

# Nature-Culture Dialogues

## Managing culture and nature in the landscape

Session 5 with Jane Lennon

The World Heritage Cultural Landscapes handbook 2009 has excellent guiding principles. These principles, following the Burra Charter process of identification, assessment of significance, policies for conservation, action plans, monitoring implementation and presentation of results - have been followed for both of Jane's case studies - Landcare and Lake Victoria - but land abandoned for socio-economic reasons or natural disasters clearly does not follow guidelines. Limitations arise when joint funding ceases or only one set of problems, for example feral animal invasion or erosion, is targeted rather than considering impacts across the whole landscape and the farmer has to implement conservation actions from his own funds and resources. On the other hand, the Aboriginal advisory committee to the water managers ensures continuity of protection works and has evolved some new practices like a smoking ceremony before each quarterly meeting and a renewed interest in dating cultural heritage material.

We have the ICOMOS-IFLA World Rural Landscapes Principles ratified in 2019 and following the same four steps. Despite acknowledgement of these principles, there is still poor on-the-ground understanding of management of all the integrated values expressed in the landscape.

The 2015 IUCN paper, Protected Area Governance and Management, discussed management using a different framework based on approaches for contemporary cultural practices, cultural use with integrative approaches, cultural spiritual values, cultural use of sacred sites and cultural features (tangible cultural heritage).

A new exemplar would emphasise human integration and embeddedness within a continuing co-adaptive ecological reality – an entanglement approach rather than maintaining the hyper-separated paradigm of 'altered' versus 'pristine'. Authenticity and integrity have been narrowly assessed based on historical narratives of change whereas an entangled, looped, evolutionary framework across temporal and spatial scales offer a means of understanding not only change, but also continuity in the rural landscape as habitat. Connectivity, entanglement of layered evidence in the biocultural landscape of varying scales and multiple tenures of public and private, in the

### Attendees

Jane Lennon (JL)  
Marika Franklin (MF)  
Cari Goetcheus (CG)  
Nora Mitchell (NM)  
Patricia O'Donnell (PD)  
Ana Bajcura (AB)  
Brenda Barrett (BB)  
Darwina Neal (DN)  
Diane Menzies (DM)  
Alicia Cahn (AC)  
Jon Weller (JW)

### Apologies

Maya Ishizawa (MI)

### This meeting:

Jane Lennon  
28 January 2020  
10PM GMT

### The next meeting:

Jon Weller  
27 February 2020  
1PM GMT

**midst of increasing uncertainty and unpredictability – are all key issues to be considered in a new approach.**

**Where to next in our natureculture journey?**

We started the year with a talk by Jane Lennon. Jane’s context in Australia was reflected in her talk, the devastating effect of the recent fire in the ‘absolute loss’ that they experience. Jane’s experience in the management planning and implementation in the above-mentioned case studies raise the issue of actually achieving ongoing conservation of landscapes with all their attributes through integrated management. While Maya’s talk focused on “What kind of skills we need to build on the skills of the participants” in the nature-culture linkages workshops, Jane questions whether our seemingly well-known principles that are captured within the various documents (roughly listed above) are good enough. Jane consolidated these various principles and guidelines into a single document. A valuable document, that is circulated as part of this summary. Participants in the meeting had the opportunity to comment on this document.

- Attendees**  
Jane Lennon (JL)  
Marika Franklin (MF)  
Cari Goetcheus (CG)  
Nora Mitchell (NM)  
Patricia O’Donnell (PD)  
Ana Bajcura (AB)  
Brenda Barrett (BB)  
Darwina Neal (DN)  
Diane Menzies (DM)  
Alicia Cahn (AC)  
Jon Weller (JW)

**SUMMARY**

<p>Jane has been involved with the World Rural Landscapes Principles project working on case studies from Australia. Some of these have been published in the US ICOMOS conference proceedings. Jane has also been involved in a cultural landscape management planning and implementation regime at Lake Victoria, a privately owned water storage to the local Traditional owners the Maruara-Barkindji for 20 years. It is of great cultural significance as it is surrounded by ancient burial sites, recently identified to 28,000 years old, and abuts grazing lands.</p> <p>This long experience has raised many issues for management of all stakeholders of an arid landscape of cultural significance. Jane also presented a paper in Delhi about abandonment of agricultural lands and their reversion to wild rural landscapes.</p> <p>These three projects raise serious issues about actually achieving ongoing conservation of landscapes with all their attributes through integrated management. Given stakeholder involvement which waxes and wanes, governance which changes over time and with different personnel, funding which can be diverted and global influences beyond the control of stakeholders, there are uncertainties which must be addressed in a dynamic way or else the tasks seem too daunting.</p>	JL,MF
---	-------

- Apologies**  
Maya Ishizawa (MI)

*1. Adaptation in landscape management in times of climate change will inevitably result in changed landscapes -how much change is acceptable to whom -farmers, conservationists, local residents?*

JL,PD,  
MF, NM,  
BB

PD made a comment on the various experts; That the material used for shade cloth is not necessarily beneficial (toxic waste-plastic in soils) for the land from an environmental perspective. This highlights the value of Multi/trans disciplinary teams in the assessment and management of cultural landscapes.

NM: We Have been operating in different silo's. We need to bring our ability to assess, and look at change through the lens of heritage in the company of other lenses.

DN: Patricia made a comment to the effect that it didn't matter what crops went back into agricultural/productive landscapes, as long as the use had not changed.

DN: The question is, what about landscapes on the World Heritage List that are listed because of specific crops, such as Coffee Plantations or Vineyards, that must be planted with something else when the environmental conditions have changed? They would still be productive agricultural landscapes, but lose their integrity of supporting the specific crop for which they had been listed...

JL: This is an excellent example of the dilemmas I posed. Same for changed species composition of forests post constant bushfires -so IUCN and ICOMOS need to think about these often-irretrievable changes.

PD: Yes- there is certainly an issue where a crop in a productive landscape is an element of the outstanding universal value (OUV)- vineyard and coffee plantation are good examples. To be considered further. In many cases it is agriculture, and the crop is not an OUV element.

From the reading (Taylor & Lennon 2011): Environmental ethics have been central to the debate on natural values, in particular that of whether nature has instrumental value or intrinsic value. Feng Han's (2006) discussion on these values is instructive: instrumental value is assigned because of the usefulness of something; in contrast, intrinsic value relates to values of things as ends in themselves. To complicate matters further is the question of the origin of intrinsic value. Is it subjective, created by human thought and value systems, or is it objective, where value is endemic in its own right and simply waiting to be recognised objectively? This was remedied philosophically in 2005 in the merging of aesthetic value in the World Heritage natural and cultural criteria.

JL commented on the dreadful sense of loss that is felt with the devastating fires that ravaged through Australia when asked about the impact from an aesthetic point of view. JL also commented on the rapid recovery on some of the trees that show new growth, but also areas that will be lost, and that in turn questions the integrity of such an area.

**Attendees**

Jane Lennon (JL)  
Marika Franklin (MF)  
Cari Goetzeus (CG)  
Nora Mitchell (NM)  
Patricia O'Donnell (PD)  
Ana Bajcura (AB)  
Brenda Barrett (BB)  
Darwina Neal (DN)  
Diane Menzies (DM)  
Alicia Cahn (AC)  
Jon Weller (JW)

**Apologies**

Maya Ishizawa (MI)

<p>BB: There is a scenic quality of productive landscapes (aesthetic value), but it is more difficult to look at it from an economic/productive/social viewpoint.</p> <p>From the reading (US/ICOMOS 2018 Proceedings): The Landscape Law is dedicated to the creation of vibrant communities with distinct personalities, not solely focused on a strict preservation of original historic fabric and environments. The resulting landscape – with mechanisation, tourists and new construction – ‘may not fit with strict Eurocentric conservation traditions but it will be authentic in the broader sense that is now being articulated in Asia’ (Pollock-Ellwand et al. 2009)</p>	<p>JL,PD, MF, NM, BB (continue)</p>
<p>2. Value</p> <p>2.1 <i>Is it change in values or practice or land use? How much change is acceptable and to whom?</i></p> <p>MF: Commented on the ‘degree of acceptable change’ a concept that was developed by Job Roos. Roos applies this concept in his search for the adaptive reuse of historic buildings in the Netherlands. How much can the function/form change before the character of the historic building is lost. Perhaps there is something in this concept that could be applied to the management of a cultural landscape? Perhaps the missing link to the management of CL is the notion of Landscape Character; Character cuts across institutional boundaries, and is not limited to land use but considers the range of elements that attributes to its character.</p> <p>MF: Commented on the well-defined methodology of the Burra Charter, but that it seems more appropriate for static entities. A case study for the use of a combined methodology is the Stellenbosch Heritage Management Plan that follows the outline of the Burra Charter, filled in with elements of HUL (with its focus on a city as a continuous dynamic system) and elements of Rob Joos’s theory on adaptive reuse/ ‘herbestemming’ (previously circulated, but available here: <a href="http://www.stellenboschheritage.co.za/phase-4">http://www.stellenboschheritage.co.za/phase-4</a>)</p> <p>2.2 <i>The question arises -how to manage values at different scales (a) and in different times and with changing personnel (b)?</i></p> <p>2.3 <i>The IUCN Approach follows different framework based on approaches for contemporary cultural practices, cultural use with integrative approaches, cultural spiritual values, cultural use of sacred sites and cultural features (tangible cultural heritage). Does this approach help in integration of on-ground management? Or should it be values, practices, uses?</i></p> <p>MF: (a) Rob Joos’s methodology specifically focus on understanding value that is found within a given study area. Roos listed six value lines, and mentions that one can add to the value lines depending on the need of the site. The value lines are: Ecological, Economical, Historic, Social, Emotional, and Aesthetic (the principles document mentions some of these already -</p>	<p>JL, MF, PD, NM</p>

### Attendees

Jane Lennon (JL)  
 Marike Franklin (MF)  
 Cari Goetcheus (CG)  
 Nora Mitchell (NM)  
 Patricia O’Donnell (PD)  
 Ana Bajcura (AB)  
 Brenda Barrett (BB)  
 Darwina Neal (DN)  
 Diane Menzies (DM)  
 Alicia Cahn (AC)  
 Jon Weller (JW)

### Apologies

Maya Ishizawa (MI)

<p>– MF proposed to add aesthetic and emotional, and historic to the list). The team used these value lines on different scales of the Stellenbosch CL, and again later for the development of the in the Conservation Management Plan for the <i>criteria for decision making</i>. Using them to detangle the CL in the analysis phase and entangle the values again in the development of the criteria to be place specific.</p> <p>NM: We should not forget about the ‘intangible’, the knowledge base.... (part of a Heritage perspective)</p> <p>(b) In this project we tried to make the public custodians of the project by making the CMP, and relevant information, available on an online platform. The requirements for the CMP needed to be satisfied for any development proposal to be reviewed. This lessened the burden of the personnel. Increased transparency enabled a better understanding of the CL (intrinsic values that is transcribed into text gave words to inherent feelings about the landscape).</p>	JL, MF, PD, NM (continue)
<p><i>3. With movement off the land to urban settlements much rural land is being abandoned and nature is reclaiming it - a continuum or loss of CL</i></p>	JL
<p><i>4. Given stakeholder involvement which waxes and wanes, governance which changes over time and with different personnel, funding which can be diverted and global influences beyond the control of stakeholders, how do we address these uncertainties?</i></p>	JL
<p><i>5. Are our principles inclusive enough to capture nature cultures ie the 23 WRL principles under 4 headings, the 6 guiding principles for CL mgt from UNESCO and Maya’s 4 principles</i></p> <p>MF: Access was given for a link to Jane’s document in a google docs format for comment</p> <p>JL: Highlighted governance, and the way it played out with the bush fires in Australia.</p> <p>PD: Good Governance were listed when we worked on HUL (Community engagement, finance etc.)</p> <p>NM: IUCN looked at good governance more than us, perhaps a good place to start.</p> <p>JL: The mayors and often school teachers has been the hero’s in the fires in Australia (grassroots), and not the authority.</p> <p>BB: In the US there’s a lot of discussion on the collaborative management of large landscapes. There’s the big Network Landscape Conservation- it applies equally well for heritage.</p> <p>JL: Productive landscapes and governance, perhaps we need more talks on this.</p>	JL, MF, PD, NM, BB

### Attendees

Jane Lennon (JL)  
 Marike Franklin (MF)  
 Cari Goetcheus (CG)  
 Nora Mitchell (NM)  
 Patricia O’Donnell (PD)  
 Ana Bajcura (AB)  
 Brenda Barrett (BB)  
 Darwina Neal (DN)  
 Diane Menzies (DM)  
 Alicia Cahn (AC)  
 Jon Weller (JW)

### Apologies

Maya Ishizawa (MI)

<p>6. <i>It seems very clear to me that many people are aware of the range of principles but still we have this natureculture divide in management of many landscapes. How are we going to address this?</i></p> <p>6.1 Locally 6.2 Specifically 6.3 Respectfully 6.4 Sustainably</p>	JL
<p>7. <i>Do conservation frameworks help? ie translating identified values in a landscape to policies and then actions to conserve those values in a sustainable living landscape.</i></p> <p>DM: Currently we don't have a category of cultural landscape in our national law (outstanding natural landscapes are a matter of national importance in NZ) even though Tongariro National Park was inscribed as both a natural and cultural landscape) However, the chair and a member of the small review panel working on a broad review of our environmental legislation asked me to comment on a couple of topics including their intention to have cultural landscape included as a matter of national importance. I have just commented (Janes background papers were useful thanks Jane) and he responded straight away and said that it was very useful. Thanks to our discussions I was able to say, yes, should be included but aim to integrate nature, culture, ancestral landscapes and historic heritage (currently is in the legislation) so that they do not produce a fragmented or siloed approach.</p>	JL,DM
<p>8. <i>Where to next in our natureculture journey?</i></p>	JL

## ACTION

Green- Done

2019/09

### 1. Divide of Nature and culture

a) A summary of the history of the divide between Nature and Culture (to include as a 10 min feedback in the next talk)?

MF: In one of the readings provided by DM: Adams, W. and Mulligan, M. (ed) 2003, Decolonizing Nature: Strategies for Conservation in a Postcolonial Era, Earthscan, London. The text below highlights some of the struggle of difference in world views, and the history thereof, but not yet the core of it (to be answered under b)



*In terms of direct political control by European powers, colonial rule was finally brought to an end in much of the world in the third quarter of the 20th century, especially as the result of a string of anti-colonial struggles that emerged in former European colonies in the wake of World War II. In South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, new post-colonial political structures emerged. The end of direct political control might have been expected to open the way for more independent thinking about the relations between society and nature, perhaps based on non-Western traditions and cultural fusions. This did not happen. From the late 19th century onwards, the decolonization process had involved the creation of 'modern' nation states that were built, essentially, on European*

*models and traditions, and the deep ideological legacy of colonialism endured. Smith (1999) comments that indigenous people have been subjected to 'the colonization of their lands and cultures, and the denial of their sovereignty, by a Introduction 5 colonizing society that has come to dominate the shape and quality of their*

*lives, even after it has formally pulled out' (p7). Modern European colonialism was not monolithic, and the diverse experiences of decolonization were complicated. In parts of the world where European settlement and land occupation was either complete or very extensive (for example, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the US, Canada and South America), direct imperial control by European political powers ended as the settler societies progressively assumed administrative control (in a relatively painless form of decolonization). But such settler societies had established their own, internal, forms of colonialism in order to dominate indigenous minorities*

*(for example, in Australia; see Chapter 4), or profoundly suppressed majorities (as in the case of South Africa or Rhodesia [Zimbabwe] before majority rule). In many settler societies, indigenous peoples were herded into isolated fragments of their former terrain, on 'reservations', 'missions' or 'tribal lands', administered with a complex mix of brute exploitation, paternalistic exhortation and racist disdain. In such context's decolonization has often been piecemeal and is still far from complete. As decolonization reached its peak in terms of the political independence of nation states, new forms of trans-national and global colonization – in the form of cultural and economic engagement – began to gather force, accelerating rapidly during the last part of the 20th century. The process of political decolonization was therefore overtaken by globalization and neo-colonialism, making the transition to post-colonial societies complex and messy....*

b) A list of references in environmental philosophy to reveal the deep root of Western separation (Fran, Steve?)

2. A list of principles starting from the IUCN 2016 Mālama Honua, and ICOMOS. 2017 Yatra aur Tammanah document (Done by JL).

Mālama Honua: <https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/malama-honua-en.pdf>

Yatra aur Tammanah: [https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/General\\_Assemblies/19th\\_Delhi\\_2017/19th\\_GA\\_Outcomes/ICOMOS\\_GA2017\\_CNJ\\_YatraStatement\\_final\\_EN\\_20180207circ.pdf](https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/General_Assemblies/19th_Delhi_2017/19th_GA_Outcomes/ICOMOS_GA2017_CNJ_YatraStatement_final_EN_20180207circ.pdf)

3. List of partners of different perspectives that need to be part of this principle document (IUCN, IFLA etc.)

4. Collect a list of examples of some of the best practice of merging C/N from around the globe. The list should

include a summary of those efforts. The focus should be on best practice, although we could learn from both good and bad efforts.

#### 1.1 West Lake, China

5. Organise a talk that covers the concept of 'Wilderness' - a concept many countries applied, but suffered by as a conservation model. (Fran, Jane, Nora, Brenda?). Who should we engage with for the Wilderness Congress in India in 2020?

### 2019/10

Training for ICOMOS experts, and access to local attitudes in WH review proses (suggestion/check?)

- Check for available Anthropological training methods that is available (LJ)?
- Suggest experts to have access to local attitudes?

Describe and add three principles from this talk to principles document (Thanks JL)

Description of each of these terms (Thanks AB)

1. The recognition of the condition of *Universal*
2. The *regional value*, special for every society.
3. The "*chronological time*",
4. The "*regional evolution time*"
5. The "*maturation process of each individual from a region*"

### 2019/11

Do all of the above!

### 2020/01

Comment on the principles document that Jane compiled, and circulated with this document.

JL: From many case studies we can distil a range of issues for each principle, should we organize frameworks around these?

MF: Perhaps we could list the range of issues here?

JL: Listening to the country; clear objectives, modifications due to monitoring and a long-term commitment are lessons we have learnt.

MF: JL to expand/explain the reference to 'country' here, and perhaps list her *lessons learnt* here?

NM: Mentions the collaboration between IUCN and ICOMOS, and a potential project? (Perhaps NM could expand on the potential projects here.