

(in)significance: a discussion about values and valuing in heritage

Friday 15 May 2015, Ann Harding Conference Centre, University of Canberra

Conveners: Tracy Ireland and Steve Brown

Symposium abstract

The notion of 'significance' is a central concept for heritage conservation in many parts of the world—it describes what the institutions of heritage choose to remember and what they choose to forget. Used in American historic preservation legislation from the late 19th century, and in the 1964 Venice Charter, in Australia the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 1979) introduced the phrase 'places of cultural significance', a concept that emphasised meanings over monuments. Determining significance is a process of ascribing values—culturally constructed meanings or qualities attributed by individuals and groups to a heritage object, place or landscape. Valuing heritage has led to practices that typically list, rank and then privilege particular values—at world, national and local levels. At the symposium we hope to explore the history, theory and practical application of the concept of significance and broach the idea of insignificance.

NOTES ON SESSION 1: history and practice

Session 1 <i>history and practice</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ What is standard practice for the application of significance in heritage, museums, archives, libraries and other locations?▪ What is being taught at tertiary levels on the theory and application of significance?	
9.00 – 9.20	Welcome and outline of Symposium: why (in)significance?	Tracy Ireland
9.20 – 9.35	Perspective 1. 'places of cultural significance'	Bronwyn Hanna
9.35 – 9.45	Perspective 2. Social value determinations - changes in the looking glass	Jane Harrington
9.45 – 9.55	Perspective 3. Significance: Pluralism, intellectualism and the crafting of tools	Robyn Sloggett
9.55 – 10.05	Perspective 4. Conservation communities	Alison Wain
10.05 – 10.15	Perspective 5. Grappling with AIM734 - Understanding significance	Linda Young
10.15 – 11.00	Discussion. What's changed since 1979? Where are the overlaps and separations across fields of practice?	Panel of 5 presenters Facilitator: Kristal Buckley

Note on notes

The following summary is not a verbatim transcript. Rather, the notes are a series of statements that seek to capture what was expressed and discussed. The notes are not intended for direct quotation in a scholarly sense, but rather they provide a flavour of the Session-3 discussion.

Welcome and outline of Symposium: why (in)significance?

Tracy Ireland (Associate Professor of Cultural Heritage)

Welcome to the University of Canberra. My name is Tracy Ireland and I am the leader of the Future Heritage Program of the Centre for Creative and Cultural Research.

Acknowledgment of Country- I acknowledge the Ngunnawal peoples as the traditional custodians of the land upon which we are meeting today, and pay respect to all Elders past and present. I would also like to extend that respect to all Indigenous people present today.

I would like to formally thank my colleagues Professor Jen Webb, Katie Hayne, Professor Angelina Russo, Dr Steve Brown, Dr Mona Soleymani, and student volunteers Hakim Abdul Rahim and Robyn Victory for making today possible.

Significance as a concept and a method is shared between the different disciplines and professions that constitute the ever broadening field that we call 'heritage'- from libraries and archives, museums, heritage places and sites; from the intangible and the digital to the material; from archaeology, to architecture and materials conservation.

Yesterday some of us got together to discuss the need for a heritage education network that might help build communication across these disciplinary, institutional and jurisdictional boundaries and to support heritage educators working in different contexts –the notion of significance is central in all of these contexts, clearly demonstrating the need for research and research–led teaching around this fundamental precept. So it's exciting for me that the first activity of the Future Heritage program of the Centre for Creative and Cultural Research, here at the University of Canberra, is today's symposium.

The genealogy of the concept of significance, as an amalgam of discrete values, is complex. It was used in American historic preservation legislation from the late 19th century, and the 1906 *Antiquities Act* in the US linked significance closely to the idea

of the nation- as the imagined community that shared the values seen as reflected in or perhaps constituted by heritage. In Europe Alois Reigl's 1903 work *Der moderne Denkmalkultus*, seen as the foundational text for modern conservation, set out an influential theory of values- however the Athens Charter on the Restoration of Ancient Monuments of 1931 does not refer to significance or values, but rather to principles for what we would now term the maintenance of authenticity.

The term 'cultural significance' is used in the 1964 Venice Charter, the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, and in Australia, the *Burra Charter* (Australia ICOMOS 1979), introduced the phrase 'places of cultural significance', a concept that emphasised meanings over monuments.

At the heart of our discussions around significance here in Australia has been the need to make values explicit and to understand where they come from and who they benefit - the notion that values are made and constructed within particular historical, political and economic circumstances, that they are ways of seeing, ways of knowing, not naturally occurring phenomenabut this remains a somewhat contentious discussion in heritage conservation and management frames.

Debates tend to lurch between positions that see values as inherent in objects, and thus able to be managed through strict adherence to principles of care and management of those objects, to the position that there is no such 'thing' as heritage- which intentionally de-privileges the material as a corrective to the effects of the former position (Smith 2006, *The uses of heritage*, Routledge).

Recent approaches to materiality, such as what Ian Hodder calls 'the entanglement of people and things' or Jane Bennet's 'vibrant matter' – offer a range of alternative positions in this debate which goes to the heart of how we approach significance in heritage.

To start the discussion I will take you from our signature image featuring our '(in)significant' stone tools to this image of beautiful Kimberly points from the website of the British Museum's Indigenous Australia exhibition. I noticed this comment about these objects one of the Museum's blogs:

'... the Kimberley points are displayed with a simple label, describing dates and materials. The points appear to be doing a good job of transmitting their value for themselves' <http://blog.britishmuseum.org/2015/05/08/one-hit-wonders-spear-points-from-the-kimberley/>

I will leave you with this as a starting point for discussions for our first panel looking at where our ideas about heritage values and how they are articulated have come from.

Format

The format of the symposium is each of four sessions comprise a series of 'lightening presentations'—ten minutes in length; sharp and speedy—followed by panel and audience discussions. Each session will be chaired and facilitated.

Audience members are encouraged to participate in the discussions. We recognize in the room a huge cultural capital—perhaps one million years of experience.

Acknowledged Duncan Marshall's recent award of the inaugural Bathurst Macquarie Heritage Medal, awarded in recognition of his contribution to Australia's heritage.

Session 1 - *history and practice*

Chair and Facilitator

Kristal Buckley, Member of the Order of Australia (Lecturer in Cultural Heritage, Deakin University Melbourne).

Speakers

Dr Bronwyn Hanna (Independent Scholar); Dr Jane Harrington (Director of Conservation and Infrastructure, Port Arthur Historic Site); A/Professor Robyn Sloggett (Director of Centre for Cultural Materials Conservation, University of Melbourne); Dr Alison Wain (Course Convener for the Bachelor of Heritage, Museums and Conservation, University of Canberra); Dr Linda Young (Senior Lecturer, Deakin University Melbourne).

DISCUSSION

Kristal Buckley. What key question do the panel members see as arising from the five presentations?

- Jane Harrington. Why is the cultural heritage environment devoid of an attraction to people working in anthropology and sociology? Why are practitioners in these disciplines resistant to being part of mainstream contemporary cultural heritage practice?
- Alison Wain. How do we understand what people do with cultural heritage in the present? How do we incorporate that into our sense of what we are preserving?
- Bronwyn Hanna. A comment. Attracted to the notion of significance as inherently unstable and therefore it becomes open to continual re-working.
- Linda Young. Is it useful, is it productive, is it realistic to bring together the format domains of heritage – objects, places, and intangibles?

Open to audience questions and comments.

- Ross Gibson. One of the concepts the Burra Charter transfers from the Venice Charter is that significance is embodied in fabric. This seems to create a blockage that limits social, cultural, and spiritual significance being recognised or emphasised.
- Audience. 1. Significance in an Australian sense seems to be subjugated to some degree by other influences. For example, American notions of celebrity. There seems to be less knowledge of significance in an Australian context. How might Australians promote local heritage issues and values? Can social media play a role in this regard? 2. Concerning large machines, there is a rapid loss of knowledge on their use because knowledgeable people are dying out. This also relates to a lack of appreciation of how things were used.
- Alison Wain. My research points to a considerable interest in ordinary people's stories. People are looking for personal connection to individuals. Social media facilitates knowledge concerning, for example, celebrities, and enables 'personal' connections to be built into one's own life: a feeling we know that person. So people participating in my research expressed interest in people they knew—e.g., a family member—or thought they knew—e.g., a celebrity. Hence, where heritage place interpretation provides a personal link to another individual, then the 'consumer' often becomes engaged. 2. There is a huge concern amongst people working with

large machinery that knowledge of use and maintenance is not being sufficiently transferred. The issue is how can future generations be encouraged and supported to build personal connection to knowledge holders in order for them to commit time to develop skills, funding to maintain equipment, and to make an intangible tradition associated with the large machine a part of themselves.

- Jane Harrington. From my perspective, it is not so much about keeping people interested in how things are running, its how do we equally have a mindset of understanding what we do with heritage. There is a gap between vision and reality. I illustrate the point with a personal story. My ‘hallelujah moment’ in heritage occurred whilst working on the Murray Islands—an extraordinary privilege—and watching the development of the township of Murray and the movement of people into new houses. One traditional house survived. A current heritage practice is to protect and conserve that structure. Why are we not conserving the practice that would allow another such structure to be built? It is the notion of practice which is a huge issue: i.e., not just how to maintain and conserve special objects, buildings, and places, but understanding how trade skills are heritage and a significant component of heritage. It is a quantum leap that heritage practitioners, and the Burra Charter, need to make. At a different level, we have a *World Heritage Convention* and a *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage*: why a need for separation?
- Robyn Sloggett. We seem to be joining the two audience questions together through the topic of traditional practice—the need to invest in traditional knowledge holders. This is a major heritage issue. On Murray Island, Elders want their children to be educated and aspire to an economically sustainable future. Is spending time learning to build a traditional house important to local people in this context? How do heritage practitioners insert themselves into such a situation? This is challenge worthy of our attention.
- Bronwyn Hanna. In revisions of the Burra Charter, there has been an historical shift, particularly in 1999 to “bring people into the Burra Charter” (to quote David Young). The shift concerns uses, meanings, and associations. The charter allows for the incorporation of intangible heritage practices into concepts of significance. It is up to practitioners to apply it. There are well-established processes for identifying and conserving heritage items. How do we conserve practices? This is a current challenge.
- Brian Egloff. Jane observed that there are few anthropologists who are members of ICOMOS. In fact there are extraordinarily few social scientists. I don’t know of psychologists or sociologists in ICOMOS (but could be wrong). These disciplines deal with values; values are a core of the disciplines. Meanwhile we as historians and archaeologists are bringing forth pronouncements on social values. Is that appropriate? Setha Low, a psychologist, has produced studies of social and community values with regard to heritage spaces such as a plaza in Mexico and Independence Square, Pennsylvania. Low has presented values using approaches, different from heritage methods, from which historians, archaeologists and architects can learn.
- Jane Harrington. Exactly! All of the work I have done is based in anthropology – for example, my doctoral research. The field of heritage needs to engage with work in psychology. Particularly when dealing with values that extend into the economic sphere. Those of us who have dealt with heritage in the context of disasters wonder

if heritage is the last thing to be thought about? For example, an issue in Christchurch, New Zealand, after the earthquake was to save significant historic buildings based on an argument of community health and recovery, rather than an argument founded in fabric itself. It is an approach that is not typically applied in heritage management. There is huge scope for research and application of notions of attachment and identity-creation in our practice. It is about community relationships and significance in relation to place connectivity and wellbeing rather than fabric. This is something we have to explore.

- Bronwyn Hanna. ICOMOS is an interdisciplinary organization and its membership is not restricted to archeologists and architects. I am an art historian, a discipline concerned with finding meaning in objects and how people find significance in things. ICOMOS members include geologists and lawyers. All disciplines explore notions of significance in different ways. ICOMOS allows people to communicate across disciplinary boundaries.
- Jane Harrington. Agree that ICOMOS has a diverse disciplinary membership. However the core disciplinary backgrounds of those people currently engaged in mainstream cultural heritage assessments of significance are architecture, archaeology, and history.
- Victoria Pearce. Thanked Bronwyn for summing up the lists of charters and reminding us that doctrinal text came into being because people were scared of losing heritage. For example, the loss of Venice. This was also a theme of Jane's presentation in relation to the idea of 'imagined space'. We are now all faced with losing heritage that is important to us and there is a consequent rise in support for the idea of cultural heritage. The last year has been a global catastrophe for heritage: losses through war and natural disaster. People are looking at lost heritage and imagined spaces as matters of concern. Robyn's presentation provoked the question: how do we apply a national agenda for significance? Is it not time for us to look at public opinion with respect to conserving spaces? And how we respond to the global heritage losses within Australian heritage practice? How can we 'grab' community energy to create a more global discussion that feeds back into Australian heritage and supports action? For example, in relation to attempts by the Western Australian government to close down remote Aboriginal communities.
- Robyn Sloggett. This is a story from Yackandandah, Victoria. It focuses on what we have lost and how we articulate the significance of loss. We can talk about destruction and loss at Nimrod in Iraq and identify the communities and disciplines affected. At Yackandandah there was a woman who passed away eight years ago. She was 102. Every week she worked as a volunteer at the Yackandandah Historical Society Museum (now destroyed). She would produce paper cutout figures and pin them above a fireplace. She did this because this was how people with little money decorated their lounges when she was a child. Evidently it was a national decoration methodology. No one in Yackandandah now continues the practice. It was a significant practice that talked to economics and gender. Does it matter? Heritage practitioners have many frameworks we place onto such things. We need to deconstruct processes of heritage significance before we can reconstruct an idea of significance. There is so much that is lost. If we look at the issue through another prism it would not be so significant. Therefore what is the prismatic focus we bring to heritage? What's in? What's out? And why? Maybe Nimrod is OK. I am not sure the

paper cutouts are OK. Heritage could argue cutouts were of a place and time. We have to critically look at the underpinnings of our heritage practices.

- Alison Wain. Whether we acknowledge it or not the practice is personal. When we see a great exhibition, it is often because the curator has a passion for a particular area of reflection or has discovered something or wants to delve deeply into a subject. It is that passion expressed through the exhibition which draws people into something they knew nothing about before. We could record everything about everything and it would be blancmange. What is important is those moments of personal passion that tell a story of or interpret the past.
- Jane Harrington. On a happy note and as an ex-President of Australia ICOMOS, ICOMOS is an organisation that offers formal means for members to move from the domestic and national spheres into the international arena and contribute concerns and comments on global issues. I would like to echo previous comments on heritage at the domestic scale with an anecdote. When I was junior (but older age-wise) in this arena, I had a conversation with a director of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority who proposed a new rezoning plan. He said the community will support this because it is World Heritage. I said something like: I think you are living in lala land, because that is not going to be the case. It is not the big things that motivate the community. From my research experience, it is the small and local things that people will attach themselves and value as really important: things they want to keep for their children and their community. Significance extends beyond the personal level to the community level (e.g., a village, street, and extended family). There is an entrenched view that the government will care for heritage on behalf of the community. However as we know there are lapses – as evidenced currently in Western Australia. This is when we do need to motivate individual and concerted interest. ICOMOS meetings can often produce charters. Perhaps there can be a letter produced today to the WA Premier with signatures from everyone in this room.
- Linda Young. Perhaps things are not as cataclysmic as they seem. Cataclysms come and go. I want to pick up on a point made on place heritage, people's values, and heritage practitioners not knowing. Heritage is a 'taste'. Some people have musical intelligences and others do not. Some people have mathematic intelligences, etc. An interest in old things from the past is definitely a taste. For lots of people such an interest is absurd: they are interested in the now and future. I suspect even people into the now and future has certain practices, values, and things at home with which they do heritage. They would not call it heritage, but they do it. This connects to an age-old cry: 'the oldies are dying and the knowledge will go'. People have long been saying this. An example is the engine being used by grandpa and his grandsons (Alison Wain presentation). The grandchildren are young and may or may not develop into enthusiasts. But there will always be more enthusiasts who will come along and take it on, though maybe not in the same way or as expertly, which is my experience from over 30 years. The larger issue is showing that almost all people have heritage and do heritage at some times during their lives. Making Christmas cake is an example.
- Andrew Simpson. A comment. A lot has been said on how heritage practice comes to grips with the 'intangibles'. A few people have observed that intangibles aren't waiting to be translated into heritage practice. It is worth remembering that there are some nations, particularly in Asia, that do have a distinctive investment in the

preservation of intangible heritage. Some of those models might not suite the case examples discussed today, but they are worth considering. There are in Asia, for example, interesting models for protecting and preserving traditions or processes invested in a single individual and methods for transmitting them. There is still the ideological question of deciding what makes the cut and is worth continuing. My point is that there may be nations more advanced in their thinking about these issues than Australia and from which we can learn.

- Linda Young. You have touched on a field which has been let down by the absence of an academic discipline and practices flowing from it. And that is folklore/folk life. In Australia the subject area never took off. It disappeared after the 1980s Hope Inquiry. This is because the idea of folklore/folk life conjured up visions of gnomes sitting on toadstools, which is not the focus of British and American scholars and practitioners studies. In Australia there is no group of people who have created a discipline around folklore/folk life and said: this is important, there is thinking to be done, and intangible heritage has many manifestations. It is an issue in Australia that there is no body of work in folklore/folk life, and that there are absences concerning the intangible more generally. It is a missing bone in the heritage body.
- Sharon Sullivan. Congratulated everyone on the stimulating content in all of the papers. I want to make some points concerning Aboriginal heritage. One of the reasons the Burra Charter has flourished is because, in its many revisions, work has been undertaken to make it inclusive of Aboriginal heritage, which is multi-layered, past and present, tangible and intangible. This has enabled Australia to build a body of practice around intangible heritage to a greater degree than many European nations. As heritage practitioners, we tend to give Aboriginal people a greater say in what their values are than we necessarily give to non-indigenous communities. Therefore, Australian heritage practitioners benefit from working with Aboriginal people because of their integrated view of heritage. An integrated approach is something we tend to have lost in much of our non-indigenous heritage practice. Thus the effect of Aboriginal heritage in Australia is well worth looking at because it has powered and is the reason why Australian heritage practice is 'on the ball'.
- Bronwyn Hanna. There is so much to say on this topic. The Burra Charter has been criticised for not dealing well with Aboriginal culture. I think the charter lays out a framework that is inclusive of and applicable to Aboriginal culture. In my oral history project I interviewed 18 Australians and five New Zealanders. New Zealand is interesting when compared to Australia, though Australia deals better with its multicultural heritage. New Zealand is a bi-cultural country and deals well with Indigenous culture. For example, the New Zealand heritage charter is in English and Maori; and Maori issues are more openly integrated into that charter than are indigenous issues into the Burra Charter. Nevertheless, the Burra Charter allows Australian heritage practitioners to examine the heritage of Aboriginal culture and to welcome that cultural influence with regard to how we understand significance.
- Robyn Sloggett. I have one thought I would like to seed. In thinking about the issue of plurality, there are some big questions around language, translation, position, etc. What would a community heritage grant look like to knit a jumper? If we can envisage what that application would look like and be successful, then we have moved some way to address some of the questions we have been thinking about this morning.

- Alison Wain. I would like to echo what Sharon is saying. Often we do not value our Western-based traditions or take the same sorts of approaches to them that Aboriginal people apply to their cultural heritage. Aboriginal people bring a real passion and commitment to valuing. Perhaps this issue arises because heritage practitioners are too busy looking forward.

SUMMARY (Kristal Buckley)

At the request of the conveners, I will try to sum up the key points of the session. These points can act as a springboard for and inform discussions in the next session.

We made a good start with background history and how did we get here as well as some characteristics of our own country, Australia, and our cultures, histories and points of view. We heard about periods of innovation and radical thinking in Australian heritage and a need for more of this now. We heard about perceived shortcomings and consensus around some of these – what the object of conservation should be; how our practices should be defined; issues of process, terminology, and ideas.

We heard questions about the role of governments. In the past governments were recognised in the heritage field as leaders, facilitators, and supporters: they demanded rigour, consistency, and framing. Currently this is less the case. Governments are dependent on collaboration with and outsourcing to groups like Australia ICOMOS.

We discussed language – what we call things, how we practice, how we discuss things. We talked about the notion of ‘double domain’ (Linda Young), which I think is worth further consideration. We also heard about the possibilities for convergence; at the same time acknowledging differences in the way we practice within the various heritage sectors we are trying to link together. From Robyn Sloggett we heard some practical things about the costs of professional activity and whether it is delivering sufficient benefit to those knowledge holders and communities we are supposedly assisting. We heard a lot about intangible heritage – a big topic, but we have made a good start in being ‘unsettled’ in relation to this topic. Should we give up social value mechanisms? Are there are better ways of talking about intangible heritage? Are there disciplines doing good heritage work and with which we need to better connect? We moved up and down between national and global questions and very local questions – that is, scale is an important topic for further discussion. Finally we had a question about whether there is a national agenda and how it is being formulated.

I hope that some of these points from the presentations and the discussion will be picked up during conversations during the day. Thank you to the panel.

[Joyous applause]

Session 1: *abstracts and biographies*

Bronwyn Hanna – *‘places of cultural significance’*

The Australia ICOMOS *Burra Charter* has been internationally acclaimed for its ‘values based conservation’ approach and has helped shift the emphasis in heritage practice from material fabric to the meanings that people attribute to places. This talk draws on oral history interviews with Australia ICOMOS members who wrote the original *Burra Charter* in 1979 and the major revision in 1999 to briefly discuss how the term ‘significance’ became important.

Bronwyn Hanna studied Australian art and architectural history at the University of Sydney and completed a PhD at UNSW in 1999. Since 2003 she has worked for the NSW Heritage Division of the Office of Environment and Heritage as a listings officer and in 2005 was project manager for the World Heritage listing for the Sydney Opera House. From 2010–14 she collaborated with the National Library of Australia on an independent research project, 'An oral History of the Burra Charter'. In 2014 Australia ICOMOS commissioned her to write a short history of the organisation.

Jane Harrington – *Social value determinations - changes in the looking glass*

Social value has evolved to become an established component of assessments of heritage significance. But have our methodological and theoretical approaches to the assessment of social value evolved equivalently? Or are we out of step?

Jane Harrington has been involved in cultural heritage for over 20 years. Since 2006 she has held the position of Director of Conservation and Infrastructure with the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority. She is currently a member of the Australian Heritage Council, Australian Convict Sites Steering Committee which oversees the world heritage listing, and of the Australian World Heritage Advisory Committee. Jane is an Adjunct Professor with Deakin University, and is a past-President of Australia ICOMOS and a member of the ICOMOS International Committee on Intangible Cultural Heritage.

Robyn Sloggett – *Significance: Pluralism, intellectualism and the crafting of tools*

Significance has proved to be a useful tool in procedural issues (eg Export of Movable Cultural Heritage, Heritage Grants, MAP etc.), but cannot in its current form be elevated to an intellectual position, nor can it address issues of pluralism. It is therefore a useful, but specific tool that supports bureaucratic procedural rigour in a way that is beneficial to some parts of the sector, but claims of objectivity are insecurely based.

Robyn Sloggett is Director of the Centre for Cultural Materials Conservation, which delivers industry-focused teaching, research and consultancy programs related to cultural preservation. Her current research incorporates art authentication, the scientific and cultural analysis of painting and medium used, Australia art market development and the impact of art fraud, cultural conservation in Southeast Asia, and the preservation of cultural material and archives held in remote and regional communities. She has received the following industry awards: AICCM Conservator of the Year Award for ‘Services to the Conservation Profession’ (2003); AICCM Award for Outstanding Research in the Field of Materials Conservation (2012); and ICOM AUSTRALIA Award for International Relations (2013).

Alison Wain - *Conservation communities*

Close, personal connections encourage passionate, participatory involvement in heritage. This approach is often felt to conflict with the more respectful stewardship approach adopted by people with less immediate connections. In this talk I discuss the differences between detached and participative cultural spaces, and the role of creativity in the making of new personal meanings for heritage.

Alison is the Course Convenor for the Bachelor of Heritage, Museums and Conservation at the University of Canberra, teaching in the areas of conservation, cultural heritage management, material culture and sustainability in heritage. Alison has a background in the conservation of archaeological and historic objects and is particularly interested in the ways in which people value, preserve and display large machinery. Her other research interests include the preservation of intangible and digital heritage, the use of lasers for the analysis and cleaning of heritage artefacts, and the development of materials conservation practice and conservation science.

Linda Young - *Grappling with AIM734 - Understanding significance*

I'm in the thick of teaching a new unit, part of Deakin's Cultural Heritage and Museum Studies group project to bring along the uneven, but surely certain, convergence in thinking about and managing heritage places, objects/collections and intangibles. I hope we're establishing a broad umbrella of heritage; it's somewhat rocky, but I'm glad to share it with this meeting.

Linda Young has taught aspects of cultural heritage and museum studies at the University of Canberra for 15 years and Deakin University for 10 years (and wonders where the years went...) She learned about these topics on the job, going to ICOMOS conferences, reading and talking, and visiting oodles of museums and sites. She is a historian by discipline.