CHAPTER FOUR

Cultural landscapes and identity

Lisanne Gibson

Cultural landscapes are both artefacts within which we can trace past historical social and cultural arrangements, and places which reflect fields of action confirming and negating contemporary arrangements of culture and society. No matter how picturesque they may be, cultural landscapes are spaces with real political, cultural and social effects on the present. Daily we wander past objects–memorials, monuments and so forth–often paying them no attention at all and yet these sometimes invisible ‘signposts on a cultural landscape’ can have significant impact both in terms of their presence and, as we shall see later, their absence.¹ The case of the memorial to the Kalkadoon and neighbouring Mitakoodi people in remote North West Queensland (QLD) in Australia is a sharp illustration of this point.

The Kalkadoon/ Mitakoodi memorial, which features gentle reminders of Aboriginal land ownership, was erected as a bicentennial project in 1988 by long-time area resident and Cloncurry general practitioner Dr David Harvey Sutton. With the support of the Mitakoodi Aboriginal Corporation in Cloncurry, Sutton designed and financed a monument to draw public attention to Aboriginal history in the bicentenary year. The monument is located at Corella River on the Mount Isa to Cloncurry Highway at the purported tribal boundaries of the Kalkadoon and Mitakoodi peoples. It consists of

a brick wall with images of the Aboriginal flag, Aboriginal warriors, spears, boomerang and plaques with poems on either side (see Figure 4.1). One of the central plaques reads:

```
You who pass by are now entering the ancient tribal lands of the Kalkadoon/
Mitakoodi, dispossessed by the European; honour their name, be brother and sister to
their descendants.
```

[Insert Figure 4.1 here- landscape]

Figure 4.1 Kalkadoon/ Mitakoodi Memorial, 1988. The photo shows Kalkadoon man John Brody.

The overall effect of the arrangement is ambiguous. The monument’s form, with its prominent flag, is something like a claim to territory, as is part of the inscription. Yet, as Chilla Bulbeck argues, other elements, the poems in particular, repeat the strategies that relegate Aboriginal culture to the past and gloss over both historical and contemporary struggles. The poems map out a version of Aboriginal ‘progress’, with descriptions of ‘wild men’ and ‘brown Adam’ who have adapted to the ‘space age’ and whose ‘children have been accepted as free, equal and valued members of modern Australian society’. There is no mention on the memorial of the 1884 battle between Europeans and Kalkadoon people at the nearby Battle Mountain in which around 200 Aboriginal people died (discussed further in later in this chapter) or indeed anything that points to the distinctive experiences of Aboriginal people, a point that was further underscored by the

---


monument’s unveiling by the Minister for Ethnic Affairs in the, at the time, notoriously racist QLD State government.4

Despite the relatively conservative character of the monument it has been the subject of violent vandalism to the extent that explosives destroyed it in 1992. Although rebuilt, such attacks persist and demonstrate that positive representations of Aboriginality are not universally accepted in the context of contemporary Australian politics and society.5

[Insert Figure 4.2 here- portrait]

Figure 4.2 Kalkadoon/ Mitakoodi Memorial detail showing bullet holes where the memorial has been shot, 1988

The Kalkadoon/ Mitakoodi Memorial is not on either the State Heritage Register, neither is it protected under a local listing scheme. Would such protection make it less vulnerable to attack? The nearby Kalkadoon/ Kalkatunga Memorial discussed later in this chapter, which specifically memorialises the conflict at Battle Mountain, is on the Queensland Heritage Register and has not been vandalised to this extent. But this could

4 It may be that by ‘unveiling’ this monument the government was attempting to correct this general opinion as earlier in 1988 it had lost the watershed Mabo vs Queensland court case, in which the High Court of Australia decided that the Queensland Coast Islands Declaratory Act, which attempted to retrospectively abolish native title rights, was not valid according to the Racial Discrimination Act 1975. The subsequent Mabo vs Queensland case found, for the first time in Australian history, that native title existed in Australian common law, a finding that initiated the Commonwealth Government of Australia to develop the Native Title Act, 1993. See M. Goot and T. Rowse, Make a Better Offer: The Politics of Mabo, (Sydney: Pluto Press, 1994).

5 L. Gibson and J. Besley, Monumental Queensland, 53-54.
simply be because the Kalkadoon/ Mitikoodi Memorial is laden with images including a large Aboriginal flag whereas the Kalkadoon/ Kalkatunga Memorial simply carries a plaque. The key point here is that landscapes are not static in their meaning and are the site and focus of ongoing power struggles over what stories are represented. The representation of these stories in our landscapes has important cultural, political, social and perhaps even economic effects in the present.

There has been a great deal of consideration given by academics and, to a lesser extent, heritage practitioners to the role of heritage in the construction and articulation of identity. In the last five years in particular there have been a number of publications considering heritage as the locus of an important cultural politics which has effects beyond the cultural in the social and economic spheres.\(^6\) This anchoring of considerations of heritage in relation to its concrete cultural, social and economic contexts and effects is not new,\(^7\) but it is relatively recently that it has emerged as a significant feature of the literature. However, despite this, albeit recent, emphasis in the academic literature, the
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form of what counts as heritage (defined in terms of what gets protected as heritage) has changed little, as Barbara Bender comments:

> Apart from acting as the custodians and entrepreneurs of prehistoric monuments, English Heritage and the National Trust have focused on the landmarks of those with power and wealth, inscribed in an aesthetic that bypasses, as it has done for centuries, the labour that created the wealth. More recently the net has been cast wider, but, despite acquiring Victorian back-to-backs or derelict mills or mines, the presentation remains sanitized and romanticised, emphasising local colour rather than the socio-economic conditions that generate both wealth and poverty, people’s pain or their resistance.\(^8\)

In the face of this critique, many writers have argued for a methodology based on consultation and consensus which will allow the management of heritage(s) which is plural and representative. But is ‘heritage’, at least in so far as it is articulated in contemporary policy and programmes, constitutively or even practically capable of being representative of a society in which deeply plural experiences and values are validated. Is consensus about what counts as heritage possible, or even desirable? In this chapter I want to tease out a variety of knotty issues around, in the first instance, the fabric focused logic underpinning heritage management and the implications of this for ‘social value’.

Second, I want to discuss the limits of heritage protection and the implications of this for the cultures and alternative histories of marginalised identities via a discussion of a detailed survey of ‘outdoor cultural objects’ undertaken on the Australian State of Queensland. In conclusion, I want to discuss critiques of heritage which propose consultation as a means of achieving processes of heritage management which are representative.

---

Valuing Cultural Landscapes

In this chapter I use the term cultural landscapes rather than ‘historic environment’ as I think that the former refers to places as not simply reflective of identities but as both reflective and productive of identities.9 ‘Historic environment’ is a static understanding of landscape, as a canvas on which the evidences of history can be discerned. I prefer to think of landscape as a living environment in which signs and signifiers (whether historic or contemporary) and their meanings are constantly being remade. Unlike ‘historic environment’ as articulated in English Heritage documents as a canvas of the past, ‘cultural landscapes’ are a canvas of the present. Bender argues, ‘Landscapes are thus polysemic, and not so much artefact as in process of construction and reconstruction’.10 Of course, this process is far from value neutral in the stories landscapes tell us about the past and the present. Denis Cosgrove, for instance, has shown how landscapes can be understood as part of a wider history of economy and society.11 But landscapes most crucially tell us about the present; as Howard Morphy puts it ‘the ancestral past is subject to the political map of the present’.12 As discussed with the example of the Kalkadoon/Mitikoodi memorial, these signposts on landscapes are much more than the markers of stories without effect, rather, as Sharon Zukin argues, ‘the symbolic economy of cultural
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11 D. E. Cosgrove, Social formation and symbolic landscape, (Croom Helm, 1984), 1.

12 In Bender, ‘Introduction’ in Landscape: Politics and Perspectives, 2.
meanings and representations implies real economic power'.\textsuperscript{13} It is difficult to find any of this significance in relation to present day effects in the rather static ‘historic environment’.

Another consequence of using the term ‘cultural landscapes’ rather than ‘historic environment’ is that it suggests an approach to heritage which understands it not as an object which is the static locus of some internal value, but as a process. Laurajane Smith has argued that ‘there is no such thing as “heritage”’.\textsuperscript{14} Rather, for Smith, heritage is heritage \textit{because} it is subjected to the management and preservation/conservation process, not because it simply ‘is’. This process does not just ‘find’ sites and places to manage and protect. It is itself a constitutive cultural process that identifies those things and places that can be given meaning and value as ‘heritage’, reflecting contemporary and cultural social values, debates and aspirations.\textsuperscript{15}

There are a number of implications of Smith’s statement which bear teasing out. In the first and most obvious sense, it follows from this position that there is nothing self-apparent or given about regimes of value and significance, rather these frameworks are specific to our particular social, cultural, economic and political contexts. Drawing on the anthropologist Marcel Mauss’s famous proscription on the cultural and historical specificity of contemporary personhood, objects, buildings and places are ‘formulated’ as

\textsuperscript{13} S. Zukin, ‘Space and Symbols in an Age of Decline’, in \textit{Re-presenting the City: ethnicity, capital and cultural in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century metropolis} ed. A.D. King, (Macmillan Press, 1996), 44.


\textsuperscript{15} Italics in original, ibid., 3.
heritage ‘only for us, amongst us’.\(^\text{16}\) Perhaps even more significantly, Smith, drawing on the Foucaultian conception of ‘governmentality’ as a productive process of power and knowledge, argues that it is the very ‘governing’–the frameworks, instruments, policies and programmes–of heritage management which actually produce heritage.\(^\text{17}\) Of course, as I have already begun to establish, this is far from a neutral process, in the case of heritage management, the ‘for us and amongst us’ has involved only limited sections of the population.

In the past 15 years the concepts of ‘social value’ and ‘cultural significance’ have gained ground as categories of value, enabling objects and places to be recognised when their significance is not primarily aesthetic or historical. The increasing emphasis on these categories is partly due to the criticism which many have identified that heritage management is too narrow, failing to reflect the breadth and depth of history, culture and society.\(^\text{18}\) The concept of social value in heritage understands the locus of value of objects and places as being within communities and people rather than in fabric whose meaning is identified by professionals. In a report on social value commissioned by the Australian Heritage Commission, Chris Johnston defines places with social value as those which can:

- provide a spiritual connection or traditional connection between past and present;


• tie the past and the present;
• help to give a disempowered group back its history;
• provide an essential reference point in a community’s identity;
• loom large in the daily comings and goings of life;
• provide an essential community function that develops into an attachment; [and,]
• shape some aspect of community behaviour or attitudes.  

However, as we will see in later in this chapter, social or cultural value is often difficult to establish for a variety of reasons. The primary reason is the fact that often the ‘provenance’ or the history of the social or cultural significance of an object has been lost or forgotten, a problem exacerbated when the object is perceived to be outside established heritage frameworks. For those arguing for social or cultural value it is the social or cultural significance attributed to the object or place which is the source of value rather than the actual fabric of the object or place. The relative fragility of these intangible values poses significant challenges for heritage governance as we will see. Probably the most significant challenge, however, to arguments which attempt to give primacy to social and cultural value is the fact that, despite the rhetoric to the contrary, social and cultural value are still not widely accepted in actual practice as definitive categories of value in their own right.

Like other social and cultural policies and programmes contemporary heritage management must be articulated to values which are understood to define contemporary societies. In the case of both Australia and Britain these values are understood to be

Johnston’s definition was broadened by K. Winkworth, Review of existing criteria for assessing significance relevant to moveable heritage collections and objects, (Canberra: Department of Communications and the Arts, 1998), to include collections and objects rather than only ‘places’.
multi-ethnic and plural. We have seen already in our brief consideration of the English Heritage document *Power of Place* how the rhetoric of contemporary heritage governance is articulated to managing heritage in the name of ‘the people’ and understanding the character of heritage places involves understanding ‘the value and significance that people ascribe to them’. From this it might seem that social and cultural value have become important in contemporary heritage policy. However, further interrogation of key contemporary heritage management documents reveals that this importance is undermined and that in fact fabric focused, professionally defined (rather than community defined) value assessments remain the dominant paradigm of significance. We can demonstrate this by considering two key contemporary heritage policy documents.

Heritage policy and programmes in Australia are based on the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999, which defines heritage significance in terms of ‘aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations’. The Burra Charter was first developed in 1979 in response to the *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites* (Venice 1964) and has been and still is very influential on heritage management instruments internationally. Its precepts and especially its definition of ‘social value’ and ‘cultural significance’ have been influential particularly in arguing for community inclusion in the processes of heritage management. The Charter’s latest revision, in 1999, gave more emphasis to both the intangible aspects
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of heritage value and the importance of social and cultural value. It describes these as ‘the recognition of less tangible aspects of cultural significance including those embodied in the use of heritage places, associations with a place and the meanings that places have for people’.\(^{22}\) On this basis the Charter

recognises the need to involve people in the decision-making process, particularly those that have strong associations with a place. These might be as patrons of the corner store, as workers in a factory or as community guardians of places of special value, whether of indigenous or European origin.\(^{23}\)

Thus, the Charter appears to be assertively articulated to community focused assessment of social value and cultural significance. This established understanding of the Charter has been challenged by Emma Waterton, Laurajane Smith and Gary Campbell who argue that ‘construction of terms such as fabric and cultural significance inherently contradicts attempts of social inclusion and community participation’.\(^{24}\) Waterton et al go on to show how, in contrast to its stated recognition of intangible meanings, the Charter’s construction of the notion of fabric, ‘ Assumes that cultural heritage is inherently fixed within, thus becoming physically manifested and subject to conservation, management and other technical practices’.\(^{25}\) It follows from this that the locus of expertise implied by the Charter remains the heritage professional and not communities. As Waterton et al argue “‘Participants’ are contrasted with “‘the experts”, pushed into the role of

\(^{22}\) Ibid., Background.

\(^{23}\) Ibid.


\(^{25}\) Ibid., 348.
beneficiaries, and thus made passive’, 26 and therefore, ‘the idea that the conservation values of experts might be just another set of cultural values is entirely absent in the discursive construction of the text, and for that matter all texts of this sort’. 27

Even in the new English Heritage policies and guidance on the management of the historic environment Conservation Principles, the proposed conservation process places communication with people and communities as the second step after the evaluation of fabric (and the establishment of its significance) by experts. 28 As the Chairman of English Heritage states in the introduction this document sets out the framework on the basis of which the historic environment in England is managed by English Heritage. 29 However, analysis of the document reveals that, despite the community focus of English Heritage’s rhetoric, the discourse which informs Conservation Principles places communication with people and communities as the second step after the evaluation of fabric (and the establishment of its significance) by experts. For instance, under the third proposed Principle on understanding the significance of places a process is described which establishes that ‘it is necessary first to understand fabric’; secondly, the process will ‘consider who values the place and why they do so’. 30 Thus fabric and expertise always comes before value as established by non-expert communities. This is despite the fact that the second Principle proposes that ‘Everyone should have the opportunity to

26 Ibid., 350.

27 Ibid., 349.


29 Ibid.

30 Ibid., 21, italics added.
contribute to understanding and sustaining the historic environment. Judgements about the values of places and decisions about their future should be made in ways that are accessible, inclusive and informed.\cite{31} Yet Principle 2.3 states that ‘Experts would use their knowledge and skills to help and encourage others to learn about, value and care for the historic environment’.\cite{32} As Waterton et al identified in the Burra Charter, so too, the English Heritage \textit{Conservation Principles} are defined by a fabric focus which looks to expertise as the locus for the establishment of meaning and value. What are the implications of this fabric focus for an actual cultural landscape?

\textit{Cultural Heritage Mapping}

I want to explore some of these issues by discussing research I undertook with Joanna Besley from 2000 to 2003 in Queensland (QLD). The ‘Public Art and Heritage’ project was funded by the Australian Research Council and also received some funding from the Public Art Agency and Cultural Heritage Branch of the QLD State Government. Between 1999 and 2007 the Public Art Agency was responsible for QLD’s ‘percent for art’ scheme which funded public art, defined broadly to include built art forms such as statuary, installations, building design elements, and so forth, it could also include ephemeral cultural forms such as festivals, dance, and so forth (although in practice it rarely did). The Cultural Heritage Branch is responsible for managing the QLD Heritage Register and the State’s heritage programmes. The ‘Public Art and Heritage’ project aimed to investigate outdoor cultural heritage and public art in the State, its management,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 20.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
and the extent to which there were strategic policy linkages between the two Departments and the policies and programmes they managed.

The research needs to be viewed in the context of the State’s introduction of an *Integrated Planning Act* in 1997 which required QLD local governments to undertake both cultural heritage mapping and cultural mapping in order to inform the development of cultural plans for the management of all local cultural resources (the receipt of state government arts funding was dependant on the development of these plans). On the face of it, this impetus was based on the widely accepted best practice cultural planning aims of recognising the multiple agencies across government responsible, in various ways, for cultural programmes and resources. It was believed that identification of all cultural resources which could then be managed using a ‘whole of government’ approach both at State and local government levels would result in a more pragmatic management of the State’s cultural assets and would also result in more inclusive policies and programmes due to a more integrated system for managing the diversity of assets in the State. As it turned out by 2002, 5 years after the introduction of the Act, only 45% of the 128 local councils and 20% of the 32 indigenous councils had undertaken the mapping.

---


36 Ibid., 25.
The cultural heritage mapping process was based on what were considered to be best practice methods of public consultation directed at achieving a plural identification of cultural heritage. However, the process could only enable a limited pluralisation of response. This was so for three primary reasons:

1. Local governments engaged in the cultural heritage mapping process by following the Queensland Government’s *Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Management*. The consultation procedure defined in this document provided a framework of nine historical themes which were significant to the States’ history against which a particular localities heritage was to be mapped. The guidelines suggested that councils could introduce additional sub-themes to deal with the specific local history of an area; however in practice this was rarely done.

2. Public consultation was a required part of the cultural heritage mapping process; however, the requirement for consultation was interpreted very differently by the councils. Our survey of the organisational bodies responsible for the management of heritage—128 local councils and 28 indigenous councils—found that of the small number of councils who had conducted cultural heritage studies or surveys, only 50% included public consultation as a component. In addition, on further analysis we found that activities defined as ‘public consultation’ included appointing a committee of heritage experts and appointing a member of the public to sit on it. Other activities defined as ‘public consultation’ most commonly took the form of public meetings, meetings with
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39 Ibid.
local specialist groups such as historical societies and meetings with individual members of the community, known to be experts. Such activities are unlikely to encourage participation by the general public or a representative understanding of cultural significance. Problems with public consultation are well documented; not least the significant resources and time required to undertake consultation which aims for more than token community engagement. While the State government required public consultation to take place in the process of cultural mapping, they provided no funds to enable this. Little wonder then, that such limited consultation actually occurred.

3. The third reason why this seemingly best practice model for the establishment of a pluralised definition of cultural heritage resources could not result in a genuinely representative understanding was the very constitution of the process which lay at the heart of Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Management. The heritage process as defined by this document provided a limited framework which was biased to events understood to be part of an already established State history and which was limited to tangible objects and places. Having established this limited lens through which heritage could be defined, the document also established the role of the expert as the transmitter of this framework and thus ultimate arbiter of what came to be understood as culturally significant.

Signposts on a Cultural Landscape

40 Ibid.


42 Cultural Heritage Branch, Guidelines for Cultural Heritage, (see note 40).
While the difficulties with achieving a representative understanding of heritage value are significant, the designation and protection of some objects, buildings and places and not others has considerable discursive and practical consequences. I have discussed some of the theoretical coordinates of this acknowledgement of the cultural, economic, political and social consequences of ‘heritage’ in the first section of this chapter and in the introduction to this book. Here I want to discuss through a range of examples the importance of objects in local cultural landscapes and in relation to the cultural landscapes of states and nations.

As part of the ‘Public Art and Heritage’ project we surveyed the existence, provenance and heritage management of a category of objects we called ‘outdoor cultural objects’ throughout the State of QLD. We defined outdoor cultural objects as objects intended to have a representative, memorial or symbolic functions and which were located in places easily accessible to the public. This was taken to include sculptural art, monuments, memorials, mosaics, murals, tympanaeum, building badges (with a sculptural element), outdoor advertising objects (such as ‘Big Things’), sundials, and fountains. We documented over 200 objects, the vast majority of which were not on either the State Heritage Register or local cultural heritage maps. Many of the objects had common characteristics which were in contrast to our expectations. We assumed that most of the objects would be installed by government programmes to provide reminders of Empire, or models of worthy citizens to be emulated. In contrast the majority of the objects we discovered were installed by community subscription or community groups. So while they were not listed in the Heritage Register or on local cultural heritage maps,
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the fact that many of these objects were there as a result of community efforts demonstrated that the local stories that these objects represented were significant to that community. The specificity of these objects was particularly poignant when we looked at the overall survey of the cultural landscape of QLD and the story communicated through the outdoor cultural objects on it. The story told by the ‘official’ cultural heritage landscape of QLD (those things protected through the State Heritage Register or through local listings or mapping) is a story in which women, Indigenous Australians and the majority of QLD’s ethnic communities, including communities, such as the Chinese, who have lived there for more than 200 years, are close to absent. In contrast, the stories told by the objects we surveyed in the ‘unofficial’ cultural landscape of QLD were comparatively diverse, although as we will see the absences are still significant.

Monuments and memorials which tell of the contribution of women, and working women in particular, to the story of QLD are almost absent from QLD’s cultural landscape. Where women are represented in the landscape, they are represented as symbolic of particular roles or ideals, such as Queen Victoria, or the Weeping Woman War Memorial.

[Insert Fig. 4.3 here- portrait]

Figure 4.3 The Weeping Mother Memorial by Frank Williams and Co., 1922.

We found only two objects in the entire State which represented women as workers, both of which were memorials to Sister Elisabeth Kenny.\(^{44}\) The monuments in Toowoomba and Nobby were installed by community subscription but are on neither the State Heritage Register nor the local cultural heritage maps. It was a women’s

\(^{44}\) L. Gibson and J. Besley, *Monumental Queensland*, 142- 43.
organisation (in this case the Country Women’s Association, responsible for the installation of many of the memorials in QLD) that was the instigator of the Sister Kenny Memorial Garden in Nobby. Sister Kenny’s methods of medical treatment were recognised overseas before they were accepted in Australia, particularly in America, where she was depicted as a heroine in a Hollywood movie, Sister Kenny (1946), about her life. Kenny invented a treatment for polio based on the application of hot compresses and massage. This form of treatment was in direct contradiction to the established medical procedures of the time, which involved the application of splints and immobilisation of the limbs. Brisbane doctors ridiculed her methods at a government-sponsored demonstration and the report of a Royal Commission conducted by leading QLD doctors in 1937 damned her methods. Over time, her technique of gradual and gentle rehabilitation based on mobilisation of the limbs became recognised by the medical establishment as the best method for the treatment of polio.

[Insert Fig. 4.4 here- landscape]

Figure 4.4 The Sister Kenny memorial sundial in Toowoomba, QLD.

The absence of women in the landscape and moreover the lack of ‘official’ recognition of those markers which do exist is not exclusive to QLD. ‘The Unusual Monuments Project’, an Australia-wide survey that sought to catalogue all the monuments that depicted labour history, women’s history, and the history of Indigenous Australians, found that there were very few monuments to the work of women. This

45 Ibid.

survey found that despite the fact that ‘the female form abounds in many monuments… it is not women who are represented but rather abstract ideals… Less common are the monuments which celebrate dead or living females’.  As we found through our survey of the State of QLD, Bulbeck found that ‘There are more monuments to women in Australia than a reading of the various registers of Australian monuments… would suggest’.  There are a number of reasons Bulbeck identifies to account for this: the lack of signposts–tourist brochures, official and local histories in which women ‘do not find a place’; and, as we found also, the relative material insignificance of memorial’s to women which tend to be plaques, small cairns and such like, rather than imposing statues located in busy places.

The opening of the ‘Women in Australia’s Working History Project’ in 2002 at the Australian Workers Heritage Centre provided an opportunity, not yet realised, to address the lack of commemorative objects to women workers in Queensland’s cultural and urban landscapes. The project seeks to correct the imbalance and to celebrate the lives, work and contribution of Australian women past and present. The project is the first occasion on which women’s contribution as workers in the home, in the community and in the paid workforce is collectively recognised in a permanent tribute on a national scale. However, as an illustration of Bulbeck’s point about the relative material invisibility of women’s

47 Ibid., 8.
48 Ibid.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
51 Australian Workers Heritage Centre, Opening celebration of stage one of the Women in Australia’s Working History Project, (Barcaldine: Australian Workers Heritage Centre, 2002).
history compare this small static exhibition with ‘The Ringer’ a monumental sculpture of a stockman installed just down the road at the Australian Outback Heritage Centre. In this very material comparison we find reasserted the hegemonic view that the story of QLD (and Australia) is a story almost exclusively of heroic white working men.

[Insert Fig. 4.5 here- portrait]

Figure 4.5 ‘The Ringer’ by Eddie Hackman, 1988

Perhaps unsurprising given the well known biases of Australian history is the relative absence of outdoor cultural objects marking the histories of Indigenous Australians. Prior to 1970, outdoor cultural objects mostly reflected orthodox versions of Australian history. These objects utilised European ways of identifying achievements and marking the landscape, such as the erection of plaques, statues, cairns and other commemorative strategies. The material form of these objects and the attitudes reflected in their inscriptions are, therefore, an inevitably selective and Eurocentric account. Thus, in many of these objects Indigenous Australians are depicted as helpmeets to a larger European story.

With the emergence of other perspectives on Australian history and increasing public and, to a limited extent, legal recognition of the demands of Aboriginal people, discursive spaces are gradually being made for alternative versions of Australian stories, although conflicts about dissonant national, regional and local stories are an object of vigorous and ongoing public debate. There are not as yet many outdoor cultural objects


that directly represent or embody these challenges to traditional historical interpretations. However, there are a number that assert Indigenous identity and culture or utilise Indigenous forms of aesthetic expression, for instance, the artworks by Indigenous artists Virginia Jones and Ron Hurley in memory of Oodgeroo Noonuccal, the Brisbane based poet and activist known as Kath Walker\textsuperscript{54} and ‘Reconciliation Path’ by Indigenous artists Bianca Beetson and Paula Payne in the Boondall Wetlands.\textsuperscript{55} All of these works were commissioned by public art programmes run by a University in the former and a local council in the latter case.

[Insert Fig. 4.6 here- Landscape]

Figure 4.6 ‘Oodgeroo, the Woman of the Paperbark’, by Virginia Jones, 1996.

The importance of cultural programmes, including public art and heritage programmes which enable alternative stories to be signposted in the landscape is clear when we have some idea of the absence of Indigenous Australian history from the QLD landscape. For instance, despite the prevalence of war memorials in the State, Indigenous Australians are significant by their absence despite their active participation in the wars in which Australia has fought. Anzac Square in Brisbane is the location for the eternal memorial flame and as such is the physical and discursive centre for all the State’s war memorials. This Square has memorials representing all participants in the wars including recently installed memorials to women and war animals; however, as yet Indigenous Australians are absent. In fact, we found only one memorial which mentions Indigenous Australian participation in the world wars and this was installed in 1992 by the

\textsuperscript{54} L. Gibson and J. Besley, \textit{Monumental Queensland}, 210.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 227.
Yugambah people of the Gold Coast region to commemorate their people who fought in the two world wars, Malaya, Borneo and Vietnam.\(^{56}\)

Only one memorial in Queensland directly acknowledges the history of conflict related to the invasion of Australia by Europeans. Like many other plaques mounted on stone cairns, this one commemorates a centenary— one hundred years since the slaughter of Kalkatungu people at Battle Mountain and ‘one hundred years of survival’ of their descendants. Erected by the Kalkatungu/ Kalkadoon people in 1984 at the Kajabbi bush pub north-west of Cloncurry and twenty kilometres from Battle Mountain itself, the memorial explicitly links the events of the past with the political issues of the present. Unveiled by Charles Perkins, an Aboriginal activist and senior public servant, and George Thorpe, a Kalkadoon elder, the plaque reads in part: \(^{57}\)

\begin{quote}
This obelisk is in memorial to the Kalkatungu tribe, who during September 1884 fought one of Australia’s historical battles of resistance against a para-military force of European settlers and the Queensland Native Mounted Police at a place known today as Battle Mountain—20 klns south west of Kajabbi.

The spirit of the Kalkatungu tribe never died at battle, but remains intact and alive today within the Kalkadoon tribal council. ‘Kalkatungu heritage is not the name behind the person, but the person behind the name’.
\end{quote}

The message is a direct affirmation of contemporary Aboriginal social and political structures as well as a statement of pride in the past and present collective actions of Aboriginal people. The cairn not only commemorates the battle but was also timed to celebrate the founding of the newly formed Kalkadoon Tribal Council. The cultural significance of Battle Mountain as the site of an event that symbolises Aboriginal

\(^{56}\) Ibid., 115.

\(^{57}\) Ibid., 51- 53.
resistance to colonial invasion is acknowledged by the inclusion of this place on the *Register of the National Estate.*

As I argued in the introduction to this chapter the representation and official recognition (through heritage protection) of some stories and not others has concrete and real effects on the everyday. Some of QLD’s other significant communities are totally absent from local heritage maps, cultural registers and heritage programmes. For instance, we could find no representations of the very significant Vietnamese community, which in Brisbane we found particularly surprising. Perhaps even more surprising was the absence of representations of stories of the various Chinese communities from around the State, particularly given the relatively long history of some of these communities.

Despite the capacity to protect heritage on the basis of social value which is enshrined in QLD’s heritage legislation and part of the framework for the local cultural heritage mapping, a glance through the State Register and the local heritage maps shows that the objects and places that are managed as heritage tend to have particular physical characteristics, which allow them to be understood as architecturally or aesthetically significant. This presents a particular problem for the State’s objects which are symbolic
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58 Ibid.

59 As judged by language spoken in the home the Chinese community is the largest and the Vietnamese community the third largest foreign language speaking community in the State. The top five languages spoken at home in Queensland were Chinese (1.0%), Italian (0.7%), Vietnamese (0.4%), German (0.4%) and Greek (0.3%) according to Queensland Government, Office of Economic and Statistical Research, *Queensland Characteristics: A State Comparison (Census 2001 Bulletin no. 15),* [http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/queensland-by-theme/demography/population-characteristics/bulletins/qld-characteristics-state-comp-c01/qld-characteristics-state-comp-c01.shtml](http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/queensland-by-theme/demography/population-characteristics/bulletins/qld-characteristics-state-comp-c01/qld-characteristics-state-comp-c01.shtml), (accessed 17/07/08).
of diverse stories for two reasons. Firstly, many of the unlisted objects we found had been installed or developed by community fund raising, as many of the communities in QLD are small and are not wealthy, communities are only able to draw on very limited resources. The lack of funds available means that objects commissioned through community subscription are often not materially significant, at least in accepted aesthetic or architectural terms. In the second place, in many cases due to lack of management, the provenance of these objects has been lost. This loss of provenance is a significant factor which militates against such objects being listed or at least locally managed.

As the example of the Kalkadoon/ Mitakoodi Memorial discussed in the introduction to this chapter makes clear, despite their lack of formal recognition as ‘heritage’, objects such as these are far from insignificant. A recent survey of Australian attitudes to the past ‘Australians and the Past’ challenges the ‘assumption that Australian’s knowledge of history arises from formal teaching and officially endorsed accounts of the past’. Rather, in a survey involving 350 telephone and 150 face-to-face interviews Paul Ashton and Paula Hamilton found that the most important medium for historical narrative was objects and places. Commemoration and memorialisation were found to ‘have close associations with historical objects and places’. However, objects and places were important not for a value internal to the object or place, such as an aesthetic value, but as vehicles for remembering or as ‘a driving or anchoring force in
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narratives’. Above all though Ashton and Hamilton found that history and what was valued as history was a highly personal and individual construct. Given the articulation of ‘heritage’ to unifying identity constructs such as ‘national’ how can we develop a process for valuing ‘heritage’ which is attendant to the radically individual nature of people’s historical stories, which would manage dissonant versions of heritage, but also be practical in its applications. Or is such a thing impossible?

Heritage representation- is ‘community’ the answer?

There are volumes of literature dissecting specific heritage management or interpretation programmes and critiquing them for not being representative. Such critiques usually propose two related requirements to enable a ‘heritage’ which is plural and representative. First, a high level of self awareness on the part of the heritage process, programme, and practitioner is proposed such that the process/ programme/ practitioner is not influenced by the hegemonic power/ knowledge relations which inform and limit ‘heritage’. As Emma Waterton puts it in relation to archaeologists we must be aware ‘of those knowledge systems that have allowed archaeologists to distance themselves from the political and social acts of archaeology’. Markwell, Stevenson and Rowe argue that ‘in spite of its aims and legitimating rhetoric, much cultural planning [including heritage
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management] is occurring without the active involvement of local communities, and with little regard for the specificities and complex histories of place’. In Markwell, Stevenson and Rowe’s critique we find the second element purportedly required for the achievement of a ‘representative heritage’ namely community consultation. In the first part of this chapter I identified in brief some of the practical challenges with community consultation. Here I want to explore some of the theoretical problems with the notion of community consultation. This is not with the aim of questioning whether the participation of peoples and communities should be a key part of any cultural programme or policy which involves public resources. On the contrary, it is precisely because I believe public participation should be a much more central feature of the heritage process that I want here in conclusion to engage briefly with some of theoretical and methodological issues involved.

According to the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu ‘public opinion does not exist’. Bourdieu argues that public opinion as evidenced by surveys can never be a representation of unfettered public opinion as it is always framed and moulded by the framework of the survey, and the capacity that publics have to participate. As Tony Bennett argues social science research methods designed to identify community opinion actually produce ‘public opinion’ ‘as a new agent and mode of action on the social’. Andrea Witcomb has identified a similar effect in relation to heritage and museums. Witcomb concurs with Bennett’s analysis that ‘community’ is a construct as much of
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social science surveys, as of museum and heritage ‘community’ programmes.\textsuperscript{70} Nevertheless, she argues that Bennett goes too far in his analysis and thus he cannot account for the agency of communities. Witcomb proposes instead that in understanding museums (or heritage organisations/ programmes/ or groups of practitioners) themselves as communities then it becomes possible to think of working with communities as a dialogue between multiple communities. This is rather than the transmission based model of communication as suggested by the consultation model with its inference of a centre and periphery. However, processes of ‘dialogue’ are far from free of power/ knowledge relations, the replacement of ‘dialogue’ advocated by Witcomb does not avoid the criticism’s of ‘consultation’ that it is invariably based on unequal power/ knowledge relations. As Jeffrey Minson describes it

\begin{quote}
 talk about the ethical-political value of participatory democracy almost invariably makes reference to its ideal forms of expression (principles, ends, values, prefigurative models). The result: endless stand-offs and unstable compromises between champions of the participatory ideal and “realists”.\textsuperscript{71}
\end{quote}

Minson proposes avoiding these ‘intellectual and sentimental cul-de-sacs’ by attending to the practical and pragmatic procedures for participation. For Minson a democratic heritage process would involve a system which equipped citizens with the capacities necessary for participation. This is not to discount Witcomb’s analysis of communities of practice involved in dialogue with ‘non-practice’ communities but rather to add another dimension to this through the recognition that enabling the agency of peoples and ‘communities’, is only possible within frameworks of action and by utilising particular

\textsuperscript{70} A. Witcomb, A., \textit{Re-Imagining the Museum: Beyond the Mausoleum}, (London: Routledge, 2003), 81.

techniques and capacities which are not innate. It is crucial that we are clear eyed in our understanding of what Bennett terms the ‘ontological politics’ at play,\textsuperscript{72} which in the interaction of cultural knowledge’s and social sciences establishes an ontological triangulation of heritage, identity and representation. It is in its very essentialism that the power and the danger of this equivalence lies. If we want to aid the formulation of landscapes which speak more broadly than is currently the case, and given the affects of these on the contemporary everyday, it is surely imperative that we do so. What this might involve is attendance to the micro, mundane and practical programmes which aim to equip peoples with the capacities necessary for various kinds of participation.

In the case of the ‘outdoor cultural objects’ we discovered in QLD this would perhaps involve introducing a flexibility which is impossible to conceive within the current expert led ‘protection of fabric’ based model of heritage management. Rather as architecture and heritage studies academic Kim Dovey argues:

Educating communities to research and defend their places of value is easier to justify than the determination that such places are to be protected by law against development. Such an approach avoids some of the dilemmas … in that it does not measure, define, judge or paralyse places of social value. Rather it empowers and enables people to define themselves and places as part of the general development of democratic social life.\textsuperscript{73}

The implications of this for the heritage sector might include programmes which equip peoples with the capacities to articulate the things and places they value as heritage or even indeed to create new markers of past or present heritage.

\textsuperscript{72} T. Bennett, ‘Making Culture, Changing Society’, 626.

\textsuperscript{73} K. Dovey, ‘On Registering Place Experience’ in People’s Places: Identifying and Assessing Social Value for Communities, (Canberra: Australian Heritage Commission, 1994), 33.
Establishing ways to empower communities and peoples in this way is the challenge not only for the heritage sector but for all cultural policy.
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