Part 3

Constructions

The previous three chapters presented a compilation of data that show how the Reef has been experienced by visitors. This includes knowledge built through navigation, strategic control, geographic location, sensuous engagement and through various forms of capture. In this third section of the thesis this material is drawn together to illustrate how the region has been constructed as a land and seascape that is understood by visitors within particular paradigms. It investigates constructions of the Great Barrier Reef that have particular currency within the tourism industry; namely the paradise islands, coral gardens of the underwater world; and the concept of a single Great Barrier Reef.
Chapter 8

Paradise

The previous chapters have shown that the Reef is not only experienced as submerged corals, fishes and other living organisms of the underwater sphere, but that the islands, cays and other land masses and associated flora and fauna are an integral part of visitor experiences of the region. This chapter explores how visitor experience and knowledge of the islands have changed over time and how their knowledge of place has accordingly changed. The ideal of a paradise on earth has been particularly influential in achieving the physical changes to island environments. The changes are such that landscapes are no longer perceived as quintessentially Australian but rather as ones that are generic and displaced. This transformation is suggested and confirmed by the range of visual and textual materials referred to in Part 2. These illustrate how a place regarded by many as being an “Australian icon” has become a place where visitors rarely enjoy an Australian experience. And in the next chapter I consider how the construction of the underwater world parallels and complements the island paradise.

I have argued elsewhere that management of the heritage values of the Reef is focused on particular visual aesthetic qualities, and that this has displaced some elements in the landscapes experienced by visitors (Pocock 2002c). This chapter explores how the failure to recognise and manage these attributes has led to the transformation of the physical environment.

Through an analysis of this material, I have constructed a representation of the Reef as it has been seen by visitors and portrayed by tourism industries in different eras. The data suggest how representations and experiences of the Reef have changed over time. One of the most significant changes is the physical presentation made to visitors. As we have seen in the preceding chapters tourist interactions with the environments of the Reef have been diminished through changes in technology and facilities. These changes in experience are also a result of significant changes to the physical environments in which
visitors find themselves. I pay particular attention to those indicators of ‘Australianness’ that are outlined in my methods and which help to address my aims.

**Australian Landscapes of the Great Barrier Reef**

Australian native vegetation thrives on most of the islands of the Great Barrier Reef and it is managed and maintained as part of the World Heritage Area. The vegetation, particularly of the continental islands of the Whitsundays, shares many characteristics with the bush of the adjacent Australian mainland. However, the areas frequented by visitors are vastly modified. Tourism activity is heavily focused in the coastal and offshore areas of Cairns and the Whitsundays with ninety-five percent of tourism activity focused in just five percent of the Marine Park (Wachenfeld, *et al.* 1998: 93). Within these areas the vegetation has been significantly altered. The central tourist destinations are well serviced by a range of hotels and resorts and while native vegetation persists in close proximity, and even within view of major resorts, the majority of visitors stay in accommodation surrounded by highly manicured gardens. These gardens contain a variety of exotic plants such as coconut and other introduced palms, hibiscus and frangipani that are not characteristically Australian. Rather they are characteristic of created tropical gardens. As a result contemporary visitors are buffered against the surrounding environment that is more distinctive of its Australian location.

![Plate 49: Camp on the edge North West Island c. 1928](image)
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In contrast, the earliest visitor accommodation on the Great Barrier Reef comprised canvas tents pitched on the water’s edge, among trees of the islands as is seen in Plates 5-9 and 49. Communal facilities and laboratories were makeshift structures often simply using the shelter of larger trees (Plates 6-50). And as discussed in the previous chapters visitors were exposed to a range of sensory experiences, including those produced through interactions with native vegetation. In this historic period visitors spent longer at particular locations, and travelled to more places on the Reef than they usually do today. Their experiences of particular Reef locations and of their relationship to each other were therefore more intense. People were subject to a greater range of sensations than contemporary visitors, and while many of these were uncomfortable or even dangerous, they provided the backdrop against which the Reef itself was celebrated. It even seems that the adversity heightened the pleasures of their experiences. While accounts are full of somewhat predictable rapture about life on the Reef, other aspects of the environment made deep and lasting impressions on visitors. In particular, the landscapes and environs of the Reef islands were an integral part of their experiences.

Plate 50: Dene Fry working in an outdoor laboratory on Masthead Island 1910

Dene Fry © Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales
My analysis of photographs from the early part of the twentieth century suggests that the vegetation in areas frequented by Reef visitors was distinctly Australian. Many of the photographs are quite small and indistinct. In spite of this, the vegetation is still visibly unmodified and ‘Australian’ in character. Other photographs show the island vegetation more clearly, and it is apparent that pandanus, eucalypts, hoop pines, she-oaks, tournefortia and pisonia trees were prolific. These species surrounded camps where visitors slept, ate and entertained themselves. It also covered much of the islands where visitors went walking, bird-watching or where they climbed to the summit of hills to look at a panoramic view.

Plate 51: Commonwealth Government promotional image for Heron Island used Pandanus, a native species, to frame the visitor experience.

ANTA © National Archives of Australia (M914/1, 5566) c. 1950

Within this rich range of sensory experiences the sound of she-oaks was highlighted as an integral and evocative element of the Reef islands (Pocock 2002c). The environment also offered a distinctive visual outlook. Some written accounts refer to the visual attributes of the native vegetation, but it is the photographs that really bear witness to its abundance and predominance in the landscape. Photographic images capture, both deliberately and incidentally, the dominance of the bush setting. Their forms are used to
frame photographs and lend texture and shape to black and white images. Photographers make use of the pandanus or screw palms to lend their striking silhouettes to black and white photographs of Reef twilight, and she-oaks add delicate fringes to the edges of images. This use of native species in promotional images lasted well into the second part of the twentieth century (Plates 51 and 52). She-oaks are also incidentally captured in photographs of outdoor science laboratories and other Reef localities. Their branches peek around the edges of tents and are scattered on the ground and among coral compositions (Plates 50 and 53). The analysis of historic photographs indicates that the Australian bush was predominant in the landscapes that tourists visited, and was thus integral to Reef experiences. It was also an unavoidable element in the presentation of the Reef to people who had never been there.

Plate 52: Casuarina branches soften the edges of black and white promotional images of Reef islands c. 1950

© National Archives of Australia (M914/1,5476)

Prior to visiting the Great Barrier Reef themselves, people had access to photographs through magazines, newspapers and private collections as discussed in Chapter 7. However, the number of images was in fact quite small. Photographic technology was not as prolific as it is today, and so the same photographs were recycled in a number of
formats and contexts as I have already pointed out. For instance the two images in Plates 32 and 33 were originally taken in 1910 when they became part of Dene Fry’s personal photograph album. The same images were subsequently reproduced in association with a *National Geographic* article by Charles Barrett (1930). Furthermore, the limitations of photography, particularly its inability to represent colour or underwater life, meant that publicly available images were black and white stills taken from above the water surface. The vast majority of which are (is)landscapes in which native vegetation is prevalent.

![Coral composition set among casuarina branches on Masthead Island, 1910](image)

**Plate 53: Coral composition set among casuarina branches on Masthead Island, 1910**

Dene Fry © Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales

The photographs used in advertising brochures were likewise black and white images characterised by the Australian bush. While advertising and other promotion also used drawings and posters that allowed the inclusion of more stylised elements, photography was a particularly important means by which the Reef was captured as discussed in the previous chapter. For early twentieth century visitors, the majority of whom were Australian, the bush landscapes of the Reef were not particularly distinct and on his train journey from Victoria to Queensland, Crosbie Morrison made the following notes in his diary:
General scenery very similar to Victoria–main bush is Eucalypt–mainly Maculata and Corynocalyx, with later a number of fine specimens of E. Alba [sic].

(Morrison 1925b: 20 May)

His diary entry for the next day is as follows:

At Mackay The Pioneer River is crossed, and the country settles down to become fairly uninteresting. The only features of interest are Canefields and a pineapple field. Pandanus continues to be a feature of the Creek beds, and in two cases beautiful slender palms in flower were seen.

(Morrison 1925b: 21 May)

His interest is clearly in those elements of the landscape that in some way represent the tropics. In writing to his family he summarises some of these observations and makes additional comments on the vegetation:

[The vegetation is] very similar to that of Victoria because of the gum trees which form the forest tree from Tasmania to Cape [York].

[From Rockhampton] the tropical flora starts, since Rockhampton is actually in the tropics. In all Creek beds are found a curious branching palm – the screw pine or Pandanus, – called by the natives Bread fruit – although it is not at all like the true bread fruit from the South Sea Islands. Another botanical curiosity – a tree-fern-like thing called Cycads – is also found along the line, together with grass trees very similar to those on Kangaroo Island.

(Morrison 1925c: undated)

An element that is noticeable in Morrison’s interpretation of the landscape is that the vegetation that is similar to elsewhere in Australia is not as interesting as the more exotic and clearly tropical elements. He therefore pays particular regard to sugar cane, pineapple, palms and pandanus or breadfruit, noting that the latter is not authentic. This points to an interesting paradox. Pandanus trees are native, and thus arguably authentic within Australian landscapes, but they are not a true form of breadfruit and are thus only substitute symbols of the South Pacific. Even though Morrison was a scientist, he was seeking something exotic. To this extent he was a holidaymaker like many others and his desires and motivations appear to agree with Urry’s (1990) theory that tourists seek a view that is different to the everyday. However, it is clear that the ‘different view’ that Morrison sought was one that he conceptualised prior to travelling to the Australian tropics. There is no suggestion that what he is seeking will be truly surprising, only that it will fulfil a preconceived idea of a tropical location. At the same time, however, the view that Morrison wanted to see, was not that of the Australian bush.
**Australian Bush as the Everyday**

As an iconographic landscape of attachment, the Australian bush is most typically portrayed as harsh, dry, inland rural country. It may at first seem that the bush is not necessarily an everyday experience for Australians because Australia is one of the most urbanised countries in the world and the majority of its residents live in urban areas on the coastal fringe of the continent. History has also shown that colonial Australians have systematically replaced the Australian bush with cultivated plants from Europe to reduce their sense of alienation in the Australian landscape (Franklin 1996: 39-56). However, the importance of the Australian bush in the construction of Australian national identity has been articulated by researchers from a variety of disciplines, including historians, philosophers and anthropologists (see, for example, White 1981; Kapferer 1988; Schaffer 1989; McGrath 1991; Spillman 1997). As this environment became more familiar, and nationalism strengthened, elements of the native landscape were subsequently protected, enhanced and reintroduced and now persist as valued elements in many urban areas of Australia. The bush also remains a place where urban Australians go to reinforce their identity (Knowles 1997).

In spite of inconsistencies between how people live and what they value, the bush remains a strong symbol in constructions of Australian identity. McGrath (1991: 114) has suggested that critiques of the bush legend have given a misplaced emphasis to finding realism in the myth, rather than paying attention to ideological purpose. The continuing role of the bush myth in Australian ideology is certainly suggested by its use in important national events, notably the Opening Ceremony of the 2000 Olympic Games in Sydney. The bush played an integral part of the symbolic presentation of Australia to the world at this event. As in academic discourse, the validity of bush imagery to portray Australia was discussed widely by the media, and is neatly encapsulated in the first of a four part television series, *Selling Australia*, screened by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation in 2001 (ABC Television 2001). However, Judith Kapferer (1996: 52) has argued that discussions that seek to undermine Australian myth-making do little to change the way in which Australians see themselves.
and the bush thus continues to play a powerful role in the portrayal of Australia and its people.

The bush myth is also an important aspect of marketing Australia as a tourist destination. Rowe (1998: 76-7) has argued that it is easier to use Australian ‘nature’ as a unique signifier of an Australian tourist destination than any built or cultural element. In spite of an awareness in intellectual and public discourse that the bush image is a construct, Australians’ own conceptions, and the perceptions of other nations, is that this is Australia. The bush continues to hold a central place in how communities in Australia assert themselves, and how they are perceived by others. Although the bush of popular mythology is not part of the everyday experience for most Australians, it is the imaginative norm.

**In Pursuit of Paradise**

So Crosbie Morrison, *en route* to the Reef, sought an experience that contrasted with the everyday bush of the Australian landscape. My analysis of sources suggests that the physical context of Reef experiences was transformed during the twentieth century in an effort to meet this expectation.

The potential for tourism to make an important contribution to the Australian economy was recognised in the late 1920s and the Australian National Travel Association was established in 1929 (Chapter 2). Attention was focused on the most lucrative overseas markets and those with the potential to attract desirable immigrants. The United States of America was a particular target (Prime Minister’s Department 1927). In seeking to promote the Reef to these markets the travel industry considered the existing facilities deficient for the establishment and maintenance of a larger tourism enterprise. In particular, the standard of accommodation and activities at island locations, and the supporting transport infrastructure, were judged to be inadequate for American tourists. Several tourism reports made strong recommendations for change (see for example Queensland Tourist Development Board 1947; Department of the Interior 1957), and during the following decades a series of alterations occurred within resorts.
A major impetus behind the nature of these changes is seen in the European idealisation of tropical islands. Western European fascination with the tropics has its origins in a search for the Garden of Eden, and in both medieval Europe and Arabia the creation of botanical gardens was a way of recreating an earthly paradise (Grove 1995: 21-4). During the ensuing centuries the need to maintain and exploit an increasing demand for resources took colonists to lands characterised by unfamiliar animals and plants. Colonial economic interests combined with the growing curiosity in scientific explanation made exotic lands even more attractive. Nowhere seemed more abundant in life than the tropical regions, and so they came to represent an actualisation of the idealised garden (Smith 1992; Grove 1995; Sheller 2001). The islands of the tropics drew particular attention because they served as self-contained units in which Europeans could more clearly delineate their observations of natural processes (Grove 1995). Sheller (2001) has argued that this taxonomic and spatial ordering initiated new ways of conceiving the landscape. The ways in which these new visions of landscape became standardised and imposed on other colonial landscapes is well documented (see, for example Ryan 1996).

Parallel with the utilitarian interest in the environments of the tropics, is a deeper psychological interest in islands. Along with the expansion in colonialism was a desire to find paradise. Social discontent in Europe encouraged people to imagine a Utopia, free of the burdens of their societies, and the tropical islands described by explorers seemed to offer the social refuge that people wished for. These islands became a rich source of material for popular literature in Europe, particularly in France from the 1600s, and so the tropical island fantasy became entrenched through fictional works like *Robinson Crusoe* and *Treasure Island* (Grove 1995; Sheller 2001). These works influenced popular thought about exploration, and most importantly shaped the colonial nature of tourism. *Robinson Crusoe* also experienced a resurgence in the late nineteenth century and was influential in a time that saw a shift in landscape preference from the cultivated to the romantic and wild. Sheller (2001) has argued that this influenced the conception of the tropical landscapes, particularly those of the Caribbean, as a natural Eden even though the landscapes had been vastly modified by human use.

It was the reports from Tahiti that most particularly captured the European imagination, rather than the lives of Australian Aboriginal people or Patagonians who were perceived
as leading much harsher lives. The Australian continent was, of course, also the subject of European colonial exploration but it is the harshness of this continent that is highlighted most frequently in accounts of the period (White 1981: 11-14). In contrast with descriptions of the Pacific, Australian indigenous peoples and the environment, flora and fauna of the continent are often described in derogatory terms. Accounts of the time seem to emphasise the lack of water and infertility of Australian soils. There is a particular focus on dangers and ‘weirdness’ that stems back to a time before the continent had been ‘discovered’ by Europeans (Langton 1996; Ryan 1996: 105-11). Although Ryan has argued that the inverted world of the antipodes placed Australia in a pre-existing paradigm, it was not one in which the perfection of the Garden of Eden is recognised. Rather it placed the Australian continent firmly at the extreme edge of the world where all that is perverse and strange resides (Ryan 1996: 105-11). The strangeness of the Australian landscape and the threats and disagreeableness it produced are well documented elsewhere. The alienation felt by the new colonists led them to modify the Australian environment to recreate the landscape aesthetic of Britain as a way of making it feel more like home (see for example Franklin 1996). However, by the nineteenth century the bush was regarded by Australians as home, and for many painters and writers it served as “an imaginative refuge” (White 1981: 102). The bush also developed a much deeper iconography, within Australian society and it is this that led to the link between national identity and the bush.

Barr has given an account of the developments that took place in the Whitsundays where locally owned resorts were replaced by ones controlled by non-local entrepreneurs (Barr 1990: 33-45). This was at least partly to do with a sense that the industry required operators to break Australian cultural practices. Sheller (2001) has argued that the Caribbean was a place where labour was done by others and this created a setting for abandon and indulgence to take place. In order to replicate this at the Reef, Australians had to change the way they thought about themselves. The provision of a labour-free environment was only partly true of the Australian context as the early tourist industry relied on pastoral family hosts more than the exploitation of indigenous labour. Although Aboriginal labour was used on the islands, Aboriginal people have largely been made invisible in the Great Barrier Reef tourism industry and it was not constructed around the same transparent paradigm of servitude. Barr (1990: 21-32) suggests that there was considerable resistance to the development of a tourism industry
around the Whitsundays as it came at too high a social cost. The money was not worth the breakdown of the egalitarian status that Australians liked to maintain about themselves (Kapferer 1988). This is implied in the comment by Henry Lamond when he said in 1931 “I wasn’t going to have my children dictated to by any half crown tourist” (cited in Barr 1990: 10). It is possible to read into Lamond’s comment that tourists behaved, and expected hosts to behave, in a way that was rather ‘unAustralian’. In particular, hosts were expected to assume a role of inferiority to the tourists which did not sit well with the concept of egalitarianism.

In spite of this local resistance, changes did occur and infrastructure was provided as early as 1932 when Embury first based an expedition on Hayman Island. This, however, was unusual, and visitors were provided with the option of camping, which suggests that it may have been a preference.

Members are to state whether they prefer a tent (as above) to a bed on the verandah of a community room. There will [be] such community rooms for either men or women. The community room with bed on verandah is recommended as most suitable for the climate.

(The Australian and New Zealand Traveller’s Gazette 1932: October)

Huts have been erected on Hayman Island, and for those who prefer them, there will be tents.

(Daily Mail 1932: 23 December)

On Lindeman Island in the 1930s, accommodation comprised grass huts (Plate 12) described as being of Torres Strait style (The Sun Sunday 1935: 20 January). From the 1940s onwards there was an increase in planted gardens, filled with exotic palms and hibiscus, and lined with white painted stones. This transformation occurred at different rates at different locations, but generally the resort accommodation became more substantial and the scrubby grasses all but disappeared in the immediate vicinity of tourist facilities. The Australian bush was no longer so invasive (see Photographic Essay).

These changes were encouraged by the tourism bureaux and Australian National Travel Association (ANTA), and local operators were encouraged to develop better accommodation and to provide a greater variety of activities and entertainment. Beyond the amenities, however, there was a less explicit, but concerted effort to change the
physical landscapes associated with the Great Barrier Reef. In a submission to ANTA, Theodore Roughley, a strong advocate of Reef tourism, said:

\[
I \text{ consider an ideal plan would be to choose a mainland island, on which a capacious modern hotel could be erected, and to run in conjunction with it one or more coral islands where comfortable thatch-roofed cabins could be disposed in such a way that the natural beauty of the island is enhanced and not spoilt, as so often obtains at present.... Most people have a mental picture of a coral island in a tropical setting of palm trees, of the crystal-clear water of a lagoon where multi-hued fish and other forms of colourful marine life abound, and where life may be idled away with the cares of the world forgotten. Every effort should therefore be made to present this picture to the tourist in actual reality, otherwise he [sic] may leave the Reef disappointed by his [sic] experience, with consequences that will be anything but fruitful.}
\]

(Roughley 1947: 97)

The implication of Roughley’s statement that “[m]ost people have a mental picture of a coral island in a tropical setting of palm trees,...” and that “[e]very effort should therefore be made to present this picture to the tourist in actual reality,...” is that, not only is the accommodation to be of a particular standard, but that the presentation of the physical landscape also had to change. Roughley’s statement indicates that in an unaltered state, the Reef did not fulfil the ideal tropical destination that many people expected.

In its native state the Great Barrier Reef islands could therefore be a source of disappointment for visitors. The incongruity between the imagined and experienced environment was reported in a newspaper article about the British expedition to Low Isles in 1928.

\[
Palm \text{ trees, turquoise lagoons, sand-like gold filings, cobalt skies, purple shadows, the lisp of the sea, staring moons -... In light fiction, yes; in practice, as the British scientists on Low Island are finding it, scarcely so alluring.}
\]

(The Sydney Morning Herald 1928: 29 November)

And in 1933, another newspaper article reported the disillusionment of the first Embury expeditioners to Hayman Island.

\[
A \text{ sudden [sic] descent during a breathless day by sandflies and mosquitoes left a trail of woe and drove many from shorts into long trousers. The newcomers experienced the inconveniences and discomforts attendant upon settling into a newly-formed camp. Others who were visiting these languorous}
\]
latitudes for the first time looked in vain for the blue lagoons and coconut palms, the turtles and mutton birds of fame and fiction. Picnic make-shifts and at first a rather uncertain dining schedule, were a new and disturbing experience for many.... This was not what they expected....

(Wigmore 1933b: 14 January)

This expectation of blue lagoons and coconut palms was not necessarily drawn from early twentieth century advertising. As noted, the photographs that were available were largely black and white images that could not fail to capture the native bush that surrounded the camps of early island holidays. The idealised landscape could, however, be introduced through images that did not rely on photography. Palm trees were sometimes sketched alongside text and photographs in brochures. Similarly the few early travel posters of the Great Barrier Reef that have survived include elements that were not necessarily present. Posters have the imaginative capacity to provide underwater views that were not necessarily available to visitors, as well as the capacity to manipulate elements of the associated landscapes. Images of the underwater world, fishing and boating are all present in these posters. Although landscapes are not always included or dominant, where they are represented they include some elements of the idealised island. A poster by Percy Trompf includes a glimpse of pandanus in a palm like formation on the edge of an island (1933) (Plate 3), while another by James Northfield (c. 1930a) gives prominence to palm trees on the edge of a sandy beach.

A 1947 report to the Queensland Tourist Development Board recommended that advertising be controlled to avoid misleading promotion. The report notes that the Great Barrier Reef, in particular, was the subject of deceptive advertising in Victoria and New South Wales. This was highly unsatisfactory for tourists (Queensland Tourist Development Board 1947: 50-1). Although it does not specify what aspects had been misrepresented, the concern was serious enough to make it a major recommendation. It can be assumed that at least part of the misleading advertising related to the facilities and access to the Reef. This is suggested by an account published in 1955 in which the author talked to a southern visitor at a Townsville hotel:

“I came to the tropics to play bowls – something you can’t do in the winter where I come from – and to explore the Barrier Reef. There’s a bowling green,” he pointed across the road, “but where’s the reef?”

“Out there,” I nodded towards the east, “forty miles away.”

“I thought it was closer than that. How do you get there?”

“You don’t, as a rule,” I replied.
His face assumed a quizzical expression.

“I don’t understand you. I came up here expecting to spend about half my time out on it, studying it and collecting shells. What about these advertisements you read, and the posters you see plastered up on railway stations about big game fishing on the Barrier Reef and all that?”

I explained that whilst Barrier Reef advertisements flamboyantly depicting the fishing, beauty and marvels were not exaggerated, in some respects they are grossly misleading. They convey the impression to the intending tourist that it is as easy to travel from the mainland to the reefs, as it is to go from Circular Quay to Manly [Sydney] or from the bridge across the Yarra to St. Kilda [Melbourne]. One advertisement I had recently read invited tourists to “Come and play on the coral islands”, but no mention was made how inaccessible they are, or how limited the accommodation.

(Lock 1955: 38-9)

This suggests that as late as the mid 1950s visitors experienced difficulties actually getting to the Reef. People who travelled a considerable distance from southern cities and towns were consequently confined to mainland towns and never reached an island or the Reef itself (Lock 1955: 39). It is also possible, however, that the problems with misleading advertising might have related to the comparisons of the Reef to other islands of the Pacific.

Plate 54: Honeymooners at Hayman Island in 1960. In spite of the Australian setting, the woman wears a hula skirt as representative of the tropics.

© National Archives of Australia (M914/1, 7129)
The South Pacific had become synonymous with an idealised paradise since the time of European colonial expansion, and tourism promotion consciously inserted the Great Barrier Reef into this paradisical paradigm. In spite of the fact that the South Pacific was itself a construct and experiences of places like the Caribbean could be just as disappointing (Sheller 2001), the Reef was frequently compared to the Pacific in brochures, newspapers and magazines. In 1934 *The Telegraph* newspaper captioned a photograph with the following description: “the Great Barrier Reef, where every year more Australians go to seek the glamour of the South Seas” (*The Telegraph* 1934). And in 1950 a brochure for the Whitsunday Islands proclaimed that “Queenslanders need not go so far afield as Polynesia for romantic coral-girt isles” (Queensland Government Tourist Bureau 1950). These aspirations were increasingly reflected in the physical landscapes of the Reef. As part of the upgrading of accommodation and facilities of the Reef, the Pacific theme was introduced into island resorts. Increasingly the Reef islands were portrayed as a Pacific destination. Photographs show an escalation in the generic Pacific elements in the resort landscaping as well as in architecture and decoration. Resort accommodation, meals, decor, dress and entertainment of an Hawaiian or generic
Pacific theme were fairly standard by the 1960s and 1970s (Plates 54 and 55, and Film Compilation).

**The Coconut Palm as Signifier of Paradise Found**

Even before extensive changes were made to tourism facilities and environments, tourists searched for paradise on the Reef. Their search was not always in vain. Both tourists and industry found elements of the tropical ideal they were looking for. Coconut palms, in particular, played an important role in meeting visitors’ expectations of a tropical location. There is some debate as to whether *Cocos nucifera* is native to Australia. Its absence from islands and coastlines at the time of Captain Cook’s voyage suggests that it arrived in Australia by human agency after European colonisation rather than by floating across the oceans (Cribb and Cribb 1985: 88-9). Even if coconut palms existed on the Australian coast prior to European colonisation, they were not present in significant numbers. Early photographs of the Reef support this, and show coconut palms to be quite unusual on Reef islands. Where they are present at all, they are growing around settlements and are much more noticeable in places like Low Isles where the lighthouse had been established since 1878, some time before the British Expedition was based there. The introduction of coconuts in these locations is usually attributed to mariners who planted coconuts and introduced goats to the Barrier Reef islands as a source of food for those using the Inner Route and working on ships in the region. Henry Lamond provides the following account which suggests that the coconut was not only introduced, but that it continued to be scarce in the Barrier Reef for some time after European invasion.

_I remember my father telling me, during a trip along the coast, that the government of the day, in the early ‘nineties, had put goats and rabbits, planted coconuts on many of the islands as an aid to shipwrecked mariners. The wrecks never came; the goats jumped ahead and prospered; the rabbits never survived a second generation; the coconuts took hold and grew where it suited them—which wasn’t in many places and on few islands._

(Henry George ("U.9.L") Lamond 1948)

In spite of the scarcity of coconut palms, early tourists to the Great Barrier Reef islands did expect to see them. When they were sighted tourists rushed to capture them in photographs and to engage with the traditions of climbing the long trunks, opening the
fruit and drinking their milk. Captions of photographs and accounts by people indicate that visitors are generally excited when they see coconut palms for the first time. The relative dearth of the trees was enough to make recording singular specimens worthwhile, and in extolling the beauty of Whitehaven beach in 1933 a holidaymaker wrote that “Whitehaven also possesses a stately cocoanut palm” (Stainton 1933). While this suggests that these trees were something of a novelty, they were obviously important to visitor experiences. In spite of their rarity, coconut palms are relatively over-represented in photographs in comparison to their actual presence. Promotional photographs and other images deliberately used particular elements which were subsequently captured in personal images. In this way their influence is made real by reportage of the photograph (Albers 1992; Watts 2000). The coconut palm in particular is used as a signifier of a tropical location. For example a picture of the writer Edmund Banfield’s bungalow on Dunk Island in a 1935 issue of Walkabout Magazine (Plate 56) purports to show the dwelling (Barrett 1935: 36). The photograph is dominated by a coconut palm even though the vegetation surrounding his home is distinctly native. Without the palm there is nothing to indicate that this is an image of life on the Great Barrier Reef, or even that it is on a tropical island.

Wherever they were found coconut palms became a focus of tourist attention. As signifiers of the tropics they were carefully framed by tourists’ cameras. So in spite of their relative scarcity on Reef islands in the historic period, photographs containing palm trees are quite numerous even though the surrounding bush is quite clearly less tropical and the palms unusual (see Plates 57 and 58). Both individuals and tourism organisations focused their attention on those parts of the Reef that did meet preconceived ideas of tropical islands. The following description from the Queensland Tourist Development Board in 1947 describes such an idyllic location.

_For 50 miles our twelve-ton launch dipped and rolled into the swell of the Pacific. A speck appeared on the horizon – Heron Island in the Capricorns. About an hour later we reached a tiny tropic isle, just a few giant handfuls of coral thrown up some fifteen or twenty feet above the reef, a thousand vivid green trees and palms jumbled together in riotous luxuriance, and there was your island paradise where the white coral shores are washed by the warm waters of the Pacific._

(Queensland Tourist Development Board 1947: 23)
The attention given to the palm appears to reflect a distortion in how people perceive the islands. This description of Heron Island suggests a bias in what is actually seen and remembered. The statement that “a thousand vivid green trees and palms jumbled together in riotous luxuriance” is somewhat at odds with a collection of photographs from a trip to Heron Island in 1953 (Love 1953) or the image published in the same period by Dakin (1950) (Plate 59). These black and white photographs suggest that the description of Heron Island is reasonably accurate. However, in none of the images is it possible to discern any palm trees, native or otherwise, and even today Heron is one of the few resorts that maintains native vegetation within the resort areas. Palms may have been present but they were not conspicuous, and the writer has remembered and focused on an atypical element in the jumble of plants.
Plate 57: A tourist poses in front of a young coconut palm while holding two coconuts, 1933
Berryman © National Archives of Australia

Plate 58: Tourist posing with coconut in front of palm trunk. Note the casuarinas and other scrub that dominates in the background.
Berryman 1933 © National Archives of Australia
Throughout the tourism history of the Great Barrier Reef, visitors are fascinated and drawn to the coconut palm. In 1925 Crosbie Morrison accompanied a scientific expedition to the Reef and spent considerable time on the adjacent mainland. His account of the beauty of Yarrabah Mission, south of Cairns, is linked with the presence of coconut palms.

The Mission Station is a picturesque place with lots of Coconuts [sic] and grass houses, and a white jetty and white cross.

(Morrison 1925b).

His descriptions of other locations on the Reef also contain this imagery of palms, and as cited earlier he paid particular attention to the “thick grove of palm trees silhouetted against the sky” (Morrison 1925d: 28 August). In the ‘Voyage of the Cheerio’ example, the importance of palm trees is clearly expressed by the different authors, including Eric Watson who said “[t]he setting was extremely beautiful; the tide came right up to the camp, while a full moon enhanced the tropical effect of the cocoanut palms” (Watson 1935).
By the 1960s and 1970s the idyllic tropical island had become a reality for many tourists visiting the Great Barrier Reef. Palms were planted in ever increasing numbers. Although these trees were no longer unusual, they attracted attention and formed an important part of realising an imaginary place. The planted coconuts were mature enough to be used in almost all promotion for the Reef, and the environments surrounding the resorts conformed to the imagined landscape. In visiting Green Island in 1975, Marjorie Bradsworth recorded in her diary that:

... Green Island ... certainly lives up to its name. A real tropical island with its palms and thick undergrowth and trees set in the very blue ocean which pales to a bright green in the water surrounding the island.

( Bradsworth 1971: 8 July 1975)

The Reef offers tourists what they want to see, and Green Island has become a “real tropical island”. For Marjorie Bradsworth this is signified, above all, by the palm tree. Early photographic images available of the Reef, as I have shown, depict an environment rich in Australian flora. In spite of this, people expected to find another landscape when they visited the tropics. The strength of the Pacific island fantasy was such that the desire to see coconut palms was expressed in disappointment when they were not found, and they generated considerable pleasure when they were. People seek out these trees because they symbolise being somewhere different. More than this, however, they represent paradise, and have been used in this way in other contexts (see, for example, Watts 2000).

The Coconut Palm as a Symbol of the Great Barrier Reef?

Locals who understand the Reef on the basis of long term relationships and experiences, and those who have worked and lived on the Reef for significant periods of time, find the palm and the ideal it represents not only misleading but unnecessary. For people with a longer term knowledge of the Reef, attachments are developed on a range of sensory and personal experiences that are independent of fantasy (Pocock 2002c).

As we saw in Chapter 5, long-time tour operator Captain Tom McLean found palms to be a poor replacement for casuarinas. In his opinion the sound of she-oaks was “infinitely more subtle” than palms (McLean 1986: 2). They also provided a good
source of shade that would have been very appealing in the heat of the day (see for example the picnic on Scawfell Island, 11). McLean’s sentiment is echoed by local communities in Proserpine, a small rural town on the Australian mainland coast adjacent to the Whitsunday passage. The Proserpine community has been resistant to the growth of tourism for a long time (Barr 1990: 21-32), and their relationship with the Reef is a complex mix of personal attachment through their own holidays and work experiences, and a dislike for what it has come to represent. In 1994 the president of the Proserpine Historical Museum Society expressed her sense of loss of the Australian landscape at the Reef:

_Hundreds of palms have been planted at various islands – sure this makes them resemble Tahiti, but where are the trees natural to the locality? In the days of the Embury expeditions, scientists called Hayman “a botanists’ Paradise”._

(Price 1994)

It is difficult to find an environment within any of the resorts in the Whitsundays today that does not conform to the ideal. Imitation cultural elements prevail in the ubiquitous Hawaiian style shirts of staff, thatched roofs and umbrellas. This is particularly noticeable at South Molle where hibiscus motifs, thatched roofing and Polynesian dance nights are highlights of the resort (Plate 60). However, they are not alone. Resort photographers on both South Molle and Long Islands are employed to wander among the guests to capture their images. They carry with them a suite of props including leis made of artificial frangipani and other exotic flowers to ensure their subjects will be captured within a context of the tropical illusion.

Common to all contemporary tourist islands are the smooth green lawns and neatly trimmed coconut palms (and other kinds of palms that look similar but require less maintenance) that dominate resort landscaping. Interestingly, however, native vegetation is abundant on Reef islands, even on the very edge of the resort properties. Tourists use very little of the Great Barrier Reef, and most of the 1,200 miles of reefs and associated islands and coast are relatively unchanged since European invasion in the late 1700s. The vegetation seen in the early photographs persists in vast tracks of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park World Heritage Area, which is carefully managed and protected. It is even possible to camp on a few of the islands in settings similar to those of the past. However, camping is barely promoted, and access to information about it is
limited. The vast majority of visitors stay in international style resorts with lush planted gardens. The environment that tourists are exposed to is one that is highly manicured and the way in which people interact with it is highly controlled.

Plate 60: “Flames of Polynesia” performers, Whitsundays, Great Barrier Reef

Although native trees, bushes and grasses are present in some of the landscapes surrounding resorts, they are much less conspicuous in the immediate vicinity of accommodation, eating facilities, public areas, popular beachfronts, poolside or in other areas most often used by tourists. Similarly, contemporary promotional materials use palm trees to frame tourist experiences. Thus, both promotional images and the experience of being at one of the resorts is characterised in this way. For the most part the space around resorts is highly controlled with distinct areas for staff and maintenance activities, and pathways and roads that steer tourists to particular parts of the islands and keep them within the confines of the constructed landscapes. There is also an emphasis in contemporary tourism on relaxation and indulgence and few people exert themselves enough to leave the confines of the resorts. The predominance of palm trees in the central parts of the resorts is unmistakable, and on disembarking at the jetty it is the clusters of palm trees that clearly indicate where the resort is located (Plate 61).
A Tourist Gaze for Australian Visitors

The comparison between historic sources and observation of contemporary tourist locations suggests that the Great Barrier Reef has become more idealised and less reflective of its Australian location. The exotic has been sought out and propagated. Although native vegetation persists in abundance on Reef islands and cays today, it is largely absent in the locations presented to visitors. The Australian bush has been removed from the daily experiences of visitors at the Great Barrier Reef, and is no longer a central image of the landscape. Some essential characteristics of the region have changed and consequently fewer people are exposed to an Australian landscape at the Reef (Pocock 2002c). At a time when the Australian Commonwealth Government is moving to establish a list of nationally significant places, on which Australian World Heritage properties will automatically be inscribed (Australian Heritage Commission 1998: 8) the Reef is experienced by the majority of visitors as somewhere that could be anywhere. The changes to the landscape of the Reef have implications not only for the conservation of flora particular to Australia, but also for commercial interests of tourism.
Increasingly overseas visitors are wanting to experience something that is more particular of place (Rowe 1998), and generic tropical islands can be found more cheaply elsewhere. Native flora and fauna of the Reef may not be exotic to Australians, but it is distinctive of the region and also of its Australian location. As such it could establish a necessary tourist gaze for overseas visitors. However, the exotic that tourists seek is not necessarily one contrasting with the everyday, but a contrast that is already known and understood within existing imaginative paradigms.

Furthermore, the Great Barrier Reef islands were and continue to be an important tourist destination for Australian people. The tourist context that has been constructed at the Great Barrier Reef is at the expense of an environment that is distinctly Australian.

Regrettably, these resorts offer such features as Bamboo decor, Polynesian and “Aloha” evenings with dancers in grass skirts. Australians must learn to create their own particular image, not copy that of other countries. Overseas visitors come here to see Australia and do not appreciate a false imported atmosphere. (Bennett n.d.)

In spite of Bennett’s claim in relation to overseas visitors, this “false imported atmosphere” has been created because it is distinct from the landscapes found elsewhere in Australia. It is also a generic ‘exotic’ that provides many visitors with their desired tourist experience.

Early written accounts of visits to the Great Barrier Reef do not generally focus on the visual aspects of vegetation on the islands. However, historic photographs show that early Reef holidays were essentially bush camps not dissimilar to those on mainland Australia that continue to be popular today (see for example Davidson and Spearritt 2000: 171-2 for a brief descriptive history of camping holidays in Australia). Knowles has argued in relation to families camping in the Tasmanian World Heritage Area that these activities are an important aspect of local identity. The interaction with the bush is much more than one of admiration “as you drive through it”, but rather is “meant to be ‘felt, smelt and experienced with the senses’” (Knowles 1997). In the early period, tourists who visited the Reef were primarily Australians and holidays on the Reef were similar to bush camping on the mainland. Without the ready access to the Outer Reef, or the underwater world of contemporary Barrier Reef tourism, visitors spent as much time
exploring land as they did reefs and the bush was indeed ‘felt, smelt and experienced with the senses’. Longer and slower journeys provided a strong sense of orientation and these experiences contributed significantly to the knowledge visitors built of the region, and through which they developed a strong sense of place. I have suggested that the symbolic importance of the bush in constructions of Australian identity is sufficient to make the bush an everyday experience for Australian people. Australians do not regard going bush as a tourist activity, but one that (re)establishes identity. For many, then, camping or going bush does not construct a tourist gaze that is distinct from the everyday. The Australian native vegetation is therefore incapable of constructing the tourist gaze, and in this state the Reef does not offer a desirable tourist experience for Australian visitors. In contrast, the idealised tropical islands presented at resorts of the Great Barrier Reef allow Australian tourists to believe that they are somewhere else.

Anticipation and imagination are important factors in modern consumerism, and Urry argues that these are constructed through advertising and the media (1990: 13). The barrage of visual promotion associated with Reef tourism is certainly dominant in consumers’ experience and knowledge, regardless of whether they have visited the Reef or not. However, promotion alone is not responsible for the way in which the Reef has been imagined and anticipated, or how those forces have effected physical transformation of the Reef environment. The expectations that early visitors had of the Great Barrier Reef region could be regarded as unpredictable within their temporal context. Black and white photographs dominated by Australian scrub cannot have been entirely responsible for people’s expectations. The strength of the expectation that left visitors looking “in vain for the blue lagoons and coconut palms”, or caused them excitement when they saw a coconut palm, suggests that this ideal was one entrenched through some other mechanism. People’s desire to find a tropical ideal at the Reef is a strong force in the changes to landscapes of the region. This desire is fuelled by the mental image of an idyllic Pacific island vitalised by fiction and adventure writing.

The ideal of Pacific islands was fostered and grown within a European tradition of romance about tropical islands described and depicted in the writings of Daniel Defoe, Robert Louis Stevenson, and artists like Paul Gauguin. This dates back to the fourteenth century in Europe and was renewed and reinvented in colonial contexts. Not all Pacific locations met the idyllic image that people had constructed, and eighteenth century
travellers to the Caribbean sometimes felt disappointment at the landscapes they found there (Sheller 2001). However, they were able to select particular elements of the scene to reconstruct an experience that mirrored that which was presented through popular literature and art of the time. Unlike the Caribbean, the Australian continent was characterised by Europeans as harsh and strange. In spite of this, Australian landscapes became familiar to colonists and ultimately this harshness became an important characteristic in national identity. The Great Barrier Reef offered an opportunity for Australian tourists to construct a paradise that was distinct from their everyday experience. This was not only an image consumed and desired by tourists, but one which the fledgling tourism industry shared. They truly believed that the recreation of this landscape would ensure the burgeoning of tourism in the region, and they have not yet been proved wrong.

The evidence provided by personal accounts of early Reef visitors suggests that the way in which the Reef is imagined and dreamed of, parallels and possibly precedes any major advertising. At the same time, personal experiences of the Reef mimic those of the advertisers. The Reef is therefore not experienced as ‘new’ but as a place that meets pre-existing ideals. Unlike the explorers of the Australian mainland who sought a pre-constructed blank, the Great Barrier Reef is already filled with elements of the tropical ideal before it is ever physically colonised, and stands apart from its continental affiliation. McGrath (1991: 123) has suggested that Australian tourists who now visit the outback “imagine that they are explorers”, and live out the Australian myths through a kind of historical re-enactment. Early visitors to the Reef express a similar interest in going to the unknown and orienting themselves in the landscape. However, whereas the outback myth creates a distinct past which is central to Australian nation creation (McGrath 1991: 122-3), the Reef provides the elusive promise of escape from the everyday. As such the region forms part of a larger mythical paradigm of a utopia free of the problems of society. Although the Pacific has become synonymous with paradise, the utopian landscape is no truer of any other part of the Pacific than it is for the Barrier Reef. As such the paradisical paradigm is essentially placeless. The deliberate construction of a Pacific landscape is created because it meets the expectations of a preconceived and therefore familiar and controlled ‘other’. The generic Pacific is thus a copy of something that has never existed and can be seen as a final stage simulacrum in
which the copy has no relation to an original and hence is hyper-real (cf. Baudrillard 1983).

Unlike the outback that provides an Australian colonial nationalism, the Reef fulfils another colonial vision: that of the generic and familiar other. While tourists who are predominantly of Western middle-class backgrounds demand a gaze that contrasts with their everyday experiences, they also want those differences to be comfortable and non-threatening. As Watts (2000: 248) has suggested, the palm is an example of the exotic made familiar, typical and therefore non-threatening and an attraction for visual consumption. It has been argued here, that the coconut palm is a forceful emblem of the idealised tropical island. The palm is not an isolated element, but part of a broader image creation of a Pacific ideal that includes tropical fruit, hibiscus and frangipanis and stylised architecture. The desire to find paradise at the Reef, however, is particularly expressed as a search for palm trees and the capturing of them in photographs. It is the lack of palm trees that are commented on, and expressed as disappointment in the early part of the twentieth century. It is also the palm tree that reinforces and satisfies people that they are in fact in the tropical location. This is not necessarily a Great Barrier Reef location, but it is a tropical fantasy. The essential element in tourists’ imaginative attachment to the Reef islands in the twentieth century is the palm. The coconut palm is a prolific and, importantly, an apparently ‘natural’ element of the landscape. It is also easily recognised in shape and form, and readily reproduced in gardens, photographs, drawings and cartoons. It is a striking motif in the earliest images of the Pacific, and as such is a powerful synecdoche of an imagined tropical paradise.

The changes to the tourist landscapes of the Reef are influenced not only by a visually prolific industry, but also by a colonial imagination. The human imagination is a powerful force (Taussig 1993: 22), and in the case of the Reef an abstraction has been given a physical presence. In creating an alter experience, tourism draws heavily on imaginative imagery and fantasy which underlies the power of the representations (Barthes 1957: 74-77; Rowe 1998: 78). The tourist gaze of the Great Barrier Reef that is created as alter through production of an imaginary ideal is a copy of a copy, or a simulacrum with no reference to the real. This produces a quintessential modern holiday in which the Reef is perceived and experienced in the same way as any other tropical holiday destination. The articulation of fantasy that is captured in this paradigm remains
both a construct and a spectre, and therein lies its continuing dominance in tourist imagery.

The simulacrum of the island paradise is also recreated through the underwater world, as I will discuss in the next chapter.
In the previous chapter I argued that the Reef has been constructed to fulfil a colonial vision of paradise. The focus of my argument was on the landscapes of the Reef and the shift away from sensuous knowledge of vegetation to the importation of visual symbols of the imagined paradise. In this chapter I similarly consider sensuous experiences in the experience and construction of the underwater Reef. This is a sphere that seems to deny human beings an everyday knowledge and experience, and yet many innovations in the twentieth century have facilitated greater access to this environment.

The corals, reefs and associated life of the underwater world are characterised by colour, light and sound that contrast strongly with the human terrestrial environment. To this extent an experience of the Reef remains otherworldly and hence maintains its charm as a tourist destination. In this chapter I look at how the underwater has been constructed as strange and marvellous and yet contained within familiar and everyday constructs. As with other modes of colonisation, including those inferred in relation to landscapes in Chapters 5 and 8, scientific explanation provides a means to lessen the strangeness of the underwater world. And it is through science and conservation that the Reef is commonly portrayed and understood. At the same time, however, science separates nature (other) from humanity or culture (self). In this chapter I consider the role of the human capacity to mimic and draw analogies as a means to undermine this distinction. Through mimesis the underwater world has been constructed and reconstructed as both familiar and fantastic, and people have manipulated and conquered aspects of the other which is the natural world.

**Cartographic Mimesis: Control Over the Other**

Since initial European colonisation of the Australian continent, observers of the Great Barrier Reef, in all generations, have highlighted the otherness of this natural
phenomenon. Whether it is a source of joy or fear, the alterity of the Reef is regarded as unsurpassed. Western philosophy, by and large, separates cultural and natural aspects of the world and through this binary positing Nature is defined as other in relation to human experience (Glacken 1999; Fullagar 2000; Lowenthal 2000). The sense of otherness is heightened in human encounters with those parts of the natural environment that are perceived as a direct threat or as inhospitable to humans. People are essentially terrestrial beings, and although many can swim and dive, human life cannot be sustained underwater. The underwater world therefore remains closed to everyday experiences. Human engagement with this world is restricted by the physical limitations of the human body and time spent underwater is always finite. As such this landscape is largely an alien one in terms of human phenomenological knowledge and the underwater world is constructed as a colonial frontier.

As outlined in Chapter 5, the earliest documented encounters with the Reef by European colonisers are characterised by bewilderment and fear. The Reef was constructed as alter partly through its geographical position in the antipodes (See White 1981: 1-15; Langton 1996; Ryan 1996: 105-7) and the fear of the unknown was an integral part of its physical threats. Early navigators perceived that the dangers of the Barrier Reef lay within its sheer physicality. The imagined and actual perils emanated from the labyrinth of coral reefs and the confusion of underwater formations that threatened to wreck or entrap their ships. They sought to conquer their fears of the unknown, as perceived from the surface of the sea, through a process of mimesis.

Navigators who charted the seas depended on a clear distinction between land and sea (Ryan 1996: 120), but the Reef constantly challenged this delineation through the myriad of corals and shoals. The labyrinth in which they found themselves was largely invisible. In the 200 years following British colonisation, mapping the Reef was a continuous concern. In the earliest period navigators used extensive sailing directions and made charts, maps and drawings to aid their progress through the coral maze and eventually to enter and leave the lagoon through the outer wall. European cartography is conducted within a Western scientific discourse that ignores the social construction of maps. Within this discourse maps are regarded as reflections of the real and are also confused with the real (Ryan 1996: 101). It is from this perspective that charts of the Reef were constructed as both mimetic reflections of the Reef and as copies through
which the original could be controlled. The threatening experience was eliminated by
the establishment of a familiar route through the Reef facilitated by charts. In other
words, the maps and charts made by navigators were copies of the Reef through which
its dangers could be controlled. Although a sense of fear continues to be associated with
the navigation of the Great Barrier Reef today, for the most part it has been overcome
through cartographic mimesis.

Baudrillard (1983) has suggested that simulacra represented by maps are not reflections
of a reality, but reflections of an abstraction. He has argued that the abstraction is now at
the point where the map precedes the territory, and creates the territory (Baudrillard 1983). Furthermore, he suggests that simulacra are now defined by their significance as
more real than the real, that is the hyper-real. While early navigators may not have
confused the reefs and shoals with charts of the Reef, the ability of the simulated
version to convert the unknown into familiar conventions is integral to how these copies
operated as a powerful means of controlling the physical phenomenon. As Ryan (1996)
illustrated that explorers drew on pre-established conventions, charts created the Reef as
a construction of European maritime conventions. Mapping the Reef depended on
reading and interpreting existing signs and using panoramic and controlling vantage
point that characterises Western cartography. Another important aspect of the Jorge
Luis Borges fable that Baudrillard draws on is that when the map finally rotted away,
the original landscape felt foreign and unfamiliar to the people. This reflects knowledge
of the Reef, particularly, as early navigators charted it and each generation of navigators
adjusted the recordings of their predecessors. More importantly, however, this reflects
the problem of using maps to manage human interaction with the Reef. Maps and charts
continue to be used as a central component of the management of the World Heritage
Area. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority seeks to control not only the
physical Reef, but also the way it is constructed and used by people, through provision
of zoning maps and approved navigational routes. Human interaction with and
experience of the Reef is not so easily captured and transformed through cartographic
mimesis. Rather, it sets up a site of resistance, or creates the capacity for human
interactions to go unnoticed (cf. de Certeau 1984). Maps are constructed through a static
Cartesian construction whereas technologies have allowed people to expand their
experiences beyond the panoramic. Human interactions with the Reef change more
rapidly than maps, and while the simulacrum of the map provides a comfortable place
from which managers seek to control the Reef, an historical exploration of visitor experiences at the Reef suggests that human experience is antithetical to this type of surveillance.

Historically, then, maps and charts of the Great Barrier Reef operated as copies that allowed control over the original. Maps also depend on an aerial, strategic view that is controlling and panoptical. Although charts were partly constructed through the use of soundings which gave navigators some sense of the sea floor and its composition, charts themselves operated from the surface. The underwater world that is now synonymous with the Great Barrier Reef was not yet accessible to direct human experience and remained a sphere of chaos and danger.

**Out of Control: A Return to Otherness**

As the superficial navigation through the coral shoals and islands became more familiar and people gained control over the Reef through mapping, modern developments offered a different view of the Reef that threatened to destabilise this position of power. According to Baudrillard, the simulacrum is a more comfortable place for (post)modern experience than the real world, and even in historic times cartography offered a means of building a simulacrum that created the familiar within the unfamiliar. However, initial interactions with the underwater world of the Reef initially plunged people back into the ‘real’ world. There was no equivalent to the cartographic simulacrum for them to experience the Reef at an intimate scale.

Science and technology facilitated and encouraged the opening up of an underwater frontier that was distinct from the surface world and cemented the Reef as definitively different and other. Scientific observation of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries paid greater attention to the life of the Reef itself, and thus began the human journey into the world beneath the sea. Scientists made observations in the coral pools on the exposed Reef at low tide. Essentially observation depended on still weather conditions and favourable tides. Holidaymakers routinely mimicked scientific activities and this type of observation from the surface was the predominant way in which the Reef was experienced in the earliest period of non-Indigenous visitation. Like the
scientists, these visitors peered opportunistically into clear water pools left by the receding tide. Here they were able to see underwater life, but it was a view through the water surface. The scene was quite volatile and any disturbance of the surface stranded the viewer in the superficial sphere. A good view of the corals could not be guaranteed.

Incautiously you move for a better view, when suddenly the world of brilliant fish-gems vanishes, like some illusive spectre, into the shade of the coral.

(Gilbert 1925)

Examination from above the surface did not allow participation in the world of the other, because disturbance of the surface closed the viewer out. Access to the underwater world was ephemeral, and the encounters were chance-like and thrilling. The experience was voyeuristic with the scene observed from outside as a non-participant. There was a lack of sensuous engagement within the living underwater world, even though collecting facilitated sensuous interactions on the surface. Examination of the Reef as a distant and alien world, separate from the superficial, maintained the Reef as distinctly other. The world within the pool was observed as distinct from the self and the characteristic view of activity is as an outsider or even omnipotent being.

These glimpses gave people their first idea of the particular nature of the underwater world. Without the simulacrum, human experience was challenged and overwhelmed by the excursions into the real which was an uncomfortable space. In 1925 an Australian Museum scientist, recorded that “[t]he first glance into a coral pool is bewildering” (Gilbert 1925).

Some early technological developments enabled greater visual access and facilitated more prolonged viewing of the Reef. The waterscope was a precursor to the glass-bottomed boat. Commonly comprised of a piece of glass at the bottom of a paraffin tin, it was used to look underwater without the interruption of surface disturbance. This equipment allowed people to view the subsurface at high tide, and from the sides of boats. Access was no longer dictated by the ebb and flow of the ocean and clement weather to gain access. The greater access afforded by waterscopes and glass bottomed boats made the frontier underwater landscape more accessible. People were able to observe and compare the landscapes above and below the surface. Like many colonial
descriptions of new places, particularly the antipodes (White 1981; Langton 1996; Ryan 1996), descriptions of life on the Great Barrier Reef are characterised by a sense of the other. Many include the adjectives ‘bizarre’, ‘weird’, ‘odd’ and ‘astonishing’.

Altogether the impression one of teeming life, altering in the course of centuries by an infinite amount of tiny efforts, one of the strangest features on the face of the earth.  

(Council for Scientific and Industrial Research 1926a: 19)

Early Reef visitors used the sea to bathe rather than to engage with the underwater world. Some early scientists, notably Mel Ward, developed swimming goggles to dive and collect samples. However, the vast majority of visitors had to settle for a view from the exposed reef, or through a waterscope or glass bottomed boat. Early views of the underwater Reef were from the surface looking in from above. There is a detachment that we do not necessarily perceive in the immersion of the modern diver. This position places the viewer as an outsider and the alter, and from this stems the desire to engage sensuously with the other. There is a sense of frustration at being separate, and a desire to get closer to the underwater world, to experience it in multi-dimensional and multi-sensual ways. The limitations of visual access compelled some early twentieth century visitors to enter the water fully-dressed. The desire to enter this world is also expressed in the following quote:

Alice should certainly have extended her adventures in Wonderland to Nor’-West Islet. It is a matter for distinct regret that not even the doctors in the party are able to devise a potion to enable us to shrink sufficiently to go for a ramble in the burrows of the mutton birds, and to enjoy an occasional tea party with the crabs, instead of poking a clumsy forearm or forefinger into their haunts and receiving only a sharp nip by way of communication; and the fascination of a leisurely swim and the intricacies of the coral fronds, with their gaily-colored [sic] population of fishes and sea-stars and eels and animalcule, finds its nearest substitute in some fleeting glimpses through diving goggles or a water-glass.  

(Wigmore 1931)

This introduced a tension between the need to maintain a controlling aerial view, and the desire to engage in a multi-sensual way with the living Reef. Sensuous engagement is less strategic and hence life observed below the water appeared strange and confronting. The strategic view of the Reef that was offered by maps and charts of the region enabled navigators to steer around dangers that threatened ships on the surface.
However, they did not provide a strategy to control the living threats of the hidden depths. In fact, there was as yet no comparable simulacrum of underwater life. As people acknowledged the complexity of the environment beneath the surface of the sea, new perceptions of danger emerged. People were forced to confront the real Reef in a way that maps had mitigated from a strategic vantage point. Many creatures that are now regarded as benign and passive were once characterised as malevolent.

*Here one has to pick one’s way carefully to avoid stepping into the quickly but forcefully closing mouth of a giant clam, or knocking one’s shin against the poisonous knitting-needle-like spikes of black echinoderms or sea-urchins, made especially evil looking by their points of light.*

(Council for Scientific and Industrial Research 1926a: 19)

Clams, in particular, were regarded as killers, and there are few accounts of the Reef from the first part of the twentieth century that fail to mention the risks of becoming trapped by the giant molluscs. Modern science has disclosed that certain dangerous animals do exist on the Reef. However, many of the earlier fears have been declared unfounded. Contemporary conservation ethics render the natural world benign and fragile, as opposed to the threat and dominance the environment posed to earlier generations (see for example Knowles 1997; Lowenthal 2000). In spite of this, fear continues to be an important element in the construction of the Reef. Fear enhances the alter state of the Great Barrier Reef and stages it for control and conservation.

In spite of many Reef dangers being alleviated through the construction and explanation of maps and science, first encounters with the underwater world continue to be marked by surprise and disbelief. The exclusion of surface turbulence meant that the scene through a waterscope was sometimes in stark contrast to the surface of the water. Groups of visitors who used this simple but effective tool gave out “[e]cstatic cries of wonder and admiration” (*Manilla Express* 1933). The waterscope thus opened up, not only fear, but a delight in the other that constituted the underwater world.

*You adjust your water telescope – this is usually an ordinary dipper with a glass bottom cemented in. When it is placed on top of the water and you look through the glass there is no ripple to obstruct the view, and you can see everything below as clearly as you can in your room at home. You make yourself comfortable by sitting down in the six inches or so of water at the edge of a pool, and place your feet on the coral ledge below. Then you begin*
to “listen in.” You throw your bread crumbs and meat into the pool, and your “picture show” commences.

("Whampoa" 1930: 20)

The invention of the waterscope provided the opportunity for visitors to see the Reef and its underwater life at close quarters. The view offered is microscopic and much less amenable to control than that which had been constructed from the surface. In other words, the view through the waterscope did not provide a vantage point from which to construct a strategic view. The view through a glass bottomed boat or waterscope is disorienting and results in a loss of control, or a loss of the composite picture available from a raised vantage point or a map.

Even though the view through the waterscope did not achieve the multi-sensual and multi-dimensional sense of participation that accompanies snorkelling and diving, it was more like that of a participant. The experience of the Reef through the waterscope sacrificed the panoramic view, and therefore is more analogous to ‘walking the streets’ (de Certeau 1984). It is an activity much less amenable to management through maps. However, the experience through the waterscope, like later ways of accessing the underwater Reef, provided an opportunity to elaborate a different view; that of coral gardens.

**Seeking Similitude: Coral Gardens**

The greater visual access to the Reef, facilitated by the invention of waterscopes, led to the naming of the ‘other’ with nouns and adjectives of the terrestrially familiar. The features of the underwater world are described in terms that make them known. This is not simply a matter of using the language of the colonising people, but describing elements of the underwater as artefacts of that cultural world. The choice of vocabulary is based on people’s recognition of similarities between underwater objects and those of the terrestrial cultural landscape. More particularly, nouns are used as adjectives to describe this very different world in terms of the superficial everyday.
A common description, including those from participants in the ‘Voyage of the Cheerio’, is the characterisation of the Great Barrier Reef as comprised of ‘coral gardens’.

_The remainder stayed on board to fish, and running up to anchor at the edge of the reef were delighted by the under-water views of the beautiful coral gardens ... submerged by the high tide._

(Watson 1935: 7)

As people peered into coral pools at low tide or by means of a waterscope, the corals are seen as gardens of flowers:

_For a moment nothing is observable but the clear, still water and numerous forms of coral, the polyps of which spread out their tentacles like the petals of a small daisy._

(Gilbert 1925).

_To gaze down through the deep blue, yet somehow crystal clear water, into what appears to be an enchanted flower garden, with blooms of unimaginable colouring and formation, and inhabited by the most weirdly and quaintly shaped marine life, of every rich conceivable and inconceivable hue, criss-crossed, zigzagged, circled, and spiked, with colours mingled and intermingled in a vision dazzling to the eye, proved a never ending joy, and held on spell-bound at its beauty, as the ever changing picture of the waterscope was revealed._

(Anderson c. 1935)

Other descriptions refer to corals as being like “a tropic forest”, and having “tree-like forms” (Council for Scientific and Industrial Research 1926a: 19). This animal world is more often equated with the plants that make up the gardens of Europe than with any marine or Australian landscape.

The nomenclature of similarity extends to the individual species of corals and other marine life. Within the coral gardens are mushroom, table, plate, staghorn, fan and brain corals. This nomenclature is so easy to understand that a group of uninformed tourists is able to readily recognise which species is which. These names persist today, and on one tour in the Whitsundays a tour guide commented how easy it is for visitors to recognise the corals from their names without him having to physically point them out. A similar observation is made in the narration of a 1952 documentary which states that although corals have complex scientific names, common names are given “for similarity to
objects with which we're familiar in our everyday life” (Cine Service Pty Ltd 1952). Similarly, fishes are named in reference to terrestrial animals. There are porcupine, squirrel, and bat fishes, as well as clown fish. Many of these names are reminiscent of European countryside. And as the coral is to a flower garden, fishes are to butterflies and birds. There are several species of butterfly fish on the Reef, as well as bird fish. There are hawkfish, several species of parrotfish and “beaked” varieties of other fish, all of which invoke their avian counterparts. The parrotfish is brightly coloured, and its name suggests that the fishes of the coral reefs are brighter than any bird in Europe.

It is possible that the analogy between butterflies and fishes comes partly from the netting of both in collections and research (Plate 36). One might expect the analogy to birds to be stronger in the correlation of fish names to those of birds and butterflies. On reflection, however, the nomenclature of fish dates back to a time before snorkelling and diving were a common visitor experience. In peering into the coral gardens from above people still had a perpendicular view of the garden rather than a horizontal one that is more characteristic of human participation. Birds are more common overhead in terrestrial experience, whereas butterflies are creatures that fly all around human stature. The analogy of water to air may not have been as apparent when peering into the world of fishes from overhead. The correlation between the underwater Reef and the terrestrial environment is made more complete through a range of technologies. It is also apparent in contemporary visits to the Reef that underwater participation is much more a focus of the experience than it was or could be in the past. To this extent fish-watching has largely displaced bird-watching and other land based activities.

Susan Buck-Morss (cited in Taussig 1993: 20) has suggested that new technologies have provided “a new schooling for our mimetic powers”. In this way, new technologies that give people greater access to the underwater world have engaged a range of senses beyond the visual. They have also facilitated a much more tactile vision, the eye becoming “an extension of the moving, sensate body” (Taussig 1993: 25-6). This sensate eye is able to conceive of the world around it in new ways and motion film has unveiled new human experiences of the Reef. Citing Koch, Taussig (1993: 36) suggests that film provides a sensuous connection; a blending together and dissolution of images and their movement. The capacity for free-diving, including snorkelling, also facilitates this new conception of the underwater world because, like film, movement in water is
analogous to flying and gives the human body the capacity to gain multiple views of the same object. The analogy of diving or snorkelling to flying is a common one, and the underwater landscape is conceived of as one of garden and air rather than coral and water. The coral garden is a construct that closely links Western notions of landscape with the world observed beneath the water, and the analogies are an important way for people to engage with the underwater in reference to their daily multi-dimensional experience.

The viewpoint is central to the construction of the picturesque and the panoramic (Ryan 1996) and the view of the coral garden is similarly constructed as panoramic and picturesque. While some explorers insert the ‘familiar other’ into unknown landscapes (Ryan 1996: 84, 117), in the case of the Reef, it is the very familiar and tamed garden that is projected onto the other. Through the construction of an underwater garden, the Reef is therefore transformed from a place of threat and danger to one of safety and discipline. Gardens are essentially tamed places in which the wildness of Nature is controlled and in which human agency is paramount. As such they are simulacra of Nature. They are peaceful places, and in constructing the coral reefs as gardens, the Great Barrier Reef came to be regarded as a benign place.

This taming of the wild and dangerous is reinforced by the creation of the tropical paradise simulacrum. Transformation of tourist landscapes at the Reef to meet an imaginary Pacific ideal replaces the characteristically harsh and dry Australian bush with an exotic, rich and plentiful tropical growth. The colourful coral gardens and the tropical paradise with its palms, hibiscus and frangipanis mimic each other. While the coral gardens are inhabited by brightly coloured parrot and butterfly fish, the island paradise is represented by colourful parrots and butterflies. The brightly coloured denizens of each simulacrum can be seen in the people wearing brightly printed shirts and leis around their necks in the island paradise, and the colourful fishes of the coral gardens. The fish of the underwater world are described as though they are indeed people at a social gathering. They are not only named after terrestrial creatures, but are attributed with human characteristics.
Numbers of fish are to be seen everywhere, scampering from under your feet as you bathe, and playing hide and seek among the coral.

(Morrison 1925c: undated letter)

Creatures that are perceived in this way are constructed as engaging in activities that parallel human occupation and play. The following description translates the strangeness and diversity of the underwater world into the equivalent diversity of contemporaneous Western society. It attributes anthropomorphic characteristics to the fish, distinguishing them with human temperament, and describing their colour and form as human clothing. They are also attributed with human vocation and share our sense of play and emotion. This social gathering is befitting of a coral garden.

Unmistakable flappers in dainty and charming garden dress of pale corn colour or pale green, bright young he-men in blue and green racecourse suits, long lank students in drab brown, fussing matrons in black and grey, scholarly Parsons in black with white collar all complete, grass widows flitting here and there and flirting their spotted muslins and fur-below, gay bachelors in greys, steady bankers going golfing in plus fours, footballers and tennis players in accoutrements that would satisfy the soul of the most exciting international representatives, shy and modest young things with blue bows and eyes that peer shyly from an almost hidden corner, tiny babies carrying a blue light and sporting their ribbons as babies were wont to do since Father Time first set his clock ticking, the stay-at-homes in black, brown, deep red, lurking in the background— all are there in one small coral pool, and also intensely interested you may stand there every day for two hours on the edge of such a pool gazing through a water telescope, and at the end of a month’s sojourn among them all find your “insatiable curiosity” is still an “insatiable curiosity”.

("Whampoa" 1930: 20)

The Great Barrier Reef as Commodity

The two simulacra, the coral garden and tropical island paradise, fuse the underwater Reef and the islands into a commodity. The commodity is itself an opportunity for fetishism in which the notions of the natural and wild are essential elements. This is the case even though the experienced landscape is entirely a simulacrum, and the way in which the Reefscape is experienced is a social construction. The endless reproduction of images of both the coral garden and the tropical island paradise are integral to the process of the Reef being made into a fetishised commodity. I will elaborate on some of the means by which this has been achieved.
The colonial history of the Great Barrier Reef has a temporal parallel in the development and use of the camera in Western societies and it has been photographed by an enormous number of people, from every conceivable vantage point. All possible still and moving images, from satellite and aerial photographs to microscopic underwater vignettes, have been used to portray and enhance the mystique of the underwater corals. These advances have also opened the way for personal experiences and conceptualisation of the Reef, providing some of the first horizontal and underwater views. Photography of the region parallels the tug-of-war between panoptic control and microscopic disorientation.

Life underwater seems quite beyond what human beings can imagine or describe, based on their experience of the terrestrial world. A certain magical or dreamlike quality is attributed to the experience that seems to have no equivalent in their terrestrial knowledge.

*Then, of a sudden, the incredible, blazing beauty of coral hues of every conceivable shade and color [sic], and of infinitely varied structure such as no human mind could conceive, leaps to the eyes. It is a shock that electrifies the imagination.*

(Wigmore 1932)

While visitors struggle for words to describe the Reef, photography provides a capacious means of reproducing and communicating the phenomenon (Chapter 7). Photographs can be carried and kept far from the Reef itself, and in this way they have brought the Reef from its state of alterity into the everyday. Photographs provide a means for people to experience the Reef, without visiting it in person. Although the coral garden and the tropical island are constructions, they are both held to be natural and pristine. Photographs of the Reef enhance this view through the elimination of any human, particularly industrial, activity. Postcards, tourism brochures, advertisements and other commercial reproductions largely exclude the industries that thrive on the Reef and adjacent mainland. In this way they serve to enhance the commodification and fetishisation of Nature. It is this aspect of the Reef that is misconceived and that gives rise to the Reef as a fetishised commodity.

The power of the photograph is due, at least in part, to the element of contact between the original and the copy which provides the copy with some power of, and over, the
original (Sontag 1973; Taussig 1993, and see Chapter 7). In this way photographs of the Reef have maintained and expanded the element of contact that is so central to the effectiveness of Reef mimesis. The camera has made the Reef tangible and communicable. This role is particularly valuable today when conservation management has lessened direct contact between people and the Reef. Contact is a central element in the authenticity of a Great Barrier Reef experience. Although contemporary divers gain greater access to the underwater world through immersion, people are actively discouraged from touching any of the creatures or objects beneath the surface. Photographs remain one of the few ways in which contact can be achieved and the vast proliferation of photographic images of the Barrier Reef is reminiscent of Taussig’s observation that: “[a]s with cinema, the eye grasps at what the hand cannot touch”. (Taussig 1993: 183). Close up views of Reef life are therefore an important indicator of authenticity in contemporary tourist experiences.

*Divers grope with words to express the gap between the experience and the recollection. The diver wants to latch onto and hold the feeling of being there. This helps explain the popularity of underwater photography. To me, holding camera gear gets in the way of actually 'being there', but, to many, film conveys better than words the immediacy of the underwater experience.*

(Love 2000: 10)

The activity of photography has a long history and continuity of use in Reef experiences. It has become more affordable and accessible to a broad range of people. At the same time conservation has diminished other practices of capture. Consequently, photography has expanded to fill these niches. I therefore suggest that photographs, film and video are the modern equivalent of fossicking and collecting; activities that were once an integral part of visiting the Great Barrier Reef. Like other kinds of collections, photographs can be sorted and catalogued and modern forms of photography also have the capacity to invoke other senses. The specimens once collected by visitors were part of the larger conceptual whole of the “Great Barrier Reef”, and this gave these items particular significance. More than mere memory aids, these acts of souveniring gave visitors a tangible object that was part of the original, and hence assumed this power in its own right.
After the “lions have been fed,” each seeks from the organisers his own washing basin and hurricane lamp, and prepares for nightfall. As a little of the afternoon is left, the beach is visited, and the amateur conchologists are seen picking up shells that would be despised on the beaches of Sydney, Melbourne, and Southport. In the evening the electric torches with which the visitors have provided themselves make the island look a veritable Venice and the lights shining in the tents give the island the appearance of having large Chinese lanterns resting on the ground.

(Collins 1933)

The above quote also suggests that it is not the intrinsic aesthetic qualities of the shells or objects themselves, but rather their connection with the Reef. The coral fragments and shells that are scattered around the world are powerful connections between the Reef and visitors, and create a link between the everyday experience and the otherworldliness of the underwater Reef. Shells are still dominant in the souvenir trade associated with the Great Barrier Reef and some of their significance rests in their status as ‘natural’ objects, or as a part of ‘Nature’.

In this way, too, aquariums have come to be an important and ‘natural’ link between the underwater world of the Great Barrier Reef and the everyday terrestrial experience. Aquariums present a sophisticated form of collecting, voyeurism and imitation. They also provide a sense of immersion. They represent both contact and copy, and bring the Great Barrier Reef into the everyday while maintaining distinctiveness. However, the element of contact is slightly displaced in that visitors do not collect their own specimens for display. In other words, aquariums have no direct equivalent in visitor participation. However, they facilitate control of the unknown through the provision of a simulacrum, which is itself a part of the commodification of the Reef.

Early aquariums were no more than holding tanks constructed on Great Barrier Reef islands. They allowed scientists to observe specimens collected from nearby water in close detail. Without access to the underwater world, scientists needed to create controlled environments in which to make observations. Aquariums of a more sophisticated nature are still used in this way by marine researchers. The creation of a copy in the form of an aquarium represents an act of mimesis in which both copy and contact ensure the power of the original are maintained, and even expanded. Life in aquariums is observed as though it is the original and the scientific explanation is in no way undermined by the artifice. The control provides a means of gaining greater
accuracy and thus the aquarium operates as a simulacrum that is more powerful and significant than the original.

Aquariums also offer the opportunity of holding and observing the Reef some distance from its original location. Early attempts were intended for both scientific examination and as a way of bringing the Reef to those who had no personal experience of the place. Photography and collections of shells and corals were not always sufficiently powerful copies of the original. The loss of colour in both photography and collections was particularly problematic in recreating the wonder of the Great Barrier Reef (Chapter 7). The sense of movement was also lost and viewpoints were limited. The expertise and technology required to transport and keep reef creatures in non-tropical environments is complex and costly. Many early experiments were unsuccessful, but the possibility of creating a part of the Barrier Reef in a more accessible location was, and continues to be, vigorously pursued.

*The collection for the Zoo is an experiment which may lead to many of the vividly coloured coral fish being brought before the eyes of the Sydney public, but this first consignment was seriously depleted when the wire net in which the catch was being towed to the boats fouled a snag.*

(Wigmore 1933a)

The aquarium is able to bring the other of the underwater world into the everyday human experience in comfort and convenience. Before the technology was fully developed, underwater viewing chambers were constructed on islands and these offered similar convenience, comfort and ease of access for tourists on short-term visits. The underwater viewing chamber offered secure and guaranteed access to the underwater world by submerging the viewers beneath the surface where weather could adversely affect the experience. This way of viewing the Reef still provides good access for those of differing abilities who cannot snorkel and dive, particularly the elderly and the very young. In the second half of the twentieth century underwater viewing chambers removed the necessity of uncomfortably bending over coral pools, squeezing around the glass panel in glass-bottomed boats or in fact being on water at all. People can enjoy the Reef while seated or standing in completely dry surroundings, and yet still engage with the visual experience of immersion. The chambers are likened to lounge rooms at home and so the extension of the familiar into the frontier landscape is expanded. In this respect the underwater viewing chamber was a real prototype for the modern aquarium.
The commercial aquariums we know now, are large-scale enterprises with large glass fronted tanks which allow the viewer to look at the exhibits from the vantage point of the underwater diver or participant. More than this, observers tend to stand and walk around as they might on land and so the sense of routine participation in the underwater world is accomplished.

The Great Barrier Reef lies some distance off the Australian mainland, and many tourist centres on the associated coast have some form of aquarium for tourists to visit. Many refer to the Great Barrier Reef in their presentation and promotion. Townsville is situated adjacent to the Central Section of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area. In spite of this proximity to the original, Townsville has an aquarium of its own, called “Reef HQ”, self-proclaimed as “the world’s best living reef experience” and a more recent refurbishment of the facility has seen the adoption of the slogan “see the reef up close”. It is synonymous with the Reef itself, and allows people to experience the Great Barrier Reef without leaving the Australian mainland. In Sydney, the Australian gateway for the majority of overseas visitors, there is a large aquarium that boasts a “Great Barrier Reef” section. A promotional web site for the aquarium states that “[h]ere you will see the Great Barrier Reef close up” (Quakk.com/). The aquarium facilitates access to the Reef for those who cannot visit the original location in person, and the Reef is thus experienced and understood through an elaborate simulacrum.

As copies of the coral pools and the underwater world, aquariums continue the chain of replicating images of the Reef that is necessary to the fetishised commodity. Relatively early in the colonial history of the Reef, the original begins to be described as the copy as a way of communicating its significance. The coral pools and underwater world of the original Great Barrier Reef are described as aquariums. The narration of the 1935 Film, This is Australia, suggests that the Great Barrier Reef is an aquarium and the life within it, merely items of display:

*The Great Barrier Reef, the grave of many a ship, a golden expanse of amber coral, built by tiny insects, a marvellous aquarium. Now look at the exhibits: there’s a dogfish ... a bêch-de-mer....*

(Gamon 1935)
Aquariums allow people to walk around and view the underwater world as a participant. However, they remain terrestrial – they dress conventionally, breathe without artificial aids and talk, hear and feel as they do in everyday life. In spite of the success that aquariums achieve in bringing the Reef into the everyday, facilitating access and providing almost unlimited close up views of underwater life, there is an incomplete metamorphosis particularly as sensuous experience is limited to the visual. Diving, even more than snorkelling, is therefore hailed as the ultimate Reef experience.

Free-diving and snorkelling provide some freedom of access to the underwater Reef, but the need for oxygen limits the sense of real participation and forces people to the surface. The transformation of the human body has certainly been aided by the development of new technologies. Scuba gear allows people to breathe and balance in water as though they are fishes, and it is possible to remain submerged for extended periods. Nor is it necessary to maintain a physical link to the terrestrial sphere by ropes and tubes of earlier diving helmets. However, for contemporary divers, the limitations are all too apparent, and the intrusion of time, as oxygen supplies dwindle, is a reality that transgresses the transformation from human being to sea creature (Love 2000: 12). These means of knowing the Reef, however, are primarily visual means. Although the capacity to dive has created new sensuous interactions in the form of floating and immersion, other senses are diminished through the same technologies. Although divers can hear sounds of the Reef and fishes, they are even more likely to hear their own bodies – particularly breathing. The air is pre-packaged in aqualung and tastes are limited to the mouth piece with only the general taste of salt. Access to the underwater world is thus always limited to particular visual qualities.

The Great Barrier Reef is largely understood through scientific explanation, and the history of the Reef is also a history of science. People’s engagement with the underwater world of the Great Barrier Reef, however, suggests that mimesis has been equally important in its appropriation and control and the visual amenity valued in the underwater vignettes is the same as that of the terrestrial world.
I have argued that the Reef is understood through the construction of two simulacra, the tropical island and the coral garden. The fusion of these simulacra into the conception of a single ‘Great Barrier Reef’ creates a commodity that is central to how the region is appreciated by tourists and valued by managers. It is a fetishised commodity because both tropical islands and coral gardens are misconceived as ‘natural’ or part of Nature.

The conception of a single and natural entity is fundamental to the World Heritage status of the region, the way it is managed and how it is appreciated by visitors. The natural quality of the Reef is its most important attribute. World Heritage isolates and rarefies naturalness as distinct and important. Nature is assessed under its own system that makes no reference to those who ascribe or inscribe the values. Visitors’ authentic Reef experiences are also dependent on this ‘naturalness’, or an encounter between humans and ‘nature’, self and other. The way in which heritage systems and visitors value these natural qualities is also dependent on the unparalleled scale of the Reef. The fusion of these attributes into a single commodity is itself dependent on the simulacra of maps and imagery. This chapter explores how these attributes of uncontaminated nature and unprecedented scale, both essential to the World Heritage status of the region, are constructions that cannot be experienced except through simulacra.

A Single Reef

In earlier chapters I have outlined the ways in which the Great Barrier Reef has been constructed as a single entity. This commenced with navigators and the cartographic conventions that allowed them to conceive of the Reef in terms that were familiar to them, and which enabled the region to be represented in a single view. The creation of maps and charts of the region have also gained a visual reality through the advent of aerial photography and satellite imagery. Although these technologies make use of a
number of manipulative techniques, photography is credited with representing an actuality and through them, the Reef as a singular entity is visually confirmed. The cartographic and aerial syntheses are also integral to the way in which the region is managed. The promotion of the region as a single Reef was also important for the conservation lobby and resulted in the establishment of the world’s largest marine park and the inscription of the largest World Heritage property. Support for the preservation of the whole Reef, rather than a series of discrete marine parks, rested largely on ecological arguments that the many individual reefs operate as an interrelated whole (Wright 1977). The conception of a single Great Barrier Reef is also responsible for its characterisation as unique because it creates a Reef system of a size that is unparalleled by any other. In this way the size of the Reef stems from its creation as a single entity and, although a construct, is taken as synonymous with the natural qualities of the region, including its aesthetics.

Nature is also misconceived in management itself. The notion of Nature as other is essential to management. Without the dualism between nature and culture, management and conservation lose their purpose. For if human activity is considered to be part of natural processes, managers and conservationists would not feel obliged to reverse instances of human impacts. On this basis Milton (2000) has argued that it is in the interests of conservation to uphold and extend the separation of people and nature. The insistence on this binary opposition results in an ambiguity in the way in which conservationists themselves operate. Management and conservation wish to eliminate human interference in the natural sphere, but this requires a denial or exclusion of their own activities that are other forms of intervention (Milton 2000). In this way too, the control of the Great Barrier Reef is ambiguous.

**(Mis)Management: Magic and Contagion**

Management is not simply about allowing biological and geological processes to continue, but rather involves controlling and disciplining the Reef. The control that management seeks is the prevention of contagion between industry (or people) and the Reef (or Nature). The threats from people are seen as both direct as in instances of physical collision or oil spills, and indirect through occurrences like global warming and
associated coral bleaching. Both are regarded as instances of contamination, in both a magical and physical sense, that leads to a loss of Nature.

*Humans have had it good till now. Now the corals are telling us – beware. Our time may be coming to an end. Watch out for the corals. When they go, we’ll follow.*

(Love 2000: 188)

This statement suggests that the future of the Reef is directly linked with the future of humanity. Love’s comment clearly indicates, that in spite of her own deep time account of geology and the coming and passing of reefs and other phenomena, that the future of humanity is interchangeable with the future of the Reef. This suggests a totemic relationship between people and Reef.

The symbolism of the Reef is therefore ambiguous in the way that Knowles has identified a conflict in the relationship that bushwalkers have with the bush. She identified that the bush was both a threat and a source of well-being to bushwalkers (1997: 57). Likewise, the health of the Reef is a reflection of the health of the people, and yet it is possible for the people to be drowned, stung by deadly marine stingers or eaten by any number of large carnivorous creatures on the Reef.

Control over these dangers has been effected through mimesis as a means of colonisation. This is a two way process (cf. Taussig 1993) in which people transform the otherworldliness of the Reef into the everyday, and simultaneously desire to become other. This has been accomplished through a range of mimetic technologies and the creation of simulacra. These allow visitors to experience the Reef in ways that are analogous to their everyday activities and surroundings. At the same time, other technologies allow visitors to enjoy intimate encounters with the underwater world as participants. This is seen in technologies that enable the transformation of the human body from terrestrial to marine creature. However, the desire to be other runs contrary to conservation in which humans are excluded from Nature.

In spite of the control that mimesis facilitates over the other, contagion threatens to undermine that relationship. The distinction between the Reef and people, its position as Nature in opposition to culture, is essential to the way in which the region is managed.
Reef management is founded on the dualism of industry and nature. The production and reproduction of Reef images and other simulacra are careful to eliminate elements of the everyday. Images in postcards that proliferate around the North Queensland tourist industry are largely free of sugar mills, mine sites and other evidence of industrial activity in the region. Pictures of the Reef show brilliant colours and healthy marine life. There are few images of the everyday industrial or domestic world. Maintenance and work associated with the tourist industry itself is carefully disguised; taking place in the early hours of the morning, in segregated parts of islands or towns, or elsewhere that it can be made invisible. Human intervention is hidden and the simulacra is made more effective. This is not merely a matter of creating the tourist gaze (Urry 1990), but of maintaining Nature as other.

Instances of contagion between Nature and people disrupt these relationships and also highlight other misconceptions in management of the Reef.
Case Study: *Bunga Teratai Satu*

On 2 November 2000, the container ship *Bunga Teratai Satu* crashed onto the Great Barrier Reef, 22 nautical miles southeast of Cairns. The incident and the subsequent reparation made national and international headlines. The ship had stuck fast to Sudbury Reef, in essence a small part of the whole. However, the reaction that the incident sparked suggested otherwise. The perceived impact was far greater, and it seemed that the whole of the Great Barrier Reef was under threat. Similar arguments were successful in the lobby to create the Marine Park in the 1970s (Wright 1977). However, unlike the issues of oil spills, mining, coral bleaching and Crown of Thorns outbreaks the damage resulting from this particular incident can be seen as relatively contained. Nevertheless it represented an instance of direct contagion between industry and nature, and as such threatened all of Nature. Contagion between the two opposing elements threatened not only that particular location on the Reef, but the phenomenon as a whole.

Significant physical damage occurred to the corals of Sudbury Reef when the tanker struck. Initial reports suggested that the ship had left a seventy metre length gouge in the coral. Further threats were also identified from the contents of the vessel. There was no suggestion that the ship itself was damaged or that its contents would escape their containers. However, media coverage sensationalised the oil, chemicals and other pollutants on board. Freeing the coral of the ship became a priority, and several unsuccessful attempts were made to refloat the *Bunga Teratai Satu* in the days after it was grounded. It was almost two weeks before tugboats were able to pull the tanker from Sudbury Reef, and not until three sections of the reef had been removed with explosives. A history of Reef navigation and the passage of time have demonstrated that wrecks can in fact be as rich, if not richer, in biological diversity as other marine locations. However, the possibility of leaving this ship on the Reef was never considered – not least because the vessel was in tact and its cargo destined for Australian consumers. Nevertheless its presence was seen as particularly polluting because of the anti-fouling agents used on the ship’s hull. This is toxic to marine life, and even after the ship had been removed, conservation groups were suggesting that its effects would be felt for anything up to five years (WWF Australia 2000). There is also something more to this repulsion which is echoed in Love’s (2000: 77) comment that “[h]umans build artificial reefs from old tyres and concrete blocks. Nature, one hopes,
will do better”. Why is the interference of humans, or the addition of artificial materials to the Reef, so abhorrent if they ultimately extend the diversity and richness of marine life that is valued and revered in World Heritage listing?

Once the ship was freed from the Reef, divers immediately went underwater to see what damage had been done. A film from this excursion was released for television news and the public was shown an underwater desert with lots of sand and coral rubble. In these colourless depths viewers saw not the colourful fish and coral usually associated with the Reef, but grey sharks and stonefish that had begun to recolonise the area. While this might have been considered a positive and remarkable speed for initial signs of recovery, what is emphasised in the reports is the return to danger and chaos. *The Australian* reported on 12 January 2001 that a clean-up operation had begun to restore the area of impact.

*With a shark as an inquisitive visitor and poisonous scorpion fish providing an occupational hazard, divers were yesterday cleaning up the mess left by a Malaysian container ship that ran aground on the Great Barrier Reef late last year.*

*(Pryor 2001)*

Scorpion fish include lionfish and firefish which although venomous are renowned for their striking form, brilliant colour and beauty. In this report, however, the scorpion fish, together with the sharks and stonefish shown in the news footage, have been relegated to the poisonous, dangerous and ugly. Stonefish are adept at camouflage and are able to transform themselves into the grey and mottled colours of the sea floor. Because they present a hidden danger they are characterised as threatening and malicious, and the stonefish is also referred to as the ugliest of all fish. In contemporary promotion and experience of the coral underwater these dangerous creatures are seldom highlighted. The incident of the tanker and the destruction it caused can therefore be seen to have disrupted more than this specific area. The colourful coral gardens were returned to a colourless and dangerous threat. There was also a loss of the order and containment of the garden. A strong call by conservation groups to have all vessels escorted through the Inner Route suggests that the control achieved through cartographic mimesis had been lost.
The contagion caused by the tanker also hints at another form of contagion that is not often recognised in relation to the Great Barrier Reef and World Heritage listing. The recognition of the Reef as a place of universal value brings with it a strong implication of global ownership which has been a source of conflict for many local communities at World Heritage properties. The Reef is also presented and constructed through an idealised Pacific that displaces its Australian context (Chapter 7). Furthermore, the tropical islands and coral gardens can both be seen as colonial constructs laden with values of the British Empire. The Bunga Teratai Satu therefore poses another form of pollution, and that is of the exotic. The fact that the tanker was Malaysian – Asian and Other – was given considerable attention in the press even though the goods were intended for Australian consumption. At a time when the refugee polemic was raging, the Reef incident reflected heightened Australian xenophobia. It was one of the few instances in which the Reef was claimed by the Nation and not for the world. This exposes some of the values implicit in heritage regimes and the groups whom they best represent.

The physical area of impact from both the collision of the Malaysian tanker and the consequent management and recovery strategies is relatively small in relation to the 350,000 square kilometres of coral reefs and islands that constitute the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area. The contamination, in a magical sense, however was polluting of Nature. Contagion occurred when the carefully separated elements of nature and industry mingled as a result of the accident. Maintaining the separation of industry from nature forms the focus of Reef management today. The idea of the authentic, pristine naturalness of the Reef is an essential part of the way it is valued by the listing processes of World Heritage. It is these underlying concepts of authenticity, nature and wildness that underpin the value of the Reef as a commodity. Management and experience of the World Heritage Area are oriented towards maintaining and witnessing these ‘natural’ values, and preventing contagion between two opposing forces.

It is ironic that the human influence so central to the establishment of the garden, the islands and the conceptual whole that provide people with control over the Reef, is also a source of contamination and destruction. This ambiguity creates a series of contradictions that undermine conservation of the Great Barrier Reef. The four major contradictions are:
• Through mimesis people seek to control the other, and also to become other.
• The Reef is both a source of well-being and a source of danger.
• People must not interfere with Nature, but intervention is necessary to (re)construct or maintain ‘nature’.
• Biodiversity enriched through artificial means is less valuable than naturally occurring biodiversity.

A further point of particular interest is the idea that the threat to one small reef could undermine the integrity and authenticity of the whole Reef, and by implication, the health and future of all humanity.
The Whole is not a Sum of its Parts

The ultimate view of a single Great Barrier Reef is that from space. In one picture it is possible to conceptualise the Reef as a whole, to comprehend and control it through a reproduction that has the power of the real. At the same time the complexity and diversity of the Reef is illustrated through reproductions of its intimate life forms. In this way the Reef that people experience is a cinematic collage. The collage is made up of multiple images at different scales and from different viewpoints. It comprises strategic satellite and aerial imagery, scenic panoramas and images of islands and seascapes. There are also surface images of and by tourists, in hotels or by pools, on islands, ships and dinghies, walking on beaches and resting under palm trees. The collage also brings underwater divers and the living reef to the surface in detailed close-up imagery of polyps, fish, sea slugs and micro-organisms in the sea floor. The challenge to management is that these activities and views are not singular or strategic. For all that the Reef is renowned for its immensity, most people experience it through very small parts. These experiences of the Reef are antithetical to management. Management is dependent on the panopticon, or strategic view as represented by maps, aerial photographs and zoning. However, the way in which people actually experience the Reef, through snorkelling and diving, aquariums and glass-bottomed boats, is through its parts. In other words management operates through a misconception of the Reef as a whole. This is analogous to de Certeau’s (1984) walking the streets in which the strategic view of management is unable to reflect the experiences and practices. The way in which people experience the underwater Reef is also reminiscent of Dr Aziz in Salman Rushdie’s Midnight’s Children. Dr Aziz treats a female patient through a hole in a sheet that is held up to preserve her virtue. In diagnosing and treating the woman in small sections, Dr Aziz falls in love with the parts rather than the whole.

\[In short: my grandfather had fallen in love, and had come to think of the perforated sheet as something sacred and magical.\]  

In this way, too, people have fallen in love with the Great Barrier Reef, and the technology that facilitates access to the underwater is itself sacred and magical. Human
love of the Great Barrier Reef is also a love of the human capacity to mimic the ultimate other, Nature.

Whether looking through the water surface, a waterscope, glass bottomed boat, aquarium porthole, camera, microscope, or even facemask, visual interaction with the underwater Reef is analogous to looking through a perforated sheet. In spite of all the technology that facilitates access to the underwater world, the Great Barrier Reef remains alter and human experience limited. People try to control and understand this through the production and influence of technology. Reproductions pull the Reef in many directions. They subjugate its sublime character, extend its infinity and control its dangers and difference. The elaborate chain of mimesis that is processed through maps, photographs, films and aquariums, is integral to the fetishisation of the Reef as a commodity. The appeal of the Reefscape stems not only from its otherness, but also from the way in which its signifiers have captured and enhanced the power of the original. A history of experiences of the Reef suggests that it is not a linear history of controlling events, but a constant pulling and pushing of the mimetic faculty that both gives and removes governance over the phenomenon.

**Hyper-Reality**

The elaboration of ways in which the Reef has been reproduced and replicated is an indication of its status as a fetishised commodity. The endless production of photographs and the creation of aquariums also leads to the production of the hyper-real (Eco 1986). Effective mimetic technologies produce a hyper-reality in Reef experiences in which the copies appear more authentic than the original. For many snorkellers and divers the experience of entering the underwater world of the Great Barrier Reef is reminiscent of the aquarium, so that in relating the thrill of her first dive on the Great Barrier Reef, Karen Miller recalls that “[t]here were many mixtures of parrotfish and butterfly fish, which always remind me of aquarium fish” (Miller 2001). This inversion of the role of copy and original, between the aquarium and the Great Barrier Reef, is further sublimated in the example of ReefWorld.
ReefWorld is a self-contained aquarium centre. Like many modern aquariums, it offers a viewing chamber, souvenir shop, kiosk and dining. It is a little more unusual in that visitors are provided with sundecks and a facility to actually swim with the exhibits. At ReefWorld you can do almost everything that you can do in a city aquarium. But you can also do more. You can take a helicopter ride to gain a controlling aerial view of the Great Barrier Reef and you can sit in the comfort of a semi-submersible boat and view a wall of coral. All this is possible because of the extraordinary fact that ReefWorld is situated on Hardy’s Reef on the Outer Great Barrier Reef (Figure 1).

ReefWorld (Plate 62) is a large offshore pontoon, and shares some similarities with theme parks such as Disney World (see for example, Eco 1986; and Berleant 1997 for an aesthetic analysis of Disney World). It is different in that time intrudes and there are real dangers associated with the Outer Reef. Pontoons act like small islands and offer a sense of security to what otherwise would surely be recognised as a foolhardy activity; plunging into the depths of the ocean. “Walking on the pontoon is comparable to walking on land, and the structure allows easy access to all activities” (Pure Pleasure Cruises 1999). People can swim along the coral wall at Hardy’s Reef, and there are ropes to guide them. This provides a sense of security and containment, as well as a necessary safety measure. Visitors are advised to stay within this vicinity and lifeguards keep a lookout for anyone straying too far. Strong currents are a real threat and deaths in
similar enclosures are reported in the media from time to time. But in theory visitors are at liberty to explore any part of the Reef. Only one area is declared a no-go zone. Snorkellers and divers are requested not to swim in front of the glass wall of the underwater viewing chamber.

On one end of the pontoon is a darkened auditorium with rows of benches where visitors can sit in dry comfort and watch the world of fishes. This is like many theatres in aquariums built on land. The water through the window is a luminous blue from the daylight that streams through from the surface. It is at once very familiar and very different and seems to represent a moment in which mimesis and alterity blur. At one level the rule about not swimming in front of this chamber appears to simply ensure that fish are not chased away by divers and snorkellers, and to guarantee the presence of fish on the outside of the chamber. However, there is another interpretation. Schools of fish flow all around the snorkellers and divers swimming along the edge of the wall and some, like the maori wrasse, Wally, seem to actually seek visitors out, having become accustomed to them. At other less elaborate pontoons such as that at Kelso Reef off Townsville there are no such restrictions and fish appear to be unbothered by people in the water. As Love (2000: 6) says “fishes move largely indifferent to human intrusion”. So the presence of an occasional snorkeller is unlikely to scare away all the fish. It is more likely that the prohibition on people in this area of the ReefWorld pontoon is aimed at enhancing the sense of Nature. It also enhances the sense of the aquarium.

The Outer Barrier Reef is regarded by many as the most authentic part of the Great Barrier Reef and is promoted as providing visitors with a ‘genuine’ Reef experience. It is for this experience that people must travel beyond the mainland city aquariums. This is what it is all about: the vastness, the vivid colours, the swirls of corals and ribbons of blue, the depth of water beyond the security of the coral wall, the vast and infinite phenomenon, all out of reach of land. ReefWorld achieves this through mimicking the mimesis of the aquarium. It is a brilliant case of what Taussig has described as “an almost drug-like addiction to mime, to merge, to become other – a process in which not only images chase images in a vast, perhaps infinitely extended chain of images, but one also becomes matter” (1993: 43). For ReefWorld is not simply a facility in which people can view the ‘real’ thing. It has captured essential elements of the modern day aquarium in its construction, presentation and associated amenities. It has also captured
many of the other elements of a Great Barrier Reef experience that include a range of historically constituted activities such as sunbathing on islands, climbing down into the underwater observatory, viewing corals from a glass sided vessel, taking helicopter rides and learning to scuba dive and snorkel. ReefWorld is therefore a simulacrum of several simulacra.

ReefWorld is another expression of Taussig’s observation that more than ever mimetic technology has led to an excess that results in mimetic faculty and mimetic historical product turning on one another, so that the self is no longer separable from its alter (1993: 252). The effectiveness of the aquarium or the pontoon as a copy of the original depends on both copy and contact and is not dependent on realism alone (Taussig 1993: 10-11). Rather, the aquarium encapsulates the sublime, and transforms that which is beyond human comprehension into a package for consumption. The original experience of the Great Barrier Reef is thus likened to an aquarium.

ReefWorld’s ascendancy lies in its mimesis of the original and its copies. It brings together all aspects of Reef visitors’ history in a space that could constitute the original. The original has been observed, copied and sampled, taken away, and then brought back to the authentic location in which it originated; transformed, enriched and more powerfully authentic.

**From Place to Non-Place**

ReefWorld brings together aerial scenery and close up intimacy of coral gardens, the Outer Reef and the safety and comfort reminiscent of an island or aquarium. Although it is described as providing authenticity in Reef experiences, as a third stage simulacrum it no longer represents any original. Further to this, the experiences offered by ReefWorld suggest the degree to which contemporary Reef visitors fail to experience a sense of place. I have argued in Chapter 3 that a sense of place derives from the experiences of a knowing sensate body, a sense of orientation and location, as well as a sense of time. Visitor activity at ReefWorld suggests that few if any of these attributes are experienced by contemporary Reef visitors.
Augé (1995) has developed the concept of non-place in contrast with his definition of ‘anthropological place’. He identifies anthropological place as established and symbolised; and socially constructed and inscribed in both space and time. In contrast he defines non-place in the following way:

*If a place can be defined as relational, historical and concerned with identity, then a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical or concerned with identity will be a non-place. The hypothesis advanced here is that supermodernity produces non-places, meaning spaces which are not themselves anthropological places and which ... do not integrate the earlier places: instead these are listed, classified, promoted ... and assigned to a circumscribed and specific position.*

(Augé 1995: 77-8)

It is the pervasiveness of the sign, and lack of both identity and relationship that characterises the non-places of supermodernity of which travellers’ space is taken to be an archetype (Augé 1995: 86). De Certeau (1984: 103-4) suggests that the proper names attributed to places also attribute direction to an itinerary and are thus the impetus for movement. He argues that this movement could not be foreseen prior to the action itself and hence proper names are always retrospective of practice. Consequently proper names supplant places and these named locations are transformed into passages of movement and create non-place or ‘nowhere place’. However, Augé (1995: 85) suggests that through such place names, the places themselves gain status as a part of a journey. He argues that a horizon is a necessary part of any journey and that movement traverses places so that place names are accumulated as words and non-places to create the necessary itinerary. A journey such as this is one of more than a single place and is brought about through the traveller’s own movement and the external moving landscape which is accumulated by the traveller as a series of ‘snapshots’ (Augé 1995: 85-6). These snapshots can also be interpreted as the isolated single points in an itinerary as opposed to the journey which links them together. These snapshots characterise the way in which travellers’ experiences of place have changed. Journeys of supermodernity are routed around places by way of highways and other corridors that skirt around places with living history and identities. The traveller is no longer is privileged with insight into everyday lives of particular places in travelling through those places. Instead signs along highways declare the historical nature of a particular region and thus history is replaced with its signifiers (Augé 1995: 73). So non-place is firstly without history.
Importantly, Augé identifies how an individual can fulfil the role of spectator without having a focus on the spectacle itself. One of the conditions of supermodernity is that the individual loses the usual referents of identity and instead is only defined by their role or action within a particular non-place (Augé 1995: 103-6). The traveller who thus identifies through the act of being a spectator, rather than focusing on an actual spectacle, is illustrative of this. As such the tourist identifies as a spectator and this becomes the spectacle itself (Augé 1995: 86). This idea is significant because it expands and complements Urry’s (1990; 1992) discussion of the tourist gaze to recognise that it is not only the subject of the tourist gaze, but also the act of gazing itself that is important to the traveller and of establishing tourist identities in supermodernity. This act of gazing enables tourists to identify with the promotional imagery of non-places, to imagine themselves in the position of the gazer. In this Augé suggests that while the image only portrays something about the would-be traveller, the object of the gaze is named as a particular destination and thus constitutes a classic non-place (1995: 86).

The third factor in non-places is the question of relatedness. In contrast with modernity in which old and new were interwoven into a working whole, supermodernity reduces all history, local particularity and exoticism into forms of spectacle. There is also a lack of synthesis with any particular curiosity along a journey equated to all others, so that they remain equivalent and unconnected (Augé 1995: 110-11). This is reminiscent of Casey’s (1996) discussion of how regions, defined as a broad spatial units comprised of a number of interrelated and co-located places, can be undermined by the lack of relationships and a lack of distinction. He suggests that the absence of any clear relationship between a series of places results in the obscuration of local knowledge. Additionally he suggests that when places of a related region lack individual specificity or distinction they merge into one another and the region reverts to abstract space (Casey 1996: 45-6). Augé, however, characterises the equivalency and unrelatedness with non-place.

Such idealised destinations are identified by Augé as another form of non-place which is more properly an imaginary place. These places are ‘banal utopias’ and clichés that only exist as the words that evoke them. Unlike de Certeau’s non-places which represent a disjunction between everyday use and lost myth, in imagined places words create images which in turn create myths that are realised through television, imagining
and tourism (Augé 1995: 95-6). These imaginary places are not classic non-places by Augé’s own definition either. His non-places are defined by the words and texts which provide instruction or information to people and which thus define their behaviour and in turn their prescribed identity as traveller, shopper or driver. Non-places are also defined by time because they are subject to timetables and itineraries. However, this is not expansive or historical time because non-places are only lived through in the present and history is only present when it takes the form of spectacle (Augé 1995: 103-4).

The Reef as Non-Place and Space

The journey from the island resorts of the Whitsundays to ReefWorld was by way of a large fast catamaran. The timetable suggested that there were several alternative departure times on any particular day. This gave the impression that the trip was analogous to everyday commuting. However, the different departure times simply reflected the time it took to travel between all the island embarkation points. This reduced the sense of time that passengers could expect to spend on the journey to the Outer Reef and time was therefore distorted even before passengers boarded the vessel. The journey to Hardy’s Reef commenced with ports of call at key island resorts, and these were some of the few locations mentioned by the skipper. It took just under two hours to travel from South Molle Island, the last point of embarkation, to the ReefWorld pontoon. During the voyage, the majority of passengers sat inside in the air-conditioned cabin. There and on the outer deck were a number of televisions which screened video for the duration of the voyage. These served to distract people from observing their movement in space and time.

Although ReefWorld provides several means by which to access aspects of the Reef, these are by-and-large focused on visual experiences. The focus of these activities, including diving and snorkelling, is on looking at the Reef. As Rodaway (1994: 131-3) has suggested, human vision is always partial rather than panoramic or all encompassing. And contemporary experiences of the Reef increasingly focus on visual amenity in isolation from a fully sensate and thinking body. The all encompassing vision of the Reef, from the air or outer space, is not an embodied sensuous experience and does not contribute to a sense of place. Similarly, intimate encounters with the
living Reef are increasingly experiences of dislocated and disembodied visual sense. The Reef commodity represented simultaneously by close-up and distant imagery is only possible through the camera and interactions with the underwater sphere are similarly mediated by technology. There is always technology between people’s bodies and the Reef itself. While some technologies enhance our sensuous appreciation (cf. Rodaway 1994), the increasing focus on visual senses has displaced many others. In addition, the living Reef can only be experienced sensuously as small parts of the strategic whole. It is not possible to have a multi-sensuous knowledge of the conceptual whole. Human appreciation of the Reef is therefore strongly tied to technological advances and mimetic capacity.

At ReefWorld guide ropes create a swimming enclosure that provides security for visitors. They ensure that people can find their way back to the pontoon with only the most basic sense of relative orientation. Even danger is no longer a personal concern. The Great Barrier Reef is presented as synonymous with this small cordoned off section of the Hardy Reef lagoon. The catamaran and pontoon on which people spend most of their time are both examples of archetypal non-places that characterise modern travel (Augé 1995). These are inhabited by large numbers of people who, unless travelling together in groups, remained anonymous – only identified by their participation in the trip and by the activities that establish them as tourists.

The lack of a sense of place is not, however, restricted to ReefWorld or even to aquaria or other pontoons. Instead the history of visitor interactions with the Reef suggests that contemporary tourists’ experiences are of an imaginary non-place rather than place in contemporary encounters with the geographic space of the Reef. This can be seen in tourist resorts on the islands which mimic one another, but most importantly they mimic other parts of the Pacific and an imagined destination. As such they have become a series of equivalent and unrelated spaces in a broader region which itself lacks distinction. Consequently the Great Barrier Reef is experienced as non-place.

This is not to say that the region cannot be perceived as place. Augé’s arguments project a rather bleak image of contemporary society – or as he portrays a lack of society. However, he recognises that there are many forms of contemporary existence and that the non-places of supermodernity are only one of these. Significantly, too, he maintains
that even within non-place places can be constituted and so non-place is never an absolute state.

Much of the conservation effort at the Reef is focused on conserving particular aspects of the physical environments. The same elements that form the basis of distinctive experiences of place for visitors at the beginning of the twentieth century continue to thrive in the area today. They also continue to contribute to local residents’ sense of place. The factor that has changed is the way in which visitors interact with these environments. This has occurred primarily through the focus on visual qualities that characterises management, tourism experiences and heritage assessment and are reinforced through conservation measures. The reliance on visual amenity allows many aspects of the Reef to be misconceived. The beauty of the Reef is presumed to be intrinsic in the ‘natural’ qualities of the region. This visual appreciation is not ameliorated by the smell of death and decay, a slimy touch, excess of heat, insect bites or danger. Hyper-reality transforms the underwater Reef into the everyday and renders the unknown and other dangers benign. It also creates a commodity in which the interference of humans is rendered invisible. And most significantly this allows the Reef to be known as ‘natural’ and synonymous with Nature.
Conclusion

I set out to examine visitors’ experiences of the Reef, and how places are constructed through sensuous knowledge. The project originated in a recommendation to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority that social values are an important element of heritage significance often overlooked by management (Greer, et al. 2000). My task was to identify social values of the Great Barrier Reef to assist in its effective conservation. Like many aspects of heritage practice, the definitions and use of criteria are under-theorised and often misinterpreted. In the first instance, I therefore reviewed ‘social value’ as a criterion to assess heritage places. I found that social value is poorly defined and articulated and consequently the methods used to identify and assess these values are equally unclear. I concluded that social value can in fact be equated with heritage value more broadly, because all heritage is socially constructed. In doing this I not only questioned the distinction between natural and cultural heritage, but questioned the very merit of social value as an assessment criterion.

In spite of my conclusion that social value is a poorly conceived and unsuitable criterion, the purposes for which it was developed and is used in Australian heritage contexts are important. There is an increasing acceptance in many spheres of heritage practice and research that heritage needs to move beyond the traditional realm of the grand and elite, to consider the everyday and to recognise cultural and social groups traditionally underrepresented by heritage regimes. At the same time and in parallel there are persuasive arguments that the division between natural and cultural heritage is artificial and unsustainable. It is partly in response to these two issues that social value has gained such currency in Australia. Nevertheless, the term is poorly defined and ineffectual in assessment. I therefore sought an alternative avenue through which to consider these issues.

Another problem with a focus on ‘social value’ is that very few heritage management regimes in Australia or elsewhere in the world include ‘social value’ as a specific criterion. World Heritage listing, under which the Reef is recognised and celebrated,
does not have the capacity to assess significance solely on the basis of social significance. Nor does it have the capacity to consider natural and cultural values under a single framework. In contrast, aesthetics are used to assess heritage in many different heritage regimes and, in the case of World Heritage listing, aesthetic criteria are specified for both natural and cultural heritage. Furthermore, some heritage regimes recognise that aesthetics are socially constructed and can be an important means through which people express association with particular environments. I therefore focused my research on the aesthetics of the Reef as a means to understand how the region is constructed and understood and how this has changed over time.

Further to my critique of social value, I reviewed the way in which ‘aesthetics’ are defined and used in heritage assessments. Although many heritage definitions encompass non-visual experiences, the application of these criteria focuses predominantly on particular visual qualities. Consequently significance assessments are strongly biased towards assumptions about architectural aesthetics and natural beauty. These operate to the exclusion of other cultural groups and an everyday sense of place. In seeking to address the concern of social value in relation to aesthetics, I therefore adopted the term ‘sensuousness’. The use of a different term serves to break the nexus between ‘aesthetics’ in its traditional contexts of fine arts, architecture and landscape, and its application to heritage management. In doing so it is possible to consider a much broader range of corporeal knowledge and to consider its relationship to place and space.

The way in which places are constructed through a sensate and knowing ego is the central way in which I have sought to understand visitor experiences of space and their construction of place. The sensual experiences of the body are considered as interdependent, with sight, sound, smell, taste and touch informing one another through a kinetic, oriented and thinking body. These experiences produce a knowledge of place. This emplaced and embodied knowledge is culturally determined because both places and bodies are culturally informed. It is also a knowledge that is often taken for granted or second-nature and as such it constitutes the types of everyday cultural places that heritage practitioners seek to identify through social values.
These ideas have been applied to my study of the Great Barrier Reef and the principle aims of the project, to develop an understanding of how the physical space of the Great Barrier Reef has been perceived and constructed through visitor experiences. Two of the primary aims of this research were to develop methods through which to assess social values, and through these methods to identify insight into the social reproduction of the values and associated knowledge. These two aims are related. Social value is often taken to be synonymous with contemporary value and hence established methods do not account for change over time. An interest in temporal changes necessitates the use of alternative methods of inquiry.

I used a range of archival data sources to reconstruct the ways in which visitors have used and understood the Reef in the historic past. These include both private and public representations of the Reef. Visual qualities dominate the recognised aesthetics of the Reef, and both photography and visual quality are important to the Reef and contemporary tourism. I therefore used photographs and film in addition to written texts to reconstruct past visitor experiences of the Reef. Having used these sources in the historic context, it was appropriate to use analogous contemporary materials for the purpose of comparison. For this reason my research of contemporary experiences depended on texts that were equivalent to those in the archives, particularly diaries, travel journals and photograph albums available on the internet, and observation of the physical context of tourist activity. The sources were analysed in accordance with my research questions to identify the sensuous experiences that people have encountered at the Reef in different eras.

The methods are novel to heritage studies, particularly social value which has no methodological or disciplinary structure of its own. One of the outcomes of this research has therefore been the development and implementation of assessment methods that not only allow consideration of temporal change and continuity, but which also offer a more systematic method of analysis. The methods are also significant because the sources are not framed within heritage processes. Heritage assessments that involve community members in the identification of values usually elicit information through forms of direct questioning. Consequently the data gathered are strongly influenced by the heritage or development issue in question. The sources I used were not constructed in this way to the extent that they did not rely directly on conscious community
participation. This is important for two reasons. Firstly, it allows the identification of significant experiences that are not consciously constructed and which might be taken for granted by participants. Secondly, it provided scope to consider how people experienced the Reef in a particular historical context without the influence of contemporary issues, hindsight or nostalgia. My focus on sensuousness through the use of textual forms therefore allowed me to identify some of the values that are usually omitted from heritage assessments, and are thus neglected in management.

The results of these methods indicate that it is possible to identify significant social trends in how visitors experience the Reef in different times. The different source types have also been used to substantiate, support and further an understanding of any particular pattern. Furthermore, it has been possible to interpret these experiences to comprehend how multiple spaces and places are (re)constructed within a single geographic location through time.

In Part 2 of the thesis I identified a range of sensuous experiences that contribute to people’s construction of the Reef. These include a sense of orientation and location as well as the senses of sight, sound, smell, taste and touch. This part of the thesis also considered the role of capture and the way in which constructions and knowledge of the Reef has been transmitted within and between generations.

A significant change in sensuous knowledge of the Reef is the awareness of Cartesian spaces of the Reef. In the early twentieth century, visitors were aware of their location at particular points or along routes of their journeys within the Reef. They were also aware of differences between particular locations. They made a strong distinction between the mainland islands and coral cays, and between the associated fringing reefs of these locations and of the Outer Reef itself. This sense of location was partly a re-enactment of navigational discovery and points to a heightened sense of place. This is conspicuously absent from contemporary Reef experiences, in which any one of the locations within the 348,700 square kilometres of reefs can be taken as synonymous with the Great Barrier Reef. This is enhanced by modern infrastructure particularly rapid transport in which the journey to particular parts of the Reef is no longer part of the experience of the place, but an inconvenience in reaching a final destination whether that is one of the island resorts or a pontoon.
These same changes to infrastructure also resulted in changes to other sensuous experiences. The construction of resorts with air-conditioned accommodation, swimming pools and landscaped gardens serves to dissociate visitors from the environments of the Reef location. Consequently many of the sensory experiences that contributed to early visitors’ knowledge of the Reef have been removed from the spaces that tourists use. In a few instances particular sensuous qualities have a long and continuous association with particular locations, such as the sound of the pure silica sands at Whitehaven Beach in the Whitsundays. However, in many more instances senses have been diminished through changes to the landscape. This was notable in relation to the sound of she-oaks. Although present throughout the World Heritage Area, casuarinas are absent from tourist locations. Even when present, their subtle sighs are obliterated by modern infrastructure and even the competing sounds of a constructed ‘nature’ of the Pacific ideal. Many sensory experiences that can act as indicators of particular locations have been lost to visitors.

While some senses have been diminished in visitor experiences, new technologies have made others possible. This is particularly true of human access to the underwater living Reef and the reproduction and transmission of Reef experiences between and within generations. This history suggests that over time visitor experiences of the Reef have become increasingly dominated by isolated visual experiences. This emphasis comes from the interrelationship of several factors, including the importance of sight in human physiology, the ways in which technology both reflects and reinforces that bias, and the transmission of visual information via those technologies. The capacity to engage in a multi-sensuous way with various environments is also restricted by conservation ethics which prohibit particular activities that were once integral to Reef visits. In spite of these changes, and in contrast with Byrne et al.’s (2001) suggestion that social significance has little continuity from one generation to the next, my research suggests that such experiences are based in a continuity of knowledge that is transmitted in a range of texts. Without such social reproduction there could be no culture or continuity through which to recognise heritage. The sensuous engagement of people with the Great Barrier Reef indicates that the way in which space is experienced and through which places are constructed, is built from cultural continuity and disruption, as well as innovation.
Through these sources I identified change and continuity in how people construct and understand particular Cartesian spaces as social spaces and places. Part 3 of the thesis explores particular visitor constructions of the Reef. These include the idealised tropical islands which mimic and are mimicked by the colourful coral gardens of the underwater. These two simulacra are misconceived as part of nature and fused into a single Great Barrier Reef commodity. The singular Great Barrier Reef is also a simulacrum because it is only possible to conceive or visualise this single entity through (re)productive technologies of maps and photographs. Photography is able to simultaneously present and construct multiple views of the Reef which are not possible in person. Similarly, the substitution of any part of the Reef for the whole is made possible through the synecdoche of the coral garden which in turn is represented through aquaria. Hence the Reef is increasingly presented and communicated through simulacra in which visual experiences are not only dominant, but are also disembodied and dislocated.

The scale and danger of the Reef have precedence in the opinions and experiences of the navigators and this conception of the Reef has been reiterated throughout the twentieth century. Although technological changes have facilitated new ways of experiencing the Reef, its underlying danger continues as a threat. Even though new technologies allow the whole Reef to be conceptualised through a singular copy (the satellite image) and experienced through the elaborate simulacrum (ReefWorld), these are fragile constructs. Contagion between the carefully separated industry and nature, quickly transform the panorama or coral garden into a place of chaos and danger.

Reef simulacra promote limited and particular visual experiences. Although I sought to identify sensuousness beyond these, they are dominant in contemporary experiences of the Reef. Consequently, visitors and the ‘universal’ body of people who value the Reef can only understand and know it through this construction. This has not always been the case, and nor is it so for the individual experiences of people at the Reef. However, the management of heritage landscapes, and the way in which statements of significance determine that management, are constructed around a strategic view. This does not allow consideration of the everyday and sensuous knowledge of place. In relation to the Reef, this is epitomised in the view of the Reef as a singular, and therefore unique,
phenomenon. This strategic view is that of an outsider. It does not assist in knowing how the Reef is experienced at a local level, or what elements of a particular landscape are worthy of protection. A significant implication of this for management is the failure to identify embodied ways of knowing the Reef. The panoramic and strategic views of the Reef are therefore important to tourists and to managers, but there may be other ways of conceiving the Reef, and it is these values that are neglected.

The results of this research suggest that sensuous experiences are an integral part of people’s construction of places. It is through an ‘embodied cogito’ that places are realised. The identification of a range of sensuous experiences at the Reef in different eras illustrates how knowledge of the region has changed and continued through time. The Reef was understood through sensuous experiences of particular locations in the past, and it is likely that locals continue to experience parts of the region in this way. However, sensuous knowledge of the Reef is significantly diminished in the modern era. Baudrillard (1983) has suggested that postmodern experiences are not based in the real. Instead of multi-sensuous engagement with the environment, experience is now based in visual amenity, particularly through simulacra. This is also the way in which heritage is constructed and experienced in the present. These limitations are compounded in relation to the Reef aesthetics which are assessed through a static and narrow definition of visual quality. These particular visual qualities are central to contemporary visitor experiences, and significantly are the means by which people who have never been there acquire knowledge of the place. The Reef is deemed to be of ‘universal value’, but the only way in which absent people can know the Reef is through simulacra which present a static visual panorama in which other senses are significantly diminished. Significantly, neither the strategic view nor any of the other dislocated and disembodied experiences of the Reef constitute the kind of local knowledge built from sensuous experience that constitutes space.

As a consequence of changes in technology, infrastructure and ideology, visitors to the Reef enjoy experiences that are displaced or part of space. They no longer appreciate the range of sensuous knowledge that characterises place. Tourists are not emplaced and their knowledge is only of visual aspects without the relationships that characterise place. In this sense the Reef can also be known as non-place characterised by a lack of history, relations and identity (Augé 1995).
The significance of heritage places is often linked to their role in establishing or maintaining a form of social identity. This is particularly the case in relation to social significance which is to some extent regarded as one and the same (Byrne, et al. 2001: 70-2). As with ‘aesthetics’ and other terms used by heritage practitioners, the application of identity is often taken as a fixed status and intrinsically significant. Identity, however, is relative to the role of the individual and their relationship to others (cf. Goffman 1961). In spite of the socio-economic and cultural stereotyping of tourists, they comprise diverse individuals and cultural identities. Their identity as a unified group is established through particular mechanisms, a significant aspect of which is the construction of a tourist gaze (cf. Urry 1990, 1992). In relation to the Reef, I have suggested that the tourist gaze of the region is one based in the creation of the tropical island fantasy; a simulacrum in which the palm is a powerful synecdoche. It is also established through the panoramic gaze that creates the region as a singular entity of unparalleled scale. And thirdly, the tourist gaze is established through the view of the coral gardens. To this extent the Reef is a significant tourist destination. The visual qualities of the region are integral to its heritage status and its tourist appeal, and hence it might be argued that the aesthetics of the Reef are important in establishing the identity of tourists.

This realisation raises the question of whether social identity is necessarily significant, or rather whether all identities are equally significant in heritage assessments or in the recognition of place. The significance of a tourist identity is questionable given that this is only ever a temporary one. It is also an identity created out of a lack of usual relations and defined only according to the act of gazing and other activities that define people in non-places (cf. Urry 1990; Augé 1995). The state of being a tourist is sometimes regarded as a liminal phase, and tourism is unquestionably a significant global phenomenon of the twentieth century. Tourism is therefore worthy of study. However, the connection between heritage and identity in this instance is not necessarily a significant aspect of the heritage value of the Reef or in the constitution of place. The identities are not emplaced and are therefore not integral to the place. Instead the identities are created through gazing on a familiar exotic or other. It is the act of gazing that is primarily significant rather than that which is gazed upon. Contemporary experiences of the Reef suggest that knowledge of the Reef is acquired in similar ways
by both visitors and people who have always been physically distant from it. Hence the way in which the Reef is understood is not dependent on an embodied or emplaced experience. This knowledge is not a local knowledge of place borne out of a sensuous engagement, but a simulacrum that bears no relation to the original. As such the relationship between identity and place is unsubstantiated.

In contrast with this way of knowing the Reef, early twentieth century visitors engaged with the landscapes of the region in a way that gave them a sensuous embodied knowledge of locations from which they drew a knowledge of place. Although they too were drawn by the idealised Pacific islands, the experience of being at the Reef combined both these imaginative ventures with tactile, olfactory, visual and auditory experiences of the region. Their knowledge of the Reef was thus understood to encompass elements of a particular location that are drawn from both the physical or material environment and their own perceptions and associations of that environment. This served to undermine or complement the generic and imagined space and early visitors constructed and valued particular places.

While it can be argued in relation to the tourist gaze that the Reef establishes a tourist identity, this seems only to confirm that World Heritage listing is at the cost of local identity and interests. The Reef is likely to be automatically included in the new Commonwealth register of nationally significant places because it is a World Heritage property. However, the national list might be expected to relate to national identity. In spite of this, the Reef is not experienced or known by visitors in relation to any of the known indicators of ‘Australianness’ – mythical or otherwise. Instead the Reef is known through simulacra that represent a generic and idealised ‘elsewhere’.

**Future Research and Application**

There has been very limited research undertaken in relation to the social histories of the Great Barrier Reef and the possibilities for further research appear almost endless. There are many more sources that could be explored both for tourism and in relation to other industries and social groups. The development of methods as well as some of the theoretical contributions of this research also have the capacity to be applied to other
regions. To a large extent this study has only been the beginning and the scope for further research is extensive. I have therefore only highlighted a few instances of where and how this might be pursued.

**Methods**

Even though my research redefines social value and is focused on sensuousness as aesthetics, the methods are relevant to those continuing to work with a social value criterion (see Pocock 2002b). The methods are particularly relevant to the identification of heritage constituted from everyday practices and in a variety of cultural contexts. This sense of the everyday is particularly neglected within current regimes. Neither the focus on particular visual characteristics in aesthetics assessments nor the forms of questioning that characterise social value assessments are able to facilitate the identification of this everyday knowledge of place.

The methods that are usually used to assess social values are limited to forms of direct questioning. In considering global significance I was interested in interrogating sources produced by nonlocals, and many sources I identified were not used in this study. However, many remain potentially profitable avenues of research. One of the important aspects of the methods I have used for this study is the reliance on materials that have not been consciously constructed for use in heritage assessments. The particular sources used for this study are by no means exhaustive and there are others that could be used.

The internet has opened up many more opportunities to identify community views in a contemporary context. Internet forums or on-line discussions about a particular location could be used as a means of recording and gauging significance as it changes over time. Management agencies could even consider adopting such reflective means for recording significance in place of, or as complementary to, the static statements of significance that quickly become historical documents (cf. Byrne, *et al.* 2001: 62). Less directly, tourists (and other groups of interest) could be asked to share the images and text that they select for display on web pages. Although many are publicly available, not all can be found with search engines, and this would open up a rich source of contemporary views.
As suggested in Chapter 4, it would be possible to use contemporary photographs of particular locations by seeking permission to view and analyse images as they were printed at processing shop fronts. This would be a useful means of ascertaining those elements people think are significant and what they have chosen to transmit to future generations. Similarly, visitor books from resorts would be an informative source of information. I had wished to use postcards as a source in this project but did not find an established collection. However, these have the potential to show the popular images that tourists select of the Reef as well as the personal observation that might be reflected in the slightly public nature of messages they record.

The methods could be used further in relation to the Reef or applied to other areas of interest. They could be extended and substantiated further by being used in conjunction with established ways of gathering information. This would provide the means to cross-check different methodological approaches. In future this could contribute to the development of quantitative assessments to substantiate the qualitative observations. This should not seek to identify a singular ‘truth’. To the contrary, such multiple sources could facilitate the recognition of a truly multiple and diverse heritage and acknowledge the many different places that can be known in a single geographic space.

The methods I have used could also be extended to make a more deliberate attempt to gather materials from the recent past. There is a gap in public collections from the 1950s and later. While this is likely to be a reflection of ownership resting with the individuals and families who created them, my experience suggests that these types of ephemera are quite vulnerable to destruction and loss of context. Systematic collection of these materials is therefore something that could be coordinated by an appropriate institution through strategic advertising and public announcements.

Any of these materials, including the data gathered and interpreted for this research, could be compared, contrasted and reinterpreted in conjunction with oral histories and other verbal testament. These kinds of qualitative findings should also form the basis of any quantitative surveys to ensure that these are more representative.
Tourism Research

My thesis has built on a small but significant amount of historical research on tourism in the Whitsunday region of the Great Barrier Reef. I have included materials from other locations on the Reef, but these are largely unexplored. Many significant aspects of these histories could be explored. In particular, the far northern region of Queensland and the relationship between rainforest and Reef would be an interesting area of investigation. The vegetation of the northern parts of the Reef coastline is generally much more dense than that around the Whitsunday region. Early trips to the Reef in the Cairns vicinity commonly included exploration of the ‘jungle’ of the Kuranda area. Current PhD research at James Cook University by Justine Thorp will make a significant contribution to visitor understanding of North Queensland rainforest. From this research it will be possible to consider how the construction of the Reef as an idealised paradise is extended and complemented by the portrayal of the Queensland Rainforest as ‘jungle’.

Local Knowledge

This study has focused on tourists and visitors, but the significance of the Reef to locals with an involvement in the tourism industry would be a complementary and useful study. Two industries or activities that stand out as being suitable for this kind of investigation are the commercial and recreational fishers, and the scientists who use the Reef. Both groups have a long history of association and continuity of practice in the region. Unlike contemporary tourists, and in different ways, each group is conscious of the particular locations in which they work. The extended periods for which they find themselves at sea or on islands or underwater exposes them to a range of physical sensations. They also have strong social networks and are governed by their own social rules. As such these groups might be expected to have a strong sense of place at the Reef, though the ways in which it is constructed in each instance will be significantly different.

The perspective of locals could also be explored from within tourism by focusing on the operators and employees. The historic material suggests a local resistance to tourism,
and it would be useful to investigate if, and how, the inconsistencies between tourism and Australian identity are reconciled in the contemporary era.

**Indigeneity and the Pacific**

The role of Aboriginal people in Reef tourism is particularly worthy of consideration. Aboriginal people are largely written out of tourism discourse at the Reef, but my analysis of photographs and other texts from the first part of the twentieth century suggests that not only were they present, but that they were actively involved in establishing the industry. I am keen to pursue this and have held initial discussions with Aboriginal representatives who have shown interest in research of this kind.

The construction of the Great Barrier Reef as an idealised Pacific destination (Pocock 2002a) has displaced the recognition of Aboriginal people who have rights and interests in the lands and seas of which the World Heritage Area is comprised. There is an extensive literature on the exploitation of local peoples on the islands of the South Seas (Grove 1995; Kahn 2000), but the equivalent research is absent from the literature in Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander studies. Aboriginal people are marginalised in the portrayal of the Reef, and at best are mentioned in passing by a few authors (e.g. Bowen and Bowen 2002). However, they played an extremely active role in the establishment of the industry. Aboriginal reserves at places like Palm Island and Yarrabah were popular tourist attractions in the early twentieth century and Aboriginal people staged a number of cultural performances for visitors. Aboriginal turtle-hunting, spear-fishing and turtle-egg gathering were also popular tourist activities that depended on Indigenous knowledge and cooperation. Evidence of these activities survives in film footage, archival sources and other ephemera (Pocock 2002b). Aboriginal people were not only the object of non-Aboriginal curiosity, but were active in the establishment of scientific research stations (Bowen and Bowen 2002: 258ff), and the development of the earliest resorts of the Whitsundays. They were employed to ferry passengers by row boat from cruise ships, carry gear from boats to shore, and cook meals for tourists. Research into these materials could therefore make an invaluable contribution to a poorly acknowledged aspect of Aboriginal history. In this regard it parallels the work of McGrath (1987) and shows the important contribution that Aboriginal people have
made to significant economic activities in Australia. The exclusion of Aboriginal people from popular conceptions of the Reef denies them proper recognition in terms of continuing associations and knowledge of the Reef. It also excludes them from a now highly profitable industry in which they played an essential role.

**A Way Forward?**

While other values are assessed within disciplines with methodological structures, social significance has developed in response to inadequacies in existing heritage regimes. My review suggests that we should move away from social value as a criterion to assess significance. This is based on my argument that all heritage is socially constructed and that unlike other analytic or thematic ways that significance is assessed, social value encompasses all values. Consequently managers have difficulty relying on this category of significance in making decisions about protection and use because it is neither systematic nor consistent. The recognition of the socially constructed nature of all heritage values does, however, allow us to consider that each social group will have particular ways of experiencing, understanding and constructing places. As such it is useful to consider whether the ‘three in a line model’ of aesthetic, historic, scientific values, is equally appropriate for the assessment of all places. The variety of ways in which different social groups may create particular places within the same geographic location or space suggests that not all groups will find this model equally useful. Byrne et al. (2001) have suggested that Aboriginal heritage places should be assessed in the same way as historic built heritage in Australia, and by implication should adopt this model of assessment. However, my research suggests that current assessments construct heritage as a sign. Such signs tend to be non-places rather than embodied places, and remain unrelated to the local places that may exist in the same location. This is an underlying conflict in management in that the values we create are the values that we can manage and do not necessarily constitute place. The application of the traditional model to Aboriginal heritage will not therefore bring us closer to understanding local knowledge and a sense of place.

Although the way in which senses are experienced and interpreted are themselves culturally constructed, the framework that this thesis uses to investigate visitor’s
understanding of the Reef can serve as a common starting point for all social groups. This is not to say the experiences will be the same for each group. Rather, by recognising the importance of being in place and of acquiring knowledge through a sensate, encultured and thinking body, it is possible to recognise how different groups of people come to know and be in their place. A more precise and consistent use of terminology would therefore, in itself, facilitate more equitable access to the provisions heritage regimes.

The Great Barrier Reef is a large physical environment that comprises many local places and spaces. The way in which people have come to know it from their embodied experiences of being in any one of these locations allow people to appreciate and acknowledge the Reef for its distinctive qualities. It is only through such multisensuous, embodied experience of being in place that we can truly understand the complexity and diversity of the many environments and places that make the Reef unique. The end of the Reef will not necessarily signal the end of humanity, but the exclusion of people from these environments will signal the end of a complex and multiple knowledge, appreciation, respect and understanding of the region.
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### APPENDIX 1: SCHEMATIC TIMELINE OF THEMES AND EVENTS RELEVANT TO THE TEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Captain James Cook sails along Great Barrier Reef aboard HMS Endeavour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>Sir Joseph Banks, botanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EUROPEAN NAVIGATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>William Bligh and mutiny on Bounty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Matthew Finders and Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>Robert Brown, botanist, made marine collections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Reef charts corrected during hydrographic survey of Australian coastline by Philip Parker King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Lieutenant Charles Jeffreys on the Kangaroo charts the full length of the Reef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Beagle Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Wreck of Stirling Castle, Swain Reef - Eliza Fraser survives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Joseph Beete Jukes, geologist, and John MacGillivray, botanist, recorded marine life of the Reef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Francis Price Blackwood, HMS Fly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>John MacGillivray, official naturalist assisted by William Milne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Survey of Coral Sea including Outer Reef by Captain Henry Denham aboard the Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>John MacGillivray, official naturalist assisted by William Milne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Thomas Cook Established in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Centennial Exhibition in Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Saville-Kent's <em>The Great Barrier Reef of Australia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Edmund and Bertha Banfield move to Dunk Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Pearl shell declines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Thomas Cook Brisbane Office Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Thomas Cook Brisbane Office Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Saville-Kent Appointed Queensland Inspector of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Dene Barrett Fry visits NW Island with members of the Australian Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>CONSERVATION ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1929</td>
<td>REEF TOURISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Great Barrier Reef Committee founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Conservation Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Australian Museum warns of declining turtles, North West Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Edmund Barfield died on Dunk Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>REEF TOURISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>ANTA and QGTB established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Henry Lamond leases Molle Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>1st Embury Expedition, Based on Lindeman Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>E.F. Pollock Expedition to North West, Heron, Hoskyn and Fairfax Islands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>E.F. Pollock Expedition to North West Isle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>REEF TOURISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Collecting by visitors raised as issue for science. Some Reef islands proclaimed animal sanctuaries and taking of coral along foreshores prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>All islands declared wildlife sanctuaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Whitsunday Tour of the Symbol. Last Embury Expedition to North West Isle and first to Hayman Island. Embury and Pollock Expeditions Visitor accommodation on Brampton Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Last and 14th Embury Expedition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>The Voyage of the Cheerio organised by Staff of Australian Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Heron Island developed as tourist resort by Chris Poulson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Henry Lamond left South Melle after Ernie Bauer took up lease. Tourist facilities established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>CONSERVATION ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>TOURISM INTERRUPTED BY THE WAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>REEF TOURISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>ANTA reopens. QTDB criticise infrastructure and facilities at the Reef. Queensland Tourist Development Board (QTDB) established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>TOURISM INTERRUPTED BY THE WAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>PROSERPINE TOURIST ASSOCIATION formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Tom McLean begins operation of Roylen cruises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>American service personnel visit the Reef during shore leave (eg 1943 at Mackay).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Captain P.M. Moody purchases lease of Daydream Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Fledgling Research Station established on Heron Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION

- Test drilling for oil on Wreck Island

### CONSERVATION ISSUES

- Royal Hayman Hotel Opens, includes jetty
- Proserpine Aerodrome Opens
- Daydream Island operation closed
- Underwater Observatory established at Green Island
- Lindeman Island improved airstrip and runs Lindeman Air Services from Mackay
- New bungalows constructed on South Mole
- Ansett takes control of Proserpine Aerodrome
- Brampton Island purchased by Crapark Motels. Resort facilities built at Lindeman and South Mole.
- Princess Alexandra of Kent visits Lindeman.

### REEF TOURISM

- New bungalows constructed on South Mole
- Ansett takes control of Proserpine Aerodrome
- Brampton Island purchased by Crapark Motels. Resort facilities built at Lindeman and South Mole.
- Princess Alexandra of Kent visits Lindeman.

### 1960s

#### SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION

- Liege University, Belgium Expedition to the Reef

#### CONSERVATION ISSUES

- Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) Symposium on Reef protection
- Outbreak of Crown of Thorns Starfish observed from Green Island Underwater Observatory
- High controversy surrounding oil drilling and other resource extraction. ACF lobby for Commonwealth control
- Wildlife Preservation Society and Littoral Society lodge appeal against Ellison Reef mining application.

#### REEF TOURISM

- Daydream Island Resort Rebuilt and Opens
- Brampton Jetty opens
- Airstrip opens on Brampton Island
- Bruce Highway opened. Tom McLean purchases lease of Brampton Island.
- Shute Harbour opens
- Airlie Beach emerges as accommodation centre
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Construction of One Tree Island Research Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Lizard Island Research Station established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Orpheus Island Research Station established under JCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td><strong>SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>First oil disaster on Reef near Tuesday Island in the Torres Strait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>UNESCO Convention for Protection of World Heritage established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act and Australian Heritage Commission Act passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td><strong>CONSERVATION ISSUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Marjorie Bradworth at Green Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increasing number of hotels in Airlie Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td><strong>CONSERVATION ISSUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Heritage Properties Conservation Act passed by Commonwealth Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Barrier Reef included in the World Heritage list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td><strong>CONSERVATION ISSUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Heritage values of the Reef by Lucas et. al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td><strong>REEF TOURISM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 million tourists visit the Reef each year from the mid 1990s onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bunga Teratai Satu ran aground on Sudbury Reef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EUROPEAN NAVIGATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSERVATION ISSUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>REEF TOURISM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Values

### Values Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural criteria against which the Great Barrier Reef was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981.</th>
<th>Examples of World Heritage values of the Great Barrier Reef for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Criterion (i) an outstanding example representing a major stage of the earth's evolutionary history.** | The Great Barrier Reef is by far the largest single collection of coral reefs in the world. The World Heritage values of the property include:  
- 2904 coral reefs covering approximately 20 055km²;  
- 300 coral cays and 600 continental islands;  
- reef morphologies reflecting historical and on-going geomorphic and oceanographic processes;  
- processes of geological evolution linking islands, cays, reefs and changing sea levels, together with sand barriers, deltaic and associated sand dunes;  
- record of sea level changes and the complete history of the reef's evolution are recorded in the reef structure;  
- record of climate history, environmental conditions and processes extending back over several hundred years within old massive corals;  
- formations such as serpentine rocks of South Percy island, intact and active dune systems, undisturbed tidal sediments and "blue holes"; and  
- record of sea level changes reflected in distribution of continental island flora and fauna. |
| **Criterion (ii) an outstanding example representing significant ongoing geological processes, biological evolution and man's [sic] interaction with his natural environment.** | Biologically the Great Barrier Reef supports the most diverse ecosystem known to man [sic] and its enormous diversity is thought to reflect the maturity of an ecosystem, which has evolved over millions of years on the northeast Continental Shelf of Australia. The World Heritage values include:  
- the heterogeneity and interconnectivity of the reef assemblage;  
- size and morphological diversity (elevation ranging from the sea bed to 1142m at Mt. Bowen and a large cross-shelf extent encompass the fullest possible representation of marine environmental processes);  
- on going processes of accretion and erosion of coral reefs, sand banks and coral cays, erosion and deposition processes along the coastline, river deltas and estuaries and continental islands;  
- extensive *Halimeda* beds representing active calcification and sediment accretion for over 10 000 years;  
- evidence of the dispersion and evolution of hard corals and associated flora and fauna from the "Indo-West Pacific centre of diversity" along the north-south extent of the reef;  
- inter-connections with the Wet Tropics via the coastal interface and Lord Howe Island via the East Australia current;  
- indigenous temperate species derived from tropical species;  
- living coral colonies (including some of the world's oldest);  
- inshore coral communities of southern reefs;  
- five floristic regions identified for continental islands and two for coral cays;  
- the diversity of flora and fauna, including:  
  - Macroalgae (estimated 400-500 species);  
  - Porifera (estimated 1500 species, some endemic, mostly undescribed);  
- Cnidaria: Corals - part of the global centre of coral diversity and including:  
  - hexacorals (70 genera and 350 species, including 10 endemic species);  
  - octocorals (80 genera, number of species not yet estimated);  
- Tunicata: Ascidians (at least 330 species); |
Criterion (ii) an outstanding example representing significant ongoing geological processes, biological evolution and man's interaction with his natural environment.

- Bryozoa (an estimated 300-500 species, many undescribed);
- Crustacea (at least 1330 species from 3 subclasses);
- Worms:
  - Polychaetes (estimated 500 species);
  - Platyhelminthes: include free-living Tubellaria (number of species not yet estimated), polyclad Tubellaria (up to 300 species) and parasitic helminthes (estimated 1000's of species, most undescribed);
- Phytoplankton (a diverse group existing in two broad communities);
- Mollusca (between 5000-8000 species);
- Echinodermata (estimated 800 extant species, including many rare taxa and type specimens);
- fishes (between 1200 and 2000 species from 130 families, with high species diversity and heterogeneity; includes the Whale Shark Rhynchodon typus);
- seabirds (between 1.4 and 1.7 million seabirds breeding on islands);
- marine reptiles (including 6 sea turtle species, 17 sea snake species, and 1 species of crocodile);
- marine mammals (including 1 species of dugong (Dugong dugon), and 26 species of whales and dolphins);
- terrestrial flora: see “Habitats: Islands” and;
- terrestrial fauna, including:
  - invertebrates (pseudoscorpions, mites, ticks, spiders, centipedes, isopods, phalangids, millipedes, collembolans and 109 families of insects from 20 orders, and large over-wintering aggregations of butterflies); and
  - vertebrates (including seabirds (see above), reptiles: crocodiles and turtles, 9 snakes and 31 lizards, mammals);
- the integrity of the inter-connections between reef and island networks in terms of dispersion, recruitment, and the subsequent gene flow of many taxa;
- processes of dispersal, colonisation and establishment of plant communities within the context of island biogeography (e.g. dispersal of seeds by air, sea and vectors such as birds are examples of dispersion, colonisation and succession);
- the isolation of certain island populations (e.g. recent speciation evident in two subspecies of the butterfly Tirumala hamata and the evolution of distinct races of the bird Zosterops spp);
- remnant vegetation types (hoop pines) and relic species (sponges) on islands.
- evidence of morphological and genetic changes in mangrove and seagrass flora across regional scales; and
- feeding and/or breeding grounds for international migratory seabirds, cetaceans and sea turtles.

Criterion (iii) contain unique, rare and superlative natural phenomena, formations and features and areas of exceptional natural beauty.

The Great Barrier Reef provides some of the most spectacular scenery on earth and is of exceptional natural beauty. The World Heritage values include:

- the vast extent of the reef and island systems which produces an unparalleled aerial vista;
- islands ranging from towering forested continental islands complete with freshwater streams, to small coral cays with rainforest and unvegetated sand cays;
- coastal and adjacent islands with mangrove systems of exceptional beauty;
- the rich variety of landscapes and seascapes including rugged mountains with dense and diverse vegetation and adjacent fringing reefs;
- the abundance and diversity of shape, size and colour of marine fauna and flora in the coral reefs;
- spectacular breeding colonies of seabirds and great aggregations of over-wintering butterflies; and
- migrating whales, dolphins, dugong, whale sharks, sea turtles, seabirds and concentrations of large fish.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion (iv) provide habitats where populations of rare and endangered species of plants and animals still survive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Great Barrier Reef contains many outstanding examples of important and significant natural habitats for <em>in situ</em> conservation of species of conservation significance, particularly resulting from the latitudinal and cross-shelf completeness of the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World Heritage values include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- habitats for species of conservation significance within the 77 broadscale bioregional associations that have been identified for the property and which include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- over 2900 coral reefs (covering 20,055km²) which are structurally and ecologically complex;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- large numbers of islands, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 600 continental islands supporting 2195 plant species in 5 distinct floristic regions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 300 coral cays and sand cays;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- seabird and sea turtle rookeries, including breeding populations of green sea turtles and Hawksbill turtles; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- coral cays with 300-350 plant species in 2 distinct floristic regions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- seagrass beds (over 5000km²) comprising 15 species, 2 endemic;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- mangroves (over 20,700km²) including 37 species;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Halimeda</em> banks in the northern region and the unique deep water bed in the central region; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- large areas of ecologically complex inter-reefal and lagoonal benthos; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- species of plants and animals of conservation significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Environment Australia 2002)
APPENDIX 3: CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization meeting in Paris from 17 October to 21 November 1972, at its seventeenth session,

Noting that the cultural heritage and the natural heritage are increasingly threatened with destruction not only by the traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction,

Considering that deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world,

Considering that protection of this heritage at the national level often remains incomplete because of the scale of the resources which it requires and of the insufficient economic, scientific, and technological resources of the country where the property to be protected is situated,

Recalling that the Constitution of the Organization provides that it will maintain, increase, and diffuse knowledge, by assuring the conservation and protection of the world's heritage, and recommending to the nations concerned the necessary international conventions,

Considering that the existing international conventions, recommendations and resolutions concerning cultural and natural property demonstrate the importance, for all the peoples of the world, of safeguarding this unique and irreplaceable property, to whatever people it may belong,

Considering that parts of the cultural or natural heritage are of outstanding interest and therefore need to be preserved as part of the world heritage of mankind as a whole,

Considering that, in view of the magnitude and gravity of the new dangers threatening them, it is incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, by the granting of collective assistance which, although not taking the place of action by the State concerned, will serve as an efficient complement thereto,

Considering that it is essential for this purpose to adopt new provisions in the form of a convention establishing an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods,

Having decided, at its sixteenth session, that this question should be made the subject of an international convention,

Adopts this sixteenth day of November 1972 this Convention.

I. DEFINITION OF THE CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Article 1

For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as "cultural heritage":

monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.

**Article 2**
For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as "natural heritage": natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view; geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation; natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

**Article 3**
It is for each State Party to this Convention to identify and delineate the different properties situated on its territory mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 above.

---

**II. NATIONAL PROTECTION AND INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION OF THE CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**Article 4**
Each State Party to this Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage referred to in Articles 1 and 2 and situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State. It will do all it can to this end, to the utmost of its own resources and, where appropriate, with any international assistance and co-operation, in particular, financial, artistic, scientific and technical, which it may be able to obtain.

**Article 5**
To ensure that effective and active measures are taken for the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage situated on its territory, each State Party to this Convention shall endeavor, in so far as possible, and as appropriate for each country:
- to adopt a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes;
- to set up within its territories, where such services do not exist, one or more services for the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage with an appropriate staff and possessing the means to discharge their functions;
- to develop scientific and technical studies and research and to work out such operating methods as will make the State capable of counteracting the dangers that threaten its cultural or natural heritage;
- to take the appropriate legal, scientific, technical, administrative and financial measures necessary for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of this heritage; and
- to foster the establishment or development of national or regional centres for training in the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage and to encourage scientific research in this field.

**Article 6**
Whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of the States on whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 is situated, and without prejudice to property right provided by national legislation, the States Parties to this Convention recognize that such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate.

The States Parties undertake, in accordance with the provisions of this Convention, to give their help in the identification, protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage referred to in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11 if the States on whose territory it is situated so request.
Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to take any deliberate measures which might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage referred to in Articles 1 and 2 situated on the territory of other States Parties to this Convention.

**Article 7**
For the purpose of this Convention, international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international co-operation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve and identify that heritage.

**III. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**Article 8**
An Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the Cultural and Natural Heritage of Outstanding Universal Value, called "the World Heritage Committee", is hereby established within the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. It shall be composed of 15 States Parties to the Convention, elected by States Parties to the Convention meeting in general assembly during the ordinary session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The number of States members of the Committee shall be increased to 21 as from the date of the ordinary session of the General Conference following the entry into force of this Convention for at least 40 States. Election of members of the Committee shall ensure an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world.

A representative of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (Rome Centre), a representative of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and a representative of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), to whom may be added, at the request of States Parties to the Convention meeting in general assembly during the ordinary sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, representatives of other intergovernmental or non-governmental organizations, with similar objectives, may attend the meetings of the Committee in an advisory capacity.

**Article 9**
The term of office of States members of the World Heritage Committee shall extend from the end of the ordinary session of the General Conference during which they are elected until the end of its third subsequent ordinary session.

The term of office of one-third of the members designated at the time of the first election shall, however, cease at the end of the first ordinary session of the General Conference following that at which they were elected; and the term of office of a further third of the members designated at the same time shall cease at the end of the second ordinary session of the General Conference following that at which they were elected. The names of these members shall be chosen by lot by the President of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization after the first election.

States members of the Committee shall choose as their representatives persons qualified in the field of the cultural or natural heritage.

**Article 10**
The World Heritage Committee shall adopt its Rules of Procedure.

The Committee may at any time invite public or private organizations or individuals to participate in its meetings for consultation on particular problems.

The Committee may create such consultative bodies as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

**Article 11**
Every State Party to this Convention shall, in so far as possible, submit to the World Heritage Committee an inventory of property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage, situated in its territory and suitable for inclusion in the list provided for in paragraph 2 of this Article. This inventory, which shall not be considered exhaustive, shall include documentation about the location of the property in question and its significance.
On the basis of the inventories submitted by States in accordance with paragraph 1, the Committee shall establish, keep up to date and publish, under the title of "World Heritage List," a list of properties forming part of the cultural heritage and natural heritage, as defined in Articles 1 and 2 of this Convention, which it considers as having outstanding universal value in terms of such criteria as it shall have established. An updated list shall be distributed at least every two years.

The inclusion of a property in the World Heritage List requires the consent of the State concerned. The inclusion of a property situated in a territory, sovereignty or jurisdiction over which is claimed by more than one State shall in no way prejudice the rights of the parties to the dispute.

The Committee shall establish, keep up to date and publish, whenever circumstances shall so require, under the title of "List of World Heritage in Danger", a list of the property appearing in the World Heritage List for the conservation of which major operations are necessary and for which assistance has been requested under this Convention. This list shall contain an estimate of the cost of such operations. The list may include only such property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage as is threatened by serious and specific dangers, such as the threat of disappearance caused by accelerated deterioration, large-scale public or private projects or rapid urban or tourist development projects; destruction caused by changes in the use or ownership of the land; major alterations due to unknown causes; abandonment for any reason whatsoever; the outbreak or the threat of an armed conflict; calamities and cataclysms; serious fires, earthquakes, landslides; volcanic eruptions; changes in water level, floods and tidal waves. The Committee may at any time, in case of urgent need, make a new entry in the List of World Heritage in Danger and publicize such entry immediately.

The Committee shall define the criteria on the basis of which a property belonging to the cultural or natural heritage may be included in either of the lists mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 4 of this article.

Before refusing a request for inclusion in one of the two lists mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 4 of this article, the Committee shall consult the State Party in whose territory the cultural or natural property in question is situated.

The Committee shall, with the agreement of the States concerned, co-ordinate and encourage the studies and research needed for the drawing up of the lists referred to in paragraphs 2 and 4 of this article.

Article 12
The fact that a property belonging to the cultural or natural heritage has not been included in either of the two lists mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11 shall in no way be construed to mean that it does not have an outstanding universal value for purposes other than those resulting from inclusion in these lists.

Article 13
The World Heritage Committee shall receive and study requests for international assistance formulated by States Parties to this Convention with respect to property forming part of the cultural or natural heritage, situated in their territories, and included or potentially suitable for inclusion in the lists mentioned referred to in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11. The purpose of such requests may be to secure the protection, conservation, presentation or rehabilitation of such property.

Requests for international assistance under paragraph 1 of this article may also be concerned with identification of cultural or natural property defined in Articles 1 and 2, when preliminary investigations have shown that further inquiries would be justified.

The Committee shall decide on the action to be taken with regard to these requests, determine where appropriate, the nature and extent of its assistance, and authorize the conclusion, on its behalf, of the necessary arrangements with the government concerned.

The Committee shall determine an order of priorities for its operations. It shall in so doing bear in mind the respective importance for the world cultural and natural heritage of the property requiring protection, the need to give international assistance to the property most representative of a natural environment or of the genius and the history of the peoples of the world, the urgency of the work to be done, the resources available to the States on whose territory the
threatened property is situated and in particular the extent to which they are able to safeguard
such property by their own means.
The Committee shall draw up, keep up to date and publicize a list of property for which
international assistance has been granted.
The Committee shall decide on the use of the resources of the Fund established under Article 15
of this Convention. It shall seek ways of increasing these resources and shall take all useful
steps to this end.
The Committee shall co-operate with international and national governmental and non-
governmental organizations having objectives similar to those of this Convention. For the
implementation of its programmes and projects, the Committee may call on such organizations,
particularly the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of cultural
Property (the Rome Centre), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and
the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), as well as
on public and private bodies and individuals.
Decisions of the Committee shall be taken by a majority of two-thirds of its members present
and voting. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

**Article 14**
The World Heritage Committee shall be assisted by a Secretariat appointed by the Director-
The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,
utilizing to the fullest extent possible the services of the International Centre for the Study of the
Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (the Rome Centre), the International
Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Union for Conservation of
Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) in their respective areas of competence and capability,
shall prepare the Committee's documentation and the agenda of its meetings and shall have the
responsibility for the implementation of its decisions.

**IV. FUND FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL
HERITAGE**

**Article 15**
A Fund for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of Outstanding Universal
Value, called "the World Heritage Fund", is hereby established.
The Fund shall constitute a trust fund, in conformity with the provisions of the Financial
Regulations of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
The resources of the Fund shall consist of:
compulsory and voluntary contributions made by States Parties to this Convention,
Contributions, gifts or bequests which may be made by:
other States;
the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, other organizations of the
United Nations system, particularly the United Nations Development Programme or other
intergovernmental organizations;
public or private bodies or individuals;
any interest due on the resources of the Fund;
funds raised by collections and receipts from events organized for the benefit of the fund; and
all other resources authorized by the Fund's regulations, as drawn up by the World Heritage
Committee.
Contributions to the Fund and other forms of assistance made available to the Committee may
be used only for such purposes as the Committee shall define. The Committee may accept
contributions to be used only for a certain programme or project, provided that the Committee
shall have decided on the implementation of such programme or project. No political conditions
may be attached to contributions made to the Fund.

**Article 16**
Without prejudice to any supplementary voluntary contribution, the States Parties to this
Convention undertake to pay regularly, every two years, to the World Heritage Fund,
contributions, the amount of which, in the form of a uniform percentage applicable to all States,
shall be determined by the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention, meeting
during the sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization. This decision of the General Assembly requires the majority of the States
Parties present and voting, which have not made the declaration referred to in paragraph 2 of
this Article. In no case shall the compulsory contribution of States Parties to the Convention
exceed 1% of the contribution to the regular budget of the United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization.
However, each State referred to in Article 31 or in Article 32 of this Convention may declare, at
the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, that it shall not
be bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article.
A State Party to the Convention which has made the declaration referred to in paragraph 2 of
this Article may at any time withdraw the said declaration by notifying the Director-General of
the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. However, the withdrawal
of the declaration shall not take effect in regard to the compulsory contribution due by the State
until the date of the subsequent General Assembly of States parties to the Convention.
In order that the Committee may be able to plan its operations effectively, the contributions of
States Parties to this Convention which have made the declaration referred to in paragraph 2 of
this Article, shall be paid on a regular basis, at least every two years, and should not be less than
the contributions which they should have paid if they had been bound by the provisions of
paragraph 1 of this Article.
Any State Party to the Convention which is in arrears with the payment of its compulsory or
voluntary contribution for the current year and the calendar year immediately preceding it shall
not be eligible as a Member of the World Heritage Committee, although this provision shall not
apply to the first election.
The terms of office of any such State which is already a member of the Committee shall
terminate at the time of the elections provided for in Article 8, paragraph 1 of this Convention.

Article 17
The States Parties to this Convention shall consider or encourage the establishment of national
public and private foundations or associations whose purpose is to invite donations for the
protection of the cultural and natural heritage as defined in Articles 1 and 2 of this Convention.

Article 18
The States Parties to this Convention shall give their assistance to international fund-raising
campaigns organized for the World Heritage Fund under the auspices of the United Nations
Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. They shall facilitate collections made by the
bodies mentioned in paragraph 3 of Article 15 for this purpose.

V. CONDITIONS AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Article 19
Any State Party to this Convention may request international assistance for property forming
part of the cultural or natural heritage of outstanding universal value situated within its territory.
It shall submit with its request such information and documentation provided for in Article 21 as
it has in its possession and as will enable the Committee to come to a decision.

Article 20
Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 13, sub-paragraph (c) of Article 22 and
Article 23, international assistance provided for by this Convention may be granted only to
property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage which the World Heritage Committee
has decided, or may decide, to enter in one of the lists mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 4 of
Article 11.

Article 21
The World Heritage Committee shall define the procedure by which requests to it for
international assistance shall be considered and shall specify the content of the request, which
should define the operation contemplated, the work that is necessary, the expected cost thereof,
the degree of urgency and the reasons why the resources of the State requesting assistance do
not allow it to meet all the expenses. Such requests must be supported by experts' reports
whenever possible.
Requests based upon disasters or natural calamities should, by reasons of the urgent work which they may involve, be given immediate, priority consideration by the Committee, which should have a reserve fund at its disposal against such contingencies. Before coming to a decision, the Committee shall carry out such studies and consultations as it deems necessary.

**Article 22**

Assistance granted by the World Heritage Committee may take the following forms:

- studies concerning the artistic, scientific and technical problems raised by the protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage, as defined in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11 of this Convention;
- provisions of experts, technicians and skilled labour to ensure that the approved work is correctly carried out;
- training of staff and specialists at all levels in the field of identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage;
- supply of equipment which the State concerned does not possess or is not in a position to acquire;
- low-interest or interest-free loans which might be repayable on a long-term basis;
- the granting, in exceptional cases and for special reasons, of non-repayable subsidies.

**Article 23**

The World Heritage Committee may also provide international assistance to national or regional centres for the training of staff and specialists at all levels in the field of identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage.

**Article 24**

International assistance on a large scale shall be preceded by detailed scientific, economic and technical studies. These studies shall draw upon the most advanced techniques for the protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the natural and cultural heritage and shall be consistent with the objectives of this Convention. The studies shall also seek means of making rational use of the resources available in the State concerned.

**Article 25**

As a general rule, only part of the cost of work necessary shall be borne by the international community. The contribution of the State benefiting from international assistance shall constitute a substantial share of the resources devoted to each programme or project, unless its resources do not permit this.

**Article 26**

The World Heritage Committee and the recipient State shall define in the agreement they conclude the conditions in which a programme or project for which international assistance under the terms of this Convention is provided, shall be carried out. It shall be the responsibility of the State receiving such international assistance to continue to protect, conserve and present the property so safeguarded, in observance of the conditions laid down by the agreement.

### VI. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES

**Article 27**

The States Parties to this Convention shall endeavor by all appropriate means, and in particular by educational and information programmes, to strengthen appreciation and respect by their peoples of the cultural and natural heritage defined in Articles 1 and 2 of the Convention. They shall undertake to keep the public broadly informed of the dangers threatening this heritage and of the activities carried on in pursuance of this Convention.

**Article 28**

States Parties to this Convention which receive international assistance under the Convention shall take appropriate measures to make known the importance of the property for which assistance has been received and the role played by such assistance.
VII. REPORTS

Article 29
The States Parties to this Convention shall, in the reports which they submit to the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on dates and in a manner to be determined by it, give information on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have adopted and other action which they have taken for the application of this Convention, together with details of the experience acquired in this field. These reports shall be brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee.
The Committee shall submit a report on its activities at each of the ordinary sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

VIII. FINAL CLAUSES

Article 30
This Convention is drawn up in Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish, the five texts being equally authoritative.

Article 31
This Convention shall be subject to ratification or acceptance by States members of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures.
The instruments of ratification or acceptance shall be deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Article 32
This Convention shall be open to accession by all States not members of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization which are invited by the General Conference of the Organization to accede to it.
Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Article 33
This Convention shall enter into force three months after the date of the deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, but only with respect to those States which have deposited their respective instruments of ratification, acceptance or accession on or before that date. It shall enter into force with respect to any other State three months after the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession.

Article 34
The following provisions shall apply to those States Parties to this Convention which have a federal or non-unitary constitutional system:
with regard to the provisions of this Convention, the implementation of which comes under the legal jurisdiction of the federal or central legislative power, the obligations of the federal or central government shall be the same as for those States parties which are not federal States;
with regard to the provisions of this Convention, the implementation of which comes under the legal jurisdiction of individual constituent States, countries, provinces or cantons that are not obliged by the constitutional system of the federation to take legislative measures, the federal government shall inform the competent authorities of such States, countries, provinces or cantons of the said provisions, with its recommendation for their adoption.

Article 35
Each State Party to this Convention may denounce the Convention.
The denunciation shall be notified by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
The denunciation shall take effect twelve months after the receipt of the instrument of denunciation. It shall not affect the financial obligations of the denouncing State until the date on which the withdrawal takes effect.

Article 36
The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization shall inform the States members of the Organization, the States not members of the Organization which are referred to in Article 32, as well as the United Nations, of the deposit of
all the instruments of ratification, acceptance, or accession provided for in Articles 31 and 32, and of the denunciations provided for in Article 35.

**Article 37**

This Convention may be revised by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Any such revision shall, however, bind only the States which shall become Parties to the revising convention.

If the General Conference should adopt a new convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new convention otherwise provides, this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification, acceptance or accession, as from the date on which the new revising convention enters into force.

**Article 38**

In conformity with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, this Convention shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations at the request of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Done in Paris, this twenty-third day of November 1972, in two authentic copies bearing the signature of the President of the seventeenth session of the General Conference and of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and certified true copies of which shall be delivered to all the States referred to in Articles 31 and 32 as well as to the United Nations.
APPENDIX 4

CRITERIA FOR THE INCLUSION OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES IN THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

23. The criteria for the inclusion of cultural properties in the World Heritage List should always be seen in relation to one another and should be considered in the context of the definition set out in Article 1 of the Convention which is reproduced below:

"monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and of man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological points of view."

24. A monument, group of buildings or site - as defined above - which is nominated for inclusion in the World Heritage List will be considered to be of outstanding universal value for the purposes of the Convention when the Committee finds that it meets one or more of the following criteria and the test of authenticity. Each property nominated should therefore:

a. represent a masterpiece of human creative genius; or

ii. exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; or

iii. bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared; or

iv. be an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history; or

v. be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change; or

vi. be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural);

and

Section C, Operational Guidelines World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1999)
b.

i. meet the test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship or setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components (the Committee stressed that reconstruction is only acceptable if it is carried out on the basis of complete and detailed documentation on the original and to no extent on conjecture).

ii. have adequate legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural properties or cultural landscapes. The existence of protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level and/or a well-established contractual or traditional protection as well as of adequate management and/or planning control mechanisms is therefore essential and, as is clearly indicated in the following paragraph, must be stated clearly on the nomination form. Assurances of the effective implementation of these laws and/or contractual and/or traditional protection as well as of these management mechanisms are also expected. Furthermore, in order to preserve the integrity of cultural sites, particularly those open to large numbers of visitors, the State Party concerned should be able to provide evidence of suitable administrative arrangements to cover the management of the property, its conservation and its accessibility to the public.
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CRITERIA FOR THE INCLUSION OF NATURAL PROPERTIES IN THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

43. In accordance with Article 2 of the Convention, the following is considered as "natural heritage":

"natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view;

geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation;

natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty."

44. A natural heritage property - as defined above - which is submitted for inclusion in the World Heritage List will be considered to be of outstanding universal value for the purposes of the Convention when the Committee finds that it meets one or more of the following criteria and fulfils the conditions of integrity set out below. Sites nominated should therefore:

a. be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features; or

b. be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals; or

c. contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance; or

b. contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation;

and

b. also fulfil the following conditions of integrity:

i. The sites described in 44(a)(i) should contain all or most of the key interrelated and interdependent elements in their natural relationships; for example, an "ice age" area should include the snow field, the glacier itself and samples of cutting patterns, deposition and colonization (e.g. striations, moraines, pioneer stages of plant succession, etc.); in the case of volcanoes, the magmatic series should be complete and all or most of the varieties of effusive rocks and types of eruptions be represented.

3 Section D, Operational Guidelines World Heritage Convention {UNESCO, #499}
ii. The sites described in 44(a)(ii) should have sufficient size and contain the necessary elements to demonstrate the key aspects of processes that are essential for the long-term conservation of the ecosystems and the biological diversity they contain; for example, an area of tropical rain forest should include a certain amount of variation in elevation above sea-level, changes in topography and soil types, patch systems and naturally regenerating patches; similarly a coral reef should include, for example, seagrass, mangrove or other adjacent ecosystems that regulate nutrient and sediment inputs into the reef.

iii. The sites described in 44(a)(iii) should be of outstanding aesthetic value and include areas that are essential for maintaining the beauty of the site; for example, a site whose scenic values depend on a waterfall, should include adjacent catchment and downstream areas that are integrally linked to the maintenance of the aesthetic qualities of the site.

iv. The sites described in paragraph 44(a)(iv) should contain habitats for maintaining the most diverse fauna and flora characteristic of the biographic province and ecosystems under consideration; for example, a tropical savannah should include a complete assemblage of co-evolved herbivores and plants; an island ecosystem should include habitats for maintaining endemic biota; a site containing wide-ranging species should be large enough to include the most critical habitats essential to ensure the survival of viable populations of those species; for an area containing migratory species, seasonal breeding and nesting sites, and migratory routes, wherever they are located, should be adequately protected; international conventions, e.g. the Convention of Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), for ensuring the protection of habitats of migratory species of waterfowl, and other multi- and bilateral agreements could provide this assurance.

v. The sites described in paragraph 44(a) should have a management plan. When a site does not have a management plan at the time when it is nominated for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee, the State Party concerned should indicate when such a plan will become available and how it proposes to mobilize the resources required for the preparation and implementation of the plan. The State Party should also provide other document(s) (e.g. operational plans) which will guide the management of the site until such time when a management plan is finalized.

vi. A site described in paragraph 44(a) should have adequate long-term legislative, regulatory, institutional or traditional protection. The boundaries of that site should reflect the spatial requirements of habitats, species, processes or phenomena that provide the basis for its nomination for inscription on the World Heritage List. The boundaries should include sufficient areas immediately adjacent to the area of outstanding universal value in order to protect the site's heritage values from direct effects of human encroachment and impacts of resource use outside of the nominated area. The boundaries of the nominated site may coincide
with one or more existing or proposed protected areas, such as national parks or biosphere reserves. While an existing or proposed protected area may contain several management zones, only some of those zones may satisfy criteria described in paragraph 44(a); other zones, although they may not meet the criteria set out in paragraph 44(a), may be essential for the management to ensure the integrity of the nominated site; for example, in the case of a biosphere reserve, only the core zone may meet the criteria and the conditions of integrity, although other zones, i.e. buffer and transitional zones, would be important for the conservation of the biosphere reserve in its totality.

vii. Sites described in paragraph 44(a) should be the most important sites for the conservation of biological diversity. Biological diversity, according to the new global Convention on Biological Diversity, means the variability among living organisms in terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part and includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems. Only those sites which are the most biologically diverse are likely to meet criterion (iv) of paragraph 44(a).
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CRITERIA FOR THE REGISTER OF THE NATIONAL ESTATE

CRITERION A:
ITS IMPORTANCE IN THE COURSE, OR PATTERN, OF AUSTRALIA'S NATURAL OR CULTURAL HISTORY

A.1 Importance in the evolution of Australian flora, fauna, landscapes or climate.

A.2 Importance in maintaining existing processes or natural systems at the regional or national scale.

A.3 Importance in exhibiting unusual richness or diversity of flora, fauna, landscapes or cultural features.

A.4 Importance for association with events, developments or cultural phases which have had a significant role in the human occupation and evolution of the nation, State, region or community.

CRITERION B:
ITS POSSESSION OF UNCOMMON, RARE OR ENDANGERED ASPECTS OF AUSTRALIA'S NATURAL OR CULTURAL HISTORY

B.1 Importance for rare, endangered or uncommon flora, fauna, communities, ecosystems, natural landscapes or phenomena, or as a wilderness.

B.2 Importance in demonstrating a distinctive way of life, custom, process, land-use, function or design no longer practised, in danger of being lost, or of exceptional interest

CRITERION C:
ITS POTENTIAL TO YIELD INFORMATION THAT WILL CONTRIBUTE TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF AUSTRALIA'S NATURAL OR CULTURAL HISTORY

C.1 Importance for information contributing to a wider understanding of Australian natural history, by virtue of its use as a research site, teaching site, type locality, reference or benchmark site.

C.2 Importance for information contributing to a wider understanding of the history of human occupation of Australia.

CRITERION D:
ITS IMPORTANCE IN DEMONSTRATING THE PRINCIPAL CHARACTERISTICS OF: (I) A CLASS OF AUSTRALIA'S NATURAL OR CULTURAL PLACES; OR (II) A CLASS OF AUSTRALIA'S NATURAL OR CULTURAL ENVIRONMENTS

D.1 Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of the range of landscapes, environments or ecosystems, the attributes of which identify them as being characteristic of their class.

D.2 Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of the range of human activities in the Australian environment (including way of life, philosophy, custom, process, land use, function, design or technique).

CRITERION E:
ITS IMPORTANCE IN EXHIBITING PARTICULAR AESTHETIC CHARACTERISTICS VALUED BY A COMMUNITY OR CULTURAL GROUP

E.1 Importance for a community for aesthetic characteristics held in high esteem or otherwise valued by the community.

CRITERION F:
ITS IMPORTANCE IN DEMONSTRATING A HIGH DEGREE OF CREATIVE OR TECHNICAL ACHIEVEMENT AT A PARTICULAR PERIOD

F.1 Importance for its technical, creative, design or artistic excellence, innovation or achievement.

CRITERION G:
ITS STRONG OR SPECIAL ASSOCIATIONS WITH A PARTICULAR COMMUNITY OR CULTURAL GROUP FOR SOCIAL, CULTURAL OR SPIRITUAL REASONS

G.1 Importance as a place highly valued by a community for reasons of religious, spiritual, symbolic, cultural, educational, or social associations.

CRITERION H:
ITS SPECIAL ASSOCIATION WITH THE LIFE OR WORKS OF A PERSON, OR GROUP OF PERSONS, OF IMPORTANCE IN AUSTRALIA'S NATURAL OR CULTURAL HISTORY

H.1 Importance for close associations with individuals whose activities have been significant within the history of the nation, State or region.
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THE BURRA CHARTER (THE AUSTRALIA ICOMOS CHARTER FOR THE CONSERVATION OF PLACES OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE)

Preamble

Considering the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice 1964), and the Resolutions of the 5th General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (Moscow 1978), the Burra Charter was adopted by Australia ICOMOS (the Australian National Committee of ICOMOS) on 19 August 1979 at Burra, South Australia. Revisions were adopted on 23 February 1981, 23 April 1988 and 26 November 1999.

The Burra Charter provides guidance for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance (cultural heritage places), and is based on the knowledge and experience of Australia ICOMOS members.

Conservation is an integral part of the management of places of cultural significance and is an ongoing responsibility.

Who is the Charter for?

The Charter sets a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places of cultural significance, including owners, managers and custodians.

Using the Charter

The Charter should be read as a whole. Many articles are interdependent. Articles in the Conservation Principles section are often further developed in the Conservation Processes and Conservation Practice sections. Headings have been included for ease of reading but do not form part of the Charter.

The Charter is self-contained, but aspects of its use and application are further explained in the following Australia ICOMOS documents:

• Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance;
• Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy;
• Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports;
• Code on the Ethics of Coexistence in Conserving Significant Places.

What places does the Charter apply to?

The Charter can be applied to all types of places of cultural significance including natural, indigenous and historic places with cultural values.

The standards of other organisations may also be relevant. These include the Australian Natural Heritage Charter and the Draft Guidelines for the Protection, Management and Use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Places.
Why conserve?

Places of cultural significance enrich people’s lives, often providing a deep and inspirational sense of connection to community and landscape, to the past and to lived experiences. They are historical records, that are important as tangible expressions of Australian identity and experience. Places of cultural significance reflect the diversity of our communities, telling us about who we are and the past that has formed us and the Australian landscape. They are irreplaceable and precious.

These places of cultural significance must be conserved for present and future generations.
The Burra Charter advocates a cautious approach to change: do as much as necessary to care for the place and to make it useable, but otherwise change it as little as possible so that its cultural significance is retained.

Article 1 Definitions

For the purpose of this Charter:

1.1 Place means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views.

1.2 Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations.

Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects.

Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.

1.3 Fabric means all the physical material of the place including components, fixtures, contents, and objects.

1.4 Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.

1.5 Maintenance means the continuous protective care of the fabric and setting of a place, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves restoration or reconstruction.

1.6 Preservation means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

1.7 Restoration means returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.

1.8 Reconstruction means returning a place to a known earlier state and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material into the fabric.

1.9 Adaptation means modifying a place to suit the existing use or a proposed use.
1.10 Use means the functions of a place, as well as the activities and practices that may occur at the place.

1.11 Compatible use means a use which respects the cultural significance of a place. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.

1.12 Setting means the area around a place, which may include the visual catchment.

1.13 Related place means a place that contributes to the cultural significance of another place.

1.14 Related object means an object that contributes to the cultural significance of a place but is not at the place.

1.15 Associations mean the special connections that exist between people and a place.

1.16 Meanings denote what a place signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses.

1.17 Interpretation means all the ways of presenting the cultural significance of a place.

Conservation Principles

**Article 2 Conservation and management**

2.1 Places of cultural significance should be conserved.

2.2 The aim of conservation is to retain the cultural significance of a place.

2.3 Conservation is an integral part of good management of places of cultural significance.

2.4 Places of cultural significance should be safeguarded and not put at risk or left in a vulnerable state.

**Article 3 Cautious approach**

3.1 Conservation is based on a respect for the existing fabric, use, associations and meanings. It requires a cautious approach of changing as much as necessary but as little as possible.

3.2 Changes to a place should not distort the physical or other evidence it provides, nor be based on conjecture.

**Article 4 Knowledge, skills and techniques**

4.1 Conservation should make use of all the knowledge, skills and disciplines which can contribute to the study and care of the place.

4.2 Traditional techniques and materials are preferred for the conservation of significant fabric. In some circumstances modern techniques and materials which offer substantial conservation benefits may be appropriate.

**Article 5 Values**

5.1 Conservation of a place should identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.

5.2 Relative degrees of cultural significance may lead to different conservation actions at a place.
Article 6  Burra Charter Process

6.1  The cultural significance of a place and other issues affecting its future are best understood by a sequence of collecting and analysing information before making decisions. Understanding cultural significance comes first, then development of policy and finally management of the place in accordance with the policy.

6.2  The policy for managing a place must be based on an understanding of its cultural significance.

6.3  Policy development should also include consideration of other factors affecting the future of a place such as the owner’s needs, resources, external constraints and its physical condition.

Article 7  Use

7.1  Where the use of a place is of cultural significance it should be retained.

7.2  A place should have a compatible use.

Article 8  Setting

Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate visual setting and other relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.

Article 9  Location

9.1  The physical location of a place is part of its cultural significance. A building, work or other component of a place should remain in its historical location. Relocation is generally unacceptable unless this is the sole practical means of ensuring its survival.

9.2  Some buildings, works or other components of places were designed to be readily removable or already have a history of relocation. Provided such buildings, works or other components do not have significant links with their present location, removal may be appropriate.

9.3  If any building, work or other component is moved, it should be moved to an appropriate location and given an appropriate use. Such action should not be to the detriment of any place of cultural significance.

Article 10  Contents

Contents, fixtures and objects which contribute to the cultural significance of a place should be retained at that place. Their removal is unacceptable unless it is: the sole means of ensuring their security and preservation; on a temporary basis for treatment or exhibition; for cultural reasons; for health and safety; or to protect the place. Such contents, fixtures and objects should be returned where circumstances permit and it is culturally appropriate.

Article 11  Related places and objects

The contribution which related places and related objects make to the cultural significance of the place should be retained.
Article 12 Participation

Conservation, interpretation and management of a place should provide for the participation of people for whom the place has special associations and meanings, or who have social, spiritual or other cultural responsibilities for the place.

Article 13 Co-existence of cultural values

Co-existence of cultural values should be recognised, respected and encouraged, especially in cases where they conflict.

Conservation Processes

Article 14 Conservation processes

Conservation may, according to circumstance, include the processes of: retention or reintroduction of a use; retention of associations and meanings; maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and interpretation; and will commonly include a combination of more than one of these.

Article 15 Change

15.1 Change may be necessary to retain cultural significance, but is undesirable where it reduces cultural significance. The amount of change to a place should be guided by the cultural significance of the place and its appropriate interpretation.

15.2 Changes which reduce cultural significance should be reversible, and be reversed when circumstances permit.

15.3 Demolition of significant fabric of a place is generally not acceptable. However, in some cases minor demolition may be appropriate as part of conservation. Removed significant fabric should be reinstated when circumstances permit.

15.4 The contributions of all aspects of cultural significance of a place should be respected. If a place includes fabric, uses, associations or meanings of different periods, or different aspects of cultural significance, emphasising or interpreting one period or aspect at the expense of another can only be justified when what is left out, removed or diminished is of slight cultural significance and that which is emphasised or interpreted is of much greater cultural significance.

Article 16 Maintenance

Maintenance is fundamental to conservation and should be undertaken where fabric is of cultural significance and its maintenance is necessary to retain that cultural significance.

Article 17 Preservation

Preservation is appropriate where the existing fabric or its condition constitutes evidence of cultural significance, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other conservation processes to be carried out.

Article 18 Restoration and reconstruction

Restoration and reconstruction should reveal culturally significant aspects of the place.
Article 19 Restoration

Restoration is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the fabric.

Article 20 Reconstruction

20.1 Reconstruction is appropriate only where a place is incomplete through damage or alteration, and only where there is sufficient evidence to reproduce an earlier state of the fabric. In rare cases, reconstruction may also be appropriate as part of a use or practice that retains the cultural significance of the place.

20.2 Reconstruction should be identifiable on close inspection or through additional interpretation.

Article 21 Adaptation must be limited to that which is essential to a use for the place determined in accordance with Articles 6 and 7.

21.1 Adaptation is acceptable only where the adaptation has minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place.

21.2 Adaptation should involve minimal change to significant fabric, achieved only after considering alternatives.

Article 22 New work

22.1 New work such as additions to the place may be acceptable where it does not distort or obscure the cultural significance of the place, or detract from its interpretation and appreciation.

22.2 New work should be readily identifiable as such.

Article 23 Conserving use

Continuing, modifying or reinstating a significant use may be appropriate and preferred forms of conservation.

Article 24 Retaining associations and meanings

24.1 Significant associations between people and a place should be respected, retained and not obscured. Opportunities for the interpretation, commemoration and celebration of these associations should be investigated and implemented.

24.2 Significant meanings, including spiritual values, of a place should be respected. Opportunities for the continuation or revival of these meanings should be investigated and implemented.

Article 25 Interpretation

The cultural significance of many places is not readily apparent, and should be explained by interpretation. Interpretation should enhance understanding and enjoyment, and be culturally appropriate.

Article 26 Applying the Burra Charter process

26.1 Work on a place should be preceded by studies to understand the place which should include analysis of physical, documentary, oral and other evidence, drawing on appropriate knowledge, skills and disciplines.
26.2 Written statements of cultural significance and policy for the place should be prepared, justified and accompanied by supporting evidence. The statements of significance and policy should be incorporated into a management plan for the place.

26.3 Groups and individuals with associations with a place as well as those involved in its management should be provided with opportunities to contribute to and participate in understanding the cultural significance of the place. Where appropriate they should also have opportunities to participate in its conservation and management.

Article 27 Managing change

27.1 The impact of proposed changes on the cultural significance of a place should be analysed with reference to the statement of significance and the policy for managing the place. It may be necessary to modify proposed changes following analysis to better retain cultural significance.

27.2 Existing fabric, use, associations and meanings should be adequately recorded before any changes are made to the place.

Article 28 Disturbance of fabric

Disturbance of significant fabric for study, or to obtain evidence, should be minimised. Study of a place by any disturbance of the fabric, including archaeological excavation, should only be undertaken to provide data essential for decisions on the conservation of the place, or to obtain important evidence about to be lost or made inaccessible.

Investigation of a place which requires disturbance of the fabric, apart from that necessary to make decisions, may be appropriate provided that it is consistent with the policy for the place. Such investigation should be based on important research questions which have potential to substantially add to knowledge, which cannot be answered in other ways and which minimises disturbance of significant fabric.

Article 29 Responsibility for decisions

The organisations and individuals responsible for management decisions should be named and specific responsibility taken for each such decision.

Article 30 Direction, supervision and implementation

Competent direction and supervision should be maintained at all stages, and any changes should be implemented by people with appropriate knowledge and skills.

Article 31 Documenting evidence and decisions

A log of new evidence and additional decisions should be kept.

Article 32 Records

32.1 The records associated with the conservation of a place should be placed in a permanent archive and made publicly available, subject to requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.

32.2 Records about the history of a place should be protected and made publicly available, subject to requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.
Article 33 Removed fabric

Significant fabric which has been removed from a place including contents, fixtures and objects, should be catalogued, and protected in accordance with its cultural significance.

Where possible and culturally appropriate, removed significant fabric including contents, fixtures and objects, should be kept at the place.

Article 34 Resources

Adequate resources should be provided for conservation. 

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.
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**REEF TOURISM LOCALITIES AND FACILITIES OBSERVED DURING RESEARCH PERIOD (2000-2003)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism Centres</strong></td>
<td><strong>Airlie Beach, including Airlie Beach markets</strong></td>
<td>Mainland adjacent Whitsundays, Central Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cairns</strong>*</td>
<td>Australian Mainland, Far North Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day Tours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Captain Cook Great Barrier Reef Cruises</strong></td>
<td>Town of 1770, Lady Musgrave Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FantaSea Whitehaven Cruise</strong></td>
<td>Whitehaven Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ocean Rafting</strong></td>
<td>Whitehaven Bay, Whitsunday Island; Nara Inlet, Hook Island; Pittstop Bay, Border Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proserpine River EcoTour</strong></td>
<td>Proserpine, Australian mainland adjacent Whitsundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em><em>Pure Pleasure Cruise</em> Orpheus Island</em>*</td>
<td>Orpheus Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Flames of Polynesia</strong> South Molle**</td>
<td>South Molle Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offshore Pontoons</strong></td>
<td><strong>ReefWorld</strong></td>
<td>Hardy Reef, Outer Great Barrier Reef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em><em>Pure Pleasure Cruise</em> Kelso Reef</em>*</td>
<td>Kelso Reef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Island Resorts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Club Crocodile</strong></td>
<td>Long Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hamilton Island Resort</strong></td>
<td>Hamilton Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Palm Bay Hideaway</strong></td>
<td>Long Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South Molle Resort</strong></td>
<td>South Molle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unguided bushwalks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long Island</strong></td>
<td>Happy Bay, Fish Bay, Pandanus Bay, Humpty Point, Palm Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Magnetic Island</strong></td>
<td>Florence Bay, Arthur Bay, Horseshoe Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South Molle Island</strong></td>
<td>Paddle Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Informal observation of cruises and activities outside fieldwork observation in the Whitsundays.
APPENDIX 9

DATABASE CHECKLISTS USED IN ANALYSIS

Image Analysis

Perspective
- Landscape
- From water
- Above water
- Aerial view
- Horizontal view
- Large scale (distant)
- Other...

Landscape Features
- Day
- Sun
- Islands
- Palm trees
- Other vegetation
- Rail/track
- Billboard
- Boat
- Clear sea
- Wharf
- Stars
- Swimmers
- Swimming pool
- Bush
- Stormy sea
- Cyclone
- Reef
- Reef edge
- mainland
- Corals
- Plant life
- Seaweeds
- Shells
- Other...

Sea creatures
- Coral fish
- Game fish
- Turtles
- Whales
- Dolphins
- Eagles
- Crocodile
- Other...

Total people

Women
- Active
- Formal
- Casual
- Fully clothed
- Semi clothed
- Bare
- Naked
- Other...

Men
- Active
- Formal
- Casual
- Fully clothed
- Semi clothed
- Bare
- Naked
- Other...

Children
- Active
- Formal
- Casual
- Fully clothed
- Semi clothed
- Bare
- Naked
- Other...

Ethnicity
- Aboriginal
- Chinese
- South east European
- Asian
- Other...

Activities
- Water transport
- Snorkelling
- Diving
- Spear fishing
- Snorkelling
- Swimming pool
- Dressing
- Fishing
- Walking
- Mountain climbing
- Boating
- Other...
Field Observation
Film Analysis Checklist

Catalogue Information

Creator: Tate, Frank

Date: 6.1941

Production date

Title: [Tate, Frank. Barrier Reef Islands: Break, Dunk, Houns, Fraser and Hindshinbrook Channel 1941: Home Movie]

Medium: Home Movie

Length: minutes

Colour: Colour Sound: Silent

Availability: ScreenSound Australia

Order copy: call number: 327589

Copyright: Copyright provided

Location

Brief description

Analysis

Purpose

Landscape

Tropical

Australia

Reef

Perspective

People

Experience

Activities

Sensations

Description
Summary Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Summary</th>
<th>details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>summary purpose</td>
<td>□ Government/Promotion □ Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary orientation</td>
<td>□ orientation □ scenic □ portrait □ group/activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exotic signifier</td>
<td>□ yes □ no □ palm □ other veg □ pacific 'culture'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian signifier</td>
<td>□ yes □ no □ vegetation □ Aboriginal people/culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensation</td>
<td>□ sound □ visual □ smell □ taste □ touch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather</td>
<td>□ fine/pleasant □ storm/unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary landscape</td>
<td>□ islands □ water surface □ underwater □ land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date summary</td>
<td>□ pre 1900 □ 1920-1930s □ 1960s-1970s □ 1900-1910 □ 1940-1950s □ contemporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capture</td>
<td>□ photography □ aquarium □ collections □ film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human presence</td>
<td>□ yes □ no □ people □ industry □ buildings □ towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way of life</td>
<td>□ accommodation □ boats □ domestic duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Film Compilation

Access and Activities at the Reef

The enclosed CD contains samples of footage from a selection of home movies, documentaries and advertisements for the Great Barrier Reef.

The CD can be viewed in a CD-Rom Drive on a personal computer using Microsoft Media or other free software.