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Introduction

The term “cultural resource management” includes prehistoric and historic sites, any material recovered from these sites, and places or areas of historic or religious significance. Cultural resource management involves the preservation and recovery of cultural resources that might otherwise be threatened by vandalism or construction (Fagan 1996 p.156). In this review, cultural resources are taken to include the archaeological record, which is the result of site formation processes - the processes of people and nature that create – in the landscape- evidence of the cultural past. This evidence, consisting of isolated artefacts, artefact scatters, monuments, sites and other vestiges of human behaviour including rubbish dumps, is called the archaeological record (Fagan 1996 p.650).

An examination of cultural resource management in the Antarctic is limited to the recent past, the domain of historical archaeology, since there is no record of prehistoric or indigenous occupation in Antarctica.

The review has focussed on the status of the management of the non-built environment – essentially archaeological deposit, isolated artefacts and artefact scatters. There is an existing, comprehensive literature on the management of the huts of the “Historic Era” which is easy to access. The heritage significance of these huts has been identified and accepted by the Antarctic Treaty members, as evidenced by their designation as Historic sites under Annex V of the Madrid Protocol (1991). While, there is continuing debate over how best to conserve individual huts, professionally qualified archaeologists and conservation architects are involved in the development of conservation or management plans for their continued management by identified agencies (for example Godden Mackay Logan 2001, Downie & Smellie 2001, TAE/IGY Hut Project Team 2001, AHT 2003 and Liddle 2001).

The situation with regard to management of archaeological deposit in Antarctica, in particular where it has not been associated with one of the historic hut precincts, is a different matter. An area of potential conflict has developed, over the recognition of archaeological deposit as cultural resource rather than rubbish, with the adoption of Annex III of the Madrid Protocol. Annex III contains provisions for waste management and removal, which are a potential threat to the conservation of archaeological deposits in-situ.

The International Polar Heritage Committee (IPHC) has expressed concern recently that “there is no recognised way of defining what an “historic site” is and much significant historic material is under threat because its historic value is not accepted.” (IPHC 2001)

The IPHC has adopted as a guiding principle for its own work that:
“all evidence of previous/finished human activity in the polar areas has a potential significance for the documentation and understanding of the history of these areas and should be expertly assessed with an eye to possible designation as a cultural heritage site before being altered or removed.”

**Background**

The Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties have recognised the value of the Historic Resources of the Antarctic from the first Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) convened in Canberra in 1961, as evidenced by Recommendation I-IX on Historic Sites (see copy Appendix 1.)

The early history of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties approach to the designation and management of Historic Resources is summarised by Warren (1989). Warren (1989 p.2) undertook to provide a theoretical and organizational basis for the treatment of cultural and historic sites, structures and objects in the Antarctic and to provide a guideline against which specific sites reports could be evaluated. Warren concluded that “the designation of Historic Monuments by the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties under the Antarctic Treaty does not adequately protect the Historic Resources of the Antarctic” (Warren 1989 p.7). Warren’s review of the situation, at the time, identified a number of problems including:

- a lack of designation criteria and systematic evaluation, which had led to some critical aspects of Antarctic activity, early resource exploitation and maritime exploration, not being well represented within the designated sites;
- a lack of scientific expertise, significantly a lack of involvement by professional archaeologists and conservators, arguably reflected by the fact that neither the range of sites designated nor the majority of the field work conducted on them recognised the scientific value of the resource – and in fact, cleaning up and other site disturbance had significantly damaged the information value of these sites;
- an existing structure within the Antarctic Treaty System which served to limit the involvement of historic resource professionals, in particular the reliance on the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) for technical advice when SCAR had no representatives from disciplines which deal with historic resources;
- a lack of funding for research and conservation activity as regularly budgeted items, which raised the question of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties joint responsibility to the resource – inherent in declaring it worthy of preservation; and
- implementation of management recommendations, with typically historic resources receiving low priority in overall program planning and also not being included within the planning process for many scientific organizations.

Warren concluded, “It would be appropriate for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties, having declared this a valuable resource, to request assistance from
appropriate expert organizations to prepare a more complete and in depth report on the subject of Historic Monuments.”(Warren 1989 p.21).

Since the period covered by Warren’s review, the Madrid Protocol (1991) has been signed and its Annexes adopted. Provision for protection of Historic Resources is contained in Annex V, Article 8. Listed Historic Sites and Monuments may not be damaged, removed or destroyed. However, Annex III of the Protocol contains provisions for waste management and removal, which are a potential threat to the conservation of archaeological deposits in-situ, which have not been assessed for their scientific value or designated as historic sites.

Article 8 and Annex 1 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty set out the requirements for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA’s). In looking at potential environmental impacts, the Madrid Protocol takes a broad interpretation of what constitutes the environment. It specifically requires that activities be planned and conducted so as to avoid degradation of areas of historic significance (Articles 2 & 3 Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 1991 Article 3 Environmental Principles 2. b) (vi). Therefore, one area of interest identified by the literature review was whether historic assessments were automatically completed for every EIA or only for those in close proximity to an Historic Site already designated under Annex V of the Protocol.

The 1995 Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting Resolution 8 and Resolution 5 (2001) set out criteria for the identification of historic sites, (see Appendix 2).

Recent Developments

The International Polar Heritage Committee (IPHC) was founded on 1st November 2000 as a scientific committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). ICOMOS is a non-governmental organisation of professional cultural heritage workers, which serves as an advisory body to UNESCO on matters related to world heritage. ICOMOS works to protect and conserve cultural heritage throughout the world. The objectives of the IPHC are to:

a) promote international co-operation in the protection and conservation of non-indigenous heritage in the Arctic and Antarctic;

b) consult and co-operate with Arctic indigenous peoples regarding heritage of cross cultural significance;

c) provide a forum for interchange of experience, ideas, knowledge and the results of research between administrators, archaeologists, conservators, historians, legislators and other professionals;

d) promote international studies and projects; and

e) expand technical co-operation by fostering links with specialised institutions.

The establishment of the IPHC was in response to a growing concern amongst cultural heritage and resource management specialists that polar heritage is at risk (IPHC 2001).
**Status**

In this review, the current status of cultural resource management in the Antarctic has been determined by an examination of:

- policy documents, statements, website information on management provided by the Antarctic Science program agencies (where accessible);
- environmental impact assessment documents, guidelines, policy and statements (as above);
- management plans prepared for sites in the Antarctic;

In response to difficulties encountered with accessing material via websites and in non-English translations, a review of documents listed in the Antarctic Bibliography for the period 1990 to 1998 was also undertaken. The Antarctic Bibliography is a continuing series of compilations presenting abstracts and indexes of current Antarctic literature published since 1962. The material was jointly compiled by the Cold Regions Bibliography Project at the Library of Congress and by the Scott Polar Research Institute of the University of Cambridge, with each volume covering a period of 12 months. Material on historic resources is covered under the “General” subject category, and foreign-language titles are presented with an English translation and abstract. The Canterbury University library holding of Antarctic Bibliography terminates at 1998.

A bibliographic search for the period 1999 to 2001 was also conducted through the Scott Polar Research Institute Library Antarctic bibliography (SPRILIB) on-line, using the search terms – “archaeology”, “heritage”, “heritage resources”, and “cultural resource management “. The SPRILIB site search function terminates at 2001.

**Argentina**

The Argentine Antarctic Institute website was not available, for review.

A review of Argentine material in the Antarctic Bibliography and SPRILIB indicated that historic resource management was being carried out under the framework of the MUSEOANTAR program as part of *Argentina’s participation in the preservation of Antarctic historic patrimony* by the Argentine Antarctic Institute (Capdevila & Ageitos 1993). The objectives of the MUSEOANTAR program are to restore, preserve and maintain historical Antarctic monuments and to recover, restore and preserve utensils and other items abandoned by Antarctic expeditions. The activities of the MUSEOANTAR program since the 1979-80 summer season are summarised in *Historic archaeology in Antarctica* (Capdevila 1992) and include work in the area of Snow Hill Island, Paulet Island and Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula. Conservation measures have also been undertaken more recently, in conjunction with the MUSEOANTAR programme at historic sites of the 1901-04 Nordenskjold expedition (Ageitos 1999 and Capdevila 1999).

The first meeting of Latin-American Antarctic Historians was held at a workshop at Esperanza station, Antarctica 17-24 November 1992 (Capdevila & Fourcade 1999).
Australia

The Australian Antarctic Division (AAD) website contains an explicit recognition of cultural heritage (also known as cultural material, cultural resources and cultural property) including: a definition, discussion on value, and the steps involved in managing cultural heritage including purpose, focus and practice.

The site contains a clear policy statement on cultural resource management.

“The AAD has a commitment to conserve and manage our cultural heritage places and artefacts in the subantarctic and Antarctic regions. We take a multi-disciplinary approach in order to understand the issues and develop appropriate conservation measures, including input from historians, archaeologists, scientists and other specialists in the conservation of different materials.”

The AAD maintains an asset register of known artefacts belonging to AAD, and a new database is under development.

Recognition of the value of cultural resources and the need to preserve them is found in various management plans. For example, the Macquarie Island Nature Reserve Management Plan (1991) contains a clear statement that the Objects of Management includes: “to record, protect and/or preserve any historic localities, artefacts or relics found in the reserve or adjacent waters.” Although, it should be noted that this sub-Antarctic island is managed by a protected area management agency, the Department of Parks, Wildlife and Heritage, Tasmania, with a much longer history of acceptance and experience in managing cultural resources, than the AAD.

A review of Australian material in the Antarctic Bibliography and SPRILIB indicated that in 1987 ANARE supported an archaeological survey of sealing sites at Heard Island as part of its Australian Antarctic research program (Lazer & McGowan 1987). At the same time, survey and excavation of historic sites on Macquarie Island was being undertaken by the Department of Lands, Parks and Wildlife (Townrow 1989). Debate on heritage conservation and the need for a management plan for Macquarie Island heritage resources was also being articulated by Davis at this time (Davis 1988).

A brief review of recent ANARE Research Notes indicates that cultural heritage research has been accepted as a legitimate scientific research interest, as demonstrated by the inclusion of two papers “The importance of ‘historic sites’ on Heard Island for protection of scientific resources and environmental management of a world heritage site.” (Hughes & Lazer 1998) and “On their own: towards an analysis of sealers’ sites on Heard Island” (McGowan 1998).

More recently, Australian interest has focussed on the initiatives and debate around the continued conservation of Mawson’s Antarctic huts (Hughes 1992, 1994) and issues associated with conservation and curation of artefacts in designated historic sites (Hughes, King & Ganther 2001 a. & b., and Hughes, Daniel, Pearson & Cole 2000). Although, discussion on the implications of hazardous materials, materials
conservation and significance criteria for abandoned sites continue (Hughes & Lazer 2000).

**Belgium**


**Chile**

The Antarctic Institute of Chile (INACH) website was not available in English, for review.

A review of Chilean material in the Antarctic Bibliography and SPRILIB indicated archaeological survey and excavation work was undertaken on Desolation Island (Stehberg & Lucero 1995) and Cape Shirreff (Stehberg & Lucero 1996, Daniel 1999) supported by INACH. INACH, in cooperation with the Norwegian Government, was also involved in a project to recover and preserve the whaling settlement on Deception Island (Munoz 1996).

**France**

The French Polar Institute (IPEV) website (English translation) was unavailable for review.

A review of French material in SPRILIB indicated that the French have set up a programme for archaeological investigation and possible conservation work at historic sites in Terre Adelie, Antarctica, and French sub-Antarctic islands, under the Association Amicale des Missions Australes et Polaries Francaises (AMAPOF) (Mouel 2002). Conservation work has also been undertaken by the Commission des Sites Archeologiques et du Patrimoine Culturel at various French stations and the restoration of a whaling station at Port-Jeanne d’Arc, Iles Kerguelen (Perillo 2001 a. & b.)

**Germany**

The German Alfred Wegener Institute website [www.awi.bremerhaven.de/AWI/index.html](http://www.awi.bremerhaven.de/AWI/index.html) did not contain any reference to cultural resource management policy, but did contain a summary of the history of German polar research.

**Italy**

The Italian Antarctic Program website was unavailable for review.
A review of Italian material in the Antarctic Bibliography and SPRILIB indicated an interest in the historic sites and monuments of Victoria Land and an understanding of their scientific value – “archaeological excavations of the huts and neighbouring areas contribute to the understanding of activities that took place there and can corroborate or correct contemporary written reports. “ (Baroni 1991 & 94). Also noted was a “private archaeological expedition to the Antarctic Peninsula in search of traces of prehistoric human habitation” (Anon 1999).

**Japan**

The National Institute of Polar Research website did not contain any reference to cultural resource management policy.

**New Zealand**

The Antarctica New Zealand (ANZ) website [www.antarcticanz.govt.nz](http://www.antarcticanz.govt.nz) and Annual Report for 2002-2003 were reviewed, but neither contained any reference to cultural resource management policy.

However, the ANZ Environmental Management Strategy (1998), found on the same website, contains a set of guiding principles, which includes:

*Principle 1: Antarctic Values*

> Protection of the unique and special values of Antarctica, in particular the intrinsic, wilderness, aesthetic, environmental and historic values, the value of Antarctica for scientific research, the essential role Antarctica plays in global ecosystem functioning and the interactions between these values.

A review of New Zealand material in the Antarctic Bibliography and SPRILIB indicated that most activity in the area of historic resource management over the 1980’s and 90’s was focused on the continued conservation of the historic huts in the Ross Sea Region (Harrowfield 1988, 1989, 1990 a & b). Crerar (1999) provides a brief overview of the work of the New Zealand Antarctic Heritage Trust in this regard.

More recent thought on definitions of Antarctic heritage can be found in Kirby, Stewart and Steel (2001), although informed by a cultural landscape rather than cultural resource management perspective.

ANZ is in the process of drafting policy for management of artefacts from the post-heroic era, including: guidelines for an artefact evaluation process, historic value criteria, relocation criteria and a removal process (pers comm. Sherrie-lee Evans 2004).

**Norway**

The Norwegian Polar Institute website did not contain any reference to cultural resource management policy. However, Norwegian activities in Antarctica are
codified in national legislation in the *Regulations Relating to Protection of the Environment in Antarctica* (1995). In the General Provisions of the Act, there is a specific statement of intent on the minimizing of impact on cultural resources:

*S. 4 On activities in Antarctica in general*

Activities in the Antarctic shall be planned and conducted so as to have the least possible effect on the environment in Antarctica and dependent and associated ecosystems, and so as to preserve the value of the region to research. In this connection, the activity must be prevented from leading to:

- risk of damage to areas of biological, scientific, historical or ethnic importance, of significance to the region’s characteristics as a wilderness, or
- damage or other degradation of historical sites and cultural monuments.

A review of Norwegian material in the *Antarctic Bibliography* and SPRLIB indicated that in 1989-90 the Norwegian Antarctic Research Expedition included an archaeological survey of industrial archaeology at South Georgia (Basberg & Naevestad 1990). The Norwegians also undertook a census of whaling relics on South Georgia, which included survey and mapping of sites (Basberg 1999). The census was preceded by growing attempts to collaborate in Norway with BAS, leading to the South Georgia Whaling Museum at Grytviken in 1990.

A report on “The Antarctic, Norwegian administration for natural and cultural remains”, including a conservation plan for 1999-2004, has been produced (Njastad 1999, in Norwegian).

More recently, the Norwegians have taken a proactive role with regard to the issue of recognition of cultural resources with the submission of a resolution at the 2001 Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) Resolution 5 - *Guidelines for handling of pre-1958 historic remains* (copy attached as Appendix 3). The draft resolution reads, in part, that “Noting that increased activity in Antarctica has increased the pressure on historic and cultural sites and artefacts not protected by current measures, it is recommended that The Guidelines for handling of pre-1098 historic remains,….be used by Parties as a guidance in questions relating to protection of historic remains in Antarctica.”

The Guidelines have taken a precautionary approach to ensuring that the adequate assessment and conservation of cultural resources in Antarctica takes place by:

- granting all pre-1958 historic artefacts/sites automatic protection, prior to assessment;
- providing that historic artefacts/sites should be disturbed as little as possible until they have been properly recorded and evaluated; and
- stipulating that the guidelines pertain to historic artefacts/sites for which the existence or present location has not been established.

Currently, the Norwegian Polar Institute and the Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage are both involved in the development of a management strategy plan for the whaling station remains on Deception Island (IPHC 2002).
Russia

The Russian Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute website [www.aari.nw.ru/main-en.asp](http://www.aari.nw.ru/main-en.asp) did not contain any reference to cultural resource management policy, but did contain a link to the Museum of Arctic and Antarctic website.

South Africa

The South African National Antarctic Program (SANAP) website did not contain any reference to cultural resource management policy.

Spain

A review of Spanish material in the [Antarctic Bibliography](https://antarticlibrary.org/) indicated that the 1993-1994 Spanish Antarctic Expedition included a terrestrial and marine archaeological survey for a Spanish shipwreck in the Cape Shirreff area (Martin-Bueno 1994).

Sweden

The Swedish Polar Research Secretariat website was unavailable for review.

United Kingdom

The British Antarctic Survey (BAS) website [www.antarctica.ac.uk/About_Antarctica/Conservation/index.html](http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/About_Antarctica/Conservation/index.html) did not contain any reference to cultural resource management policy.

The section, on the website, dealing with Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) in Antarctica notes that Preliminary Assessment is required for the conservation of historic sites.

A review of British material in the [Antarctic Bibliography](https://antarticlibrary.org/) and SPRILIB indicated that the British were well aware of the potential conflict between cultural resource conservation and waste management generated by the Madrid Protocol, and in particular in relation to their responsibilities for the clean up and removal of abandoned stations and field huts on the Antarctic peninsula. Shears and Hall (1992) detailed the approach adopted within BAS to the management of the abandoned British stations including the development of a three-phase program of initial desk study and survey, action plan and future building management.

As a result of this process, four former stations were designated as Historic Sites, and conservation work commenced on the first of these stations, Port Lockroy (Collinge & Burkitt 1996).

More recently, the report of Working Group 1 Management of Historic Sites and Areas which is part of the BAS sponsored group developing a management plan for
Deception Island clearly acknowledges the current area of conflict for cultural resource management:

5. The value of artefacts was discussed in their relation to the distinction between waste and garbage. The point was made that the value of waste lies in its record of many of the activities present at Whalers Bay. It was agreed that before artefacts are considered for clean up or removal, they should be inventoried and documented (including mapping) for their historical and cultural value. Also, waste whose risk to the environment or to human or wildlife safety outweighs its historical benefits (i.e. toxic waste) should be identified and disposed of properly. (Splettstoesser & Rossnes 2002).

The working group comprises representatives from Argentina, Chile, Spain, UK, USA, as well as the tourist organisation IAATO and the Antarctic nature conservation organisation ASOC (IPHC 2002).

**United States of America**

A review of the National Science Foundation (NSF), Office of Polar Programs (OPP) and Antarctic Conservation Act 1978 (2001 update) websites was undertaken, but no reference to cultural resource management policy was found. The American enabling legislation, the Antarctic Conservation Act 1978, only provides protection for historic sites, which have been designated under Annex V of the Protocol.

A review of American material in the Antarctic Bibliography indicated that in 1993 attention was focussed on East Base (the first US base on Antarctica) on Stonington Island, with repair, salvage and interpretive work undertaken (Parfit 1993). The site had been designated as an historic monument in 1989. It is interesting to note that the National Science Foundation, concerned for the protection of the East Base Historic Monument, as well as the necessity to remove debris and hazardous materials, requested the assistance of the National Park Service to prepare recommendations for the management of the site and its environmental cleanup (Spude & Spude 1993).

**Other agencies**

**COMNAP – the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs**

The Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) published “Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica” in June 1999. The general objectives of these guidelines were to achieve transparency and effectiveness in assessing environmental impacts during the planning stages of possible activities in Antarctica.

However, the guidelines do not identify cultural resources as an element of the environment for which impact needs to be assessed, explicitly. Although, there is a requirement for assessment in relation to “special values of the area (if previously identified)” (COMNAP 1999 p.7).
The omission of cultural resources from automatic inclusion in the EIA process is unusual, given that it forms an integral part of EIA process in key treaty party EIA processes in their own countries (i.e. Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States of America – all have provision for the assessment of impact on cultural resources as a standard element of the environment in their legislated EIA processes.

It would appear to be a serious omission. If the historic significance of an archaeological deposit has not already been assessed, leading to an Historic Site nomination, the impact of any proposed activity on that deposit will not be assessed under the proposed EIA guidelines.

**ICOMOS – International Polar Heritage Committee (IPHC)**

The IPHC confirmed its view that cultural resources are at risk from some current management practices with a 2003 paper to the Heritage at Risk section of the Annual Report of 2002-2003 of International ICOMOS, entitled “Rubbish or Relics?” The paper raises the question of “At what point, if at all, do relics become rubbish?” and points out that “Although the environmental lobby is well intentioned, is seeks only a return to ‘pristine’ conditions and is not always able or willing to recognise the historic value of the site.” The paper concludes that in order to avoid the destruction of historic material for environmental reasons, clear and widely agreed definitions of ‘relic’ and ‘rubbish’ are needed, and that it is essential that cultural heritage expertise is actively involved in all such discussions at each threatened site.

**Graduate Certificate in Antarctic Science, Gateway Antarctica**

The Graduate Certificate in Antarctic Science (GCAS) course, managed by Gateway Antarctica, Canterbury University, has also recognised this area of potential conflict, as evidenced by previous GCAS syndicate topics. In 1999, a proposed syndicate topic was “Human Artefacts in Antarctica: treasure to be conserved or junk to be removed?” (Cadenhead, Johnstone, Kestle, & Webb 1999). The syndicate report, while presenting a reasonable summary of the issues, was restricted by a lack of editorial background in archaeology or cultural resource management. The approach taken in the report was artefact centred as evidenced by the definitions provided in the report:

**artefact** – moveable historic items of all descriptions that are directly associated with an Antarctic expedition, and which were taken to Antarctica for consumption or use there, or were created by members of an expedition while in the Antarctic. (AHT 1992)

**rubbish** – an item which

1. Is in such poor condition that it is not reasonably possible to conserve it,
2. Has a limited life if left untreated,
3. Does not contribute in any significant way to our understanding of the human history of Antarctic,
4. Does not contribute to the visual qualities of the site or building of which it is a part, and
5. Is not a unique or relatively rare item. (Dingwall & Walton 1996)

**relic – a part or fragment of an object left after the rest has decayed**

are not informed by an understanding that most of the archaeological deposit or cultural resource that archaeologists work with is rubbish i.e. items that have been discarded as rubbish by the original users of the item. In fact, a large part of the scientific value of this ‘rubbish’ lies in an understanding of the site formation processes which have led to the rubbish being deposited in specific patterns, layers, locations and conditions. Therefore, questions of condition (1), survivability or conservation requirements (2), aesthetic impact (4), and uniqueness or rarity (5) of artefacts, are largely irrelevant to any consideration of the scientific value of the deposit (3) – which can only be determined by a qualified archaeologist. The “artefact-centric” focus of the report also led to a polarisation of options – being essentially to conserve in-situ or remove artefacts from Antarctica – without any consideration of the need for salvage archaeology and/or recording of archaeological deposits before removal or further deterioration.

It was interesting to note that neither the syndicate report nor the accompanying literature review made any reference to the extensive body of published work on cultural resource management philosophy or guidelines. Although a number of recent, comprehensive guidelines and overviews are available in the University of Canterbury library (e.g.; ICOMOS 1992, Pearson & Sullivan 1995, Davidson & McConville 1991, Hall & McArthur 1993 & 1996,)

**Analysis**

In 1989, Warren undertook a review of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties approach to the designation and management of historic resources. The review identified a number of problems, which contributed to a conclusion that historic resources were not being adequately protected under the Antarctic Treaty system. The extent, to which these problems have been addressed, since 1989, formed one element of this review. The review has established that, in relation to the identified problems:

1. **Lack of designation criteria & systematic evaluation**

While, some criteria for designation and evaluation have been provided in the ATCM resolutions 5 (1995) and 8 (2001), these criteria have not yet lead to a systematic evaluation of historic sites/relics for designation across Treaty Parties. The one exception to this is a systematic evaluation of British bases on the Antarctic Peninsula (Shears & Hall 1992) which has led to the designation of four former stations has historic sites.

Despite the lack of systematic evaluation, more attention is being given to the previously under-represented sites of early resource exploitation and maritime exploration. Argentina, Australia, Chile, Norway, Spain and the United Kingdom
have all been involved in management activity, survey and/or archaeological excavations associated with early whaling and sealing sites, and early maritime exploration sites.

A number of these sites are now designated Historic Sites.

2. Lack of scientific expertise

The need for expertise within the field of cultural resource management would appear to be generally accepted by Treaty Parties. This acceptance is evidenced by the use of cultural resource management professionals to undertake survey; excavation and conservation work, as well as write plans of management, demonstrated by Argentina, Australia, Chile, France, New Zealand, Norway, the United States of America and Spain.

3. Lack of existing structure

There is still no formal structure within the Antarctic Treaty System, which can provide expert technical advice on cultural resource management. However, individual treaty parties have developed active relationships with individual professionals and professional organisations in order to access technical advice, for example: the French use of AMAPOF and the Commission des Sites Archéologiques et du Patrimoine Culturel (Perillo 2001a. & b.), and the use of the National Parks Service by the National Science Foundation to prepare a management plan for East Base Historic Site.

The establishment of the International Polar Heritage Committee by ICOMOS also provides for an independent body with the necessary expertise to provide technical advice and comment on the management of cultural resources in the Antarctic.

4. Lack of funding and associated integration in scientific research programs

In general terms, funding for cultural resource management in the Antarctic remains problematic, with external funds of private donations and external grants being significant contributions to a number of high profile historic conservation projects (for example Mawson’s Hut, and the Ross Sea Huts). While, individual projects have been supported by scientific programs (eg. Heard, Macquarie Islands & Mawson’s huts – by the AAD, and Antarctic Peninsula bases – by BAS), Argentina appears to be the only Party which has integrated archaeological investigation into its scientific research program, under the MUSEOANTAR program. Chile and France are certainly involved in archaeological investigations and conservation works in Antarctica, but to what extent these activities are an integrated part of their scientific research programs could not be determined.

During the review, it became evident that policy statements on cultural resource management by the Antarctic Treaty Parties were difficult to access, if they existed at all. Australia has been developing philosophy and guidelines on cultural resource management at a domestic level since the early 1980’s and has acknowledged best
practice at an international level. Therefore, it is no surprise that Australia appears to be the only Treaty Party with a clearly articulated policy on cultural resource management in Antarctica, which is transparent and easily accessible via the AAD website.

Relic vs. Rubbish

A further issue, which had not arisen at the time of Warren’s work, but has been assessed by the review, is the “relic verses rubbish” debate. The potentially conflicting demands of conserving cultural resources (Annex V) and removing waste (Annex III) inherent in the Madrid Protocol have been identified within the context of Antarctic cultural resource management in an Australian, New Zealand, Norwegian, United Kingdom and American context. However, in most cases this identification has been inferred from actions undertaken by these Parties. It is evident that the area of concern is a developing issue with very little formal published discussion or debate yet available.

The IPHC “Heritage at Risk” reports to ICOMOS for 2001 & 2003 are the only articulated expressions of the issue, to appear in print, that were identified by the review.

Norway has taken the lead on providing guidelines for the use of all Treaty Members to address the area of potential conflict between cultural resource conservation and waste removal.

New Zealand and the United Kingdom are demonstrably aware of the issue, and both have processes underway, which seek to address these issues.

Conclusion

In summary, the review determined that Argentina, Australia, Chile, New Zealand, Norway and the United Kingdom are the Treaty Parties which are currently playing a leading role in cultural resource management in Antarctica, as demonstrated by the quality and quantity of published work relating to cultural resource management activities available.

However, the level of awareness and activity in relation to cultural resource management with regard to the other Treaty Parties was difficult to determine without undertaking further research outside the scope of this literature review.

Productive areas for further research are identified as:

- the extent to which environmental impact assessments in Antarctica include an assessment of the proposed activity on cultural resources (especially where the activity is not proposed in or adjacent to a known historic site);
- a comparison of environmental impact assessment procedure in Antarctica and domestically, for each Treaty Party, with particular reference to impact
assessment on cultural resources and domestic legislation concerning cultural resource conservation;
- a comparison of cultural resource management in areas of the Antarctic (for example sub-antarctic islands) covered by the domestic legislation of various Treaty Parties and cultural resource management in Antarctica as covered by the Antarctic Treaty System and various elements of enabling legislation of relevant Treaty Parties;
- the extent to which archaeological survey and investigation has been integrated into the scientific research programmes of Party members;
- a comparison of funding sources available for cultural resource management in the Antarctic between the Treaty Parties:
- a fuller review of current policy in relation to cultural resource management of each of the Treaty Parties; and
- a fuller review of current practice and the response of Party members to the Norwegian guidelines from ATCM Resolution 5 - Guidelines for handling of pre-1958 historic remains.

The development and circulation of a detailed questionnaire on cultural resource management policy and activity to all ATPC members, is recommended as a strategy for overcoming the lack of information available on websites and in official publications.