INTRODUCTION

Cultural landscape as a heritage management concept has flourished since the adoption of the World Heritage categories of cultural landscape by UNESCO in 1992, a landmark event in heritage practice. In the language of World Heritage, three categories of cultural landscape are recognised: ‘designed landscapes’ (landscapes that are designed and intentionally created such as gardens and parklands), ‘organically evolved landscapes’ (large areas resulting from social, economic, administrative and/or religious activities over time including agricultural landscapes) and ‘associative landscapes’ (locations with powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations) (UNESCO, 2011: Annex 3).

The World Heritage process, however, largely provides a framework for identifying, assessing and inscribing outstanding cultural landscapes (as well as ‘mixed cultural and natural heritage’ properties; UNESCO, 2011) and does not stipulate on-ground management practice in any great detail. Indeed, there is a divide in this system between the cultural landscape concept and operational management. This situation stands in contrast to the IUCN protected area system approach that links each of six protected area categories with management objectives (Dudley, 2008). Within the IUCN categories, category V protected areas (i.e., protected areas where the interaction of people and nature over time have produced an area of distinctive character; Phillips, 2002) overlap in many ways with the World Heritage notion of cultural landscape (sites that are the combined work of nature and humanity; UNESCO, 2011).

A key issue in the management of cultural landscapes concerns governance. Since cultural landscapes recognise the mutually constituted relationships between humans, ecosystems and landscape, there are a diversity of ways in which communities can be included in management regimes (cf. Mitchell & Buggey, 2001). Approaches can include the transfer of ownership of protected area landscapes and Community Conserved Areas (Brown & Kothari, 2011) to, and/or joint management with, Indigenous people (e.g., Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Australia, and Sacred Mijikenda Kaya Forests, Kenya) and the implementation of a variety of shared governance-stewardship models in the management of multi-tenured landscapes (e.g., National Heritage Areas, USA (cf. Mitchell & Melnick, 2012), and the Loire Valley Cultural Landscape, France). However, in this paper I am principally concerned with national parks reserved for the purpose of nature conservation and education/recreation (IUCN category II) where governance is primarily a state responsibility.
The paper describes a project undertaken in the state of New South Wales (NSW), Australia, to develop an on-ground approach to park management that draws on the cultural landscape concept. The paper outlines the reasons for adopting the approach, presents three case studies used to develop the approach and presents a step-by-step method. The project has resulted in the publication Cultural landscapes: a practical guide for park management (Brown, 2010).

TOWARD A CULTURAL LANDSCAPE APPROACH

A cultural landscape perspective, which recognises the entanglement of history and ecology with landscape, provides an opportunity to address a number of concerns common in park management, such as separate management regimes for natural and cultural heritage (Adams & English, 2005; Meskell, 2012; Taylor & Lennon, 2012) and management focused on material or tangible cultural heritage. The idea of cultural landscape offers a conceptual tool that can integrate separations between culture and nature, tangible and intangible, and biological and cultural diversity (Buggey, 1999; Pretty et al., 2009; Rössler, 2006) for the purpose of heritage management.

Within the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS), as in many protected area agencies across the world, heritage management is segregated such that natural (ecosystems and geodiversity) and cultural (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) heritage are managed separately (see Lockwood et al., 2006). This is evidenced for example in legislation, bureaucratic structures, budgets and park plans of management that separate natural, Aboriginal and 'historic' (in Australia meaning post-1788 non-Indigenous) heritage. In addition, an Indigenous presence in Australia for more than 45,000 years, and Aboriginal world views that construct culture and landscape as inseparable, make problematic Western natural landscape concepts (Head, 2010).

A related and overlapping issue in park management is that cultural heritage management has, until recently, conceptualised heritage mainly as physical traces of the past (isolated sites or objects such as a hut, fence, bridge, Aboriginal rock art site, shipwreck, grave or piece of machinery). A 'site-based approach' is thus an 'easy' concept for land managers and heritage practitioners as it supports separating the natural and cultural for research and management purposes. It effects this separation by treating heritage as items contained within the natural environment rather than as traces of historical behaviour that have helped constitute the 'natural' environment. A cultural landscape perspective offers an opportunity to move away from a focus on objects and sites as ends in themselves, toward managing the material record in its historical and broader landscape, including ecosystem, context. A socio-nature approach also offers opportunities to better integrate natural and cultural heritage conservation, particularly in an agency like the NPWS that traditionally has had an organisational culture that favours natural heritage conservation. Thus, a cultural landscape approach offers an opportunity to integrate natural and cultural heritage conservation by seeing culture and nature as interconnected dimensions of the same space. That is, the social and the natural are co-constituted rather than oppositional (Head, 2010). The implication for park management, particularly in an agency like the NPWS, is that natural and cultural heritage conservation requires holistic and integrated management approaches.

A CULTURAL LANDSCAPE APPROACH FOR NSW PARKS

Drawing from a review of global literature on cultural landscapes (Brown, 2007), two key ideas underpin the cultural landscape approach adopted in NSW. First, that history has taken place across all parts of the landscape and, second, that the form of the present landscape is the product of long-term and complex relationships between people and the environment. Evidence of human activity may be detectable in the vegetation or in landscape modifications (e.g., from sand mining) as well as in built structures, historic documents and archaeological evidence. Some pasts have ‘touched the landscape only lightly’ (Nugent, 2005: 5) while some places of historical activity are marked by imposing built structures or are commemorated for their association with important events or people.

Applying a cultural landscape approach to managing the NSW park system is underpinned by a number of general principles.

1. Landscape is a living entity, and is the product of change, dynamic patterns and evolving inter-relationships between past ecosystems, history and cultures.
2. The interactions between people and landscape are complex, multi-layered and are distinctive to each different space and time.
3. Community engagement and dialogue, where all people’s values are noted and respected, are characteristic of a cultural landscape mentality.
4. All parts of Australia’s landscape have community connection and associated values and meanings.
5. A key element of cultural landscapes is the continuity of past and present.
In considering how these principles might be applied ‘on the ground’, field work was undertaken in three case study park landscapes to document the histories of past and present human-environmental interactions, as well as the surviving material traces of those histories (archaeology). The case study parks were selected to represent, very broadly, different environments across NSW (coast, mountain and semi-arid interior) and different historic themes (recreation, forestry and pastoralism). These historic themes are common to much of the NSW protected area system and therefore any approach to represent them in one landscape will have broader application. It is significant to note that the historic themes integrate Aboriginal historic experience (e.g., Aboriginal people worked in the forestry and pastoral industries) with non-Indigenous histories and that each case study landscape has deep time and ongoing Aboriginal presence. This point emphasises the many-layered and entangled histories of the park landscapes even though the focus of each case study was one particular historical activity.

A COASTAL HOLIDAY LANDSCAPE: YURAYGIR NATIONAL PARK

Yuraygir National Park (YNP) (declared in 1980) is located on the north coast of NSW near the regional centres of Grafton and Coffs Harbour and approximately 600 km north of Sydney. The park boasts over 65 km of coastline, encloses a number of small coastal villages and covers an area over 35,000 hectares. The Solitary Islands Marine Park, established in 1998, adjoins the southern coastline of YNP.

The park lies within an ecological transition zone between the temperate southern areas of eastern Australia and the tropical north. The zone of overlap has significance for the number and diversity of both plant and animal species (NPWS, 2003a). Nine major groupings of plant associations have been identified and mapped within the park. Fire regimes and sand mining, as well as introduced plants and feral animals, have resulted in considerable ecological change and, for example, 14 of 30 mammal species recorded in YNP are considered threatened.

The landscape/seascape that is now YNP has been, and remains, the Country of Aboriginal people, a concept that does not refer to legal tenure in the Western sense but rather to deep-time Indigenous custodianship. Aboriginal stories from the area tell of the creation of this landscape (Heron, 1993), while regional archaeological evidence suggests usage for over 20,000 years. Aboriginal people maintained connections with the park landscape throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and continue to do so (Kijas, 2009).
From the historical and archaeological narratives that have been constructed for YNP (Kijas, 2009; Tuck, 2007), ten overarching historical themes or layers have been developed (Brown, 2008). Historical themes are a tool that can be used to understand, interpret and map the history and storylines of a place or landscape (Australian Heritage Commission, 2001). In the case of YNP, they have proved a useful tool for organizing and ordering a large amount of heritage information, as well as for explaining the connectivity between history, people and landscape.

One of the overarching themes for YNP is ‘enjoying the landscape’, meaning the landscape associated with recreation and relaxation. For YNP the combination of coastal villages and the national park provides opportunities for boating, picnicking, camping, fishing, swimming, surfing and bush walking on some of the best beaches in Australia (NPWS, 2003a). The park landscape has always been a place of escape and relaxation for local and distant groups of people. Recreation has shaped the landscape through physical features such as villages, camping areas and access roads as well as via social meanings evident in local stories and holidaying practices (Brown, 2008).

Two features of recreational places within YNP, which are not discussed below, are worth noting. First, camping locations most frequented by Anglo-Australians, including the formalised camping areas of YNP, coincide with evidence of deep-time occupation by Aboriginal people. These locations require management for their multiple cultural values. Second, evidence of camping within YNP is ephemeral (‘touched lightly’) and few archaeological traces survive of previous access tracks, campsites or recreational activities such as fishing, surfing or boating. This means that most evidence of recreational use and activity is derived from historical records and from oral testimony. The historical and archaeological studies prepared concurrently for the park by historian Johanna Kijas (2009) and archaeologist Dan Tuck (2007), emphasise the landscape-scale of history (a ‘physically located history-making’ approach) as well as community connections and associations (social values) with landscape.

Holidaymaking is a land-use that links cultural values at two levels in Australia. On a national level White (2005) observes that by the beginning of the twentieth century an Australian holiday ‘tradition’ was discernable, with distinctive customs and practices. At local levels camping and associated activities such as swimming, fishing and walking are social practices that serve to reinforce identity and connection to place (Harrington, 2007). Along the Yuraygir coastline recreational camping has taken place since 1860, when the settlement of the first coastal villages began. Each village has a distinctive history of occupation by different communities and family groups from within the region (Kijas, 2009). Thus, the pattern of coastal recreation reinforced a sense of identity, difference, separation and community for many residents of the north coast region.

Within YNP there are seven designated camping and day-use areas and two areas that provide for day-use only. The management framework for these and other recreational facilities such as walking tracks is set out in the plan of management for the park (NPWS, 2003a) and, more broadly, outlines policy with regard to visitor management, services and infrastructure. However, strategies for understanding the cultural values of recreation visitors have not been developed.

The landscape of Pebbly Beach Camping Area in the south of YNP is a good example of management practice recognising and supporting historical and social values (Kijas, 2009). Pebbly Beach is an isolated camping location. It has been regularly used over a long period by large parties of families and friends who live in the immediate local area, but also by campers from south-eastern Queensland. The camping area has always been accessed using four-wheel-drive (4WD) vehicles and is characterised as a low-key camping experience.

By respecting the history and character of recreational camping, the local park management regime has sought a balance between continuity and change at Pebbly Beach. Continuity has meant allowing access to the area for those people with long-term connections, retaining the isolated campsites setting, maintaining 4WD access and facilitating the low-key camping experience. On the other hand, changes have included formalising the camping area (installing toilets, defining campsites and protecting Aboriginal shell middens and vegetation), formalising the access route, employing a care-taker, charging fees and closing parts of the beach to vehicles. Collaborative clean-ups of the camping area surrounds are undertaken by NPWS staff and regular camp-users.

The management of intangible cultural heritage values and landscape change at Pebbly Beach is successful because the history of holidaying and people’s connection to place has been acknowledged and respected in a way that also integrates the conservation of ecosystem values.
A MOUNTAIN FOREST LANDSCAPE: WASHPOOL NATIONAL PARK

Washpool National Park (WNP) comprises a landscape of diverse forest types that form a complex mosaic of vegetation assemblages on the Great Dividing Range (NPWS, 2005). Core areas of the park were gazetted in 1982 following one of the highly publicised ‘battles’ over rainforest protection that characterised Australian forestry and conservation policy debate in the late 1970s and early 1980s. In 1985 the bulk of the newly proclaimed WNP was declared a wilderness area and in 1987 was included as part of the World Heritage listing, based on natural criteria, for ‘Gondwana Rainforests of Australia’ (whc.unesco.org/en/list/368). The western parts of WNP, formerly parts of the Curramore and Spirabo State Forests, were added to the protected area in 1996.

As part of the cultural landscapes project, work was undertaken in WNP to investigate the extent to which the forests, constructed as natural for the purpose of wilderness declaration and World Heritage listing, are a product of cumulative transformation through seasonal grazing and forestry operations (Dean-Jones & Brown, in press). Did past cattle grazing and forestry shape the structure and character of the present forest? This question has broader implications for the management of humanly modified forests now within reserves managed for conservation.

The ‘forest as historic artefact’ study in WNP endeavoured to integrate information derived from both historical and ecological sources. The historical methods involved a literature review of the history of the landscape including existing written and oral histories. The field study involved field-based discussions with current and former land-users, which provided invaluable understandings of vegetation-based evidence of past and current land-use and land management practices. The ecological methods utilised for the study involved a literature review of the ecology of the landscape as well as a field recording programme.

Existing ecological/land-use studies in the Washpool region provided a basis for understanding present vegetation structure in eucalypt forests where there has
been a history of grazing and regular burning. For example, Henderson and Keith (2002) report a detailed ecological study of the impacts of fire and grazing in the temperate forests in a nearby national park, focusing particularly on changes to the shrub layer in the understory. The study results support the hypothesis that grazing and associated burning practices are associated with a simplified understory. Tasker and Bradstock (2006) surveyed 58 eucalypt forest sites on the northern tablelands of NSW to test the significance of grazing practices on forest understory structure. Their results indicate that cattle grazing practices (i.e., grazing and the associated frequent fire regimes) can have major effects on forest structure and composition at a regional level.

The field study undertaken within WNP as part of the cultural landscape project examined 12 sample plots, each 100x100 metres (one hectare) in size. The plot size, required to document both vegetation indicators and land-use indicators, provided a sufficient area to gain an appreciation of large tree density, but also allowed observations to be made of the variability of understory species. Two examples, simplified for the purpose of this paper, illustrate the field process and results.

A field sample plot was located in the former Curramore State Forest, an area that has never been logged and was leased for cattle grazing by the Sloman family from the early years of the twentieth century to the 1990s (see picture on previous page). Seasonal (winter) grazing in the local dry open forest involved regular (spring) low intensity burning to encourage understory regrowth. Two features of the vegetation structure were recognized that result from high frequency fire regimes and grazing pressure on vegetation. First, the burning regime and seasonal grazing changed the species composition and structure of the forest understory and increased the density of naturally occurring grass species. Second, there has been a reduction in the regeneration capacity of canopy trees leading to a longer term change in vegetation structure attributable to cultural factors.

A second field sample plot (Coombadja Creek) was located in an area of dry sclerophyll forest that was selectively logged in the late 1960s. Material evidence of logging includes multiple cut tree stumps (over 20 within the sample plot), reject saw logs on the ground (5-10 trunks unsuitable for milling because either the central pipe is rotten or there is extensive branching and/or burls on the trunk), a heavily overgrown track, a log loading ramp, log loading area and evidence of tree damage caused by forestry machinery. A key feature of the local vegetation subject to logging is, not surprisingly, reduced density of old-growth trees (less than 10 per hectare based on the sample plot), significantly less than in local unlogged forests (30-40 per hectare), reflecting the resource focus of foresters on trees for saw log timber production.

Disentangling disturbance evidencing past and present historical activity from ecosystem processes within a forested landscape is a complex task. Nevertheless, a cultural landscape approach is useful in conceptualising forested landscapes as continually transforming as a result of complex interactions between ecological processes and human values/activities. It follows that forested areas, such as those of WNP, that have been modified by historical activity do not ‘revert’ to ‘natural’ landscapes. The effect on vegetation from cattle grazing and selective logging activity, which in Washpool followed from past Aboriginal use (plant gathering, burning practices) and precedes conservation practice (burning regimes, invasive species control), was not simply additive or consecutive but cumulative. That is, each historical activity not only adds a new and distinct layer, but also influences the trajectory of later forest regeneration and transformation processes.

The implication for forest management is not that forested landscapes should or can be ‘frozen’ in time such that markers of historical activity are conserved, but rather that documenting and understanding ecosystems and past/present human land-use is an essential part of conservation. Documenting and integrating ecological and human histories of vegetation is necessary for evidence-based adaptive management and essential for the public interpretation of forests. Such an approach does not undermine an aim of optimum biodiversity and ecosystem health and resilience, but does challenge park management to be clear concerning what it is that is being conserved.

AN INLAND PASTORAL LANDSCAPE: CULGOA NATIONAL PARK

Culgoa National Park (CNP) is located north of Bourke in north-western NSW and adjoins the NSW-Queensland border. CNP is situated in a semi-arid environment and is a landscape that has deep time Aboriginal connection (at least 30,000 years) and a continuous pastoral history from the 1840s to 1996 (Veale, 1997). The protected area was reserved in 1996, primarily to protect a section of the Culgoa River and associated extensive floodplain with riverine woodland and open grassland vegetation (NPWS, 2003b), vegetation communities that are rare,
and poorly represented in NSW reserves. The protected area initially covered 22,430 hectares and comprised three former pastoral properties; Byerawaring, Cawwell and Burban Grange. It was extended in 2006 to cover over 36,000 hectares with the acquisition of the pastoral leases of Old Toulby, Diemunga and Pine Grove.

A considerable amount of cultural heritage documentation and research has been undertaken within CNP, including an Aboriginal archaeological field survey (English, 1997), a land-use history (Veale, 1997), buildings conservation assessment (Stacy, 1997), research on the pastoral labour camp of Dennawan (Harrison, 2004), and an inventory of historic items (Smith, 2006). Together, these studies document over 500 tangible heritage items which can be organized under five historic themes – Aboriginal cultures (Muruwari Country); marking the land (surveying); working the land (pastoralism); living on the land (homesteads and settlements); and conserving the landscape (Brown, 2011).

Despite the extent of cultural heritage research and documentation, it was not clear (in 2006) that the landscape-scale of the pastoral heritage of the park had been fully captured. What had been recorded was a series of heritage ‘nodes’, representing the material expressions of Culgoa’s history. What seemed to be lacking was information on the way that these places were linked/connected to each other and also to the world outside the park. Mapping the recorded items on a corporate database as points also served to reinforce the impression that the pastoral heritage of CNP is extremely limited in a spatial sense (Moylan et al., 2009). To begin to address this issue, oral histories were undertaken at CNP with former property owners Bruce and Ian Ponder to illustrate the way in which the whole of the landscape was used in the practice of pastoralism and the ways in which the material nodes documented by English (1997), Stacy (1997), Harrison (2004) and Smith (2006) were each part of a larger interconnected system. Essentially then, this was about using people’s lived experiences (intangible heritage) to enrich the meaning of the material traces of the protected area’s history.
A final project undertaken at Culgoa has been an attempt to represent all of the landscape as cultural (Moylan et al., 2009). Most government and non-statutory registers utilise point datasets (the heritage nodes discussed above) to represent cultural heritage items. An effect of this approach is to emphasise that cultural heritage comprises a series of spatially discrete material remains or heritage 'sites', suggesting separate locations which are somehow disconnected from their broader historical, ecological and landscape contexts.

Alternatively, spatial representation of heritage can be set within a cultural landscape framework, acknowledging that all parts of the landscape have cultural histories, associations and meanings resulting from long-term and ongoing human-environmental interactions (Moylan et al., 2009: Figure 1). The output of this project is the creation of a 'Cultural Landscape Atlas' for CNP, a mapping product illustrating how all parts of the landscape have cultural meaning. For the purpose of the Atlas, cultural heritage information was entered as point, line and polygon data. In addition, selected historic aerial imagery and parish maps were georeferenced, with site plans and photographs incorporated into the Atlas as hyperlinks.

The mapping products produced by the project comprise an interactive electronic DVD-Atlas and hard copy maps. Both focus on meeting the management needs of field-based park-staff. The development of the Cultural Landscape Atlas has been undertaken to map heritage items as part of park management planning as well as to provide a centralised repository for relevant heritage information. The Atlas concept was devised in order to address a number of agency-specific needs. These include:

- To illustrate through spatial representation that all of the landscape (not just 'sites') has cultural values.
- To visually illustrate the complexity and extent of cultural heritage values in a way that is compelling to staff (who are unlikely to be easily engaged through a lengthy text-based planning document).
- The need to have an operational focus: this should be easily utilised for park planning purposes and for field-based management activities. That is, the Atlas should be a practical management tool that facilitates and invites staff participation.

Together, the physically located history-making approach that draws heavily on oral testimony (Brown, 2011; Veale, 1997) as well as the landscape scale cultural mapping project (Moylan et al., 2009), illustrate the complex socio-natural landscape of CNP.

**TOWARD A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO MANAGING PARK LANDSCAPES**

The field studies undertaken in Yuraygir, Washpool and Culgoa national parks provide case studies which were used simultaneously to develop and test a practical approach to park management in NSW. An important part of the case study work was the collaborative working process between researchers and local NPWS staff. This process was underpinned by a participation action research model whereby action (change, improvement) and research (knowledge, understanding) are achieved at the same time because people affected by the research were participants. Thus local park staff (field officers, rangers and managers) participated in fieldwork, discussions and workshops over the period of the project (2006-2008), conducted as an equal partnership between traditionally trained 'experts' (archaeologists, historians, spatial scientist) and local 'expert' staff. Active participation of the 'end-users' of the cultural landscape management approach was essential for a number of reasons. First, to obtain practical feedback on issues related to the idea and application of a cultural landscape approach to park management. Second, the work raised awareness of staff to the depth of information on cultural heritage available from existing data sources, but also served to highlight the continuing need to document living people's connections, associations and attachments to the park landscapes and to support the continuation of these linkages. Finally, the involvement of local park staff...
served to ensure ‘buy-in’ for the cultural landscape concept. An expectation of this aspect was that local staff would then act as advocates for the approach across the wider organisation.

Based on the collaborative working process and field studies undertaken in the three case-study park landscapes, a six-step cultural landscape approach applicable to park management in NSW was developed (Figure 1). The approach draws on two main methodologies. First, the steps parallel an adaptive planning process, which treats management as an iterative process of review and revision (Lockwood, 2006). Second, the approach mirrors heritage management processes, such as those articulated in the Australia ICOMOS (1999) Burra Charter and Australian Natural Heritage Charter (Commonwealth of Australia, 2003), which emphasise significance as a basis for making management decisions. The Australian heritage system adopts a thresholds-based values approach, where the values attributed to heritage landscapes are assessed against a series of criteria to qualify for local, State, national or international heritage status. In general, for an item to meet the criteria it must either be an outstanding or rare example (e.g., most intact selectively logged dry sclerophyll forest) or representative (i.e., derives its values from the extent to which it can act as an exemplar of a class or type of

Figure 1: Steps in applying a cultural landscape approach. Source: Brown 2010.
landscape: Harrison, 2010). The values approach is a method used to tease out the socio-natural values of each park landscape.

The cultural landscape approach advocated for NSW park management requires a clear statement of what park management is seeking to achieve before the six-step process is implemented. However, the steps are not always sequential. For example, both community engagement and information gathering are likely to be continuously ongoing activities; the completion of one step may lead to the re-examination or refinement of a previous step. Finally, these steps are a guide for park management – they are not a formula set in stone. Creativity, innovation and adapting to local circumstances will benefit applying the approach.

The application of the cultural landscape approach is presented in the publication Cultural landscapes: a practical guide for park management (Brown, 2010) and is available as a free internet download. Case studies are presented throughout the guide to ground it in the context of actual park management.

CONCLUSION

Landscapes, including protected area landscapes, are dynamic; co-produced by humans and non-humans. We need look no further than the multitude of books and television documentaries, such as The Botany of Desire (Pollan, 2001), Catching Fire: How Cooking Made Us Human (Wrangham, 2009) and even the BBC’s Time Team, for evidence of the deep entanglement of human and planetary histories. Cultural landscape is a concept that recognises that the social and the natural are co-constituted and that nature is not external to humanity nor humanity to nature.

The idea of cultural landscape offers a conceptual tool that can be applied in protected area management to work toward the integration of natural and cultural, material and immaterial, and biological and cultural diversity. In order to achieve such integration, it is necessary for protected area staff trained in the Western traditions of environmental sciences, as well as those trained in the humanities/social sciences, to be able to break free of disciplinary boundaries in order to recognise the socio-natural construction of landscape. This can be a challenging task where traditional protected area structures conceptualise and manage nature and culture separately.

A key emphasis of the cultural landscape approach advocated in NSW is the need to integrate people’s stories, memories and aspirations continually into management processes; that is, to recognize that the cultural values of landscapes are inextricably bound up with the lived experiences, identities and connections of past and present individuals and communities. If peoples’ stories and attachments to protected area landscapes are not recorded, then an impression is created that the landscape is devoid of human history. Thus, active management programmes need to take into account the spiritual and symbolic meanings that people ascribe to protected area landscapes. Furthermore, protected area managers need to understand how these meanings support community identity, well-being and human rights. By respecting and acknowledging peoples’ attachments to and feelings for landscapes, park managers can help ensure that there is long-term community support for protected areas. If the cultural landscape approach outlined here can go some way to achieving this goal, then it is a worthwhile project.
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RESUMEN
El concepto de paisaje cultural tiene gran prevalencia en la gestión del patrimonio mundial. La idea de paisaje cultural cuestiona diferencias pertinaces en la gestión del patrimonio, en gran parte de origen occidental, entre la naturaleza y la cultura, así como entre los aspectos tangibles (materiales) e intangibles (inmateriales) del patrimonio. Ofrece una conexión conceptual que puede entrelazar cosmovisiones occidentales, orientales e indígenas muy diferentes. Sin embargo, la gestión cotidiana de parques entraña retos reales en la aplicación de los enfoques basados en el paisaje cultural. Este documento se centra en los esfuerzos realizados en Nueva Gales del Sur, Australia, para el desarrollo de una guía operativa para la aplicación de un enfoque basado en el paisaje cultural. Se detalla un método paso a paso, y para ilustrar el desarrollo de este enfoque se presentan tres ejemplos de estudios de caso relacionados con el paisaje, en donde el pastoralismo, la silvicultura y el turismo son temas históricos dominantes.

RÉSUMÉ
Le concept de paysage culturel se développe considérablement dans les pratiques de gestion du patrimoine mondial. L'idée de paysage culturel remet en effet en cause les distinctions persistantes, essentiellement d'origine occidentale, entre la nature et la culture dans la gestion du patrimoine, ainsi qu'entre les formes de patrimoine tangible (matériel) et intangible (immatériel). Ce pont conceptuel peut ainsi relier des vues très différentes sur le monde occidental, oriental et autochtone. Cependant, de vrais défis restent encore à relever pour appliquer les approches de paysage culturel dans la gestion réelle et quotidienne des parcs. Ce document se concentre sur le travail réalisé en Nouvelle Galles du Sud, en Australie, pour rédiger un guide opérationnel permettant d’appliquer l’approche des paysages culturels. Une méthode pas à pas est exposée et trois études de cas liées aux paysages où le pastoralisme, la foresterie et le tourisme vacancier sont des thèmes historiques dominants, sont présentées pour illustrer la mise en œuvre de l’approche.