Introduction

Work on this project began in 1984. In August of that year, I spent 10 days in northern Cape York for preliminary consultation and archaeological reconnaissance. In the following four-year period, from 1984 to 1987, I spent several months of each year in northern Cape York, mostly living and working with people from the Injinoo (Cowel Creek) community. The experience of working with local people and the insights I obtained as a result of spending a prolonged period of time with the community have changed my approach to archaeology, and radically changed the project as it was originally conceived. These changes began in 1986, but were more clearly formulated in 1987. This thesis documents these changes and identifies some of the implications for Australian archaeology, especially in terms of heritage management.

The original project that I took with me to Cape York in 1984 was inspired by archaeological concerns and interests (see Chapter 2). However, as a result of my experiences working with Aboriginal people in New South Wales, I was deeply committed to undertaking this within a context of adequate and proper consultation. At that time, my personal belief was that archaeology is not necessarily invasive of indigenous heritage, given an appropriate process of consultation. In the intervening years since the commencement of this project, this philosophy has been shaken many times. The experience of applying scientific interests-within the context of a Cape York community prompted many questions concerning the rights and empowerment of Aboriginal people with regard to their heritage.
It is unusual to change radically the orientation of a thesis towards the end of fieldwork. Usually, if changes do occur, they are made at a relatively early stage in the life of a project. In this case, I would argue that it was not until I had acquired a 'critical mass' of knowledge that I could make the necessary associations and connections. Therefore, no apology is seen as necessary for the late change. In fact, it was the very process of working through the original project that led to the development of the present one.

The final decision to make the change was undertaken in early 1987 and stemmed from a feeling that work such as this was necessary if there was to be a real reconciliation between archaeologists and Aboriginal people. The antagonism between the two groups had been growing steadily since its first major public expression at the Australian Archaeological Association Conference in Hobart in 1982 (see Langford 1983; Allen 1983). However, the courage to complete the work came some time later. At that time, there was little tolerance in Australian archaeology of work that did not address ecological issues which were the primary concern within the dominant paradigm. My original project, which sought evidence for social intensification in northern Cape York, questioned the ecological paradigm and therefore was in itself a departure from the norm. It took a considerable period of time to accept that I had stumbled upon a problem of even greater proportions. The issue of reconciliation between indigenous people and archaeologists can be seen as part of the general process of reconciliation that is being undertaken in contemporary Australian society. However, given the central role played by archaeologists in the management of heritage over the preceding three
decades, it is perhaps timely to review the way in which 'the past' has been constructed and 'heritage' defined.

Many times in the course of writing this thesis, the comment has been made by colleagues that it would be 'of use to Aboriginal and Torres Strait people'. This thesis is not aimed at educating indigenous people about their past. Such lofty pursuits are the province of those who hold that archaeology is the primary key to the past. Rather, this project illustrates the way in which one archaeologist's views changed as a result of working with indigenous people who have a very different way of knowing and using the past. If there is any grandiose aim, it is rather to document the way in which issues related to this have been played out within a particular context. At a time when control of indigenous heritage is increasingly shifting into the indigenous court, the central issue is no longer 'Who owns the past?'. Rather, it surrounds the contribution that archaeology can make in relation to this. This thesis confronts some of these issues and presents some solutions within a specific context. Ultimately, the most important goal is to convince the archaeological community that such research is necessary and worthwhile.

1.1 Aims

This thesis has a number of specific major aims. Firstly, it illustrates that many of the conflicts which occur between archaeologists and indigenous people are not necessarily a product of bad planning, poor consultation skills or simple misunderstanding. Rather, it is asserted that the potential for conflict is embedded in the paradigms, history and practice of Australian archaeology.
Secondly, the description of field studies and experiences is aimed at illustrating the nature and type of interactions that occurred in the field between people from the community and me. This is important, because in my view the specific nature of these interactions and the links with anthropological work were critical factors in the recognition of problematic areas in archaeological practice. These include the duplicitous nature of the process of consultation and its relationship to the empowerment of indigenous people in this area. The recognition of alternative ways of perceiving the past and its 'monuments' was similarly only possible because of these factors.

Another major aim is to provide an alternative to traditional archaeological approaches in northern Cape York, especially with regard to heritage management. The community-based approach was devised to meet the specific social and cultural needs of the peoples of northern Cape York, especially in relation to connections between heritage and identity. This example does, however, illustrate the potential for research into alternative approaches elsewhere.

The final aim of the thesis is to demonstrate that while these perceptions on heritage were drawn from my experiences of working with indigenous people, the problem is rather the lack of fit between scientific or archaeological constructions of heritage and the way in which the past has meaning for ordinary people, in any society, in the present. This is not to deny the way in which specific cultural knowledge or experience shapes such meanings, but rather that the archaeological discourse is equally foreign to those outside of the ivory walls of the heritage tower.
1.2 Research design and methods

In a traditional archaeological thesis, this section would focus on sampling strategies, excavation techniques and theoretical frameworks that are the pillars of archaeological interpretation. While this might have been done for the original project, it is not possible here. However, it is true to say that it was the experiences and frustrations of attempting to carry out the original project that led to an understanding of the potential contribution of a work that focused on these. The 'problems' I was experiencing were not unique, but rather symptomatic of a broader pattern.

The fact that the current project existed in the crevices (or was it crevasses) of the first was not, however, without methodological problems. For example, it took a long time to recognise that the problematic was being defined in this way and that the 'data' was gathered (at times inadvertently) in the process of attempting to do something else. This resulted in much confusion and provided many challenges in the early stages of research, indeed until the new project was clearly formulated. It is important to note that the information needed to make this change came slowly. The factors which influenced the decision to take up this present research and which account for its current shape are briefly discussed in the remainder of this section. Due to the unconventional nature of the thesis, these are the best approximation of research design and methods.

Firstly, there were my own experiences in the field, the commitment to consultation and the approach to fieldwork that developed in the course of the project. By 1987, I had spent extended periods of time in northern Cape York. My approach, especially in 1986 and 1987, was to live either
within the community or in some instances, to spend time outside, but in the company of community members. When living in the community, I lived with local people and essentially embraced everyday community life. Trips were undertaken with community members, usually with a 'non-archaeological' purpose in mind (e.g. oyster and yam gathering, fishing, pig hunting etc). In these instances, I provided the transport, helped in the task at hand (if I was capable) and inspected the area for sites. In this way I observed the way in which community members operated in the landscape. In addition, the relationships that were established on these trips provided the platform from which my understanding of community perspectives was developed.

In addition, I had the benefit of undertaking fieldwork with an anthropologist during 1986 and 1987. This project was undertaken in response to community requests that were defined in the course of the archaeological work (Greer and Fuary 1987; Fuary and Greer 1993; see also Chapters 5-8). It involved the collection of genealogical material, life histories and traditional affiliations of members of the Injinoo community. This work provided many insights into community perspectives. By the end of 1987 I had a tolerable understanding of many aspects of community life, of some parts of the landscape and of the 'connectedness' of its physical, economic and spiritual associations.

These experiences were juxtaposed with observations of the interactions between archaeologists and Aboriginal people at formal venues such as conferences (e.g. the Australian Archaeological Association Conferences in Canberra in 1983, at Lorne in 1985, and at the Burdekin in 1990). In many instances, both parties displayed a tacit dissatisfaction with the other and yet in a formal capacity, it appeared that relations between the
two groups were good and progress was being made. For example, at the Annual General Meeting of the Australian Archaeological Association (AAA) in 1990, Aboriginal representatives were elected, for the first time, onto the executive committee. At the same meeting a draft code of ethics was proposed (by an Aboriginal archaeologist) and accepted. This code was adapted from one developed by a meeting of various indigenous delegates at the second World Archaeological Congress (WAC 2) held in Venezuela in September 1990.

The continuation of a feeling of dissatisfaction in spite of these important and necessary developments suggested that there were perhaps deeper and more pervasive reasons for this 'silent conflict'. It was apparent to me, based on my field experiences, that some Aboriginal people might want much more than what was being offered by the archaeological community. As an archaeologist, it was apparent that while a number of changes were becoming accepted by the archaeological community, there was a lack of understanding about the rationale behind it. This lack of understanding was a serious impediment if the solution to the conflict lay in structural and more radical changes to the discipline.

With this background, a project was devised that would explore these issues within one particular context. The context is extremely important because, having worked with Aboriginal people in both New South Wales and Queensland, it occurred to me that any solution to this type of conflict would have to acknowledge the local historical and contemporary situations in which Aboriginal people find themselves. I felt that the scope of a PhD thesis would provide the necessary breadth to investigate this complex and developing area.
There are few precedents to this thesis in Australian archaeology (but see Byrne 1993). In many ways, the 'methods' used to gain an understanding of Aboriginal perspectives were (and had to be) anthropological. However, this was combined with a knowledge of archaeological history, theory and practice to produce the final result.

1.3 Style and structure of the thesis

There have been a number of stylistic aims in writing this thesis. These include the use of clear and accessible language, with an emphasis on simplicity of style within a logical framework. The use of clear and accessible language is important when delivering any message, but more so when advocating for re-evaluation and change. Moreover, the sentiments put forward in this thesis have relevance to groups who are located outside the discipline. For this reason, the language used could not be too esoteric or obscure.

The present chapter provides a general introduction to the thesis. It outlines the aims, the research design and method and the central argument of each chapter. For example, Chapter 2 provides a 'selective' history of archaeology in Australia. It establishes that while Aboriginal people have been involved in heritage management in Australia for more than twenty years, their influence on archaeological thinking has been constrained by the dominance of processual approaches. The latter's influence is expressed most fully in this area through the widespread acceptance of the Cultural Resource Management (CRM) approach, which was developed from principles in natural resource management.

Chapter 3 is a history of archaeological work in Queensland. This chapter particularly focuses on the way in which archaeological work has been
distanced from anthropological projects, in spite of the anthropological focus in Queensland, especially in the north of the State. Connected to this is the fact that there has not been a strong tradition of involving indigenous people in archaeological work in Queensland. The central concern of Chapter 4 is to explain this. While the explanations are extremely complex, two major factors are the distancing of the disciplines of anthropology and archaeology in this country and the political and social context of indigenous people in Queensland.

Chapters 5 to 8 describe the years of field study undertaken in northern Cape York. Chapter 5 documents the original project, its aims and aspirations and the initial trip to the area for consultation and reconnaissance. The description of the original project is important, for an understanding of what emerged from the ashes of that project must stem from an understanding of the project itself. Chapters 6 and 7 describe the dismantling of the original project through the development of knowledge and the reservations and considerations that were its corollaries. The narrative style that is contained in these chapters is intended to impress upon the reader the way in which this knowledge builds slowly, through the engagement of the researcher in the everyday life of the community.

Chapter 8 describes the anthropological project, known as the Cowal Creek Country Survey, undertaken by Maureen Fuary and me in 1987 (Fuary and Greer 1993). While this was originally aimed at facilitating better consultation for the archaeological project, the outcome was ultimately the change in orientation that has resulted in the present thesis. The Cowal Creek Country Survey focused on the delineation of traditional affiliations, life histories and the documentation of the
complexity of the colonial experiences of northern Cape York peoples. This provided a coherent body of information from which issues related to identity and heritage could be defined. Chapter 9 illustrates these in relation to 'archaeological' sites which are located within a cultural landscape located along the east coast strip of the study area. This chapter shows how these 'sites' are woven into the beliefs, stories and practices that give form and shape to this landscape, providing the theatrical 'props' which affirm contemporary ontology and identity.

This understanding of the cultural complexities in northern Cape York, which includes the history of precontact groups, the 'relocations' imposed by the Queensland Government and the nature of life on the reserves, provided other insights. For example, Chapter 10 reconsiders the relationship between the process of consultation and its purported aim: the empowerment of indigenous people in relation to ownership and control of their past. An examination of the history of the region suggests that 'black-white' relations have been (and must still be) affected by the past. This is exacerbated by the fact that consultation is a reactive process which allows indigenous people to respond to proposals, but which does not directly address their own needs in relation to research.

Chapter 11 is concerned with the description of an alternative approach to archaeology and heritage management. It takes account of the findings in Chapters 9 and 10. The community-based approach is particularly relevant in relation to heritage management and has, as its central role the way in which heritage is used in the construction of local identity(ies). This is in contrast to current models of heritage management which may be related to the development of national identities or global concepts of 'significance'. This chapter suggests that
challenges to such notions should not be seen as relevant only in societies of the non-West and that the problem is perhaps more related to the lack of fit between the archaeological discourse of heritage and the discourses of ordinary people.

Finally, Chapter 12 summarises the arguments of each chapter and defines in brief the way in which these are used to present the thesis.

1.4 Theoretical influences
The theoretical position that has most informed this thesis is that of feminist theory. Until recently, feminist archaeology has largely been concerned with revealing androcentric bias in archaeological interpretation (including the models, language and assumptions that are employed), with defining (and finding) gender in the archaeological record, with stereotypes in archaeological practice and with developing alternative models that address such issues (e.g. Conkey and Spector 1984; Conkey and Williams 1991; Conkey and Gero 1992; Gero 1985, 1988; Spector and Whelan 1989; Spencer-Wood 1991, 1992; Wylie 1991, 1993; Roberts 1993; Spector 1991, 1994).

There are, however, elements of this thesis that can be related to postmodern approaches. These include reflection upon the heritage discourse and the connections with colonialism which runs through the thesis. This can be compared with Byrne (1993) whose work was influenced by postmodern critique. The postmodern connection might also be seen in the recognition of the hegemony of scientific discourse and the potential for this to affect community perspectives (Chapter 11). This understanding of the relationship between knowledge and power stems in part from the writings of Foucault (e.g. see 1977, 1980) and have
been taken up by postmodernism. It could also be discerned in the overall mission of the thesis to direct attention to 'other voices' and in the use of de Certeau's (1984) notion of the importance of 'practice' in relation to the definition of 'place' and 'space'.

Although it is not often acknowledged, there are many common points of reference between feminism and the postmodern approach. Maci-Lees et al. (1989: 14) assert the primacy of feminism, stating that

Like European explorers discovering the New World, Clifford and his [postmodern] colleagues perceive a new and uninhabited space where, in fact, feminists have long been at work.

The influence of feminist approaches in this thesis is evident in the 'selected history' of Australian archaeology presented in Chapter 2. This illustrates the way in which the feminist standpoint of some early heritage managers in part facilitated the ongoing involvement of indigenous people in this area. Like postmodernism, feminist approaches also issue a challenge to the dominant sector, however they also offer a political standpoint lacking in postmodernism. This standpoint emphasises the importance of change to the status quo and is therefore more akin to the aspirations of indigenous and other groups that also have a political agenda.

Perhaps most importantly, this feminist viewpoint can be seen in my response to the people with whom I worked. In many ways, it would have been considerably easier to continue with the original project. Certainly, they was no objection to this from northern Cape York people. The recognition of the gulf between the outcomes of the original project and the community's requests and needs can be seen in the work of other feminist scholars. Spector (1994) has described her response to working
with the Native American heirs to the sites on which she excavated. Her own response, which centers on new forms of writing in archaeology, is different to that depicted here. However the recognition of the need for a response, and that this will require change in the discipline has a familiar ring. This response goes beyond the reflection of postmodernism and is informed by political understandings. Again, as Mascia-Lees et al. have stated:

...what appear to be new and exciting insights to these new postmodernist anthropologists - that culture is composed of seriously contested codes of meaning, that language and politics are inseparable, and that constructing the 'other' entails relations of domination - are insights that have received repeated and rich exploration in feminist theory for the past forty years. Discussion of the female as 'other' was the starting point of contemporary feminist theory.

This aspect of thesis represents its theoretical contribution to an emerging feminist perspective in Australian archaeology (e.g. du Cros and Smith 1993).

1.5 Conclusion
This thesis has many points in common with those unpopular voyages of discovery that in many ways defined modern colonialism. By this, I mean that it has been difficult, exciting and at times, foolhardy. It is, however, the colonialist underpinning of any venture of this sort that disturbs me most. Certainly, the association between archaeology and the colonialist endeavour is a taint from which the discipline has never been rid.

This interpretation is based on my understandings of northern Cape York and its peoples and should not be seen as an indigenous perception of
heritage or 'the past'. Its chief contribution lies in illustrating the way in which these understandings challenge the archaeological discourse. The critique from within is an important component in redressing our colonial past in archaeology. My 'mission' therefore is to lay out this challenge to the archaeological discourse of heritage within a particular social and political environment.

However, while some scholars (e.g. Murray 1992) find this process of reflection to be the end point of this critique, the community-based approach is an attempt to provide an alternative platform. In the political context of Australian archaeology in the 1990s, this thesis is presented as something of a small (but increasingly crowded) life-boat.
Archaeology, heritage and indigenous 'voice': a selective history

The development of archaeology in Australia has been documented by a range of authors including Mulvaney (1971, 1977), Murray and White (1981), McBryde (1986), Golson (1986) and Horton (1991). More recently, aspects of the discipline's history have been presented by Byrne (1993) and Moser (1995). In this chapter, selected elements in the history of the discipline are used to explain some of the tensions which are currently embedded in Australian archaeology, perhaps particularly heritage management. These elements include the theoretical positions which have dominated the discipline in this country, the development of heritage management and the history of indigenous involvement in the discipline. An examination of the dynamics which surround these elements reveals the bases of contemporary problems in the control and management of indigenous heritage.

2.1 Theoretical directions: the concern with ecology

Early archaeological research was undertaken by a number of people in Australia, notably McCarthy (e.g. 1948) and Tindale (e.g. 1937). However, the 'professionalisation' of the discipline is generally taken to have started from the point at which staff were appointed to universities in this country. It is argued in this section that since professionalisation, Australian archaeology has been dominated by an interest in the interactions between humans and the environments they occupy. Over more than three decades, approaches have varied, however the human-environment nexus most often remains the central core of archaeological research.
2.1.1 The Cambridge inheritance: ecological approaches to economic archaeology

When Mulvaney returned to Australia from Cambridge in 1953, his appointment to the University of Melbourne was as an historian rather than an archaeologist. In spite of this, he initiated a programme of archaeological research which, in many respects, set the stage for subsequent developments. Moreover, his presence at the University of Melbourne may have been the catalyst for the appointment of staff at other institutions. Certainly, by 1962 Golson had been appointed to the Australian National University, McBryde to the University of New England, Tugby to the University of Queensland and Wright and Megaw to the University of Sydney (Mulvaney 1962; McBryde 1986). Mulvaney's own official appointment as an archaeologist did not occur until he became a Senior Fellow in Prehistory in the Research School of Pacific Studies at the Australian National University in 1965 (Clark 1986). These appointments marked the beginnings of systematic and concentrated research in this country through the work of the researchers themselves, as well as their undergraduate and postgraduate students (see also Golson 1986; McBryde 1986).

As Murray and White (1981) suggested in the title of their paper, many of the people appointed to these positions had been trained at Cambridge and much was made of the impact and influence of the 'Cambridge connection'. Since the publication of the Murray and White paper, McBryde (1986) and Golson (1986) have analysed the sources and extent of Cambridge and other influences on the development of archaeology in this country. Both accounts stress the contribution of Grahame Clark and his ecological approach to economic prehistory. However, they
acknowledge that the way in which these issues were pursued was largely through a 'traditionalist' approach, involving the excavation of stratified sites (McBryde 1986:17; Golson 1986:8-9; see also Murray and White 1981:257) and '... on reconstructing culture history from careful typological analysis, and on exact excavation techniques emphasising stratigraphic interpretation' (McBryde 1986: 17). The perceived connections between ecology and technology are illustrated in the following statement made by Mulvaney and Joyce (1965: 174):

It is more relevant to assess man's [sic] exploitation of, and his ecological adaptations to the environment, in the light of these technological factors.

### 2.1.2 Ecology and the 'New Archaeology'

This was, however, a period of change within the discipline. Binford, on one side of the Atlantic and a number of Cambridge researchers (such as Higgs and David Clarke) on the other, were making new demands and introducing new perspectives and approaches to the examination of archaeological data (Binford 1962; Bogucki 1985; Clarke 1968; Higgs et al. 1967; see also McBryde 1986). These events largely coincided with the period of professionalisation in Australia. These new influences affirmed the established interest in ecological concerns, but approached these in a different way. Golson (1986: 4) has compared the differences between the culture-history approach that he was using in the late 1950s and early 1960s, with that of Roger Green (who represented the 'new wave' in 1962-63). The following lengthy quote suggests that while the interest in ecology may have had its roots in Graham Clark's 'Cambridge', new ways of looking at archaeological data were being developed. Golson (1986: 4) states:

The scheme I had proposed for considering the question consisted of two prehistoric phases defined largely in terms of artefacts, separated by a
transitional phase that remained undescribed, though all the crucial changes must by default have taken place there... Some sites could not be incorporated in the scheme because they lacked the types of artefacts that defined it. The information they possessed about the people responsible for them was unavailable since the narrow perspective within which the evidence was viewed made it impossible for it to be handled. Even with the artefacts themselves only limited success had been achieved in analysis beyond their segregation into two contrasted but over-large assemblages. As against this, Green presented a sequence of five prehistoric phases forming a connected and coherent sequence, defined not in terms of artefacts whose typology was almost incidental to the theme, but vividly and comprehensively in terms of interlocking changes in ecology, subsistence and settlement. Almost every site could be assigned at least a provisional place in the scheme, whether it produced any of the standard types of artefact or not.

McBryde's (1986: 22) account notes the influence of the 'New Archaeology' on the developing discipline. She outlines a number of important developments, such as new approaches to 'people/land relations' and work undertaken with contemporary Aboriginal groups. McBryde (1986: 22) states that

Themes such as the management of the landscape using fire (firestick farming - Jones 1969; Hallam 1975), the control of water resources or the husbanding of plant foods now emerge as part of wider studies of 'adaptation' or human ecology...

She notes that a number of American researchers (themselves educated in the 'New Archaeology') undertook fieldwork in Australia at this time, bringing with them the new approaches and ideas. She states that the 'New Archaeology' was very much concerned with the way in which the archaeological record was formed and suggests that the new interest in
ethnoarchaeology in the 1970s was partly related to this. Ethnographic work was undertaken with Aboriginal people in order to formulate models of past behaviour. There was no suggestion that this work would link contemporary people and the 'archaeological' sites in the landscape. Byrne (1993: 203) has stated:

Gould's...*Living Archaeology* was, for instance, not about the recontextualization of archaeological remains by living people but about bringing living people within the context of archaeology.

It was recognised that some sites (such as burials, ceremonial and mythological sites) have religious or cosmological significance. Further, it was recognised that these were problematic for archaeology. They were sometimes impossible to identify and thus '...they remained part of the living culture of Aborigines...' (Byrne 1993: 202). Archaeology tended to ignore such sites, creating the division between 'sacred' and 'secular' sites. The latter included living sites, stone and ochre quarries and manufacturing sites etc. This conveniently provided archaeology with a class of 'evidence' that remained detached from living people.

The ecological approach is characterised by the notion of stability. As change is measured in terms of changes in the environment, long periods of cultural stability are the obvious corollary. Within this approach, confirmation of long-term cultural stability is provided by stone artefact sequences which show minimal change and an apparent lack of technological innovation over long periods of occupation.

The late 1960s and early 1970s were also characterised by the development of heritage legislation in Australia and the establishment of statutory authorities to administer these. Archaeologists played a leading role in the development of the heritage agenda at this time and the new waves
that were sweeping research-oriented archaeology were also influential in
the emerging 'public archaeology' (see sections 2.2 and 2.3 below). By the
end of the 1970s, however, it is fair to say that the agenda of
archaeological research was now set, with a strong emphasis on the way
in which environment influenced behaviour, and with renewed interest
in ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological work and their implications for
archaeology.

2.1.3 Alternative frameworks
It remained until the early 1980s for a challenge to be issued to the
ecological framework. Thomas (1981) mounted a scathing attack on the
ecological paradigm, choosing to exemplify its weaknesses within the
cherished ground of Tasmanian prehistory. Two years later, Lourandos
(1983) presented a comprehensive interpretation of archaeological,
ethnohistorical and ethnographic evidence which suggested that changes
in archaeological sequences in southwestern Victoria were attributable to
a broader process of economic intensification in the late Holocene.

Lourandos' approach was explicitly reliant on social models as an
interpretive framework. Within such frameworks, changes in the
environment may be responsible for the broad parameters of culture (and
thus culture change), but social forces provide the motivation and dictate
the nature and extent of change (Lourandos 1983, 1985). This was in
sharp contrast to interpretations that dominated the previous decade
which were characterised by the relationship between people and the
environment, and its more refined component of ecological
within these models are tied to changes in the environment (e.g. see
Beaton 1985) and emphasise long periods of cultural stability. Lourandos
issued a challenge to Australian archaeology by suggesting that intensification was a feature of late Holocene occupation throughout the continent (Lourandos 1983: 87-88). The discipline was confronted with the notion that the emphasis on stability in previous representations of past Aboriginal societies may have been misleading. Moreover, the problem lay in the increasingly popular environmental framework that had been taken up by the discipline.

For example, implicit in Lourandos' work was a questioning of the 'hunter-gatherer' model of Aboriginal societies upon which much of the previous work in Australian archaeology had been based. This model was largely derived from early ethnographic work undertaken with Aboriginal people in the arid zone. It emphasised continental cultural uniformity, a dependence on the gathering and hunting mode (with more emphasis on gathering), and a residence pattern which is strongly nomadic and seasonally-based. This model has persisted in much archaeological work despite recognition of its inadequacies (e.g. Jones 1969, Allan 1974) and considerable anthropological evidence indicating that Aboriginal societies were, and are, considerably more diverse and dynamic that this model allows (Greer 1994).

The publication of Lourandos' paper provoked significant opposition and prompted one of the more lively debates within the discipline in recent years (see Lourandos 1983, 1984, 1985; Beaton 1983, 1985; Cribb 1986). This debate centred around the polarisation of the two approaches to the explanation of culture change.

Two other alternative perspectives emerged in this decade. Feminist archaeology in Australia was perhaps prompted by Conkey and Spector
(1984) who placed an explicitly feminist perspective on the international archaeological scene. However, women have historically played a significant role in Australian archaeology and contributions by women such as Isobel McBryde, Betty Meehan, Sharon Sullivan, Laila Haglund and Sandra Bowdler (to name just a few) have played a large role in shaping Australian archaeology since professionalisation (see also Watson-Alexander 1995). The emergence of feminist archaeology in Australia towards the end of the 1980s can perhaps be seen as an outcome of the influence these major female players combined with the energy and enthusiasm of a generation of women schooled in feminist critique. The Australian feminist position is exemplified by papers such as that of Beck and Head (1990) and by the hosting of the three Women in Archaeology Conferences (see e.g. articles in du Cros and Smith 1993).

The second major development grew out of the work undertaken in the 1970s with indigenous people. It was characterised by the (now) much-used but unresolved question of 'Who owns the past?'. McBryde's (1985) book, which placed this question as its title, was focused on issues surrounding the perplexing question of 'ownership' of the past. While indigenous involvement in Australian archaeology is perhaps more readily traced to the domain of public archaeology (see section 2.2), McBryde's book (and the symposium from which it stemmed) suggests that this questioning of ownership was having an impact in the academy. Some authors began discussing ways of incorporating notions of indigenous ownership into the practice of archaeology. This was most noticeable with practitioners who worked with skeletal remains (e.g. Pardoe 1985, 1990, 1992), which for many archaeologists were distinguished from 'secular' sites because of their religious and cosmological associations. Greer's (1987, 1989, 1994, 1995 and the present
thesis) work with Aboriginal people has resulted in the development of a new kind of archaeology, which focuses on the communities with whom the archaeologist works. These issues were also finding expression in other nations with colonial pasts (e.g. see Trigger 1985 and more recently Hill 1992; McGuire 1992; Friedman 1992; Spector 1994) and this trend has continued into the 1990s (e.g. see Layton 1989; Murray 1992; Moser 1995).

2.1.4 'Chinks' in the armour

The alternative frameworks that were developed in the 1980s and early 1990s represent some major 'chinks' in the armour of the ecological paradigm. However, this did not result (at least initially) in a major shift of emphasis and the concern with ecology remains as an important 'staple' in Australian archaeology (see also Huchet 1992). Why has this enduring concern with ecology been sustained?

Firstly, the archaeologists who 'professionalised' the discipline in the 1960s brought ecological approaches to economic archaeology as part of their intellectual baggage from Cambridge. The 'New Archaeology' offered a revamped approach to these concerns which emphasised archaeology's ability to define universals of human behaviour. This approach emphasised the need for objectivity and utilised methods drawn from the natural and physical sciences (such as sampling and statistics). This allowed the discipline to distance itself from the 'naturalist' and 'antiquarian' associations of previous approaches and to position itself within the modern sciences (see also Byrne 1993). This connection with 'Science' probably helped to validate archaeology, not only within the academy, but within the wider community.
2.2 Archaeology and heritage management

The term 'public archaeology' was developed in the 1960s and 1970s following the development of legislation and the establishment of statutory authorities to protect cultural material. It encompasses activities which are more generally known in Australia today as heritage management. During this period archaeology played a primary role in the definition and management of heritage. The term 'public archaeology' itself suggests the degree to which the notion of 'heritage' was conflated into an archaeological view of the past (see also Byrne 1993).

The popular view within the discipline is that developments within the heritage area were linked with the professionalisation of the discipline that had begun a few years earlier. In this view, such developments were not aimed at saving archaeological sites for Aboriginal people or from development, but rather from the excesses of amateurs and collectors, and to a lesser extent the deterioration caused by vandals and time (Mulvaney 1970: 115). Byrne (1993) perceives a deeper meaning in the timing of these developments. He notes that the notion of protecting 'archaeological sites' had been mooted by early practitioners (notably Etheridge and later McCarthy). He suggests that the reason that these developments occurred was rather related to issues of national identity and that the conflation of the discourses of archaeology and heritage were instrumental in this. He states that archaeologists themselves '...perceived the interests of archaeology as overlapping or even being coterminous with the interests of the nation' (Byrne 1993: 198; see also Fowler 1987).

At roughly the same time, the United States was similarly engaged in
establishing legislation and authorities to protect archaeological sites. Schiffer (1979:2) has described this:

Like many industrial nations, the U.S. began to ponder its declining cultural heritage and the decreasing habitability of its environment. To counter these losses, several laws were enacted that profoundly affected American archaeology... These laws have produced in just a few years a distinctive American archaeology; it goes by the names conservation archaeology, cultural resource management (CRM), or contract archaeology...

'Cultural Resource Management' or CRM emerged at a time in American archaeology when the 'Binfordian revolution' was, for many reasons, becoming, in Leone's words, 'everybody's archaeology' in the United States (Schiffer 1979:1). It is not surprising then that this new form of archaeology was heavily influenced by (if not directly derivative of) the Binfordian perspective. McGimsey (1972) undertook an examination of 'public archaeology' in the United States and was one of the earliest statements in this area. Schiffer and Gumerman (1977) was also an important publication which focused on the establishment of a framework for CRM, on the nature of reports, management strategies, research design, predictive strategies, mitigation and on the assessment of significance. The emphasis on universally valid generalisations about human behaviour meant, for example, that a haphazard approach to the location of sites was no longer adequate and required the definition of systematic approaches to site location. The notion of regional sampling was introduced. While sampling had previously been used in excavation contexts, regional sampling was aimed at producing reliable and replicable statements about human behaviour across a broad region. This was in stark contrast to the site-specific approach of previous researchers and opened the way for a plethora of research into the problems of regional sampling (e.g. Plog 1976; House and Schiffer 1977).
In the early days of its development in Australia, public archaeology was criticised for being unscientific and for lacking theoretical prescription and vigour (see discussion in McKinlay and Jones 1979: 100-102). Partly in response to this, heritage agencies in Australia began defining their approach as 'cultural resource management' (see Flood 1979; Sutcliffe 1979; Witter 1979). In the early to mid 1980s, a range of authors set about the task of articulating this approach in the Australian setting (see McKinlay and Jones 1979; Bowdler 1981; Sullivan and Bowdler 1984). For example, Sullivan (1984: v) defined the role played by 'cultural resource managers' as being

...actively involved in processes relating to archaeological survey and assessment of sites and areas threatened by development, listing of significant sites on statutory state and national registers, and planning procedures aimed at the long-term legal and physical protection of a sample of places of cultural significance.

The term 'cultural significance' covers aesthetic, historical, scientific and social values (e.g. see Sullivan 1984: vi; Bowdler 1984: 1; Flood 1984: 55; Bowdler 1981: 127). Yet it would seem that, whether consciously or not, there has been a privileging of scientific values. This can perhaps be explained in a number of ways. Firstly, during the period in which legislation was enacted and statutory authorities established there was a conflation of the two discourses of archaeology and heritage. In this process, the interests of other groups (including indigenous groups) could be subsumed into those which were/are important within archaeology.

Within the discipline, the CRM model, which was largely imported from the United States, offered a clearly articulated framework for the assessment of archaeological significance. Bowdler (1981, 1984) has
defined the principles of assessing archaeological significance. In the later paper (Bowdler 1984: 1) she states:

I have argued elsewhere...that, in general, it is the archaeologist's task, 
*qua* archaeologist, to assess *archaeological* significance, which is to say, *scientific* significance. I attempted in the same place, in the context of a review of the relevant, largely American, literature, to also define what archaeological significance might be. I concluded that archaeological significance should be assessed according to *timely and specific research questions* on the one hand, and *representativeness* on the other.

The most interesting aspect of this is the equation between scientific and archaeological significance which indicated the newly forged connections between archaeology and science.

As a system for the management of heritage, CRM is constrained by the fact that it can only define and assess the scientific interests in heritage. Thus, it does not provide a means of addressing a broader range of values. Research interests or questions are defined by the archaeological community. CRM developed largely out of the processual approach and is therefore concerned with the development of generalisations of human behaviour. This necessitates methods and techniques (e.g. sampling; obtaining 'adequate' sample percentages etc.) in order for results to be verifiable statistically and replicated. This approach presupposes maximal access to the landscape which may be problematic in areas where Aboriginal owners put access to large tracts of land off-limits for religious or cosmological reasons.

Scientific interests were to some extent offset by the consultation process which attempted to elicit the 'social' significance of sites. However, the notion of 'consultation' was and is problematic in that the agenda of
heritage is already set. This leaves only a reactive role for those who were being consulted. This point is more fully developed in Chapter 11. Many changes in practice have occurred in an attempt to accommodate Aboriginal wishes, including the separate and restricted storage of information that is private and confidential. While recent practices have resulted in the involvement of indigenous people in many aspects of the CRM process, the essential definition of 'heritage' and heritage management has not otherwise changed.

Archaeologists have long played a custodial role in the collection and preservation of indigenous heritage. In museums they were responsible for collections of artefacts and human remains that were legally owned by the State. In university departments, academics had detailed information about particular groups of Aboriginal people or aspects of the past. However, the conflation of heritage with archaeology in the late 1960s and early 1970s meant that the 'official' version of the past was drawn from archaeology (see also Ellis 1994: 8). This established the custodial role of archaeologists on a new footing. Ellis (1994: 9) has described the way in which the archaeological perspective on the past became woven into the fabric of 'heritage':

It is significant that all early Aboriginal heritage legislation was concerned with 'relics'; that is, the material evidences of a previous, displaced, cultural entity. This was the raw material of archaeology and it was this discipline which, particularly on the east coast of Australia, moved to occupy the intellectual field which had been created by the establishment of 'relics' agencies. In doing so, the discipline brought with it preoccupations and questions that were framed by the particular scientific paradigm it occupied. That paradigm consequently exerted significant influence on the future direction and practices of cultural heritage management in Australia.
2.3 Aboriginal involvement in Australian archaeology

Australian archaeology can claim to have had more than twenty years of involvement by indigenous people in the discipline. This relationship was initiated by the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies (now the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies) but was fostered and facilitated through the newly formed statutory authorities.

2.3.1 The role of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies (AIAS)

In 1959, negotiations for the establishment of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies began, with an Interim Council formed in 1961. The Institute was formally created in 1964 to promote, initiate and support Aboriginal Studies. The infant discipline of archaeology in Australia relied heavily upon the Institute (Moser 1995: 152):

The community of Australian archaeologists benefitted from the Institute's work in funding research; organizing conferences and meetings; creating a newsletter; publishing major texts and monographs; setting up advisory panels; pushing for legislation; recording archaeological sites; establishing an official membership; producing a comprehensive bibliography and database on Aboriginal studies; and assisting in the setting up of carbon-dating facilities.

During the early period, the role of the Institute remained firmly attached to the pursuit of Aboriginal studies within an academic framework.

At the same time, Aboriginal people in this country began to demand social justice across a range of issues (Ellis 1994: 7-8). Moser (1995: 155-6) has described some of the political events that occurred
during this period. These include the establishment of the Tent Embassy on the lawns of Parliament House in January 1972, the election of the Whitlam Labor government in the same year and the changes in Aboriginal Affairs as a result of this. During this period, archaeologists, anthropologists and other academics heard, perhaps for the first time, Aboriginal perceptions of their work. Ucko (1983: 14) has described the Aboriginal reaction to academically inspired Aboriginal studies and states that:

By 1974 anthropologists and archaeologists in universities had begun to run for cover. As already noted, archaeologists (and physical anthropologists) had seldom if ever carried out meaningful consultation with traditional Aborigines and were by and large unprepared to interact with urban Aborigines.

Ucko (1983: 15) states that the Institute undertook a major role in addressing such issues:

The AIAS, with its advisory subject committees, its earlier innovatory decision to include Aborigines both on such committees and on its Council, and the undoubted influence that it had by its control of finance was seen by the academic fraternity to be the body which should attempt to redeem the situation.

The AIAS was able to achieve some important developments in this area. The passing of the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act in 1976 opened the way for a proliferation of work (including archaeology) and the Institute undertook a major role in this (Moser 1995: 159). In addition, the AIAS was an early and significant player in the issue of the return of Aboriginal skeletal remains. Moser (1995: 157) cites a number of examples which illustrate this, including the AIAS support for the return and
cremation of Truganini, the Tasmanian Aboriginal woman whose body had been treated as a subject of scientific interest. In these two areas, the AIAS developed important approaches to the consultation and involvement of Aboriginal people.

At this time, both the Institute and the statutory authorities underwent a process whereby Aboriginal people became increasingly involved. This included the employment and training of Aboriginal people, their inclusion on advisory committees, the insistence on consultation with regard to research, the broadening of the role of archaeology to include the interests of living people and the establishment of education programmes aimed at the broader Aboriginal population (Ucko 1983; Sullivan 1985; Pardoe 1992; Moser 1995). An important development in this regard was the Institute-funded 'Sites of Significance Recording Project' which was established in 1973. Through this project, funds were provided to the embryonic State authorities to initiate their own state-based programs (Moser 1995: 160-161). The programs were to be undertaken with Aboriginal people and in a number of States, Aboriginal Rangers or Site Officers were employed.

The involvement of Aboriginal people established, even in this early period, that there was an Aboriginal perspective on heritage that was not always accommodated by the scientific approach. Moser (1995: 161) has described the involvement of Aboriginal people in the Sites of Significance Recording Project. She states:

The important point to make about the Sites of Significance Programme was that it changed its aims as a result of Aboriginal participation in the project. Archaeologists were forced to confront Aboriginal associations with the land
in general, and specific sites in particular. While the initial emphasis had
been on locating archaeological sites or placing 'dots on the map', it soon
became clear that Aboriginal people had strong views about the aims and
function of the programme.

2.3.2 The National Parks and Wildlife Service of New South Wales
Aboriginal involvement in heritage varied from state to state, however it was probably the National Parks and Wildlife Service of New South Wales, under the direction of Sharon Sullivan, that most directly addressed this during this period. This was perhaps particularly the case when, towards the end of the 1970s, Ucko left the Institute which subsequently became increasingly distanced from archaeology. It was thus left to the state authorities to continue this process.

A number of factors can be used to explain the degree of influence exerted by 'National Parks' at this time. Firstly, much archaeological work was concentrated in New South Wales at this time. This included work at Lake Mungo (Bowler et al. 1970; Bowler et al. 1972; Bowler and Thorne 1976); Allen's (1974) research in the Darling basin; McBryde's (1974) work in New England and the interest in the NSW south coast (e.g. Bowdler 1971, 1976; Lampert 1971; Lampert and Hughes 1974; Poiner 1976). Obviously the policies being put in place by Sullivan and her organisation were reaching the heart of the archaeological 'Who's Who?' of the times. Moreover, within the state of New South Wales, all archaeological work was directed through this authority and therefore their policies on consultation were enforced through the requirement for a permit to undertake excavation. In addition,
there were historical connections between National Parks in NSW and the archaeological academy. Many of the staff had trained at the Universities of New England and Sydney and had established connections with staff in these institutions. These links perhaps facilitated and accounted for a degree of interchange between the Universities and the public archaeologists during this period in New South Wales. Finally, the NSW National Parks served as a role model for other state heritage authorities and in some instances provided them with expertise and advice.

It can thus be established that this organisation exerted significant influence upon the development of public archaeology in this country. However, it remains to be explained why this heritage agency was committed, perhaps more than its contemporary organisations, to indigenous involvement. In this early period, in contrast to research archaeology, this organisation was largely staffed by women with a strongly feminist perspective. Mascia-Lees et al. (1989: 11) have pointed out that 'feminists speak from the position of the other'. This link between feminist concerns and those of indigenous people may also be seen in the relationship and re-orientation of research undertaken by Spector (1994) on sites that are significant to Native American people. It may also be discerned in Haglund's (1975) report on the excavation and analysis of skeletal remains at Broadbeach in southeast Queensland. In the latter, publication of Haglund's work was delayed by the author while she attempted to locate traditional owners (Haglund 1975; see also Chapter 3). A first hand understanding of and empathy with those in the position of 'other' may have provided the environment within which indigenous interests in heritage could be explored. As more Aboriginal people became involved in this area (either as employees of National
Parks or on advisory committees or through the process of consultation) more challenges were issued to the scientific view of the past and heritage.

The identification of an Aboriginal perspective on heritage had the potential to challenge many aspects of the discipline. Firstly, it called into question some archaeological methods and practices, which, had this aspect been fully explored might have challenged the scientific approach of Cultural Resource Management. This challenge, however, formed the basis of relations in the following decade. From an Aboriginal perspective, this divergence between their own views of the past and its archaeological representation must have been most obvious in the fact that legislation was largely aimed at the scientific concerns (see Sullivan 1985). Moreover, education programmes were largely aimed at educating Aboriginal people about archaeology but not archaeologists about Aboriginal perspectives (see also Byrne 1993: 203-205). Much of the disenchantment expressed by Aboriginal people in the following decade may be attributed to this.

2.3.1 'Consultation' and indigenous rights in heritage

While much of the previous decade was marked by a number of heady changes, a conservatism swept through Australian society following the election of the Fraser Government at the end of 1975. In terms of indigenous involvement in heritage, this had the effect of shifting the emphasis from the initiation of change to the consolidation of what had already been introduced.

The difference between indigenous and archaeological views of the past, which was becoming increasingly obvious, was also being felt within the
archaeological community. There was a growing realisation of the implications of some of the trends in Aboriginal involvement that had been introduced in the 1970s. That is, while the archaeological community had welcomed the changes of the previous decade, there were apparently limits to such change. During this period, Ucko (1983: 20) wrote that one of the major conflicts of interest between Aboriginal people and archaeologists is concerned with the limits of real recognition of Aboriginal rights when they directly challenge the recognised interests of professional archaeologists to an extent greater than such things as the loss of the occasional skeleton or museum object.

While the notion of consulting with Aboriginal people concerning archaeological work was by now well known, if not well formulated within Australian archaeology, this did not resolve issues of ownership and control of heritage that most characterised this period. The first public challenge to archaeological authority in such matters was delivered in December 1982, when members of the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre (TAC) decided to attend (uninvited) the Australian Archaeological Association Conference that was being held in Hobart. This was prompted by the film The Last Tasmanians and the presence, at the Conference, of archaeologists who had been involved in making the film. The TAC were responding to the implication (suggested by the title of the film alone) that there were no living Aboriginal people in Tasmania. Langford’s address to the meeting on behalf of the TAC clearly defined Aboriginal ownership and emphasised the divergence of Aboriginal and archaeological viewpoints in the title, ‘Our heritage - your playground’ (Langford 1983).
The issue of ownership became increasingly important in the following years (see also section 2.2). Allen (1983: 9) clearly illustrates the attitude of many archaeologists at the time:

> I am unaware of any professional archaeologist working in Australia at this time who would take exception to the proposition that Aborigines, as a deeply involved and committed group, are among the proper custodians of the Australian cultural heritage and that field research should only be carried out in consultation with those custodians.

This attitude is summed up in Allen's assertion that Aboriginal people 'are among [the emphasis is mine] the proper custodians' and that their interest is, 'as a deeply involved and committed group'. This statement betrays the fact that for some archaeologists, heritage, rather than being a birthright, was something that one could choose to become involved in if one has the right level of commitment. This implies that there are no rightful owners of heritage and that the list of potential custodians is as long as the number of people who could make that commitment.

In the following years, this issue of 'who owns the past?' was an important theme in Australian archaeology. However, with the exception of McBryde (1985), few major publications were undertaken in this area. While archaeologists undertook 'consultation' (in its many forms) with Aboriginal people, the murky depths of ownership of heritage remained a problematic issue to explore. Those who did take a stand tended to take a universal view of heritage (e.g. Mulvaney 1981, 1985; see also Byrne 1993; Moser 1995). This perspective argues the antiquity of archaeological material renders it the 'common heritage' of all people. It follows from this that a scientific view of the past, which is perceived to be universally objective and without ethnic, political or other bounds, is the only appropriate means of understanding the past.
In this decade, the issue of control of heritage was dealt with through the notion of 'consultation'. By the end of this period, this notion was firmly incorporated into CRM approaches. However, the process of consultation, whether it is undertaken at the local or community level or through advisory committees, represents at best only minimal control. It invites those being consulted to respond to an existing agenda whether this is research or heritage management. Their options are limited to rejecting the proposals, or interjecting in the archaeological process, presumably where practices are beyond limits that are acceptable (e.g. see Pardoe 1992). In recent years, it has become common practice in some states for indigenous people to work with archaeologists. In most instances, the intention is to 'monitor' the archaeological work and practices. This process provides only for a reactionary role rather than real control of heritage. Indigenous people are not involved in the construction of the past, but rather they are asked to eliminate unacceptable practices associated with the established archaeological view. Given this, archaeological views are likely to have only limited appeal to indigenous people and make little or no contribution in terms of the construction of their (as opposed to national) identity (see also Chapter 11).

2.4 Conclusion

Several major points have been presented in this chapter. Firstly, it was established that in spite of the introduction of new approaches over the last decade, the discipline has a strong and continuing interest in ecological relationships. It was suggested that these are still largely filtered through a framework drawn from 'New' or processual archaeology. They focus on changes in the environment to explain
culture change and thus emphasise long periods of cultural stability. The popularity of such approaches lays primarily in their appropriation of 'science' and scientific methods and techniques. These reduce the overwhelming business of the explanation of culture to finite variables and are seen to improve the credibility of archaeology within academic and broader public communities.

These theoretical directions, which dominate academic archaeology, have influenced the way in which heritage management has been developed in this country. This is in spite of the fact that research archaeology is largely removed from the decision-making and other processes of heritage management which provides the discipline with a large measure of validity in terms of the broader community (Smith 1994). In addition, practitioners in research archaeology have not generally had the same level of interaction or involvement with indigenous groups, thus this important influence has had, until recently, only marginal impact. In this sense, the 'tail' would appear to be wagging the 'dog'.

The predominant model used in heritage management views 'heritage' and 'culture' as 'resources', and borrows heavily from the natural sciences for ways of assessing the significance of these. The scientific or positivist approaches used within such frameworks have little or no relevance to indigenous perceptions of the past. However, because such approaches provide a 'universal heritage' they are acceptable to the dominant majority. They have thus been useful in the development of national identity. 'This partly explains the crisis between indigenous people and archaeologists that has been ongoing for more than a decade. Recent events, e.g. the legal dispute between La Trobe University and
the Tasmanian Aboriginal Lands Council (*The Australian*, July 1995) suggests that this crisis is deepening. This is in spite of the efforts of some practitioners, particularly heritage managers, to address issues surrounding indigenous perceptions of the past and ways in which these can be incorporated into contemporary heritage management. This thesis explores these issues from the experience of working from within an Aboriginal community.
A history of archaeology in Queensland

The history of archaeological work in Queensland mirrors, in some ways, that in other parts of Australia. For example, early work was dominated by those associated with museums and there was a pronounced interest in rock art and human remains. A major difference, however, was the presence of large populations of Aboriginal and Torres Strait people in Queensland who had strong links with their land, cultures and customs. This was especially the case in Cape York Peninsula which received considerable anthropological attention on account of this. In addition, the presence of Aboriginal people in the State prompted the appointment of a 'Protector of Aborigines'. Some of those who undertook this role (e.g. Roth) also recorded ethnographic information about the cosmologies, customs and material cultures of some of these peoples.

3.1 Early work

European interest in Aboriginal sites in Queensland can be traced to 1884, exactly 100 years before the commencement of the present project. At this time, scientific interest in the colony of Queensland was fostered by the newly formed Royal Society of Queensland. This organisation was preceded by the Philosophical Society but was more oriented to the natural sciences. The first volume of the Proceedings of the Royal Society of Queensland included an article describing rock engravings at Pigeon Creek in southeast Queensland (Tryon 1884; Hall 1984a). The article is interesting in that it is not just a description of antiquities but offers an analysis which uses available ethnographic information in the production of its framework. Shortly after this (1888-1898), A.C. Haddon
visited Cape York as part of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Strait.

A survey of the Proceedings shows, however, that while there was some anthropological study undertaken in New Guinea and much more interest in palaeontology and the other natural sciences, it was several years before the society was offered another morsel of either Australian ethnography or archaeology (Jack 1896a, 1896b; Shirley 1896). This was followed by a comparative flurry of activity with some thirteen papers produced over the next twenty or so years (e.g. Matthews 1900, 1901; Shirley 1911; Mackie 1911; Hamlyn-Harris 1913, 1915a, 1916, 1917; Bennett 1918). However, such papers represented only a minute fraction of the work of the Society in this period.

In the same period Roth (1901a, 1901b, 1902, 1904, 1907, 1908a, 1908b, 1909a, 1909b, 1910a, 1910b, 1910c) was recording ethnographic information in North Queensland while in his role as northern Protector of Aborigines. Roth's recording of elements of material culture as well as customs and practices represents a significant body of information, albeit generalised.

Between 1918 and 1959 there was not a single paper focusing on Aboriginal issues in the Proceedings. The drought was broken by Mack (1959) who wrote an article entitled 'Settlement and the Aborigines of Australia and Tasmania.' This was a sparse discussion of the initial colonisation of Australia and Tasmania and more concerned with the appropriate manner-of dealing with the 'native problem'.
The *Memoirs of the Queensland Museum* show a similar pattern with a number of papers of anthropological interest produced between 1913 and 1924 (Hamlyn-Harris 1913, 1915a, 1915b; Hamlyn-Harris and Smith 1916; Longman 1918; Richards 1924). An interval of some fifteen years passed before Shellshear (1939) published his paper on 'The Skull of an Australian Aboriginal found at Stradbroke Island, Queensland.' While some of these papers were concerned with Aboriginal social life, several described items of material culture or collections held in the Queensland Museum. A few described archaeoological sites.

In the 1920s and 1930s, Ursula McConnel, Donald Thomson, Lauriston Sharp and the partnership of Hale and Tindale all undertook anthropological work in Cape York Peninsula. McConnel visited Cape York several times in the late 1920s and early 1930s working with several groups of Cape York people, but concentrating on the Wik-Munkan people. McConnel defined elements of their tribal social organisation, recorded important myths and legends and interconnections between several of the Cape York groups (McConnel 1934, 1939, 1940, 1950, 1957; see also Taylor 1984). Given the enormous upheaval that had occurred in Cape York, particularly in northern and coastal Cape York, her work represents a significant remnant of information. This is all the more important because it was collected prior to the more intensive period of government intervention that followed shortly after her time in the field. Of most interest to this research was McConnel's recognition of the dynamism of Cape York societies, 'the shifting sands of culture-change', both in terms of external events and internal forces. In addition, she acknowledged the terms used, at the time, by the people themselves to describe their tribal groups rather than imposing labels collected in previous ethnographic work (McConnel 1939: 59-60; Fuaery and Greer
1993). In the early 1930s, Sharp (1934 a, 1934 b, 1937, 1939, 1940, 1952, 1958) carried out ethnographic work with the Yir-Yoront of western Cape York, who were the southern neighbours of the Wik.

At approximately the same time, Thomson (1939) worked with the Wik Monkan people of Cape York. While principally anthropological in nature, his work provided archaeology with a number of key concepts which have been incorporated into the frameworks used by later researchers. For example, he defined a system that operated according to systematic seasonal scheduling and noted that this was associated with a specialised material culture to the extent that (1939: 209):

In each case the camps and the house types, the weapons and utensils, are of a specialised type and related to the seasonal life, so that viewing these independently at different periods of the year, and seeing the people engaged in occupations so diverse an onlooker might be pardoned for concluding that they were different peoples.

In addition, he raised the relative 'invisibility' of a contemporary gathering and hunting people with a rich material culture but who leave only '...the slenderest of evidence for later archaeological investigation' (Thomson 1939: 211). Thomson also emphasised the richness of the coastal resource zone (Thomson 1939:213) which has been elaborated by more recent Cape York researchers such as Chase and Sutton (1981, 1987), Hynes and Chase (1982) and Harris (1976, 1977).

Hale and Tindale (1933) were at Princess Charlotte Bay in eastern Cape York. They recorded aspects of social life, vocabulary and trade. Importantly for archaeology, they also made detailed notes of the locations of particular types of camps, items of material culture and made
detailed plans of particular sites such as Endean rockshelter on Stanley Island. These sites were revisited during the research undertaken by Beaton (1985) some four decades later.

In 1959, W.E.H. Stanner (1961; see also Mulvaney 1984) visited Cape York to investigate the shell mounds near Weipa. Stanner's brief was to determine the origin, whether natural or cultural, of the mounds. Although he opted for a natural origin, he had little to offer in the way of explanation of these phenomena. He did, however, open the way for a number of later researchers on this problem (e.g. Wright 1971; Bailey 1975, 1977).

The anthropological work undertaken in Queensland, particularly in areas like Cape York, provided rich accounts of contemporary lifestyles and traditional customs of the people studied. McCarthy (1939) availed himself of some of this information in his continent-wide survey of trade, but otherwise his work did not provoke a flurry of archaeological interest in such areas. This was in spite of the fact that Thomson, at least, appears to have been very aware of the implications of his work for archaeology.

While amateur interest in Aboriginal society, artefacts and culture continued in this period (e.g. Webb 1960; Bartholomai and Breeden 1961), the new wave of professionalism which was sweeping Australian archaeology was also having an effect in Queensland. Firstly, a number of the new 'professionals' visited the State and undertook significant and systematic fieldwork. Secondly, the establishment of archaeology at the University of Queensland was an important milestone.
3.2 Visiting archaeological scholars

In 1959, D.J. Mulvaney received slides of the rock art of Kenniff Cave (Mulvaney 1984:5). Over the following five years, extensive survey and excavation was undertaken in this general region on Mt Moffatt Station in the south-western side of the Carnarvon Range (Mulvaney and Joyce 1965). This work closely followed on the heels of one of the most important technical developments in archaeology: the introduction of radiocarbon dating in the 1950s. The radiocarbon estimates from Kenniff Cave placed initial occupation in the region at a minimum of 16,000 years ago (Mulvaney and Joyce 1965: 169). This was the first evidence of Pleistocene occupation in Australia and it is not surprising that it sparked renewed interest in an old (but continuing) theme in Australian archaeology: the antiquity of occupation (e.g. Etheridge 1890, 1905).

The work at Kenniff Cave and The Tombs, undertaken by Mulvaney and Joyce (1965) reflects those interests in ecology and economic prehistory that were imported to this country from Cambridge University. While a good deal of attention is paid to the definition and description of artefact types, artefact sequencing and the development of phases in Australian technology, the authors also express an interest in the relationship between prehistoric people and the environment in which they lived (see Chapter 2; Mulvaney and Joyce 1965).

In addition, a metrical analysis was undertaken on the artefacts from Kenniff Cave. This new approach illustrated the desire for a more objective approach in archaeology. The results reflected a heightened interest in the technology of stone flaking which contrasted with previous analyses which had concentrated on the description of form and types (e.g. McCarthy 1946).
In 1963, Wright (1971) undertook further work on the Weipa shellmounds in far north Queensland. These were the mounds that had previously been examined by Stanner (1961; see also Wright 1971; Mulvaney 1984: 5), and the new investigation maintained the central focus of establishing whether the mounds were cultural or natural in origin. In contrast to Stanner's proposal of a natural origin, Wright's excavations revealed that artefacts (particularly polished bone points) were present throughout the loose mound of shell and that one species, *Anadara trapezia*, dominated (Wright 1971). This evidence indicated a cultural origin of the mounds although a definitive explanation for their form eluded the researcher.

Wright also undertook some excavations in the Laura district of Cape York Peninsula. While the site (L-1 or Mushroom Rock) contained both rock art and archaeological deposit, Wright's investigations concentrated on the excavation of the deposit and analysis and interpretation of the stone industries present. In particular, he identified periods of stability and change represented in the artefactual traditions over more than 6,000 years (Wright 1971: 137). Like Mulvaney and Joyce (1965) he provided some synthesis of available Australian data, attempting to place the information from the site into the developing framework of Australian stone artefact traditions (see Wright 1971: 138). In addition, this excavation and those undertaken by him at two other rockshelters (Bare Hill and Chillagoe) were aimed at demonstrating one aspect of Aboriginal usage of the environment, viz. the use and procurement of stone. Wright lamented the lack of evidence '...that would allow us to write a prehistory in terms of the relationship of man [sic] to his environment' (Wright 1971: 140). In so doing, he was expressing the
heightened interest in the environment which is further attested to by the title of the book, *Aboriginal Man and Environment*, in which this paper appeared (Mulvaney and Golson 1971).

### 3.3 Archaeologists in residence

While researchers from other parts of Australia were visiting Queensland to undertake research, in 1963 anthropological courses began to be taught by Donald Tugby in the Psychology Department of the University of Queensland. In 1963-64, an archaeological survey of the southern region of Moreton Bay and on Moreton Island was undertaken by V.V. Ponosov (1964) of this Department. Teaching in the Department consisted, in the main, of service courses for social work students and Tugby was joined in 1965 by an archaeologist when John Clegg was appointed to the Department as a Tutor. The establishment of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology in 1965 saw the appointment of a number of members of staff, headed by Peter Lawrence as Foundation Professor of Anthropology (John Taylor, pers. comm.). Clegg undertook preliminary analyses on artefacts from a site called Cathedral Cave in the Carnarvon Gorge (Clegg 1965a, 1965b).

Rescue work on the Aboriginal burial site at Broadbeach was also initiated in, with funding from the (then) Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies in Canberra. Laila Haglund (who took up residence in Brisbane in the same year) was invited to direct the excavation (Haglund-Calley and Quinnell 1973; Haglund 1975: 1). The excavations at Broadbeach continued over a three year period from 1965 to 1968 (Haglund 1975: xi). The research represents a milestone in the development of archaeology in Queensland for a number of reasons. Firstly, it was a rescue operation. The skeletal material was under threat
from soil contractors, developers (the site is situated on Queensland's infamous Gold Coast), looters and treasure seekers, miners, curious members of the public and the natural processes of erosion exacerbated by modern development (Haglund 1975: 3). Because of this, the research was conducted under a different set of operational standards from the average piece of academic research and is perhaps more in line with modern management work. For example, Haglund notes that constraints of time and her own availability for the task precluded a more rapid recovery of the remains and that much damage was done to the site between seasons of fieldwork (Haglund 1975: 3). While some measures were taken to prevent public access to the site, these were either ignored or vandalised. Thus, the work proceeded with a sense of urgency (1975: xi):

This meant that we had to push on and excavate even when we would have preferred to first spend more time assessing the material already recovered to find problems and aspects that might be usefully concentrated on during another season.

At the time of the discovery of the burials, no legislation existed in Queensland to protect them or any other Aboriginal remains or sites (Haglund 1975: 3). The Aboriginal Relics Preservation Act of 1967 was enacted during the period in which the fieldwork was undertaken and was perhaps brought in largely as a result of this work. The need to protect Aboriginal sites, places and artefacts was strongly illustrated in the inability to prevent or even mitigate the disturbance to and subsequent destruction of the burial ground. Unfortunately, as Haglund (1975: 3) points out,

Even had the Aboriginal Relics Preservation Act of 1967 been in force when we started this excavation, it is doubtful whether the site would have been protected by it.
Haglund had a number of aims. Firstly, the excavations were undertaken with a methodological rigour (see Haglund 1975: 3-8). This rigour is especially notable given that there was a dearth of professional assistance available and that equipment and techniques were often necessarily the result of Australian bush ingenuity more than anything else (1975: xi). This rigour was an attempt to rescue as much stratigraphic information as was possible under the circumstances. The site occurred within a sandridge with undifferentiated deposits and these had been further subjected to erosion and human disturbance. From the outset, one of Haglund's major aims was to define the different burial practices and associated rites that were practised at the site. Furthermore, she wanted to determine whether different practices dominated during different time periods. In this sense, Haglund's aims were very anthropological in origin and she utilised the ethnographic literature available. Her aims were to be achieved through the implementation of a rigorous methodology (cf. the work of Mardaga-Campbell 1995 on the living floors of Walkunder Arch Cave, Chillagoe; Mardaga-Campbell 1986 on living floors at Pillar Cave; Campbell and Mardaga-Campbell 1993 on Walkunder Arch; Campbell 1978, Mardaga-Campbell and Campbell 1985 on Turtle Rock in the Hervey Range, Queensland).

While the examination of Aboriginal skeletal remains has had a long history, the early researchers in this area were not archaeologists as such but anatomists or naturalists with an interest in differences in human shape and form. Their investigations were usually undertaken on individual crania or museum collections (e.g. Longman 1918). They did not involve examination of the remains in situ, and the remains were not carefully removed under controlled excavation conditions. The excavation at Broadbeach represented the first Australian example of an
archaeological examination of such material. Moreover, unlike many who had previously worked in this area, Haglund was aware of the Aboriginal community's sensitivity to this type of research. The report on excavations published in 1975 had originally been submitted for publication in 1972 (1975: xii),

However, it seemed that a book like this might be offensive to members of the local Aboriginal community and publication was shelved. There has now been much more dialogue between Aborigines and archaeologists about such matters, and I hope this book will be accepted as an interesting document which throws light on some aspects of the complex culture of the Aborigines in the Brisbane area. I know from many discussions that their descendants have a keen interest in this.

Another researcher working in Queensland at this time was Eleanor Crosby. She undertook what was methodologically a very early systematic survey of archaeological sites within the drainage system of Robinson Creek and the Dawson River (Crosby 1968: 73). She carried out an analysis of painting sites found in the survey according to characteristics such as motif, technique and colour, as well as a stone artefact analysis (Crosby 1973).

During the 1970s, researchers continued to visit Queensland and undertake research. Rosenfeld et al. (1981) investigated the buried pecked engravings at the Early Man site at Laura. She had been attracted to the area by the early work of Tresize, an amateur archaeologist who recorded many rock art sites in the region (Tresize 1971). Given the uniqueness of the Early Man rockshelter (the engravings were covered by an archaeological deposit), dating of the art was one of the most important considerations. However, the investigation was also aimed at exploring the relationship between the rock art and other archaeological data.
In the late 1960s to early 1970s, Bailey (1975, 1977) undertook further work on the Weipa shell mounds in Cape York Peninsula as part of his global examination of middens for his PhD thesis. In 1972, Moore undertook archaeological work in the Torres Strait and at Cape York. He excavated sites on Muralag or Prince of Wales Island in the lower western islands of the Torres Strait, and at a small rockshelter at Red Island Point and a campsite at Evans Bay on the Cape York mainland. Moore's aim was, in part, to find archaeological evidence attested to by ethnographic accounts from the region. Significantly, he undertook two small test excavations within the current study area (Moore 1979; see also Chapter 9). Moore's work was followed by that of Vanderwal (1973) who carried out an archaeological survey over a broad area of the Torres Strait. Vanderwal's aim was to locate sites that could illustrate aspects of trade in this area however few sites were located and none that could shed much light on this topic.

3.4 Archaeological 'regions' and themes
Since the mid-1970s, there has been an acceleration of development in archaeology in Queensland. New appointments have been made to the two university departments teaching archaeology which have resulted in the expansion of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. While further testing and refinement occurred within the themes that had already been determined, few changes (other than an increase of people on the ground) can be observed during this period. Increasing numbers of archaeologists have, however, resulted in work on many areas in Queensland. In some instances, this has facilitated the development of archaeological 'regions'. In the following sections, a summary of the major regions is presented.
3.4.1 The Herbert-Burdekin

In 1974, Helen Brayshaw arrived in Townsville to begin a PhD project on the Herbert-Burdekin region. Her thesis presented information on the ethnohistoric literature, the ethnographic collections and her own archaeological investigations within the region (Brayshaw 1977). The specific questions she was interested in were as follows (1977: ix):

1. the relationship between material culture and the environment;
2. the idea of cultural variation within a specific region; and
3. to place the material culture of the Herbert-Burdekin within the context of our knowledge of broader Australian Aboriginal material culture.

Following McBryde's (1974) early work, Australian archaeology was marked in the 1970s by the development of a regional approach to archaeology. Brayshaw's work represented the first regional study of the archaeology of North Queensland. In addition, the link between people and the environment they occupied was an intrinsic theme in her work (Brayshaw 1977: 3):

It seemed that a region of such variety would provide a very good opportunity to study aspects of the Aborigines' relationship with their environment and the extent to which variations in their material culture reflected variations in the environment.

In 1975, John Campbell arrived in Townsville to take up a position at James Cook University. Initially, he undertook ethnoarchaeological work in the rainforest around the Tully River, working with Aboriginal people from this area. This work was discontinued following the death of one of his closest co-workers and publication abandoned due to the
wishes of his relatives (John Campbell, pers. comm.). In 1977, on the recommendation of Helen Brayshaw, he began work at the Turtle Rock site, located in the Hervay Range, just south-west of Townsville. The site was being disturbed by cattle and horses and was suffering seasonal erosion. Excavations at the site were carried out by archaeology students who were being trained in precise three-dimensional recording. Archaeological aims included determining artefact reduction sequences, sourcing raw materials, defining the relationship between rock art at the site and the floors, and determining the relationship of the site to its surrounding catchment (Campbell 1978; Mardaga-Campbell and Campbell 1985). The rock art studies at Turtle Rock have not been completed but form part of Hatte's doctoral research on the Townsville region (Hatte 1992; In prep.; see also below).

The present author undertook an archaeological survey of Magnetic Island as part of her BA (Hons) work for the University of Sydney (Greer 1981). This work placed the evidence from Magnetic Island within the regional framework outlined by Brayshaw, providing some refinement to the original model. More recently, Hatte (1992, In Prep.) has extensively surveyed the Townsville district in her study of the rock art and archaeology of the area. This work forms part of her PhD research. It has been complemented by two BA(Hons) theses on the Cape Cleveland area (Plant 1989; Lee Long 1990). Scott (1992) also focused on the Cape Cleveland area, in particular the conservation problems of the rock art at the Clevedon and Roxmere sites. Hatte is currently working with an anthropologist undertaking doctoral studies for the University of Queensland within the same region (Heijm In Prep.). They have undertaken joint work on Palm Island, an Aboriginal community off the coast of Townsville.
Bird's (1987) BA (Hons) work at Beachmount in the lower Burdekin provided further evaluation of Brayshaw's regional framework for the Herbert-Burdekin. She followed up her study with monitoring and assessment of the impact of three tropical cyclones on coastal sites at Beachmount just south of the mouth of the Burdekin River (Bird 1993, 1995).

Campbell (1979, 1982) undertook some early work on Hinchinbrook Island. This work was principally aimed at recording the fish traps located on the leeward side of the island, however some test excavation was undertaken on middens. This work is being followed up by Bird (In Prep.; pers. comm.) who is undertaking doctoral research on both Hinchinbrook and the adjacent mainland. This work is being done in association with Aboriginal communities in the Cardwell and Ingham areas.

3.4.2 The Central Highlands
Ecology and management of resources were important themes in Beaton's (1977, 1982) work in the Central Highlands. He focused on the use of toxic plants (cycads) and their role within the subsistence strategy used in this region. He suggested that the toxic plants were used as a 'communion' food. More recently, Beaton (1991a, 1991b) has published results from his earlier excavations at a number of rockshelters in the Carnarvon Gorge region. Knuckey and Kippin (1992) have also undertaken preliminary survey of 'Stonehenge', a property in central Queensland.
The theme of rock art and archaeological sequences was also taken up by Morwood in the Central Highlands (Morwood 1980, 1981). Morwood recorded the rock art of more than 83 sites between the Warrego and Barcoo Rivers, applying a principal components analysis (PCA) in order to determine the 'differential distribution of artistic variables within or between sites' (Morwood 1980: 98). His excavations at four rockshelters in the same general region provided stone artefact assemblages which were analysed in terms of implement morphology, raw material and characteristics of the edges, as well as providing a comparison for other sites, like Kenniff Cave, in the region (Morwood 1981). Again, he applied PCA.

3.4.3 The south-east coastal region

This broad region includes work in Moreton Bay and on Moreton Island, Fraser Island, at the Sunshine Coast (north of Brisbane) and the Gold Coast, located south-east of the capital.

Initial work in the Moreton Bay region was undertaken in the early 1960s by Ponomov (1964) and somewhat later by Stockton (1974). However, the Moreton Regional Archaeological Project (MRAP) was begun in mid-1977 following the appointment of Jay Hall to the staff of the University of Queensland in 1976. Adequate funding for the project was to follow in 1979 (Hall and Robins 1984: 85). The project was devised with broad aims, however a number of themes appear to have been important (Hall 1980, 1982, 1984; Hall and Robins 1984:85-87):

1. the concept of a regional investigation, epitomised by a multi-stage approach which examined different environments and microenvironments within a single region;
2. the need for a systematic approach to survey and excavation, and
3. the importance of the environment (especially sea level changes) for the prehistoric populations which occupied the region.

Generally speaking, the MRAP project took on the earlier theme of humans and their interaction with the environment, re-interpreting this in the more up-to-date idiom of ecology and the management of resources. This was undertaken within a coastal setting which had already attracted some attention in Australian archaeology (e.g. Lampert 1971; Bowdler 1970, 1977; see also the papers in Bowdler 1982), however it also incorporated a revived interest in islands and the way in which they were utilised in the past. There was an emphasis on methodological rigour. While this was not new to Queensland archaeology (cf. Haglund 1975), the focus here was on systematic field survey. This can perhaps be traced to the popularity and attention that such issues were attracting in the United States, where Hall himself had been trained.

The initial work on the project has been expanded by a number of smaller projects including: Alfredson (1983, 1984); Crooks (1982); Draper (1978); Hall and Love (1985); Hall et al. (1987); Hall and Hiscock (1988); Hall and Bowen (1989); Hiscock (1988); Love (1985); Richardson (1979, 1984); Robins (1983); Robins and Hall (1981); Walters (1980, 1985). While coastal and island areas within this region received much initial attention, work was undertaken in the hinterland in the 1980s (Morwood 1986; Hall 1986; Hall et. al. 1988; Hall and Hiscock 1988; Hiscock and Hall 1988; Satterthwaite and Heather 1987; Walters 1985, 1992a, 1992b). The southern limits of this region were extended to the Gold Coast with the excavation of a site on Hope Island, in line with the Environmental Impact Statement for the Sanctuary Cove Resort (Walters et al. 1987). This was an interesting project in that it was undertaken jointly by the
Kombumerri Cultural Centre, an Aboriginal organisation, and the Anthropology Museum at the University of Queensland. In spite of this collaboration, the resulting paper addresses only specifically archaeological issues concerning the work undertaken at the site.

Early work was also undertaken on Fraser Island by Lauer (1977, 1979) and Devitt (1979); for more recent work, see McNiven and Hiscock (1988). McNiven (1985) began work in the Cooloola region on the Sunshine coast north of Brisbane as part of his doctoral research at the University of Queensland. This work conveniently filled the geographical gap between Fraser Island to the north and Moreton Bay to the south (see McNiven (1988, 1989, 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1992a, 1992b, 1993).

3.4.4 Other island regions
Rowland turned his attention to the Central Queensland coast when he undertook work on midden sites on North and South Keppel Islands (Rowland 1980, 1981, 1982, 1985). The major thrust of this work was to determine the occupation sequence of the middens and to place them within the framework for coastal and island occupation that was being established elsewhere in Queensland. Morwood (1982) also carried out work on Wild Duck Island in the Broad Sound region between Rockhampton and Mackay. The sites investigated were located during development work for a proposed resort on the island. Morwood's concern with defining the nature and pattern of occupation within this island group reflects the general concerns of coastal archaeology at this time. This work does, however, differ in one respect in that he notes that research in such areas will be critical to their subsequent management (Morwood 1982: 111).
In 1981, Rowland investigated sites on Moa and Naghi Islands in western Torres Strait that had been reported by Barham (see Rowland 1985: 123). This expanded upon earlier work in the Torres Strait (Moore 1979; Vanderwal 1973) and complemented the work that was then being undertaken by Barham and Harris (1983, 1985). While other work was aimed at general survey and the location of sites, Rowland's (1985: 123) investigation had more specific aims:

The Torres Strait has obviously had a complex cultural/linguistic and human/physical history that could date from at least 6000 BP and perhaps well into the Pleistocene, yet both Vanderwal and Moore have commented on the apparent recency of sites on the islands and radiocarbon dates have confirmed this. Therefore before the history of the Torres Strait can be further deciphered a primary objective must be to determine whether there is any evidence for earlier phases of occupation of the islands. It was with this broad objective in mind that I undertook survey in the Torres Strait.

His conclusions, like those of his predecessors, was that given the relatively recent dates for excavated sites, the problems related to the initial colonisation of Torres Strait cannot yet be solved. Like Vanderwal, he notes the environmental extremes and the dynamic nature of the coastal landscape in this region and the effect that this is likely to have on the preservation of sites.

Rowland (1986) also pioneered work in the Whitsunday Islands, off the coast from Mackay. This has been followed with PhD work by Barker (1989) on Hook Island and masters research by Border (pers. comm.) in the Cumberland Group and further south. John Campbell and Peter Veth (pers. comm.) are carrying out underwater examination of submerged volcanic caves off Penrith Island.
3.4.5 Cape York

The early work on shell mounds and the excavations by Wright and others were to have been followed up with a large multidisciplinary project known initially as the Cape York Cultural Ecology Project (CYCEP) which was then by the (then) Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. The multidisciplinary approach, its ecological perspective and the sheer scope of plans for this project meant that it would have epitomised the 'state of the art' approach to the disciplines involved at the time (John Campbell, pers. comm.). Unfortunately, after a difficult start in 1976 this project was discontinued in 1978, less than half of its expected life of five years. Some of the concepts from this project were incorporated into later work undertaken at Princess Charlotte Bay in northeast Cape York by Beaton (1985), who had briefly been appointed as a Research Officer on the project. Beaton's investigation (during the late 1970s and early 1980s) into the archaeology of Princess Charlotte Bay was one of the largest and best funded archaeological projects undertaken in Queensland. Like its predecessor, the CYCEP, it was multidisciplinary, well resourced and had the requisite personnel to enable broad-scale, systematic investigation (Beaton 1985).

Interest in coastal archaeology maintained a high profile in this period. Beaton was interested in the relationship between coastal people and their ecological parameters (including islands). However this theme was extended by the extensive geomorphological work (see Chappell 1982) undertaken on the project, tracing the evolution of the present ecology of Princess Charlotte Bay (Beaton 1985: 5):

Radiocarbon dating at Princess Charlotte Bay has focussed on determining the relative time frames and histories of aspects of the coastal ecology, especially the position of sealevel, the periodicity of chenier formation, the rate of mangrove
and mud flat progradation, and how these fit with the Aboriginal occupation history.

The use of geomorphological investigation in attempting to solve archaeological problems was very much in line with other key investigations undertaken elsewhere in Australia (e.g. Lampert and Hughes 1974). Beaton's interpretation provided a localised account of occupation in relation to the appearance (and disappearance) of shell resources within the Bay. He used this evidence to reject Lourandos' (1983) suggestion that changes in the archaeological record in the late Holocene could be interpreted as evidence for 'intensification' which resulted from changes in social forces. Beaton (1985) suggests that ecological factors such as those evident at Princess Charlotte Bay provide not only the framework or parameters for such change, but also their explanation. In so doing, Beaton presented an explicit statement of the ecological approach which is inherent in many Australian studies (cf. critique of this approach by Thomas 1981). Cribb and Minnegal (1989) have published work which shows how occupation events can be defined on a small deflated site at Princess Charlotte Bay. Cribb (1986a) had already pointed out some of the major shortcomings of Beaton's fieldwork and analyses.

Cribb (1986b) undertook work in western Cape York in conjunction with the ethnographic project undertaken by the South Australian Museum and the Aboriginal community of Arukun. This is one of the few long-term projects that has been undertaken within an Aboriginal community in Queensland. While Cribb's work is obviously influenced by his field experience, he unfortunately does not explore the implications of working within such contexts to any great extent.
In recent years, the early interest in the shell mounds of Cape York has been resurrected. This was prompted by the conflicting reactions of Comalco and the Napranam Aboriginal Corporation to Stone (1989) who suggested that cultural explanations for the mounds may not have taken into account the activities of scrub turkey or other megapodes. This provoked responses from Bailey (1991, 1993) who had previously worked on the mounds and Cribb (1991) who refuted Stone's assertion (see also Stone 1991).

At the southern end of Cape York, early work in the Laura area has been followed up by a number of authors. Flood and Horsfall (1986) undertook investigations at Green Ant and Ecidna shelters on the Koolburra Plateau, near Laura. Lilley (1986) examined the nature and distribution of surface sites on the Koolburra Plateau, using systematic sampling techniques. Morwood began working in the Laura area, undertaking reconnaissance fieldwork and negotiations with the Laura and Hopevale Aboriginal communities (Morwood and Davidson 1988; Morwood and Tresize 1989; Morwood 1990; see also Pearson 1989; Huchet 1990; Silvano 1992; Sutton 1989). Britnell (1991) carried out an archaeological survey at Cape Bedford in conjunction with the Hopevale Aboriginal community as part of a BA(Hons) project. Meanwhile, in the Mitchell-Palmer area, David (1992, 1994) undertook investigations as part of his PhD research for the University of Queensland. These were extended to the Mount Mulligan or Nullabarigan area.

Anderson and Robins (1988) conducted joint anthropological and archaeological research in the Bloomfield River area of south-eastern Cape York. Their work focused on a comparison of an ethnographic reconstruction of the economy and residence patterns in the latter half of
the last century with contemporary land and resource use. This was then compared with results from an archaeological survey undertaken with the aim of developing archaeological models and exploring the relationship between archaeological, ethnographic and historical evidence (Anderson and Robins 1988: 182).

In northern Cape York, research was undertaken for the present thesis, beginning in 1984 (see Greer 1989, 1994). In addition, joint anthropological-archaeological work has been undertaken in conjunction with the Injinoo community (Greer and Fuary 1987; Fuary and Greer 1993). McIntyre (1994, In Prep.) and McIntyre and Greer (1995) have also undertaken projects in this area. McIntyre's work, which forms the basis of her PhD thesis, is concerned with Aboriginal perspectives on what are generally considered to be 'European' sites (such as Somerset and World War II sites) in this region.

3.4.6 The Wet Tropics

In the rainforest, initial excavation by Campbell (1982b) was followed up by Horsfall (1983, 1984a, 1984b, 1987). This was aimed at unravelling the antiquity of occupation of the rainforest and the nature of occupation within this supposedly marginal environment. One of the most interesting outcomes of this work concerned the traditional management and use of resources (specifically toxic nuts such as the Queensland walnut) as a key to successful occupation of the rainforests. At this time, the idea that rainforests could not be occupied continuously by gatherer-hunters had been gaining ground both overseas and in Australia. Pentecost (1992) has carried out BA(Hons) thesis work on rock art conservation problems in the Wet Tropics and has since been working further with the Camu and Jumbun communities. Crothers (1995) has
just completed her BA(Hons) research on earth mounds in the same district.

3.4.7 Chillagoe and Mungana

Early research in the dry tropics was undertaken in 1980 by Campbell at Walkunder Arch Cave, near Chillagoe. This work was prompted by interest in the large limestone formations and the possibilities they held for preservation of archaeological remains of great antiquity (John Campbell, pers. comm.). This site has since proven to have an excavation deposit sequence that extends over approximately 16,000 years at least, with exceptionally well-preserved Holocene material (Campbell 1982; Campbell and Mardaga-Campbell 1993). The latter has been investigated by Mardaga-Campbell (1986, 1995) in her work on living-floors. Birkett (1983, 1985) undertook a site catchment analysis of the area around the Walkunder Arch site and David (1983, 1984) analysed faunal material from the Holocene layers at this site. In both instances, this work formed part of their BA(Hons) requirements at James Cook University and the Australian National University respectively. David (1990) began postgraduate work in the neighbouring area of Mungana and between Chillagoe and the Walsh River. This included surveys for open-air sites as well as analyses of rock art in the district for the Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage and his own research interests (David 1988, 1989, 1990, 1992; see also David and Cole 1990).

3.4.8 The Lawn Hill region (north-west Queensland)

Archaeological investigations into the north-west of the state have been undertaken by a number of researchers. The first systematic investigation of the area was undertaken by Hiscock and Hughes (1984).
The archaeological survey yielded a large number of sites, including Colless Creek Cave, which has both late Pleistocene and Holocene occupation layers (Hiscock and Hughes 1984: 118). Initial work was concerned with the examination of resource use over a long time period. Hiscock's doctoral research was then undertaken within this area (Hiscock 1984a, 1984b, 1986; see also Hall 1986). Hiscock (1984 b) appears to have had at least two major aims in the later research:

1. the identification and description of artefact assemblages within this region (Hiscock 1984a);
2. a comparison of prehistoric patterns of spatial organisation which focused on the factors which contributed to the selection of rock shelter sites within a restricted portion of the study area.

Robins and Trigger (1989) also conducted ethnoarchaeological research in this area, joining their respective expertise in archaeology and anthropology. More recently Gorecki et al. (1992) have reported on an archaeological survey on Esmeralda Station, in the hinterland of the Gulf of Carpentaria.

3.4.9 The Selwyn Ranges and the North Queensland Highlands

Morwood and Davidson (1988) reported on the initiation of fieldwork by Davidson in the Selwyn Ranges and the completion of Morwood's work in what he has termed the 'North Queensland Highlands'. Davidson's work was followed up by Sutton's doctoral research (Sutton, In Prep.) which included excavation at the rockshelter site of Cockatoo 2. BA(Hons) projects on metabasalt quarries were also undertaken by Simmons (1991) and Innes (1991) for James Cook University, Mount Isa Mines Pty. Ltd. and the Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage.
3.5 Conclusions: regions and themes in archaeological work in Queensland

It can be seen from this survey of archaeology in Queensland that much work has been done in establishing archaeological baselines in a number of regions. The archaeology of some regions (e.g. the southeast of the state) is now very well known. It can also be seen, however, that while several new regions have been investigated, much research has concentrated on the elaboration of a number of already established themes, e.g. coastal archaeology has had a long and continuing place in the archaeology of Queensland. Within some regions, e.g. the Herbert-Burdekin, there has been an attempt to refine the regional model that has been established. In other instances, evidence from adjacent regions such as Chillagoe, Mungana and Laura have provided comparative evidence (see David and Cole 1990).

Of key interest to the current thesis is the fact that most archaeological work in Queensland has not directly involved Aboriginal or Torres Strait communities, except where initial permission has been required to obtain permits to undertake research. Where joint anthropological-archaeological work has been undertaken, this has (with the exception of the present and associated projects) followed on from long-term anthropological investigations. In such instances, the initial relationship between the researchers and the community is established through the anthropologist's long-term association. Such instances are, however, rare. Moreover, they do not reflect the large amount of anthropological research that has been conducted in areas such as western and eastern Cape York, where anthropological projects have been running for more than two decades (e.g. Anderson 1984; Chase 1980; Sutton 1978; Taylor 1984; Von Sturmer 1978). It is also in spite the early work of McConnel,
Thomson, Sharp, Hale and Tindale and others previously described in this chapter.

Explaining this phenomena is the central concern of the following chapter (Chapter 4). While a number of factors undoubtedly play a role in explaining this, there is one important key to this explanation. This involves the political context within which many of Queensland's indigenous people lived until very recently. I refer specifically to the reserve system in Queensland and the links between the government department that administered this and the development of heritage management in this State. In the following chapter this relationship is described in relation to the absence of archaeological work in such areas.