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In response to the Productivity Commission's May 2005 Issues Paper I would like to address two issues: first, the aspect of management principles in relation to historic heritage places and second, the broader issue of the role of tourism in the conservation of historic heritage places.

1. Management Principles

In tacitly acknowledging a ‘hierarchy of significance’ of heritage places, Box I of the Issues Paper provides a good starting point. The values and significance of heritage resources are often acknowledged but not integrated into the management process. The concept of a ‘hierarchy of significance’ in the context of Australian heritage resources was first presaged in the Pigott Report\(^1\) in 1975 and was further developed, in the context of the management of natural heritage resources in the QTTC's submission to the Commission of Inquiry into the conservation, management and use of Fraser Island and the Great Sandy Region\(^2\).

The criteria for assessing resource values and significance, the framework for determining resource significance levels, and the criteria for determining preferred tourism/resource interaction advocated in this submission received further recognition in Appendix D of the report by the Tourism Working Group of the Prime Minister's Ecologically Sustainable Development Working Groups in 1991\(^3\).

---


\(^2\) QTTC (1990). Submission to the Commission of Inquiry into the conservation, management and use of Fraser Island and the Great Sandy Region. Brisbane, Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation

A subsequent paper co-authored by the writer\textsuperscript{4} extended these principles to the management of cultural as well as natural heritage resources and a copy is submitted for the Inquiry's consideration, with the recommendation that these principles should underpin the Inquiry's recommendations on the management of historic heritage places.

2. The Role of Tourism in the Conservation of Historic Heritage Places

In 1997 the writer co-authored a paper\textsuperscript{5} which examined government funding of so-called 'halls of fame' and their failure either to cover their operating expenses from earned income, or to make any discernible difference to the number of tourists visiting destinations in which they were located. The paper concluded by advocating alternative ways of turning heritage resources into tourism products and, in 1999, the writer was awarded a Product Development Grant to study overseas examples of the type of initiatives advocated in the 1997 paper. A copy of the report\textsuperscript{6}, and the 'How to .. .' kit that was produced as part of the study is enclosed for the information of the Inquiry. In short the report concludes that the government's penchant for funding so-called 'halls of fame' (which are, in fact, no more than museums) through porkbarrelling vehicles such as the Federation Fund, and the Regional Partnerships program are an ineffective way of conserving heritage and of developing cultural tourism products. Such funds would be better redirected into adaptive re-use of heritage buildings and structures, more \textit{in situ} interpretation and the development of heritage trails similar to the examples studied in the writer's 1999 report. It is therefore recommended that this Inquiry devote resources to examining how best this might be achieved, using the principle of the ‘hierarchy of significance’ as a basis for determining the level of funding that should be contributed by each level of government.

Yours sincerely

Dr Richard Bramley


A more detailed analysis of the failure of the hall-of-fame ‘edifice’ approach to heritage conservation and cultural tourism product development can be found in the writer's doctoral thesis.