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Abstract

If planning is the conscious formulation of a preferred future and deliberate actions to realise that future in the landscape, then Indigenous Australians have long been involved in planning settlements and regions. Yet such actions – pre and post-contact – are absent from the history of Australian planning, as evidenced by some major texts on the subject. What also passes without serious comment in the planning literature and contemporary practice are the theoretical implications of admitting key aspects of recent Indigenous history – such as prior occupancy, ongoing sovereignty, resistance strategies, ghettoisation and Native Title. There are, therefore, significant gaps in the history and theory of Australian planning which impact negatively on its current teaching and practice. The consequences of such omissions range from incomplete histories to ongoing injustices in Australian planning practice. My larger research project will collate these absences before reworking the history of Australian planning from the perspective of those systematically excluded from it – women, migrants from racially marked non-white backgrounds and Indigenous Australians. This paper will consider only a small part of this larger project. It will first examine some of the key texts which construct the history of Australian planning before examining one place – Lake Condah in Western Victoria – as one site of permanent settlement by the Gundijmara people who lived in stone houses arrayed in villages around an engineered sophisticated fish farming enterprise. Here then is but one example – admittedly subject to contestation over its scale, anthropological and archaeological fundamentals – which challenges the view of indigenous Australians as not only nomadic and “primitive” but also as legitimately placed outside the history of Australian planning. I will conclude by speculating on what this example might mean to any reworking of that history.

Introduction

If planning is the conscious formulation of a preferred future and deliberate actions to realise that future in the landscape, then Indigenous Australians have long been involved in planning settlements and regions. Yet such actions – pre and post-contact - are absent from the history of Australian planning, as contained in the major texts on the subject. What also passes without serious comment in the planning literature and contemporary practice are the theoretical implications of admitting indigenous issues – such as prior occupancy, the meaning of country, ongoing sovereignty, resistance strategies, ghettoisation and Native Title. There are, therefore, significant gaps in the history and theory of Australian planning which impact negatively on its current teaching and practice. The consequences of such omissions range from incomplete histories to ongoing injustices in Australian planning practice. My larger research project will collate these absences before reworking the history of Australian planning.


This paper has been fully peer reviewed by the UHPH 2010 Expert Review Committee.
from the perspective of those systematically excluded from it – women, migrants from racially marked non-white backgrounds and Indigenous Australians.

This paper will consider only a small part of this larger project. It will first consider some of the key texts which construct the history of Australian planning before examining one place – around Lake Condah in Western Victoria – a site of stone villages and engineering works for fish farming by the Gundijmara people. Here then is but one example – admittedly subject to contestation over its scale, anthropological and archaeological fundamentals – which challenges the view of indigenous Australians as not only nomadic and “primitive” but also as legitimately placed outside the history of Australian planning. I will conclude by speculating on some implications of such a case study for any reworking of that history.

**Key planning texts: their approach and exclusions**

It has often been noted that history is written by the winners. While not usually applied to planning, it is a valid and important question to ask if Australia’s planning history has been constructed from the perspective of a select few to exclude the imprint and concerns of those marginalised by its practice. Key texts used in planning courses to chart and interrogate the history of Australian planning variously limit and further marginalise Indigenous issues. Indebted to the work of Sarah Oberklaid on this subject, I agree that these texts can and should be interrogated for their treatment of Indigenous issues.1 The key planning texts include:


As the most recent, Thompson’s book devotes most space to Indigenous matters of the three texts. Issues discussed include *terra nullius*, the dispossession of Indigenous Australians through planning regimes, and the different relationships and perceptions of land between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. Ed Wensing has a dedicated chapter where he argues that Australian planning as a discourse is blind to its role, past and present, in the dispossession of Indigenous peoples. He continues:

This cultural blindness means that conventional land and property planning as well as management regimes have been, and... continue to be, instrumental in sanctioning and reinforcing ABTSI people’s dispossession of their land and culture, causing loss of physical, spiritual and cultural traditions and customs.2

As a result, he suggests, the vast historical and contemporary inequities between ATSI people and other Australians can no longer be ignored in contemporary planning and land management processes.3 As well as being complicit in the problem, Wensing concludes, planning must be integral to its solution.

262
The chapter by Wensing contrasts to an earlier one written by Freestone which, while purporting to be ‘A history of planning’, only refers to the marginalisation of Indigenous people ‘from the outset’ of the surveying of Australian cities, without tracing the ongoing process of marginalisation and containment. Similarly, despite the cultural differences between Indigenous communities, they are not admitted in Thompson’s chapter on ‘Planning for diverse communities’ nor in Conroy’s chapter on ‘Planning for heritage and conservation management’. While raising past and current Indigenous issues in planning, Wensing’s chapter has the effect of segregating them off from other major planning concerns – for the natural environment, planning for the metropoles, regions and rural environments, heritage, planning history, environmental sustainability, urban infrastructure, planning for difference and so on – despite their obvious relevance.

Gleeson and Low’s *Australian urban planning* is concerned with planning since World War II. In its Introduction the authors urge readers to consider the injustices towards and displacement of Indigenous people. In their brief discussion of Aboriginal exclusion from planning processes, Gleeson and Low use the example of development in the tourist town of Broome, Western Australia, thereby choosing an atypical case study. The authors do not relate the development dilemmas and Indigenous issues in this place to other cases or more generally to the experience of urban and regional Australia, suggesting that such matters emerge in remote rather then central planning sites. They do discuss how *Mabo* and the *Native Title Act* have changed the meaning of land in the Australian legal system and discuss examples of partnership agreements between planning authorities and Indigenous groups as well as the possible model offered by the New Zealand’s *Resource Management Act*.

However, overall their discussion is cursory, confined to exceptional examples in a small number of pages.

The discussion of Indigenous issues in Hamnett and Freestone’s *The Australian metropolis: A planning history* is confined to a chapter by Helen Proudfoot which addresses the origins of planning in Australia. According to Proudfoot, colonisation dramatically and irreversibly changed the perception and management of land. She notes how Aborigines had previously ‘ranged over their defined territories according to a seasonal pattern, hunting, fishing and culling the fruits of the land, but not cultivating the soil or domesticating animals for meat consumption’ and implies an end to Indigenous culture, traditions and management as a result of colonisation. Proudfoot does not consider the vast diversity of Indigenous land uses or the possibility that people other than Europeans could plan their lands, nor does she admit to her account communities that have maintained their traditions and land management practices post-contact. Indeed she maintains that ‘though the indigenous people had been living in bands or small communities of fluctuating size, they had not established permanent settlements. Agriculture, pastoralism and urbanism were thus the radical innovations of British colonisation’. Proudfoot thereby affirms the notion of *terra nullius* as a term which means, amongst other things, that Aboriginal peoples did not use their lands ‘properly’ – ie as the British did through cultivation, animal grazing, buying and selling - and certainly does not admit the possibility of sedentary occupancy, any notion of urban settlement or conception of Indigenous people planning their lands.
Having introduced some vital – if erroneous – notions of Indigenous occupancy and colonisation into the history of Australian planning, the rest of the Hamnett and Freestone book proceeds to move chronologically through the various stylistic movements – such as City Beautiful, Garden City and Modernity – and key metropolitan plans, that make up its European history. In this exercise, the main game becomes the creation of University planning schools and the establishment of professional associations. The history of planning becomes the story of Australia’s cities and the well meaning professionals – who really only exist from the creation of University planning schools and associations from around 1910 – who attempt to service, reshape and accommodate new transport technologies within them. The idea of planning being a normative and conservative profession, defining and managing a land system built on stolen property, oriented primarily to the needs of metropolitan commerce and operating to contain and confine racialised social groups, is never raised in this history. Even the challenges offered by Native Title, urban ghettos and successful land claims over metropolitan Australia are not admitted into any of the discussions in this key text.

In these three major texts on Australian planning history, then, Indigenous people and their experiences are relegated to bit players – limited in their coverage or confined to examples played out on the remote edges of the continent. In addition, an array of deeply problematical and empirically invalid assumptions pervert their politics, building into them misguided and limiting views of Indigenous peoples as non-active makers of their lands. In consigning Indigenous people to the primitive status of non-planners, not only are they thereby excluded from the history of planning, but Aboriginal relations to land and its conscious modification is thereby rendered invisible in the history of Australian planning. Further, planning as a relatively benign practice of drawing up guidelines for the major urban metropoles and engaging with key current issues of sustainability, climate change, social inequality, cultural heritage etc denies the planner’s ongoing role in confining and marginalising Indigenous people and their issues. If present, Aboriginal people are relegated to the past or to the irrelevant edges of planning practice in the major texts on Australian planning. There is therefore a need to rethink and rework the historical foundations, assumptions, politics and theoretical underpinnings of Australian planning. The existence of groups of Indigenous people living a sedentary, village life offers just one starting point for such a rethinking, but one which has many profound implications; not only for planning history but also its practice.

Such work in rethinking the nature of Australian planning is not completely new. In earlier work I was one of the few academics to take the “black armband” reworking of Australian history into planning. Thus in the mid-1990s, in a quest to apply post-colonial thinking to suburban developments in Australia, I undertook historical research to assess the contemporary implications of indigenous occupancy and multiculturalism to the laying out and sale of Roxburgn Park, a new suburban development in north west Melbourne. Such work joined that by a number of other geographers, such as Fay Gale, Kay Anderson, Richard Baker and Elspeth Young, Jane Jacobs and Wendy Shaw amongst others, in bringing Indigenous issues to the fore in the occupancy of Australia’s towns and regions. While such work has produced great insights into particular places, these studies have not been connected to the legal basis and operation of the planning system as a whole. Nor has there been much work which has considered Indigenous occupancy as “planned”.
There are therefore gaps between geographical research and planning which need to be filled. On the other side of the academic ledger, while there has been some fine histories written on Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations in the occupancy of the Australian continent — such as by Brian Attwood, Richard Broome and Henry Reynolds — none address the implications of this history for planners. The historical work does not consider the spatial dimension while the geographers tend to neglect the historical, legal and planning implications of their work. Further, the official recognition of Native Title in 1973 and the Mabo (1992) and Wik (1996) decisions have shifted the legal basis of planning in Australia. However, little theoretical work has been done in assessing their implications. While there have been detailed legal and historical appraisals of specific land claim cases — such as the Yorta Yorta in northern Victoria or the Hindmarsh Island case in South Australia — there has been little contemporary assessment of just how such cases could and should impact on the nature of rural, regional or urban planning more generally. What does exist is an extensive literature informed and written by Indigenous scholars who are documenting and integrating Aboriginal knowledge systems into the management of country. Thus, for example, Marcia Langton has looked at the ways in which the use of fire in the utilisation of lands in northern Australia can and should be acknowledged in any definition of “wilderness” and national park management. Such work has not been more widely incorporated into planning practice. There is therefore a real academic as well as practical need to rework and rethink the history of Australian planning from its Indigenous margins, an exercise that will have significant conceptual as well as practical implications. One site from western Victoria raises particular challenges and directions for such a re-working.

Indigenous planning – the case of Lake Condah

Numbering at least 500 000 in 1788 Aboriginal peoples utilised very different land management and settlement systems occurred across the continent. I would argue that most can be considered as involving the planning and managing of these landscapes. One way to illustrate this claim emerges from one case study of an area best known as part of the western sheep grazing lands of Victoria which, in post-contact history, is also renown as the site of two major Aboriginal reserves and missions – Lake Condah and Framlingham (Figure 1 indicates their location).

Known in the 19th century as the Portland Bay District, this area consists of a large volcanic plain, covering 15 000 square kilometres, stretching from Melbourne to Portland and from the Great Divide south to the Otway Ranges. Aborigines called these plains “waark” and the tribal divisions reflected geographical divides. At the great midsummer meetings at Mirraewuue, around a marsh to the west of Caramut, friendly tribes met for hunting, feasting and recreation. Numbering up to 10 000 people, oral and archaeological evidence indicates that these gatherings occurred around stone villages of between 100 and 200 dwellings and utilised the eels that had been caught and smoked in elaborate fish farming systems. Some of the eels that were caught were smoked in hollowed out trees and these have been carbon dated as being utilised for at least 8 000 years. Here then in sites occupied by the Gundijmara people around Heywood and Lake Condah, the history and theory of Australian planning can be shaken to its foundations. Despite intense archaeological disputation that key sites around Allambie and Tyrendarra were produced somehow by nature, my
own historical research along with interactions with the Gundjimara people, confirm the characterisation of this landscape as planned. To elaborate on the sites and the evidence, I will firstly consider some of the historical record before examining a few key archaeological surveys – by the Victorian Archaeological Survey, Heather Builth and Sharon Lane – before engaging with the views of the local Indigenous occupants of this area. The final part of this paper will speculate on where such evidence takes a rewritten post-colonial history of Australian planning.

![Fig 1: Location of Aboriginal reserves and missions in Victoria](image)
(Source: Federal Department of Indigenous and Multicultural Affairs)

**Stone villages – Historical accounts**

In March 1842 Chief Protector of Aborigines George Augustus Robinson and Assistant Protector Sievwright ventured onto the stony rises to the south of Mt Eccles. Robinson's journal from that trip records how he:

> Led our horses into the stony rises: masses of larve, steep stone – horse could barely walk – plenty ash hills, round sharp layrs, plenty huts of dirt and others built of stones...At the native camp they had oven baking roots...Stone houses, stone wiers...Mt Napier bore north and Mt Eels WNW.20

The squatter Peter Manifold similarly observes:

> When we first occupied the country, it was quite common for the natives to use these circles as camping-places, always having fires in the centre...The circles are generally formed of large stones set on their edges, and bedded in the ground close together, without any stones on top...The stones are of common basalt...The situation selected was generally where water was convenient, or in some favourable place for game. The circles were about the size of the ordinary mia-mys, that is, from ten to twenty feet in diameter.21

And in 1848 settler William Westgarth noted:
On the banks of the Eumerally Lake or Swamp, where the stony rises of that locality commence there was a ‘native township’ as it was termed, where the aborigines generally encamped for a portion of the year for the purpose of fishing.22

1876 R.B. Smyth provided a detailed description of circular shelters of basalt found in the Lake Purrumbete area.23 James Dawson’s Australian Aborigines published in 1881 mentioned dwellings with walls ‘built of flat stones.24 and Thomas Worsnop’s Prehistorica arts published in 1897 described horseshoe-shaped stone foundations found at old camping places on the rough basalt around Mount Eccles and Lake Gorrie.25

Associate with these villages were extensive engineering works which canalised eels and other fish into an array of traps. Stretching for hundreds of metres, these systems were not noted in detail by those who travelled throughout this country – raising some interesting questions about the efficacy of first hand accounts and the vested interests of those such as Robinson – officially the Protector of Aborigines – as well as squatters such as Peter Manifold and William Westgarth – who may well have not wanted any notion of planned, sedentary, sophisticated settlement to be recorded and circulated across a colony busy usurping lands. But the archaeological and contemporary evidence of such works is overwhelming and uncontested.

Archaeological evidence

As an archaeological landscape, the stony rises in the region of Mt Eccles stand out because of the concentration of Aboriginal stone structures present – a concentration unparalleled on the rest of the continent.26 Hundreds of these structures have been recorded across the landscape as the result of archaeological survey work carried on since the 1970s especially by the Victorian Archaeological Survey, and interpretation has varied widely. Some archaeologists have seen these sites as a cluster of ‘houses’ which may have been occupied simultaneously to form ‘special camps’ or settlements inhabited by hundreds of people,27 or have identified them as parts of ‘villages’ and semi-permanent settlements.28 Others have suggested that the stone circles are the remains of relatively short term camp sites29 the outcome of natural processes of lava flow and tree growth30 or that the structures were ‘windbreaks, hunting blinds or day camping places’.31 Some local landowners believe that the structures are of European construction and have dismantled them to both clear their fields for other uses and utilise the stone for fencing and sale.32 A more sinister interpretation might encompass the possibility of early squatters destroying many of these dwellings in the interests of disproving any notion of indigenous sovereignty or settlement that might complicate their claims for unfettered access.

The debate rages intensely in archaeological circles, with different surveys and surveyors eliciting divergent evidence and interpretations. Thus an early Victorian Archaeological Survey (VAS) assessment of the Kinghorn site (near Mt Napier) noted that: as the hamlets clustered, the presence of central fireplaces within houses with semi-circular floor plans ‘it is tempting to argue that the site is a single encampment where all structures were occupied contemporaneously...we can link each cluster with family units and estimate the maximum population of the settlement ...as at least 300’.33 They suggested that occupants of these sites may have originally lived or
camped on nearby clusters of mound sites which they were then forced to abandon as a result of stress 'caused by Europeans or other Aboriginal groups'. Anne Clarke’s 1989/1990 re-survey and assessment of a number of areas investigated by the VAS was for cultural heritage management. However, of the 317 previously recorded sites 159 or 50% could not be relocated! Many also were not associated with archaeological remnants indicating human habitation, such as tools, flints or fire remnants. This led to their re-interpretation as natural features – circular depressions in the lava, the result of soil compaction or caused by tree roots.

Heather Builth did a survey around the Mt Eccles stony rises – on two properties now owned by Winda Mara Aboriginal Corporation. Her PhD thesis presents an argument that a pre-contact viable and sustainable economic settlement existed on the Mt Eccles lava flow. This settlement involved the modification of wetlands into fisheries for the short and long terms management of eels, the use of manna gum trees so that they “functioned as facilities in which to smoke eels” and the construction of dwellings and storage caches. Although the land was drained by Europeans in the late 19th century, Builth measured the landscape and used geographical simulation to conduct a virtual re-flooding. She found an artificial system of ponds connected by canals covering more than 75 kilometres. She concludes: “It was a gigantic aquaculture system”. With facilities to procure, preserve and store eels, Builth argued that pre-contact Aboriginal people around the Mt Eccles stony rises ‘had the means to be sedentary’. She recorded 51 stone dwellings in her northern study area and 103 in the southern part – in the Tyrendarra property. She found many stones lay in circular patterns and were so uniform that they could only have been stacked there by humans. She further noted how: “the majority of dwellings, the dwellings with storage caches, are situated in close proximity to the edges of culturally constructed, maintained and managed wetlands”.

In contrast to the work of Builth, that of Sharon Lane has excavated two examples of stone piles arranged in a C or arc shape with two at least indicating that stones had been removed from the middle to form walls along with 10cm of soil. Flake stone and glass artefacts have been found within but also outside these two structures suggesting that they date from a post contact period and could have arisen from land clearing, wall building or comprise temporary mia mias. Lane thereby further challenges the argument for pre-contact stone villages of permanent settlement.

Identification of the stone-based huts in the stony rises has therefore been a matter of some debate amongst archaeologists with the main difficulties being:

- Confusion with non-Aboriginal structures and post-contact constructions
- Confusion with natural features

There is also the issue of their deliberate destruction to construct European facilities, especially the much lauded stone fences of the region. It is known that some squatters deliberately destroyed Aboriginal huts and property with the intention of letting them know they were no longer welcome. They were also destroyed by the land clearing process and to use the stone in other ways.

Despite such disputation, however, there is little doubt amongst archaeologists that at least some stone houses were constructed in the Lake Condah-Allambie-Tyrendarra
area. There is also no doubt that there existed — and still exists — an extensive engineering facility across these lands to guide water, fish and eels; to basically farm and manage the marine food supply as well as to process it for later use. What is debated is the scale and permanency of such activity — whether we can indeed talk of villages of 300 dwellings where indigenous people lived a sedentary life at relatively high population densities, managing virtual town ships and farming their marine environments to ensure constant sources of food. Not only does the historical record hint that such is the case, but the archaeological work of Heather Bulith confirms it. So for example, pollen samples from trees analysed by Peter Kershaw at Monash show that eels were smoked there at least 8000 years ago in quantities appropriate for the feeding of up to ten thousand. Why such activities were not documented in great detail by the invading Europeans may well be related to their Indigenous guides not leading them to these places, conscious decisions by the British not to acknowledge such settlements — for fear of disturbing the well rehearsed fallacy of *terra nullius* — but also perhaps because earlier disease — spread from the sealers and whalers who had worked the nearby coast for nearly 50 years — and the violence which accompanied land seizure, led to the abandonment of these areas. The evidence assembled by archaeologists such as Buith also meshes with the understandings of those who currently have custodianiship over this country — the Gundijmara people and it is to this oral evidence that this paper now turns.

**Local observations and accounts**

In December 2008 I was taken on a tour of the Lake Condah area by Eileen Saunders from the Gundji Mirring Corporation. Leaving Heywood and travelling towards the coast, we traversed sealed roads passed by huge trucks rumbling to and from the stone quarries which still make use of the rocky landscape — to crush it up for road surfacing — before heading into the Lake Condah mission. It was here in 1868 that the Anglican church established an array of simple houses, a church, school and other buildings to accommodate those left after the Eumerella Wars of resistance to white invasion. Further north from the mission there is the Allambie property. Purchased by the State Government because of the 1975 VAS survey of the area confirming the richness of its archaeological heritage, we reach a marshy area marked out with signs confirming that this was now Gundij Mirring Land overseen by the Traditional Owners Aboriginal Corporation. Listed with the Victorian Heritage Trust and being prepared for World Heritage listing, this site is now finally being recognised as truly extraordinary in the history of Australia. Here, Eileen walked me in a vast circle, along pathways that edged canals and traversed bridges, which in turn were dotted by groups of stone foundations arranged in circles. Here were the remnants of scores of stone dwellings. Adjacent to each other, in clusters of two, threes and more, some even had common walls, a terrace in a suburb, as Eileen cheekily explained. For her and others at Gunditj Mirring there is no question that what we were seeing was an ancient and long occupied site of permanent habitation, where hundreds if not thousands of their forebears had lived and made skilful use of the aquaculture and irrigation system that was all around us.

Ken Saunders a Gundijmara and member of the Lake Condah Sustainable Development Project observed that the skills associated with utilising the fish races and eel traps still exist (43). Saunders concludes an ABC Catalyst episode that presented Heather Bulith’s research:
We weren't nomads. We didn't wander all over the blood (y sic) place and go walkabout. We had an existence here. Well you couldn't have a blackfella telling that story. So to prove it we had to have a white person doing the scientific research to say this is real.\textsuperscript{44}

This is a view that is echoed by the Executive Officer of Guditj Mirring Denise Lovett when asked about the divided opinions on the site held by archaeologists. It is a view that I have no reason to question but rather to incorporate into a revised history of Australian planning.

**Beginning the rewrite – some implications**

The existence of an extensively modified landscape created to farm and manage eels is a clear example of Indigenous planning. Across 100 kilometres of land that was naturally swampy in what we now know as western Victoria, Aboriginal people created weirs, channels and dams to make the whole landscape far more productive. In parts, the channels were dug through solid rock to allow water to flow from swamp to swamp. Some of the channels and ponds stretched more than 30 kilometres. The associated villages – of between 100 to 200 houses – for Heather Bulith at least, were like company towns, with dwellings to house people who worked the farms and a system of centralised governance necessary to organise the large scale production and storage of food as well as the ceremonial activities which occurred on this site. For the Guditj Mirring traditional owners of this country, its past use and current importance are self evident. What this place and its history poses for the history of Australian planning is a set of profound questions.

Firstly, if indigenous people were not only present and resistant in the Australian landscape, but planned its use, occupied it in permanent settlements and engineered its modification, then such activity has to be incorporated into the history of planning. Australian planning did not begin in 1919 or even 1788, but at least 8 000 years ago!

But it goes further than this. Because Australian planning is based on the Torrens Title as it was built upon the theft of indigenous lands classified as "terra nullius" – formally in Governor Bourke's 1834 proclamation in response to the Batman Treaty – then this research shows that there is something very wrong about the foundation of our entire land ownership system. If Native Title is now formally recognised as pre-dating European occupancy and if this only applies to reasonable nomadic use of lands – for hunting, fishing and care of country, basically unobtrusive uses which have to be fought for in agonisingly long court cases – what happens if such Title also includes sedentary and sustained use of substantial areas of land? The current planning system secondly, then, could well be seen as based on not only stolen lands but on a Native Title regime which should be significant reformulated and broadened.

Thirdly, there are the moral and political implications of such an example as it impacts on current planning practice. While Wensing can thoughtfully note how: 'Mabo recognized past wrongs which occurred because of rational and technocratic approaches to land use planning and development... while planners have a moral and ethical responsibility to ensure that past wrongs are never repeated\textsuperscript{44} in one of the few contributions to this issue, I would suggest that this example pushes the moral and
political obligation further. Indeed I would argue that the case of the Gundjimara people around Lake Condah demands not only financial compensation for the loss of their lands and livelihoods but the integration of Indigenous interests into every planning decision that impacts on land in this country.
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