

Wilderness in Australia: What's Happening in a World Context

Ralf Buckley

Abstract—Wilderness in Australia has no formal legal designation at a national level as it does in the United States. In addition, new federal environmental legislation abdicates responsibility almost entirely to the States. A national wilderness inventory has recently been completed, but abandoned by the current federal government. Almost all wilderness recreation in Australia is in national parks, which are in fact a State designation, and in World Heritage areas. Private recreation and commercial tourism are growing rapidly in these areas, pushing into backcountry wilderness as well as frontcountry, increasing impacts and consuming an ever greater proportion of diminishing management budgets. Park managers are seeking funds from tourism to contribute to operating costs, and examining tour operator accreditation schemes to reduce *per capita* impacts.

There are no national forests in Australia, only State forests, and these are managed almost entirely for logging. The Regional Forest Agreements, a joint federal-state political process supposed to allocate public forests appropriately between production forests and new parks, has led to accelerated logging in wilderness areas of high conservation value, minuscule increases in the protected area estate, and little or no increase in management budgets. The tourism industry is now sufficiently concerned at this decrease in scenic destinations that it has begun, albeit barely, to lobby in concert with conservation groups for a form of tourism land tenure or recreation reserve, analogous to the wilderness areas managed by the United States Forest Service.

There is no legislated national wilderness designation in Australia, though wilderness is a component of protected-area planning in particular States. Wilderness is hence largely a descriptive rather than a legal term. Wilderness is an important concept in Australia environmental and land management policy, however. Indeed, one of the country's four principal nongovernment organizations is named The Wilderness Society.

My aim here is not to review the history of wilderness science and politics in Australia, but simply to summarize major current issues and controversies. These fall into three principal categories:

- the National Wilderness Inventory
- recreational pressures on wilderness in protected areas
- political controversy over future management of wilderness in public forests

In: McCool, Stephen F.; Cole, David N.; Borrie, William T.; O'Loughlin, Jennifer, comps. 2000. Wilderness science in a time of change conference—Volume 2: Wilderness within the context of larger systems; 1999 May 23–27; Missoula, MT. Proceedings RMRS-P-15-VOL-2. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station.

Ralf Buckley, Director, International Centre for Ecotourism Research, School of Environmental and Applied Science, Griffith University, Parklands Drive, Southport, Queensland, 4217, Australia. Telephone: 61 7 55 948675, Fax: 61 7 55 948895, e-mail: r.buckley@mailbox.gu.edu.au

National Wilderness Inventory

The federal government has for some years been compiling a national inventory of wilderness throughout Australia, including an inventory of wild and scenic rivers. This has been a large-scale exercise involving the compilation of data from all possible sources including new studies commissioned specifically for the NWI. Information has been available on the Environment Australia Website www.ea.gov.au, but only in summary form: the detailed information compiled during the NWI has not been published. Recently, the NWI has culminated in the Wilderness Delineation Project, where expert teams have carried out aerial and ground surveys of areas identified by the NWI as of highest wilderness quality. These surveys focused initially on core areas, adjusting wilderness rankings where appropriate. They then examined the edges of each area, delineating practical boundaries which could potentially be gazetted or at least identified through a series of national wilderness maps.

At the end of June 1999, however, the current federal government cut all funding to the National Wilderness Inventory, the Wilderness Delineation Project and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Branch of Environment Australia. There appears to be no mechanism or commitment to publish the considerable volume of data collected and analyzed to date. Nor, apparently, is there any intention to proceed to the logical next step, which would be to negotiate some form of joint federal-state wilderness agreement and legislation.

Such an agreement could give formal recognition to wilderness areas identified in the Wilderness Delineation Project. Their national significance could be recognized, and they could be branded as National Wilderness for tourism marketing. They could also be identified as priority areas for conservation, with restrictions on activities which would reduce wilderness values, such as vegetation clearance, construction of roads or powerlines, and so on.

The Commonwealth decision to close down the wilderness component of Environment Australia might be seen as simply a step from federal research to state implementation, were it not for two critical factors. In some States many of the areas identified in the NWI, such as military training areas, are in fact under Commonwealth control. Other areas, such as World Heritage, are under joint Commonwealth-State control. In either case, the States cannot proceed without Commonwealth consent and involvement. Even for land under State tenure, State governments cannot proceed unilaterally because they have no information on which to act—the detailed data from the NWI and WDP has not been made public even to State governments.

This situation is particularly ironic in view of recent history. When the Commonwealth first proposed the designation of areas such as South-West Tasmania, the Wet Tropics of Queensland, and Kakadu National Park as World

Heritage, the State Governments opposed the nominations and withheld data which the Commonwealth wished to use.

Wilderness in Parks: The Growth of Tourism

Historically, national parks in Australia have been perceived as areas where fauna and flora, water quality and wilderness quality are all protected for posterity. Certainly, parks are for people too, and recreation has long been a significant land use in particular parks. In Australia, however, recreation has always been secondary to the primary conservation purpose of the parks. In most parks, high-intensity recreational activity has largely been restricted to relatively small sacrifice zones near roadheads and other entrances. Currently, however, there is a worldwide trend to increased use of conservation reserves for commercial nature, eco and adventure tourism (NEAT) as well as private outdoor recreation. Parks are being managed more as playgrounds than preserves. Plant and animal species, airsheds and water catchments, whose security was supposedly assured through inclusion in protected areas, may now be threatened by tourism and recreation inside those reserves.

In addition to an increase in the total number of visitors to national parks, there is also an increase in the proportion visiting as commercial tourists rather than private individuals. This trend to commercial tourism is important for wilderness management, because tourism is a large and powerful industry with considerable political power. Some members of the industry view commercial tourism operations in national parks as a right. This view is not held by environmental groups and park management agencies. Quite apart from philosophical and legal concerns over the primary purpose of conservation reserves, there are concerns about the ability of park services to manage protected areas for conservation, if management for tourism were given a higher priority.

If governments believe that parks can meet their management costs by levying the tourism industry, they may fail to provide the basic resources required for fundamental conservation management, e.g., for control of weeds, pests, pathogens, feral animals and fire, and for monitoring and management of endangered species populations.

If the tourism industry believes that any financial contributions it makes to park management should be used for tourism infrastructure, such as carparks, tracks and toilets, then park management agencies will be left without the resources for basic conservation management. If parks obtain their funding through their value for commercial tourism rather than their value for conservation and private recreation, it seems likely that park management agendas will be modified to reflect the priorities of commercial tourism. This would apply whether funding is derived directly from tour operators or from governments which treat parks primarily as a basis for short-term economic returns through tourism, rather than longer-term economic, social and environmental returns through conservation.

This is not an argument against commercial tourism in national parks, but a question of priority and perspective. In Australia, parks are legally designated for conservation first, and private recreation second. Commercial tourism is

potentially a valuable adjunct to either or both in so far as it adds economic and social value without reducing the environmental and social value of the conservation estate. These priorities, of course, are not solely the view of conservation groups: they are specified by the statutes under which national parks were established in most countries.

In Australia, attitudes to commercial nature tourism in national parks are currently divided and ambiguous. Several states have produced strategies or draft strategies for nature tourism or ecotourism, but these have been produced by different government agencies and have met with varied receptions. Queensland, for example, has an Ecotourism Plan, but this was produced by the tourism portfolio rather than the park management agency, and is a general document not confined to the conservation estate (Queensland 1997). Implementation is the responsibility of an environmental group in the state tourism portfolio, relying largely on public communication rather than a statutory approach.

In New South Wales, the parks management agency produced a Draft Nature Tourism Strategy in response to large increases in visitor numbers and the growth of commercial tourism (Worboys 1997). It has not been adopted to date, however, because of public perception that it would constitute a *de facto* grant of rights to commercial tourism in public national parks. Western Australia has a Nature Tourism Strategy (Western Australia 1997) which has apparently been adopted by both the tourism and land management portfolios.

In some states at least, funding for basic park management is perilously low, and park management agencies are looking closely at nature tourism as a potential source of operating revenue. Most states already charge park entrance fee and operator permit fees, at least in the more heavily visited parks. Some are considering quite substantial increases in fees for commercial tour operators.

One model which might be adopted more widely is that used by the Western Australian Department of Conservation and Land Management for Purnululu National Park in the Kimberley region. This agency issues a single licence for the exclusive right to run helicopter overflights over the Park's famed beehive-shaped sandstone domes. The licence is allocated by tender, and the successful tenderer reputedly pays substantially for the privilege—enough to meet the entire management costs for the park. Because of the fragility of the sandstone domes, the management agency has a deliberate policy to encourage overflights rather than on-ground visitors, even though noise from helicopter and light aircraft causes considerable impacts on backcountry hikers, and perhaps also on native birds.

Wilderness Tourism in State Forests and Other Public Lands

Australia has a federal system of government, but its public forest management agencies are at a state government rather than a federal level. In Australia, tourism is only now being recognized as an important land use in public forests. Historically, because of public concern and controversy over logging and woodchipping, state forestry agencies have completely banned the public from some areas, with special legislation in some cases. In other areas,

however, state forests are used extensively for private recreation, principally by people who want to travel in 4WD vehicles, light fires, carry firearms, bring pets, and other activities generally restricted or banned in national parks. Because this is largely private recreation rather than commercial tourism, however, it has largely been ignored in land use policy. Its social economic value as measured by travel costs, however, is an order of magnitude higher than gross income from logging and woodchipping (Driml 1997, Ward 2000), even without taking into account the far higher environmental costs of logging.

In cases where land use has actually changed from logging to conservation and tourism, as in the Queensland Wet Tropics, actual income also increased by an order of magnitude (Driml 1997). In areas of southeast Australia, where logging has historically been subsidized by the public purse and woodchips are still sold for as little as 9 cents a tonne, the relative economic gain from changing to tourism as a principal land use would be even greater.

While state forests are very important from a wilderness conservation perspective, forests make up a relatively small proportion of total land area in Australia. There are large tracts of public wilderness land in the arid zone. Some of this is in national parks, but much is in Aboriginal reserves or vacant Crown land. Most is under pastoral lease. Since cattle are restricted to areas around waterholes and stock bores, however, even pastoral leases may contain wilderness areas several thousand square kilometers in extent. Both tourism and oil exploration are increasing in the arid zone, but the impacts are far smaller than those of logging in state forests.

Regional Forest Agreements

Until a few years ago there were a number of federal environmental controls on logging. Logging and woodchipping licences were granted by state government agencies, but most woodchipping is for export, which gives the federal government the constitutional right to trigger its own environmental legislation. This backstop, however, has been opposed vigorously by the forestry industries and at least some state forestry agencies, for many years.

Both the current right-wing federal government and its left-wing predecessor have successively abandoned their environmental powers to the state governments, firstly under the federal-state Inter-Governmental Agreement on the Environment, and more recently through abolishing the Register of the National Estate, removing export controls as a trigger for federal EIA, and greatly weakening both the triggers and substance for federal EIA and conservation law. Some state governments, such as Queensland, have simultaneously weakened their own EIA and nature conservation law. Protection for wilderness in Australia through planning and endangered-species legislation, therefore, is currently at a very low ebb.

In addition, during the last couple of years, again in response to lobbying from the timber industry and state forestry agencies, federal and state governments have embarked on a series of so-called Regional Forest Agreements. The intention is that all public forests throughout Australia should be subject to so-called Comprehensive Regional Assessments; those of high conservation value,

including wilderness, should be converted to national parks; and the remainder should be allocated to production forestry essentially free of environmental controls.

This might appear to be a reasonable enough approach if carried out competently, with adequate time, resources, expertise, and public participation, and without political bias. In practice, however, it is a highly political exercise aimed at removing environmental controls from logging and woodchipping in Australia's few remaining stands of old-growth forests, even though this will only prolong the current lifestyle of rural timber towns by a few years at most, whilst destroying their future opportunities for long-term livelihood from nature tourism. No doubt this story sounds remarkably familiar to those from the U.S.A.

The RFA process has proceeded separately in each state. When it started it was perceived as a political contest between logging and conservation. The tourism industry and private recreation received little mention. As the process has proceeded, tourism and recreation have emerged as a critical component. This has occurred principally through representations from individuals in research institutions and government agencies, environmental groups, and specialist organizations such as the Ecotourism Association of Australia, off-road vehicle associations etc. Until very recently the mainstream tourism industry, including national associations, state government agencies and large tourism corporations, has taken little or no part in the Regional Forest Agreement process.

Concerns and claims raised by environmental groups about the conduct of the RFA process in different states include the following:

- information on the conservation values of state forests is very scanty, with new species still being discovered at intervals, and the Comprehensive Regional Assessments have been written up largely without time or resources to carry out adequate baseline surveys;
- public involvement has been very limited, and often restricted to noncontroversial aspects such as European cultural heritage;
- land with no trees of interest to the logging or woodchip industries has been added to the forestry estate specifically so it can then be allocated for conservation, leaving all the forested or timbered areas for logging and chipping;
- even after the forestry and parks agencies reached agreement on a state RFA, secret political deals at ministerial level led to key areas, scheduled for conservation, being reallocated to production forestry;
- continued logging and woodchipping in Australia's few remaining stands of old-growth forests could only prolong the current lifestyle of rural timber towns by a few years at most, whilst destroying their future opportunities for long term livelihood from nature tourism.

The RFA process may well have helped to raise public awareness of the conservation, wilderness and tourism value of old growth forests in Australia. Perhaps the most impressive demonstration of this occurred in Western Australia, where several hundred prominent members of the right-wing political party which currently holds government in that state, staged a media event in which they

simultaneously telephoned the State Premier on their mobile phones in order to protest the continued logging of forests in the southwestern part of the state. In Western Australia, the forests and parks were managed by the same government agency, which has invested in infrastructure for forest tourism in some areas and is well aware of its economic value. This agency has now been split again (2000).

It is possible, and indeed quite likely, that public concerns may lead to the repeal of Regional Forest Agreements during the next decade. By then, however, it will be too late. The areas will already have been logged. Historically, whenever suggestions have been made that an area of forest might be converted to national park, the rate of logging has intensified dramatically; so that by the time the area is designated as park, most of its forest cover has been cleared (Ward 2000).

Whilst individual staff in the State Forestry Commissions now recognize the importance of conserving old growth and wilderness areas as a resource for nature tourism, the agencies as a whole seem to believe that they will be able to profit from tourism without changing current logging practices. Meanwhile, environmental groups argue that a national process which was supposed to protect forest areas of high conservation value has in fact removed existing environmental controls and hastened the rate of clearing. They argue that this has occurred not only in areas with tall trees and high-value sawlogs, but also in areas which are clear-felled simply to sell woodchips at bargain basement prices.

In July 1999, tourism and conservation interests joined forces to lobby the Queensland State government in regard to the South-East Queensland RFA. Private tour companies, two tourism research organizations, and the Queensland state branch of the peak national tourism industry association joined as signatories to an open letter to the State Premier by environmental groups. The Premier of Queensland was quoted as follows: "The Federal Government has promised \$10 million at the end of the RFA process which we will forego if we opt out. \$10 million is a very small percentage of the money involved in this process and we stand to gain far more from a sensible forest management scheme" (Beattie 1999). On 16 September 1999, the Queensland Government, timber interests and environmental groups signed the South East Queensland Forests Agreement. As of March 2000, this has not been ratified by the federal government and is hence not an RFA. The Premier, however, has stated that the State will proceed independently, irrespective of Commonwealth endorsement (Keto and Scott 1999).

Research Needs for Wilderness Tourism in Australia

Australia's Cooperative Research Centre for Sustainable Tourism (CRC Tourism), recently carried out a three-stage

survey of nature tourism research priorities held by relevant land management agencies and tourism associations in all states and nationally. This included forestry agencies as well as parks and heritage agencies. Economic issues received strong emphasis, in addition to long-standing research requirements for land and visitor management, and more recent concerns in relation to risk and liability.

Research priorities put forward by different agencies fell into three broad categories. The first category is economic and market issues. These issues include the size of the nature tourism sector, its contribution to regional economies, the value of public lands in contributing to this sector, infrastructure and asset management costs, and mechanisms for funding ongoing management costs, both through public sector budget processes and through private investment.

The second category relates to commercial operations management. This includes arrangements between land managers and tour operators, permitting and licensing, accreditation, liability and insurance, environmental management systems and performance, cooperative research programs, and guide training programs.

The third category covers land and visitor management: that is, management tools and indicators for assessing and maintaining the quality of the natural environment and visitor experience. This includes effectiveness of visitor education and other visitor management tools, design of environmental monitoring programs, relative significance of tourism or other conservation management issues such as weeds, pests, feral animals and fire, and management issues for new and emerging land uses and recreational activities.

References

- Beattie, P. 1999. Queensland may create own forest scheme for jobs and environment. Press statement, quoted in Keto, A. and Scott, K. 1999, South-east Queensland Regional Forest Agreement: does Queensland need it? *Rainforest News* 31: 1.
- Driml S. M. 1997. Bringing ecological economics out of the wilderness. *Ecol. Econ.* 23: 145-153.
- Keto, A. and Scott, K. 1999. SEQ Forest Agreement brings peace. *Rainforest News* 32: 1-4.
- Queensland, Department of Tourism, Small Business and Industry. 1997. Queensland Ecotourism Plan. QDTSBI, Brisbane.
- Ward, J. 2000. The Relative Net Economic Benefits of Logging And Tourism in Native Australian Forests. PhD Thesis, Griffith University, Gold Coast Australia.
- Western Australia, Department of Conservation and Land Management. 1997. Nature Based Tourism Strategy for Western Australia. WACALM, Perth.
- Worboys, G. 1997. Draft Nature Tourism and Recreation Strategy. NSW National parks and Wildlife Service, Sydney.