Identity, history and heritage in northern Cape York

The connection between archaeological sites and identity is illustrated by Henrika Kuklick (1991) in the aptly titled paper, 'Contested Monuments: The Politics of Archaeology in Southern Africa'. Kuklick describes how the site of Great Zimbabwe has been used by successive regimes, from the days of Cecil Rhodes and the British South Africa company to modern Zimbabwe, which was established in 1980. She states that (1991: 138):

To every group that has made an icon of the ruins, they have been material evidence of a prosperous and powerful state that once held sway in the land. There, however, the resemblance between different groups' received histories of Great Zimbabwe ends. Seeking to legitimate their rule, British settlers and African nationalists subscribed to very different accounts of the building of the ruins, placing their construction alternatively in ancient times and the relatively recent past, and identifying the builders - or, at least the architects - either as representatives of some non-African civilization or members of the indigenous population. The stories of Great Zimbabwe have served to rationalize either colonial rule or African autonomy.

Until relatively recently, the notion of 'different accounts' has received scant attention in archaeology (but see Byrne 1993). This can perhaps be traced to the dominance of the 'New Archaeology' in many parts of the world over the last thirty years. The 'New Archaeology', with its scientific perspective and quest for objectivity combined with colonialist ideology to privilege archaeological interpretation over others. Certainly, archaeologists have been reluctant to analyse the relationship between archaeology and identity. If the subject has been discussed, it has generally focused on the theoretical obstacles involved in the use of archaeological evidence in identity construction (e.g. see Shennan
1989) or on the way in which archaeological interpretation has been used to positive effect by indigenous groups. But this latter point is debatable. For example, it has been suggested that archaeological interpretations, particularly the focus on pushing the occupation of the continent back into the past, have been 'useful' to indigenous people in Australia. It has also been claimed that archaeological work has helped in land claims (see Allen 1983: 9; Jones 1985: 23; Murray and White 1981). This has been touted as a social justification for archaeology, especially in the face of indigenous protest over the use of 'Our heritage [as] your playground' (Langford 1983). However, for many indigenous people, the notion of having to recourse to accounts of their culture that are perhaps more valued by non-indigenous people emphasises the colonial nature of their existence. Cowlishaw (1988: 104) has discussed the construction of Aboriginal identity in small towns in New South Wales. The alternative is surely to re-value indigenous accounts.

A major outcome of the work in northern Cape York was recognition of the (often implicit) links between archaeology and identity and the role of consultation in defining and perpetuating these. In the previous chapter, it is argued that identities have developed in response to the colonial and historical situations that people have experienced in this area. The main concern of this chapter is to explore ways in which archaeological sites are incorporated into northern Cape York ontology and identities. Firstly, however, it is necessary to discuss the notion of identity and how and why it is constructed.

10.1 What is 'identity'?

The notions of 'identity' and 'ethnicity' have been discussed by Fuary (1991: 3). She states that the establishment and maintenance of cultural identity is often a product of the type of social upheaval which sees the group transformed into a minority and the conditions of their subsequent existence oppressive. Fuary
(1991: 3) states that:

During this process culture may be recreated and tradition redefined in response to new and changed conditions. This cultural identity may be ascribed or self-defined...through utilisation of a number of shared covert and overt symbolic cultural elements. While these symbolic elements, such as language, shared ancestry, beliefs, diet, dress and shared experience, need to be agreed upon by members of the cultural group, they are not always obvious or accessible to out-group members...

Tonkinson (1990: 199-201) has attempted to define terms such as 'Aboriginality' and 'Aboriginal identity', which she states are 'widely used', but 'seldom defined'. In attempting to do so, she draws on the writings of a number of Aboriginal people and social scientists and states that (1990: 200):

They identify the following characteristics as common to all Australian Aborigines: descent from the original inhabitants of Australia; a shared historical and cultural experience, particularly that arising from relations with non-Aborigines; the Dreaming, or Aboriginal worldview; intimate familial relationship with the land and with the natural world; social interaction based predominantly on the mutual obligations of kinship; observance and social importance of mortuary rituals; and bi- or multilingualism.

Tonkinson (1990: 193) notes that identity exists at a number of levels and discusses two of these. The first is the identities of local or regional groups who '...share history, culture, and social organization'. The second is the more recent notion of pan-Aboriginal identity. While these two represent the two extremes in terms of identity, in some areas, individuals may subscribe to a number of identities that are invoked in particular contexts. They are not mutually exclusive.— For example, contemporary local groups may be constituted by what were once missions or reserves (see also Ellis 1994: 7). In Queensland, communities are often made up of people from different
traditional groups draw together by common historical experiences and situations. Thus, a number of identities may exist even at the local level. This concept of difference and similarity, and the contexts within which one might invoke different identities is of particular relevance to a discussion of contemporary identity in northern Cape York. The shared historical experience of the reserve also provides northern Cape York people with a common basis on which to maintain contemporary communities and social structure.

10.2 Archaeology and identity

There has been little discussion of the relationship between archaeology (and archaeological sites) and identity. Issues of relevance to such a discussion include different approaches to the past and the conflicts that are an inherent component of these, as well as issues of ownership and control of heritage. These issues are discussed to some extent in McBryde (1985) and in three of the four relevant volumes in the One World Archaeology Series: Layton (1989 a, 1989 b) and Cleere (1989). Shennan (1989), the fourth in this series offers the only explicit discussion of this relationship, although this is limited to theoretical problems of inferring identity or ethnicity from archaeological interpretation.

McBryde (1985) provides a comparatively early examination of different notions of 'ownership' of the past, chiefly but not exclusively within the Australian setting (exceptions include Trigger 1985). Most notable are the conflicts inherent in the differing approaches expressed by, for example, Mulvaney (1985) and Wilmott (1985) and the role played by some in heritage agencies, such as in tempering this conflict (Sullivan 1985). Layton (1989 a) illustrates the diversity of ways of looking at the past, both in terms of geography and ontology. For example, Anawak (1989) describes Inuit perceptions of the past; Ndagala and Zengu (1989) relate the approach of the
Hadzabe of Africa; and Williams and Mununggurr (1989) describe the Yolnu (north-east Arnhem Land) understanding of the past. What is noted, but not treated in detail, are the implications of these alternative approaches to the past in terms of archaeology (and archaeological sites) and heritage management. Where such conflicts between indigenous versus archaeological approaches to the past are identified (e.g. in Williams and Mununggurr 1989), the analysis is deflected to another volume edited by Layton (1989 b) and to a particular (and comparatively small) area of archaeological work: the excavation and analysis of skeletal material. The importance of archaeological sites is explained in terms of their role as '...signifiers, tangible embodiments of shared values and ideas' and the (perhaps reasonable) assumption that 'A community's interest in the remains of the past is therefore unlikely to be casual' (Layton 1989: 11). It is obvious from these volumes that indigenous expressions of the past are intimately linked with notions of identity.

What should follow from Layton (1989 a, 1989 b) is a discussion addressing the role of archaeology when confronted with such alternatives. Such was the intention for the two volumes edited by Shennan (1989) and Cleere (1989). Shennan (1989) confines the discussion of identity largely to the theoretical concerns outlined previously. As McBayde (1992: 262) has observed:

The obverse of this is the use of archaeology in the validation of political and national perceptions of identity. Past material culture may acquire powerful symbolic values.

In so doing, the contemporary political concerns associated with the relationship between archaeology and identity are neatly side-stepped, and an 'in-house' debate offered instead. This is disappointing for although the theoretical discussion is important and necessary, it is not essentially new to archaeology. A more interesting discussion following on from issues identified in Who Needs the Past and Conflicts in the Archaeology of Living Traditions (Layton 1989 a, 1989 b) might have focused on current notions of 'heritage' and heritage
management and the way in which alternative approaches to the past (perhaps as well as archaeology) can be used in the construction of identity. The title of Cleere's (1989) *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World* offered promise of just such a discussion. However, as Byrne (1991: 271) has commented:

In *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World* ...several articles addressing general management issues - mostly by Europeans and Americans - are followed by papers dealing with the problems faced in particular countries or at particular sites. Despite the diversity of local circumstances it is clear that a fundamentally similar approach to heritage management has been taken in most countries and it seems equally clear, to my mind at least, that this approach is essentially the one which was developed in Europe and America.

Byrne (1991: 273) finds that there is no discussion as to why this particular construction of heritage is '...necessary or appropriate in these places or how they relate to local cultural values'. In this paper he calls for 'alternative heritages and alternative models of heritage management' in order to address such issues (Byrne 1991: 273). In the following sections, the connections between identity and archaeological sites are discussed.

### 10.3 Archaeological sites and identity in northern Cape York

In previous chapters it is illustrated that there are many identities in northern Cape York. These are perhaps contextual, drawn from a historical backdrop which has, until the present day, alternated between the distancing and uniting of people who now live within this region. In this section however the connections between land, cosmology and identity are discussed in relation to the archaeological sites along the East Coast strip which were chosen for excavation in the original project. The aim is to demonstrate how cosmology operates to affirm notions of identity and how this is reinforced through
everyday practice. This is then analysed in the light of the original proposal to add an archaeological interpretation of the sites that are found in this 'cultural landscape'.

The term, 'cultural landscape' is defined, as previously stated, as a portion of land which is given shape and meaning through the stories, beliefs and practices of the group that is currently resident on it, or who have ownership of it. These stories, beliefs and practices may stem from precontact situations but have been transformed by historical (and especially colonial) experiences and may now pertain to a broader group. This is in contrast to some definitions of this term which refer to 'archaeological sites' within a landscape. In the former instance, archaeological sites may be present, but their meaning or significance is expressed through the role they play within the local cosmology.

It is suggested that it is the contemporary cosmology of northern Cape York peoples that provides a social 'glue' which allows these people from different backgrounds and experiences, and who have been pushed apart to some extent by more recent historical events, to continue effectively sharing their land and their lives. The northern Cape York communities are now linked by marriage and kin. However, at the ideological level, their shared cosmology facilitates the construction of a shared identity, while reinforcing 'traditional' identities which are the basis of these ideas. This is illustrated in the East Coast strip (see Chapters 6-8) where there is a general acceptance of beliefs and practices related to this area.

10.3.1 Links with the past

Injinoo people have links with the precontact past in a number of ways. These include their tribal affiliations, through kinship and family connections, their traditional languages (although these are neither widely spoken nor known),
through recollections about technology, food, medicine and societal rules, and through the various relationships that people have with land (Fuary and Greer 1993). The latter include hunting, gathering and fishing activities which still comprise an important component of the community's domestic economy, but are intimately tied, as is any use of land, with beliefs, stories and sites or places of significance. Aspects of the more recent past are also important and include the establishment and history of the village, the development of Creole as the first language, recent cultural additions etc. It is, however, the associations with land that form a strong link between past and present, for these have survived (albeit perhaps developed and changed) the rigours of dislocation, relocation and the long period of incarceration by church and government.

This analysis is focused on one set of beliefs that are associated with that strip of the east coast and hinterland which extends from the vicinity of the Kennedy inlet and Jackey Jackey Creek to Somerset. It includes a discussion of the stories, beliefs and important places in this area in order to illustrate its importance to the community and, I would suggest, in the construction of their identity. This is contrasted, in a later section, with the archaeological knowledge and potential of the area. The boundaries of this area (especially its inland extent) cannot be accurately defined, but at least some of the beliefs that are broadly associated with the area appear also to relate to the scrub around Lockerbie. Thus, the 'East Coast strip' represents the eastern half of this long narrow peninsula (see Figure 2).

10.3.2 Stories, beliefs and practices on the East Coast strip
As outlined in Chapters 6 to 8, there are a number of stories and beliefs that are associated with the East Coast strip. This area is associated with the Wamera story, in which the landscape is created by the boy who followed a northwards route from near Jackey Jackey Creek, disappearing into the earth and leaving a
pool of water behind him wherever he re-emerged. The story culminates in the boy's emergence at Somerset and the creation of the passage between the mainland and Albany Island (see Chapter 6; see also Fuary and Greer 1993 and Figure 2). Certainly, this watery strip of coast, with its lakes and waterholes and springs that bubble up on the beach affirms this explanation for the creation of the landscape.

In previous chapters it was established that this area is believed to be inhabited by malevolent supernatural beings. People within the communities are afraid of these beings and believe that a confrontation with them will result in 'madness'. Certainly, a number of people within the communities are said to have 'looked' these beings and the area around Fishbone Swamp is known to be particularly dangerous for this reason. In addition, specific areas along the East Coast strip are thought to be places where the spirits of the dead now live. Because of these beliefs, northern Cape York people are wary of these sites. For example, when we were camping at Sandago (just prior to Mr Lifu joining us in 1986) we were asked on several occasions if we had had any 'trouble' out at the camp. At first, I assumed that these were references to the large groups of tourists that passed this way, as I had been somewhat apprehensive of camping in such an isolated spot. However, I later became aware that the question stemmed from an incredulity that we should choose such a potentially dangerous place to camp!

There is an emotional element to the beliefs associated with these sites. This is illustrated by the fears and concerns that people have when visiting the area and in the methods they used to control these. During our first formal introduction to the site, the speaker called out in language to the 'old people'. He told them who we were and what we were doing, and that we meant to help, not harm. We were told that such introductions are sometimes associated
with visions and apparitions. Certainly this ceremony, taking place in an almost lunar landscape of bleached eroding dunes, was very moving.

The large midden sites that we worked on at Sandago are said to be the camps of such spirits and the 'fireplaces' that we excavated are thought to be their fireplaces. This focus on the 'fireplaces' led me to examine the notion of these as symbols. McConnel (1931: 103) states that to the Wik Munkan, the campfire was a powerful symbol which suggested processes and institutions. She says:

The camp fire is the centre of family life, around which a man and his wife, or wives, and children sleep and feed. Convention guards the approach to the camp fire. Certain relatives are welcomed, others are tabooed. The arrangement of camp fires depends upon the relationship of the families to one another - some relatives may camp close, others only at a distance.

And again, in *Myths of the Munkan* (1957: 62) she reiterates:

Not only does fire give light in darkness and heat for cooking food, but the camp-fire is the hearth of the home round which a family sleeps and eats together. For a man and woman to sit and eat by the same fire is the ritual of marriage, and the symbol of the family; the word for husband is *pamtu:ma* or 'man of the fire', and for wife is *wantyatu:ma*, 'woman of the fire'.

For example, its physical presence signified the complex social and economic activities which surround the procurement, preparation and consumption of food. It was embued with memories of the families who, at least for a season or two, claimed the space around this focal point. It was evocative of relationships, of the marriages that were made around it and of the networks of kin with their associated conventions and taboos. Even the location of the campfire in relation to others confirmed one's place within this entangled web of relationships. It is perhaps not surprising that these 'features' we were excavating evoked such strong images of the people who are said to use them.
These sites are linked with the nearby lakes: the spirits occupying the latter by day and the coastal sites at night. This represents another link between past and present, because we had been told during the anthropological project that before contact the movement between the lakes and the coast was part of the seasonal shift. It is interesting to note how the seasonal shift has been collapsed into the diurnal in this story.

Another important aspect of this story is related to the continuation or practice of beliefs. When I was first told this story, I imagined that it had literally been taken from a body of knowledge that existed in precontact times. It was some time before it occurred to me that while the general substance of the story undoubtedly has its origins in the past, it is the continuation of the business of story creation, the practice of beliefs that I was witnessing in this case. This is not to say that just anyone has such rights today; rather, the 'speakers' have something of a mandate to continue this practice. This is an important point as the continuation of such practices is surely the embodiment of contemporary culture and identity.

These places and the paths between them encapsulate the concept of 'bifortaim'. This is, broadly speaking, an 'other' period that exists in the interstices of the present. This includes both the past (what might be termed the 'pre-contact' period) as well as the present, through beliefs and the practices such as formal introduction to country which provide access to the spirits. In such areas, one must be careful not to call out in anger or to swear at this country as this would invite trouble. One should 'chuck' something (that is, make a gift of a cigarette, food, the first catch of fish if this is the purpose of the trip etc.) when in this country. These beliefs and practices are not only adhered to by people from Injinoo. Members of other communities are similarly aware, at some level, of these beliefs and the necessity, when visiting this area, to engage in appropriate
behaviours and practices. As such, these beliefs represent an important component of the contemporary cosmology of northern Cape York peoples, and they are perhaps a major component of that which has survived in this area. They are derived from the past, stemming from the beliefs of individual traditional groups (in this case, the Sandbeach people). However, they are generally subscribed to by all communities in this area. As such, they represent a thread from which the contemporary identity of northern Cape York peoples is woven while at the same time reinforcing the authority of the traditional owners.

10.3.3 Sites of memory: the sad history of Sandago

This association between the sites and the dead has an historical poignancy which infuses the memory of the last occupiers of these sites. According to local story, these people were massacred by Frank Jardine shortly after the establishment of Somerset. They are said to be buried close by. A similar version of this story is told by Kennett, one of the unfortunate missionaries sent to Somerset in 1867 by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (Moore 1979:238). Kennett, however, relates the demise of the Unduyamo (and most of the Gumakudin, the Cape York people) at the hands of the fierce Yadhaigana from the Escape River. Casting aside the specifics of historical fact, it seems that a large number of these people were lost in a single tragic episode. This occurred in the twilight which preceded an era of alienation for northern Cape York peoples. The poignancy of this episode is encapsulated in the cold fireplaces which are evident on the sites today and is another thread that is woven into the contemporary belief that these are the campsites of the spirits of the dead.

10.3.4 Sites as monuments of identity

It is, however, the relevance of these symbols to people in the present that is of
most relevance to this discussion. Initially, upon realising the symbolic aspect of these sites, my first reaction was that I had somehow stumbled upon a very complicated set of sites. I now think that similar circumstances would apply to any major archaeological site or complex and that there is a relationship between the presence of such sites and the continuity of stories, beliefs and practices that allow people to deal with these.

These stories, beliefs and practices are part of the everyday cognitive schema of northern Cape York peoples. As such, they are a well-spring of local identity and an important source of empowerment. The maintainence of beliefs, practices and stories, and the ability to continue creating stories affirms a sense of what it is to be 'Sandbeach', to be from Injinoo and at another level, to be from northern Cape York.

These sites also serve as text for the colonial history of northern Cape York. The tragic passing of the people of Sandago coincided with the beginning of a bloody period and the end of life as it had previously been known. Interestingly, the size and quantity of material on the sites is vastly exaggerated by the process of deflation which was probably initiated by the introduction of hard-hooved animals at Somerset. It would seem then, that as the oral accounts of this episode fade, the physical evidence has been revealed.

One of the most interesting aspects of these sites and specifically of the fireplaces is the way in which they were incorporated into the existing cosmological framework. This highlights the dynamic nature of 'stories' in northern Cape York and emphasises the contemporary relevance of the cultural landscape. Perhaps these ordinary symbols, that is the campsites and campfires of these vanished peoples, became the spark for those stories and beliefs that have survived, against the odds, into the present. The sites might therefore be
seen as mnemonic devices which revive the memory of those who once occupied them. As such, they are the very visible and real evidence of myth, story and history entering the present. Feeley-Harnik (1991: 40), writing on 'Finding memories in Madagascar' has stated that:

Memory is associated with places, often burial places, in many parts of the world. In contemporary Madagascar, these places are the fertile, rocky ground where the living join with the dead to form ancestries, lest they die out together.

I suggest that in northern Cape York, these sites are places where 'the living join with the dead to form ancestries'. Moreover, those who do not directly participate in this (i.e. those who do not have traditional affiliations to this area), recognise, respect and share these beliefs. In doing so, they legitimise traditional ownership and are part of the process of forging new identities based on shared experience.

10.4 Conclusion: monuments in a cultural landscape

In previous chapters, the links between these stories, beliefs and practices and the construction and maintenance of identities were illustrated. This chapter has been largely concerned with developing a view of the 'archaeological' sites on the East Coast that incorporates their role as elements of local identity. I have attempted to show that these 'middens' are symbols of this enduring 'past'. They are monuments within the cultural landscape and the theatrical 'props' which stimulate the continuing practice of culture.

This has many implications for archaeology and heritage management in this country. It calls into question contemporary notions within the archaeological community about the relationship between archaeology and heritage and the way in which 'archaeological sites' are perceived and assessed in relation to this. These points are further addressed in Chapter 11.
Alternative approaches to archaeology and heritage management

The provocatively titled *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous Values and Archaeology* (Layton 1989 b) suggests that there is some question as to whether those who are not engaged in the business of archaeology are at all interested in the 'past'. While there is an emphasis on the description of indigenous perceptions of the past in this volume (e.g. Williams and Mununggurr 1989), some authors (e.g. Ndagala and Zengu 1989; Nwana 1989; Raharijaona 1989; Chase 1989) are at least somewhat concerned with showing the potential links between such perceptions and archaeological interpretations. In the same volume, Stone (1989: 195) expresses concern with the gap between archaeological interpretations and public perceptions of the past. He states that:

This chapter argues that professional archaeologists in Britain (both academic and field-based) do not take enough notice of the perceptions of the past held by the public.

Stone's answer in terms of narrowing this gap is to provide the public (particularly school children) with information concerning archaeological 'material and ideas'. In other words, this gap can be narrowed by educating the public in archaeological interpretations of the past. What is missing in this volume is an explicit discussion of the way in which archaeological perceptions of 'the past' can be changed by educating archaeologists on the perceptions of indigenous and other groups.

The major concern of this chapter is to examine the way in which the perceptions of people in northern Cape York have changed my own
perceptions of the past. This includes the development of an alternative approach to archaeology, which I have termed 'Community-based archaeology' (Greer and Fuary 1987; Greer 1989), and perhaps more importantly, the application of this approach in heritage management. The aim in exploring these is not to replace traditional approaches, but rather to offer alternatives. The approaches that are outlined here are suggested only within the context within which they were developed and these specific models should not be seen as a 'recipe' that can be uncritically applied elsewhere. The broader contribution of these models lies, however, in the implication that such alternatives are possible, necessary and desirable and in the suggestion that research into this area is legitimate, especially in terms of emerging areas within heritage management (e.g. Byrne 1993).

11.1 Community-based archaeology

The primary concern of Community-based archaeology is the use of archaeological research in the construction of indigenous identity. Thus, this approach does not aim to satisfy needs within the discipline, unless these (happily) coincide. This may best be explained by recourse to the original thesis topic. In 1984, my research topic was centred around evaluating the evidence for socio-economic intensification in northern Cape York. As such, it was an attempt to enter a major debate that was emerging at the time the project was initiated (see Lourandos 1983, 1984, 1985; Beaton 1983, 1985; Cribb 1986). In this sense, the research was 'timely and specific' as advocated by Bowdler (1981, 1984) and addressed a debate that was current within the discipline. In contrast, the focus in a community-based archaeological approach is on determining community needs, particularly in relation to the development of identity, and in defining a research project that can address these.
Between 1984 and 1987, the Injinoo community had several specific needs which, when defined, were met to some extent by the initiation of the Cowal Creek Country Project. It has been argued in other parts of the thesis that the need to record traditional affiliations, life histories, genealogies, stories and songs was a significant motivation for the community to agree to the original archaeological research. The importance of recording such information lies in its potential in the construction of not only individual identities for particular traditional groups, but in determining what is constituted by 'Injinoo' and 'northern Cape York' identities today.

11.1.1 History and explanation of the term 'community-based archaeology'

This term was first used by the author in a conference paper at the Townsville ANZAAS Congress (Greer and Fuary 1987) and further refined in a second paper delivered at the Australian Archaeological Association Conference at Mildura (Greer 1989). Since this time, it has been somewhat loosely used to refer to archaeological work undertaken either with, or for, Aboriginal people and communities. In contrast to such definitions, 'Community-based archaeology', as I have defined it, has specific principles which govern research and which distinguish this approach from that of others.

The use of 'community-based' within this term has several interrelated functions. The term 'community' in relation to Aboriginal and Torres Strait people has attracted some criticism, particularly in terms of the government's role in the development of these. Use of the term in this instance does not address such arguments. Rather, it follows current usage of the term within the communities of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island people in northern Cape York and inherently recognises the historical processes that have produced these. It also acknowledges the cultural and
historical complexity of these communities and that connections between
them has resulted a new social dynamic. For example, the pattern of social
and kin relationships have changed as a result of this. While there is an
important interest in primary tribal affiliation, the complexity of social
relationships in subsequent times has meant that an individual may have
many lines of affiliation that cannot be drawn within precontact parameters.
Much discussion at the workshop held in August 1987 at Injinoo involved a
reckoning of such lines of affiliation, with older members of the community
providing younger members with guidance in this (see Chapter 8). One of
the strongest message that emerged from the fieldwork in northern Cape
York was that while the revival of interest in primary 'tribal' affiliation was
welcomed, the community had, and wanted to retain, a strong identity as
'Injinoo'. Within a broader context, the various communities have, in
addition, a collective identity as 'northern Cape York people'.

Given this complexity, it is difficult to conceive of an approach that centres
only on one specific group without reference to the others. Such an
approach might well provoke rivalries and feed factional disputes and is
potentially destructive in terms of community cohesion and, ultimately,
identity. As the broad aim of Community-based archaeology is to assist in
the construction of community identity, the targeting of only particular
groups within a community would not be undertaken under this banner.
By putting the community first, any such disputes can be played out within
the community, without the intervention of outside interests or agenda.

11.1.2 Principles of community-based approach
As was stated previously, the primary aim of a community-based approach
is to define a role for archaeological research in the definition and
construction of community identities. In order to achieve this, a central
concern is the development of a dialogue between community and researcher that not only provides the point of initiation for the project, but which can be embedded in it. This differs from notions of 'consultation' (even multi-stage consultation) and 'participation' in that these, at best, describe a process whereby Aboriginal or Island people share in the archaeological discourse. As suggested in Chapter 9 'consultation' is a reactionary process, that is, one is able to react to proposals or propositions. In a community-based approach, the proposals are developed as an integral component of research by both the researchers and those on whose heritage the research is based.

There are, however, several requirements for the development of this dialogue. Firstly, the researcher may be obliged to undertake negotiations at a number of levels. This may be ultimately aimed at defining the persons or groups with whom to undertake further negotiation (the 'speakers' in northern Cape York), as well as determining those elements within the community that form the basis of contemporary identity. The outcome of these negotiations should be the definition of research questions that are acceptable to both the community and the researcher, and the development of an agreed code of methods and practices. As illustrated in Chapter 9, this is in contrast to the process of conventional consultation which has focused on the delineation of unacceptable practices, but does not address the issue of the questions being researched.

Communication between the researcher and the community can only be empowering to the community if it is predicated on excellent communications. Communications can be defined in at least two broad areas. Firstly, there is the somewhat straightforward issue of language. For example, while many Aboriginal people are multilingual, and usually speak
English, communication should be undertaken in the language which is most empowering for each particular community. In northern Cape York, Creole is the first language of most people and the lingua franca of the broader region which extends northwards across the Torres Strait and southwards to other Cape York communities. As such, it is likely to be the most empowering language for the communities of this region. If the researcher is unable to speak the appropriate language, an interpreter could be used or alternatively, one could choose to work with an anthropologist who has worked in the region and who has the appropriate language, experience and other skills.

The second dimension of communication involves the domain in which consultation should take place. Again, like language, the domain should be that which is most empowering for the community. As defined in previous chapters, the village domain (rather than the Council Office) offered the best opportunity for empowerment in the work undertaken in this project. The general point to be made here is that in a community-based approach, such issues should be dealt with in the initial stages of work. Again, working with an anthropologist who has had experience in the region should assist in this process. Given the nature of anthropological research, and the requirement to spend considerable periods of time in the field, an anthropologist who has worked with the community (or even in the general region) should be able to define the original domain and facilitate discussions in the appropriate domain. In the present project, the language skills and expertise of the anthropologist with whom I worked allowed negotiations between the community and me to enter what I have called the 'village domain'. The connection between language and entry to this domain cannot be underestimated, although proficiency in Creole alone would not necessarily have ensured that this would have taken place.
11.1.3 Decision-making within the dialogue

In a community-based approach, there are decisions to be made at every stage of the project. In the initial stages, there are issues to resolve such as the definition of appropriate and mutually beneficial research questions. The parameters of ownership and dissemination of the material collected should be established and the nature and level at which specific community members will be involved. At deeper stages of the research, complex issues concerning the contribution of archaeological research to the construction of identity(ies) are discussed and decisions made. These are discussed in the following sections.

Definition of research questions

The community-based approach draws research questions from both the interests of the researcher and the community. This does not necessarily mean that the researcher goes into the community with a 'blank slate'. Where this is the case, anthropological expertise plays an important role in the defining and interpreting areas of interest to the community(ies). However, if anthropological research has previously documented genealogical information, relationships to land, stories, contemporary beliefs etc., this might provide a basis for initiating discussions concerning the nature of research.

The parameters of ownership and the dissemination of cultural property

In the early stages of research arrangements concerning the ownership of material produced in the project should be determined between the researcher and the community. Similarly, the issues of the extent to which such information can be disseminated and the conditions under which this can occur should be outlined (see also Veth 1991: 65). These are complex
problems which should take into account both the skills, expertise and rights of all participants (including the researcher).

It may be necessary to establish structures to deal with these problems. The proposal for the Injinoo Land Trust was partly in response to the need for a body that could direct and oversee matters of cultural importance. More recently, the establishment of the Apudhama Association has taken on this role. Its broad base of elders from a number of the communities recognises the historical and cultural complexity of northern Cape York and symbolises the emerging collective identity of peoples from this area. It was perceived as being necessary to separate Apudhama’s role from that of the general administration and co-ordination of the community, which is undertaken by the community council. Community councils in Queensland are established by a political process which replicates that of the dominant society. Councillors may therefore be younger people, elected for their administrative skills, but who may not have the cultural links and expertise of senior members of the community. Councils are not necessarily representative of all cultural groups present in the communities and, because of the political nature of their formation, could well represent only limited factions. For all of these reasons, the councils may not be the most appropriate body to deal with cultural matters.

Community involvement

One of the most important, and sometimes problematic decisions involves defining who can and should participate in various stages of the discourse. In an ideal situation, such information would be widely known within the community and the researcher would be directed towards the appropriate individuals and groups. In areas that have suffered significant removal and dislocation, this will not be straightforward. Anderson (1986:
306) suggests that of the 14 Aboriginal communities listed in his 1984 survey, only half were made up of a 'local population'. The latter however is something of a misnomer as it defines the general region from which the community was drawn rather than the diversity of cultural groups. Each of the seven communities made up of a local population comprises a number of different, and at times, competing, groups.

In this sense, Injinoo is predominantly a local population, with community members being drawn from people whose traditional lands extended as far south as Port Musgrave on the west coast and Cape Grenville on the east coast. In addition, some of the Island people who live in the community, especially those who can trace their links to Muri may be seen as representing the northernmost extent of this local population. However, the establishment of other communities in northern Cape York (Bamaga, Seisia, Umagico and New Mapoon) has provided a social environment of great complexity which is exacerbated by the fact that northern Cape York people can be found living elsewhere. Often, the proposal of a project provides the catalyst for community negotiations in relation to this. This can be an exciting process, however the possibility of contested ownership and the time required to negotiate agreements have to be written into such a project.

Secondly, in such cases, the project is often (again) the catalyst for the establishment of an appropriate process for dealing with such matters. Initial contact, as in the present project, may be with community councils. However, more specific work, involving local information or landscapes that are associated with particular groups or individuals should only be discussed with those individuals who have traditional links or custodial responsibilities for such areas.
In the present process, both the definition of ownership and the establishment of a process to deal with cultural matters occurred as the project unfolded. Moreover, the project itself changed direction significantly over the same period of time. The definition of traditional links and associations and locating Injinoo families, groups and individuals was a large, time-consuming but necessary component of the Cowal Creek Country Survey, which was itself a response to this change of direction. In the future, the draft register of Injinoo people and their connections to traditional groups has been prepared by Fuary (1993) and the report by Fuary and Greer (1993) will provide important tool for the community to use in relation to this decision-making process. A point that needs stressing, however, is that these difficulties were experienced within a community that is perceived to be located in close proximity to their traditional lands. How much more difficult must it be where people have been relocated and traditional groups scattered from one end of this large State to another.

11.1.4 Problems with the community-based approach

While there is much to recommend the community-based approach, there are some problems which should be addressed. Firstly, some archaeologists may reject an approach that acknowledges external control of research directions. Arguments surrounding the importance of 'academic freedom' and the dangers of such external, especially political control have been used in the past against such notions. However, there are several points to be made in relation to this.

Firstly, there is a vast difference between the use of archaeology to promote the particular aspirations of a ruling class or dominant sector and a community-based approach which has a very limited sphere of influence and control. Indeed, it has been argued that it is the scientific or
archaeological construction of the past that has served these nationalistic goals. For example, Trigger (1984) has illustrated the connections between interpretations of the past and nationalist agenda. Fowler (1987) provides three examples (Mexico from around A.D. 900 to the present, Britain from approximately A.D. 1500 to the present and the People's Republic of China since 1949) in which archaeology has served 'nationalistic goals and ideologies'. Byrne (1993 has discussed the way in which the appropriation of Aboriginal cultures has been used in the construction of national identity. He (1993: 236-237) states that:

The 'traditional' Aboriginal culture thus mediates between the settlers and the soil. In the process of becoming what I have called 'the new natives', white Australians have testified 'traditional' Aboriginal culture as a source of national authenticity. The stark reality of contemporary Aboriginal lives always threatens, however, to break into this construct with the truth (of deaths in custody, violence on the North Queensland reserves, or simply with the truth of modern, innovative, urban Aboriginality). Herein lies the construct's instability. The importance of Aboriginal 'archaeological' heritage may reside in its apparent, inherent, stability.

A community-based approach, by definition, is not aimed at producing an account of the past which serves 'pan-Aboriginal' interests. Rather, it attempts to facilitate control over matters of culture and heritage at the (comparatively) micro-social level of the local community. Any commonality of interest amongst these communities must then be treated, in democratic terms, as having an honest and legitimate basis. Clearly, a community-based approach to the past which focuses on localised elements of identity and heritage is the opposite of those which facilitate nationalistic pursuits.

Secondly, the development of this approach does not presuppose that it should or would become the only approach to archaeological research in this
country. Therefore, any political bias that could result from the use of this or similar approaches could be countered by more traditional archaeological research.

In addition to the more philosophical considerations, there are a number of pragmatic and methodological problems that should be discussed. Firstly, as outlined above, the Community-based approach is heavily dependent upon anthropological expertise and/or previous work. This can be achieved by working with an anthropologist, as was the case with the Cowal Creek Country Survey. However, this approach has considerable organisational problems and requires significant amounts of time, a factor which was significant in delaying the final presentation of the present thesis. Alternatively, an archaeologist wishing to use the Community-based approach could elect to undertake research within a community for which a considerable amount of anthropological work has already been undertaken. Certainly, this is the case in western Cape York (for example, Sutton 1978; Von Sturmer 1978; Taylor 1984) and in eastern Cape York (Anderson 1984; Chase 1980). However, this approach is dependent on the co-operation and support of the anthropologists who were responsible for the earlier work and so is not without its own organisational problems. The advantages of this method lie in that, to some extent, the work of defining and interpreting community perspectives and values for the archaeologist may have already been undertaken. Moreover, if at least the initial work is undertaken with the anthropologist, potential language and other communication problems could in part be overcome. A major disadvantage lies in the difficulty of establishing and maintaining a research relationship between the anthropologist and archaeologist. This is perhaps especially problematic given the current trend to distance these two disciplines.
One of the areas that is most problematic in terms of the application of a community-based approach is that of consultancy work, and especially Environmental Impact Studies (EIS) that are associated with development. In such instances, the major problem is again the amount of time required to initiate and undertake, even under the best of circumstances, a Community-based approach. These types of consultancies generally allow only a limited amount of time for EIS work, which renders this approach unworkable. However, EIS work represents a major portion of archaeological work in this country in terms of the preliminary survey, location, recording and assessment of sites. As such, it is probably this area, more than others, that would benefit from adopting a Community-based or similar type of approach. This issue is more fully explored in the following section.

11.2 A community-based approach to heritage

A cornerstone of the community-based approach revolves around the way in which archaeological work can contribute to the construction of identities, rather than the production of a piece of research that might play such a role. Thus, once traditional affiliations and an appropriate process have been determined, a community-based approach focuses on the definition of specific elements of identity that have been retained by each group, or which have been developed by the community as a whole. In northern Cape York, the stories, beliefs and practices that are associated with Sandago tend to be best known by those who have specific traditional links with this area. However, a belief in the presence of supernatural beings is woven into the fabric of collective community identity. While other groups may not have specific knowledge of this place, their recognition, respect and perhaps especially fear of the forces that operate here suggest that this is an important element not only for ‘Sandbeach’ and ‘Injinoo’ identities, but for
that of a collective northern Cape York identity.

At the end of 1987, it seemed that the greatest contemporary significance in the sites at Sandago lay in the way in which they articulated with the cosmological, ontological and historical factors and the way in which these became part of a framework of identities. My initial response to this was that the management of these sites and their definition in these terms was therefore a more important consideration than exploiting their somewhat limited research potential. In line with this, I felt that it was this which was the major contribution of the Community-based approach. An example of this can be seen in the implementation of the Somerset Conservation Plan undertaken in this area by McIntyre (1994). This plan was developed on behalf of the Injinoo community in order to address the problems of management at the Somerset, particularly in relation to high levels of tourist activity. A community-based approach is being used in this project in the following ways:

1. to determine the levels of 'ownership' or 'custodianship' of the site and surrounding landscape within the community and to define individuals and groups that should be included in the decision-making process;
2. to determine the significance of the site and the landscape in which it is located to such individuals and groups, and to the community as a whole;
3. to define an appropriate conservation zone on the basis of information obtained above;
4. to determine the appropriateness of particular management practices and techniques within this context (Susan McIntyre, pers. comm.).
11.2.1 Definitions of heritage

More recently, however, this link between sites and identity has provoked a broader rethinking of the notion of 'heritage' both within and beyond this project. While Stone (1989) deplores the gap between archaeologists' and ordinary peoples' perceptions of the past and seeks to fill this with education in archaeological thought, the community-based approach embraces non-archaeological perceptions and seeks to incorporate these into the definition and management of heritage. An important element of this discussion is the separation of the areas of 'archaeology' and 'heritage management'. In the west, these have often been conflated such that when Stone (1989) talks about archaeologists in Britain ignoring the perceptions of the past held by the public, he is referring to the fact that the public have not been well provided with archaeological interpretations. The community-based approach, as defined for northern Cape York, privileges non-archaeological perceptions because of the role that they play in the construction of local identities.

The origin of the contrast in these approaches can be seen in the different conceptions of 'heritage'. The community-based approach sees 'heritage' as a range of elements of culture that can be seen as the birthright of some groups (see also Greer 1994). This birthright is not based on the scientific demonstration of a continuous heritage that extends into the distant past, but rather the contemporary and historical associations between places and/or landscapes and people. In this sense, the community-based approach is based on a different perception of the role of timeframes. Most archaeology, including contemporary heritage management, is based on obtaining temporal frameworks. For example, a knowledge of where a site can be placed in relation to this is an important component in the assessment of its scientific significance. In contrast, the community-based approach stresses
contemporaneous associations with sites in which the past plays a role but is not the most important factor in its significance. Underlying this difference is perhaps the fact that we are dealing with different approaches to time. Greer (1994: 196) has provided a generalised description of Australian Aboriginal approaches to time:

> Just as language links people in space, Dreaming links people through time and space.
>
> It is a spiritual sphere or eternal life that exists in the interstices of normal secular life and is based on a concept of timelessness which does not incorporate notions of historical or chronological time. It is where the past and present meet.

In northern Cape York, the past and the present meet in the stories, beliefs and practices that are associated with the East Coast strip. Moreover, the sites at Sandago are monuments that symbolise this 'timelessness' and which also act as the 'theatrical props' which can be used to invoke this state.

An important element of the community-based approach is that there is an in-built dynamic. As community needs change in relation to shifts in the focus of identity, so too will the archaeological response. For example, while the present assessment of the community significance of the sites at Sandago may seem appropriate at this point in time, the dynamics of a living culture suggests that this will change over time. In this sense, a community-based approach does not provide a recipe or a prescription to be cast in concrete. Rather, it provides a framework which continually adjusts to changing needs.

### 11.2.2 Links between Anthropology and Archaeology: the emergence of Cultural Heritage Studies

A community-based approach to heritage is strongly related to, and in many ways, dependent upon, anthropological work. For example, the Cowal Creek Country Survey and the subsequent reports (Fuary and Greer 1993; Fuary 1993) provide an excellent platform from which further Community-
based projects (e.g. McIntyre 1994; In Prep.) can be undertaken. More specifically, the type of anthropological work required includes documenting genealogical information and historical information relating to both the community as a whole and to individuals. At Injinoo the draft register prepared by Fuary (1993) provides the community with a base from which to decide who should be involved in a project. Information on precontact life, contemporary beliefs and practices, life histories and the establishment of the communities in northern Cape York is recorded in Fuary and Greer (1993). This provides the community with details of traditional affiliations of northern Cape York peoples (including those who currently live outside of Injinoo and other northern Cape York communities) and suggests a range of further work that was identified in the course of the project. This facilitates negotiations with a broad range of traditional owners or 'speakers'. This is important, as those who have borne the responsibilities and at times, the burden of consultation can spread decision-making, especially where important cultural concerns are involved, over a larger group. In the past, such persons were often left with enormous responsibilities, simply because they were 'on-the-spot'.

The second area of anthropological research that is important and indeed integral to the community-based approach involves the definition of elements of community identity. These elements can be defined as the interaction between contemporary custom and shared history, beliefs and links with the past (see Chapter 10). The documentation of these, which is traditionally the province of the anthropologist, allows the researcher and the community to determine what aspects of archaeological work could be useful. If the work on the middens at Sandago had not been informed by the knowledge of beliefs, stories and practices, the archaeological work would have proceeded in an unreconstructed way with the best of intentions.
Again, the need for anthropological expertise increases where communities have suffered most and such information is, as previously mentioned, scattered over several generations and many individuals and/or is 'underground'. This is in contrast to some current perceptions in which anthropological expertise is deemed important only where there is a strong link with what is perceived to be the precontact past.

Anthropology and archaeology have had a troubled history of alliance and separation, largely the result of different 'traditions' in both disciplines and the development of different schools that emerged from this. In the last twenty years in Australia, there has been a trend to separate the two with a number of university departments that previously linked the two either separating and forming alliances with other disciplines or establishing independent units. While the academic pursuits of both disciplines are perhaps diverging considerably, it is in the applied areas that a new unity can be perceived. The area of cultural heritage management is one such area. Anthropologists can play an important role in this area, if one accepts that the construction of identities is an important consideration in the definition of 'heritage'. Archaeologists, on the other hand, have developed an expertise in the area of heritage management given the two or three decades in which they have been responsible for this area. In addition, their knowledge of landscape and the emerging concept of 'cultural landscapes' (see also Chapter 9) provides an overview of heritage concerns on the one hand and a framework within which information on beliefs, stories, practices, language and other elements of identity can be placed.

This emergent area of 'Cultural Heritage Studies' will not, however, be simply a hybrid of the two disciplines. Rather, each discipline brings to this discourse a number of skills and a knowledge base from which new
foundations and priorities can be established. In Australia, this area can include cultural heritage management, but it can also include the developing areas surrounding Native Title and other land claims, as well as a number of areas which focus on the construction of cultural identity.

11.2.3 Hegemony and the archaeological heritage

The inclusion of perceptions such as those outlined in this chapter are not especially new in the heritage area. In fact, much of what has been outlined above can be accommodated within the 'social value' component of cultural significance within the Burra Charter (see Article 1.5) in Australia. This has been defined in the following way in the Guidelines to the Burra Charter (Article 2.5):

Social value embraces the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national, or other cultural sentiment to the majority or minority group.

The community-based approach differs however in terms of the emphasis given to 'social' rather than other (e.g. scientific) values. It recognises that the colonial experience of many indigenous people in this country has left them with the need to engage in the development of identities as a means of cultural and social survival. Under such circumstances, more emphasis is placed on social values, perhaps especially in relation to archaeological values. There is a recognition that as archaeological perspectives on the past are drawn from the dominant (and non-indigenous) sector, a hegemony of western thought may detract from indigenous perspectives. This has been exacerbated by the emphasis on or privileging of archaeological interpretations of the past which have dominated heritage management until recently (see Chapter 2).

Secondly, I would contend that in some instances archaeological methods of investigating and managing the past, e.g. excavation, are potentially destructive of the very devices, i.e. the theatrical 'props', which are used in the continuing practice of culture. The excavation and removal of the
fireplaces at Sandago are a good example of this (see also Chapters 8 and 10). In contrast, the community-based approach seeks to affirm community perspectives and values and to support the continuing practice of culture.

In addition, because archaeological or scientific perspectives of the past stem from outside the community, they offer the latter only a reactive role through the processes of consultation and to a lesser extent participation. This means that while they have an opportunity to respond to proposals, their concerns are not an integral part of the framing of research questions. Again, the notion of good archaeological management being driven by 'timely and specific' research questions which are framed within the discipline (Bowdler 1981, 1984) further distances the community from anything other than a reactive role. Furthermore, the emphasis on consultation as a means of empowering indigenous people is constrained by the context of current power relations between them and non-indigenous people in this country.

11.2.4 The changing role of heritage

When the concept of a state (that is, legislative) role in the protection of heritage was first mooted in the early 1960s, it was motivated by a desire to protect archaeological 'relics'. The role of archaeologists was as interpreter and adviser (and therefore custodian) as the model of heritage was entirely drawn from archaeological sources, concerns and interests. These concerns surrounded the differences between a professional approach and that of amateurs. They were linked with the development of scientific practices and legislative frameworks that served this academic model (Mulvaney 1963; 1968; 1990: 249). The establishment of statutory authorities occurred in the late 1960s (in Queensland and South Australia) and other states followed in the 1970s. By this time, the influence of Cultural Resource Management,
developed in the United States and influenced by the 'New' or processual archaeology, was beginning to be felt in Australia. Following criticism of the limitations of 'public archaeology', many statutory authorities decided to embrace CRM as the tool by which scientific value was measured (see also Chapter 2).

This was further exacerbated because the need for management was most strongly felt in metropolitan areas such as Sydney. This resulted in the early establishment of a heritage agency (the NSW NPWS) and the adoption of models for protecting cultural heritage (e.g. CRM). Due to the specifics of the New South Wales situation (and particularly in and around Sydney) the competing interests in land tenure had the effect of conflating the broad banner of heritage management under the immediate pragmatic needs of 'planning'. Much of the regional archaeologists' time, especially in the metropolitan area, was taken up in ensuring that sites were not threatened by competing needs and in the development of predictive models and statements in relation to this. The level of development in such areas and the resultant need to establish convincingly 'archaeological significance' in the face of this, probably accounts for the adoption of CRM as a scientific (and perhaps therefore acceptable) model. Due to the success of the NSW NPWS in the early days under Sharon Sullivan, this agency was used as a model in the development of other heritage agencies (see also Chapter 2). However, the inappropriateness of applying this model in other states lies in the different colonial, historical and contemporary experiences of indigenous people in different parts of Australia. More recently, the use of this model within in New South Wales itself has been questioned by Byrne (1993).

While academic constructions of heritage may have been acceptable previously, the 1990s has so far been marked by dramatic developments in
the relationship between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians. For example, the historic *Mabo* decision in 1992 in the High Court of Australia has acknowledged native title in Australia. Sutherland (1993: 67) states that:

Indigenous Australians achieved a major breakthrough in their struggle for the recognition and restoration of their rights to land and other resources in June 1992, when the High Court, Australia's most superior court, ruled that native title over land held by Murray Islanders in the Torres Strait was recognised by the common law.

The enactment of Native Title legislation in the following year, which outlines the applications of native title, provided national recognition of the rights of indigenous people in this country.

In Chapter 2, the connections between heritage management in Australia and the 'New' or processual archaeology are outlined. CRM emerged from this approach in the 1970s as the scientific answer to the problems of managing the archaeological resource base. While the practice of heritage management underwent many changes in the 1980s and early 1990s, current practice still derives much of its terms and references from a system that is external to those of indigenous societies in Australia. It is obvious that this way of looking at the past, this *archaeological* past, will no longer provide an adequate model in an environment of increasing recognition of the 'rights to land and other resources'.

In addition, the disciplinary focus of qualifications is likely to change in line with a changing focus. While heritage managers are still largely drawn from the discipline of archaeology, this has broadened in recent years to include historians and architects, largely as a result of a recognition of the heritage of the postcontact period. In addition, the expertise of indigenous peoples themselves in relation to heritage has also been recognised. On the basis of
this thesis however it is clear that in some instances training in anthropology would assume far greater importance for archaeologists than it has done in the past in Australia.

11.2.5 Origins of the community-based approach

Although the ideas and concepts behind the community-based approach have not been widely discussed in Australian archaeology, it should not be supposed that this approach has emerged without antecedent. It is my conviction that this approach has grown out of the feminist perspective which played a large role in the involvement of indigenous people in heritage management. As was suggested in Chapter 2, feminists can identify with the category of 'other', into which indigenous people have often been placed. Spector's (1994) study similarly describes the development of an alternative approach to archaeological interpretation. After working with Dakota (Native American) people and becoming dissatisfied with forms of writing tied to traditional archaeological methods and analysis, she began to reassess the way in which she had learned to interpret the past. Her response was to develop new approaches to archaeological writing. In particular, she herself focused on writing the story of a single artefact, an awl that was uncovered in the course of her investigations. Spector (1994: 1) states that:

When I excavate sites and touch things that have lain untouched for centuries, I know why I am an archaeologist. But until now, when I wrote about those sites and objects, I felt no connection with the past, my own or that of the people whose cultural landscapes I had unearthed. Writing 'What This Awl Means,' a story about a Dakota girl who lost a carved awl handle a century and a half ago, brought back thoughts and feelings I had experienced as a young girl drawn to archaeology. As I learned about the discipline - and, especially, how to write about archaeology for academic readers - I found myself increasingly distanced from the question that had fascinated me since childhood: What was life like for people in the past? While
composing the awl story in place of the standard archaeological report or scholarly article, I was reminded of my original reasons for wanting to be an archaeologist. These motives are empathetic - a longing to discover essences, images, and feelings of the past - not detached, distanced, objective.

Spector's explicit feminist underpinnings (the volume is subtitled Feminist archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota village) and her desire to incorporate the 'essences, images, and feelings of the past' illustrate a connection with the past which goes beyond scientific interest. I believe that it illustrates the connections between feminist thought and an understanding of and empathy with the position of 'other'.

The community-based approach could also be seen to share many elements with postmodernism and its disciplinary forms: the new ethnography in anthropology, postprocessualism in archaeology and postAboriginalism in Aboriginal studies. These include the recognition of 'other' voices and of the constraints of western constructions within these areas. Such approaches encourage a reflexive attitude in relation to the construction of the 'other', with a focus on reflecting upon this process of construction. However, just as the community-based approach attempts to go beyond the changes in archaeological practice that exemplify the best of current approaches, so too does it attempt to go beyond just reflection. On a more pragmatic level, the current popularity of postmodernism within some sectors of the academy may provide community-based approaches with a level of acceptance which would not have been forthcoming with other paradigms (e.g. ecological determinism).

11.2.6 Community-based archaeology and heritage management

The role of heritage managers in a community-based system would ideally be significantly different from that undertaken by many heritage authorities
today. The process might be described in the following way:

1. establishment of links with (and sometimes defining) the community(ies);
2. initiation of work on registers of traditional affiliation etc.;
3. determining, with the community, their needs and requirements with regard to heritage management, for example, determining conceptual and/or geographical areas that are important to the community sense of identity;
4. development of a framework for research and development, including:
   (i) defining existing anthropological, archaeological, historical and other knowledge and the role that might be played by 'experts' who have previously worked with the community;
   (ii) developing projects that address issues outlined in points 2 and 3 above;
   (iii) facilitating an ongoing process of community workshops in which the information and direction of management can be reviewed.

This system is obviously personnel intensive, requiring many more heritage managers than currently exist. For this reason, many of those who are engaged in the business of heritage management are likely to have (at best) a somewhat cynical response to such suggestions. I would contend, however, that it is the role of research to present the ideal position in relation to orientation and process. If these are seen to be acceptable, it is then up to practising heritage managers to apply these to the extent that it is possible within existing constraints.

11.3 The community-based approach within a world perspective

The connections between archaeology, the past and colonial and imperial ideologies have been apparent for more than a decade (e.g. Trigger 1984;
Fowler 1987). McBryde (1985) and Layton (1989 a) presented the complexity of issues surrounding 'ownership' and 'control' of the past, and the papers in Layton (1989 b) imply that there is more to the past than archaeological interpretation. More recently, Spector (1994) illustrates that the experience of working with people who are the inheritors of a culture can change one's outlook and approach to the past. Byrne (1993) has illustrated that in both Thailand and northern New South Wales where he undertook fieldwork, there existed a distance between the archaeological construction (and therefore management) of the past and that of its cultural heirs. Byrne (1993: 239) states:

What may undermine the conservation ethic more seriously than Post-modern critique, though, may be its obvious lack of fit in the societies of the non-West.

11.3.1 Scientific discourse and ordinary people's notions of 'place'

The evidence which suggests a separation between western and non-western perspectives on the past is mounting increasingly. However, it may be that this 'distance' can be perceived even within western societies. In The Practice of Everyday Life, de Certeau (1984) uses a study by Linde and Labov which distinguishes between two types of oral description of the apartments of a group of New Yorkers. These types are the 'map' and the 'tour' (1984: 119):

The first is of the type: 'The girls' room is next to the kitchen.' The second: 'You turn right and come into the living room'.

The difference between the two is explained by de Certeau as the difference between 'seeing' in the case of the 'maps' and 'acting' in the case of the 'tours'. In the study, it was found that only three percent of the descriptions were of the 'map' type, the vast majority being experiential or made in terms of 'operations'. Although de Certeau's aims in his analysis of these deviate from that preferred here, his description of the difference between these two categories is useful to the present discussion. He (1984: 119) states that:
The questions ultimately concern the basis of everyday narrations, the relation between the itinerary (a discursive series of operations) and the map (a plane projection totalizing observations), that is, between two symbolic and anthropological languages of space. Two poles of experience. It seems that in passing from 'ordinary' culture to scientific discourse, one passes from one pole to the other.

This discussion illustrates the difference between a scientific discourse of 'place' and one which is held by ordinary people. While there is an enormous social and geographical distance between the ordinary peoples of New York and Cape York, I suggest that in both instances, there is a commonality in the way they view their apartments and their traditional lands, respectively. Furthermore, there is a distance between such experiences of 'place' and those drawn from scientific discourses. This suggests that the perceived disjunction between these perspectives may originate rather in the disjunction between those of science and ordinary people rather than an opposition between west and non-west.

This point is further illustrated with an example drawn from the work of Herzfeld (1991). This ethnographic study centres around the people of Rethemnos, a town on the Greek island of Crete which is known for its Renaissance Venetian domestic architecture. This aspect of Rethemnos' heritage has been the focus of a bitter dispute between the heritage agency responsible for the conservation and management of the 'Old Town' and the Rethemniots whose lives were affected by the restrictions that were imposed in relation to this. The latter included a ban on alterations to buildings (even minor changes such as the taking down of a window box) and a refusal to allow new buildings within the limits of the heritage zone. As Herzfeld (1991: xi) has stated:
Some residents were happy that their town was taking its rightful place in an official, monumentalized history. Others cared far more about the personal and family histories that they had hoped to carve out of the land according to their own commitments: dowry houses, extended homes to incorporate elderly parents and a large brood of children, business premises that signaled aggressive entrepreneurship.

This illustrates the tension between a living practice of culture and one which is based on preserving the fabric of a remnant of a romanticised 'past'. One is tempted to draw comparisons between the living culture which is embodied in the beliefs, stories and practices associated with the midden sites in northern Cape York and the archaeological perception of the past which looks more to radiocarbon dates, stone artefacts and food remains of a meal consumed at some point in the distant past.

Herzfeld develops the contrast between the official 'heritage' and the residents' views of the 'Old Town'. He notes that while the authorities view the decaying buildings as 'good', the Rethemniots who are forced to live in them see them as 'unhealthy' and 'dank'. Similarly, the tourists who come to see the 'Old Town' provide a measure of economic input. However it is debatable how much this benefits the largely impoverished locals. The latter feel that the historic area has been appropriated by the tourists, just as they feel that they no longer own their own homes. They feel that the only beneficiary is the government (Herzfeld 1991: 191),

...Then let the government buy up the best-reserved houses and cordon off an area of the Old Town, renaming it 'Good Town' (*Kali Poli*) - an aptly ironic euphemism, snarled with polite bitterness at the bureaucratic expropriation of taste and virtue. If citizens must be forced to live in a home that they feel they do not actually own, what is 'good' about life in a badly drained monument?
The sentiments expressed by the Rethemniots are familiar and serve to illustrate that the distance between archaeological notions of heritage and those of the cultural heirs of that heritage is not the preserve of the non-West. As Herzfeld (1991: xiii) has noted:

The problems that face Rethemnos are not unique to that town, although its special circumstances throw them into high relief and open them up for comparison. Archaeologists and historians everywhere face a set of interconnected moral dilemmas whose magnitude is only now becoming clear. To what extent may the desire to preserve an ancient heritage impinge on the lives of those who inhabit it? Whose heritage is it, and who makes those decisions? Can the state act as a guardian for the future, or is that paternalistic image simply a disguise for the uncontrolled use of bureaucratic authority? What, finally, is history - and who makes it?

The Rethemniot case illustrates that the archaeological construction of heritage is perhaps equally inappropriate in the west as in the non-west. This is supported by other examples including Cooney's (1994) description of the way in which cultural landscapes of different times influence present perceptions. The solution then lies in changing the discourse itself rather than the development of a more judicious approach to its application. The central concern of this chapter has been to establish the need for such reconstruction and the delineation of this within the context of northern Cape York. The ultimate aim is not the universal application of this specific community-based approach beyond this context, but rather to suggest the general direction, process and need for this type of research.

11.4 Conclusion

At the beginning of this chapter, it was suggested that rather than educating indigenous and other groups in archaeological interpretation, archaeologists
could benefit from an understanding of alternative perceptions of the past. This was illustrated by my own response to the way in which northern Cape York people currently practise and reaffirm their culture and use their heritage in the construction of their identities.

This response is encapsulated in the development of the community-based approach to archaeology which provides a framework which is aimed at empowering northern Cape York peoples in relation to the definition and management of their heritage. It attempts to overcome the problems of previous attempts at the empowerment of indigenous people in relation to heritage (e.g. by consultation) and makes the link between heritage and identity in terms of a process that is filtered through people's own perceptions rather than imposed from outside a particular culture (e.g. by the scientific or archaeological construction of heritage).

While it may seem appropriate that different perceptions of heritage can be placed 'side-by-side', it has been shown that the hegemony of scientific perspectives suggests that this is not desirable, especially in relation to the link between heritage and identity. The global ethic of 'World Heritage' is, in fact is located at the other end of the spectrum to the community-based approach, and while such values may have legitimacy in a global sense, they should not dominate those of the cultural heirs of a particular heritage. As Byrne (1993: 237) has pointed out:

- Currently, the heritage discourse tends to raise the meaning and control of 'heritage sites' from a local to a national level. As an adjunct, it may raise them still higher, into the rarified air of World Heritage. Local communities, however, are rarely passive and may find ways to contest these transactions.

This raises the issue of the changing definition of heritage and the changing role of heritage managers. It has been suggested that this has implications for
training and qualifications, as well as for the orientation and process of this area.

Finally, it has been suggested that while most accounts focus on the 'special case' of indigenous groups in relation to heritage, the hegemonic nature of the archaeological discourse may be similarly problematic in the west as in the non-west. This is not to say that heritage and identity are not shaped by the characteristics of a particular culture, but rather that problems in the process of the definition of these remain the same.
Conclusion

In 1984, the original project aimed at investigating evidence for socio-economic intensification appeared to be a demanding, but potentially rewarding challenge in the vast, archaeologically unexplored terrain of northern Cape York. In 1987, following the abandonment of the original project, I had only just begun to understand the lengths to which the new direction was taking me. In the intervening years, the development of the community-based approach in archaeology has been found support in the work of Byrne (1993) and Ellis (1994) in Australia who also present strong critiques of the archaeological (or scientific) discourse of heritage. As Byrne (1993: 240) has stated:

In the end, perhaps, the choice is between the material richness of the material past and the richness of local practice.

A commonality of experience can be discerned in Spector (1994) whose feminist response to working with indigenous people resulted in the development of new forms of writing about the past. The recognition of the broader application of this 'lack of fit' between the archaeological discourse and ordinary people's views of heritage was strengthened by the work of Herzfeld (1991). The plight of the Rethemniots will have a familiar ring to Australian (and other) indigenous peoples who are asked to identify with a past that is dotted with the stone artefacts, archaeological registers and 'facts' that represent the archaeological inheritance more than that of a particular people.

The aim of this thesis has been to illustrate these points within a particular context. The original project was abandoned in order to provide the
broadest possible scope within which these complexities could be teased out. At this point, a summary of the main arguments of the thesis is necessary in order to present the final argument.

12.1 Summary of thesis arguments

In Chapter 2 it was argued that the dominant discourse in heritage management in Australia (CRM) stems from the scientific perspective of the 'New' or processual archaeology. It was suggested that this approach views heritage and culture as a 'resource' and is strongly influenced by the way in which natural resources are valued and assessed. It was also argued that with the exception of a limited amount of ethnoarchaeological work (e.g. Meehan 1982), the heritage management area has provided the major means through which indigenous people have been involved in Australian archaeology. The final point of this chapter was that in spite of such efforts, the rift between archaeologists and indigenous people in this country can be seen to be deepening. It is suggested that the efforts to involve indigenous people in heritage management in Australia have been thwarted by the scientific paradigm which has had enormous influence in this area.

In Chapter 3, a history of archaeological work in Queensland was undertaken. It concluded that while the level of archaeological work in this State has dramatically increased over the three decades of 'professionalism', this work has been remarkable for its lack of contact with living indigenous people. This is in spite of a relatively long tradition of anthropological research in the north of the State. It was suggested in Chapter 4 that this has its roots in the distancing of the disciplines of archaeology and anthropology in this country. This is exacerbated by the fact that significant populations of indigenous people in this State lived, until relatively recently, under the repressive reserve system. Under such circumstances, the social distance
between indigenous and non-indigenous people is accentuated. Without the
links that are sometimes made with anthropology, purely archaeological
fieldwork is sometimes logistically and culturally difficult.

Chapters 5 to 8 are an account of fieldwork from 1984 to 1987. The narrative
style of these chapters is intended to allow the reader to experience vicariously the frustrations and discomfit of trying to implement the original project and the rewards of the understandings through which the current project unfolded. This has been an important consideration in this thesis. In spite of the country’s rich ethnographic heritage, few archaeologists in Australia work within the living tradition of indigenous people. In this sense, my firsthand experience of the conflicts inherent in the juxtaposition of archaeological discourse and contemporary heritage was unusual. It was the recognition of this which prompted a re-evaluation of the nature and direction of my project. In short, in the social climate of escalating conflict between archaeologists and indigenous people, I felt that a piece of work that could illuminate the sources of this had more social value. While I still feel that the original project would be exciting and interesting, I could not reject the opportunity to pursue current themes.

These fieldwork chapters introduce a number of concepts and present information which are subsequently explored in Chapters 9, 10 and 11. These include the links between anthropology and archaeology and the way in which anthropological work has helped to highlight problematic areas in the theory and practice or heritage management. Without the process outlined in Chapter 8, the connections between archaeology, identity and heritage, which are the substance of Chapter 10 could not be made. This chapter is central in terms of the major arguments presented in the thesis. In itself, it presents a view in which the cultural landscape is the focus of
heritage and identity. This picture of a cultural landscape is drawn from the stories, beliefs and practices that are associated with the midden sites at Sandago and the entire East Coast strip. This is in contrast with archaeological constructions of the cultural landscape which refer to the physical evidence of a culture, but not the culture itself. The contrast in these two perspectives is illustrated by my interpretation of the sites as mnemonic devices or theatrical 'props' which prompt the practice of culture. Conventional archaeological views see them as the repositories of evidence and hence knowledge about the past. This is perhaps the difference between a static and a dynamic view of culture.

The experiences in Chapters 5 to 8 also gave rise to Chapter 9 which questions the established view that the process of consultation legitimately empowers indigenous people in relation to the construction of the past. By examining the bases of consultation and superimposing onto this the social context within which consultation takes place, it is evident that the 'mandate' provided by consultation is suspect. Chapter 9 illustrates that the colonial history and experiences of indigenous people in this country and their consequent needs in relation to identity provide a co-ercive atmosphere which can be (inadvertently) exploited by the archaeological discourse. In retrospect, the needs of people in northern Cape York to record their living culture were, in my opinion, the 'hook' which sold the original project to them. My subsequent experiences in the field confirmed this to the extent that a separate anthropological project was set up to cater for these needs. While this was the original aim of the Cowal Creek Country Survey, an understanding of these problems led to a re-evaluation of the processes of consultation in which the latter was defined as a reactive, rather than an interactive process.
The recognition that the cultural landscapes of indigenous peoples in northern Cape York differed from those of archaeologists prompted a questioning of the legitimacy of the current bases surrounding the definition and management of heritage. These issues are examined in Chapter 11 which also outlines the community-based archaeological approach which is a framework aimed at empowering indigenous people in northern Cape York in relation to this. It is suggested that while this approach has been developed within a specific context, it provides some general principles (such as the constraints on consultation) and an illustration of the way in which similar research could be focused.

The implementation of alternatives such as the community-based approach also raises issues surrounding the changing role of heritage and the nature of training and qualifications in this area. It is suggested that while the experience and training of archaeologists have much to offer, the narrow confines of a single discipline deny the breadth of this area and the consequent need for flexibility.

While the emphasis has been on the construction of heritage within indigenous or non-western contexts in this thesis, Chapter 11 also takes up the issue of whether these are also appropriate in the west. The use of Herzfeld's (1991) example of Rethemnos' heritage suggests that while the shape and form of heritage and identity should be culturally constructed, global or scientific models are inappropriate in any context. This is supported by the work of Cooney (1994).

12.2 Theoretical contributions
While the main emphasis of this thesis has been on the critique of heritage discourse, this has been achieved largely through a feminist approach. This
approach may be seen as part of an emerging school of feminist thought in Australian archaeology. The feminist contribution of this thesis lies in the nature of the response to indigenous people, which had its antecedents in the feminist approach of some early heritage managers (e.g. Sharon Sullivan) and which can be seen elsewhere in the work of Spector (1994). Such responses have the power to question current constructions of heritage, but to also go beyond reflection. This thesis proposes a new approach to heritage that is based on the practice of culture which emphasises the dynamic nature of heritage rather than merely the fabric of constructed past.

The second theoretical contribution of this thesis lies in its applicability to Native Title claims (see also Henry and Greer In. Prep.). Currently, archaeological work has only limited application in these due to the fact that continuity of occupation is not required beyond the point of European colonisation. Therefore, the establishment of long timeframes of occupation usually provide only supportive evidence. In addition, the problems of establishing cultural continuity over archaeological timeframes renders this line of approach problematic. In contrast, it has been established in this research that archaeological 'sites' are used in the continuing practice and affirmation of culture. It illustrates the way in which contemporary cosmology and ontology are re-produced through places and landscapes. This notion of the contemporary significance of places, sites and landscapes establishes that for living people, culture is practice.

12.3 Conclusion

In a recent volume in the One World Archaeology series, Carmichael et al. (1994) address the notion of the changing definition of 'sites', especially those which are regarded as 'sacred' and the pragmatic issues in relation to their
protection. In referring to the changing concept of site 'significance', Ucko (1994: xv) in this volume writes:

Sacred Sites, Sacred Places shows how far ahead in its thinking Australia was, and possibly still is, in this regard, and in its attempts at application in actual research contexts, in comparison with other parts of the world.

It is in terms of this aspect of the contribution of this thesis (and the potential of other similar research on cultural identity and empowerment) that I would like to conclude. Given the nature of Australian society, we have been presented with a unique opportunity in this country to critique current heritage discourses and to develop new constructions. We have a history of heritage management that spans nearly three decades and a wealth of expertise in this area. We also have a long history of involving indigenous people in this area, for all the limitations of this in the past. This history and experience has enormous potential to provide models of process that could be used in other contexts.

In 1981 when Murray and White published 'Cambridge in the bush?', they wrote:

But we conclude that although Australian archaeology is singular, methodologically and theoretically Australian archaeology was and is archaeology first and Australian second.

While the development of a nationalist archaeology is the antithesis of this thesis, I would suggest that the Australian experience has the potential to suggest a range of new directions, especially in heritage management, that could have much broader application. In respect of this, it is perhaps time to get a bit of the 'bush' into Cambridge.