

**CULTURAL HERITAGE AND TOURISM IN AUSTRALIA:
CONCEPTS AND ISSUES**

Warwick Frost

*Working Paper 35/06
October 2006*

**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
WORKING PAPER SERIES
ISSN 1327-5216**



CULTURAL HERITAGE AND TOURISM IN AUSTRALIA: CONCEPTS AND ISSUES

HERITAGE

Heritage is a simple concept with complex implications. Howard defined heritage as 'anything that someone wishes to conserve or collect, and to pass on to future generations' (2003: 6). Timothy and Boyd argued that it 'represents some sort of inheritance to be passed down to current and future generations' (2003: 2). They divided heritage into three categories: *tangible immovable* (eg buildings), *tangible movable* (eg artefacts) and *intangible* (eg customs) (2003: 3). A possible fourth category is *reproduction goods and services* (Ramshaw and Gammon, 2005: 235). The tendency for governments and others to list heritage buildings and sites has often focussed popular attention on the tangible. However, there is an increasing trend for regarding intangible heritage equally with tangible heritage (Ahmad, 2006).

In the colonial period in Australia discussions of heritage focussed on English culture and national characteristics. Technological advances in printing and a high rate of literacy stimulated interest in our English heritage. As Bennett argued, 'the great history paintings, reproduced in an array of books and magazines, may have been far more mesmerising and potent for image-starved Anglo-Australians than film and television are today' (2006: 88). When the first English cricket team toured in 1861-2, an extensive newspaper discussion focussed explicitly on Australia's English heritage, what it meant and the importance of preserving it (Frost, 2002).

In contrast, for a long period there was little interest in preserving buildings and sites as heritage. The rationale simply was that Australia was too young a country to have structures of historical merit. There were exceptions, such as the move in the 1930s to preserve Fremantle's Round House. However, in this case the rationale was that it was unique, being perceived as Western Australia's oldest surviving European building (Sassoon, 2006). It was not until well after World War Two that growing nationalism, a booming economy and a sufficient span of years combined to generate widespread interest in the preservation of buildings. Even then, much of the heritage focus was on grand architecture, particularly country mansions, which reminded people of English traditions and gentility.

Over time this interest in heritage extended from the grand to the vernacular. Day-to-day life in the nineteenth century was recreated in a series of outdoor museums, termed *pioneer settlements* (Young, 2006). Steam railways were particularly popular, as in the work of the Puffing Billy Preservation Society. A recent trend has been towards symbolic sites, recalling past events but with no actual preserved components. In Melbourne, recent examples of this include the renaming of ACDC Lane (after the rock band) and Madame Brussels Lane (after a brothel-keeper). Both instances further illustrate a trend towards celebrating heritage which would have been regarded as not worth preserving in the past.

The breadth of things included in heritage is demonstrated by the example of the NSW country town of Broken Hill. Figure 1 lists the range of heritage sites and attractions which are currently marketed to tourists.

Figure 1: Heritage Attractions at Broken Hill

Attraction	Features
Broken Hill Regional Art Gallery	Art collection housed in restored warehouse
Heritage Trail	Driving tour of heritage sites
Heritage Walk	Walking tour in central Broken Hill, featuring interpretative panels of notable local writers, artists and other entertainers.
Delprat Mine	Guided tour of historic mine
Miners' Memorial	New structure, memorial to miners killed in accidents.
Titanic Band Memorial	Memorial erected by Broken Hill bands.
Railway Museum	The original railway station has been converted into a museum.
Bell's Milk Bar	1950s milk bar, with nostalgic emphasis on 1950s décor and menu
Silverton	Nineteenth century mining town 25 kilometres from Broken Hill. 'Ghost Town' ambience. A number of private galleries and museums. Silverton Hotel has featured in 140 films and commercials, including recent Tourism Australia campaign.
Living Desert	Desert park, including fauna sanctuary, walking tracks. Focal point is a sculpture park.

This eclectic mix includes sites which are specific to Broken Hill (mining), non-specific to the town and could indeed be anywhere (Bell's Milk Bar), have strong elements of fantasy (films at Silverton), are commemorative (the Miners' Memorial) nostalgic (Bell's Milk Bar), or with strong meanings for local groups (for example the Titanic Band Memorial).

An alternative approach is to think of heritage in terms of activities (referred to in an intriguingly brief way in Porter and Salazar, 2005: 362). Activities linked to heritage include performance, display, preservation and tourism. Using such an approach in the Australian context merits further research.

HERITAGE OR HISTORY?

If the focus of heritage is on the past, is heritage simply the same as history? There are two clear schools of thought on this. One makes a sharp distinction between the two concepts, the other places them much closer together.

The first view is that history is objective, factual and unchanging, whereas heritage is subjective. As expressed in a recent text on heritage and tourism:

Many people erroneously equate heritage with history. History, however, is the recording of the past as accurately as possible ... history is what a historian regards as worth recording and heritage is what contemporary society chooses to inherit and pass on (Timothy and Boyd, 2003: 237).

Furthermore, it is argued that these choices and how they are presented are typically biased. Heritage attractions offer a 're-creation of the selective past' (Timothy and Boyd, 2003: 4). This selection favours certain groups, often the political, social and economic elites, over others (Richter, 1999). Heritage is then a 'distortion of the past' which promotes 'fantasies of a world that never was' (Hewison, 1987: 10). It is 'a partisan perversion, the past manipulated for a present aim' (Lowenthal, 1998: 102-3).

A striking example of this view is the work of Loewen (1999) on memorials and monuments in the USA. Loewen examined hundreds where he argued the inscriptions were predominantly lies designed to obscure history and present a particular partisan view. Many were lies by omission, for instance, a monument to Nathan Bedford Forrest recounts his record in the Civil War, but does not mention his role in founding the Ku Klux Klan.

This literature elevates history onto a pure and lofty pedestal. In sharp contrast, heritage is denigrated. It is unworthy and not to be trusted. Such a view is popular in the UK, where Hewison (1987) and Lowenthal (1998) are greatly influential. Studies of heritage in the UK, particularly in post-graduate theses, are typically inclined to emphasise the vast gulf between virtuous history and deceitful heritage.

The contrary view argues that this distinction 'is simplistic and deeply flawed' (Frost, 2005: 236). It takes little account of current practices in history. Modern historians are greatly interested in how the past is interpreted. Their interest is in the uncertainty of theories and debates rather than the search for just provable facts. Indeed, the mere search for dates and other facts is often denigrated as *antiquarianism*.

The current trend within history to research 'memory' overlaps and is influenced by the study of heritage (see for examples Schama, 1996 and Lake, 2006). Furthermore, historians are fully aware of the political claims for the purity of certain historical interpretations. Indeed, this lively debate over the political use of Australian history has now been characterised as the 'History Wars' (Macintyre and Clark, 2003).

As Davison, in specifically rejecting the views of Hewison and Lowenthal, argued:

Even before the [history] discipline was exposed to the influence of postmodernism and poststructuralism, historians had largely abandoned the pretence of objectivity. Any history, they would cheerfully admit, was written from a point of view and, while they might eschew deliberate fabrication and distortion, the past they portrayed reflected as much of themselves as their subjects (2000: 120).

History, it is argued, is a dynamic discipline, with constant revisionism rather than an emphasis on enshrining absolute truth. A fixed history cannot exist, there is always the potential for society to reinterpret it. A valuable example of this concerns the Gold Rushes. In the last decade or so, a number of historians have engaged in a new approach to Gold Rush history. This 'edgier history of the Gold Rushes' has steered away from the conventional focus on technology and nation-building, and instead emphasised women, Aborigines, the Chinese, environmental issues and the less successful 'poor man's diggings'. This has created a major challenge for interpreters and managers of heritage sites and attractions (Frost, 2005). Do they retain interpretation based on the older approaches or do they revise it to fit these new directions?

A further factor to consider is the relationship between heritage and *myths and legends*. Initially, the latter terms were applied to folklore that had little or no basis in history. The story of Robin Hood is a good example of such a myth or legend (Shackley, 2001). However, in the Australian context these are often applied to historical persons who excite a wide range of contemporary views. Examples of such applications of these terms include the recent books: *The outlaw legend* (Seal, 1996); *Don Bradman: challenging the myth* (Hutchins, 2002); *Burke and Wills: from*

Melbourne to myth (Bonyhady, 1991); *Fool's Gold: myths and legends of gold seeking in Australia* (McGowan, 2006) and *Simpson and the donkey: the making of a legend* (Cochrane, 1992).

COMMUNITY

As well as 'what' heritage involves a 'who'. Heritage may consist of things, but it is people who choose to preserve, collect and promote these things. This human dimension is often overlooked (Howard, 2003: 6-7). Who, then, are the people making these decisions? The answer is generally given as 'society' or 'the community'. This then leads to further complications, for what is exactly meant by these terms?

It is notable that a recent Australian Heritage Commission publication on heritage and tourism discussed community primarily in terms of a *local* community. For example, under the heading 'The Community', it argued:

It is important to establish early the needs, interests and aspirations of the local community. Local communities should be consulted about the planning, development and operation of tourism projects based on heritage places. Their active involvement in all planning processes will help ensure that the tourism operation is not only sensitive to community aims and aspirations, but will be able to capture and reflect the essence of the place and its people (Australian Heritage Commission, 2001: 8).

However, the link between a place and a community is not solely defined by residency. People living elsewhere may also be part of a community with a strong linkage – a *community of interest*. This could include frequent visitors, second home-owners, members of state or national organisations (for example, the National Trust), members of 'friends' groups, people with strong special interests (for example enthusiasts for steam trains or old tools), ethnic diasporas and people with family connections. Indeed in some cases, they may have a stronger interest than the local community.

There is a substantial literature on communities and tourism. However, there are three limitations on the use of that literature here. The first is that most of the studies are from overseas. Many of these examine traditional homogeneous communities and how they make decisions about tourism. Examples include Aas, Ladkin and Fletcher (2005), who focus on Laos and Hampton (2005), who considers Java. In contrast, Australian communities are significantly different in being more modern, dynamic and heterogeneous. Even when studies are undertaken in regions which appear to be comparable to Australia, there may be major institutional differences. For example, Canadian communities have a tradition of decision-making through town meetings which is foreign to Australia.

The second limitation is that the number of studies of Australian communities making decisions on heritage tourism is quite small. These may be further limited by looking at one point in time. For example, Griffiths (1987) examined community attitudes to heritage and tourism in Beechworth. He found a great deal of negativity and ambivalence. However, at that time Beechworth enjoyed a very high rate of government employment through forestry, a prison and hospitals. The local community, could in effect, afford not to embrace the growing influence of tourism. In the intervening years, public employment has declined significantly, whereas tourism has matured. It is likely that such changes will have affected community attitudes, but no work has been done on this.

The third limitation is the issue of exclusion. In some cases, certain community groups are excluded from consultation. This may usually be because those running the decision-making process do not welcome their views. The exclusion of certain groups from the planning of the Australian Bicentenary is an important example of this (Bennett, Buckridge, Carter and Mercer, 1992). A small number of Australian studies have considered community groups who perceive

they are excluded or marginalised from decision-making (see for example, McKercher, 1997 and Frost and Lawrence, 2006). However, there is a need for greater research in this area.

Discussions of heritage and community may lead to the idea of *heritage communities*. This conjures up images of communities locked in the past, of *Brigadoon*-style villages not wishing to move forward. In the Australian context, it is highly unlikely that any community would like to see itself this way. Indeed, they would be likely to find such a description as offensive, implying that they had no future.

In some instances local communities (or sections of it) may be totally against the use of their heritage for tourism. This does not mean that they do not value their heritage, rather that they are uncomfortable in sharing it or how it might be represented by others. In the USA MacCannell told of how he advised:

A group of elderly retired Chinese farm labourers who asked me how they might fight against the plans of a land developer and the State of California to turn their entire town into a "living museum" , a "monument" recognizing the "important contribution of Asian Americans to California agriculture". So far, they have succeeded in their resistance (1976: xxvi).

IDENTITY AND COMMUNITAS

An alternative concept to community is that of *identity*. Identity is the sense that heritage provides for a group. As argued by Howard:

Whether we are discussing the family photograph album or the national park, a major outcome of conserving and interpreting heritage, whether intended or not, is to provide identity to that family or nation ... the common purpose is to make some people feel better, more rooted and more secure (2003: 147).

Unfortunately, there has been little research into heritage identity in Australia. However, two overseas case studies illustrate how communities view their heritage identity. The first is that of Scottish Highland Games in the USA (Chhabra, Healy and Sills, 2003). Such events preserve a cultural identity amongst migrant groups, even hundreds of years after migration. The second is that of Viking heritage (Halewood and Hannam, 2001). A generally popular image (often literally projected by film) is of bloodthirsty marauders. However, in Scandinavian countries, heritage attractions present a different view, focussing on customs, family life and explorers. In this case, the *image* held by tourists differs markedly from the *identity* shared by the host community.

An associated concept is *communitas*. In a study of volunteers at heritage railways in Britain, Wallace (2006) pondered what was the motivation to engage in such dirty and hard work for long hours. He concluded that they enjoyed and valued the *communitas*, a strong feeling of social togetherness and common values (Wallace, 2006: 222). He also added that for many this was an important escape from their everyday work (see especially Wallace, 2006: 226). It is quite likely that volunteers and members of 'friends' groups at Australian heritage sites have similar feelings and motivations.

HERITAGE DISSONANCE

People, perhaps through communities, decide on what heritage to preserve, value and incorporate into their identity. But what if they disagree? Tunbridge and Ashworth coined the term *heritage dissonance* to describe situations where cultural heritage provoked a 'discordance or a lack of agreement and consistency' amongst the community (1996: 20). The term dissonance originally

denoted music played in contrasting and jarring styles. Tunbridge and Ashworth argued that this was an apt analogy for the differences we hear from the community in relation to cultural heritage.

Such disagreements may be seen as unsettling and disruptive, calling for action to resolve or cover them up. However, Tunbridge and Ashworth argued that dissonance 'is intrinsic to the nature of heritage ... It is not an unforeseen and unfortunate by-product of the heritage assembly process' (1996: 21). In music, dissonance is often used to create a pleasing effect, a technique extending from singing in rounds to *mash-ups*. Similarly, dissonance adds to the appeal of cultural heritage. Indeed, it may be argued that cultural heritage which does not provoke different feelings and perspectives would be rather dull.

The concept of heritage dissonance may be illustrated by two examples. The first is the Cerne Abbas Giant, a chalk figure carved into a hillside in rural Dorset in England. The Giant has generally been regarded as the work of Iron Age Britons, perhaps 2,500 years ago. However, recently a group of historians have argued that it actually dates from the English Civil War. As interest in the differing views developed, it resulted in a mock trial (or inquest) to establish the truth, a television show and a book. While both sides were able to mount compelling arguments, neither was able to produce the conclusive evidence that would resolve the question (Darvill, Barker, Bender and Hutton, 1999).

The Cerne Abbas Giant provides an example of dissonance over what might often be a straightforward issue – when something was constructed. In this case it is the scale of the time discrepancy which makes it such a significant example. If it is 2,500 years old, it is indeed a treasure from prehistoric times. On the other hand, if it is only 350 years old, it becomes little more than an antiquarian curiosity. Its meaning and significance is tied to contrasting explanations.

The second example is the Eureka Stockade in Ballarat. While there is some dispute over its exact location (Harvey, 1994), its basic details are not contested. Instead, the dissonance is attached to the meaning of Eureka. As shown in Figure 2, there are five main schools of historical thought as to what Eureka signifies. Which school of thought is adopted affects the interpretation provided at heritage attractions and events and the entire visitor experience.

Figure 2: Schools of historical thought as to the meaning of Eureka

Liberal	Birthplace of Australian Democracy. A fight for freedom against oppressive government
Radical Nationalist	Fight for Australian Nationalism and independence from Britain
Sceptical Left	Pessimistic view, little long term benefit for workers
Conservative Revisionist	Democratic reforms were not caused by Eureka, they would have happened anyway
Capitalist Triumph	The miners were independent small capitalists protesting against bureaucratic government interference

Source: Goodman, 1998.

Heritage dissonance is closely linked with ideas of heterogeneous community and identity. Under such circumstances, it means that while, 'heritage benefits someone ... [it also] disadvantages someone else' (Howard, 2003: 4). While making, 'some people feel better, more rooted and more secure ... [it] simultaneously makes another group feel less important, less welcome and less secure' (Howard, 2003: 147). Accordingly, 'heritage battles are not just against vandals, but also

those who would also claim the same heritage' (Lowenthal, 1998: 230). This leads to the development of guardians of heritage, committed to presenting their version of history as true and excluding or suppressing the claims of rivals (Fawcett and Cormack, 2001: 687).

It is not difficult to identify examples of such exclusions in Australia. For the 1988 Bicentenary, organisers attempted to exclude both Aboriginal groups and descendants seeking an old-fashioned recreation (Bennett, Buckridge, Carter and Mercer, 1992). For the 2001 Sesquicentenary of the Gold Rushes, the Victorian Government chose Clunes as the site where gold was first discovered, while refusing funding to Warrandyte, the rival claimant for that honour.

Dissonance is a contentious concept, at odds with notions that history is absolute and that tourism should avoid conflict. It is also notable that some researchers have argued that, 'we should not assume that every heritage destination is contested' and 'conflict, then, is not an inherent quality of heritage tourism' (Porter and Salazar, 2005: 362-3). Nonetheless, they argued that we do need to focus on those cases which provoke dissonance and try to understand how and why that conflict arose (Porter and Salazar, 2005: 362-3).

AUTHENTICITY

Dissonance may be seen as akin to *authenticity*. The latter concept ascribes truth, reality or accuracy to heritage. Concerns with authenticity first arose with collections in museums and art galleries. Curators needed to ascertain whether new additions were authentic or not. High prices for acquisitions encouraged this focus, after all, if an institution or collector was paying top dollar they needed to be absolutely certain that they were getting what they had paid for. An instructive example of this issue is the 2006 sale of a water bottle which may have been used on the Burke and Wills Expedition. The bottle is from the right time period, but there are doubts about whether or not it was actually carried by the explorers. Establishing this authenticity will significantly affect interest in this artefact and its price.

McCannell (1976) extended the concept of authenticity to the experiences of tourists. He argued that tourists were nostalgic for a simpler past due to 'the modern disruption of real life and the simultaneous emergence of a fascination for the "real life" of others' (1976: 91). Accordingly:

Sightseers are motivated by the desire to see life as it is really lived ...[creating] a new kind of social space that is opening up everywhere in our society. It is a space for outsiders who are permitted to view details of the inner operation of a commercial, domestic, industrial or public institution (1976: 99).

MacCannell argued that tourists were seeking authenticity by being allowed 'backstage' at attractions. By going behind the scenes they were able to have a more satisfying experience, though of course, they could never truly experience any more than just being tourists (1976: 99-102). The concept of authenticity was further extended to issues such as the restoration of historic buildings (Howard, 2003: 224-7) and the accuracy of interpretation at heritage attractions (Timothy and Boyd, 2003).

In Australia, outdoor museums (also known as pioneer settlements) have attracted much discussion in regards to authenticity. Sovereign Hill, a recreation of the Gold Rushes at Ballarat, is the largest and most successful. However, it has been criticised for encouraging 'a sense that interest in the gold rush was mostly for children and tourists' (Goodman, 1994: x). Furthermore, there was 'an inevitable fixation upon the outward trappings of the gold era – the equipment, 'the look' of the buildings, and the clothing of the miners'(Goodman, 1994: x). Similar sentiments have been expressed about authenticity at outdoor museums and heritage attractions in the USA (DeLyser, 1999 and 2003; Gable and Handler, 1993; Lowenthal, 1998: 102). In the UK there has been spirited debate over heritage recreations. Criticisms have included 'inconsistent standards of

conservation and curatorship', 'taking buildings out of their local setting' through relocations and interpretation which has been described as 'edutainment' and 'fakelore' (Stratton, 1996: 156).

On the other hand a number of studies have been praiseworthy of Sovereign Hill's approach to authenticity in its interpretative programmes (Clark and Cahir, 2003; Davison, 2000: 168-176; Evans, 1991; Frost, 2005; Garton Smith, 1999; Ham and Weiler, 2004; Moscardo and Pearce, 1986). Unfortunately, little research has been conducted on other outdoor museums in Australia.

The focus on authenticity has in itself attracted criticism. Cohen argued that the term was being taken out of its original museums context (1988: 374-7). In its new usage, he argued, it should not be seen as absolute, but rather as 'negotiable' (1988: 374). Tourists, depending on their level of interest and concern, would have different criteria for authenticity (1988: 376). Furthermore, as authenticity was negotiable, then attitudes might change over time. Cultural heritage which was once regarded as inauthentic, might in time be accepted as authentic. Cohen termed this *emergent authenticity* (1988: 379-80) and linked it to the concept of the *invention of tradition* (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983). An example of such a change is the holding of Scottish Highland Games in regions of recent settlement such as the USA and Australia (Chhabra, Healy and Sills, 2003).

Even though authenticity is still widely discussed in journals such as *The Annals of Tourism Research*, Cohen's criticisms have greatly altered views on it. More recent studies have moved beyond the view of authenticity as an absolute concept towards *perceptions of authenticity* by tourists, operators and stakeholders (examples include Chhabra, Healy and Sills, 2003; Chronis, 2005; Fawcett and Cormack, 2001; Halewood and Hannam, 2001 and Waitt, 2000). In some respects the concept may now be passé, partly replaced by a greater interest in dissonance.

TOURIST MOTIVATIONS

The interests and characteristics of tourists at heritage attractions are much under-researched. Generally, it is argued that they are strongly interested in history and may be older and better educated than other tourists in the general region (Howard, 2003). In some cases, it may be held that they are highly committed and passionate. The term *pilgrimage*, more generally used overseas, may be applied to those who have very strong spiritual interests. Examples include New-Agers at Uluru (Digance, 2003) and young Australians at Gallipoli (Slade, 2003). Some tourists are interested in sites of death and misery, characterised as *Thanatourism* (Slade, 2003), *Dark Tourism* (Lennon and Foley, 2000) or *Traumascapes* (Tumarkin, 2005). The prime example of this in Australia is Port Arthur in Tasmania, though most research into it has concentrated on the 1996 shootings rather than its convict past (Beirman, 2003; Tumarkin, 2005). In the USA it has been argued that visitors at historic sites are searching for experiences so intense they might be classified as *numinous* (Cameron and Gatewood, 2000).

However, there are difficulties in broadly using the term *heritage tourists*. That implies that visitors to heritage attractions and sites are solely or primarily motivated by heritage. Though, this is an area which requires much greater research, there is some evidence that visiting a heritage attraction is just one of a number of motivations for tourists choosing a destination. For example, tourists to Broome in Western Australia may be attracted by its beach or as a gateway to the outback. In visiting that destination, they may take in a heritage attraction as just one of the mix of attractions and activities on offer (Frost, 2004). Indeed, it may be that many tourists at heritage attractions are very casual in their interests and motivation.

INTERPRETATION

Interpretation provides visitors with meaning and understanding. Common methods of interpretation include guides, displays and signage. Interpretative design allows managers to

effectively communicate key messages to visitors (Ham and Weiler, 2004; Weiler and Ham, 2001). In circumstances of heritage dissonance, interpretation may be a powerful tool to communicate either one story as the 'authentic' or 'true story'. On the other hand, it may be used to convey a sense of multiple or changing perspectives (Frost, 2005).

Moscardo (1996) argued that much interpretation could be dull, uninspiring and repetitive, encouraging 'mindless' reactions, where visitors took little in. Instead, heritage attractions needed to encourage 'mindfulness' amongst visitors. Mindful visitors, she argued, were 'active, interested, questioning and capable of reassessing the way they viewed the world' (Moscardo, 1996: 382). To achieve this effective interpretation needed to be 'multisensory ... personally relevant, vivid or affectively charged ... unexpected or surprising; [and] questions are used to create conflict or ambiguity' (Moscardo, 1996: 384).

Rather than interpretation being constructed or produced for consumption, it is often a 'co-construction' between visitors and interpreters. A study of guided tours at the Gettysburg Battlefield in the USA concluded that:

The resulting narratives are contested by tourists and become subject to negotiation. During the performance of the story, tourists are not passive readers of the text. Rather, they are actively engaged by using their prior background, negotiating, filling gaps, and imagining. Hence, service providers do not simply teach history and tourists do not only learn about the past (Chronis, 2005: 400).

Such a concept is certainly applicable to Australian heritage and tourism. Visitors come fully armed with a wide variety of beliefs, expectations and prior knowledge. For example, tourists to Glenrowan in Victoria are likely to already know a great deal about Ned Kelly from school, films, books, art and museum exhibitions (Frost, 2006A). They are also likely to hold strong opinions as to whether he was a villain or hero. In such a case, interpretation may be simply reinforcing already held views. Indeed, it is likely that interpretation which conflicts with these views will be ignored or dismissed.

THE COMMERCIAL DIMENSION

There is little research into the economic benefits of heritage tourism in Australia. The Tourism Satellite Accounts, developed specifically to provide hard data on the scale and importance of tourism and its sectors, provided no detail on heritage tourism or attractions (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2000). Some researchers have focussed on case studies of heritage attractions which have not been financially successful (Bramley, 2001; Frost, 2002), though whether these are typical or not is open to debate. Overseas studies which argue that heritage tourists are high-spenders (see for example Silberberg, 1995) have not been extended to Australia.

One overseas concept which seems to fit the Australian situation is that of *Tourist Shopping Villages*. Based on research in Canada, Getz coined this term for:

small towns and villages that base their tourist appeal on retailing, often in a pleasant setting marked by historical or natural amenities. They are found along touring routes, in destination areas and near urban centres, but are markedly different from urban business and shopping districts in terms of their small scale, speciality retailing and distinct ambience (Getz, 1993: 15).

Figure 3 lists a number of examples of small towns which have developed along such lines.

Figure 3: Examples of Tourist Shopping Villages in Australia

Name	State	Heritage	Surrounding Region
Kuranda	Queensland	Rainforest, heritage railway	Cairns, Great Barrier Reef
Bellingen	New South Wales	Farming, alternative lifestyle	Coffs Harbour, coast
Yackandandah	Victoria	Gold Rushes	Snowfields, wineries
Loch	Victoria	Dairying	South Gippsland, coast
Hahndorf	South Australia	German culture, food	Adelaide Hills
New Norcia	Western Australia	Monastery, food	Perth
Evandale	Tasmania	Convicts	Northern Tasmania

Source: Frost, 2006B

In such villages, tourists may be primarily attracted by the shopping in a heritage ambience rather than specific historic sites and attractions (Cegielski, Janeczko, Mules and Wells, 2001). Furthermore, tourists may spend the bulk of their money in cafes and shops rather than on admission to museums and attractions. Nonetheless, heritage is integral to tourism as a whole in such a destination. A study of the Victorian goldfields towns of Castlemaine and Maldon showed that tourists who visited heritage sites were more likely to visit cafes and shops than those who did not visit heritage sites (Frost, 2006B)

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Y. 2006, 'The scope and definitions of heritage: from tangible to intangible', *International journal of heritage studies*, 12: 3, 292-300.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics 2000, *Australian National Accounts: Tourism Satellite Account, 1997-98*, ABS: Canberra, Catalogue no. 5249.0.
- Australian Heritage Commission 2001, *Successful tourism at heritage places: a guide to tourism operators, heritage managers and communities*, Australian Heritage Commission: Canberra.
- Bennett, M. 2006, 'The heritage of Old England', in M. Lake [ed], *Memory, monuments and museums: the past in the present*, pp. 79-90, Melbourne University Press: Melbourne.
- Bennett, T.; Buckridge, P.; Carter, D. and Mercer, C. [eds] 1992, *Celebrating the Nation: a critical study of Australia's Bicentenary*, Allen and Unwin: Sydney.
- Bonyhady, T. 1991, *Burke and Wills: from Melbourne to myth*, David Ell: Sydney.
- Bramley, R. 2001, 'So you want to build a "Hall of Fame"?', *2001 Council of Australian Universities Tourism and Hospitality Educators National Research Conference*, pp. 17-27, Canberra: University of Canberra.
- Cameron, C.M. and Gatewood, J.B. 2000, 'Excursions into the un-remembered past: what people want from visits to historical sites', *The public historian*, 22: 3, 107-127.
- Cegielski, M.; Janeczko, B.; Mules, T. and Wells, J. 2001, *The economic value of tourism to places of cultural heritage significance: a case study of three towns with mining heritage*, Australian Heritage Commission: Canberra.
- Chhabra, D.; Healy, R. and Sills, E. 2003, 'Staged authenticity and heritage tourism', *Annals of tourism research*, 30: 3, 702-719.
- Chronis, A. 2005, 'Coconstructing heritage at the Gettysburg storyscape', *Annals of tourism research*, 32: 2, 386-406.
- Clark, I.D. and Cahir, D.A. 2003, 'Aboriginal people, gold, and tourism: the benefits of inclusiveness for goldfields tourism in regional Victoria', *Tourism, culture & communication*, 4: 3, 123-136.
- Cochrane, P. 1992, *Simpson and the donkey: the making of a legend*, Melbourne University Press: Melbourne.
- Cohen, E. 1988, 'Authenticity and commoditization in tourism', *Annals of tourism research*, 15: 3, 371-386.
- Darvill, T.; Barker, K.; Bender, B; and R. Hutton 1999, *The Cerne Gaint: an antiquity on trial*, Oxbow: Oxford.
- Davison, G. 2000, *The use and abuse of Australian history*, Allen and Unwin: Sydney.
- DeLyser, D. 1999, 'Authenticity on the ground: engaging the past in a California ghost town', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 89: 4, 602-632.
- DeLyser, D. 2003, "'A walk through Old Bodie": presenting a ghost town in a tourism map', in S.P. Hanna and V.J. Del Casino [eds.], *Mapping tourism*, pp. 79-107, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis.
- Digance, J. 2003, 'Pilgrimage at contested sites', *Annals of tourism research*, 30: 1, 143-159.
- Evans, M. 1991, 'Historical interpretation at Sovereign Hill', *Australian historical studies*, 24: 96, 142-152.
- Fawcett, C. and Cormack, P. 2001, 'Guarding authenticity at literary tourism sites', *Annals of tourism research*, 28: 3, 686-704.

- Frost, W. 2002, 'Heritage, nationalism, identity: the 1861-62 England Cricket Tour of Australia', *The international journal of the history of sport*, 19: 4, 55-69.
- Frost, W. 2003, 'The financial viability of heritage tourism attractions: three cases from rural Australia', *Tourism review international*, 7: 1, 13-25.
- Frost, W. 2004, 'Heritage tourism on Australia's Asian shore: a case study of Pearl Luggers, Broome', *Asia Pacific journal of tourism research*, 9: 3, 281-291.
- Frost, W. 2005, 'Making an edgier interpretation of the Gold Rushes: contrasting perspectives from Australia and New Zealand', *International journal of heritage studies*, 11: 3, 235-250.
- Frost, W. 2006A, 'Braveheart-ed Ned Kelly: historic films, heritage tourism and destination image', *Tourism management*, 27: 2, 247-254.
- Frost, W. 2006B, 'From Diggers to Baristas: Tourist Shopping Villages in the Victorian Goldfields', *Journal of hospitality and tourism management*, 13: 2, 136-143.
- Frost, W. and Lawrence, M. 2006, 'Taxes and host – tourist tensions in Australian coastal resorts' *Current issues in tourism*, 9: 2, 152-156.
- Gable, E. and Handler, R. 1993, 'Deep dirt: messing up the past at Colonial Williamsburg', *Social analysis*, 34, 3-16.
- Garton Smith, J. 1999, 'Learning from popular culture: interpretation, visitors and critique', *International journal of heritage studies*, 5: 3/4, 135-148.
- Getz, D. 1994, 'Event tourism and the authenticity dilemma', in W.F. Theobald [ed.], *Global tourism: the next decade* (pp. 313-329), Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford.
- Goodman, D. 1994, *Gold seeking: Victoria and California in the 1850s*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Goodman, D. 1998, 'Eureka Stockade', in G. Davison, J. Hirst and S. MacIntyre [eds], *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*, pp. 227-8. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Griffiths, T. 1987, *Beechworth: an Australian country town and its past*, Greenhouse, Melbourne.
- Halewood, C. and Hannam, K. 2001, 'Viking heritage tourism: authenticity and commodification', *Annals of tourism research*, 28: 3, 565-580.
- Ham, S. and Weiler, B. 2004, 'Diffusion and adoption of thematic interpretation at an interpretative historic site', *Annals of leisure research*, 7: 1, 1-18.
- Harvey, J. 1994. *Eureka rediscovered: in search of the site of the historic stockade*. Ballarat: University of Ballarat Press.
- Hewison, R. 1987, *The heritage industry: Britain in a climate of decline*, Methuen, London.
- Hobsbawm, E. and Ranger, T. [eds] 1983, *The invention of tradition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Howard, P. 2003, *Heritage: management, interpretation, identity*. Continuum: London.
- Hutchins, B. 2002, *Don Bradman: challenging the myth*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Lake, M. [ed] 2006, *Memory, monuments and museums: the past in the present*, Melbourne University Press: Melbourne.
- Lennon, J. and Foley, M. 2000, *Dark tourism: the attraction of death and disaster*, Continuum: London.
- Loewen, J.W. 1999, *Lies across America: what our historic sites get wrong*, New Press: New York.
- Lowenthal, D. 1998, *The heritage crusade and the spoils of history*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- MacCannell, D. 1976, *The Tourist: a new theory of the leisure class*, Schocken: New York, 2nd ed. 1999.

- Macintyre, S. and Clark, A 2003, *The history wars*, Melbourne University Press: Melbourne.
- McGowan, B. 2006, *Fool's Gold: myths and legends of gold seeking in Australia*, Lothian: Melbourne.
- McKercher, B. 1997, 'Benefits and costs of tourism in Victoria's Alpine National Park: comparing attitudes of tour operators, management staff and public interest group leaders', in C. Michael Hall, John Jenkins and Geoff Kearsley [eds], *Tourism planning and policy in Australia and New Zealand: cases, issues and practice*, McGraw-Hill: Sydney, pp. 99-109.
- Moscardo, G. 1996, 'Mindful visitors: heritage and tourism', *Annals of tourism research*, 23: 2, 376-397.
- Moscardo, G. and Pearce, P. 1986, 'Historic theme parks, an Australian experience in authenticity', *Annals of tourism research*, 13: 3, 467-479.
- Porter, B.W. and Salazar, N.B. 2005, 'Heritage tourism, conflict and the public interest: an introduction', *International journal of heritage studies*, 11: 5, 361-370.
- Ramshaw, G. and Gammon, S. 2005, 'More than just nostalgia? Exploring the heritage/ sports tourism nexus', *Journal of sports tourism*, 10: 4, 229-241.
- Richter, L.K. 1999, 'The politics of heritage tourism development: emerging issues for the new millennium', in D.G. Pearce and R.W. Butler [eds], *Contemporary issues in tourism development*, Routledge: London and New York, pp. 108-126.
- Sassoon, J. 2006, 'The courage of their convictions: creating cultural landscapes in 1930s Western Australia', *International journal of heritage studies*, 12: 3, 255-266.
- Schama, S. 1996, *Landscape and memory*, Fontana, London.
- Seal, G. 1996, *The outlaw legend: a cultural tradition in Britain, America and Australia*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Shackley, M. 2001, 'The legend of Robin Hood: myth, inauthenticity, and tourism development in Nottingham, England', in V.L. Smith and M. Brent [eds], *Hosts and guests revisited: tourism issues of the 21st century*, pp. 315-322, Cognizant: New York.
- Silberberg, T. 1995, 'Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritage sites', *Tourism management*, 16: 5, 361-5.
- Slade, P. (2003). Gallipoli Thanatourism: the meaning of ANZAC. *Annals of tourism research*, 30: 4, 779-794.
- Stratton, M. 1996, 'Open-air and industrial museums: windows on to a lost world or graveyards for unloved buildings?', in M. Hunter [ed], *Preserving the past: the rise of heritage in modern Britain*, pp. 156-176, Alan Sutton: Stroud.
- Timothy, D.J. and Boyd, S.W. 2003, *Heritage tourism*, Prentice Hall: Harlow.
- Tumarkin, M.M. 2005, *Traumascapes: the power and fate of places transformed by tragedy*, Melbourne University Press: Melbourne.
- Tunbridge, J.E. and Ashworth, G.J. 1996, *Dissonant heritage: the management of the past as a resource in conflict*, Chichester: Wiley.
- Waite, G. 2000, 'Consuming heritage: perceived historical authenticity', *Annals of tourism research*, 27: 4, 835-862.
- Wallace, T. 2006, '"Working on the Train Gang': alienation, liminality and communitas in the UK preserved railway sector', *International journal of heritage studies*, 12: 3, 218-233.
- Weiler, B. and Ham, S. 2001, 'Perspectives and thoughts on tour guiding', in A. Lockwood and S. Medlik [eds], *Tourism and hospitality in the 21st Century*, Butterworth Heinemann: Oxford, pp. 255-264.

Young, L. 2006, 'Villages that never were: the museum village as a heritage genre', *International journal of heritage studies*, 12: 4, 321-338.