Chapter 9 Kaurna Management & Determination: Phase 6

Chapter Outline

Previous chapters discussed phases which have occurred or are occurring now. This chapter discusses a proposed and predicted Phase 6. The phase is a logical next step because the trajectory of the changes in methods of inclusion, the strength and diversity of the narratives included, coupled with the emergence of strong Kaurna leaders and groups and greater political and cultural cohesion. This will, in my opinion, naturally lead to and facilitate self-determination and Kaurna management of their public space cultural presentation and inclusion.

This chapter examines issues that are specific to Kaurna public space inclusion and Kaurna culture, and ways to consolidate and expand Kaurna cultural presentation. This does not exclude pan-Aboriginal inclusion by the state and others but would facilitate Kaurna ownership of their cultural production. As Adelaide is on Kaurna people's Country, any activity to include them in the public space brings to the fore some specific considerations: as they are the Aboriginal people of Adelaide, their inclusion and cultural presentation is different to pan-Aboriginal inclusion.

The chapter sets out several considerations which can contribute to the authenticity of Kaurna public space outcomes and facilitate the emergence of a broader and more inclusive Kaurna public space identity and Aboriginal sense of place. To this end, I propose potential sites and themes for the commissioning of Markers and outline projects that would facilitate inclusion, such as Kaurna ownership of sites and the need for the physical and cultural maintenance of Kaurna sites in addition to, or as an alternative to, western based public space commemorations.

Phase 6. Kaurna Management and Determination: Yet to Occur

Full Kaurna responsibility for the implementation and management of projects; location, design brief, cultural content, conceptual development and fabrication of works which represent their culture (within normal public space governance constraints).

I introduce this chapter with the words of two senior Kaurna cultural custodians.

… we have a right to our history displayed in our country (Williams, 2001).

A fundamental principle for Kaurna is our right and the right of Indigenous peoples to own and control our cultures (O'Brien in O'Brien & Rigney, 2006:25).

Adelaide is on Kaurna Country, an acknowledgement increasingly understood and recognised since the mid-1990s. Over the last fifteen years or so numerous public artworks and commemorations have been commissioned by the three levels of government and community organisations, to acknowledge, interpret or directly represent Kaurna and other Aboriginal peoples' cultural heritage. Whilst pan-Aboriginal acknowledgements continue to be commissioned, the trend with major public artworks and commemorative or interpretive Markers in Adelaide is towards specific Kaurna acknowledgments and the development of contemporary Kaurna cultural motifs. As anthropologist and architect Paul Memmott (2007:310) has outlined in terms of architecture, which I suggest parallels public art:

It is usually not preferable to draw semiotic references from any but the local Aboriginal culture. At least the designers should not transpose Aboriginal concepts from one cultural region to another without widespread consultation among the host and donor groups, to ensure that such a transference is ethically and legally acceptable (in terms of intellectual rights) as well as being semiotically relevant.

Kaurna people have not yet had full control and determination over any projects that represent them; they have not had control over the project brief, site location, project management, conceptual development and implementation (within normal public space governance procedures). Whilst there have been many successful cross-cultural facilitations and collaborations in the projects outlined in this thesis, the opportunities for Kaurna people to fully determine the processes, and thus the outcomes, have not yet eventuated. It is to be recognised that there is only a limited number of Kaurna/Aboriginal people familiar with both the structure of public space governance and public art and design practice. This necessitates input from other public space design professionals and administrators. The question is whether this input is under the management of Kaurna or not. As Tasmanian Aboriginal Ian Anderson said (1995:40):

It is a fundamental problem of how non-Aboriginal people and institutions relate to Aboriginal people and communities. The fundamental consideration driving change in these social relations must be the extent to which they empower us Aboriginal people to define who we are and enhance how we communicate our experience through our symbolic products.

A significant contribution to creating a contemporary Kaurna constructed symbolic landscape and sculptural forms is the dominant culture letting go of some of its paternalistic ways of managing Aboriginal affairs and interaction, creating space for processes that are Aboriginal in nature to emerge, and for Aboriginal people to have greater management of and responsibility for their affairs. This is not just applicable in public space processes, it is an evolution needed in broader governance, political and social practices in terms of Aboriginal self-determination. Given that as a society Australia has only relatively recently moved away from the almost total control of Aboriginal people, under Protection Acts and mission living, there has been a need for rapid social adaptation for urban and other Aboriginal peoples. One way to understand contemporary Aboriginal cultural challenges, including those for Kaurna, is to appreciate the fracturing that occurred with, and since, colonisation. In essence there had been a thousand generations, or more, of hunter-gatherer living, a generation of decimation and dislocation at first contact, three or four generations of mission and fringe living and attempts at assimilation into mainstream culture under paternalistic control, and only one or two generations of urban living. For Kaurna, the first generation of urban born is now being more politically and culturally active. This presents massive personal and collective challenges in achieving contemporary social inclusion and equity, and cultural expression.

In the context of Kaurna language, Lewis O'Brien (2006: 29) has outlined that 'Our language struggle mirrors our broader political struggle. Kaurna language must be seen as vital to Kaurna self-determination'. The Kaurna public space Markers present a 'visual language' and self-determination in that field can be seen as of comparable importance. He further stated (2006:30) 'Kaurna language does not share the same legal space as English. Therefore our struggle will continue for our language, our

culture, our land, and our people'. This, I contend, applies equally to public space cultural presentation.

Although no doubt well intentioned, the governance structures under which public artworks have been produced have still been those of the dominant culture. Aboriginal inclusion is still under the terms of reference of institutional bureaucracies and management processes which link into the notion of 'whiteness', a belief that Western culture, traditions and institutions are superior to Aboriginal structures. As Moreton-Robinson explained (2004:75) 'Whiteness establishes the limits of what can be known about the other through itself, disappearing beyond or behind the limits of this knowledge it creates in the other's name.' This attitude I believe has not facilitated full self-determination and self-representation by Aboriginal people in the public space. Coupled with this is often a simple lack of knowledge and appreciation of Aboriginal people's life structures and cultural protocols. These comments are not intended to belittle the achievements to date, but to limit any self-congratulatory assessment of what has been achieved and suggest that other approaches that provide self-determination are still opportune.

There is a parallel with Aboriginal architecture. The concluding argument by Mallie & Ostwald (2009:11) about evolving a culturally appropriate Aboriginal architecture is one that applies equally to public space Aboriginal Cultural Markers and I therefore quote them in full. Their paper explored:

> … the way in which certain discourses about Aboriginal peoples and cultures are maintained through architectural form, expression, materiality and program. Ultimately, the simplification, mystification and appropriation of Aboriginality denies the possibility of an architecture that thoroughly addresses local Aboriginal peoples' needs (spatially and symbolically) in addition to respecting their natural environments. As Ian McNiven (1998:47) notes, the 'problem is more than a clash of belief systems - it is a clash of powers to control constructions of identity.' As a consequence, '[w]ho controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past' (Orwell cited in Russell, 2001:93). Therefore, there is a need to eliminate the classification and categorisation of Aboriginality in architecture and to create a new language that is focused on the future rather than continually looking at the past. Furthermore, the concepts of 'authenticity' and 'primitive' must become redundant in order to create a 'decolonised', culturally appropriate Indigenous architecture. As architecture 'is both form and process, it can transform ways of seeing'.

I shall now discuss several issues which are crucial to the emergence and eventual success of this phase. I present these issues from the perspective of a non-Aboriginal but as someone who has extensive experience in cross-cultural collaboration.

Cultural Protocols between Aboriginal Language Groups

The next level of non-Aboriginal understanding moves from the issues of the Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relationship to inter-Aboriginal relationships, a more specific consideration of the cultural protocols between Aboriginal language groups, again something that must be enabled as part of self-determination, and public space representation.

Adelaide, as the capital city, represents all of South Australia in terms of the state's political structure and the colonising process. Adelaide was the gateway for imperial expansion and the colonisation of the hinterland and all other South Australian Aboriginal language groups. Within this colonising construct it is appropriate for Adelaide, as the state's capital city, to represent all Aboriginal groups within the state. The state government Department of Transport Infrastructure and Energy has acknowledged all South Australian language groups at its former Transport building by naming all groups on the façade window (Figure 7-40). For Reconciliation Week 2010, the South Australian Government supported the painting of a metropolitan tram with the names of all South Australian language groups (Figure 9-1).

Figure 9-1 Reconciliation Week Tram, 2010

However, at the same time it is appropriate to recognise that Adelaide is on Kaurna people's Country which raises the need to consider acknowledging the traditional protocols and relationships between Aboriginal language groups. Whilst these protocols have been severely disrupted by colonisation, they are relevant in terms of Aboriginal cultural renewal and need to be recognised when acknowledging broader aspects of Aboriginality. Ancestral tribal lands, songlines, trade routes, and even enmities, rivalries and alliances are part of contemporary cultural considerations. As outlined by Memmott (2007:310) '… the architect must carefully differentiate between an Aboriginal client group and the local traditional owner group, as the two may not be the same'. So too within the public space design process.

Not any Aboriginal artist can represent another language group without appropriate cultural guidance and authority. There has been some disquiet expressed to me by Kaurna when non-Kaurna Aboriginal artists represent Kaurna culture without appropriate guidance or approval, sometimes resulting in inappropriate or misleading cultural representations. It can be of a comparable insult as a German artist being commissioned to represent French culture in a public artwork in Paris, just because they were European, without political or cultural sanction from the French.

One consideration within the context of public space Aboriginal recognition and inclusion is to fully recognise Kaurna 'cultural sovereignty' over their Country. There is not an Aboriginal citizenship in Australia but it is common practice for Aboriginal people to define the cultural group/s they identify with as part of personal and cultural identity. I have heard some Aboriginal people say that they have two

passports, one from the Australian government and one (informal) from their cultural group. It is my experience that most Aboriginal people also acknowledge whose Country they are visiting or reside on and pay respect to that group.

A contemporary protocol between language groups is evolving when carrying out cultural activities, such as performance, to acknowledge traditional protocols. The Kaurna cultural performers I know always acknowledge that the yidaki (didgeridoo) is not their traditional instrument but comes from northern Australia and that they use it with permission from the traditional owners. For public artworks the inter-cultural protocols are evolving at a community level by way of Kaurna cultural custodians broaching the subject at an individual level when transgressions occur and raising the issue with cultural and other institutions. But it is important that authorities commissioning public artworks also understand this distinction and accommodate it in all aspects of the project from Project Brief through concept selection, approval and fabrication of works to dedication, access and maintenance. If a work is a specific acknowledgement of Kaurna it is beholden on the commissioner to ensure Kaurna involvement from the beginning and that they have the determining say if a non-Kaurna artist is to be involved in such a project.

For major public/civic artworks which are pan-Aboriginal in nature I suggest Kaurna also be involved to guide Aboriginal protocol issues. That is, sovereignty over symbolic Aboriginal expression on their Country is respected. This is an issue that requires further practical development in determining how and who would be involved. Precedents are evolving in that over the last several years, for major commissions, there has been a practice (or policy) of state government agencies seeking representation from the Kaurna organisation acknowledged by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, which at this time is the Kaurna Nation Cultural Heritage Association. Alternatively, non-state government organisations may seek representation from a respected cultural custodian or a local Kaurna person. It is not suggested that Kaurna need be involved with any and every school or community group commissioning a generic Aboriginal mural or such like, it would be a cumbersome process and an unreasonable demand on Kaurna, but rather that Kaurna are involved with any high profile works. Cultural sensitivity is required in this determination.

Further Kaurna Public Space Markers: Potential Themes and Sites

A thematic approach to Aboriginal inclusion or commemoration has not existed as part of public art commissioning or governance processes to date. The lack of a thematic approach is understandable because of the diverse nature of the commissioning; numerous individuals, institutions and organisations have instigated the Markers identified. Markers have been brought about on an ad hoc basis with no critical overview or planning and a lack of any central consideration of proposals by Kaurna at a political or cultural level. Within, or spread over the phases, there are identifiable themes emerging and thematic representation has potential for further development in future Markers.

I present here an overview of themes and sites that could be addressed in future Markers. I do so in the anticipation that this might assist commissioning organisations and Kaurna to evolve a more complete or complex narrative in the public space. A more sophisticated understanding of Kaurna and Aboriginal cultures would assist not only Aboriginal peoples in their representations in the public space

but also help the broader community to engage Aboriginality, Aboriginal land and the pre-European cultural landscape.

This outline was developed by me without direct input from Kaurna custodians and others. As discussed in Chapter 3, my research method did not formally evolve as collaborative or participatory with Kaurna. My outline draws on my knowledge of what has been included in Markers to date and their locations, my collaborative involvement in several public space art and design projects, and the structures used for European heritage surveys and public space representation in South Australia. The outline I present does not purport to be fully representative or exhaustive but is provided as an initial framework for further contributions by others; cultural custodians, cultural historians, anthropologists and so on. Whilst there is a crossover and inter-changeability between themes and sites, these categories have been adopted as a working structure. The outline includes some items which are also, or perhaps more, appropriate to the broader Aboriginal community and their colonisation experience than to Kaurna but are included as part of an inclusive and adaptable structure. I do not suggest that a central organisation is required to control and dictate the manner, content and location of new Markers. However, for Kaurna, within the currently evolving political and cultural structures, it is desirable to nominate an appropriate organisation to evolve and host an advisory template to assist the commissioning process.

I provide the overall outline of themes and sites first and then follow on with a discussion of some particular points that I recommend need considering in the commissioning of Markers.

Themes for Consideration

Traditional Cultural Practices
    . Dreaming narratives
    . Cultural, spiritual and social relationships
    . Ecological relationships and Aboriginal landscape values
Post-Colonisation
    . South Australian Aboriginal colonial history (including Aboriginal
     dispossession)
    . Aboriginal resistance and warrior commemoration
    . Cross-cultural social interactions
    . Use of Aboriginal knowledge in the settlement process
    . Use of Aboriginal guides and trackers
    . Loss of Aboriginal habitation sites (ecological/landscape changes)
    . Mission and fringe living
    . Urbanisation
        . Migration to the city
        . Cultural and political organisation and achievements
        . Education
        . Social and sporting activities and achievements
    . Aboriginal relationships to colonising symbols

Sites for Consideration

Traditional Sites
    . Habitation Sites (which for Kaurna are)
        . Coastal
        . Wetlands

. Waterways

. Foothills

. Other

. Dreaming sites

. Memorial sites

. Burial sites

Post-Colonisation Sites

. Early settlement and contact sites

. Sites of tragedy (distressful aspects of colonising history)

. Aboriginal Reserves (land parcels set aside for independent Aboriginal occupation)

. Twentieth century sites-Kaurna and other Aboriginal peoples

. Mission and fringe camp sites

. Aboriginal homes (homes of the Stolen Generations)

Topographical Viewing Sites

. Panoramic sites

Cross-Cultural Sites

. Sites of significance to both cultural traditions

Themes Discussion

The themes outlined are reasonably self explanatory. On the theme of Aboriginal knowledge, the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (1994:24) has stated of the role of Aboriginal people in Australia's exploration, the pastoral industry and other domestic and economic contributions 'Museums and monuments could recognise the role of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander experts in the history of European discovery and exploration'. This is a theme that has not been widely included in public markers. For instance, in the founding of Adelaide a Kaurna woman accompanied Colonel Light, the Surveyor–General, whose task it was to select the site for the colony, as he sailed up and down the coast of the 'Adelaide' region seeking a site for a port.

Sites Discussion

Traditional Sites

In terms of ancestral or sacred sites for Kaurna, the Tjilbruke Dreaming is the best known dreaming narrative for the Adelaide region. Twelve Markers acknowledge the Dreaming and are discussed in detail in Chapter 10. There has not been a similar focus on other Dreaming narratives or ancestral sites, as they are not as well documented, or the sites have been lost to urban development. There is a network of traditional Aboriginal songlines and storylines that have existed or still do exist in the now urban spaces. As Lewis O'Brien (2007:202) stated:

> *Some people mistakenly think that all the Aboriginal Dreaming sites in this country are way out in the bush, but that's not the case. Some Dreaming sites are right here in the middle of the city. I also think the non-Indigenous people in this country have developed the idea that all the 'real Aboriginal people' live in the bush, but that's not true either. We Kaurna people of the Adelaide Plains have got Dreaming sites in the middle of the city …*

Whilst it is recognised that the constrictions of the urban plan are significant, considering Aboriginal narratives and place making in urban and social planning may reveal new opportunities and ways of seeing place. For instance, new urban developments/redevelopments could consider the Kaurna cultural landscape as a

criterion for determining locations of open space. Master planning for long term development can do the same. There is a thirty year plan for greater Adelaide (Planning SA, 2010) but there is minimal recognition of a Kaurna cultural landscape. The spaces proposed may provide, over time, stopping points, connectors or the concept of cultural corridors, not dissimilar to the biodiversity conservation intention of vegetation corridors and havens. Aboriginal Cultural Markers, in particular public space design, can provide for cultural diversity and cultural conservation.

Post-Colonisation Sites
The understanding of what constitutes Aboriginal heritage is evolving, so the inclusion of sites (and themes) which have post colonisation and contemporary cultural significance is important. As Batten (2005:243) pointed out:

> *Ideas of what constitutes heritage change over time. The things, places, ideas, stories and memories that combine to become heritage are constantly evolving. .… Aboriginal heritage has often been fossilised in the minds of many as 'prehistory'. In this way Aboriginal heritage is seen to be limited to sacred sites, rock art, colourful traditional dances and crafts, all liberally blended with the romance of the Dreaming. This view of heritage fails to allow for change … Aboriginal society has changed over time and therefore aspects of heritage have, of necessity, evolved. Non-Indigenous ideas however about what constitutes Aboriginal heritage have proved resistant to change.*

In a study of Aboriginal attitudes to heritage in the town of Wyndham in northern Western Australia Batten (2005:244) outlined three key themes that emerged from the study: '[t]he importance of acknowledging difference when dealing with heritage issues; the role of contemporary history and heritage in society; and the particular role of conceptions of place and space in Aboriginal perspectives of contemporary heritage'. She (2005:245) further outlined that the views of those older Aboriginal people who had elements of a traditional life in their upbringing revolved more around the land, whilst the younger ones tended to blend those of the older people with more traditionally European perspectives of heritage.

Early Settlement and Contact Sites
There has been limited acknowledgement of early settlement and contact sites in the Markers identified, with only two sites commemorated, the *Native Location Pilta wodli* in the North Parklands and the former *Native School Establishment*, now in the Migration Museum (Phase 5). There is a rich narrative to be presented in this respect and one council, the City of Charles Sturt, has commissioned research to uncover the stories of its region and then present or commemorate them publicly as appropriate. The council area incorporates the site of Adelaide's first port, the Old Port or Port Misery, which functioned from early 1837 until October 1940, an important site of interaction between the existing and incoming cultures.

Sites of Tragedy
Post colonisation sites of tragedy or distress are of particular significance to Aboriginal people. In this regard the theologian, Sigurd Bergmann (2008:88) questioned:

> *What does the remembrance of the pain of the past mean for the design, planning and development of urban space? Must every pain be remembered? What can be forgotten? To begin with, pain enters the sphere of remembrance,*

whether we want it or not. The crucial question is how to deal with the remembrance of the pain of my neighbour. But such a question does not suggest a universal answer; it must be negotiated all the time, and in the frame of discourse ethics it should be done in a participatory process between those involved ... and that built places and the planning of city space should play a central role in enabling and supporting this negotiation.

There are sites in Adelaide that deserve the negotiation outlined by Bergmann. Two such sites relate to the second and third executions in the colony, the public hangings of two Aboriginal men on 31 May, 1839. They took place on a scaffold erected in front of the colonial Ironstores in the North Parklands and their bodies were buried in the then temporary gaol (1838-1841) located in what is now the north east corner of the Government House domain and adjacent parkland (Slee, 2010). British justice was applied to Kaurna as British subjects, whether they had consented to being subjects or not. The South Australian Governor has recently consented to a ground penetrating radar survey of the Government House site to establish the extent of any archaeological evidence. How any discoveries would be commemorated will become the next challenge.

Twentieth Century Sites - Kaurna and other Aboriginal Peoples
The significance of the 20th Century built heritage to Aboriginal culture, in the way it pertains to the development of an urban Aboriginal presence and consequent political and cultural activities, has received little attention. Just as many buildings or places are recognised because significant events took place there in European history, this ought to be the case for Aboriginal urban history as well. It is an area that requires supporting research as little has been recorded to date.

Topographical Viewing Sites
In the same way that many existing panoramic viewing sites, i.e. scenic lookouts, provide information and interpretation on the colonising or natural landscapes, an Aboriginal cultural landscape could also be considered. To date this has received little, if no, attention in determining the location of Markers. An exemplar of the potential is the Flinders University Campus. Located on an elevated site with extensive views of Adelaide's coast, plains and foothills, it also overlooks nearby Warriparinga, a well-known Kaurna habitation and Dreaming site. It is highly likely that the site the University occupies would have been a place for Kaurna to view the extended landscape. This use has been conveyed to me by Kaurna cultural custodians, and the topographical relationship between the sites is obvious.

As well as the topographical resonance for both cultures, Flinders University and Warriparinga are both repositories of cultural knowledge and places of teaching and learning. This similarity provides further opportunities for engagement between the differing cultural paradigms and a possible impetus for commissioning and contextualising public space Markers.

Cross-Cultural Sites - Sites of Significance to both Cultural Traditions
Adelaide, as the capital city, represents and reflects the collective symbolic expression of its people and the state. There are three main cultural precincts where this cultural expression is concentrated, Victoria Square/Tarndanyangga, North Terrace and the Adelaide Festival Centre. North Terrace and Victoria Square were part of Colonel Light's original plan of the city, the Adelaide Festival Centre precinct has developed since the 1960s. The locales occupied by Victoria Square and the

Adelaide Festival Centre are also recognised as being sites of particular significance to the Kaurna as Tarndanyangga and Tarnda Kanya (Red Kangaroo Rock) respectively. There is a convergence or cross-over of both cultural significance and symbolism.

The locale of North Terrace, a boulevard constructed along the southern edge of the valley of the River Torrens/Karrawirraparri, does not have the same particular recognised Kaurna significance and is entirely the construct of the incoming culture. These differences I suggest provide for differing approaches to Kaurna inclusion; one recognises the inherent or embodied Kaurna meaning, the other, recognises inclusion of Kaurna and other Aboriginal cultures in the broader symbolic construct of the state. *Tarndanyangga* is being recognised as outlined in Phase 5 and *Tarnda Kanya* (Red Kangaroo Rock) is an essential cultural consideration in the Riverbank Precinct Masterplan, commissioned by state government, now under development.

I have discussed some themes and sites to establish a structure against which new project proposals can be considered. I will now discuss ways to more effectively identify and elaborate the potentials.

Further Kaurna Public Space Inclusion: Research & Facilitation

An essential component of developing concepts for themed or site specific public art projects is conducting research into the specifics of place and uncovering histories or narratives that may then inform the concept. The use of unsound base research material very easily leads to unsound public outcomes and examples of this have been noted in this research (*Kaurna meyunna, Kaurna yerta tampendi Recognising Kaurna people and Kaurna land*, Adelaide Festival Centre, Adelaide, 2002 [Figure 8-3], *Taikurrendi*, Christies Beach Coast Park, Christies Beach, 2005 [Figure 8-48], *Winnaynee Horseshoe Inn Reserve*, Old Noarlunga, 2006 [Figure 8-51], *Towilla Yerta Reserve*, Port Willunga, 2007 [Figure 8-54], *Glow Taltaityai*, Port Adelaide, 2009, [Figure 8-5]). The length of the thesis has precluded detailed discussion on the problematic outcomes I have noted. Just as there has been an evolution from generic Aboriginal inclusion to specific Kaurna recognition, it is also appropriate that there be, over time, a deeper understanding and more authentic public space representation of Kaurna. This is emerging but would be greatly assisted by ready access to research material. As many public artworks are commissioned at a local level, more specific local knowledge will be of assistance in elaborating the gamut of Kaurna and other Aboriginal cultural activity.

Cultural Research and Surveys by Council Areas

Numerous local histories have been produced about the post settlement history of suburbs, towns and regions. Few have a developed content on Aboriginal history. Whilst perhaps never complete, numerous thematic and geographical heritage surveys have also been undertaken throughout South Australia by heritage authorities for the purposes of European heritage identification, conservation and interpretation. There is no equivalent for Aboriginal heritage and according to Hemming and Rigney (2003:2) 'Binary categories such as post-colonial European heritage versus Indigenous heritage characterise most major South Australian heritage surveys … and create significant barriers to investigations of historical and continuing colonial relations'. Whilst there has been a greater level of research on Kaurna culture over the last two decades or so, much of this is contained in academic publications or institutional reports. The research has not been comprehensively presented in a readily accessible public format. Artist and others who work in public space practice,

and those who commission works, are not necessarily skilled (or have the time and inclination) to undertake comprehensive research. In addition, not all Kaurna descendants have a deep understanding of their history and traditional cultural practices.

In 1994 the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation proposed that historians and their organisations have the opportunity to play a significant role in the process of reconciliation by promoting a wide community appreciation of Aboriginal Australians' cultures and history. The Council suggested local governments, as the initiators of many local histories, have the responsibility to encourage Aboriginal histories as part of their community histories. An exemplar of a community-based initiative to consolidate information is *Footprints in the Sand: Kaurna life in the Holdfast Bay area* published in 2000 by the Holdfast Bay Reconciliation Group. This small booklet, compiled mainly from already published information, gives an informative overview of the pre and early post contact history of the locality. Holdfast Bay (Glenelg) was the point of disembarkation of the first settlers in late 1836 until the Port opened in early 1837.

The identification of significant Aboriginal archaeological and anthropological sites is an on-going process and often occurs when places are subject to development proposals or building activities, when there is a structured investigation and survey of the area or significant earth moving activities. The contemporary construction of a rail line extension to the south of Adelaide has uncovered a number of ancient Kaurna burial sites. Whilst it is not expected that all information on significant sites can be made public, an overview can. The City of Port Adelaide Enfield (2007) commissioned a report on the Port Adelaide area to consolidate information. From Canberra, Australia's capital, there is an exemplar of suburban based research and publication, *Belconnen's Aboriginal Past: a glimpse into the archaeology of the Australian Capital Territory* published in 1997. This sixty page book provides a comprehensive history of the Aboriginal occupation of the suburb of Belconnen.

Whilst it may be thought that by now significant sites in the urban area would have been recorded, this is not necessarily the case. There has not been a comprehensive and systematic survey conducted. As an exemplar, as a consequence of my research to locate Markers along the River Torrens/Karrawirraparri, when I visited one area I noted two scar trees, one of which I knew was already included on the South Australian Register of Aboriginal Sites. In a further survey of the area with Karl Telfer, as part of a *Kaurna Public Space Recognition and Inclusion* report for the City of Charles Sturt, a third scar tree was located. This scar was from the making of a Kaurna shield (Figure 9-2), an uncommon relic in the metropolitan area, which has stood silently for over 175 years without recognition or protection under heritage legislation. These two additional scar trees have now been nominated for consideration for the Register of Aboriginal Sites[34] under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act, 1988* (SA).

---

[34] Access to this Register is restricted to those with a 'need to know' and decisions as to whether any site is commemorated or marked now rest with the Kaurna cultural custodians. As has been demonstrated with the marking of the Tjilbruke Trail, acknowledgement can contribute to recovering lost social relations but there is sensitivity required as to whether specific sites are commemorated.

Figure 9-2 Shield Scar Tree, Karrawirraparri

The undertaking of research and consolidation of existing knowledge on a local government area basis would greatly assist council decision-making, community knowledge and understanding, and the evolution of public space Markers. There is a pre and post settlement history for Aboriginal people throughout the Adelaide metropolitan area which is deserving of more informed articulation. The inclusion of Aboriginal histories as part of community histories applies also to public spaces controlled by local governments which make visible and commemorate aspects of their history and local culture. In that sense, government authorities who control the public space have a responsibility to contribute to the overcoming of the 'great Australian silence' through implementing sound research. The City of Charles Sturt has recently commissioned the Kaurna cultural mapping of its area to provide sound information and a better articulation of the area's Kaurna history to inform the creation of public space Markers and other activities.

Oral History Recording

The older generation of Kaurna and other Aboriginal people who migrated from the missions to the city is passing away. Their stories are integral to the transition to urban living and the memory of other ways, the 'old days', and many stories have already been lost. I suggest that oral history recording is an economical and expedient means to preserve these memories and is to be encouraged and facilitated by state and local government, and any other institution or person that can assist. As well as recording history for posterity their stories have rich story telling possibilities and the act of recording their lives can be a cathartic experience for the story tellers themselves, to have their lives and experiences valued and recorded. I have undertaken an oral history recording of Georgina Williams for the State Library of South Australia. It was a rewarding experience for us both.

Books have been published on the lives of Kaurna descendants Lewis O'Brien (2007) and Veronica Brodie (2002) but that is a resource consuming exercise and not likely to be common. There is much more to record, as outlined in a publisher's note at the end of the book on the life story of Veronica Brodie (Brodie, 2002:189):

There are a lot of Indigenous people who want to tell their stories, and let the world know what they have been through. It is not only therapeutic for the story tellers, it is also important for non-Indigenous people to learn that there is another side and another version to Australia's contact history. But finding funding and publishers is not easy.

Kaurna Sites: Physical and Cultural Maintenance

The physical conservation and protection of Kaurna sites themselves may be of more import than actual commemorations or artworks in the Western tradition. When it is understood that in the Aboriginal tradition, symbolic meaning is inscribed in the land itself rather than the constructed monument, to advocate the preservation and protection of the integrity of a site, rather than a Marker to commemorate what was there and has been lost, is I suggest a more profound way to acknowledge Aboriginal culture and beliefs. Loss or degradation of sites, which continues to occur, can set back the potential for the evolution of a shared space, physical and cultural, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, which recognises the significance (and inviolability) of the sites because of their inherent Kaurna meaning.

When Kaurna is understood as a contemporary living culture in the process of renewal, the conservation of sites to preserve the physical links with ancestral places and traditions can provide tangible links to a past. Following on from the commemorations that have been achieved which mark and draw attention to Kaurna cultural sites, the ongoing physical and cultural maintenance of sites, particularly the Tjilbruke Dreaming sites, requires further immediate and long-term consideration. Although it can be difficult to confine the definition of a site to a particular 'spot' rather than a broad (physical and cultural) landscape, large-scale landscape changes (in the form of urban expansion and coastal development) have or are occurring in the vicinity of Tjilbruke Dreaming sites. These changes have the potential to threaten or overwhelm some sites' sense of place and their continuing functioning as rallying points for broader social change. The 2002 *Tjilbruke Dreaming Tracks Project* report (Hassell, 2002) which outlined a number of conservation actions has not been implemented to any significant degree.

Karkungga *Red Ochre Cove*, a Kaurna anthropological and Dreaming site marked as part of the Tjilbruke Trail, represents several thousand years of human activity[35] in the mining of the ochre for ceremonial and other purposes (O'Brien, 2007: 204, 206), but the site has not become a significant part of the incoming culture's sense of place or perception of self. The existence of such a significant Aboriginal site within greater metropolitan Adelaide is not generally appreciated (despite the fact that several similar Aboriginal ochre mines in the Flinders Ranges region in the north of the state have interpretive information and/or restricted access). The sense that 'real' significant sites exist only in the bush continues. Karkungga *Red Ochre Cove* is a significant site in need of enhanced ecological management because of erosion caused by vegetation loss, storm water runoff and human activities such as cross-country bicycle and motorbike riding. It is a prime site for renewed Kaurna cultural activities and broader cultural interpretation.

---

[35] The precise dating of the occupation of the Red Ochre Cove site has, to my knowledge, not been the subject of an archaeological study. The coastline of that region is between 7500 and 10000 years old (i.e. dating from the last ice age). Aboriginal middens at nearby Moana Beach, a place the Dreaming traverses, have been dated at between 6000 and 7000 years old (O'Brien, 2007:204).

I contend that the preservation of sites is a most important stage in Aboriginal recognition and inclusion in the symbolic value of the public space, realising Aboriginal self-determination and in cementing reconciliation, indeed in facilitating the emergence of a shared 'Australian' culture.

Kaurna Sites: Ownership of Cultural and Spiritual Sites

Traditional Aboriginal culture was based on an interconnected relationship between the people and the natural, living, environment, referred to as Country. At present Kaurna do not communally own or manage any of their ancestral lands. They do not have the sites on which to practice their culture and express their spirituality, or religion.

In contrast, the colonising religions have places to gather to express and develop their faith and spirituality. They have a prominent expression of self and their beliefs in both the built and cultural landscapes. They own a significant property infrastructure and have highly developed modes of internal and external communication to facilitate their coming together, to practice and express their religions, and to express views into the broader society and political processes. These religions have significant physical, economic and cultural capital, much of it derived from inter-generational inherited wealth, to pursue their activities. They have multiple income sources to support an organisational infrastructure and activities, including the formal teaching and expression of faith or spirituality. Aboriginal cultures do not have the places or equivalent resources to develop and express their spirituality, their wealth base having been taken at colonisation.

Places of equivalent significance are required for urban Kaurna/Aboriginal people. The land is the 'church', and more places, such as Warriparinga, are required for spiritual reflection and renewal. Church buildings are dominant signifiers in our Christian based cultural landscape. Equivalent Aboriginal signifiers are absent or not readily understood in terms of the embedded Aboriginal landscape meaning and creation narratives.

The *Commonwealth Native Title Act, 1993*, has established a process where some Aboriginal people can make claim to their traditional lands (National Native Title Tribunal, n.d.) but this excludes land held under freehold title which, except for Crown lands, is the case for Kaurna County. There are mechanisms for Aboriginal peoples to gain access to land through Indigenous Land Use Agreements under the Native Title provisions or to acquire land through the Indigenous Land Corporation but there has been no practical outcome for Kaurna at this stage. There are not the spaces for them to practice their cultural tradition, beliefs and spirituality.

Kaurna Political and Cultural Renewal

It is important to be aware, although outside the direct scope of this thesis, that Kaurna empowerment and internal governance structures will impact on public space representation in how and who is involved in the commissioning processes, what public artworks are selected for implementation and what is the cultural content of those artworks or other forms of Markers. The Kaurna community is faced with many challenges in evolving effective political and cultural representation. The representative Board must operate under the *Associations Incorporation Act*, *1985*, a form of governance based on popular elections and majority decision making which is at odds to traditional governance (and open to internal and external political manipulation).

The Kaurna Native Title Claimant Group is the body which represents Kaurna under the Commonwealth Native Title legislation and comprised (initially) sixteen descendants of the known Kaurna apical ancestors to represent the contemporary family groups or clans. There has been an ongoing debate within Kaurna on whether this model, the equal representation of all apical ancestor groups, or families, should have greater application in decision making than the (Western) rules of Incorporation; the former is seen as more equitably representing all clan groups (and potentially age groups) and reflecting traditional ways. The Kaurna community, in conjunction with its legal representatives, is engaged in an on-going process of determining the most appropriate forms of decision making, in both political and cultural spheres.

Sensitivity to these issues by commissioning bodies and arts and design practitioners involved in cross-cultural collaborations is necessary. Being involved in cross-cultural collaborations in which the non-Aboriginal represents another culture is not just 'another job', it requires a commitment to cultural learning and skills sharing not usual in other collaborations.

Summary

I consider that Phase 6, Kaurna management and determination of their public space inclusion, is a logical and required next step in the evolution of the way Kaurna Aboriginal Cultural Markers come into existence in Adelaide's public space. The phase is a logical next step because of the trajectory of the changes in methods of inclusion, the developing strength and diversity of the narratives included, as well as the evolution of stronger Kaurna leaders and groups and a more informed understanding in the non-Aboriginal community. Outcomes will depend on a series of interconnected interactions between Kaurna cultural renewal, political activity and strength, and the humanity, sense of equity and actual reparation by the dominant culture. These aims are not without their challenges.

What can and is to be achieved is something that has not existed before. For Kaurna, it is the invention of a new tradition which draws on the old, serves a need in the present, but looks forward to a future. Not a future that is a repetition of the past with minor amendments around the edges, but a truly new future. It may be semantics, but to me a new future implies a revitalisation, renewal, restructuring, and realignment for both cultural heritages. That is what I believe is necessary and what can be achieved in collaboration with Kaurna for an equitable inclusion of Kaurna and other Aboriginal cultures in the public space of Adelaide. The Kaurna focus of this chapter does not imply the absence of a continuing need for the broader recognition of Aboriginality in the public space.

Ongoing and adaptive cultures continually renew when faced with change and adversity. Australian Aboriginal cultures are known for their ability to adapt and renew over extended human time. The city now provides one context in which adaptation is occurring and that is the context for Kaurna. A re-inscription of the landscape of the city is therefore appropriate, albeit difficult; a re-inscription that will benefit all, Kaurna, non-Kaurna Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal alike, by contributing to Aboriginal identity and another way of knowing the city, and as a signifier of the process of reconciliation. As Batten (2005:253) summarised 'Only by acknowledging the range of sites which can constitute a site of 'significance' to Indigenous people will a truly encompassing picture of Australia's Indigenous history and heritage be achieved'.

Despite the Markers achieved, there remains an overwhelming invisibility of Aboriginality in urban places. In the future, as in the past, the strength of Kaurna culture will be reflected in the strength and depth of Kaurna inclusion in the public space. I believe that this proposed and predicted Phase 6 will assist and reflect a fuller reconciliation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians. The phase is a required next step because anything less will not amount to true reconciliation. Stanner (1979:216) summarised in the 1968 Boyer Lectures that:

> *Aborigines have always been looking for two things: a decent union of their lives with ours but on terms that let them preserve their own identity, not their inclusion willy-nilly in our scheme of things and a fake identity, but development within a new way of life that has the imprint of their own ideas.*

I have suggested a series of issues that will hopefully contribute to this quest.