Some voices, including Aboriginal leaders and conservation NGOs have advocated approaching Aboriginal and conservation interests through the lens of ‘tenure blindness’ (Holmes 2011b) to look beyond the reified boundaries of tenure lines on maps to see the landscape more contextually. Holmes (2011) claims that Cape York is critical in shaping the national land rights debate. He states that “Indigenous empowerment based on land rights has posed challenges to all non-Indigenous interests on the peninsula, most notably pastoralists, mining companies, conservationists and the state government” (Holmes 2012: 261). Fused with an increasingly polarised Aboriginal constituency (typically traditionalist and localist versus modernist and developmentalist), innovative solutions are required from conservation and Aboriginal organisations, and State government. A study by Agius et al. (2007: 201) on an Indigenous Land Use Agreement in South Australia found that innovative responses required “transformed spatialities”, creating “a third space, a hybrid space, a recognition space, a point of intersection for dialogue between and within cultures, an inclusive, formative space, and one that is creative and open.” Unlike Agius *et al.* (2007), Holmes (2012: 261) sees the resolution of Cape York’s conflict as intractable “given this region’s trajectory towards complex multifunctionality involving both Indigenous and non-Indigenous interests”

Pastoralism is prominent in Cape York and has a deeply embedded history. Like elsewhere in Australia, “[t]he material practices of pastoral settlement and land use are central to the creation and maintenance of geographies through which settler Australians claim belonging in the island continent” (Gill 2005: 43). Pastoralism therefore plays a critical role in defining Cape York identities. There are approximately 112 pastoral properties in Cape York which account for almost 60% of the peninsula landmass (Stevenson 1998). Aboriginal ownership of pastoral leases accounted for 7.1% of the total pastoral lease area in 1995, and has since increased (Hill et al. 2008). In some cases, Aboriginal pastoralists have adopted pastoralism as part of their cultural lives (Stevenson 1998). Pastoralism also provides an opportunity to be on-country performing customary cultural activities (Stevenson 1998).

Average property values are historically low at \$4 per hectare in 2009, compared to other rural pastoral areas, with prices of \$11 in Bourke, New South Wales (NSW), and \$75 to \$1500 in nearby Burdekin Shire, QLD (Office of the New South Wales Valuer General 2009; Queensland Department of Environment and Resource Management 2011; Stevenson 1998). Cattle grazing has dominated Cape York since the early 20th century and remains the largest industry in Cape York by land use, though is currently below the 77% coverage it had in the 1970s (Holmes 2011b). It has been criticised as an industry in decline and concerns have been raised about its ongoing feasibility (Holmes 2011b), though a recent House of Representatives inquiry stated that “[c]ontinued growth of the beef industry is likely due to a promising export outlook” (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Economics 2011: 18).

Figure 1.3: Cape York Peninsula land tenures in 1970. **SOURCE:** (Holmes 2012: 255).

Figure 1.4: Cape York Peninsula land tenures in 2010. **SOURCE:** (Holmes 2012: 257).

The decline in the value of the pastoral industry parallels the ascension of mining as Cape York's most profitable industry. Aboriginal people have experienced dispossession and disempowerment as a result of mining interests, and the link between mining and global capital has consequences for local people. Mining was first proposed in Aurukun in Cape York in 1957, yet very little has materialised despite agreements and policy to ensure development, and is largely due to the unpredictability and instability of global capital (Martin 2011). Profits have not been equally shared between extraction companies and Traditional Owners for the removal of minerals on their lands since there is no requirement under the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth).

One of the largest bauxite mines in Australia (and the world) is located at Weipa on Cape York's western coast. Operations began in 1961 (Klimenko and Evans 2009). It is owned and run by Rio Tinto Alcan and employed 745 people in 2009, 25% of whom identify as Aboriginal (Rio Tinto 2012a; Rio Tinto 2012b). Weipa and the Cape Flattery silica mine (the largest producer of silica sand in the world) are the only fully developed mines in Cape York, but according to the news media, new bauxite and coal mines continue to be proposed (AAP 2010; Australian Broadcasting Corporation 2010; McFadzean 2011). Mining will likely remain "the only major activity capable of overcoming the heavy cost burdens imposed by extreme isolation, with the only alternatives being niche, high-value products in horticulture and aquaculture, requiring investments in capital and human skills not readily attracted to the peninsula" (Holmes 2012: 263).

While the continuing change and resolution of land tenure in the Indigenous property estate maintains a trajectory of increased conservation, there is less certainty for the growth of tourism which is limited by infrastructure (Holmes 2012). The upgrading of the Peninsula Development Road has been identified as being 'fundamental' to a functioning and expanding tourism market (Chester 2010). As illustrated by Figure 1.3, while in the dry season the road is usable, in the wet season many sections of the road can be closed, seriously limiting access for road-based tourists. However, tourism remains an important economic factor in Cape York, both in real terms and in terms of the role tourism plays in the discourse of World Heritage. According to a study produced for the Department of Environment and Resource Management, tourism "is considered to be an important way for local communities to gain social and economic benefits from World Heritage and a potential source of funding for protection of a site" (Planning for People 2011: 18). One regional Aboriginal organisation, the Chuulangun Aboriginal Corporation in Cape York has embraced tourism. Tourism is not just seen as potential income, but as a way of regulating the "unwanted incursion" of tourists and hunters within its jurisdiction (Smith and Claudie 2003: 18).

Globally, World Heritage sites are some of the most popular tourist destinations, and revenue raised from tourists is often a large contributor to funding maintenance (Hazen 2009). It has been noted by Hazen (2009) that World Heritage acts as a 'brand name' that is used to appeal to the tourist market.

Figure 1.5: Road access availability in the Cape York Peninsula. **SOURCE:** (Avalook at Australia 1999)

Tourism in neighbouring World Heritage sites, the Great Barrier Reef and Wet Tropics, contributed roughly \$2.6 billion between 2004 and 2005 to the QLD economy (\$2.18 billion at the Great Barrier Reef and \$426 million at the Wet Tropics) (Prideaux and Falco-Mammone 2007), and has been considered a success for the Wet Tropics site (Chester 2010). However, some of the communities within the site boundaries “have missed out or seen little benefit owing to fundamental factors of tourism dynamics (access, product, linkages with other attractions/products/accommodation)” (Chester 2010: 39). Despite this criticism, Chester (2010) maintains that tourism will be the most effective generator of economic development resulting from World Heritage, and “is the most prospective means for communities to gain economic independence and sustain livelihoods from any Cape York World Heritage area” (Chester 2010: 54).

Box 1.2 demonstrates that Cape York tourism is currently a marginal operation at best, with limited international support, and appeals primarily to adventure seekers who find its ruggedness appealing. World Heritage status may see these figures change significantly if infrastructure is improved, with expected increases in tourist numbers, changes in demography, and increases in money spent. However, according to a Wild Rivers Interdepartmental Committee, “[m]ass tourism is not a feasible option for the Cape York Peninsula” though it does not specify why (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Economics 2011: 19).

State investment is likely to play an important role in the economic development of the region for some time to come in the absence of a productive neoliberal marketplace (Altman 2001)

Box 1.2: Tourism Statistics for Cape York

- Between 60,000 and 70,000 people visit Cape York each year (compared to 4.65 million visits per year to the neighbouring Wet Tropics World Heritage area (**House of Representatives Standing Committee on Economics 2011: 19; Prideaux and Falco-Mammone 2007**)).
- The largest proportion of visitors to Cape York is from interstate (43% in 2002, 55% in 2001) (**Tourism Queensland 2003: 2**).
- Approximately one third of visitors to Cape York are from Queensland (32% in 2002, 37% in 2001). Of these, approximately one quarter are from Far North Queensland (22% 2002, 26% 2001) (**Tourism Queensland 2003: 2**).
- Overseas residents make up less than 10% of visitors to Cape York (**Tourism Queensland 2003: 2**).
- The key age group of visitors to Cape York is 45 to 64 years (**Tourism Queensland 2003: 2**).
- The top five stated motives for travelling to Cape York are (**Tourism Queensland 2008**):
 - never been before
 - adventure
 - fishing
 - go to the Tip, and
 - four-wheel driving
- More than half the visitors to Cape York visit the Archer River, Weipa, Seisia, Cooktown, Coen, Bamaga and Musgrave Roadhouse (**NCS Pearson 2002**).

1.3 CONCLUSION

The issues described here will be addressed through an analysis of the current available literature - academic, government, commissioned reports and news media coverage - and through original research: interviews with members of key organisations that are involved in the Cape York World Heritage nomination process. This will follow the chapter structure below:

Methodology: where I discuss the conceptual framework behind my methods, the ethical approach to research, and my interview process.

Literature Review: a synthesis of the current literature and various relevant theoretical perspectives on heritage, postcolonialism, the nature/culture binary, and the economies of Cape York.

Heritage, ‘Outstanding Universal Values’ and Cape York: World Heritage in the context of Cape York, its background and values, and stakeholder goals and perspectives.

Rich, Diverse Economies: outcomes from my fieldwork in the context of previous chapters, concerning the similarities and differences in organisational visions for economic development in Cape York under a World Heritage nomination.

The Politics of Heritage: also outcomes from the fieldwork, concentrating on the nature of politics and ideological conflict and alliances between Aboriginal, conservation and industry in heritage-making.

Final Reflections: a synthesis of the results in the previous two chapters addressing my research questions.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

There are various methodological challenges involved in researching rural and non-urban areas like Cape York, such as difficulty of access, differences in positionality, and challenges of cross-cultural interactions. Epistemological challenges arise when research strives to avoid falling into the trap of the “paternalistic arrogance of imperialism” (Said 1993: xx), which have long been in evidence in the discourse surrounding ‘frontier’ landscapes such as Cape York. I acknowledge that the term ‘postcolonial’ is contested (Blunt and McEwan 2002; Braun 2002), and my research is situated within a history imbued with all the characteristics of a colonial landscape: dispossession, disempowerment, and exclusion (Agius et al. 2007; Lane and Williams 2008; MacKay and Caruso 2004; Rose 1999; Veracini 2011). Colonial discourse is still very much in evidence but, as Rose (1999: 182) concludes, these processes have become so insidious and institutionalised as to be almost invisible:

In settler societies one is situated in a political economy of violence... [M]any of these practices are embedded in the institutions that are meant to reverse processes of colonisation. Colonising practices embedded within decolonising institutions must not be understood simply as negligible side effects of essentially benign endeavours. This embeddedness may conceal, naturalise, or marginalise continuing colonising practices.

One example of colonialist processes involves the classification of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal identities when those boundaries are in fact “contested and fluid” (Shaw et al. 2006: 269). Whilst I acknowledge that the categories of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal are problematic, their common usage remains convenient for discussion and analysis in this research.

It is important to me that I aim to reject the exploitative nature of colonial research and attempt to contribute to the self-determination of Cape York peoples. I will engage with the idea of ‘decolonising research’ raised by Howitt and Stevens (2005: 32), and attempt to “use the research process and research findings to break down the cross-cultural discourses, asymmetrical power relationships, representations, and political, economic, and social structures through which colonialism and neo-colonialism are constructed and maintained.” The methodologies employed in the project are informed by these ideas, and by other critical theories that exist in the field of human geography. The most influential theory is post-structuralism, popular in the field since the 1980s. Murdoch (2006: 2) states that post-structuralism and human geography are interleaved since “they both examine nature-society interactions and concern themselves with the (spatial) consequences of these interactions.” The purpose of post-structuralism then is to describe “social and cultural systems that are open and dynamic, constantly in the process of ‘becoming’” (Murdoch 2006: 10). Braun (2002: 33) sees these social and political interactions as historically constituted, inasmuch as they “do not pre-exist their articulation in specific events, but are constituted and reconstituted in and through them.”

Michel Foucault's influential post-structuralist theory of discourse analysis is instrumental to the analysis of data, and critical reflexivity is a necessary component of fieldwork. Waitt (2005) identifies discourse analysis as an unraveller of the social context within a text (including, but not limited to, newspapers, academic texts, photographs, tourism brochures, and spoken word, in both Waitt's definition and for the purposes of this thesis), and examines the effects that a particular text may have on how an individual *engages* with that text. The methodological strength of discourse analysis, he argues, "lies in its ability to move beyond the text, the subtext, and representation to uncover issues of power relationships that inform what people think and do" (Waitt 2005: 165-166). Waitt's attention to discursive structures - unwritten conventions that both produce and explain the world - are particularly useful when encountering the divergent and conflicting opinions on heritage management (Waitt 2005). These discursive structures circulate and normalise particular ideas that become 'truth'. Post-structuralism therefore concerns the "troubling, exposing, and unsettling" of these 'truths' (Waitt 2005: 169). The utility of discourse analysis in environmental management is highlighted in Nursey-Bray (2009). Using the example of Indigenous responses to large-scale mining projects, discourse analysis revealed key differences in the competing Indigenous community responses to mining. Importantly in this context, "resource management systems are also political systems that produce resource commodities and power" and therefore "impact directly on decision making processes" making an understanding of the discursive landscape imperative (Nursey-Bray 2009: 445). Similar understandings are necessary for the context of this thesis. I will therefore use Waitt's (2005) strategies for the investigation of discourse (see Box 2.1).

In this chapter I will outline the methods used in my research, including the ethics procedure, interview process and positionality statement. Finally, a brief discussion of the limitations of this thesis is included.

Box 2.1: Strategies for Discourse Analysis (Waitt 2005: 180)

- i. Suspend pre-existing categories: examine your texts with fresh eyes and ears.
- ii. Familiarisation: absorb yourself in your texts
- iii. Coding: identify key themes to reveal how the producer is embedded within particular discursive structures.
- iv. Persuasion: investigate within your texts for effects of 'truth'.
- v. Incoherence: take notice of inconsistencies within your texts.
- vi. Active presence of the invisible: look for mechanisms that silence.
- vii. Focus on details.

2.2 POSITIONALITY

Reflexivity in the post-structuralist research engagement requires the explicit exposition of how the researcher is positioned in relation to the subject so that “everyone’s ground is destabilised and people expect surprises, challenges and to be changed” (Suchet 2002: 154). This awareness is critical when considering how the subject – their responses and composure – may be affected in response to my presence. Otherwise by ignoring the origin of the knowledge and the context under which it is produced, I may inadvertently “make false claims to universally applicable knowledge which subjugate other knowledges and their producers” (Rose 1997: 307). Critical reflexivity is particularly important in postcolonial geographies when considering the power structures that may exist between the researcher and the subject. Through the explicit analysis of position, reflexivity becomes a process of self-discovery, and the researcher opens themselves up to analysis (Rose 1997).

Critical reflexivity is also a strategy for dealing with subjectivity in qualitative research (Dowling 2005; Waitt 2005). The dispassionate interpretation of objective research that quantitative researchers strive for is “difficult if not impossible because we all bring personal histories and perspectives to research” (Dowling 2005: 25). This interpretation goes on to form the basis of the intersubjectivity of “the world created, confirmed, or disconfirmed as a result of interactions (language and action) with other people within specific contexts” (Dowling 2005: 25). During interaction with research subjects, being aware of power structures is crucial in order to maintain a two-sided dialogue. Otherwise, as Rose (1999: 176-177) identifies, “[t]he communication is all one way, and the pole of power refuses to receive the feedback that would cause it to change itself, or to open itself to dialogue.” Knowledge in this context is a reflection of and intimately involved with the circuits of power. As Dowling (2005: 23) suggests, “[t]he stories you tell about your participants’ action, words, and understandings of the world have the potential to change the way those people are thought about.”

Throughout the fieldwork process I maintained a research diary. I wrote the first entry just prior to the first interview, and attempted to articulate my thoughts on the research thus far. I continued to write as more information was presented to me, allowing my thoughts to change and coalesce over time. Maintaining a research diary has been a key way in which I engaged in reflexivity. The thought processes involved in diary writing aimed to keep me open to new ideas that arose when engaging with research participants so that I was not fixed in my position throughout the interview and research process. This also allowed me to re-evaluate interview questions and structure as necessary when interviews began to highlight particular avenues of questioning that were more relevant, and to account for the emergence of themes. In this way I could focus my questioning in particular areas with different participants in direct response to specific issues that arose between different schisms in Cape York politics. The reflexive diary articulates how my thoughts have changed and clarified over time, and has been a useful device that informed my discussion of the results of the research.

Box 2.2: Positionality Statement

I grew up as the child of school teacher parents in the outer suburbs of Adelaide. Environmental and Aboriginal issues did not feature significantly in an upbringing that can best be surmised as typically white and middle class. It was in my mid-teens when I discovered, through punk music, that there were important gaps in my understanding of the world. Gender, environmental, animal welfare and social justice issues finally became visible, and became core components of my identity in my early twenties. After some time into my twenties, I became disillusioned due to my inability to make meaningful change in the world, leading the lifestyle of constant mobility and welfare dependency in which I was then engaged, and in many ways, trapped. Being constantly on the outside, I felt muzzled by my own ineffectiveness. It felt as if my voice lacked the volume and cadence to be heard, and that even should I break through this barrier of silence, that I lacked the words to articulate my feelings. This prompted me in my mid-twenties to return to study to attempt to find a voice and the means to describe the injustices I saw in the world. I began an Environmental Science degree, but quickly found that it lacked the required multi-disciplinary and critical approach that I instinctively knew was required to reconcile the difficult terrain of Aboriginal studies and resource management in the Australian context. I switched my degree to Land and Heritage Management, which, whilst falling under the umbrella of a science degree, was heavily influenced by social studies and also considered ethics and Aboriginal issues. This gave me the opportunity to explore in more depth issues such as Aboriginal law and policy within the Australian legal and political system, environmental ethics and postcolonial studies. All of these issues I see as being critical in the geography of Australian heritage management.

My desire to engage with Aboriginal issues comes not from a place of settler guilt, but from a place of shared responsibility and deep love and connection for this country. My journey into adulthood impelled me to move interstate a number of times, starting in Adelaide where I was raised, and moving my way around the east coast. I have experienced very little desire to travel overseas in this time, usually opting for experiences that take me into more remote areas of this country. I have a passion bordering on patriotism (as distinctly removed from the symbolism of nationalism), which to me means that all Australians should be able to equally share in economic opportunity, social justice, and self-determination. I hope to make a contribution in the field of land and heritage management which I see as a discipline that recognises and supports cultural difference and mutual respect.

2.3 CONTEXT OF RESEARCH WITHIN HERITAGE DISCOURSE

Human geography has in recent years been a critical instigator of change in heritage discourse through post-structuralist and feminist theory and research methods. The work of Waterton *et al.* (2006) in heritage studies has been formative, specifically the development and utilisation of the concept of a Critical Discourse Analysis as a means of pursuing a “progressive, emancipatory and empowering social agenda” (Waterton *et al.* 2006: 343). This approach complements and expands upon Waitt’s (2005) techniques of discourse analysis in the context of heritage management. Waterton *et al.* (2006) argue that investigating a social ‘problem’ and looking “to the structure, organisation... and management of language” allows researchers to focus their understanding of how language figures in that particular problem (Waterton *et al.* 2006: 342-343). Waterton *et al.* (2006) contend that Critical Discourse Analysis renders visible instances of ‘common-sense’ in the field of science and its use of ‘experts’ that dominate heritage discourse (Waterton *et al.* 2006), for example in the IUCN and ICOMOS advisory bodies to the World Heritage Commission.

Using the investigative techniques of Critical Discourse Analysis, I analyse heritage management in general and the argument for World Heritage status in Cape York in particular. My research comes at a time when understandings of heritage and World Heritage as a global and universalising heritage convention create a discourse of sites being “spiritual sanctuaries and places of self-discovery, places of breathtaking beauty and destinations for much-needed recreation” (IUCN 2003, cited in Hazen 2009: 168). Hazen (2009) also finds evidence in the UNESCO documentation of a mindset that sees the UNESCO model as the only valid model of heritage management: “World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located” (Hazen 2009: 168). This attitude to World Heritage insinuates a global hegemony in heritage management that could be used to wrest control and context away from the indigenous people to whom the heritage belongs. As I will argue, heritage must be de-colonised and re-contextualised, particularly in sites that involve Aboriginal Australians (and may thus have ramifications for indigenous peoples elsewhere).

It is my hope that this work will contribute in some way to the wider global discussions on indigenous land rights and environmental resource management. More specifically, I hope that it may inform the current Australian agents working on a World Heritage nomination for Cape York about possibilities for action and change.

2.4 METHODS

Research was undertaken through the considered use of written texts, semi-structured interviews with members of key organisations involved in the World Heritage nomination process, and the writing of a reflexive research diary. Multiple research methods allow the researcher to triangulate, which is one strategy that facilitates credible data analysis.

2.4.1 WRITTEN SOURCES

The primary and preferred choice of written text was academic peer reviewed literature, but also included newspaper articles, government reports, consultation reports prepared for government or industry, parliamentary inquiries, and websites. Non-peer reviewed literature plays an important role in this thesis, filling in gaps between the academic sources. Often I found reports created by private consultants with their in-depth historiographies of the region useful due to the specific nature of the case study. Where non-peer reviewed literature appears in the thesis it is explicitly mentioned.

2.4.2 SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

A post-structuralist approach to research requires the researcher to be open to change and suggestion. Structured interviews and surveys are an inappropriate form of interrogation of the research questions since they do not readily/easily account for the variety of experiences and opinions. Moreover, something meaningful to one person may be substantially different for another, and an understanding of how meanings differ between people is crucial to understanding how we experience the world (Dunn 2005). Structured interviews run the risk of confusing the researcher into thinking they have discovered the ‘truth’ about the issue in question, whereas there are always many truths that need to be teased out and analysed (Dunn 2005).

The semi-structured interview is more conversational in style, and relies upon being comfortable, open and expressive in order to extract the most information. In contrast to a structured interview, the semi-structured conversational style interview is “organised around ordered but flexible questioning” (Dunn 2005: 88). This approach ensures that key themes can still be addressed and returned to if the conversation deviates too far. Due to the qualitative nature of the interview process, and particularly semi-structured interviews, rigour is maintained in unique ways helped by bringing “people ‘into’ the research process” which “capture[s] informants’ views of life” (Dunn 2005: 103). Rigour involves preparation, input from multiple sources, and verification of interpreted information (Dunn 2005).

In researching Cape York, a total of nine people of different genders, ages, and from different organisations and backgrounds were interviewed over the course of two fieldtrips to Cairns and Brisbane. Interviewees were chosen for their relationship to the World Heritage process, and as representatives of the largest interest groups in Cape York, namely: Aboriginal, conservation, government and industry. The following organisations were selected:

- Balkanu Cape York Development Corporation – to represent the Aboriginal community.
- AgForce QLD – to represent pastoral interests.
- Cape York Sustainable Futures – to represent economic development interests.
- The Wilderness Society – to represent the Australian conservation sector.
- Australian Conservation Foundation – to represent the Australian conservation sector.
- Cairns and Far North Environment Centre – to represent local conservation interests.
- Cape York Peninsula Region Scientific and Cultural Advisory Committee – to represent the advisory bodies to the QLD government.
- Department of Environment and Resource Management (now Department of Environment and Heritage) – to represent the QLD Government.

Since the election of the LNP government on the 24th March 2012, the QLD Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) has split into five separate departments under machinery-of-government changes. The department now dealing with World Heritage is the Department of Environment and Heritage. However since this was a recent change and many interviewees referred to DERM, for the sake of consistency throughout this thesis I will continue to refer to the Department of Environment and Heritage by their former acronym DERM.

Table 2.1 displays the interviewee's organisation, office location, place of interview, and role of the interviewee within the organisation (see also Appendix A). Primarily, participants were selected for their position within the organisation's hierarchy, with the most senior position targeted. However, on occasion certain individuals within these organisations were targeted for their relationship to the World Heritage nomination. For example, the Manager of the National Indigenous Conservation Program for The Wilderness Society was selected because of their role in helping to develop policy concerning environmental issues and Indigenous engagement within The Wilderness Society across Australia. I felt that this national and policy development perspective would add more to my research than interviewing the manager of just the Cape York area. The Cape York Program Officer from the ACF was targeted because they also sit on the Cape York Peninsula Regional Advisory Committee and the Board of the Wet Tropics Management Authority. Therefore, the Program Officer is immersed in a broader range of politics and organisations relevant to World Heritage than the CEO of the ACF.

Although the ACF Program Officer identifies as Aboriginal, this was not a factor in my selection since I only discovered this during the interview. Despite gaining access to Balkanu, an organisation that primarily works both with and for Aboriginal concerns, the Chief Operating Officer I spoke to was not Aboriginal himself. Therefore any Aboriginal Cape Yorker perspectives contained within the interview material is either third hand, or from non-Aboriginal representatives speaking on their behalf.

Table 2.1: Interview participants' names, organisational position and office/interview location.

Date	Name	Organisation	Organisation Abbreviation	Position	Office Location	Interview Location
18.05.12	Terry Piper	Balkanu Economic Development Corporation	Balkanu	Chief Operating Officer	Cairns	Cairns Café
21.05.12	John Hardaker	AgForce Queensland	Agforce	Regional Coordinator	No fixed location	Cairns Café
22.05.12	Name withheld	Department of Environment and Resource Management	DERM	Cairns employee	Cairns	Cairns Office
23.05.12	Leah Talbot	Australian Conservation Foundation	ACF	Cape York Program Officer	Cairns	Cairns Café
23.05.12	Sarah Hoyal	Cairns and Far North Environment Centre	CAFNEC	Coordinator	Cairns	Cairns Office
24.05.12	Patricia Butler	Cape York Sustainable Futures	CYSF	Chief Executive Officer	Cairns	Cairns Office
04.06.12	Nigel Stork	Cape York Region Scientific and Cultural Advisory Committee	none	Chair	Brisbane	Brisbane, Griffith University Office
04.06.12	Ross MacLeod	Department of Environment and Resource Management	DERM	Director, Partnerships and World Heritage	Brisbane	Brisbane Café
05.06.12	Anthony Esposito	The Wilderness Society	TWS	Manager, National Indigenous Conservation Program	Brisbane	Private residence

It must also be acknowledged that by primarily interviewing people in their organisational capacity, much of the empirical information gained through interviews was of a somewhat impersonal and corporate/government voice. Names of interviewees are used where consent was given.

2.5 ETHICS

There is a moral justification for doing research ethically, and the negotiation of ethics must occur responsibly so that power is not abused or research participants debased. One of the aims of research is to synthesise conclusions from data, and inject new ideas into the public sphere for discussion. What constitutes ethical research is open for interpretation depending on whom the researcher is and the moral framework within which they reside. Gibson-Graham (2008: 618) argue:

The co-implicated processes of changing ourselves/ changing our thinking/ changing the world are what we identify as an ethical practice. If politics involves taking transformative decisions in an undecidable terrain, ethics is the continual exercising of a choice to be/ act/ or think in certain ways[.]

To me, “certain ways” means the recognition and support of cultural difference and mutual respect. However, acknowledging the need for ethical research standards in human geography work is merely the beginning, and rigour demands the ongoing negotiation of ethics in research.

A consideration of ethics is required because of the inherent power dynamic that exists in research. Power dynamics exist between the researcher, the reader, the research institution, and/or the participant. To counter the repressive dynamics of power, Dowling (2005: 25) insists that “[t]he best strategy is to be aware of, understand, and respond to it in a critically reflexive manner” such as when writing my reflexive research diary. Ethical research involves scrutinising not just the research process but my own participation in it (Dowling 2005). I did not involve Aboriginal participants as co-researchers in the project due to limited scope, I have attempted to engage with the difficulties associated with research in Aboriginal issues by consulting the guidelines of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) for research in Aboriginal studies (AIATSIS 2012).

2.5.1 A FORMAL ETHICS PROCESS

I developed an ethical research programme that was submitted to the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of the University of Wollongong. The committee is comprised of academics and laypeople, includes Indigenous members, and complies with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (University of Wollongong 2012a). My research programme was formulated in accordance with a set of national guidelines that pose a rigorous series of questions that force the researcher to consider all aspects of their project and the possible effects on their participants (University of Wollongong 2012b). The guidelines ask the researcher to consider the justification for their project, how participants will be involved, and what will be asked of them. If the benefits of the research cannot be shown to outweigh the costs, then the research will not proceed. The guidelines require that the researcher evaluate their research and address all ethical considerations before research begins, and incorporate them into the design. The primary ethical concerns for my research project were keeping participants informed of what their participation in the research entailed, ensuring consent prior to interviews, maintaining confidentiality within those interviews such as concealing names where required, and minimising harm in the form of withholding sensitive information when instructed. The AIATSIS guidelines for ethical research in Aboriginal studies were also instructive here, particularly Principle 1: *Recognition of the diversity and uniqueness of peoples, as well as of individuals, is essential* (AIATSIS 2012).

INFORMED CONSENT

Informed consent ensures that individuals participating in research are fully aware and comprehend what the research is, what is expected of them, and what they are contributing prior to the beginning of the research (Dowling 2005). The HREC required that a 'Participant Information Sheet' (See Appendix B) be drafted and included in the formal ethics application. The Information Sheet describes the aims and the objectives of the project in detail and what is required of participants, and was distributed to participants before semi-structured interviews began. This measure aimed to prevent unnecessary harm to participants through awareness and engagement with the research that reduced unwanted surprises.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Confidentiality defines the respect for the privacy of research participants, by ensuring that personal or sensitive details disclosed in the process of conducting research (e.g. through interviews) is not released into the public domain (Dowling 2005). A 'Participant Consent Form' (See Appendix C) was drafted and approved by the HREC, and was given to participants before interviews commenced. The consent form reiterated the aims and objectives of the project, and required participants to formally

give oral or written consent to being interviewed and recorded. Participants were given a choice of how they wish to be identified in the research. Options included:

- Full name and job title/organisation; or
- Job title/organisation (name withheld); or
- ID Code (complete confidentiality, name and title withheld).

This form also outlined that any problems with the research could be taken up with the HREC, and that interview transcripts could be provided upon request. Participation could be withdrawn up to one month after the interview.

Approval from the HREC was received on the 19th April 2012, and interviews began on the 18th May, 2012 (See Appendix D).

2.5.2 ETHICS AND FIELDWORK

The ethics process attempts to prepare the researcher for the investigative processes in the social sciences but the reality of the “noisy and unruly processes” that typify research with humans can hold surprises for which one cannot always plan (Rose 1999: 177).

Fortunately, no insurmountable difficulties arose in my fieldwork. It was initially difficult to generate interview appointments with certain individuals due to heavy schedules and the lag involved in email correspondence. Ensuring I was in town for long enough with available time allowed me some freedom to book some interviews with very little time in advance. Also, events that were occurring in Cape York at the time such as the Mungkan Kaanju National Park (now Oyala Thumotang National Park (CYPAL)) land hand back to Traditional Owners meant that some people were unavailable for some of my time in Cairns. This event did however create the opportunity of bringing people of interest to town, and I was lucky enough to meet informally with some individuals and build relationships that I could draw upon for further research opportunities.

Throughout my research, I remained engaged with the formal ethics process and was committed to engaging with research participants in a communicative and intuitive way. I typically allowed participants to choose where they would like to be interviewed to maximise their comfort. Some participants chose to be interviewed in their office. Others requested the interview take place at their favourite café. Whilst a café is public space, at no time did I feel that my questioning was too personal or in any way inappropriate for the environment. I based this on the participant’s verbal responses to my questions and their body language. While I did forward Participant Information and Consent Forms to participants in advance, many forgot to bring them to the interview. On most occasions I provided spare copies and on the one occasion where I had no spare forms I recorded the participant’s verbal consent instead.

2.6 LIMITATIONS

Due to the scope of the thesis, I was unable to directly access and make contact with individuals from Cape York Aboriginal communities for their comment on World Heritage. I was likewise unable to access pastoralists, tourism tradespeople, and members of the mining community. Therefore, the empirical results of the interview process are not as broad as they could be. Time was a significant limiting factor in both time available for interviews and total length of the honours year. A very restricted budget meant I was only able to visit Cairns for seven nights and this small window limited the number of interviews I could do. With more time, it may have been possible for me to follow up recommendations made by interviewees and to meet more people. I also hoped to interview someone from the World Heritage section of the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities in Canberra and although I had a participant identified, time restraints meant a mutually suitable time could not be found.

This chapter provides a synthesis of the current literature and an exploration of selected relevant theoretical perspectives on heritage, conservation and colonialism. First I will unpack the discursive structure of heritage and heritage management. Second, I will discuss the effects of colonialism within the confines of state power and Western scientific hegemony. Third, I will examine the nature/culture binary and how the concept of social nature is instructive in conceptualising heritage management. Finally, I will investigate the values of heritage management, how they may differ in indigenous contexts, and how the value placed on different economies can influence heritage-making.

3.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This thesis uses three foundational frameworks from which to analyse World Heritage in Cape York. The first conceptual framework is what Smith (2010) calls the ‘authorised heritage discourse’, the critical engagement with the idea of heritage and consideration of the power relations behind the dominant heritage discourse. The second framework I use is postcolonial theory, an investigation of how colonial discourse is evident within heritage and land management. The third framework is social nature, which examines the nature/culture binary apparent in heritage discourse.

3.1.1 AUTHORISED HERITAGE DISCOURSE

Unpacking the discursive nature of ‘heritage’ is crucial to understanding how this discourse is being enlisted to define Cape York in terms of its ‘outstanding universal value’. According to Smith (2010: 63), heritage assumes “a certain common sense understanding” that belies its political underpinnings generally and the politics of indigenous recognition specifically. Beneath this common sense understanding lie continually constituted tensions of “changing cultural, social, economic and political needs and circumstances” (Smith 2010: 63). Smith (2010: 63) argues:

The ability to control the ‘moment of heritage’, when these cultural processes and negotiations come into play at or over the care of places defined as ‘heritage’, is...inevitably arbitrated and regulated by what I have called the authorised heritage discourse.

An authorised heritage discourse stresses universal and collective values which can “obscure local and specific sub-national expressions of heritage” and “facilitate the appropriation of group identities...as ‘national’ heritage” (Smith 2010: 64). Furthermore, Smith (2010: 64) argues that the authorised heritage discourse “identifies and privileges expertise over other forms of knowledge and practice in

the management...of heritage places and objects.” In doing so, authorised heritage discourse “naturalises certain visions of national and group identity by accepting as unproblematic the links between heritage and identity” (Smith 2010: 64). This naturalisation disguises the inherently contested character of heritage. Waterton *et al.* (2006) suggest that power relations between stakeholders be explicitly stated, otherwise the authorised heritage discourse stands to undermine and marginalise certain speakers whilst authorising itself. Therefore, in order to avoid marginalising alternative perspectives, the machinery of heritage-making (anthropology, geography, archaeology) must “allow room for the reconsideration of the utility and authority of the discourses that frame the way knowledge and practice are negotiated and legitimised” (Smith 2010: 67).

The authorised heritage discourse of World Heritage has been evolving since the World Heritage Convention was first drafted by UNESCO in 1972. Australia ratified the World Heritage Convention in 1974 (UNESCO 2012a). By 1979, the Australian branch of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) had drafted the Burra Charter to specifically cater to Australian heritage management needs (Waterton *et al.* 2006). Unlike Europe’s dominant focus on architecture, Australian heritage discourse also includes flora, fauna, and landscapes in defining the collective imagination of heritage (Smith 2010). The Burra Charter has become an international standard within the Authorised Heritage Discourse. Revisions to the Charter have occurred over time as attempts have been made to increase community inclusivity and consultation. Waterton *et al.* (2006) argue that despite the practical implications of these revisions for increased community consultation and ownership of heritage management, they have in effect been largely unsuccessful due to the prominence of the authorised heritage discourse.

3.1.2 POSTCOLONIALISM

Australia is a settler state, defined by Lane and Hibbard (2005: 173) as a state “formed through colonial processes of “discovery,” acquisition, subjugation of indigenous inhabitants, and ultimately, claims of state sovereignty.” Postcoloniality describes the “cultural, economic, and political conditions that exist in the aftermath of colonialism and names a desire to engage them in a critical fashion” (Braun 2002: 21). Focusing on a colonial ‘past’ and a postcolonial ‘present’, runs the risk of obscuring ongoing inequalities between coloniser and colonised (Blunt and McEwan 2002). Blunt and McEwan (2002: 3 emphasis in original) describe postcolonialism as “a *geographically* dispersed contestation of power and knowledge.” Braun (2002: 21 emphasis in original) stresses that “colonialisms and their aftermaths are *local* in their effects and practices, even if they draw on, and are enabled by, universalising discourses (modernity, reason, progress).” There are spatially unique determinants to colonialism, and it has taken form in different ways in different places, as Rose (1999: 184) testifies:

Colonisation produces these places torn and fractured by violence and exile. Colonisers and colonised, we all inhabit these death-scarred landscapes. We are here by hope, and we are here by violence.

Colonial conflict is not confined to a distant past but continues to play out in Cape York physically, spatially, epistemologically, and temporally (Briggs and Sharp 2004: 664), including via World Heritage discourse.

Contestation of sovereignty is one of the defining dimensions of conflict between indigenous residents and the State. According to Lane and Hibbard (2005), a necessary function of the State is to legitimate itself through the deliberate subjugation of indigenous governance structures. The state must therefore continually undermine indigenous agency, and by doing so, assists in the coalescence of an clearly defined and oppositional Aboriginal group identity (Lane and Hibbard 2005). Rose (1996a: 12) describes how “embedded erasure [of Aboriginal agency]...creates absence where there was once presence.” Resistance, according to Howitt (2010), must involve a commitment to building locally negotiated institutions with high levels of ethics, accountability, cross-cultural development and autonomy. Howitt (2010: 7) states:

Recognition of rights...will help to produce locally focused institutions that are committed to (and resourced for) sustainable and equitable livelihoods built on existing (or desired) capacities within Indigenous groups rather than externally imposed solutions built around inappropriate or misunderstood ‘national’ standards.

The relationship between postcolonial institutions and local places primarily plays out in two ways: through state intervention; and through the maintenance of the hegemony of scientific ‘common-sense truths’. Literature on both examples and how they relate to Cape York are outlined below.

COLONIALISM, STATE POWER & SCIENTIFIC HEGEMONY

The relationship between Aboriginal and settler Australians has changed since the land rights’ agenda first gained strength in the 1960s and this change is evident both institutionally and interpersonally. Aboriginal Australians have now regained a level of agency, and governments and other institutions have created departments and policies that attempt to make reparations for past colonial injustices. Rose (1996a) however argues that the very nature of state institutions as sites of Western power and authority makes them culpable in ongoing discursive colonialisms.

Howitt (2010: 1) identifies discourses of emptiness, occupation and possession that have constructed the relationship between Indigenous and settler as “normalised and naturalised.” He argues that to avoid further marginalisation of Indigenous people in geographically remote locations like Cape York,

state intervention must be done in a way that acknowledges cultural pluralism and embraces new discourses of “presence, coexistence and belonging” Howitt (2010: 2).

Lane and Williams (2008: 39) argue that “the particular cultural perspectives of Indigenous peoples are often rendered invisible” in the politics of resource development. In the Cape York narrative, using the example of the Weipa bauxite mine, Suchet (1996: 201) highlights how Aboriginal governance has been “marginalised and smothered” along with “peoples’ experiences and stories.” In their study of Aboriginal participation in mining projects, O’Faircheallaigh and Corbett (2005) note a lack of Aboriginal participation. They suggest that this lack of participation may either be because individuals, communities and organisations are not aware of the potential of agreements, or have chosen not to pursue an environmental management role in exchange for other concessions such as cash settlements or employment programmes (O’Faircheallaigh and Corbett 2005).

Indigenous and Western knowledge systems are methodologically and epistemologically different in how they investigate reality. Agrawal (1995: 418) describes indigenous knowledge as “deeply rooted in its context.” Deloria Jr (1997: 35) points out that indigenous knowledge “becomes valid only when offered by a white scholar recognised by the academic establishment.” Recognition of the legitimacy of indigenous scientific knowledge has been identified as destabilising for the hegemony of expert Western scientific opinion (Briggs 2005). The origin of this dialectic is the fundamental Western belief that “all peoples *began as primitives* and *inevitably* moved toward Western forms of organisation, which in turn were guaranteed by Western religion and philosophy, which have themselves survived thousands of years of criticism and refinement” (Deloria Jr. 1997: 51 emphasis in original). Briggs (2005) further describes how the myth of progress is reflected in colonial history, with the West positioned at the apex of a knowledge hierarchy, while Africans (and all indigenous peoples) are constructed as resource exploiters who lacked the correct scientific knowledge to conduct their economies correctly. This discourse occurs today in ecological ‘crisis’ narratives.

That Western science has become universally accepted has as much to do with its historical connection to colonial expansion and geopolitical power as it does to the objective ‘truth’ of its theories and observations (Briggs and Sharp 2004). Bearing this in mind, indigenous knowledge in the local context may have more to offer than conventional science due to its unique place-based specificities and evolution over time. Positioned as such, indigenous knowledge becomes one of many “competing and contested knowledge systems” (Briggs and Sharp 2004: 662). For example, environmental managers are increasingly endeavouring to incorporate Traditional Ecological Knowledge into Western science and/or management as a measure by which environmental managers can initiate inclusive and equitable methods. If Traditional Ecological Knowledge is ‘cherry-picked’ and merged with existing Western science, this knowledge becomes de-contextualised and transformed. This process means that indigenous people have not only lost control of their knowledge and the context within which it is used, but see their culture filtered and subsumed by the authoritarian language, format, and data rendering of Western positivist science (Castree 1995; Stevenson 2004). Stevenson (2004) makes the point:

[T]he knowledge of Aboriginal peoples did not evolve to inform Western science or ERM [Environmental Resource Management]. Rather, it evolved to inform ways and understandings of life very different from those in which these paradigms emerged. In this light, and contrary to the claims of many environmental resource managers, academics, and even Aboriginal peoples, TEK [Traditional Ecological Knowledge] may have little to offer conventional ERM.

The contested understanding of what ‘nature’ means to different groups in environmental management can be viewed as a contest over “whose knowledge is ‘right’” (Pedynowski 2003): 738). According to Pannell (2006: 6) the professional scientific discourse concerning nature, land management and heritage “provides the procedures for the production” of whose knowledge is right.” Suchet (2002) sees privileging of Western understandings of ‘nature’ reflected in publications of the QLD government for Cape York which describe it as unspoiled and a wilderness, ignoring the interrelationships between Aboriginal people and landscapes. Suchet (2002: 152-153) says:

Concepts and practices of management...bring with them very specific understandings. These are used to explain and justify conquest, repression, management, conservation and development as rational, natural and desirable. By separating and opposing culture to nature, human to animal and domestic/tame to wild, superiority and universalism is assumed, and multiple knowledges, which contest, contradict or impact on Eurocentric knowledges, are silenced, ignored, devalued and undermined.

3.1.3 SOCIAL NATURE IN HERITAGE DISCOURSE

Much of Western philosophical thought is dominated by binary oppositions. These dualities conceptualise the world in a way where the ‘other’ in relation to the ‘self’ is effectively an absence (Rose 1999). In heritage management, the important duality is nature/culture. Culture can be broadly seen as a particular way of life, to which people subscribe, and the works and practices of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic activity they (re)produce (Li 2003). Nature is therefore opposite and anti-culture. According to Castree (1995: 14), the cultural study of nature is a “social, linguistic activity which, at every level...manufactures its knowledge of the world.” Building on this concept, ‘social nature’ as a theory attempts to explain that it is impossible to extract the cultural interpretation of nature *from* nature, and therefore nature is in fact, socially produced (Braun 2002; Castree 1995; Dailoo and Pannekoek 2008). Using this conceptual framework requires that the historical context of the ‘nature’ in question be interrogated in order to provide reflections on our cultural relationship with nature (Braun 2002). Looking at the historical context often makes visible the construction of nature. Through a process of rethinking how we might responsibly live within nature, we are forced to

“take responsibility for *how* this remaking of nature occurs, in *whose* interests, and with *what* consequences (for people, plants, and animals alike)” (Braun 2002): 13 emphasis in original). Willems-Braun (1997, cited in Pedykowski 2003: 741) argues that social constructivism may be problematic because it “displaces everything into the ‘social’...[and] is still susceptible to the purposes and goals of the new constructors.” Social nature therefore raises questions over what nature is, how it is constructed, and who is authorised to speak on its behalf.

Social nature has relevance when one considers that there are different and sometimes conflicting epistemologies that come into play when debating the management of nature, and these epistemologies will be conceptually important in the management of a World Heritage site listed under natural criteria. An example can be seen in the differing conceptualisations of introduced species between Aboriginal and settler Australians in land management practices. Predominantly considered ‘feral’ and in need of ‘fixing’ in Western environmental management regimes, Aboriginal people have in many places incorporated some of these introduced species into their own cosmologies (Albrecht et al. 2009). To ignore these observations and cultural adaptations in land management planning would be to reinforce a Western technocratic epistemology which Rose (1999) defines as the “pole of power [that] refuses to receive the feedback that would cause it to change itself, or to open itself to dialogue” (Rose 1999: 176-177). However, Pickerill (2009: 72) notes that in current conservation discourse, while non-Aboriginal activists respect the inseparability of the cultural from the natural in the Aboriginal domain, they do not necessarily adopt it in policies, preferring to utilise “science as the mechanism through which to prioritise areas for environmental protection, thus undermining Indigenous understandings of the cultural significance of land.” ‘Common-sense’ naturalises that physical rendering of discursive invisibility for indigenes in colonial history, and authorises “resource managers, bureaucrats as nature’s ‘defenders’ – to speak *for* nature” (Braun 2002: 43 emphasis in original).

If both conservation and development hinge upon the management of nature, wildlife and humans, there is an argument supported by Suchet (2002) that suggests part of this management is the creation and maintenance of a ‘natural’ illusion where ‘cultural’ management does not exist. Suchet (2002: 147-148) claims that this frequently occurs in national parks that are:

[O]ften presented as exemplars of nature in all its glory, unspoilt and pristine...[but] [r]endered invisible in this discourse are management mechanisms such as roads, fences, constructed water points, wildlife counts, reintroduced animals, culling quotas, feral animal baits and tourist infrastructure, as well as experiences of interaction and dispossession.

The naturalistic gaze of the conservation movement considers which places are worthy of protecting and proclaimed ‘natural’, whereas the ‘human’ interface with nature is deemed threatening to natural values (Carter 2010). In this light, nature can be seen to be transfixed in time at the point of colonisation, despite the argument of Carter (2010: 399) that “everything we know about environmental history suggests that people have been manipulating the natural world on various

scales for as long as we have a record of their passing.” Importantly for Cape York, this argument affects how people perceive pastoral landscapes. Pastoral landscapes are maligned by the conservation movement as ‘unnatural’ (i.e. different from nature at the point of colonisation) but viewed under a different conceptual framing, these same landscapes could be seen as a productive and culturally embedded ‘nature’. Pannell (2006), in her global investigation of the World Heritage list, found that little has been said about how social nature informs the World Heritage Convention. Pannell argues that this may be due once again to how the separation of nature and culture has become ‘common sense’. Pannell (2006: 71) further argues that “what passes as nature, culture or heritage at the local level is not necessarily consistent with the meanings enshrined in and operationalised by the Convention.” Pannell noted that tourism contained within World Heritage sites further reified the nature/culture divide. Particularly relevant for Cape York and the implications it may have for the conservation debate is the observation that in North Queensland, “nature is regarded as having a rock-solid reality” (Pannell 2006: 74). Examples of the photographic representation of Cape York as a ‘pristine’ wilderness and Aboriginal culture as similarly ‘untouched’ can be seen in the images in Figure 3.1 taken by Kerry Trapnell who is a strong conservation advocate and ‘expert’ representative on the Cape York Regional Advisory Committee.

Environmentalism, as one of the largest social and political movements in the world, has consequences for local places of environmental importance (Castree 1995). Less specifically, the ‘wild’ places at the centre of the movement are constructed and authorised by agents who are typically removed from the cultural geographies of the indigenous peoples who so often inhabit them (Braun 2002). In the case of Cape York, this is often Brisbane or Canberra. Braun (2002) maintains that not content with this level of disempowerment, those in the position of authority have in the past claimed representative authority over indigenous peoples (see also Deloria Jr. 1997), divesting them of their own voice and autonomy, and reducing them to identities that exist in “their present form *within* and as *effects of* contemporary struggles over land, resources, and environment” (Braun 2002: 32 emphasis in original). An epistemological shift away from the nature/culture binary is unlikely to occur soon, since binary thinking is “currently structured into agency ways of working and...[is] replicated in the selection criteria for jobs and in the ways that World Heritage nominations are set up, audited and reported” (Carter 2010: 400).

Figure 3.1: Images of ‘natural’ Cape York landscapes (See Section 8.2 for image sources).

3.2 'VALUES' & HERITAGE MANAGEMENT

The separation between natural and cultural is widely acknowledged but deeply entrenched. This divide is apparent for much heritage management, and especially so in World Heritage, where natural and cultural criteria are assessed by two distinct advisory bodies. According to Sullivan (2003: 50), hierarchical methodologies split the heritage of World Heritage “into that which gets on the List – the minority – and that which is deemed not worthy of World Heritage status – the majority.” In this sense then, heritage changes continuously across time and space, though enshrining the ‘heritage’ value of a site or artefact can freeze it in time (Graham 2002). Heritage does not engage directly with the past says Graham (2002: 1004), but “is concerned with the ways in which very selective material artefacts, mythologies, memories and traditions become resources for the present.” Occasionally when pasts must be reinvented to suit present trajectories, heritage values may be discarded, “thus heritage is as much about forgetting as remembering the past” (Graham 2002: 1004). Heritage, in its array of values and identity construction, therefore becomes a resource. According to Graham (2002: 1006), heritage is “a knowledge, a cultural product, and a political resource” utilised in identity making and the legitimisation of power, but also an “economic resource” utilised for tourism and economic development. Furthermore, heritage sites are sites of “consumption” that are inclined to “consume their own contexts” (Sack 1992, cited in Graham 2002: 1007).

Carter (2010) argues that in an Australian institutional context, the language of ‘values’ in heritage management has damaged interdisciplinary collaboration for landscape protection. She maintains that the continued dualism of nature/culture in the language of legislation and resource management policy is stifling opportunities for collaboration. Such collaborative arrangements might include the recognition of ontological pluralism for Aboriginal understandings of landscape and heritage. However, Carter (2010: 400) states that “[t]here is a tendency to exclude or downplay Indigenous perspectives when these separationist paradigms are maintained in and by settler societies because the complex connections between nature and culture are often ignored or misunderstood by the dominant institutional perspective.”

ABORIGINAL PERSPECTIVES AND REPRESENTATION

Aboriginal people often live in places settler societies designate as ‘wilderness’. To settlers, such places are wild (natural) places where they can retreat from the tamed (cultural) metropolis. However, in all cases these landscapes are the products of lengthy human interaction. Some Aboriginal Australians may consider ‘wild’ places in a profoundly different ontological framework to settler Australians. In some Aboriginal definitions, ‘wilderness’ is a landscape lacking a human presence to care for the country (Rolls 2003). Rose (1996b: 19) describes a conversation with a Northern Territory Aboriginal man who expresses his relationship with ‘wilderness’:

[Q]uiet country – the country in which all the care of generations of people is evident to those who know how to see it. Quiet country stands in contrast to the wild: we were looking at a wilderness, man-made and cattle-made. This ‘wild’ was a place where the life of the country was falling down into the gullies and washing away with the rains.

Engaging with Aboriginal perspectives on land and heritage management will therefore go a long way to increasing Aboriginal representation in the Australian heritage register. Otherwise, it will fall painfully short of its duties in representing the nation’s heritage. Adequate representation may occur through enabling Aboriginal Australians as owners of their heritage to retain control over “how and to what extent their culture is incorporated into Australia’s national heritage” (Aplin 2009: 20).

In Cape York, heritage and land management processes are often inhibited by funding constraints and limited support from regional organisations. Regional organisations often have funding priorities which, according to (Wallis et al. 2012), are not necessarily the same as that of Aboriginal communities. Using the example of the Wuthathi Aboriginal people of Shelburne Bay, the Wuthathi often find that funding is contingent on project delivery which “limits [the] Wuthathi’s ability to establish steering committees and working groups with the appropriate senior Traditional Owners and the leverage to scope for resourcing a range of cultural and environmental management imperatives” (Wallis et al. 2012: 83). Aboriginal activists advocating greater Aboriginal autonomy in land management are often therefore forced to rely on conservation groups for Western scientific knowledge resources in order to discursively connect with government agencies (Pickerill 2009). However, the community/conservation relationship can be conceptually problematic since conservation organisations are also likely to have differing land and heritage management objectives and may use their resources as leverage against Aboriginal communities’ complicity in conservation objectives.

The 2007 *United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* addressed some of the inherent historical problems associated with colonised societies: namely those of dispossession and the right to develop in accordance with their own needs (Davis 2008). Davis (2008: 464) describes the *Draft Declaration* as:

Recognising the urgent need to respect and promote the inherent rights of Indigenous peoples which derive from their political, economic and social structures and from their cultures, spiritual traditions, histories and philosophies, especially their rights to their lands, territories and resources.

The values of indigenous self-determination prescribed in the *Draft Declaration* theoretically radiate outwards through other United Nations departments like UNESCO. However, the existence of these values within the World Heritage Convention does not necessarily transfer to material benefits for indigenous peoples that occupy World Heritage sites. However, it does acknowledge the interrelationships and renegotiations between settler societies and indigenous peoples, and reflects

the growing understanding of indigenous knowledge as fluid rather than static (Briggs 2005). A progressive understanding of indigenous perspectives directly affects how authenticity in relation to sites is perceived. The *Draft Declaration* argues that authenticity is the domain of the community responsible for the heritage in question, and “should be determined according to local cultural understandings” (Alberts and Hazen 2010: 61). Where local determinations of authenticity at heritage sites differs from the current authorised perception, such as when technologies are employed that seem anachronistic, imposing a “static understanding of the cultural processes that produced it in the past” becomes a material concern for local communities (Alberts and Hazen 2010; Head 2010: 429). An example of a site of conflict is the World Heritage listed rice terraces in northern Luzon in the Philippines. The terraces were placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger by UNESCO due to degradation of the traditional irrigation system that came about when farmers abandoned 30% of the terraces. The placement on the danger list may have been flagged by tourist expectations of authentic ‘traditional’ agriculture. However, Luzon’s agricultural accomplishment has always been evolving and these landscapes can be alternatively conceptualised as “monuments that never ceased being built” (Byrne 2007, cited in Head 2010: 429).

Hill *et al.* (2012: 34) identify that “socioeconomic sustainability for Indigenous peoples only improves when real decision making power is vested in their communities through effective governing institutions that reflect Indigenous cultural values and beliefs” (Hill *et al.* 2012: 34). Smith and Claudie (2003: 7) found that the Chuulangun Aboriginal Corporation in Cape York was marginalised by ‘mainstream’ forms of governance operating within a region or subregion, which performatively reproduced “the dominance of mainstream forms of land management.” Because indigenous understandings of the relationship between people and nature do not follow the nature/culture binary, these understandings are always already marginalised from an authorised heritage discourse standpoint. An undermining of indigenous agency and the suppression of indigenous perspectives or representation is symptomatic of the authorised heritage discourse.

3.3 ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVES IN HERITAGE MANAGEMENT

Heritage management is influenced not only by the authorised heritage discourse, evolving global politics, and the conceptualisation of nature, but by the interplay between capitalism and all of the above.

The economic development of Cape York exists within the larger global economic structure of capitalism. Neoliberalism, the dominant form of modern capitalism, “can be regarded as a contemporary form of economic imperialism which has been accompanied by rising inequalities in different types of cultural, economic, environmental, social and political capital” (Howlett *et al.* 2011: 312). As an economic philosophy, neoliberalism rejects the imposition of government in affairs of the market, and “eschews social and collective controls over the behaviour and practices of firms, the

movement of capital, and the regulation of socio-economic relationships” (Howlett *et al.* 2011: 312). The spread and entrenchment of neoliberalism has profoundly affected civil society which, according to Howlett (2011: 312), has led to a “re-working of the way human society and non-human systems and beings relate.” The restructuring of society under neoliberal ideas is not isolated to Western society; neoliberalism also poses a significant challenge for rural societies (Howlett *et al.* 2011). Economic marginalisation extends throughout the rural and remote landscape because of distance from urban centres of economic growth. The backbone of the transformation and decline of rural areas is agriculture, according to Figueiredo (2008), which in Cape York takes the form of pastoralism. Of all rural people, Aboriginal Australians are the most marginalised by neoliberalism’s basis of universalism and individualism, which is inconsistent with many indigenous world views that are “based on a custodial ethic rather than an exploitative one...and are therefore not easily reconcilable with a market-based, capitalist, neoliberal ethic” (Howlett *et al.* 2011: 315). The overt visible effects of neoliberalism on Aboriginal lives in Australia has seen governments in retreat from their civil responsibilities like service provision and infrastructure which in rural and remote areas are increasingly devolving to the mineral exploration sector under the principle of ‘corporate citizenship’ (Altman 2001). The extension of this logic then is that Aboriginal “beneficiaries from agreements with mining companies should commit payments provided as compensation or benefit sharing to community purposes” (Howlett *et al.* 2011: 318). Drawing on the study of neoliberalism and Aboriginal people by Howlett *et al.* (2011), a revealing scenario emerges. In extolling the virtue of neoliberalism in the form of mineral development on Aboriginal land for the wealth and opportunities created, we can “potentially normalise both the discourse and practices of neoliberalism in general and mineral development in particular” and ultimately underestimate it “both as a hegemonic process and discursive power” (Howlett *et al.* 2011: 320). Conversely, by failing to extol Aboriginal agency, we risk “presenting Indigenous peoples as victims of neoliberalism and ‘silencing them just as they begin to speak’” (Head 2001, cited in Howlett *et al.* 2011: 320).

Gibson-Graham (2008) are interested in geographies of economic difference which stand in opposition to global capitalism. They claim that the performative effect of representing capitalism as unshakeable serves to “dampen and discourage non-capitalist initiatives, since power is assumed to be concentrated in capitalism and to be largely absent from other forms of economy”. This perspective ultimately strengthens capitalism by discouraging research on alternative economies, despite the fact that ‘marginal’ economic practices account for a larger proportion of value produced and have potentially more impact on social wellbeing than the capitalist sector (Gibson-Graham 2008). Resistance to embracing diverse economies, they argue, is “a political/ethical decision that influences what kind of worlds we can imagine and create” (Gibson-Graham 2008: 619). New economies under capitalism are likely to be judged unfairly inadequate before being critically explored. As a final point, Gibson-Graham (2008: 623) claim that whilst we are unable to ignore the past discourses and the negative impact on those who have suffered at the expense of imported Western economies and technologies, we can “choose to create new discourses and counter-technologies of economy and construct strategic forms of interplace solidarity” that recognise the concepts of social justice and equality.

The dynamics of development and power have privileged a conceptualisation of land as blank ‘space’ rather than meaningful ‘place’. Such a conceptualisation has led to the abrogation of peoples’ local economies of environmental knowledge and praxis (Escobar 2001). Much of Jon Altman’s research has opposed conceptualisations of this type, and has particularly concentrated on drawing attention to the conceptual flaws of the capitalist market economy. The capitalist market economy requires constant economic growth and is a system that fails to account for the very different economies in remote communities. Capitalism does not “recognise colonial history and the sheer diversity of contemporary Indigenous circumstance” (Altman 2009): 1). As a particular institutional example, Altman cites the 1977 instigation of the Community Development Employment Program (CDEP) as an example of a Government scheme targeting Aboriginal people that has proven cost-effective for administrators and popular with Aboriginal people, including those in Cape York (Altman 2009). The CDEP allowed for a range of productive activities to take place – hunting; spiritual obligations; land management – and was supported by Government welfare funding. Altman (2001) calls the combination of welfare funding and the productive activities it allows the ‘hybrid economy’. Because the ‘hybrid economy’ falls outside the market economy, it is seen by the State as having negative value, contributing to welfare dependency and draining public funds. Altman (2001) argues that language is important and claims that welfare should be redefined as “regional fiscal subvention” (which is often provided to other parts of regional Australia) as a form of subsidy that enables work in historically neglected remote areas and (Altman 2001: 8). The development of hybrid economies, the language used to express them, and the recognition of suitable industries within them are key elements in the production of economies of difference. In turn, the understanding of both emergent and traditional economies in Cape York contextualises the debate on how heritage-making should proceed.

THE ECONOMIES OF CAPE YORK AND THEIR ROLE IN HERITAGE-MAKING

The local effects of global capitalism are expressed in a range of industries that form the major economies in Cape York: pastoralism, tourism and mining.

PASTORALISM

Pastoralism has a long and storied history in Australian rural geographies, creating ‘mythologies’ that define identities in social and economic ways (Gill 2005). It is also the industry with the longest history in Cape York. Pastoralism has been essential in place and identity-making for the region. In colonial times, pastoralism opened up the region “making it productive in a manner consistent with European economic and cultural ideals” (Gill 2005: 144). Pastoralism’s identity-making character was not just for the settler Australians who pushed the frontier north for the colonial project and whose families remain enmeshed today in the social and cultural landscape of the region, but also for

Aboriginal people in Cape York. According to (Pickerill 2009: 70), “[p]astoralism has been one of the most important economic activities for Indigenous people on the Cape,” at least according to Western definitions of economic capital. As already mentioned, recent studies have shown that pastoralism may be in decline in Cape York (Holmes 2011b), and Chester (2010) raises further concerns over the viability of properties “after the conservation and land management needs” of World Heritage are determined. Emerging goals in conservation place-making are largely inconsistent with pastoralism. The conservation movement has attempted to silence the “existence of pastoral community and landscape in the sense of there being networks and relationships to land based on long habitation, friendship, kinship, the experience of remote area parenthood, children’s playgroups, or any number of common interests” (Gill 2005: 47). Gill (2005: 47) considers this an “extraordinary irony”, in that the conservation sector with its Aboriginal rights agenda has turned to the “very colonial concepts of progress that drove pastoral settlement in the first place to advance their criticism of pastoralism.” By inserting Australian rangelands into a global conservation agenda, it renders these landscapes as “frontier once again, as space available for new articulations of nationhood and for new ways of expressing this in land use” (Gill 2005: 47). There is wide variation in the financial means and cultural ambit of pastoralists across Australia, and though they are “portrayed as singularly powerful” by the conservation sector, they are vulnerable to global financial and meat markets (Gill 2005: 49). In their remade vision, conservationists position pastoral lands as a prime site for ecotourism and the growth of other “new models of social, cultural and economic development and formations... [where] Indigenous ties to land are likely to find their fullest expression” (Gill 2005: 48). This thinking references both geographies of economic difference and colonialism. Since extra land management requirements are never cost free, and since “[t]here will undoubtedly be an increased emphasis on natural habitat protection, with requirements relating to fences, access...vegetation retention/rehabilitation, fire, weeds, feral animals and erosion and sediment control,” there may be immediate financial penalties for individual leaseholders (Chester 2010: 55). Therefore, considering the scale of Cape York and the size of the pastoral estate, the implications for financial support to protect World Heritage values may need to be addressed in any submission to the World Heritage Committee.

TOURISM

According to Graham (2002: 1007), heritage is “the most important single resource for international tourism.” Inversely, tourism is largely parasitic on the cultural resource it is utilising and “to which it may contribute nothing” (Graham 2002: 1007). The tourism industry is playing a crucial and increasingly partisan role in heritage management, and is placed at the junction between heritage producers and consumers (Hazen 2009). UNESCO (2012b) actively encourages, as a benefit of World Heritage inscription, increased tourism for sites. Hazen (2009) suggests that tourism only reveals images and visions of preferred heritage, and as such, becomes a powerful ideological medium that works to silence alternative accounts of heritage (a point that resonates with Graham’s (2002) argument regarding heritage values being reinvented to suit present trajectories, covered in Section

3.2). Lane and Waitt (2001: 386) identify that “[a]uthenticity has been a central concept in research that addresses why tourists travel...explained as a search for an imagined authentic world and authentic experience that has been lost.” Tourism discourse creates certain narratives of authenticity, which is always a power-laden process (Alberts and Hazen 2010; Lane and Waitt 2001). If a site is listed under specific heritage criteria, is other heritage at the site marginalised or silenced through tourism discourse? Authorities in charge of ‘protecting’ these cultural practices will be required to determine what constitutes ‘authentic’ heritage, and this definition may be reflected in the eyes of the tourists rather than the holders of the indigenous heritage themselves (Alberts and Hazen 2010). Alberts and Hazen (2010: 68) argue that tourists have preconceived expectations of what World Heritage sites should look like, and tourist managers “may consciously or unconsciously attempt to ensure that these expectations are met, even if authenticity is compromised.” Li (2003) argues that the search for authenticity by tourists actually erodes the authenticity they seek, by transforming destinations into ‘attractions’. Attractions are forced to commodify and standardise cultural heritage for sale to the tourism market (Li 2003). Using an Australian example, Lane and Waitt (2001: 382) found in the Kimberley region (now a National Heritage site) a “propensity for the tourism industry to promote stereotypical images of both place and Aboriginal culture...in tourism brochures available in hotels throughout the Kimberley and others produced by government departments.” These brochures play a “negative role in reinforcing stereotypes about the region to policymakers” (Lane and Waitt 2001: 382). Authenticity, as Li (2003) sees it, should be appraised for whose heritage is visible, and like Hazen (2009), what that particular narrative is leaving out. For example, if the narrative of development is excluded, are people condemned to preserve the authenticity of the past, which might be harsh, economically poor, and devoid of enabling technologies (Head 2010; Li 2003)? George (2010) raises the point that there is often an ethical failure on behalf of the tourism industry to financially compensate local communities for their intangible cultural heritage used in tourism production. Furthermore, an increase in tourism may not be welcome from all parties. Aboriginal communities responsible for the Laura Aboriginal Dance Festival in Cape York, in response to increased numbers of non-Aboriginal festival goers, have been quoted in the media as saying “This is...a Bama [Aboriginal] festival...We don’t want people bugging the spirits here” (Van Tiggelen 2007: 36).

MINING

Mining is an emergent and widely contested economy in Cape York. Mining and tourism interact at World Heritage sites in unusual ways. Davis and Weiler (1992) argue that mining may reduce the environmental impact of tourism by reducing the economic need to entice tourists to the area. Mining also can be expected to accelerate infrastructure development (Davis 2008), which for Cape York tourism is recognisably lacking (Butler, Cape York Sustainable Futures, 24th May 2012)¹.

¹ Citations in this format refer to interviews. A complete list of interviews is provided in Table 2.1.

There is nothing within the World Heritage Convention that specifies that mining is prohibited within sites (Affolder 2007). In the absence of clarification on mining, mining corporations (under the International Council on Mining & Metals peak body) are exploring initiatives on their own for ensuring that the outstanding universal values of World Heritage sites are not compromised by their actions (Affolder 2007). Aboriginal people in Cape York now have clear tenure over a large percentage of the landscape, and new mining developments will likely develop on that land or on land with a native title claim over it. Howitt (2001: 59) identifies that resource projects, and their ability to silence competing economic discourse as part of the regime of capitalism, can become the front line between State and Aboriginal peoples and may deny them “the cultural integrity and fundamental rights...to identity, self-determination and legal protection.” Recognising the way Aboriginal people value and balance costs and benefits in locally-oriented decision making for resource projects using indicators like “local visions of sustainability and quality, and local structures of accountability for performance” may help resist dominant capitalist systems of value where “the priceless and invaluable too often becomes the unpriced and valueless” (Howitt 2001: 319). Nicholson (2002) identifies that the contest between private industrial development and conservation will remain an ongoing theme for some time.

Affolder (2007: 46) is critical of the “expressions of surprise” from social commentators that there are consequences for proposed mining sites in or adjacent to World Heritage sites. Affolder (2007: 46) remarks that: “This surprise is significant, as it reveals the lack of clarity with respect to the legal status of resource extraction in and around World Heritage Sites.” Surprise remains despite the highly politicised circumstances surrounding mining in and around the Kakadu World Heritage site. The World Heritage advisory bodies recommended Kakadu be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger because of uranium mining developments but their concerns were ultimately ignored by the World Heritage Committee. Howitt (2001: 264-265) claims that to be able to maintain the trajectory towards decolonisation, “it is necessary to build on opportunities such as those provided...however problematically, within conservative [mining] institutions such as Rio Tinto.” Consequently, Howlett *et al.* (2011: 310) in their study of mining in QLD found that neoliberalism has in some cases allowed Aboriginal people to express their agency through resource development, which has “presented opportunities for them to gain greater control over the material conditions of their existence.” Howitt (2010) and Memmott and Blackwood (2008) argue that the benefits of mining for Aboriginal people are impeded by the inability of land owners to profit from sub-surface mineral rights. Under native title and other land tenures in QLD, Traditional Owners are only granted ‘customary’ (i.e. non-market) rights on land resources, and not commercial market rights despite widespread poverty in the region (Altman 2010).

3.4 CONCLUSION

Neoliberalism is widely criticised for contributing to rising social inequality and environmental destruction, and in colonial settings economic imperialism has undermined Aboriginal agency. Paradoxically, although neoliberalism may be incompatible with some rural Aboriginal custodial values, it may provide opportunities for the Aboriginal expression of agency in the resource development sector. The resource development sector fits neatly within neoliberal capital, the silencing power of which makes it difficult to conceptualise new or alternative economies. However, 'hybrid' economies encompassing customary and nourishing activities, and that exist outside of mainstream economies, are vital to a rich, diverse and productive Cape York. Pastoralism, mining and tourism are all imbricated in the dominant economic discourse of Cape York, and can all make positive and negative contributions to heritage-making. Through an historical and discursive analysis of these industries, the way they are utilised in the discussion about Cape York economies can be understood. A synthesis of perspectives on these industries, combined with my field interviews, sheds light on the diverse economies that may exist including 'hybrid' and conservation economies, and opens up space for visions of possible economic futures. The economies of Cape York, and contrasting stakeholder perspectives on those economies set the stage for political conflict and compromise. By utilising the conceptual frameworks of 'authorised heritage discourse', postcolonialism and social nature, it is possible to analyse the ideological positions organisations take in shaping heritage.

Unpacking the discursive nature of 'heritage' is crucial to understanding how heritage discourse is enlisted in defining Cape York in terms of its 'outstanding universal value'. Authorised heritage discourse can be considered an effect of colonialism and an example of Western hegemonic power, which exists in Cape York via the State and scientific discourse. 'Common-sense' in the authorised heritage discourse disguises the contested nature of heritage, and the political tensions inherent to heritage-making. Furthermore, 'common-sense' privileges the voice of 'experts' in heritage-making. For example, Aboriginal conceptualisations of heritage and a more social nature are often subsumed by 'expert' opinion or conservation objectives. Despite on-paper claims from conservation organisations that Aboriginal interests are represented, conservation discourse still often fails to embrace ontological pluralism, and consequently, Aboriginal interests often continue to be misunderstood, disregarded and marginalised. Hoffman et al. (2012) claim that it will be important to create government funding frameworks that are better structured to support cross-cultural multi-agency collaborations that may break the current reliance on "outcome-driven funding" (Ens et al. 2012: 103).

Colonialism erases Aboriginal agency and normalises discourse of *tabula rasa* and subsequent occupation (Howitt 2010). Ultimately, restriction of Aboriginal agency affects the way governance occurs. For example, there is a lack of coordinated assistance for Aboriginal communities attempting to manage their land and heritage. Nature and 'wilderness' in Cape York are seen as having a "rock-solid reality" (Pannell 2006: 74). By using the concept of social nature, we can understand that it does not have a "rock-solid reality", and is instead a cultural construction. Social nature transcends the nature/culture binary, and therefore highlights the problematic disassociation of nature from culture

in the World Heritage Convention.

By analysing the politics of Cape York through field interviews, and acknowledging the contested nature of heritage, the common dialogue needed to enable effective land and heritage management between responsible parties, potentially through a World Heritage nomination, may become visible.

Sullivan (2003: 49) argues that the Western interest in heritage arises from materialistic underpinnings, and is primarily concerned with “the outward, physical manifestations of success, of historic events, of status, of artistic achievement and of ingenuity.” It is the fear of losing the past that drives our need for conserving what remains in the material world at present. Western emphasis on the supposedly “unspoiled” natural world also arises from this fear of loss” (Sullivan 2003: 49). Local communities that often inhabit these ‘unspoiled’ places still require a secure and comfortable life. Under these circumstances, World Heritage is unlikely to be a high priority for local communities unless they can see a direct link between it, and community needs and aspirations (Sullivan 2003).

This chapter engages with the contested places, spaces, identities and epistemologies that interact within a global instrument of heritage protection. I include a description of World Heritage and use a range of sources to critique it. This chapter will also explore the specific Australian application of World Heritage, and the heritage regimes within the case study of Cape York.

4.1 WORLD HERITAGE

World Heritage and its assessment processes are well documented in the academic literature (Alberts and Hazen 2010; Carter 2010; Hazen 2008; Smith 2010). The World Heritage Convention itself, according to Affolder (2007: 37), is “marked by an unresolved tension between state sovereignty and the recognition that certain structures, sites, and areas constitute the heritage not just of individual nations, but of humankind” (Affolder 2007: 37). Tension becomes evident when one starts asking questions. Whose heritage is being protected? How does that protection affect people who live at or around World Heritage sites?

World Heritage processes have been adapted in an attempt to respond to these tensions, specifically pertaining to indigenous and local communities. An attempt to define the ‘cultural landscape’ connection to country first occurred at Tongariro National Park, New Zealand in 1993 (followed closely by Uluru-Kata Tjuta in Australia in 1994) (Kawharu 2009). Hazen (2008) argues that importance at the international scale, even more so than at the national scale, further removes heritage from the hands of those who own it. Sullivan (2003: 54) argues that indigenous community participation is integral in the *beginning* of the World Heritage listing process because this is when communities “can bring the most influence to bear on the future management of the proposed World Heritage place.” The decisions of the World Heritage Committee are legitimated through their use of ‘expert’ advice from the World Heritage advisory bodies, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), which make the World Heritage Committee appear “less political, more objective, and more palatable” (Affolder 2007: 64). The claimed objectivity of scientific expertise may actually conceal the fact that “many issues the

Committee decides...[are] also questions of values” (Affolder 2007: 64). The World Heritage Committee developed and adopted precise criteria (the *Operational Guidelines*) in 1977 to clarify the process of inscribing sites on the World Heritage list. The criteria been revised 18 times since then (UNESCO n.d.-a). Recently, the *Operational Guidelines* were revised so that the World Heritage Committee must now consider whether particular nation-states are already well represented on the World Heritage list (Affolder 2007). Australia, with 19 sites, is considered well represented (Cairns DERM employee, 22nd May 2012). NGOs with similar objectives to ICOMOS and the IUCN can attend World Heritage Committee meetings. The *Operational Guidelines* however make no provision for other non-States Parties like mining representative bodies, in a move which Affolder (2007: 62) claims “can be viewed either as a sign of the democratic health of the regime or, conversely, as an indicator of its anti-democratic nature, revealing the extent to which interest groups dominate global institutions.” By invoking ‘expertise’ as the justification for decisions, the World Heritage Committee can “undermine democratic participation, at both the national and international levels” (Affolder 2007: 64). Heritage-making then becomes a power-laden process (Richardson 1990, in Affolder 2007: 65-66):

The involvement of "experts" in the decision-making process means as soon as an issue is institutionally construed as demanding expertise (e.g. the identification of world heritage values), the scope for legitimate participation is markedly diminished. “Only those larger environmental groups with scientific and technical information/resources (e.g. the Australian Conservation Foundation), are in a position to challenge or question the credibility of government decisions.”

Experts are often called on to examine the authenticity of the values within a site. According to Smyth and Valentine (2008: 1) in a report produced for the Cape York Peninsula Region Scientific and Cultural Advisory Committee, authenticity “refers to the credibility of the information presented in relation to the cultural heritage of the nominated area.” Authenticity, when referring to indigenous authenticity, has ramifications for indigenous communities residing within a nominated area (as in Cape York) since they will have the “credibility of their cultural information tested by the World Heritage Committee” (Smyth and Valentine 2008: 1).

If World Heritage sites are compromised by development or ecological threats (as was the case with the Jabiluka uranium mine proposal in the Kakadu World Heritage site) or any other damaging activity, there is a risk of international criticism for the States Party. International criticism in no way ensures compliance and relies heavily on the goodwill of the States Party for its effectiveness. However, it can be argued that international politics can be a deciding factor in decisions by both World Heritage Committee in how they examine nominations, and how the States Party maintains a site (Nicholson 2002).

4.1.1 World Heritage in Australia

Australia ratified the World Heritage Convention in 1974 (UNESCO 2012a). However, Australia is not a state party to the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO 2012b), but it is acknowledged in the Burra Charter (Haig 2010). Australian heritage management, much like the World Heritage advisory bodies, often divides natural and cultural heritage values between separate government departments. It also separates Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal heritage (Haig 2010). The federal Australian Heritage Council is an exception, but its jurisdiction is restricted to site heritage (therefore excluding moveable and intangible heritage) (Haig 2010).

The Australian and state and territory governments cooperated to finalise the *Australian World Heritage Intergovernmental Agreement* in 2009 to clarify expectations, roles and responsibilities for meeting Australia's obligations under the convention (Planning for People 2011). The *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (Cth) (*EPBC Act*) is the relevant legislation used to administer the requirements under the World Heritage Convention. It requires the Australian Government to attempt, to the best of its ability, to reach agreement with anyone who owns or occupies a potential World Heritage site. However, failure to do so "does not affect the submission of a property to the World Heritage Committee for inclusion in the World Heritage List" (*Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*, cited in Affolder 2007: 48).

Of Australia's 19 World Heritage sites, 4 are in QLD (UNESCO 2012a). Each site has a specific governance structure, but general governance arrangements for Australian World Heritage sites can be seen in Figure 4.1.

4.2 A CAPE YORK NOMINATION

Conservation NGOs recently agreed to a state-wide commitment to finalising a World Heritage nomination by February 2013, though some groups have their concerns about the short deadline (Hoyal, CAFNEC, 23rd May 2012). The QLD government has also tentatively stated a 2013 deadline (MacLeod, Director Partnerships and World Heritage, DERM, 4th June 2012).

The Cape York Peninsula was identified in 1982 by the IUCN as being a place of universal significance that could potentially be added to the UNESCO World Heritage list (DERM 2011). The QLD Labor government in 1992 commenced the Cape York Peninsula Land Use Study, which was used to formulate the Cape York Peninsula Land Use Strategy (CYPLUS). CYPLUS was released in 1997 and attempted to develop a coordinated strategy for sustainable land use and economic and social development. Although Holmes (2012: 261) argues that CYPLUS has had a "negligible influence in shaping peninsula futures" and should be considered a failure, the comprehensive nature of the original land use study means that it is often used as the basis for the evaluation of the natural values for World Heritage.

Tenures within WH property (examples only)	Protected Areas (eg. national park, marine park)	Cultural Sites on other public land (eg. some Convict Sites)	Indigenous Land/native title	Leasehold (eg. pastoral leases)	Freehold	Defence Land
National overview	Environment Protection and Heritage Council (Ministerial Council). Australian World Heritage Advisory Committee (comprised of representatives of each World Heritage property). Administration – Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities.					
Property Overview	Body or Committee with role for strategic coordination and management consistency. Various powers & models, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory Committee (advises relevant government agencies); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee with some statutory powers (eg. Willandra Lakes); • Board of Management for a joint management national park (eg. Uluru); • Statutory Authority with regulatory powers (eg. Wet Tropics). May also have advisory stakeholder representative groups – eg. science, indigenous groups, community – or stakeholder representation on the main body or committee.					
State Government agencies (or Commonwealth agencies where relevant)	Park management agency	Cultural site management agency or trust	Indigenous Board members (eg. Kakadu, Uluru) or incorporated body (Willandra Lakes) + Park agency	Lands Department or equivalent + leaseholder	Various agencies depending on protected features + landholder	Department of Defence
Local	Local Government Council(s) for area					

Figure 4.1: Governance structures for Australian World Heritage sites. **SOURCE:** (Planning for People 2011: 26).

Significantly, Cape York was identified in a study by Mackey et al. (2001) for the Queensland Government in 1999 as having entirely unique heritage conditions (Valentine 2006). Holmes (2011: 218) also states that the “Cape York Peninsula is exceptionally well endowed in support of emerging multifunctional objectives, notably Indigenous land rights, biodiversity protection, [and] wilderness values.” A process aimed at kick-starting a nomination was instigated by the Beattie Labor Government in 2004 (Valentine 2006). Since then, a long process of consultation with stakeholders has occurred. Importantly, the current Federal Environment Minister Tony Burke has publically stated in the media that a nomination will not go ahead without the consent of Traditional Owners in Cape York (Schwarten 2011). Smyth and Valentine (2008: 6), in their commissioned report, point out that the nomination of Cape York is “the product of cultural values held by people outside the region who appreciate the richness of its cultural and biological diversity.” Valentine (2006: 8) in another commissioned report argues that provided each group of Traditional Owners or community is recognised within the region, much of the entire area of Cape York could be listed “on the rarity within Australia of traditional management of largely intact ecosystems by traditional owners.” Whilst the places of significance have yet to be inventoried (DERM 2011), Valentine (2006) argues that a case could be made for a ‘cultural landscape’ listing (Valentine 2006).

Many Aboriginal communities in Cape York have already established land and sea management centres to represent their ongoing commitment to natural and cultural heritage resource management (Chuulangan Aboriginal Corporation 2010; Valentine 2006). One such example in Cape York is the Kowanyama Aboriginal Shire Council’s Aboriginal Land and Natural Resources Management Office (Kowanyama Aboriginal Shire Council 2011). Organisations of this type survive despite limited funding from State and federal governments. Much government spending in the area of Aboriginal land management has been on the Working on Country program (\$243.1 million until June 2013) and encouraging Indigenous Protected Areas (IPAs) (\$4,531,500 over 2011 and 2012) as part of the National Reserve System (Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities 2011b; DoSEWPC 2012). There is currently only one Indigenous Protected Area in Cape York, with another three in the consultation stage (DoSEWPC 2011a). National Parks have been regarded apprehensively by Cape York Aboriginal peoples for a long time in response to the circumstances of the Wik-Mungkan and others. In 1976, Wik-Mungkan stockman John Koowarta attempted to buy Archer River Cattle Station, which was refused by QLD Premier Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen (Department of Environment and Resource Management 2012). 1977 saw Mr Koowarta sue the QLD Government for discrimination in a case that went to the Supreme Court, which in 1988 ruled in his favour. Premier Bjelke-Peterson responded by declaring the Archer River a national park under the thin guise of a conservation agenda really aimed at preventing Aboriginal ownership.

Valentine’s (2006) report outlined five possible scenarios for how a listing might proceed (see Appendix E for maps and descriptions). Whilst these are obviously not the only combinations of land tenures over which to instigate a World Heritage nomination, they are the ones most clearly articulated at this time. NSW Consulting firm Planning for People (now TRC Tourism) claim that it is difficult to “draw meaningful lessons” for a potential Cape York nomination from other World Heritage sites in Australia due to the limited assessment of the effectiveness of their management

(Planning for People 2011: 37). At the time of writing, the boundaries for a World Heritage nomination have not yet been determined, nor has the site been put on the tentative list (DERM 2011). Under the *Operational Guidelines*, a site must be on the tentative list prior to nomination. Much of the natural heritage in the region has been determined, but it has been acknowledged that Aboriginal and settler cultural heritage is yet under-realised. Valentine (2006) therefore advocates that a Cape York nomination should concentrate on natural heritage whilst cultural heritage is still being identified. This is problematic for all the reasons raised in Section 3.1.3 concerning the separation between ‘nature’ and ‘culture’. Even when the heritage values are determined, Mackey *et al.* (2001) believe that the current nomination criteria would fail a Cape York listing, and that it would be “necessary to derive a new set of universal heritage assessment criteria” (Mackey *et al.* 2001, cited in Valentine 2006: 4).

4.2.1 GOALS FOR WORLD HERITAGE

The organisations engaged in the process of the World Heritage nomination for Cape York have a range of perspectives. It is the view of DERM that if a World Heritage nomination eventuates for Cape York, it will happen in a way that is unique in the history of the World Heritage Convention and may help “shape future World Heritage nominations” through its consent process with Traditional Owners (Cairns DERM employee, 22nd May 2012). DERM appears to be making no attempt at this time to alleviate the concerns within the community about which natural or cultural sites or activities have been targeted for nomination. This is leading to intense speculation and consternation among the many stakeholders of the region about where the boundaries will eventually fall and how it may affect them. According to Ross Macleod, community anxiety is unnecessary because unlike previous World Heritage listings in Australia, Cape York is a new opportunity:

Most of the World Heritage areas in Australia and QLD have been born out of battles for conservation...So in the community’s mind, World Heritage has been a weapon, a blunt instrument to stop stuff happening. And that’s a bit of a mindset. And what’ve tried to do with the Cape York thing is actually say “No, hang on a minute. This isn’t an instrument to stop stuff; this is actually an instrument to empower communities to shape their future. – **Macleod, Director Partnerships and World Heritage, DERM, 4th June 2012**

The concept of World Heritage is seen as “part of the mix” (Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012) of opportunities for Cape York. The increased exploration and expansion of mining permits is often cited by the conservation sector as the main impetus for advancing a World Heritage nomination.

4.2.2 STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES

Waterton *et al.* (2006) suggest that power relations between stakeholders be explicitly stated, otherwise the authorised heritage discourse stands to undermine and marginalise certain speakers, whilst authorising itself. Speaking in their organisational capacity, my interviewees made their opinions on World Heritage a ‘pitch’ to me. By introducing the stakeholder organisations in this section, and including direct quotes from the interviewees that present their position within the World Heritage process (in their own words), it may illuminate the power relations and political context of their position.

STATE GOVERNMENT

Common perceptions from staff within the QLD Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) were that World Heritage will develop a more coordinated approach to land management, or simply formalise what is already occurring in land and heritage management:

There’s a lot of money being poured into Cape York Peninsula at the moment from state and commonwealth on a whole wide range of programmes aimed at closing the gap, but they might not all be coordinated. World Heritage might be a way of saying well this is how we’re going to do NRM [natural resource management] and working on country for Cape York Peninsula. And under the umbrella of World Heritage then you can have a more coordinated cohesive approach to social and economic development based on the land use and land management economy. – **Cairns DERM employee, 22nd May 2012**

Well I think that governments’ have got a responsibility to manage the heritage anyway because it exists, and it’s everybody’s heritage...We’ve still got to manage national parks. We’ve still got to manage weeds and ferals. – **Macleod, DERM, 4th June 2012**

CONSERVATION

Anthony Esposito from The Wilderness Society (TWS) sees World Heritage as a driver of land management and building a conservation economy without the traditional industries of mining and pastoralism:

So it’s seen as protective; it’s seen as affirmative, providing recognition; and it’s seen as a potential driver of land management. Land and water management which itself will be an economic activity and a broader array of economic activities because of what World Heritage can bring in terms of public investment and private entrepreneurial opportunities around those values and the fact that people want to visit them and all the rest of it...[I]t’s about landscapes. It’s about the whole thing. And so, we’ve spent a lot of time trying to come up with policies and frameworks and tools, a toolkit, that can deliver on that with the fundamental recognition that when you’re operating on that scope you’re dealing with people, you’re dealing with multiple

tenures and land uses and differing management regimes at least at the local scale, and that's actually what you have to make sense of. And you need conservation models that work with that. And we think they're there and World Heritage is one of the important tools in that toolkit, especially for a region like Cape York which displays such vast extent of those values and also it's natural competitive advantage in a sense. It's not good for... it's not a cattle industry. Yes it's got some bauxite. Sure. But that's it. In 50 years it's gone. So then what? And most of the wealth's been exported. So we're looking at people in landscapes and how to manage them and how to build sustainable futures. *Real* sustainable futures. – **Esposito, Manager National Indigenous Conservation Program, The Wilderness Society, 5th June 2012**

Leah Talbot from the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) sees World Heritage as an instrument to coordinate a comprehensive economic plan for the region:

There's been initiative after initiative. There's been planning studies. There's been regional strategies. There's been investment of money. There's been a rollout of a whole range of things but it still not has supported the region as a whole to advance...you know we still have a lot of people living under the poverty line. We have a lot of social issues, we have a lot of health issues, educational issues. It's not a region that high investment goes into from our governments. If they want to have an instrument like World Heritage, there has to be something that accompanies it. – **Talbot, Cape York Program Officer, ACF, 23rd May 2012**

INDUSTRY

John Hardaker from AgForce QLD, when asked whether he was happy for a World Heritage nomination to go ahead as long as AgForce's constituents were included, stated:

As long as we can see the value of World Heritage, not say a blanket approach. – **Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012**

Patricia Butler of Cape York Sustainable Futures (CYSF) acknowledges her own personal bias against World Heritage, and stated that the only reason Cape York Sustainable Futures was involved in the World Heritage process was to influence the discussion more favourably for economic development. In a report, Cape York Sustainable Futures argue that “there is already sufficient legislation in place to protect Cape York Peninsula's important conservation and environmental values. A potential World Heritage nomination is not necessary to protect these values” (Chester 2010: 62). In the interview however, Butler seemed more flexible:

So I'm long time brought up as a child having that knowledge and of course, when I guess we witnessed what happened and it directly affected our family and a lot of others; it certainly stayed with me. And I probably think, I'm probably one of the wrong persons to talk to because I actually think peoples' livelihoods are threatened by any World Heritage nomination...

The egos have got to get out of organisations...and they've got to be looking at respecting the ideas of the people that live there and be more supportive of that. I'm a big advocate of all of us people that are working up there need to be working together, not against each other. And until we can work together, we're never going to get anywhere. – **Butler, CEO, Cape York Sustainable Futures, 24th May 2012**

ABORIGINAL

Terry Piper from Balkanu Economic Development Corporation, speaking in advocacy for Aboriginal people in Cape York, admits that despite considerable media exposure pitting Balkanu and the Cape York Land Council against Wild Rivers legislation, Balkanu are not in fact opposed to World Heritage:

We've always seen World Heritage as part of the mix, but we are very concerned about the issues that World Heritage brings, what people have to give up to take on World Heritage, what for Indigenous people has been the implications for World Heritage listing in other areas like the Wet Tropics. What implications a World Heritage listing has for people's decision making on their own country. So in my view, in working at Kakadu, Uluru, and closely involved in the Wet Tropics, World Heritage tends to be disempowering of indigenous people. People tend to have less say over their land. It's often an opportunity for others to come in and tell people what to do on their own land...And I think if government is clear on: "ok guys, these are the benefits. If you agree to World Heritage listing of this area, this is the kind of funding and support that we will give you." And government hasn't been clear at all on that so far. "But this is the kind of support that we'll give you to manage the land." This is the carrot for World Heritage listing. And people know what kind of things they may give up or have to give up for World Heritage listing. If they're happy with the governance structures, then it's up to the mob if they want to do it. And I see our role as like state land dealings. It's making sure that when people make a decision, they make it in an informed way. – **Piper, CEO, Balkanu, 18th May 2012**

These excerpts from interviews could be read as the positionality statements of stakeholders, and I use these to inform my analysis of their interview. In the following two chapters, I attempt to tease out the underlying themes and threads that constitute the discourse on economies and politics within a Cape York World Heritage nomination.

Figure 5.1: Pastoralism in Cape York. **SOURCE:** (Michael 2012).

Australia is already well represented on the World Heritage list. According to a Cairns employee of the Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM), there are uncertainties about whether UNESCO are seeking more World Heritage nominations from Australia: “[t]he bar’s getting higher and higher...They [UNESCO] probably think we’ve got enough and we need to manage them” (Cairns DERM employee, 22nd May 2012). If this is the case, a Cape York nomination must have a high degree of integrity for the World Heritage Commission to consider granting it World Heritage status. However, the government is genuinely committed to investing time and resources and seeing the nomination to completion.

During interviews, two major themes emerged: These can broadly be described as: (i) contestation around diverse economic opportunities; and (ii) politics and power in heritage-making. As outlined in Chapter Two, I interviewed representatives of various organisations participating in Cape York World Heritage discussions. Each of these organisations has a particular agenda to progress and each interview needs to be analysed in that context. Significantly, representatives of organisations spoke in their professional capacity about Aboriginal people and Aboriginal perspectives. If a World Heritage nomination cannot go ahead without Traditional Owner consent, the way these organisations speak for Aboriginal people in the public and political sphere has a significant impact on the information available for Traditional Owners to draw upon when giving consent.

This chapter draws upon the concepts introduced in the previous chapters to explore how economies are understood and represented by the organisations involved in a World Heritage nomination.

Tourism, pastoralism, mining, and the developing conservation industry are the primary sources of contestation, though there is also a high degree of accord in organisational positions.

5.1 ECONOMIC VISIONS FOR CAPE YORK

A heritage regime can no longer only consider conservation objectives, it must also subscribe to a clearly articulated economic strategy for the site in question. Terry Piper, CEO at Balkanu argues that “unless people have a vibrant economy, they can’t look after their land - the land doesn’t look after itself these days” (Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012).

Economic management plans are required by the World Heritage *Operational Guidelines* for World Heritage sites. The Wilderness Society (TWS) and the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) both support a social and economic development package in principle. Although no specific package has been developed, Leah Talbot, Cape York Program Officer for the ACF states that the ACF have completed research which shows “that World Heritage can attract investment of a whole range of people: internationally, philanthropic, the federal government” (Talbot, ACF, 23rd May 2012). Regarding economic development opportunities for Aboriginal people, Talbot asks if there is “some mechanism that we can put in place that we can assist groups [to] do economic development that also...gets them fast tracked and supported through” (Talbot, ACF, 23rd May 2012). New mechanisms and fast tracked development by no means guarantees stable and sustainable economies on Cape York. Stable economies require stable funding sources, an area that the government has in the past had trouble maintaining:

[T]here’s been a whole series of ranger programs that are set up – land and sea management offices – and then a stream of funding is gone and then they’ve died out, and then another stream of funding has come and they’ve come back again. – **Cairns DERM employee, 22nd May 2012**

Talbot (ACF, 23rd May 2012) argues that World Heritage will actually bring a coordinated funding opportunity to Cape York. The question of whether government-supported funding streams are a credible source of funding is disputed by advocates of neoliberalism. Other sources of financial backing are also problematic – for example, the availability of credit on varying land tenures:

It would be my guess if you wanted to buy something up there, they [the banks] wouldn’t even look at funding you 20%...the financial industry right now are not interested in anything north of Mareeba. – **Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012**

Sarah Hoyal, Coordinator at CAFNEC uses the example of a store at Bamaga which has a 2-3 million dollar turnover but can't get a loan because it resides on a type of Aboriginal land tenure which banks are not interested in (Hoyal, CAFNEC, 23rd May 2012). The availability of credit (or lack thereof) is a significant indicator of the challenges faced in gaining traction for a comprehensive economic development package in the region. The effect will be the stifling of entrepreneurial endeavours for Aboriginal communities on Aboriginal freehold land, and pastoralists on pastoral leases. The following sections concentrate on the dominant industries of pastoralism, mining and tourism in Cape York and how they affect heritage-making.

5.1.1 PASTORALISM

The pastoral estate is unlikely to be significantly altered as a result of a World Heritage listing, and pastoralists have therefore been reluctant to participate in the consultation process. Any change will most likely be as a result of other contributing factors like the Cape York Tenure Resolution Implementation Group returning title to Traditional Owners, and the boom and bust of the market economy. According to organisations on Cape York that interact with pastoralists, there is a general feeling that pastoralists themselves just want to get on with their job of raising cattle without constant imposition from government consultation processes (MacLeod, DERM, 4th June 2012). Moreover, “the region generally likes to think of itself as able to look after its own affairs and wants a framework that enables landholders to do just that” (Esposito, The Wilderness Society, 5th June 2012). However, the implication of not including pastoral cultural values in the final World Heritage nomination is that there will be an incomplete picture of the region's heritage which may lead to further resentment and disharmony between stakeholders in Cape York. According to Sullivan (2003: 53):

This runs contrary to best practice in heritage management, which insists that all the cultural values of a place – not just its primary values – should be acknowledged and catered for and that the management planning should include the conservation of all these values.

It is important that all the heritage values of the region are recognised rather than “attempting to assert the primacy of World Heritage values by ignoring or denying other valid elements of cultural significance” (Sullivan 2003: 53). However, as the emphasis within the World Heritage *Operational Guidelines* remains fixed on the universal value of heritage, it may be hard to convince the World Heritage Committee of the value of pastoralism. The inclusion of pastoralism into Aboriginal cosmologies may help define the ‘outstanding universal value’ of pastoralism for Cape York, but could also risk alienating non-Aboriginal pastoralists. Combined with reluctance from pastoralists to be involved in the consultation, the pastoralist perspective of Cape York heritage is in danger of being excluded from management plans.

Problematically, the financial value, and therefore longevity of the pastoral industry in Cape York is in doubt. It is a complex ideological and emotional decision to defend the position of pastoralism in Cape York. The quote by Lyndon Schneider (from TWS) from a 2004 edition of the Weekend Australian (cited in Holmes 2011a: 63) states a conservation objection to pastoralism:

There's a reason why the Stanbrokes and the other big beef barons aren't on the Cape and that's because it's poor country for running cattle...I can understand the social reasons behind why people are pursuing cattle on the Cape but I can't understand the economic reasons.

TWS desires the removal of conventional industry from ecologically sensitive landscapes - all of Cape York by their definition. According to Anthony Esposito of TWS, “[p]astoral lands are *managed for pastoralism*...[b]y *pastoralists*”, whereas the value of Cape York for TWS is of Cape York as a conservation estate “*managed for conservation*” (Esposito, TWS, 5th June 2012). Esposito is aware that this viewpoint is unpopular with pastoralists and acknowledges that:

[G]reenies are demonised. We're treated as somehow unworthy [laughter] of existence. It's really impossible to have a constructive, intelligent relationship and dialogue and policy conversation with people whose starting point is “you guys have no right to exist since you're a pest and you should be eradicated.” – **Esposito, TWS, 5th June 2012**

However, when asked whether there was room for pastoralism to be included in a World Heritage nomination, Esposito emphatically acknowledged the presence and embeddedness of pastoralism in Cape York landscapes:

Absolutely! I think one of the cultural heritage aspects will be the non-Indigenous cultural heritage. That is part of the Cape story. – **Esposito, TWS, 5th June 2012**

Esposito appears to be arguing for Cape York as a conservation estate without pastoralism, but with the static legacy of pastoralism still included in the World Heritage values, or at the very least, pastoral leases managed under a conservation directive by conservationists *directly*. Meanwhile, one of the provisions in the *Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007* is to allow pastoralists to be granted 75 year leases – an increase on the existing 50 year limit - if they agree to a World Heritage listing over their property. While this extra tenure security is welcomed, the provision is not likely to gain the traction required to secure World Heritage support from pastoralists. Ross MacLeod, Director Partnerships and World Heritage at DERM reported that pastoralists have more pressing concerns associated with lease conditions:

One of the interesting bits of feedback we've had from pastoralists just from the last 6 months or so was...[they're] locked into pastoralism and...[t]hey want to diversify their business. And that's a bit hard with the land act at the moment because the lease is for grazing purposes. And once you start going beyond that it becomes really hard...So that's one of the bits of information that we're looking at to see whether as part of the whole package, in addition to offering the longer leases because they also want security, we'll probably pull together a package that recommends to government to have a look at the policies around diversification and see whether we can't add some incentives in addition to the longer leases. – **MacLeod, DERM, 4th June 2012.**

The concept of diversification was also raised by John Hardaker, Regional Coordinator of AgForce, and it is encouraging to see MacLeod acknowledge this; MacLeod's position within DERM should give hope to pastoralists that change may eventuate. The representatives from AgForce and Cape York Sustainable Futures both raise a point about the role of pastoralists in land management that is often refuted by government and conservation organisations:

And you can put in as many community rangers as you like, but you do not replace eyes and ears on the ground on a daily basis maintaining fences, water troughs, road access down a regional cattle property, and mustering crews. They see things that nobody else sees because they're out there doing it. – **Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012**

We believe that...the graziers, are probably the best conservationists for the ground that anyone else can be. We just look at national parks and see the mess that national parks [are in] since the buyback of the land, it's disgraceful. – **Butler, CYSF, 24th May 2012**

Hardaker maintains that there are solutions that may appease all parties, which may just concur with Esposito's inferred goal of 'pastoral lands managed by conservationists':

[I]f you've got properties that you want under a future plan 50 years down the track then why not introduce a stewardship program and leave the graziers on the property to run it as a stewardship program? And pay them to be there...[to] maintain a grazing regime that allows them to be able to make revenue off it, but at the same time being paid to run the environmental management of it as a stewardship program...For too many people to turn around say there's no value in beef, well in 20 years' time when half the world's population is starving because we can't get food supply to them...what do we do with our massive tracts of land with nothing on it? – **Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012**

Hardaker's criticisms, essentially directed at government and conservation objectives, contain evidence of the possibility for collaboration. The lack of statutory management plans over many of the newly declared National Parks (Cape York Peninsula Aboriginal Land) (MacLeod, DERM, 4th June 2012) is an obvious point of contention for pastoralists who were, until recently, using and managing the land productively.

5.1.2 MINING

Within the Aboriginal community, there are schisms which broadly follow either: (i) economic development that engages with a 'real' economy of conventional industry (such as mining, steered by the Cape York Land Council and Balkanu) and can broadly be called 'developmentalist'; or (ii) economic development based on a more customary or "hybrid economy" (Altman 2001), and can broadly be called 'traditionalist'.

It is important to consider that the mining industry is not represented directly in this thesis. Organisational perceptions on mining's value are used to support organisational agendas, its benefit aligning more with developmentalist ideals.

A developmentalist approach is taken by the economic development group Cape York Sustainable Futures (which contains Aboriginal members), and also the ACF whose agenda aligns more closely with the developmentalist approach (Holmes 2011):

ACF is not anti-mining, but it needs to be done appropriately, in the appropriate place. So if it's going to interfere or damage conservation values and cultural values then it wouldn't be something that we would support. But if it's done in the right location and it's done appropriately, then it could be a money generator. Having said that the evidence that we have seen, it doesn't support a region. Mining supports a Fly-in, Fly-out community. It supports money being taken out of the region and being invested elsewhere...No money goes into the regional towns. So the way that mining is allowed to progress needs a review...so when they walk away after 20 years or whatever it might be...something remains. – **Talbot, ACF, 23rd May 2012.**

The ACF raise a critical point that mining, if done appropriately, can enhance the economy of a region. Despite Balkanu's developmentalist agenda, Piper maintains a similar position though he acknowledges that it is not Balkanu's decision to make as merely a representative group for Traditional Owners:

We're not for the whole-scale mining or anything like that. In fact, we'd probably say no to it. But if it is somewhere that can be done with minimal impact...on Cape York, where there's not many opportunities, [it can] mean a lot. Much more than they'd mean around Brisbane or somewhere like that. – **Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012**

However, evidence at this time suggests that Fly-in, Fly-out mining does little to enhance the economy of a region and returns to Howitt's (2010) criticism that the benefits resulting from mining on Aboriginal lands are impeded by the inability of land owners to profit from sub-surface minerals. Piper made the further point that:

[A]reas that have potential for mining shouldn't be included in a World Heritage area...Traditional Owners might say "we believe that the environment in this area here is so important, there's cultural sites and all that, we don't want mining there. Therefore we're quite happy for it to become a World Heritage area." They might think about other areas: "Nope, the environment is not so important to us there. We would accept some mining in that area, therefore let's keep that out of a World Heritage area." – **Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012**

Butler maintained that Cape York Sustainable Futures didn't believe that wholesale mining across Cape York was a possibility, and agreed with Piper that it is the right of Traditional Owners to make the choice about mining on their lands:

[P]eople want to make a living at the end of the day. And that's their first and foremost concern. This mine at Wongai [in Lakefield National Park]...Well the Indigenous mobs there want that to happen...Because they want access to a proper economy. Cape York is a third world. Why should they not have access to an economy like the rest of Australia? Why should they be determined to be a third world? – **Butler, CYSF, 24th May 2012**

The equity issue here is that while most parts of Australia enjoy the benefits of the mining boom, Cape York Aborigines largely do not. A direct engagement with a local mine in a culturally and environmentally appropriate place, with negotiated benefits for Traditional Owners may help Aboriginal people receive those same benefits. However, aligned more closely with the traditionalist approach, The Wilderness Society takes a hard-line stance against mining:

We don't think you should mine everywhere. It's really simple. You shouldn't trash the really special places in particular. There needs to be a far greater degree of care and control taken when it comes to the impact of mining...They [mines] destroy values by definition. – **Esposito, TWS, 5th June 2012**

Esposito's comment about mines destroying values by definition is summarily dismissive of any positive contribution that mines might have to land and heritage management, such as the argument of Davis and Weiler (1992) that mining may reduce the environmental impact of tourism. The divergent opinions on mining give credence to a different argument by Piper that lands in Cape York need to be "managed...by agreement" between communities and governments (Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012). Piper's argument may be valuable in circumstances where there are certain communities that wish to be included in a World Heritage site but do not have the outstanding universal cultural or natural values to support it, and must therefore rely on agreements rather than legislation to maintain and fund their land and heritage management.

5.1.3 TOURISM & THE CONSERVATION ECONOMY

Tourism occupies a vaunted position in the World Heritage lexicon. Although Cape York clearly has many characteristics valued by the tourism industry, there are also likely to be significant impediments and costs (such as access and infrastructure) involved in scaling up tourism activity. Cape York's nearest regional centre Cairns is also the base for both the Wet Tropics and the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Areas, locations that generate billions of tourism dollars annually. Cape York has been historically undervalued and under resourced, and according to ex-tourism operator and now Regional Coordinator for Agforce:

Cape York's been like a trophy for 20 years, probably closer to 25 years when I got involved in one of the first tourism reports. And...99% of the actions out of that report were never ever done. And that first one identified the impact of future tourism on Cape York, and the environmental balance...It was 1987. It covered everything from the volumes of traffic flow, to managing camping grounds, to concessionaire systems, to access with permitting systems similar to the desert parks passes in South Australia. – **Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012**

The undervaluing of small-scale tourism on Cape York is reflected in the lack of quantitative tourism data for the region, and the absence of a specific Cape York World Heritage representative within Tourism Queensland, the peak industry body. There are also questions about the ability of World Heritage as a brand to clearly articulate its position, status and function to local residents, which is important since the overwhelming majority of current visitors to Cape York are from Australia, and a significant proportion are from Far North Queensland (Overseas residents make up less than 10% of visitors to Cape York. See Box 1.2). Residents of Cairns aren't necessarily aware of the 'World Heritage' status of their neighbouring World Heritage sites (Hoyal, CAFNEC, 23rd May 2012). Increasing the tourism presence in Cape York faces obstacles other than under-developed infrastructure and World Heritage's locally invisible brand profile. A fickle tourism market and the inflated Australian dollar may deflect investment opportunity and entrepreneurial innovation:

So you have to constantly refresh your product in the market. That's true if you're making a computer, or selling a cultural tour...It's [World Heritage] not going answer all problems for all times. – **Esposito, TWS, 5th May 2012**

It's just too hard a game. Way too hard a game. With the value of the dollar the way it is, it's just too difficult. And too many regulations on top of profit margins. – **Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012**

Tourism is small on Cape York, but several stakeholders argue that it can be one part of a spectrum of potential economic opportunities in the conservation economy. The conservation economy includes “elements of biodiversity services, eco-tourism, sustainable grazing, carbon sequestration, and land condition and water resource monitoring” (Hill et al. 2008: 21), and is argued to be important by the

state government, the ACF and The Wilderness Society. ACF's work on a conservation economy in Northern Australia is largely based on the Ecotrust² model from the Pacific Northwest of America (Hill *et al.* 2008). Ecotrust Australia closed on the 31st July 2012, citing their failure to find a way to “fully fund our business on a sustainable basis” as the reason for their termination (Dodson and Gill 2012). This raises questions about the viability of a conservation economy in Australia. Nevertheless, Esposito argues that “conservation economics is around finding the things at the right scale that actually do deliver jobs and that sort of thing at scale, but that are compatible with the maintenance of the values you're talking about” (Esposito, TWS, 5th June 2012). This resonates with Gibson-Graham's (2008) ‘economies of difference’ that work outside of and in opposition to dominant modes of capitalism:

[The conservation economy] requires innovation and new things, it requires people to start imagining and innovating and researching and analysing and promoting and that's an area that's just not happening because the economic debate is so locked up. And those who would've pursued that debate are not seen...as being credible. – *Esposito, TWS, 5th June 2012*

In claiming that the conservation economy needs people to start innovating and researching, Esposito, as a public advocate for the conservation economy, evades his responsibility to Cape York people who are asking what the conservation economy will look like. Otherwise, if Cape York people have a choice between an intangible conservation economy, and a conventional industry with an articulated economic plan, people may be more likely to choose the tangible over the intangible. However, The Wilderness Society has an ally in Balkanu in developing the concept of a conservation economy:

So the challenge for us is to find ways, whether it's through carbon I don't know, whether it's fire, ecosystem services, our thing is to establish economies that employ rangers in land management that are not reliant on government funding. – *Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012*

Balkanu clearly has a mandate to explore the full spectrum of potential economic opportunities for Cape York Aboriginal communities, and developing potential activities around carbon markets and fire management has precedents elsewhere³. However, the economic development organisation Cape York Sustainable Futures is dismissive of the idea of a conservation economy, and strongly favours conventional industries:

² Ecotrust is a non-profit NGO whose goal is to “foster a natural model of development that creates more resilient communities, economies, and ecosystems here and around the world” (Ecotrust n.d.).

³ The West Arnhem Land Fire Abatement Project is a partnership between the Aboriginal Traditional Owners and Indigenous ranger groups, Darwin Liquefied Natural Gas (DLNG), the Northern Territory Government and the Northern Land Council, where Indigenous Ranger groups implement strategic fire management to offset greenhouse gas emissions from the Liquefied Natural Gas plant in Darwin.

Our organisation doesn't believe that such an economy exists. People that live there don't believe that such an economy exists. Certainly not one that is going to be a diverse economy that's going to contribute to the national GDP...The place is too big to rely on the green economy. It doesn't exist. Grazing needs to be back in the equation yes. Definitely. And the Indigenous mobs want to see, well they want an economy themselves! They want an enterprise that makes money for them. You can't live off hunting and rangers. That's not an economy. So there's agriculture. There's all sorts of things that can be...be done sensibly, sustainably. – **Butler, CYSF, 23rd May 2012**

Butler argues for a “diverse, rich economy” without much detail, just as Esposito argues for “innovation and new things” without much detail. While Cape York Sustainable Futures may be suffering the ‘dampening’ and ‘discouraging’ effects of capitalism articulated by Gibson-Graham (2008) that leads to institutions struggling to imagine a conservation ‘economy of difference’, it is not to say that Cape York Sustainable Futures are not interested in a diverse economy:

We want to see private investment be able to be carried out. We want to see a diverse, rich economy. But there's so many things that are stopping it. The land tenure. The legislation. The access. All needs to be improved before we can see...[a self-sustaining economy] coming on tap. – **Butler, CYSF, 24th May 2012**

While these organisations assert their differences, there is clearly potential for developing common ground. All parties acknowledge the need for economic change, but some are focussing on problems, some on opportunities, with ideological conflict about what constitutes ‘real’ opportunities. This makes it even more critical for organisations to research and articulate innovations such as the conservation economy so that more conservative economic development organisations can include it in their vision of a “diverse, rich economy.”

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

Hardaker sums up the frustration that some people appear to have about the insubstantial nature of World Heritage and the economic largesse it is expected to deliver:

At the end of the day they keep touting economic opportunities...Well show us. Identify them. Put them on paper. If it requires a building, fast track the tenure resolution to freehold, get it up to tender, and get an investor to come in and build it...They can fast track a wharf or port facility for a coal operation, but they can't fast track a tourism operation in Cape York with clear tenure. And if they need to have the equity partner involved, then the Indigenous can come in as a full financial equity partner, not a token equity...It's not a short term solution. And every time there's a government process that goes on the peninsula, it's short term. There's no long term plan. And I'm talking about a long term plan. Could take 15 years, and on world scales, that's a short time. – **Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012**

Hardaker raises the key themes of lack of clarity on the economic opportunities of World Heritage, difficulties with development due to tenure, equitable Aboriginal business partnerships, and absence of a long term economic plan. Hoyal has similar concerns:

And I think that's a *real* problem in the Cape. There's no real clear strategy of why you're doing CYTRIG, Wild Rivers, World Heritage, what the vision for the Cape is. And that was something that came out of the consultations we did. There's no really clear vision for the Cape. – **Hoyal, CAFNEC, 23rd May 2012**

A long-term strategy is arguably the key that could clarify all the other issues. However, serious questions must be raised about whether the length of time before the World Heritage nomination is presented (February 2013) is long enough to create a substantive long-term economic plan that accommodates most organisational goals. Importantly, many of the groups appear to agree on crucial aspects of what should be included in an economic development plan for the region. It is predominantly TWS that opposes the key industries of mining and pastoralism, and perhaps need to soften their position and maintain a greater degree of flexibility in light of the long-standing development difficulties in the region. If the organisations can set aside previous grievances and reach a consensus, then a well-managed economic development agenda with or without World Heritage may not be beyond reach. Some of the obstacles to reaching consensus between organisations are discussed in the following chapter.

Figure 6.1: Cape York Aboriginal leaders Gina Castelain, David Claudie and Jimmy Richards lobbying in support of Wild Rivers. **SOURCE:** (McQuire 2011).

Heritage nominations will always be sites of contestation due to issues of ownership, authenticity, and values. This chapter argues that nominating a World Heritage site is an inherently political act. Although the World Heritage Convention seeks to protect ‘outstanding universal values’, it is impossible to do this without coming up against a localist vs. global hierarchy of goals. For example, conservation goals are likely to be different in a local context rather than a global context, and specifically for Cape York, timeframes for submitting a nomination set by Federal Environment Minister Tony Burke and/or the World Heritage Committee may not suit local needs. Furthermore, a binary traditionalist/developmentalist vision for Aboriginal futures and economic development on Cape York, combined with contradictory organisational relationships demonstrate the difficulties in heritage-making in Cape York. The politics of heritage-making are historically embedded in the legacy of failed policies, broken relationships, ideological and philosophical opposition, and consultation fatigue. The culmination of these factors plays out in ways that are deeply felt and intensely political, but like the diverse economies of difference discussed in the previous chapter, share common threads that can be woven together:

Cape York people genuinely love Cape York. And wouldn't be in all of this if they didn't. And you find that in a lot of regions. People love their region. So it's just finding a way that everyone feels like they're contributing and no one's dominating everybody. – **Talbot, Cape York Program Officer, ACF, 23rd May 2012**

The QLD Department of Environment and Heritage (formerly DERM) is currently at the stage of “doing very broad brush stuff”, and will next try to “bring the focus down to where the best prospects for a successful nomination are” (MacLeod, Director Partnerships and World Heritage, DERM, 4th June 2012). It is important to clarify that the QLD government has no stated intention of supporting a ‘blanket’ listing over the whole peninsula (MacLeod, DERM, 4th June 2012); a common concern held by all the organisations.

6.1 POWER, CONFLICT AND COMPROMISE

The legacy of Wild Rivers has soured relationships between many of the organisations working in Cape York, even amongst groups that used to be allies. The most common explanation is that:

[N]o one really planned for...the rise of the Wild Rivers legislation. So with that...a lot of people felt that it wasn't part of the agreed long term view of Cape York. And people thought that it gave a level of protection that perhaps World Heritage could offer at the end of the day so they couldn't see the reason why we would have Wild Rivers legislation in. – **Talbot, ACF, 23rd May 2012**

The oppositional politics raised by Wild Rivers is indicative of Pickerill's (2009) assessment that groups are unwilling to concede any influence of their power. Organisational positions are entrenched and political flexing means that often ideas don't get the “proper play out” (Hoyal, CAFNEC, 23rd May 2012) they deserve, which is, as Hoyal puts it:

[U]nfortunate, particularly when you're talking about Indigenous people who are fairly remote and just need the opportunity to hear the full story from both sides. – **Hoyal, Coordinator, CAFNEC, 23rd May 2012**

According to Patricia Butler, CEO of Cape York Sustainable Futures, a survey (using a Barrett Values Centre score⁴) CYSF conducted with people in Cape York prior to the last state election found that the situation in Cape York is so disharmonious that it could, in other countries, “cause riots” (Butler, CYSF, 24th May 2012). Whilst much of the conflict has its origins in failed policies and agreements, this does not preclude alliances being made between organisations over certain issues. Organisations are only as complicit in conflict as they choose to be. In the case of this thesis, World Heritage is the arena where old grievances and ideological positions are disputed. Persistent stubbornness may result in World Heritage progressing in an incomplete manner and continuing to marginalise alternative visions for Cape York. Therefore, organisations are risking a nomination that would incompletely represent the region’s heritage.

The difficult nature of Cape York relationships was readily acknowledged in interviews. People seem fed up with conflict and opposition since it does little to help the region. For example, John Hardaker from AgForce sees the government as unwilling to make a tough call on the future of pastoralism in Cape York, resulting in attempts to accommodate pastoral interests (such as 75 year leases under the *Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act*) coming across as parsimonious and therefore provoking further suspicion and conflict:

[W]hat we asked the government to do, the previous government, was if you don’t want graziers in Cape York, tell us. So that we can advise them to pack up and sell and we’ll get out...so they can take a new direction in life. They weren’t game to make that call simply for the fact that then there’d just be another nail in the coffin for them. – **Hardaker, Regional Coordinator, Agforce, 21st May 2012**

An employee of DERM is frustrated by the inability of Balkanu to put past grievances aside to work productively on World Heritage:

Yeah, well their [Balkanu’s] response when we invite them is that they don’t want to engage in World Heritage until the Wild Rivers legislation is revoked or repealed or resolved...that’s been their standard response since I’ve been engaged but we always reiterate that the door’s open and the committees have invited them on a couple of occasions to come and address them and talk to them about World Heritage and wide range of other Cape York NRM matters but they’ve declined to date. – **Cairns DERM employee, 22nd May 2012**

⁴ “The Barrett Values Centre provides powerful metrics that enable leaders to measure and manage the cultures of their organizations, and the leadership development needs of their managers and leaders” (Barrett Values Centre 2009a). Using various tools, including the Community Values Assessment “provides local politicians and civic leaders with a way of measuring the cultural evolution of their communities with the ‘Seven Levels of Community Consciousness’ model” (Barrett Values Centre 2009b).

Anthony Esposito from The Wilderness Society appears to engage in the same paranoid and conspiratorial thoughts that he claims sabotages relationships:

I guess they [AgForce and Cape York Sustainable Futures] hate us. They bought into this what I would call conservative political mindset...Some people value industry over conservation and see them as mutually exclusive. So if that's your mindset, you're going to want to exclude environmentalists from your world view and day to day lives and all the rest of it. So I get all of that. It's just a kind of paranoid, conspiratorial, aggressive nonsense that goes with it that just makes relationships impossible. – **Esposito, Manager National Indigenous Conservation Program, TWS, 6th June 2012**

Conversely, Butler of Cape York Sustainable Futures expressed a willingness to engage with TWS:

But everybody needs to work together as opposed to fighting each other. And you've got the green groups in there that are trying to influence things. One of the things we're going to try and do in the next few years is to engage them a bit more. Particularly TWS...because they don't want to come and talk to us in the first place. They have a preconceived idea of what they want to see for Cape York that may not work at the end of the day...I find that...we still should be able to talk and respect each other's differences. – **Butler, CYSF, 24th May 2012**

Esposito invokes the ideological dimension of conflict when he asks whether oppositional politics is “a big contest because of Aboriginal rights versus greenies? Or [is] it just a big contest because it's the contest?” (Esposito, TWS, 6th June 2012). He describes this contest as the one “we're all having all of the time: the choices between destruction or protection.” The choice between destruction and protection is another example of binaries at work in organisational politics.

The potential for organisations to renegotiate their current positions towards each other has been enhanced by the Newman LNP Government, who promised to repeal the *Wild Rivers Act* in favour of a Bioregion Management Plan. Without Wild Rivers as a visible reminder of broken promises and poor consultation, doors may reopen. Importantly, Balkanu has been one of the most vocal opponents of Wild Rivers, but have always seen World Heritage more positively as “part of the mix” for Cape York (Piper, CEO, Balkanu, 18th May 2012). However, if TWS maintain support for Wild Rivers, ideological conflict between Balkanu and TWS is likely to remain. Terry Piper from Balkanu holds concerns that the ideological position of conservation groups is largely driven by their ongoing need to fundraise:

[S]omething that comes about in many ways because of the operating regimes of conservation groups. They need to be 'saving' somewhere to raise funds...because nobody's going to support TWS if they can't show “we've done this this and this.” And the difficulty with that, and you see it in the Wet Tropics for example, once the battle is won, they move on...So they're not so interested in how things are managed, how things work afterwards because that's not how their machine works. – **Piper, CEO, Balkanu, 18th May 2012**

Using the Wet Tropics as an example, the implication is that while the government must maintain a presence in the area after World Heritage is decided, the conservation groups may not have already “saved” the site. The supposed cosy relationship between the QLD government and conservation sector is one of the most contentious issues for organisations with reservations about World Heritage. Piper maintains a degree of scepticism as to the motives of government support for World Heritage, apparently because the QLD government “can see votes in it” (Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012). That conservation groups wield a greater degree of power and have a stronger voice in the decisions over land management in Cape York than other stakeholders is acknowledged even by conservation groups themselves:

The perception in the community about who gets more voice than others is probably true. I am well aware of the criticism in the community that it’s driven by the conservation groups, and that we have a stronger link, or hold, or influence over the governments. – **Talbot, ACF, 23rd May 2012**

There is an equality issue here. Conservation groups may have more control over the World Heritage and land management process for Cape York in the development stage, but may retreat when it comes to ongoing delivery and maintenance, leaving the burden on the shoulders of other organisations that perhaps had less influence over World Heritage development. If conservation organisations authorise some Aboriginal voices that support their position in favour of others that do not, it may leave some Aboriginal people outside of planning process and further substantiate the conflict between traditionalist and developmentalist goals.

The ongoing conflict within the conservation sector between the more traditionalist position of TWS and the more pro-development goals of the ACF (Holmes 2011, in Section 1.1.2) was less evident in interviews:

TWS and ACF were there together on the [*Cape York Peninsula*] *Heritage Act*, we do similar types of work, we talk to each other still around policy, we do joint lobbying at times and all that sort of stuff. And we worked together with those Indigenous groups for a very long time as well. So I think...our policy settings are broadly the same. – **Esposito, TWS, 5th June 2012**

We’ve got quite a good relationship with TWS. We regularly meet. We try and align strategies and see where there is common ground for us to work together on. Sometimes there’s not. Sometimes they like to have a different approach which is fine. And sometimes we like to do things a bit differently. So they’re very different organisations anyway. – **Talbot, ACF, 23rd May 2012**

It is possible that conflict has been sidelined in order to present a united front on World Heritage so that the conservation sector can meet their February 2013 deadline. Expressing disunity publically would likely impede progress.

6.1.1 GOVERNANCE

Governance of World Heritage sites and the way it ultimately affects land and heritage management for the region is political and contested. The listing of World Heritage areas in Australia has often happened quickly in response to urgent environmental threats, with many of Australia's listed sites "born out of battles for conservation" (MacLeod, DERM, 4th June 2012). Conservation interests have been prioritised and the speed of the process has denied certain groups from participating in the development of nominations, notably Aboriginal and industry groups. Sites nominated solely under natural criteria struggle with ongoing governance issues due to the exclusion of Aboriginal and other minority perspectives in the planning stages. In order to avoid similar problems in Cape York, consultation during the formulation of governance strategies is crucial. According to Esposito, "[w]hat concerns people, what drives people mad everywhere, is the sense in which their autonomy is compromised by an imposed decision of a larger external force" (Esposito, TWS, 6th June 2012).

Much of the resistance to World Heritage in Cape York is born from not only the legacy of Wild Rivers, but from the neighbouring Wet Tropics World Heritage site, listed in 1998 under natural criteria (Butler, CYSF, 24th May 2012; Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012; Sullivan 2003). The Wet Tropics' close proximity to Cape York, its size and multiple land tenures has invited comparisons and provides the most obvious example to Cape York residents of what World Heritage governance might look like. The failure of the Wet Tropics site to have any of its cultural aspects recognised through the World Heritage Convention has left a deep impression on local Aboriginal people who were never consulted, and were initially excluded from any governance of the site. All the organisational representatives I spoke to agreed that the Wet Tropics Management Authority would be an inappropriate and incompatible governance model for Cape York.

Terry Piper's previous experience as park manager at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park led him to the following conclusion about World Heritage:

My experience has been...some of the things that you can do on a national park are even more restricted once it becomes a World Heritage area...I think it's more than what the legislation says, because people tend to - once it's a World Heritage area - deal with the *EPBC Act* in a more confined way than they would otherwise...[U]ltimately the outcome that we've always sought is: why can't you manage Aboriginal land by agreement...rather than this complex legislative regimes and overlapping legislation?...There needs to be some way of finding simplified regulatory schemes to apply to Aboriginal land where people want to look after their land, they want to look after rivers...And to TWS and Anthony Esposito, we've said "look, we'd be happy over the whole of Cape York to have a regulatory scheme that prohibited mines within a kilometre of the rivers, prohibited excessive extraction of water, prohibited dams. Those three things that you guys are concerned about. But we want to leave all the rest of the things like whether you can clear vegetation for an outstation within a kilometre of the river to agreements." – **Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012**

There is enough in Piper's statement to suggest that Balkanu (and presumably by extension, many Aboriginal Cape Yorkers) has similar conservation aspirations to The Wilderness Society. Managing and conserving by agreement would seem like a 'common-sense' idea, except that it ignores the problematic expressions of power that come into play if there is no law with which to penalise those that fail to adhere to the agreement. This can be seen in the World Heritage Convention whereby States Parties that fail to protect their World Heritage sites cannot be penalised except by having the site placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The use of regulation and law is not outside the exploitation of power though. In Butler's belief:

[T]he Convention side of things has everything that's needed...I mean the first thing we did was get the Convention and went through it. I think they're [the government] picking parts of that Convention and using them their way instead of probably the way that it's intended to be used. – **Butler, CYSF, 24th May 2012**

Rather than the national legislation for World Heritage – the *EPBC Act* - being applied as yet another piece of legislation affecting Cape York people's lives, Hardaker (AgForce, 21st May 2012) queries whether the existing 21 acts of land management legislation in Cape York could be amended or adjusted (Cape York People United n.d.).

The complexity of Aboriginal commitments, duties, aspirations and associations with the Cape York landscape ensure that World Heritage is a difficult prospect for government departments. Many departments have little in the way of tangible relationships with Cape York people, being primarily located in Cairns or even further south in Brisbane or Canberra. Government departments may have governing skills that are effective for regional or state governance, but have little to offer local communities. A critical way in which governance structures evolve is through consultation processes with stakeholders. With much of the opposition to Wild Rivers stemming from inappropriate consultation and lack of consent, the World Heritage consultation process for Cape York has been heavily scrutinised. Consultation has been done via a country-based planning process which is about:

[W]orking with Traditional Owner groups in the form that they feel most comfortable engaging. So they [Traditional Owners] first determine how they want to engage at [either] sub-regional level, clan-based estate, or community based estate. Then they identify a range of aspirations they have for country – how they want to do things, what their economic ideas are, how they want to manage particular sacred significant areas – they identify the values to them...And then they look at management regimes. And they try and open up some discussion and document how they wish to be involved in that management. – **Talbot, ACF, 23rd May 2012**

Like the ACF, other conservation organisations support the country-based planning process (Esposito, TWS, 6th June 2012; Hoyal, CAFNEC, 23rd May 2012). According to Nigel Stork, allowing Aboriginal people to develop their own plans and aspirations is still “a positive outcome”, even if it does not result in a World Heritage nomination (Stork, Chair, Cape York Regional Scientific and Cultural Advisory Committee, 4th June 2012). Also, it engages with people on the ground and acknowledges their

governance structures (Talbot, ACF, 23rd May 2012). However, Cape York is recognised to be a region suffering from “consultation fatigue” (Cairns DERM employee, 22nd May 2012) because “[p]eople are being consulted about things that aren’t really their concern or agenda” (Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012). Furthermore, Aboriginal people in communities may have more pressing issues than World Heritage:

Traditional Owners have got all sorts of other things on their plate as well. Looking after community, family, all those, but then you get this push of World Heritage overwhelming people.
– **Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012**

People are being consulted by a determined government that has a considerable financial and temporal investment in the nomination being accepted. At the national World Heritage Symposium held in Cairns on the 9th & 10th August 2012, it was remarked that because there is such a large investment of time and money in a World Heritage nomination, its acceptance is the only justifiable outcome or those resources have been wasted (Murphy 2012). Since the federal government has stated that a nomination can only proceed with the consent of Traditional Owners, it becomes necessary to convince Traditional Owners that World Heritage is in fact something they desire. Whilst governments continue to make decisions that adversely affect Aboriginal peoples and which they have little power to influence, there is an obvious imbalance of power.

The country-based planning approach includes offers of Caring for Country money, extended land tenure, and possibly other enticements, but this is viewed with suspicion. Butler describes substantial ‘bribery’ at work in the country-based planning approach: “why are people not going to take that money?...Because they’ve got none” (Butler, CYSF, 24th May 2012). It is ironic that custodial lands attached to Aboriginal Australians since time immemorial are now used as a ‘bribe’ to support conservation objectives. Hardaker sees this inequity as a return to colonial times:

I’ve always said the only difference between Wentworth and Lawson in Victorian years ago and today is they used trinkets and beads, and we use land tenure and Toyotas. We’re still doing the same thing. – **Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012**

Whilst the conservation sector applauds the country-based planning process for its inclusivity, engagement and consent mechanisms at the appropriate levels, Piper raises a concern that it is still a top-down and imperious method of consultation. There are also practical concerns for a government consultation process that operates according to government guidelines. Both of these concerns raise the spectre of colonising discourses:

The problem with the way government consults, which is the difference to the way Balkanu say consults or the NLC [Northern Land Council] consults, government consults in a way that government wants to sell the policy...They've got riding instruction about what to tell people, because they're there to sell what governments' already committed to. – **Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012**

They're not doing it according to the bush...You're going out there to talk to bushies that work from daylight till dark and plus...so you just need to sit down and talk with them on a one-to-one basis and leave out all the jargon with 'correct engagement' and 'social wellbeing'...Set up informal meetings and rock up and have a cup of tea and coffee on their day off when they've got an hour spare. When it's not in the middle of mustering time...Then when you get short lead times for surveys that come out, they [the government] don't consider the mail systems inside Cape York. It can be anything up to 3 to 4 weeks for a turnaround for mail. That's never brought into consideration. Then when they start planning meetings which are crucial planning meetings in February, well...half their major stakeholders...can't make it [because of the wet season]...So it's very conveniently planned, or it's stupidity, or a combination of both. – **Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012**

Despite their claims to the contrary, the perception that the government has predetermined World Heritage boundaries is well entrenched. Because government departments have the greatest power to bear on any situation, other organisations are forced to scramble for power, thus heritage-making under these circumstances has an inherently oppositional nature. The greatest leverage that Aboriginal people have is that Traditional Owner consent is mandatory for a nomination to proceed, though Aboriginal groups with no formal title over country have no such right to consent.

Details of what heritage in Cape York is being targeted for World Heritage have not yet been made publically available. However, despite the ownership of heritage by local people, heritage will be evaluated by external 'experts' for the World Heritage Committee if a nomination proceeds. There are two Cape York World Heritage Advisory Committees legislated under the *Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007*. The Regional Advisory Committee has a membership of "conservation, pastoral, mining and tourism and local government interests" and advises the QLD Government on "matters relating to community engagement and on matters of concern in their particular interest areas" (DERM 2011). The Regional Scientific and Cultural Advisory Committee has a membership of "experts in a range of disciplines including cultural and natural heritage, economics, environmental sciences, anthropology, ecology and land management...[and] advises government on matters relating to cultural and natural heritage values" (DERM 2011). The fact that these two committees have only convened together twice in the five years since their inception (Department of Environment and Heritage Protection 2012) is indicative of how local heritage is colonised through the authorised heritage discourse, and how heritage 'experts' in Cape York maintain a separation between community 'interests' and 'scientific' heritage evaluation. Expert opinion may fail to recognise the post-settlement cultural values embedded in pastoral landscapes. Furthermore, heritage must be made to fit one or more of the 10 criteria in the World Heritage Convention in order to qualify as having 'outstanding

universal value'. If 'value' is dictated by the authorised heritage discourse, then power resides in 'experts' and not Cape York residents. This is despite the fact that those who own the heritage should manage it, and authenticity "should be determined according to local cultural understandings" (Alberts and Hazen 2010: 61).

Though the committees may have been "exceptionally good at offering advice to the minister on the whole process", their role as 'independent experts' means they (inadvertently or otherwise) become the spokespeople for 'truth' in the region (Stork, Cape York Region Scientific and Cultural Advisory Committee, 4th June 2012). Piper argues that:

Cape York Indigenous people are not just people who should be sitting on a committee where you've got stakeholders on there who have got little stake in Cape York. There needs to be a different structure set up for government to engage with Cape York Traditional Owners. And one of the issues for Richie [Ah Mat, former Chair of the Cape York Regional Advisory Committee and a member of the Cape York Indigenous community] was government would say on the one hand, "well you're here as an individual, you're not here to represent the CYLC [Cape York Land Council]." But on the other hand, [local] people expected him to be there...and so what government tried to stop was any caucusing of Indigenous reps...We were after funding so people could come down the day before those meetings, talk about what's on the agenda, and work out a position. Government didn't like that. And so what would happen to Richie is Ritchie would on the one hand be told by Cape York Peninsula Regional Advisory Committee, you're here as an individual, but other people would say and government on the other hand would often say, well CYLC's there [being represented]. – *Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012*

This statement reflects the difficult expectations placed on Aboriginal people that reside on regional scale governance bodies. They are required for the committees to be 'independent', but their role as Aboriginal leaders also demands that they represent the community. Conflating their role on the advisory committee with their role in representative organisations presents a dilemma. People from any culture are unlikely to be able to completely separate the strands of their professional life from their personal, and therefore bring the conflict, allegiances, and knowledge/power of their professional life to an 'independent' forum: any separation is an artificial separation. The net effect of this artificial separation may be that heritage is evaluated by 'experts' and/or community leaders on advisory committees who, potentially unaware of their own biases, may either actively or subconsciously exclude or misrepresent the region's heritage, leaving a glaring difference between the ideals of community ownership of World Heritage sites and the application of those ideals.

6.2 CONCLUSIONS

For the sake of this country...it is imperative that the environmental movement and Indigenous peoples work out the common ground between them, understand where they are both coming from and create forums and networks to work together (Dodson 1997, cited in Pickerill 2009: 66).

Politics affects all aspects of a World Heritage nomination in Cape York. The way governance structures are conceptualised, and the way consultation is carried out are the tools organisations use to influence World Heritage discussions in their favour. The backlash against the highly public and politicised Wild Rivers consultation process has perhaps caused DERM's country-based planning consultation for World Heritage to swing too far in the opposite direction. DERM is tight-lipped about anything that could suggest they have a predetermined vision for a Cape York nomination before finalising consultation. Hoyal found in CAFNEC consultations that:

Traditional Owners...they felt they would like more direction from the state and federal government about where they thought the priorities were for World Heritage. – **Hoyal, CAFNEC, 23rd May 2012**

People cannot see the value in being consulted about something (since there is already consultation fatigue) if there is no certainty that it will affect them. The above statement reflects the consistent requirement for Aboriginal people to use the voice of other organisations, in this instance CAFNEC, to have their voices and concerns heard. Ideological differences between stakeholder organisations, personal conflict and bias between representatives in these organisations, and the requirement for 'expert' authorisation of heritage showcase the difficulty in articulating the Cape York's cultural and natural values. Furthermore, including these in a nomination with a high degree of integrity, in a manner consistent with World Heritage criteria, and with the consent of Traditional Owners makes a February 2013 deadline appear unmanageable. Crucially, without Traditional Owner consent, a World Heritage nomination will not be put forward at all. However, without intending to silence Aboriginal voices "just as they begin to speak" (Head 2001, cited in Howlett *et al.* 2011: 320), that Traditional Owners may be coerced into consent by "land tenure and Toyotas" (Hardaker, AgForce, 21st May 2012) is a problematic expression of colonialism. Aboriginal people answering to other peoples' agendas like World Heritage rather than being empowered to articulate new frameworks of heritage management that reflect Aboriginal culture is indicative of the "social effects of a discourse unable to accommodate contemporary Indigenous constructions of identity, heritage and, ultimately, 'culture'" (Pannell 2006: 10).

The stakeholder perspectives outlined in Section 4.2.2 take on even more significance when one considers that the people interviewed in many instances set the policy agenda for their organisations. Therefore, the politics that these people bring to their organisations can shape how their organisation responds to the World Heritage nomination process. In many cases, personal bias or incompatible worldviews set the tone for all interactions between organisations. However, there are often instances

where opportunities for collaboration exist, such as in the development of a conservation economy. The negativity towards World Heritage that is apparent when talking to John Hardaker or Patricia Butler may negatively impact all of their discussions with people on World Heritage. Similarly, the hard-line and unapologetic conservation approach taken by Anthony Esposito that appears to discount all other Cape York visions is likely to make it hard for Esposito to negotiate with more conservative economic development organisations. If they choose, these representatives have the potential to not only disengage from ideological conflict on World Heritage, but shape the public and their constituents' opinions in favour of new directions and allegiances. In doing so, they may resolve conflict and diminish local realpolitik. This kind of foresight may be productive in not only the World Heritage debate, but in the wider context of inclusive governance that accommodates the legion stakeholder groups, community aspirations, and advocacy bodies in the region.

Defining a politics that can bridge the multiple heterogeneities...without repressing difference, is one of the biggest challenges of the twenty-first century (Harvey 1996, cited in Pickerill 2009: 77).

The discipline of geography is well placed to analyse the politics of World Heritage within Cape York, insofar as it bridges positivist data rendering (e.g. maps) with qualitative and interpersonal research. It can give equal space to multiple understandings of nature and culture, the recognition of imbalanced power relations in colonial societies, the rights of Aboriginal people, and the “multiple heterogeneities” of stakeholders. These are stakeholders that publically express their tolerance for different epistemologies of heritage (to a greater or lesser degree), whilst simultaneously engaging in a struggle for power to impose their particular worldview in the discourse of heritage-making. This thesis therefore recognises difference by concentrating on the different economic visions, and different political ideologues of heritage-making within the World Heritage debate in Cape York.

By engaging in discourse analysis, some of the regimes of knowledge, power and truth operating throughout the debate on heritage-making in Cape York have been exposed. The academic literature on heritage-making provided a solid conceptual foundation from which to consider non-academic texts dealing specifically with heritage, and gave me a solid grounding in relevant theory around which I was able to build a semi-structured interview with stakeholders on Cape York.

I have here attempted to present an understanding of the discourses of the region, analysing the way stakeholder organisations and government departments shape the political landscape, including economic understandings and opportunities based on their worldviews. Considering Aboriginal people now own large sections of Cape York, their lack of direct representation in this thesis, and within governance structures directly able to engage with the World Heritage Commission speaks volumes about the ongoing regimes of power constructed through colonialism and propagated throughout the authorised heritage discourse. Though this thesis does not solely concentrate on the inclusion of Aboriginal voices within the World Heritage debate in Cape York, through my attention to social justice issues I have given extra voice to these perspectives.

IS WORLD HERITAGE APPROPRIATE FOR THE SCALE AND DIVERSITY OF CAPE YORK?

World Heritage is *not incompatible* with Cape York, but clearly there are tough political and economic obstacles to putting a nomination forward. A lack of infrastructure, combined with tenure issues such as banks being unwilling to provide equity on Aboriginal tenure are clear examples of problems faced by the Cape York community. Despite endless consultation being undertaken, very little has materially changed for local people. There is evidence that the government may be acting on problems, for example government representatives stating in interviews that they will look into the difficulties pastoralists face in trying to diversify their economic opportunities. Equity issues on land tenure like sub-surface mineral rights are likely to be more difficult to change, but would make an immeasurable difference to Aboriginal lives. With increased mining scheduled for Cape York, this is a pressing concern.

Another difficulty has been the legacy of neighbouring World Heritage sites like the Wet Tropics, the creation and management of which has left a lasting negative impression of World Heritage on the psyche of Cape York peoples. This legacy has stifled visions of potential governance structures for a Cape York World Heritage site, and what World Heritage could contribute to the area. Bearing in mind that World Heritage aims to protect sites of ‘outstanding universal significance’ *in perpetuity* for the global community, it is arguably these localist visions that would sustain a World Heritage site for years to come. The stakeholder organisations on Cape York must seriously evaluate their perspectives and envision cooperative structures for governance that appropriately recognise: (i) the large geographic scale; and (ii) the diversity of cultures, ‘natural’ landscapes and political ideologues of the region. A more collaborative approach is mandatory, and as Patricia Butler of Cape York Sustainable Futures argues: “The egos have got to get out of organisations” (Butler, CYSF, 24th May 2012).

The diversity of Cape York cultures (whether they are pastoral, traditionalist/developmentalist Aboriginal, or conservation) and the scope of current conflict suggest that a more productive collaboration might be some distance away. Considering that Aboriginal people are experiencing ‘consultation fatigue’ and pastoralists are on the defensive, a February 2013 deadline appears unrealistic. A comment by a CAFNEC member suggesting “we’ve just got to get on with it because it’s the only time we’ve ever really had an opportunity” highlight the opportunism within the deadline (Hoyal, CAFNEC, 23rd May 2012). A long term plan for Cape York with holistic economic and conservation arrangements negotiated by agreement, but without World Heritage would appear to be more realistic and less restrictive. Whilst they would not be *in perpetuity* like a World Heritage nomination, the *in perpetuity* aspect is overstated since there is no way to penalise the Australian Government for failing to honour its World Heritage commitments. Furthermore, in Nigel Stork’s understanding, before being nominated for World Heritage a site must have National Heritage status (Stork, Chair, Cape York Regional Scientific and Cultural Advisory Committee, 4th June 2012). That a National Heritage agenda for Cape York is discursively invisible in government rhetoric and the media again suggests an element of opportunism and a possible lack of process.

HOW WILL THE SCALE OF CAPE YORK AFFECT ITS GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT UNDER WORLD HERITAGE?

Currently it is unclear what effect the scale of Cape York will have on governance arrangements under World Heritage. Stakeholder organisations have unanimously conveyed that existing governance structures for other World Heritage sites in Australia would be unacceptable in the Cape York context. Examples of suitable governance structures from outside of the Australian context were not raised with me in the interview process, and may represent an opportunity for further research.

Economic development for Cape York is highly contested and political. Schisms within the Aboriginal community that roughly translate as traditionalist/localist or developmentalist/modernist often find adherents in other organisations. Organisations can selectively pick Aboriginal communities that support their worldview, which allows them to publically claim that they are working ‘in the interests’ of Aboriginal people. However, this thesis clearly articulates that there are diverse opinions and therefore no organisation speaks on behalf of all viewpoints. Without directly engaging in cooperative research with local Cape York Aboriginal communities, it is difficult to assess how strong stakeholder organisation-to-community ties are. Industries like pastoralism and mining are often favoured by organisations that align themselves with a more developmentalist approach, whereas eco-tourism and the conservation economy are strong in traditionalist conceptualisations of development. Without being too reductive, pastoralism can be seen as ecologically damaging by conservationists, or alternatively, a user of marginal landscapes in a productive economic way whilst protecting landscapes from ecological threats. Mining can be seen as ecologically and socially damaging, but also provides options for the expression of Aboriginal agency in economic development. Organisations and individuals that commit themselves to ideological positions of ‘good’ or ‘bad’ for these industries fail to recognise the diversity of communities and landscapes on Cape York and are doing themselves a disservice. Tourism is seen as being largely beneficial, but is frustrated by underdeveloped regional infrastructure. The conservation economy is poorly articulated, and requires significant research to be seen as credible by developmentalists. The integration of these disparate industries within a regional ‘hybrid’ economy will require flexibility and an open mind from both traditionalists and developmentalists. This is unlikely to happen before the World Heritage nomination deadline of February 2013.

The scale of Cape York may have no effect on governance and economic development. More likely is that the scale of Cape York *will* affect the considerable time it takes to develop a comprehensive, inclusive long term plan for the whole region (though not necessarily planned at the regional scale), and gather support from pastoralists and conservationists and both support and consent from Traditional Owners. World Heritage *may* provide a coordinated approach to overcoming these difficulties, but other World Heritage sites in Australia have not demonstrated a favourable record of community participation. Despite remonstrations by a Cairns DERM employee (22nd May 2012) that having Traditional Owner consent may constitute a new type of World Heritage listing; working towards a deadline may push already over-consulted people too hard, and establish an incomplete plan for governance, heritage management and economic development for the region.

WHAT ARE THE DISCURSIVE STRUCTURES OF HERITAGE-MAKING AND GOVERNANCE THAT EMPOWER OR DISEMPOWER CAPE YORK COMMUNITIES?

Cape York is removed from centres of power in Australia. The departmental offices for DERM reside in Brisbane or Cairns. The offices for the Commonwealth Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (dealing with World Heritage administration) reside in Canberra. Many of the non-government organisations that work in Cape York are based in either Brisbane or Cairns. Therefore, external powerful formal governance institutions often have a disproportionately large effect on the way Cape York is discursively rendered. Cape York communities often have little opportunity to demonstrate their own understanding of the region in a public forum. When they are given an opportunity to speak, it is often de-contextualised in the media, through consultation processes they did not themselves instigate, or through the voice of heritage ‘experts’. Recent years have seen Cape York take a national stage in conservation affairs. To The Wilderness Society (TWS), it is their second largest campaign after Tasmania (Holmes 2011a). The Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) has Cape York integrated in their wider Northern Australia Campaign. The political advocacy of the conservation sector was integral in the push for QLD Labor government intervention in the region: first in Wild Rivers legislation, then in the *Cape York Heritage Act 2007* aimed at progressing a World Heritage nomination. Both TWS and the ACF have argued strongly for a World Heritage listing. Similarly, both argue for a commitment to a conservation economy. However, the dominant discourse of capitalism silences alternative economies such as the conservation economy. This thesis has given the conservation economy a place alongside other developed industries in Cape York, but the inability of the conservation sector to clearly articulate the conservation economy does a disservice to communities that may be seeking alternative economies to support their land and heritage management. Other communities wishing to utilise mining in their development, like the Wongai Underground Coal Mine Project, should have their values and agency supported by the conservation sector so that they may mitigate environmental or cultural damage, and receive the greatest benefit from their arrangement with the mining company. TWS, who are vehemently anti-mining, run the risk of stifling opportunities for rich, diverse economies, and therefore the land and heritage management opportunities that strong economies present. When Terry Piper argues “good land management depends on a vibrant economy”, he recognises the apparent risk in stifling economic opportunity (Piper, CEO, Balkanu, 18th May 2012). World Heritage has the opportunity to crystallise fluctuating government funding commitments for the emerging conservation economy.

TWS uses photographs of Cape York to discursively render it as ‘wilderness’, a term which often appears on their website and other promotional/advocacy materials (see Figure 1.1 & 3.1). Their advocacy strongly influences conservation policy at a state level. Ultimately, terms like ‘wilderness’ discursively render Cape York an ‘antisocial’ nature, devoid of Aboriginal presence, pastoral presence, and devoid of the physical and social effects of land management (e.g. roads, fences, campgrounds). These representations of ‘wilderness’ are counter-intuitive to their stated aims of Aboriginal inclusion.

Lastly, within Cape York, Aboriginal people are spoken for by a wide variety of organisations that each has an agenda to pursue. How organisations use Aboriginal representation; whether they support developing a conservation or 'hybrid' economy, or the pursuit of development through traditional industries, has repercussions for heritage management and governance structures. Particularly in the case of World Heritage, Aboriginal people are being consulted by the QLD government about an agenda that is not necessarily their own (Piper, Balkanu, 18th May 2012). When we consider that Aboriginal people are subsumed by the nation state in World Heritage-making because they lack formal direct dealings with the World Heritage Committee (Pannell 2006), this consultation has global implications. The continual need to have Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal heritage authorised and assessed by 'experts', locally through the two Cape York Regional Advisory Committees, and globally through ICOMOS or the IUCN, continues to disempower the local management and ownership of heritage. If Aboriginal people are to be the identifiers and managers of their heritage, revisiting the idea of a World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts may be empowering (Kawharu 2009).

HOW DO THE POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN CAPE YORK AFFECT LAND MANAGEMENT AND HERITAGE-MAKING?

Political relationships in Cape York already experience a great deal of turbidity. Tension is seen to exist between the World Heritage Convention and how the Australian government applies it to sites and nominations. Tension also exists *between* local organisations involved in heritage-making and *within* Aboriginal communities about priorities for economic development and cultural maintenance. These tensions make World Heritage and heritage-making an inherently political process. Heritage should therefore be de-colonised (removed from the authorising power of 'experts'), and re-contextualised (with the priority for determination, nomination, and maintenance of heritage returned to the people to whom it belongs). The politics of heritage determines that since there is not enough trust between organisations in Cape York, groups rarely concede power. However, this thesis highlights that there are in fact multiple opportunities for organisations to bridge Cape York's "multiple heterogeneities...without repressing difference" (Harvey 1996, cited in Pickerill 2009: 77). There is a strong argument for collaborating on a conservation economy that will satisfy a conservation agenda, while also representing a component of a rich, diverse economy. Key people in organisations were keen to express oppositional politics without supporting evidence, which was shown to be false in interviews with the 'opposing' organisations. Clearly, personalities within organisations play a large role in determining how the politics of organisations play out in particular issues. Making some of the personal and ideological prejudices visible in this thesis may be the first step to more productive relationships. Revealingly, Smith (2003: 44) discovered that "coexistence is likely to prove most successful where it is sought in ongoing relationships between parties, rather than in abstract, written agreements" such as legislation that confines local people to a global convention in perpetuity.

My journey through heritage-making in Cape York has been difficult and rewarding. Clearly, there are no ‘truths’ to be gained from this research, except the truth that research with humans is both messy and productive. In the case of Cape York, the complexity of context required to position the research with confidence has been one of the greatest challenges. Finding commonalities in the nuanced expression of organisational perspectives required detailed analysis of conflict and history, and careful attention to the potentiality in the words, intents and positions of the research participants. Attending to these perspectives has still only scratched the surface of opportunities and challenges in Cape York. That commonalities exist between stakeholder organisations suggests that the possibility of inclusive governance and economic development for Cape York people is not mere speculation: it is simply that diversity and distrust have thus far constrained progress. A World Heritage nomination for Cape York may still provide a foundation for the empowerment of Cape York people.

REFERENCES

- AAP (2010), 'Cape York Bauxite Mine Scrapped Over Wild Rivers Law', *Sydney Morning Herald*, October 18th, 2010,
- AFFOLDER, N. (2007), 'Mining and the World Heritage Convention: Democratic legitimacy and treaty compliance.' *Pace Environmental Law Review*, vol.24: pp.35-66.
- AGIUS, P., JENKIN, T. O. M., JARVIS, S., HOWITT, R. and WILLIAMS, R. (2007), '(Re)asserting Indigenous Rights and Jurisdictions within a Politics of Place: Transformative nature of native title negotiations in South Australia.' *Geographical Research*, vol.45, no.2: pp.194-202.
- AGRAWAL, A. (1995), 'Dismantling The Divide Between Indigenous And Scientific Knowledge.' *Development and Change*, vol.26, no.3: pp.413-439.
- AIATSIS (2012), *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies*, AIATSIS, Canberra
- ALBERTS, H. C. and HAZEN, H. D. (2010), 'Maintaining Authenticity and Integrity at Cultural World Heritage Sites.' *The Geographical Review*, vol.100, no.1: pp.56-73.
- ALBRECHT, G., MCMAHON, C. R., BOWMAN, D. M. and BRADSHAW, C. J. (2009), 'Convergence of Culture, Ecology, and Ethics: Management of feral swamp buffalo in northern Australia.' *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, vol.22, no.4: pp.361-378.
- ALTMAN, J. C. (2001), *Sustainable Development Options on Aboriginal Land: The hybrid economy in the twenty-first century*, 226/2001 in CAEPR Discussion Papers, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT
- ALTMAN, J. C. (2009), *Beyond Closing the Gap: Valuing diversity in Indigenous Australia*, No. 54 in CAEPR Working Paper Series, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT
- ALTMAN, J. C. (2010), *Wild Rivers and Informed Consent on Cape York*, 02/2010 in CAEPR Topical Issue Series, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT
- ALTMAN, J. C. (2011), *Reforming the Native Title Act*, 10/2011 in CAEPR Topical Issues, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT
- APLIN, G. (2009), 'Australian Attitudes to Heritage.' *Australian Quarterly*, vol.81, no.3: pp.19-24.
- AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION (2010), 'Chalco Calls Off Aurukun Bauxite Mine', *ABC News Online*, July 1st, 2010,
- AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS (2012), *Cape York: Code IREG303 (IREG)*, in 2011 Census QuickStats, ABS, Canberra, ACT
- BAIN-SELBO, E. (1999), 'Understanding the Other: The challenge of post-colonial theory to the comparative study of religion.' *Religious Studies and Theology*, vol.18, no.1: pp.60-60.
- BARRETT VALUES CENTRE (2009a), *About: Barrett Values Centre*. Barret Values Centre. Retrieved 27th September, 2012, from <http://www.valuescentre.com/about/?sec=contact_us>.

- BARRETT VALUES CENTRE (2009b), *Products and Services: Community Values Assessment*. Barret Values Centre. Retrieved 27th September, 2012, from <http://www.valuescentre.com/products_services/?sec=community_values_assessment>.
- BLUNT, A. and MCEWAN, C. (2002), Introduction, in A. Blunt and C. McEwan (ed.), *Postcolonial Geographies*, London & New York, Continuum International Publishing Group: 1-6.
- BRAUN, B. (2002), *The Intemperate Rainforest: Nature, culture, and power on Canada's west coast*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- BRIGGS, J. (2005), 'The Use of Indigenous Knowledge in Development: Problems and challenges.' *Progress in Development Studies*, vol.5, no.2: pp.99-114.
- BRIGGS, J. and SHARP, J. (2004), 'Indigenous Knowledges and Development: A postcolonial caution.' *Third World Quarterly*, vol.25, no.4: pp.661-676.
- BYRNE, D. (2007), *Surface Collection: Archaeological travels in southeast Asia*, Altamira Press, Lanham, MD.
- CAPE YORK PEOPLE UNITED (n.d.), *Existing Legislation Relating to Cape York and Resources Management*. Cape York People United. Retrieved 3rd October, 2012, from .
- CARTER, J. (2010), 'Displacing Indigenous Cultural Landscapes: The naturalistic gaze at Fraser Island World Heritage Area.' *Geographical Research*, vol.48, no.4: pp.398-410.
- CASTREE, N. (1995), 'The Nature of Produced Nature: Materiality and knowledge construction In Marxism.' *Antipode*, vol.27, no.1: pp.12-48.
- CASTREE, N. (2002), 'False Antitheses? Marxism, nature and actor-networks.' *Antipode*, vol.34, no.1: pp.111-146.
- CHESTER, G. (2010), *Cape York World Heritage Discussion Paper*, report written for Cape York Sustainable Futures, EcoSustainAbility, Cairns, QLD.
- CHUULANGAN ABORIGINAL CORPORATION (2010), *Land and Resource Management Framework*. Chuulungan Aboriginal Corporation. Retrieved 14th May, 2012, from <<http://www.kaanjungaachi.com.au/KaanjuLandandResourceManagement.htm>>.
- DAILOO, S. I. and PANNEKOEK, F. (2008), 'Nature and Culture: A New World heritage context.' *International Journal of Cultural Property*, vol.15, no.1: pp.25-47.
- DAVIS, M. (2008), 'Indigenous Struggles in Standard-Setting: The United Nations Declaration On The Rights Of Indigenous Peoples.' *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, vol.9, no.2: pp.439-471.
- DELORIA JR., V. (1997), *Red Earth White Lies*, Fulcrum Publishing, Golden, CO.
- DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE (2012), *Wild Rivers*. Queensland Government. Retrieved 28th September, 2012, from <<http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/wildrivers/index.html>>.
- DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (2012), *Communication Between the Advisory Committees and the Ministers*. Queensland Government. Retrieved 24th September, 2012, from <<http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/cape-york/advisory-committees.html>>.

- DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (2012), *Oyala Thumotang National Park (CYPAL)*. The State of Queensland. Retrieved 6th September, 2012, from <<http://www.derm.qld.gov.au/parks/oyala-thumotang/culture.html>>.
- DEPARTMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY, ENVIRONMENT, WATER, POPULATION AND COMMUNITIES, (2011a), *Locations of Indigenous Protected Areas in Australia | December 2011*. Commonwealth of Australia. Retrieved 14th May, 2012, from <<http://www.environment.gov.au/indigenous/ipa/map.html>>.
- DEPARTMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY, ENVIRONMENT, WATER, POPULATION AND COMMUNITIES, (2011b), *Protected Area Funding 2011/12*. Commonwealth of Australia. Retrieved 14th May, 2012, from <<http://www.environment.gov.au/indigenous/ipa/funding11.html>>.
- DEPARTMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY, ENVIRONMENT, WATER, POPULATION AND COMMUNITIES, (2012), *Working on Country*. Commonwealth of Australia. Retrieved 14th May, 2012, from <<http://www.environment.gov.au/indigenous/workingoncountry/index.html>>.
- DERM (2011), *World Heritage for Cape York Peninsula: A chance to have your say*, Department of Environment and Resource Management, State of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD
- DODSON, P. (1997), 'Finding Common Ground', *Habitat Australia, ACF Magazine*, April,
- DODSON, P. and GILL, I. (2012), *Statement Regarding the Winding Down of Ecotrust Australia*. Ecotrust Australia. Retrieved 2nd October, 2012, from <<http://ecotrust.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/statement.pdf>>.
- DOWLING, R. (2005), Power, Subjectivity, and Ethics in Qualitative Research, in I. Hay (ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, South Melbourne, Oxford University Press: 19-29.
- DUNN, K. (2005), Interviewing, in I. Hay (ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Geography*, South Melbourne, Oxford University Press: 79-95.
- EARTH TECH (2005), *Cape York Natural Resource Management Plan Final Draft*, report written for Cape York Interim Advisory Group, Queensland Government & Natural Heritage Trust, Brisbane and Canberra.
- ECOSYSTEM OUTCOMES (2012), *Cape York Peninsula Bioregion Management Plan Scoping Paper*, report written for Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, Brisbane, QLD.
- ECOTRUST (n.d.), *How We Work*. Ecotrust. Retrieved 2nd October, 2012, from <<http://www.ecotrust.org/about/>>.
- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (Cth)
- ENVIRONMENT SCIENCE & SERVICES (NQ) (1995), *Cape York Peninsula Land Use Strategy: Stage 1 Overview Reports*, Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development, The State of Queensland and Commonwealth of Australia, Brisbane and Canberra
- ESCOBAR, A. (2001), 'Culture Sits in Places: Reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization.' *Political Geography*, vol.20, no.2: pp.139-174.
- FIGUEIREDO, E. (2008), 'Imagine There's No Rural.' *European Urban and Regional Studies*, vol.15, no.2: pp.159-171.

- GEORGE, E. W. (2010), 'Intangible Cultural Heritage, Ownership, Copyrights, and Tourism.' *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, vol.4, no.4: pp.376-388.
- GIBSON-GRAHAM, J. K. (2008), 'Diverse Economies: Performative practices for 'other worlds'.' *Progress in Human Geography*, vol.32, no.5: pp.613-632.
- GIBSON, C. (1999), 'Rebuilding the Jawoyn Nation: Regional agreements, spatial politics and Aboriginal self-determination in Katherine, Northern Territory.' *Australian Aboriginal Studies (Canberra)*, no.1: pp.10-25.
- GILL, N. (2005), 'Life and Death in Australian 'Heartlands': Pastoralism, ecology and rethinking the outback.' *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol.21, no.1: pp.39-53.
- GRAHAM, B. (2002), 'Heritage as Knowledge: Capital or culture?', *Urban Studies*, vol.39, no.5-6: pp.1003-1017.
- HAIG, D. (2010), 'Reclaiming Intangible Cultural Heritage.' *Art Antiquity & Law*, vol.15, no.4: pp.365+.
- HARAWAY, D. (1988), 'Situated Knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective.' *Feminist Studies*, vol.14: pp.575-599.
- HARVEY, D. (1996), *Justice Nature and the Geography of Difference*, Blackwell, Oxford, UK.
- HAZEN, H. (2008), '"Of Outstanding Universal Value": The challenge of scale in applying the World Heritage Convention at national parks in the US.' *Geoforum*, vol.39, no.1: pp.252-264.
- HAZEN, H. (2009), 'Valuing Natural Heritage: Park visitors' values related to World Heritage sites in the USA.' *Current Issues in Tourism*, vol.12, no.2: pp.165-181.
- HEAD, L. (2001), The Pursuit of Modernity in Maori Society, in A. Sharp and P. G. McHugh (ed.), *Histories, Power and Loss: Uses of the past: a New Zealand commentary*, Wellington, NZ, Bridget Williams Books: 100-115.
- HEAD, L. M. (2010), Cultural Landscapes, in D. Hicks and M. C. Beaudry (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, New York, Oxford University Press: 428-439.
- HILL, R., GRANT, C., GEORGE, M., ROBINSON, C. J., JACKSON, S. and ABEL, N. (2012), 'A Typology of Indigenous Engagement in Australian Environmental Management: Implications for knowledge integration and socialecological system sustainability.' *Ecology and Society*, vol.17, no.1: pp.23-40.
- HILL, R., HARDING, E. K., EDWARDS, D., O'DEMPSEY, J., HILL, D., MARTIN, A. and MCINTYRE-TAMWOY, S. (2008), *A Cultural and Conservation Economy for Northern Australia*, report written for Land & Water Australia, Australian Conservation Foundation, Canberra, ACT.
- HOFFMANN, B. D., ROEGER, S., WISE, P., DERMER, J., YUNUPINGU, B., LACEY, D., YUNUPINGU, D., MARIKA, B., MARIKA, M. and PANTON, B. (2012), 'Achieving Highly Successful Multiple Agency Collaborations in a Cross-Cultural Environment: Experiences and lessons from Dhimurru Aboriginal Corporation and partners.' *Ecological Management & Restoration*, vol.13, no.1: pp.42-50.
- HOLMES, J. (2011a), 'Contesting the Future of Cape York Peninsula.' *Australian Geographer*, vol.42, no.1: pp.53-68.
- HOLMES, J. (2011b), 'Land Tenures as Policy Instruments: Transitions on Cape York Peninsula.' *Geographical Research*, vol.49, no.2: pp.217-233.

- HOLMES, J. (2012), 'Cape York Peninsula, Australia: A frontier region undergoing a multifunctional transition with indigenous engagement.' *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol.28, no.3: pp.252-265.
- HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STANDING COMMITTEE ON ECONOMICS (2011), *Inquiry into Indigenous economic development in Queensland and advisory report on the Wild Rivers (Environmental Management) Bill 2010*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, ACT
- HOWITT, R. (2001), *Rethinking Resource Management: Justice, sustainability, and Indigenous peoples*, Routledge, New York.
- HOWITT, R. (2010), 'Sustainable Indigenous Futures in Remote Indigenous Areas: Relationships, processes and failed state approaches.' *GeoJournal*, vol.September 2010: pp.1-12.
- HOWLETT, C., SEINI, M., MCCALLUM, D. and OSBORNE, N. (2011), 'Neoliberalism, Mineral Development and Indigenous People: A framework for analysis.' *Australian Geographer*, vol.42, no.3: pp.309-323.
- ILES, S. and JOHNS, G. (2010), 'An Economic Unravelling of the Precautionary Principle: The Queensland Wild Rivers Act 2005.' *Agenda: A Journal of Policy Analysis and Reform*, vol.17, no.2: pp.73-92.
- IUCN (2003), 'Recognising the Non-Material, Sacred Values of Protected Areas: The World Heritage Convention leading the way', paper presented to *Program of VIth IUCN World Parks Congress*, Durban, South Africa, 8th – 17th September 2003
- KAWHARU, M. (2009), 'Ancestral Landscapes and World Heritage from a Maori Viewpoint.' *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, The, vol.118, no.4: pp.317-338.
- KLIMENKO, V. and EVANS, R. (2009), Bauxite Mining Operations at Weipa, Cape York: A case study, in Northern Australia Land and Water Taskforce (ed.), *Northern Australia Land and Water Science Review 2009 FULL REPORT*, Canberra, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation.
- KOWANYAMA ABORIGINAL SHIRE COUNCIL (2011), *Kowanyama Aboriginal Land & Natural Resources Management Office*. Kowanyama Aboriginal Shire Council. Retrieved 16th June, 2012, from <<http://www.kowanyama.qld.gov.au/kac/lands>>.
- LACHAJCZAK, N. (2011), *Come and Dance the Night Away LAURA FESTIVAL*. bushtvblog. Retrieved 24th September, 2012, from <<http://bushtvblog.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/bushtv-palm-1.jpg>>.
- LANE, M. B. and HIBBARD, M. (2005), 'Doing It for Themselves: Transformative planning by indigenous peoples.' *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, vol.25, no.2: pp.172-184.
- LANE, M. B. and WILLIAMS, L. J. (2008), 'Color Blind: Indigenous peoples and regional environmental management.' *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, vol.28, no.1: pp.38-49.
- LANE, R. and WAITT, G. (2001), 'Authenticity in Tourism and Native Title: Place, time and spatial politics in the East Kimberley.' *Social & Cultural Geography*, vol.2, no.4: pp.381-405.
- LI, Y. (2003), 'Heritage Tourism: The contradictions between conservation and change.' *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, vol.4, no.3: pp.247-261.
- MACKAY, F. and CARUSO, E. (2004), 'Indigenous Lands or National Parks?', *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, vol.28, no.1: pp.14-17.

- MACKEY, B., NIX, H. and HITCHCOCK, P. (2001), *The Natural Heritage Significance of Cape York Peninsula*, report written for Queensland Environmental Protection Agency, ANUTECH Pty Ltd, Brisbane, QLD.
- MARTIN, P. (2011), 'Mining and Mindsets in Aurukun', *Arena Magazine*, Issue 115, p.31-36.
- MCFADZEAN, G. (2011), 'Coal Rush' on the Cape.' *Ecotone*, vol.3, no.31: pp.9-10.
- MCQUIRE, A. (2011), 'Canberra Fails to Slow Wild Rivers', *Tracker*, 1st June, 2011, Accessed 24th September 2012
- MEMMOTT, P. and BLACKWOOD, P. (2008), *Holding Title and Managing Land in Cape York: Two case studies*, 21 in AIATSIS Discussion Papers, AIATSIS, Native Title Research Unit, Canberra
- MICHAEL, P. (2012), 'Cattle Herd Vanishes in Devil's Triangle', *The Daily Telegraph*, 25th August 2012, 24th September 2012
- MILNER, C. (2004), *Peter Beattie & Labor: Policy 2004*, Australian Labor Party, Brisbane, QLD
- MURDOCH, J. (2006), *Post-Structuralist Geography*, SAGE Publications, London.
- MURPHY, P. (2012), 'Australia's achievements and legacy on the World Heritage Committee', paper presented to *Science Informing Policy Symposium Series: The future of Australia's World Heritage*, Cairns, QLD, 9-10th August 2012
- NCS PEARSON (2002), *Cape York Peninsula Visitors Survey July – October 2002*, report written for Tourism Queensland, Brisbane, QLD.
- NEALE, T. (2011), 'Duplicity of meaning: Wildness, indigenelty and recognition in the wild rivers act Debate.' *Griffith Law Review*, vol.20, no.2: pp.[310]-332.
- NICHOLSON, G. (2002), 'The Common Heritage of Mankind and Mining: An analysis of the law as to the High Seas, Outer Space, the Antarctic and World Heritage.' *New Zealand Journal of Environmental Law*, vol.6: pp.177-198.
- NURSEY-BRAY, M. (2009), 'A Guugu Yimmathir Bam Wii: Ngawiya and Girrbithi: Hunting, planning and management along the Great Barrier Reef, Australia.' *Geoforum*, vol.40, no.3: pp.442-453.
- O'FAIRCHEALLAIGH, C. (2004), 'Denying Citizens Their Rights? Indigenous people, mining payments and service provision.' *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol.63, no.2: pp.42-50.
- O'FAIRCHEALLAIGH, C. and CORBETT, T. (2005), 'Indigenous Participation in Environmental Management of Mining Projects: The role of negotiated agreements.' *Environmental Politics*, vol.14, no.5: pp.629-647.
- OFFICE OF THE NEW SOUTH WALES VALUER GENERAL (2009), *Land Values Issued for Bourke*, Office of the New South Wales Valuer General, Department of Land and Property Information, Sydney, NSW
- PANNELL, S. (2006), *Reconciling Nature and Culture in a Global Context? Lessons from the World Heritage List*, Cooperative Research Centre for Tropical Rainforest Ecology and Management, Rainforest CRC, Cairns, QLD
- PEARSON, N. (2006), 'Noel Pearson on Wild Rivers and the Cape York Heads of Agreement', transcript, Cape York Institute, 3rd June 2006, accessed 4th September 2012, from

<http://cyi.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/3-20Noel-20Pearson-20on-20Wild-20Rivers-20etc.pdf>.

- PEDYNOWSKI, D. (2003), 'Science(s) - which, when and whose? Probing the metanarrative of scientific knowledge in the social construction of nature.' *Progress in Human Geography*, vol.27, no.6: pp.735-752.
- PICKERILL, J. (2009), 'Finding Common Ground? Spaces of dialogue and the negotiation of Indigenous interests in environmental campaigns in Australia.' *Geoforum*, vol.40, no.1: pp.66-79.
- PLANNING FOR PEOPLE (2011), *Management Arrangements for Potential World Heritage Listing for Cape York Peninsula Discussion Paper*, report written for Queensland Department of Environment and Resource Management, Planning for People, Jindabyne, NSW.
- PLUMWOOD, V. (2006), 'The Concept of a Cultural Landscape: Nature, culture and agency in the land.' *Ethics and the Environment*, vol.11, no.2: pp.115-150.
- PRIDEAUX, B. and FALCO-MAMMONE, F. (2007), *Economic Values of Tourism in the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area*, Cooperative Research Centre for Tropical Rainforest Ecology and Management, James Cook University, Cairns, QLD
- QUEENSLAND AMBULANCE SERVICE (2000), *Service Plan: Enhancing the Capacity of Cape York Communities to Prevent and Respond to Health Care Emergencies and Injuries*, Queensland Ambulance Service: Far Northern Region, Cairns
- QUEENSLAND DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (2011), *Annual valuations released for Burdekin Shire Council local government area*, Office of the Valuer-General, Queensland Department of Environment and Resource Management, Brisbane, QLD
- QUEENSLAND DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND WATER (2007), *Cape York Peninsula region (map)*, Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Water, Queensland Department of Environment and Resource Management, Brisbane, QLD
- RICHARDSON, B. J. (1990), 'A Study of Australian Practice Pursuant to the World Heritage Convention.' *Environmental Policy and Law*, vol.20: pp.143-154.
- RIO TINTO (2012a), *Indigenous Employment Reaches Record Levels at Weipa*. Rio Tinto. Retrieved 3rd October, 2012, from http://www.riotinto.com.au/ENG/aboutus/179_features_1392.asp.
- RIO TINTO (2012b), *Weipa. What We Produce*. Rio Tinto. Retrieved 9th May, 2012, from http://www.riotintoalcan.com/ENG/whatweproduce/1803_weipa.asp.
- ROLLS, M. (2003), 'Black is not Green.' *Australian Studies*, vol.18, no.1: pp.41-65.
- ROSE, D. B. (1996a), 'Land Rights and Deep Colonising: The erasure of women.' *Aboriginal Law Bulletin*, vol.3, no.85.
- ROSE, D. B. (1996b), *Nourishing Terrains: Australian Aboriginal views of landscape and wilderness*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra.
- ROSE, D. B. (1999), Indigenous Ecologies and an Ethic of Connection, in N. Low (ed.), *Global Ethics and Environment*, London & New York, Routledge: 175-187.

- ROSE, G. (1997), 'Situating Knowledges: Positionality, reflexivities and other tactics.' *Progress in Human Geography*, vol.21, no.3: pp.305-320.
- SACK, R. D. (1992), *Place, Modernity and the Consumer's World*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- SAID, E. (1993), *Culture and Imperialism*, Vintage Books, London.
- SCHWARTEN, E. (2011), 'World Heritage Back On For Cape York', *Brisbane Times*, September 8th, 24th April 2012
- SHAW, W. S., HERMAN, R. D. K. and DOBBS, G. R. (2006), 'Encountering Indigeneity: Reimagining and decolonising geography.' *Geografiska Annaler*, vol.88, no.3: pp.267-276.
- SMITH, B. R. (2003), 'Whither "certainty"? Coexistence, change and land rights in northern Queensland.' *Anthropological Forum*, vol.13, no.1: pp.27-48.
- SMITH, B. R. (2005), '"We Got Our Own Management": Local Knowledge, Government and Development in Cape York Peninsula.' *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, no.2: pp.4-15.
- SMITH, B. R. and CLAUDIE, D. (2003), *Developing a Land and Resource Management Framework for Kaanju Homelands, Central Cape York Peninsula*, No. 256 in CAEPR Discussion Papers, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Canberra
- SMITH, L. (2010), 'Ethics or Social Justice?: Heritage and the politics of recognition.' *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, no.2: pp.60-68.
- SMYTH, D. and VALENTINE, P. (2008), *Pathways to Securing Cultural and Natural Heritage of International Conservation Significance on Cape York Peninsula*, report written for Queensland Environment Protection Agency Committee, A discussion paper for consideration by the Cape York Peninsula Region Scientific and Cultural Advisory Committee, Brisbane, QLD.
- STEVENSON, B. (1998), *Research Bulletin Number 3*, Cape York Land Use Heads of Agreement, Queensland Parliamentary Library, Brisbane
- STEVENSON, M. G. (2004), 'Decolonizing Co-Management in Northern Canada.' *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, vol.28, no.1.
- SUCHET, S. (1996), 'Nurturing Culture Through Country: Resource management strategies and aspirations of local landowning families at Napranum.' *Australian Geographical Studies*, vol.34, no.2: pp.200-215.
- SUCHET, S. (2002), '"Totally Wild"? Colonising discourses, indigenous knowledges and managing wildlife.' *Australian Geographer*, vol.33, no.2: pp.141-157.
- SULLIVAN, S. (2003), 'Local Involvement and Traditional Practices in the World Heritage System', paper presented to *Linking Universal and Local Values: Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage*, Amsterdam, 22–24th May 2003
- THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY (2010), *Queensland's Wild Rivers*. The Wilderness Society QLD. Retrieved 29th July, 2012, from <<http://www.wilderness.org.au/campaigns/river-protection/queenslands-wild-rivers>>.
- TOURISM QUEENSLAND (2003), *Cape York Tourism: Market assessment and potential*, Tourism Queensland, Brisbane, QLD

- TOURISM QUEENSLAND (2008), *The Cape York Peninsula & Torres Strait Tourism Development Action Plan 2008 – 2011*, Tourism Queensland, Brisbane, QLD
- UNESCO (2012a), *Australia*. UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Retrieved 12th May, 2012, from <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/au>>.
- UNESCO (2012b), *The States Parties to the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)*. UNESCO. Retrieved 2012, 23rd August, from <<http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/?pg=00024>>.
- UNESCO (n.d.-a), *The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. UNESCO. Retrieved 5th September, 2012, from <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>>.
- UNESCO (n.d.-b), *World Heritage*. UNESCO. Retrieved 27th September, 2012, from <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/about/>>.
- UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG (2012a), *Human Research Ethics Committee*. University of Wollongong. Retrieved 12th May, 2012, from <<http://www.uow.edu.au/research/ethics/UOW009376.html>>.
- UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG (2012b), *Human Research Ethics*. University of Wollongong. Retrieved 14th June, 2012, from <<http://www.uow.edu.au/research/ethics/UOW009378.html>>.
- VALENTINE, P. (2006), *Compiling a Case for World Heritage on Cape York Peninsula*, report written for Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service, James Cook University, Townsville, QLD.
- VAN TIGGELEN, J. (2007), 'War in the Wilderness', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 22nd September, p.34-39,
- VERACINI, L. (2011), 'Isopolitics, Deep Colonizing, Settler Colonialism.' *Interventions*, vol.13, no.2: pp.171-189.
- WAITT, G. (2005), Doing Discourse Analysis, in I. Hay (ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, South Melbourne, Oxford University Press: 163-191.
- WALLIS, R., WALLIS, A. and PICONE, A. (2012), 'After 80 Years Absence, Wuthathi People Plan for the Return and Management of Ancestral Homelands on Cape York Peninsula.' *Ecological Management & Restoration*, vol.13, no.1: pp.81-84.
- WATERTON, E., SMITH, L. and CAMPBELL, G. (2006), 'The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and social inclusion.' *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol.12, no.4: pp.339-355.
- WILLEMS-BRAUN, B. (1997), 'Buried Epistemologies: The politics of nature in (post)colonial British Columbia.' *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, vol.87: pp.3-31.
- WOINARSKI, J., MACKEY, B., NIX, H. and TRAILL, B. (2007), *The Nature of Northern Australia: Natural values, ecological processes and future prospects*, ANU E Press, Canberra

FIGURE REFERENCES

FIGURE 1.2

QUEENSLAND DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND WATER (2007), *Cape York Peninsula region (map)*, Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Water, Queensland Department of Environment and Resource Management, Brisbane, QLD

FIGURE 1.3

HOLMES, J. (2012), 'Cape York Peninsula, Australia: A frontier region undergoing a multifunctional transition with indigenous engagement.' *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol.28, no.3: pp.252-265.

FIGURE 1.4

HOLMES, J. (2012), 'Cape York Peninsula, Australia: A frontier region undergoing a multifunctional transition with indigenous engagement.' *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol.28, no.3: pp.252-265.

FIGURE 1.5

AVALOOK AT AUSTRALIA (1999), *Cairns, Cooktown, Atherton Tablelands*. Avalook at Australia. Retrieved 9th September, 2012, from <http://www.avalook.com/newsite/?page_id=78>.

FIGURE 3.1

Clockwise from top left:

TRAPNELL, K. (n.d.), *Serpentine River Cape York*. Cairns Peace by Peace. Retrieved 11th September, 2012, from <http://www.cairnspeacebypeace.org/?page_id=1569>.

TRAPNELL, K. (1991), *Paperbarks on the Mitchell River*. CAFNEC. Retrieved 11th September, 2012, from <<http://caf nec.org.au/what-we-do/cape-york/>>.

TRAPNELL, K. (n.d.), *Shelburne Bay wetlands, Cape York Peninsula*. The Wilderness Society. Retrieved 11th September, 2012, from <<http://www.wilderness.org.au/campaigns/river-protection/queenslands-spectacular-wild-rivers>>.

- TRAPNELL, K. (2010), *Mitchell River Paperbarks. Cape York Peninsula, Queensland*. Flickr. Retrieved 11th September, 2012, from <<http://www.flickr.com/photos/wilderness-society/6919722261/>>.
- TRAPNELL, K. (n.d.), *The Lockhart River Kawandji-Wimpa Dancers will be performing throughout CIAF 2012*. Cairns Indigenous Art Fair. Retrieved 11th September, 2012, from <<http://www.ciaf.com.au/default.asp?PageID=237&n=Lockhart+River+Kawandji2DWimpa+Dancers+2D+Day+1>>.
- TRAPNELL, K. (2011), *Termite mound in Rinyirru (Lakefield) National Park, Cape York Peninsula, Queensland*. The Wilderness Society. Retrieved 11th September, 2012, from <<http://www.wilderness.org.au/campaigns/indigenous-conservation/rinyirru-returned>>.
- TRAPNELL, K. (2010), *Locked up: The Wenlock River on Cape York*. Australian Broadcasting Corporation. Retrieved 11th September, 2012, from <<http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/01/12/2790437.htm?site=brisbane>>
- TRAPNELL, K. (2012), *Lockhart River Dancers*. Cairns Indigenous Art Fair. Retrieved 11th September, 2012, from <<http://www.ciaf.com.au/plugins/Announce/default.asp?articleId=824&name=THE+LOCKHART+RIVER+KAWANDJI-WIMPA+DANCERS>>.

FIGURE 4.1

PLANNING FOR PEOPLE (2011), *Management Arrangements for Potential World Heritage Listing for Cape York Peninsula Discussion Paper*, report written for Queensland Department of Environment and Resource Management, Planning for People, Jindabyne, NSW.

FIGURE 5.1

MICHAEL, P. (2012), 'Cattle Herd Vanishes in Devil's Triangle', *The Daily Telegraph*, 25th August 2012, 24th September 2012

FIGURE 6.1

MCQUIRE, A. (2011), 'Canberra Fails to Slow Wild Rivers', *Tracker*, 1st June, 2011, Accessed 24th September 2012

APPENDIX A: TABLE OF INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

Date	Name	Organisation	Organisation Abbreviation	Position	Office Location	Interview Location
18.05.12	Terry Piper	Balkanu Economic Development Corporation	Balkanu	Chief Operating Officer	Cairns	Cairns Café
21.05.12	John Hardaker	AgForce Queensland	Agforce	Regional Coordinator	No fixed location	Cairns Café
22.05.12	Name withheld	Department of Environment and Resource Management	DERM	Cairns employee	Cairns	Cairns Office
23.05.12	Leah Talbot	Australian Conservation Foundation	ACF	Cape York Program Officer	Cairns	Cairns Café
23.05.12	Sarah Hoyal	Cairns and Far North Environment Centre	CAFNEC	Coordinator	Cairns	Cairns Office
24.05.12	Patricia Butler	Cape York Sustainable Futures	CYSF	Chief Executive Officer	Cairns	Cairns Office
04.06.12	Nigel Stork	Cape York Region Scientific and Cultural Advisory Committee	none	Chair	Brisbane	Brisbane, Griffith University Office
04.06.12	Ross MacLeod	Department of Environment and Resource Management	DERM	Director, Partnerships and World Heritage	Brisbane	Brisbane Café
05.06.12	Anthony Esposito	The Wilderness Society	TWS	Manager, National Indigenous Conservation Program	Brisbane	Private residence

Participant Information Sheet

Fluid Cultures, Responsive Heritage

Deconstructing a World Heritage nomination in Cape York

The Project: The aim of this project is to investigate what a World Heritage nomination would mean for stakeholders on Cape York, and how they are enabled to participate in decision-making.

The Purpose: The purpose of the research is to better understand how World Heritage can operate in a large, multi-land tenure place like Cape York. Is it possible? Are there alternatives? What are stakeholders saying?

What you will be asked to do: Participation in this project involves participating in an interview sharing your knowledge and personal/organisation/corporation opinions.

You will be asked to answer questions that are structured to produce a conversation. The emphasis is always on your ideas, activities, experiences and feelings. There are no right and wrong answers. The interview may take as long as one hour, depending on the time you have available.

As a participant you always have the right to stop the interview at any time. You may withdraw data you have contributed up to a month after the interview. The questions asked cover the focus of the project. With your permission, interviews will be recorded and transcribed by myself to assist interpretation. However, the transcripts always remain confidential. Access to the transcript is only available to the researchers. Any information provided may be used in my thesis, and academic journal articles.

You are encouraged to ask any questions you might have regarding this research. *If you have any concerns or complaints about the research or how it was conducted, please contact the University of Wollongong Ethics Officer on (02) 42214457.*

The Project Organiser:

- ♦ Nick Skilton
- ♦ **Email** nb366@uow.edu.au **Telephone:** 0421 417 098

OR Supervisors:

Dr Michael Adams
Senior Lecturer
School of Earth and Environmental Science
University of Wollongong
Ph: (02) 4221 4284
madams@uow.edu.au

Dr Leah Gibbs
Lecturer
School of Earth and Environmental Science
University of Wollongong
Ph: (02) 4298 1547
leah_gibbs@uow.edu.au

Thank you. Thank you for considering participating in *Fluid Cultures, Responsive Heritage*

Dr Michael Adams
Senior Lecturer
School of Earth and Environmental Science
University of Wollongong
Ph: (02) 4221 4284
madams@uow.edu.au

Dr Leah Gibbs
Lecturer
School of Earth and Environmental Science
University of Wollongong
Ph: (02) 4298 1547
leah_gibbs@uow.edu.au

Consent form for involvement in *Fluid Cultures, Responsive Heritage.*

Project organiser:

- Nick Skilton
Email: nb366@uow.edu.au Ph: 0421 417 098
Address: PO BOX 890, Newtown, NSW 2042

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project. *If you have any further questions you can contact myself or my Project Supervisors as above.*

This form indicates my consent to be involved in the project. I have been given a project information sheet, understand what the project is about, and have been given the opportunity to ask questions.

By signing, I am consenting to:

- ☐ participate in an interview, likely to last between 30 and 60 minutes; and
- ☐ have the interview recorded, so it can be transcribed.

I understand I am not committed to finishing the interview once it begins. My consent can be withdrawn at any time within a month if I am unhappy with the project. Withdrawal of consent will have no consequence for myself.

I consent to having any information I provide used in Nick Skilton's honours thesis, and academic journals. In this research I wish to be identified by:

- ☐ full name and organisational title.
- ☐ organisation title (name withheld).
- ☐ an ID code (name and title withheld)

I understand that I can direct any questions about the research to Nick Skilton or his supervisors, and I am aware that the University of Wollongong Ethics Officer can be contacted on (02) 4221 4457 if I have any concerns regarding the research or project.

Name:

Signed:

Date:

University of Wollongong

INITIAL APPLICATION APPROVAL

In reply please quote: HE12/134
Further Enquiries Phone: 4221 3386
MR:SH

19 April 2012

Mr Nicholas Skilton
PO Box 890
NEWTOWN NSW 2042

Dear Mr Skilton

I am pleased to advise that the Human Research Ethics application referred to below has been approved.

Please note, that while the revised application has been approved, the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form should make it clearer to participants that although every effort will be made to protect their confidentiality, that this cannot be assured even for those who choose not to have full name or organisation identified. This is because of the relatively small numbers who will be asked to participate in the project. Please make these amendments and submit a revised copy to the Ethics Unit for their records.

Ethics Number: HE12/134

Project Title: Fluid Cultures, Responsive Heritage: Deconstructing a World
Heritage nomination in Cape York

Researchers: Mr Nicholas Skilton, Dr Michael Adams, Dr Leah Gibbs

Approval Date: 19 April 2012

Expiry Date: 18 April 2013

The University of Wollongong/Ilawarra Shoalhaven Local Health District Social Sciences HREC is constituted and functions in accordance with the NHMRC *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research*. The HREC has reviewed the research proposal for compliance with the *National Statement* and approval of this project is conditional upon your continuing compliance with this document.

A condition of approval by the HREC is the submission of a progress report annually and a final report on completion of your project. The progress report template is available at <http://www.uow.edu.au/research/rso/ethics/UOW009385.html>. This report must be completed, signed by the appropriate Head of School, and returned to the Research Services Office prior to the expiry date.

As evidence of continuing compliance, the Human Research Ethics Committee also requires that researchers immediately report:

- proposed changes to the protocol including changes to investigators involved
- serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants
- unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project.

Please note that approvals are granted for a twelve month period. Further extension will be considered on receipt of a progress report prior to expiry date.

If you have any queries regarding the HREC review process, please contact the Ethics Unit on phone 4221 3386 or email rso-ethics@uow.edu.au.

Yours sincerely

A/Professor Garry Hoban
Chair, Social Sciences
Human Research Ethics Committee

Research Services Office University of Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia
Telephone: +61 2 4221 3386 Facsimile: +61 2 4221 4338
research-services@uow.edu.au www.uow.edu.au/research

APPENDIX E: POSSIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LISTING SCENARIOS

Sourced from: Valentine (2006)

- (i) **Entire Peninsula:** Cape York Peninsula Land Use Strategy boundary (from the Cook Shire boundary, the Wujal Wujal Community, the Mitchell and Nassau Rivers in the south, to Cape York including Thursday and Horn Islands and other islands of the Prince of Wales group in the north) minus the Wet Tropics of Queensland World heritage Area sites (Environment Science & Services (NQ) 1995).
- (ii) **Serial Nomination of core conservation areas:** Cultural landscapes and mixed criteria of cultural and natural sites, with core areas (protected area estate and community conserved areas).
- (iii) **Eastern Cape York Ecosystems:** Catchments for all east coast river systems (Jacky Jacky, Olive-Pascoe, Lockhart, Stewart, Normanby/Laura, Jeannie) and associated east coast streams (Claudie, Nesbitt, Chester, Rocky, Massey) plus the Jardine Catchment.

- (iv) **Greater Eastern Cape York Ecosystems:** Same as Scenario 3 with the addition of the Archer River catchment to capture the key elements of the east-west environmental gradient including riparian forests and floodplains.

- (v) **Cape York Peninsula Protected Areas.** In essence this would be a stand-alone serial nomination of existing protected areas and state lands purchased (and to be purchased) for conservation purposes.