deemed wise enough or to have passed sufficient stages of initiation into adulthood. If no one of appropriate relationship, age or initiatory status is able to spend years learning the particular song-cycle and ceremonies, then knowledge dies with the custodian.

This restriction on cultural information is not a disadvantage in this current study. The only Anangu knowledge that needs to be referred to is that which is shared openly and is appropriate for all non-Indigenous men, women and children to hear. This is the knowledge that people have chosen to share for the specific purpose of changing the Westerner’s understanding of Anangu culture and values. Thus, it is a body of knowledge that can be examined under the terms of the translation performance space of cross-cultural exchange, and then assessed in terms of whether or not understanding of the alternative set of values engenders deeper understanding of Aboriginal values and creates the possibility of a new congruent culture of relationship to land.

The AP Council has approved for public presentation, all Anangu philosophy, stories and cultural information that form part of this research. Great care has been taken to refer for approval all written and visual representations of Anangu knowledge in this thesis to the Anangu who participated in the research discourse.

2. Question and Answer Techniques

Anangu and many Indigenous peoples regard direct questioning as rude and an indication of not paying sufficient attention to what is being taught by story telling, dance and body language. This method is so different to the direct question and answer methods of Western education and polite exchange that often complete misinterpretation of intent and content of exchanges occurs. Thus, what happens during cross-cultural exchange and what is seen to have happened by the various observers can be divergent.
Interpreting the Cross-Cultural Performance Space

In the field of cultural tourism the authenticity of interpretation in the presentation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage is always:

- whose Laws and stories of culture?
- who tells the Laws and stories?
- who listens to these Laws and stories?

Various fields of academic inquiry, including ethnographic anthropology, are rightly the subject of post-colonial Indigenous and non-Indigenous critique. Colonial expansion was often justified in terms of ‘civilizing the natives’; concepts of what was ‘civilized’ and ‘native’ were an ethnocentric projection of the colonial power on the ‘others’. These conceptual metaphors equating difference with less value were the ‘myths’ of Empire. Academics in anthropology and sociology argued that their fields of research were as value free as objective sciences of nature. Perhaps this was another powerful reason for including Indigenous peoples as part of nature and therefore reasonable objects of the human ‘sciences’. Unfortunately, this conflation of the concepts of ‘indigenous’ and ‘natural’ did not engender respect for Indigenous peoples or wonder at their cultural achievements. Rather, along the divide rule of nature and culture, it relegated them to the lowest position on the evolutionary scale of social Darwinism that pervaded colonial scholarship. It also underlies the discounting of Indigenous knowledge as less important and less sophisticated than Western knowledge.

Respecting Indigenous Knowledge

The reality of Western cultural hegemony and arrogance is solid ground for Indigenous scholars, such as Joan Rophia of New Zealand, to seriously question the intent of my research into a possible congruence of Western and Indigenous cultures. In response to Nganyinytja’s notion that ‘two laws can become one’, Joan said, ‘It’s more about westerners believing in, and supporting, indigenous
“ownership” of being indigenous, rather than putting up an ideal about sharing both systems, which in western culture boils down to expropriation’ (Rophia, pers. comm., 8 October 1998). She questions Nganyinyija’s belief that the two Laws can come together without allowing a final colonisation of Indigenous spirituality and values by enculturation.

Stealing Indigenous cultural artefacts, knowledge, and living and dead bodies has long been profitable trade for the colonisers. This trade that has been legitimised when objects gathered by archaeologists, anthropologists and naturalists are ‘preserved’ in Western museums and their value changes to that of scientific evidence. Western academic culture is primarily acquisitive: the researcher ‘owns’ their research and they or the university ‘own’ the intellectual property. This concept is contrary to the spirit in which Anangu share knowledge. The difference between tourism and ethnography becomes blurred in the desire of both to accumulate exotic collectables to mount in glass cases on returning home from travel.

Indigenous tourism, as experienced in the context of Desert Tracks, is not immune from the Western desire to acquire. The traveller seeks tangible and intangible artefacts. The soft and fuzzy language of ‘new-age’ spiritual tourism, sharing and caring, barely disguises the desire to gain some thing from Indigenous spirituality. One tour group on such a quest were the members of the Centre for Human Transformation in the hinterlands of Melbourne. They came and shared and took. They believed that in four days they had received ‘initiation’ into the Wajampi inma and the rights to teach it in Melbourne. The response of AP Council was to threaten to close Desert Tracks, as this kind of cultural appropriation hurt many Anangu. In the end, legally protective intellectual property agreements had to become part of the permit which tourists signed before coming on the tour. When a culture of respectful sharing interfaces with a culture of acquisition of knowledge as property, there are great difficulties. This problematic will be further explored in Chapter 13, ‘Stealing the Grindstone.’
Knowledge shared with researchers is not necessarily then, open to be used in all public contexts; it does not become the intellectual property of the researcher or the institution. Indigenous traditional knowledge in this thesis remains under the joint copyright of both the Anangu and the researcher. Individuals are always accountable to the wider group of traditional owners of the story, song or dance shared. In the recording of the Ngintaka story at Kaltjiti in June 2003, a minimum of three senior men had to be included in the discussion for the information to be orally validated. They are responsible to the many traditional owners along the whole Ngintaka Songline. Film of this interview was seen and approved by Ananguku Arts and Culture Aboriginal Corporation before being included in this thesis. The story remains Anangu intellectual property (see Tjilari 2003, ‘Ngintaka discourse’, [DVD recording], Appendix 2).

How then must a researcher proceed in recording, examining and reporting research findings on Anangu philosophy and practice of caring for country? I proceed with respect and acknowledgment that some of the knowledge tradition shared is not given for critical review. Anangu themselves inform me of how I may or may not use Tjukurpa stories, dance, ceremony and knowledge of sacred places. The cross-cultural performance space, however, where this knowledge and practice interacts with that of Westerners, is open to review and Western academic critique.

Decolonising Research Methodologies

Linda Tuhiwa Smith, a Maori Indigenous scholar, has recently published an excellent analysis of ‘decolonising methodologies’ as a guideline for research by and with Indigenous people. She suggests the following questions to be asked:

Who defined the research problem?
For whom is this study worthy or relevant? Who says so?
What knowledge will the community gain from this study?
What knowledge will the researcher gain from this study?
What are the possible negative outcomes?
How can the negative outcomes be eliminated?
To whom is the researcher accountable?

(Smith 1999:173)

My research project conforms to both the methodology of the NYP Women’s Council (see Figure 8) and the culturally appropriate research models that Smith proposes:

- **Mentor model**: the researcher was mentored by Anangu elders involved in Desert Tracks and land management on AP Lands
- **Adoption model**: the researcher has been adopted as ‘daughter’ by Nganyinytja and her extended family
- **Power-sharing model**: the community has supported, directed and substantially defined the questions to be answered by the research
- **Empowering outcomes model**: the study provides a translation schema that can be used by people engaged in cross-cultural dialogue.

Figure 8: NYP Women’s Council Action Research Method (NYPWC 2000)

NYP WOMEN’S COUNCIL ACTION RESEARCH METHOD

*Maru munu piranpa tjungu nyinara wangkara kulilkatinyi* – Black and White sitting together discussing and considering over a long period of time.

**WALYTJANGKA** – relating to Anangu from a kinship position defined by them.

**MALPARARA** – always working with an Anangu friend or mentor.

**KULILKATINYI munu NYAKUKATINYI** – listening and looking over a long period of time. Not just observing, but becoming part of the community and gaining an understanding of their perspective.

**WANGKARA KULILKATINYI munu PALYALKATINYI** – to keep on discussing and reviewing what you make and design over a long period of time.
Journey along the Ngintaka Songline

I have chosen to structure my investigation as a journey, a conceptual metaphor common to both cultures that relates new ways of knowing to travelling from one place to another. This method of comparing the cultural epics of Homer’s Odyssey and the Ngintaka Tjukurpa is a conscious choice of song sagas from both the West and Indigenous ancient oral traditions that speak of the archetypal journey.

In choosing to compare sections or verses of each story I have attempted not to belittle the wealth or complexity of either tradition. I heed Marcia Langton’s warning to non-Indigenous researchers, like myself, to be respectful translators of Aboriginal song sagas:

In the same way that white people would not tamper with the structure and form of the Iliad, the Odyssey, Chaucer’s tales, or Shakespeare, Aboriginal people do not want our oral history to be tampered with. Overzealous white historians and editors have altered the structure and form of Aboriginal stories, myths and oral records to make them more comprehensible to a white audience, but have thereby made them incomprehensible to Aboriginal audiences...When the clues, the repetitions, the language, the distinctively Aboriginal evocations of our experience are removed from the recitals of our people, the truth is lost for us.


Anangu have chosen to simplify their Wati Ngintaka story to teach visitors about their country (listen to Appendix 1). While it is commonly believed that Aboriginal culture in its traditional form was handed down pure and unchanged form from generation to generation, Anangu tradition incorporated change. In this research the changes in the inma of the Ngintaka are recorded, as Anangu created new song and dance to translate the Tjukurpa for tourists. There is evidence that their song men and women have always been able to
adapt their tradition to the new. As Ellis (1985) has said, Aboriginal music is inclusive of new and adapts to social change. Ilyatjarri and Andy Tjilari, in this case, 'dreamed' new stanzas and dances for performance of the traditional Tjukurpa. They explain change as an inherent dynamic of continuous creation: the Tjukurpa is a continuous becoming.

The role of permits, restrictions on access, photography and recording of stories and information shared in the teaching at Angatja will be examined as both necessary and limiting. It is a strange anomaly that the Land Rights that Indigenous people fought so hard to obtain are now protected by permits legislated and administrated in the language of Western law. The laws are designed to protect Indigenous people, but some Anangu ask to what extent do they become walls that prevent adaptation to the modern world. Nganyinyija herself has said, 'We fought for land rights to protect our land, but not to shut people out.' (Nganyinyija, pers.comm., 1988). Fences not only keep intruders out: they restrict and fence in those inside. Perhaps there is a need for real and conceptual barriers between different cultures to be semi-permeable to allow the flow of information both ways so that it enhances the growth of healthy trans-cultural sustainable societies.

**Source Data**

ACT I is a primarily Western academic approach to the case study of Desert Tracks Indigenous tourism on Anangu Pitjantjatjara Lands. Chapters 5 and 8 analyses the literature and research studies on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Lands: its people, climate, health, land and water management. Chapters 6 and 7 analyses the literature and statistical reports on Indigenous tourism in Australia, the national and international demand and the place of Desert Tracks within the broader industry.

ACT II approaches the case study through oral literature and interviews. The main source material to be used in this research is the Anangu oral history and philosophy recorded on Desert Tracks tours, at associated meetings, and the
oral recordings gathered by myself over the last twenty-five years, since 1980, with Nganyinytja and her family. Over this time I have translated and transcribed more than fifty ninety-minute cassette recordings of interviews, meeting minutes and oral storytelling by Nganyinytja and other Anangu involved in Desert Tracks.

As the interpreter, I have collated the transcriptions and translations of Anangu interviewed on the following film and radio productions:

- Cousteau Society and National Geographic, 1989, Australia
- Continent of Dreams, 1992, ABC Science Show on Radio National, producer Lindy Woodward
- Open Hearted Country, 1992, four part series, Rising Tide Films
- Women of the Earth, 1997, Central Australian Aboriginal Media Association (CAAMA)
- Ray Mear’s World of Survival, 1997, BBC Bristol Film Productions, episode filmed at Angatja

In 1996, as part of my research into the impacts of tourism on Aboriginal communities for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and the Northern Territory Tourist Commission, I conducted many interviews with Aboriginal people running tourism enterprises on their traditional lands in Queensland, Northern Territory, South Australia and Western Australia and produced the video, Strong Business, Strong Culture, Strong Country: Managing Tourism on Aboriginal Communities. These transcribed interviews also provided data for this thesis. My prime methodology in the collection of this data was to
interview Indigenous tourist operators and guides about the issues they identified as being of key importance.

As part of my research for this thesis, I have undertaken several field trips to the AP Lands between 2002 and 2005. In June 2002 I visited Cave Hill community and with rock art conservator Kath Sale, continued a site impact-monitoring project that we had begun in 1994. This resulted in the co-production of a report to the community, Desert Tracks and AP Council on conservation and management issues entitled *Management Issues at Walinynga (Cave Hill)*. The community have been able to use this report to gain assistance in site protection from the AP Council and the tour companies using the site.

The field trip of June–July 2003 included guiding a special interest Desert Tracks tour of professional dancers from Miramu Dance Company in Canberra to Ananguku cross-cultural dance exchange. This group were willing to be filmed and were involved in interview situations as part of my research. Excerpts of this filming have been included in the DVD, *Ngura Walytja: Kinship with Country* (see Appendix 2). The Ananguku artists received copies of three films edited from this material: a traditional dance film, *Ananguku Inma*; a collaborative cross-cultural dance film, *Red Earth*; and *Ngura Walytja: Kinship with Country*. Anangu have approved all films and interviews to be used as data in this thesis.

In April 2005 I joined a team assessing the feasibility of developing the Ngintaka Heritage Trail as a tourist route through the AP Lands. As the anthropologist I was engaged in discussing the plan with Anangu to determine where the ancestral track lay, what sections would be open to the public and under what conditions. The resulting Anangu Cultural Heritage Report on the proposed Ngintaka Songline Heritage Trail was presented to AP Council on 1 June 2005. The Executive accepted the report and approved inclusion of the data I had gathered in my thesis. An abstract of this report is Appendix 9.
Data substantiating the other side of the cultural exchange was gathered from visitor responses to the Angatja cross-cultural teaching. These are gleaned from the correspondence with participants by phone, letter or email and some wrote essays, stories and poems on their experiences. The works of Western writers and artists who participated in Desert Tracks tours are also included.

**Translation of Conceptual Metaphors**

In the process of the study several critical concepts were identified that can be usefully translated into conceptual metaphors significant to both cultures. The use of metaphors from one culture to translate the concepts of the other culture elucidates understanding across the ontological and epistemological divide between the two. These five critical conceptual nodes are clusters of values, perceptions and practices that interact in the cross-cultural performance space. These nodes are: ontology, society, economy, ecology and spirituality. These five nodal clusters form the framework of my methodology when investigating the cross-cultural performance space of Desert Tracks and structures the five chapters of Act II:

1. **Kurunpa: spiritual connection to country:** the human desire to care for country and community, to welcome strangers into the home; the desire to know and understand other country and people.

2. **Ngura walytja: ecological caring for country:** experiencing the land as relative changes the perspectives and values of all humans towards their natural environment. All strangers and new settlers in country have a responsibility to relate to their adopted land and let the land adapt their way of living.

3. **Inma Way: cultural connectivity through songlines:** Anangu teach that people keep country, family and law alive by singing and dancing the songlines of Creation. Performing the *Tjukurpa* creates relationship to our
natural landscapes. Sustainable environments rely on humans' active participation in the processes of continual recreation.

4. **Ngapartji-ngapartji: economics of reciprocity with the land**: a dynamic of exchange, an active sharing of knowledge and resources between Indigenous and Western peoples. For every action there is an equal and opposite reactive; we receive to the extent and in kind, what we give to each other, the animals, plants, lands and waters of our environment. Reciprocity is a basic philosophy and practice of Anangu.

5. **Tjukurpa: ontological laws of the land**: the different ways of knowing of all peoples must be respected to allow humanity to sustain its biological and cultural diversity. We must listen with understanding; really hear each other, to develop convergent ways of knowing.

**Conclusion**

My methodology rests firmly within the self-reflective ontological and phenomenological approach of the new humanities. The researcher enters the ontological tangible and intangible frameworks of knowledge that are affecting the conscious values, perceptions and actions of those within the field of study, then emerges to reflect on their own and others' discourses and actions within the performance space. The researcher consciously recognises respects and reflects on the different perceptions and values of cultural and natural landscapes.

On this thesis journey with a group of Desert Tracks visitors, the Anangu and Western perceptions and values that influence the practices of cultural and natural land management will become clear on the surface of their country. Anangu say, ‘Inmanguru tjina uti ngarinyi: through telling Tjukurpa story, singing and dancing the songline, the tracks of the ancestors become clear on the surface of the land’. Through telling the modern tourism story of Desert Tracks, tracking the hosts and guests engagement in the complex performance space a useful cross-cultural translation schema will emerge.
ACT I

THE WESTERN PERFORMANCE SPACE: History and Current Conditions of Eco-tourism on Anangu Lands

Prologue: How We Travel in Country.

Act I is structured according to the Western knowledge tradition. In the first chapter the history of Anangu on the AP Lands and their involvement in tourism is examined. The next two chapters discuss the national and international context and demand for Indigenous tourism that stimulated the development of Desert Tracks tours. The final chapter of this Act in the Western performance space examines the cultural natural resource management principles and practice of Desert Tracks tours in light of national and international eco-cultural tourism ethics and best practice standards.

Poem 3: ‘Belonging to Country’ by Diana James 2002

BELONGING TO COUNTRY

What country maps our skin,  
our journeys like scribbles on bark  
worm their way across  
tracks on our heart.

Land of my birth  
sounds and smells of my beginning  
symbols of the lizard skin  
tattooed on my speechless brain.

Born on the ground  
beside a fire  
suckled on a warm breast  
held by the earth.

Born on a white sheet  
washed in water  
held by the feet and slapped  
placed in a cot.

What cords tie us  
same and different  
to this land,  
and to each other.
Chapter 5

ANANGU COUNTRY, PEOPLE AND PLACE

Anangu say they have lived in these lands of Central Australia since the beginning of time. Their oral history, maintained in the songs, stories and dances of *Tjukurpa*, the Dreaming Law, tells of the creation of every rock, tree, hill, waterhole, animal and plant of these lands.

Australia is an ancient land; in Central Australia parts of the Finke River have followed the same course for at least 65 million years (Unmark 2003, website). ‘Significant stream flow in parts of Central Australia ceased around 15 million years ago (Van De Graaff et al. 1977) marking the time that aridity first began in Central Australia’ (Unmark 2003, website). Today seventy percent of the continent is considered semi-arid to arid desert. In the center of Australia average daily summer temperatures are 37-39 °C while winter ranges between 16-24 °C and night time average is -2-3 °C and often drops to a freezing -8 °C. The average annual rainfall of Central Australia varies from 10-25 cm and is very irregular, with high annual evaporation rates from 250-450 cm (ibid). Low rainfall, often in heavy localized storms causing flooding, is the norm in this country with regular, long, severe droughts. This is a region where the indigenous plants, animals and people are highly adapted to living with little water and conserving whatever they have. Exactly when Anangu first arrived in these lands is not known; archeological digs keep discovering evidence of earlier and earlier habitation of this inhospitably dry land.

Various researchers have proposed differing dates for the earliest Indigenous habitation of Central Australia. Robert Layton refers to the work of Gould in the James Range, 80 km east of Alice Springs, which produced material more than 10,000 years old. On this evidence Layton estimates ‘Aboriginal people probably lived around Uluru for over 10,000 years’ (Layton 1986:17). Archaeologist Josephine Flood (1983:33) has found evidence of habitation of the
central deserts 30,000 years ago. The most significant recent discovery of possibly the earliest human habitation of the central desert was made by Mike Walsh at Puritjara, in the Cleland Hills, a significant site of the Luritja people. Walsh says, 'The archaeology shows that people began using the overhang as an itinerant campsite 35,000 years ago, about the same time as modern humans were moving into Western Europe' (Walsh 2005:22).

I use the 35,000-year evidence found at the Cleland Hills as the probable date of the earliest Anangu peoples in the central deserts of Australia. My reasoning is based on the sociological and linguistic connections between the Luritja people and the Ngaanyatjarra, Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytatjara people (see language distribution map Appendix11). Trade routes, ceremony and initiation routes have connected these regions for a long time. Today there is constant movement between these people as they gather annually for ceremonies, football and inter-marriage. Anangu senior Lawman, Andy Tjilari, told me that these movements are based on traditional ceremonial and trade routes. Tjilari said the mulu, 'red kangaroo' Tjukurpa recounts the travels of this ancestor from Mt Davies, near the tri-state border, east across Pitjantjatjara country and south through Yakunytjatjara lands then north-west through the Luritja lands to Papunya and Yuendumu. This ancestor gave each group its different language as he travelled and instituted the ceremonies for initiation of boys into men (Tjilari, pers. comm., 1975). This is just one of the traditional songlines that link the peoples and their country along the route and they continue to perform these ceremonies with vigour and purpose, affirming the close interconnection of Western Desert peoples of this region and their Law.

Whatever the exact Western chronological date of the first Anangu in Central Australia is found to be, it is many thousands of years ago, well before the birth of the Indo-European civilizations in the well-watered valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. The birthplace of these two cultural traditions is vastly different. Anangu have evolved with the dry lands of Central Australia, managing to live and thrive in these lands because they followed the available
water and were careful to share it with the plants and animals essential for their survival. These arid lands never hosted the stock and grains of pastoralists and agriculturalists until the advent of the white-skinned travellers from distant lands on their camels and horses in the early 1860s. They were quickly followed by settlers with sheep and cattle which thirstily drank up the ephemeral waters and destroyed native grasses with their hard hooves; the settlers also introduced feral species of plants that often dominated native species.

Since then, the nomad and the settler have tried to relate to each other and this land through their different languages, differing knowledge of wet and dry, different conceptions of time and different laws governing relationships to land, water and native flora and fauna. The settler of shallow time drew linear fence-lines in the sand and bored into the substrata to extract the ancient waters for a culture that depends on high consumption of natural resources, while the nomads of deep time still move with the cycles of long droughts and flooding rains, travelling their country, performing their law and ceremonies. However, they can no longer be sustained by their traditional sources of food and water as these have been depleted by the impact of settler culture resource use.

The lands travelled on the cross-cultural tours of Desert Tracks are these Anangu lands of Central Australia. This region includes the lower part of the Northern Territory south-west of Alice Springs, the Indigenous lands of Western Australia to Warburton and the north-west corner of South Australia north of Marla Bore (see Figure 10). This was the traditional land of the Anangu who speak related dialects of the Western Desert language family (Walsh & Yallop 1993:1). Anangu do not distinguish dialects from languages. All are called tjaap which means speech or language; they recognise the commonality of their languages, saying ‘Ka nganana, anangu uwaanka, tjaa tjungu: Now we, all the Aboriginal people, are united (in) language’ (Goddard 1992:141). I will follow their convention in this thesis and refer to the languages of this region that include Yankunytjatjara, Pitjantjatjara, Ngaatjatjarra, Ngaanyatjarra, and Luritja. Indigenous people within the region are often fluent in all these
languages, which is an advantage to a researcher like myself who can speak only Pitjantjatjara fluently but can understand and be understood by most speakers of the other languages. Across the region some words have become part of a lingua franca both inter-culturally and cross-culturally. The term Anangu, meaning 'people', has come to refer to all Indigenous people of the region. While most use walypala for whitefella, Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara also use the term pirampa.

Pitjantjatjara Council

Pirampa or whitefella law divided up the traditional Anangu lands under three state laws but eventually recognised the traditional cultural connectivity of the region in administration of native welfare and federal government programs. In 1975 these Indigenous lands covering parts of the three states were recognised as one interrelated region by the Federal Department of Aboriginal Affairs and administered as the Central Region from an office in Alice Springs. Under the government policy of self-determination the Pitjantjatjara Council took over administration of these lands in 1976 when Ngaanyatjarra, Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara people formed the Pitjantjatjara Council. At a meeting at Amata in July 1976 it was agreed that membership of this regional council was available to all Anangu. The use of the name 'Pitjantjatjara' was problematic but as no other could be agreed upon it was used to represent the Ngaanyatjarra, Ngaatjatjarra, Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara people.

Land and land rights have always been central to the activities of the Pitjantjatjara Council. They recognised the region as Anangu land irrespective of state borders and the first demand was ‘that the Pitjantjatjara claim all the lands from Indulkana to Docker River’ (Vachon & Toyne 1984:39). However, this demand proved not achievable under different state legislations so the Council’s efforts were directed towards South Australian legislation. Negotiations resulted in the handing over of the Pitjantjatjara Freehold Title Lands under the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act to its traditional owners, Anangu Pitjantjatjara, in 1981.
In relation to Uluru, the Pitjantjatjara Council represented its Yankunytjatjara members' rights to that land. The Council was granted leave by the Land Commissioner to appear, through its lawyer, at the Ayers Rock Land Claim and the Council Chairman gave evidence about the Council’s attitude to and support for the claim. The Council was involved as a political body in negotiations leading to the handing back of Uluru in 1985. The Council’s anthropologists continued to be involved in the joint-management plan for the National Park, researching and representing both men and women’s interests in protecting their sacred sites at Uluru by closing them to public access.

This brief overview of the history of political and administrative control of Anangu lands provides a context in which Nganyinytja and her extended family conduct tourism at Angatja (see location in Figure 9) in the Anangu Pitjantjatjara (AP) Lands. Their tours begin at either Alice Springs or Uluru, and include the Anangu lands of Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park, the lands of the Northern Territory under Central Land Council control from Uluru to the border of South Australia, and the AP Lands. Running a tourism business over this region requires complex negotiations and permits from three administrative bodies: the Uluru National Park, the Central Land Council and the AP Council, as well as the individual communities on the lands through which the tour buses pass to get to Angatja, Cave Hill, Ernabella or Fregon.

**Anangu Pitjantjatjara Title to Land**

Physically, Anangu Pitjantjatjara Lands can be described in terms of the area marked out on Western maps (see Figure 1b). The official website of AP Council describes it thus: ‘Anangu Pitjantjatjara is incorporated by the 1981 Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act whereby the SA Parliament gave Aboriginal people title to more than 103,000 square kilometres of arid land in the far northwest of South Australia. All Pitjantjatjara, Yankunytjatjara and Ngaanyatjarra people who are traditional owners of any part of the Lands are members of Anangu Pitjantjatjara. Communities on the Lands include: Amata, Fregon, Indulkana, Mimili, Pipalyatjara, and Pukatja (Ernabella). The administrative centre of the Lands is Umuwa, near Pukatja’ (AP Council, website). These lands are some of
those owned in common by some 3,000 Anangu whose traditional land titles have been recognized by succeeding generations for thousands of years and who maintain rights and responsibilities towards this land to the present day.

Despite the presence of ex-government or mission settlements in which most people live, Anangu still move around this country constantly. Today, as they have done traditionally, they move to visit their lands and religious sites for ceremonies, to visit relatives and to attend political and sporting meetings. Traditionally, nomadic patterns were regulated by hunting and ceremonial obligations within their own estates and those of neighbouring clans. The term ‘clan’ refers to extended family groups who live together and hold rights to an area which Stanner called an ‘estate’ (Stanner 1965:2). These estates are usually referred to by naming the major permanent water source, a rockhole, spring or soak. Estates usually contain several water sources that people travel between when hunting and gathering. The hunting area is typically a larger region, which Stanner called a ‘range’, and this overlaps the range of other clans. Rights to enter another clan’s estate to hunt and forage are negotiated and payment in kind given to the owners. The traditional laws regarding the right to hunt or visit sacred sites within estates are still enforced by individuals having the right to exclude others from their estates.

Anangu do not consider estates to have precise boundaries. This flexibility would appear to be essential for survival in these semi-arid lands where rainfall variability results in regular droughts and shifting patterns of vegetation and animal migration. Layton argues that these climatic conditions necessitate a flexible boundary approach to land ownership around Uluru and my research confirms a similar pattern is common on the AP Lands (Layton 1986:39-49). One of my teachers, Peter Nyaningu, explained the Anangu concept of ngura kaputu as a cluster of important places in country towards which closely related individuals and groups of people have rights and responsibilities. Nyaningu explains that ‘traditional owner’ is a whitefella term that does not convey the Anangu concept of walytjara walytjara, ‘caring for country in family groups’.
In accordance with Nyanigu's description of land ownership and management, I use the term *ngura walytja* to describe areas people refer to as *ngayuku ngura*, 'my country'. Anangu on the AP Lands did not make a distinction between an estate and a range as Stanner defined them. Rather they talk of country for which they can speak; their rights and responsibilities include being consulted regarding any land use in this region. They spoke of their responsibilities to tracts of country and sacred sites, specifically those of their mothers', fathers' and grandparents' countries and the place of their birth.

Nyaningu explained that each *ngura walytja* extends over an area of *kuka* rights, hunting rights that are recognized by their neighbours. Within that *ngura walytja* there are sacred sites towards which they and others from outside their country have rights and responsibilities. Access to these sites cannot be granted solely by the family resident in that country; other senior custodians must be consulted. These may be descendants of that totemic ancestor or holders of ritual objects associated with ceremonies for that site. Association with a site can be acquired through being born at that site, the umbilical cord being cut there, through the fathers, mothers and grandparents of either, through having close relations on either side or by being given custodianship when other closer relatives who held that law die.

Some senior men and women of the Law have become custodians of large areas of country through knowledge of the song, ceremony and sites of that region. Andy Tjilari and Dickie Minyintirri are two such men who are regarded by others as having knowledge of, and rights to speak for, large tracts of land; their relationship to the Ngintaka Songline will be discussed in greater depth later. This extensive knowledge appears to be restricted to a few elders today, as the impact of colonization since the 1940s has meant that less traditional knowledge is able to be passed on to younger generations who are engaged in Western schooling and work. Though male initiation ceremonies are still vital and extensive, often involving up to a thousand men, women and children (Linda
Rive, pers. comm., 2004), the three-year initiation into law and land is now reduced to three months.

Women’s ceremonial life is still strong but is also reduced by the demands of community living and irregular visits to country. Major ceremonies for totemic ancestors are performed in annual cycles if sufficient numbers of the appropriate men and women can gather at specific sites to perform the ceremonies, which take several days. Ceremonial life must now fit in between a wide range of commitments including; community work obligations, regional and local council meetings, government agency meetings, funerals, football matches, and interstate travel for meetings, conferences and art or dance exhibitions. Anangu on the AP Lands are currently negotiating over twenty new projects with members of the South Australian Government Task Force (Rainow [Nganampa Health], pers. comm., 12 April 2005; see also Rainow 2004:1). Regional administration and meetings take up a large part of people’s lives today. A new nomadic pattern has arisen following the money flow of state and federal government funding priorities according to the political climate, rather than following the water flow determined by the physical climate as in traditional times.

**Ngura Walytja – Homelands Movement**

The homelands movement developed on the AP Lands during the late 1970s and 1980s after the Whitlam Federal Government made a policy decision in 1973 to assist groups who wanted to move out of major settlement back to their traditional country. People had been continually travelling back to country every year since the Ernabella Mission was established in 1937. The 3–4 months over summer were the time for annual pilgrimages on donkey, camel or foot to *ngura walytja*, ‘country of my spirit’ (see Downing, 1988). This annual trip was supported by the mission staff who often accompanied people for some of the time, or visited by truck, exchanging food, blankets and medicines for dingo scalps (Nganyinytja, pers.comm., 1980-2000).
After 1973 it became possible to apply to the government for a bore, a windmill and a tank so that families could camp more permanently in their country. In 1980, Nganyinytja and her family moved out of Amata to her homeland about 100 km west and set up a camp near the Angatja creek in the Mann Ranges. They returned to a semi-traditional lifestyle, living off the land with some basic store-food and only a couple of forty-four gallon drums of water to supplement traditional waterhole supply. Water in this environment is the number one priority for living in one place for any length of time. Evidence of continued residence at the homeland was necessary for obtaining government assistance for the highly prized bore, tank and windmill that would enable permanent residence (Nganyinytja, pers. comm., 1980-2000; see also Downing 1988).

**Figure 9:** Map of Angatja and Murputja Homelands (SG 52-11Mann, 1cm to 2.5km scale)

During the early 1980s Nganyinytja and Ilyatjari operated a rehabilitation camp for juvenile petrol sniffers at Angatja. They transported the youth away from the troubled community of Amata where alcohol abuse and gambling had weakened parental care and control. The young people were dried out, fed
well, and once strong enough were taken out hunting and gathering, learning the traditional skills of living off the land, reconnecting with the spirit in their land and in themselves. The program was partially successful with some youth successfully rehabilitated but the sustained support of the Amata community and government assistance was not forthcoming so they had to close the operation. However, the teaching model of camping out in country and learning about the cultural and natural landscapes of Nganyinytja’s traditional country around Angatja was adapted to teaching interested piranpa, whitefellas (Nganyinytja, pers. comm., 1980-2000).

**Why Tourism?**

Nganyinytja said:

> I had this idea. Lots of other people were always asking us about our culture. So I started these tours to teach people about our way of life. That is how it began.

(James 1996:20)

In 1987 the first two tour groups came into the Pitjantjatjara Lands with the Australian Conservation Foundation. These were so successful that Nganyinytja and Ilyatjari decided to regularly offer tours, they invited non-Indigenous partners Greg Snowdon and Diana James to go into business with them starting Desert Tracks tours in 1988.

The development of Desert Tracks tourism on AP Lands grew from this decision of Nganyinytja’s extended family. Angatja was the birthplace of tourism on AP Lands in 1988 and it was not until 1991 that another homeland family clan at Cave Hill asked to be included in the business. Stanley Douglas approached a co-management meeting of Desert Tracks and said he had watched the tourism business for a while and learnt from his aunty, Nganyinytja, how to work with tourists and wanted tours to come to Walinynga (Douglas, pers.comm.,1991).

The anthropological clearance and permission of the AP Council took three years to obtain so it was 1994 before the first Desert Tracks tours included Cave
Hill, or Walinynga as the cave site is called. Cave Hill, situated 20 km east of Amata, is the site of a magnificent rock art gallery that had been the focus of possible tourism plans since 1971 when the curator of Anthropology at the South Australian Museum, Robert Edwards, recommended that it be protected under the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act 1965 (see Appendix 7). Despite a detailed proposal by Edwards in 1975 that an air-conditioned museum of desert culture be developed at Cave Hill (Edwards 1975:141-146) there was no tourism to the site until Anangu approved anthropological clearance of the site for visitors in late1993.

**Figure 10:** The Anangu Pitjantjatjara Lands of Central Australia (D James, 2003).

---

**Angatja**

Angatja is a small homeland nestled in a beautiful valley at the eastern end of the Mann Ranges just below the Northern Territory border (see Figure 9). This is Nganyinytja’s country, the country of her father, very near to where she was born at the Piltarti rockhole about 15 km west of Angatja. She grew up in this country and walked it barefoot with her parents, aunts and uncles and blind
grandmother until she was aged about eleven years old. Her father traded dingo scalps for whiteman's goods, walking the long distance from Angatja to Ernabella, about 400 km return journey, with a flour bag of mixed contents on his head. Nganyinytja and her mother winnowed out the flour, tea and sugar into separate useable items on his return (Nganyinytja, pers. comm., 1980-2000).

When her father's brother moved to the new mission at Ernabella to escape the droughts of the late 1930s, Nganyinytja and her family stayed in their country for as long as they could, then they also moved to Ernabella in 1940. Nganyinytja has remained closely associated with her country all her life, travelling back there every summer for several months, and finally moving back to live there permanently in 1980. Her extended family includes Sandy Mutju, born near Angatja at Tjanmatapiti; he is also a senior traditional owner of the clan estate. He and his wife, Tjulkiwa, were core members of the Desert Tracks team, both being exceptional hunters and holders of Tjukurpa Law, the song, dance and stories of the tjala, 'honey ant', ili, 'wild fig', ngintaka, 'perentie lizard' and Kungkarangkalpa, 'Seven Sisters Dreaming'. Nganyinytja's husband, Ilyatjari, comes from country west of Angatja near Wingellina. His totemic ancestor is papa 'the dingo'. He has moved to his wife's country, which is not uncommon, and taken custodial responsibility for the country and performance of its Tjukurpa, particularly the Ngintaka and Wanampi, 'water serpent', Dreaming (ibid). Together this clan worked hard to keep their traditional knowledge alive through the modern business of eco-tourism at Angatja.

While Sandy Mutju and Tjulkiwa lived at Umpukulu, a homeland 10 km away, they were always present at Angatja for the tourists. Residents at any time varied between two and twenty, including children, and there were houses for five families. During the developmental years of Desert Tracks (1988–2000), it was a community alive with several enterprises. Ilyatjari and his sons, Sammy and Johnathon, herded wild camels, tamed them and sold them in Alice Springs; they also had a small 'killer' herd of cattle and several fine brumbies used intermittently as workhorses. Sammy's first wife was an artist and one shed was used to store her works and carved artefacts for sale to tourists. The
school bus, from the Murputja regional homelands school, collected the children every day and sometimes the whole school visited Angatja for a day with the tourists. There was no store; the nearest is at Kanypi, about an hour’s drive away on dirt roads. At a nearer homeland, Nyapari, there is a nurse and airstrip for the mail plane or aero-medical assistance. Angatja is located close to these amenities but sufficiently isolated to be removed from the constant through traffic created by stores, schools, offices and airstrips. The population has declined since Ilyatjari died and Nganyinyija left in 2001. Now the management of the tours has passed on to Nganyinyija’s daughter, Leah, and her husband, Lee Brady, with Nganyinyija’s son Sammy Lyons and his family.

Anangu Kinship Cycle

Lee Brady is the son of a man who was born near Amata but taken away because he was ‘half-caste’, a member of the stolen generation. He grew up in Port Augusta and married an Aboriginal woman of the northern Flinders Ranges. He brought his family of sons back to Amata when they were youths who had to learn the language of Pitjantjatjara and go through Anangu traditional law and initiations late in life. It was a struggle for them to be accepted and gain the respect of the elders, but Lee worked hard and has gone through the Law.

He is now a caretaker for his wife’s country at Angatja and has become the main interpreter for Desert Tracks tours. Lee’s experience of learning traditional culture as a young man has put him in an excellent position to interpret it to outsiders and visitors. He and I designed a diagram to explain simply the generational cycle of Anangu people to visitors. One visitor commented:

Lee with the aid of the Pitjantjatjara Kinship Web taught me about kinship relationships and the way people are connected within aboriginal society. The four generation system and how things come back to the source. There was much to learn. He also emphasised the idea of collective responsibility for the raising of children. For example, a son is expected to refer to their father’s brothers as
'father'. Hence a boy will have several fathers. I think this has great value, as it is so important for a growing boy to have mentors.

(Potter, 2000:4)

It is a system of two moieties, each composed of alternate generations, so the parents and children are in separate moieties, the grandparents and grandchildren in the same moiety. The two moieties are called tjintulu sun or north side and wiltjalyuru shade or south side (Nganyintja, Ilayjarri and Tjilari, pers.com., 1998). Every fourth generation the cycle returns to the beginning; the great grandfather/mother becomes the son/daughter of his/her great grandson/daughter. A symbolic representation of this cycle was devised with Lee Brady to explain the generational cycle to tourists (see Figure 11).

Figure 11: Pitjantjatjara Kinship Cycle: Two Moieties, Four Generational Cycle (D James and L Brady 1998)
Kinship Relationships Working for Business

The non-Indigenous managers, guides and interpreters who worked on Desert Tracks in the first six years of operation from 1988 to 1994 had all previously worked with Anangu on the AP Lands and were related to the Angatja family through the kinship structure as brothers and sisters, daughters and sons. The interpreters were initially all non-Indigenous people fluent in Pitjantjatjara and with many years of experience on the AP Lands. From 1997 onwards, Anangu fluent in English became the main the interpreters as personal confidence increased in answering the constant questions of tourists (see Figure 12).

Since 2001, with Odyssey Safaris operating a daily tour into Cave Hill, many new guides have become involved in the tourism performance space. Odyssey Safaris have attempted to use a limited number of their guides trained specifically to understand the Walinynga story and site, but due to the turnover of their guides specialised knowledge and experience of this site and Anangu protocols and language is limited. The daily pressure of tours has increased the numbers of Anangu guides involved, often these are less knowledgeable than the elder experienced guides and not aware of tourist protocols. The result has been a decline in the interpretative interface between tourists and guides at the site (James & Sale 2004:25).

Desert Tracks management has undergone several changes since early 2004 when the Anangu Board engaged Discovery Ecotours as contract managers. Initially the marketing manager, Martin Darcey, of Discovery Ecotours took over managing Desert Tracks. Operating out of the Canberra office proved too distant from the on-ground operations; relationships with Anangu directors, guides and the AP Council who administer permits could not be developed. Anangu business is best conducted face-to-face and then trust and relationship can be established. Therefore it was decided in 2005 that Brett Graham at Yulara would take over management. This has proved more satisfactory to all parties. A close relationship between Anangu and management is essential even if kinship is not initially extended to new staff.
**DEsert Tracks Organisational Structure**

**Joint-Venture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Anangu Partners</th>
<th>Non-Indigenous Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**1991–1994**
- **Manager**: Diana James
- **Interpreters**: Diana James, Linda Andy Tjilari, Rive, Ushma Scales.

**Anangu Owned Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Board of Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Manager**: Diana James

**Tour Operations**: Linda Rive, Terry Patroni, Jim Montgomery, Hussein Burra.

**Interpreters**: Linda Rive, Diana James, Ushma Scales

**Guides**: Anangu from Angatja, Umpukulu, Kanypi, Nyapari, Cave Hill, Amata (6–12 depending on tour group size).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Manager: Jim Montgomery Sub-Contract Cave Hill Tours: Odyssey Safaris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Board of Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Management Contract: Discovery Ecotours**
- **Martin Darcey**
- **Brett Graham**

**2005–**
- **Sub-Contract Cave Hill Tours: Odyssey Safaris**

**Interpreters**: Lee Brady, Stanley Douglas.

**Guides**: Leah Brady, Sammy Lyons, Rennie Lyons, Barney Wangin, and Stanley, Ronnie and Dixon Douglas.
Angatja Tours

Angatja is scenically very attractive to tourists, situated in the curve of a very pretty valley at the eastern end of the Mann Ranges. It is named after the large rockhole in the headwaters of a creek that winds its way down from the hills through a rocky narrow bed until it emerges onto the valley floor and widens into a usually dry sandy creekbed. This was chosen as the site of the first summer camps as it provides beautiful cool sites shaded by large river red gums. This location took advantage of the summer breezes and was within walking distance of the waterhole, and nearby was the community with showers and toilets.

Figure 13: Ilyatjari and Nganyinytja (Photos: Skipsey 1994)

Figure 14: View over Angatja (Photo: Murty 1988)
The winter camp, Atal, was about 5 km away from the homeland community sited in a grove of mulga trees on the northeast side of the eastern most edge of the Mann Ranges. The summer campsite was only used regularly for a few years from 1988 to 1990, and then intermittently for Inma Festivals of dance and song, which attracted crowds of several hundred. While the mulga winter campsite became the base camp for all Desert Tracks tours. The development of this site, Atal (see Figure 26), into a permanent ecologically and culturally appropriate tour camp with amenities is discussed in detail in Chapter 8.

Figure 15: Angatja Ngintaka Trail (Mann ED2-2000, scale:1mm=127m)

The tours to Angatja gradually increased from one a month from March to November to often two a month in the cooler months from May to September. These regular tour groups attracted large numbers of Anangu interested in seeing how tourism to their lands was working. Some came to join in the Inma Festivals, others because they were related to the Angatja families and lands, some as senior custodians of particular sacred sites in the estate and other who were related to the major Dreamings being taught: the Ngintaka lizard and
Wanampi rainbow serpent. As was to be expected the senior Anangu men and women from the surrounding homelands of Kanypi, Nyapari and Umpukulu in the Mann Ranges, became involved in the tours out of interest and concern that that tourists behaved appropriately on their lands.

However, soon others from more distant communities were taking an interest in the tours. Ngurarritja, ‘custodians and owners’, of the Ngintaka Tjukurpa from as far southeast as Wallatina, Mimili, Fregon and Ernabella came to Angatja and some from the Western Australian border lands and Arannga in the Northern Territory. These traditional owners and custodians of the Ngintaka Songline gave permission for the Angatja section to be open to the public, only a couple of sites were restricted (see Ngintaka Trail Map, Figure 15).

In 1994 Peter Nyaningu’s homeland of Ngarutjara, Mt Woodroffe, (see location on Figure 10) was opened to public visitors and Desert Tracks included this as a two day tour. Ngarutjara is the site on the Ngintaka songline and so gradually Desert Tracks was opening up new tours along this ancestral trail. It was not until 1998 that a joint meeting of the Directors of Desert Tracks and AP Executive Council decided to investigate opening the whole trail from Wallatinna to Arannga to public visitation (see Appendix 4). Funding for the feasibility study for this was provided by DITR in 2004 and the first stage of the study was carried out in April 2005 (see Appendices 9 and 10).

Nganyinytja advised Anangu at other homelands who were interested in tourism: ‘Plan what you will do with people; how you will look after them… you need to plan your time with tourists. It’s a lot of work, people need to understand this’ (James 1996:22).
Cave Hill Tours

Stanley Douglas, of the Cave Hill community, was one of the first to approach Desert Tracks in 1991 and ask to become part of the business. He wanted to start tours to the rock art shelter of Walinynga at Cave Hill. It was not until 1993 that the anthropological clearance was completed and approval for limited tourism given by the AP Council. All of the stakeholders, traditional owners, AP and Desert Tracks, were concerned that this magnificent rock art site be protected and tourism be strictly limited to ensure Anangu control of their cultural and natural heritage.

Walinynga, located 20 km east of Amata, is one of the best-preserved sites of ancient and recent rock art in Central Australia. It is also one of the few that are open to public access on tours, guided and interpreted by Aboriginal traditional owners and custodians. Unlike Arnhem Land, where there are many extensive rock art shelters, the desert regions of Central Australia contain fewer sites of rock art and these are often in remote regions not accessible to the public. The rock art in the main shelter at Walinynga has been painted and repainted for thousands of years.
Walinynga is a major site on the *Kungkarangkalpa* 'Seven Sisters Dreaming', which is an extensive Dreaming journey of Creation Ancestors right across Australia, from the east coast south of Brisbane to Roebourne in Western Australia, then back across Central Australia past Uluru and Mt Connor to Walinynga. Here the Yankunytjatjara and Pitjantjatjara people take care of the songline, story and sacred sites associated with the Dreaming as the Seven Sisters journeyed south through the Flinders Ranges to the southern coast of
Australia before turning back up to Kalgoorlie in Western Australia. This is the journey trail of *Kungkarangkalpa*, the Seven Sisters, painted symbolically across the map of Australia by Pitjantjatjara artist, Josephine Mick (Figure 1a). This Dreaming songline is of National Heritage importance, as it traverses Australia and highlights the pre-contact cultural links of Aboriginal peoples across the continent.

Walinynga rock art depicts this epic journey of the Seven Sisters Songline and the Anangu custodians know the story, song and law of this Dreaming, which they interpret to visitors as a gift of living cultural heritage. The landscape at Walinynga was shaped in the Dreaming by the Creation Ancestors, the Seven Sisters, who created the main waterhole, built a curved *yuu*, ‘wind shelter’ that can be seen in a distinctive rock formation on the western side near the large open campsite scattered with stone artefacts, then they moved around the hill away from strong winds to build a *wiltja* that has become the cave sheltering the rock art today. This is a living cultural landscape that visitors can experience through Anangu eyes when guided by the traditional owners.

Anangu, through Desert Tracks, host regular groups of tourists at this site. Desert Tracks, in 2001 under the new management of Jim Montgomery, established a joint venture agreement with Odyssey Safaris of Ayers Rock Resort to operate day tours to Cave Hill. These small groups stay an average of 3-4 hours at the site visiting the cave rock art gallery, walking to the top of the rock dome and the artefact chipping site on the western sand dunes. These commenced in 2001 with a reported 800 visitors (Montgomery, pers. comm., April 2005) to the site in small groups, with a minimum of two and maximum of six passengers per group. Initially, Odyssey Safari guides were trained by Jim Montgomery to adhere to Desert Tracks environmental and cultural codes of conduct. Under the contract, the interpretation of the site is by Anangu guides from the Cave Hill community. There is a provision however that if no Anangu guides are present the tour will proceed anyway. This is bad for their tourism business and for Anangu control of interpretation of the site.
Desert Tracks tours, now managed by Discovery Ecotours, visit the site for longer periods. In 2003 they advertised a 2–4 day tour of Seven Sisters and Ngintaka Dreaming. In 2005 the tour format has changed to a two-day ‘Cave Hill/Seven Sisters Dreaming’ at Walinynga (see Desert Tracks website).

**Cultural Heritage Interpretation**

Interpretation of these Anangu cultural landscapes at both Angatja and Walinynga relies heavily on the presence of skilled Aboriginal guides who can speak English. The problem is that often the elders who know most about the cultural heritage do not speak fluent English and the non-Indigenous tour guides employed now by Odyssey Safaris and Discovery Eco-Tours do not speak Pitjantjatjara. Thus there are potential translation problems. Instances of misinterpretation and dissatisfaction of both customers and Anangu guides was noted during my field research visits to both sites from 2002 to 2005:

Visitor comments at Walinynga, 2003:

‘We couldn’t understand the Anangu story.’

Guide, Dickie Minyintirri:

‘They didn’t listen properly, tours are too quick’

(pers. comms., 2003).

More appropriate interpretive material and signage in Pitjantjatjara and English may need to be provided for tourists; cultural protocols, the story of the Ngintaka and the Seven Sisters, maps of the cultural landscape and information regarding the natural environment would improve cross-cultural understanding. The Desert Tracks information booklet that used to be sent to all tour participants may need to be reinstituted and updated along lines similar to those designed with Anangu of the Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park.

**Governance Issues of Tourism on Anangu Lands**

Protection of the natural and cultural heritage values of Anangu landscapes open to tourists is a complex governance issue. The major stakeholders in the
Desert Tracks communities of Angatja and Cave Hill are the Anangu traditional owners, the AP Council, which holds the freehold land title, Desert Tracks Aboriginal Tour Company, Odyssey Safaris, Discovery Ecotours and the tourists who come wanting a genuine experience of Aboriginal culture. It is in all their interests that the heritage values of the sites are protected.

The cultural and natural heritage conservation plans of management already developed for the sites include the protection of vegetation cover of fragile sand dunes, erosion due to vehicular and foot traffic, wood fuel and local water use, the rock art, artefact chipping sites, road access and the sacred trees and rock formations associated with the Anangu Tjukurpa. As the frequency and numbers of tourists increase, management and amenities need to be upgraded to prevent increased road and camping erosion and dust, to provide adequate shade shelters, fly-free food preparation areas, clean drinking water and environmentally and aesthetically acceptable toilets at all sites. The infrastructure at both locations is inadequate for increased numbers of tourists.

However, the issue of who is responsible for developing appropriate tourism and conservation measures and infrastructure is problematic. Anangu Pitjantjatjara owns any permanent structures on AP Lands; therefore, private companies are reluctant to build any amenity structures on AP Lands. AP Council is unlikely to build tourist amenities or conservation infrastructure unless it receives sufficient revenue from the tours, currently only a permit fee. Desert Tracks is a small business with limited capacity to construct the necessary conservation and tourism infrastructure. The significance of the Walinynga site to the National Heritage of all Australians makes it imperative that solutions are found to these dilemmas of multi-stakeholder interest on AP Freehold Title Lands. Any plan to protect the natural and cultural heritage of the site must involve all stakeholders. Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park and Walinynga are contiguous regions under Anangu traditional law and therefore compatible natural and cultural heritage management planning is appropriate.
Conclusion

Cultural tourism is presented by government agencies and the tourism industry as a potential growth industry on Indigenous Lands in Australia. The practical development of tourism on these remote traditional Indigenous communities and the often fragile ecosystems of these regions pose a significant challenge to development (see Chapter 8). On the one hand is people's desire for economically sustainable development; on the other hand is their desire to sustain the cultural and natural resources of their homelands. Regionally, on the Pitjantjatjara Lands tourism to one homeland impacts on the shared cultural, economic, social and environmental landscape of several thousand Yankunytjatjara, Pitjantjatjara and Ngaanyatjarra people.

The traditional owners who have the right to refuse or invite tourists into specific regions on AP Lands are not individuals; they are groups. One man or woman cannot sign on behalf of their family or their clan. Anangu prefer to meet and talk together, seeking consensus among themselves, before being asked to agree to any development in their country. The proposed Ngintaka Songline Heritage Trail extends right across AP Lands involving many family clan estates and significant sites along a totemic ancestor track under the governance of many Anangu. This involves tangible and intangible cultural heritage that has to be discussed with each family clan in their country and with elders of that totemic ancestor; a consensus then has to be reached at regional level before AP Council approval can be given to any development on that route. On the AP Lands, approval on cultural terms must precede approval for any economic and conservation proposal. On Anangu Land cultural, natural, economic and social life is all sustained and governed by Tjukurpa, the Law (James 2005:8; see Appendix 9 & 10).
Chapter 6

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS TOURISM

Introduction
This chapter examines the national and international tourism issues for Indigenous Tourism, asks why Indigenous Australians are engaging in tourism and reviews the impacts of this industry on the cultural and ecological environments of Indigenous lands. Indigenous tourism is classed by the industry as special interest tourism that provides experience of traditional and contemporary Indigenous cultural and natural environments. Indigenous people’s involvement in tourism in Australia has developed in response to market demand, from the trading of artefacts on the fringes of society to the world market for Aboriginal art, music and dance.

Indigenous culture is a unique point of difference of the Australian experience that has long been used to promote Australia internationally. The Australian Government has, for many years, promoted Indigenous tourism as a viable economic option for many remote Indigenous population centres devoid of any other industry. The sustainability of Indigenous cultural tourism will depend on market demand, Indigenous human resource capacity, improved Indigenous community health and living standards, authentic and quality product, land and cultural resource management, and investment capital and enterprise development partnerships with government or industry. The extent to which these factors are being dealt with to support the Indigenous tourism industry will be examined in this chapter.

Issues in Historical Context
Aboriginal people have a long history of involvement in the tourism industry in Australia. In the 1840s ‘early settlers paid to attend Aboriginal dance
ceremonies with a Sunday corroboree being a feature of Adelaide life' (Parsons, cited in Ryan & Huyton 2000:54), while in Sydney from the 1890s Aboriginal families at La Perouse were producing artefacts to sell to tourists. Despite being officially discouraged by the government of the day, a popular pastime with Sydney residents was to catch the train out there on the weekends and purchase boomerangs from the stalls outside the Aboriginal Reserve.

Official government policy has changed from assimilation attempts to wipe out traditional culture and language to an active policy of promotion of Aboriginal arts and culture. Government involvement and promotion of Indigenous participation in the modern Australian tourism industry dates back to at least the mid 1960s with the Harris, Kerr, Forster report, *Australia's Travel and Tourism Industry* (1965). This report stimulated the Commonwealth Government's establishment of Aboriginal Arts and Crafts Pty Ltd, which was a co-operative business, designed to involve Indigenous artists directly with the tourism industry. The production and sale of Indigenous art and crafts has remained a high profile sector of the Australian tourism industry (Office of Northern Development1993:7).

Images of Aboriginal people have been exploited to promote Australia as a tourist destination. The wide use of these images produced stereotypes of authentic Aboriginality, such as the 'noble savage' dressed only in a loincloth, standing on one leg and holding a spear. This image first appeared in tourism related publications in the 1950s, including *Walkabout* (Russell 1994:4). Indigenous people today object to this 'generic' use of their images and individual operators through representative bodies like Aboriginal Tourism Australia have negotiated with the Australian Tourism Commission (ATC) to gain more control over images used in advertising.

Since the 1980s the ATC has been federally funded to promote Australia as an international tourism destination. The marketing emphasis has been largely twofold: the 'pristine' environment and the unique Aboriginal heritage. During
the 1980s and 1990s Aboriginal art, design and fashion gained recognition in Paris, Frankfurt and New York. Aboriginal art featuring traditional and contemporary designs and symbols was acclaimed as fine art and there has been sustained high international demand for this art from public galleries, museums and individual collectors. There has been a corresponding increase within the Australian tourism market of the appropriation of these designs and symbols (Simmons 2000:413).

The problems of authenticity and Indigenous intellectual copyright are issues of central concern to the Indigenous tourism industry. They question who profits from the use of Indigenous images and is the value of these images to the mainstream Australian tourism industry reflected in the income Indigenous people derive from selling these images? The prominent Aboriginal leader, Mr John Ah Kit, said that ‘Indigenous culture was being “strip-mined for commercial profit” and Aborigines were receiving little benefit’ (Jopson 1995:28). He referred specifically to the Qantas jet painted with the Yanyuwa people’s designs. While Qantas paid a fee to the Sydney based Aboriginal artist for the design no payment went back to the Yanyuwa community. As traditional Aboriginal designs are communally owned the community expects payment, ‘the profit on a single planeload of passengers would be enough to pay for a much-needed kidney dialysis machine for Borroloola...to treat the custodians of the Yanyuwa culture’ (ibid). The use of Aboriginal imagery by advertising executives is for commercial profit with no consideration of the cultural importance or impoverished social conditions of the artists. The ‘old “Made in Australia” logo was in the shape of a boomerang when Indigenous people were not recognised as citizens’, said Mr Ah Kit, and ‘he no longer wanted to hear lies about Aboriginal religious beliefs being a threat to the economy. Logos and designs had been derived from sacred places and commercial interests’ denial of these sites’ existence was terrible’ (ibid).

Sustainable industry relies on the availability and quality of product; the eco-tourism industry recognises its reliance on the natural environment and invests
in its protection. Similarly the mainstream Australian tourism industry relies heavily on Indigenous cultural imagery and product; the industry needs to invest in its cultural continuity and the greater return to Aboriginal people. Indigenous tourism cannot be developed and sustained independently of the political and social welfare of Indigenous people. It is not an industry that will develop equitably for Indigenous people in response to market forces alone.

In a largely stable, functioning society like mainstream Australia the government emphasis on economic reform in order to secure growth is a reasonable but not sufficient prerequisite for social improvement and equity. As Noel Pearson says, ‘as an Aboriginal Australian, I have a different perspective, because we live in an inferno of social disintegration and in many places we suffer not from slow economic growth, but from the absence of a real economy altogether’ (Pearson 2002:1). He is a strong proponent for Aboriginal economic enterprise development and reduction of welfare dependence, but he is realistic about the current incapacity of many Aboriginal people to enter the market.

This national issue of inequality needs to be redressed to enable Indigenous Australians to benefit directly from national and international trade in tourism. To develop their businesses Indigenous people require access to mainstream finance. Land held under communal title cannot be used as collateral for bank finance so they seek alternative methods of raising finance that accommodate Indigenous land ownership. It is important to Indigenous people that land is valued as much more than just an economic resource, it is vitally important to their spiritual and cultural continuity.

Indigenous culture is grounded in people’s relationship to the land and all living things. This concept of connectivity is a core value of all Indigenous societies: ‘nature is an extension of society itself, and the creatures that share life with them are manifestations of past and future generations - of their flesh and blood’.

(Posey 1999:xvii)
The Indigenous sustainability ethic is holistic; there is no divide between the natural and cultural environment; the connectivity must be sustained. Hultsman has developed a similar ethic in the Western context by amplifying Leopold’s ‘land ethic’ (see Leopold 1966) to an ethic of sustainability where individuals act in the best interests of the common good of the ‘community of interdependent parts, beyond humankind including the soils, water and the biotic community of plants and animals’ (Hultsman 1995:566).

The United Nations recognises the cultural and spiritual values of biodiversity as essential to global sustainability. Darrell Posey writes in the introduction to a world study of these values: ‘Values of diversity – biological, cultural and linguistic – are intrinsic to life itself and celebrated by the myriad cultures and societies that have co-evolved with the natural and metaphysical worlds that surround them’ (Posey 1999:xvii).

Sustainable Indigenous tourism must support biological and cultural diversity. This is both an ethical mandate and an economic necessity. Tourism cannot afford to destroy the natural and cultural environment that sustains the people and their cultural tourism products. Butler defined sustainable tourism as:

Tourism which is developed and maintained in an area (community environment) in such a manner and at such a scale that it remains viable over an indefinite period and does not degrade or alter the environment (human and physical) in which it exists to such a degree that it prohibits the successful development and well being of other activities and processes.

(Butler 1993:29)

**Globalisation and Tourism Sustainable Development**

The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), in its International Cultural Tourism Charter of 1999, clearly states that each country is responsible for ensuring the protection of the cultural heritage rights of all its peoples:
At a time of increasing globalisation, the protection, conservation, interpretation and presentation of the heritage and cultural diversity of any particular place or region is an important challenge for people everywhere. However, management of that heritage, within a framework of internationally recognised and appropriately applied standards, is usually the responsibility of the particular community or custodian group.

(ICOMOS 1999 website)

The international market directly affects aspects of Australian Indigenous tourism, especially the visual and performing arts. It is yet to be seen if the multilateral trade agreements Australia has signed will protect our environmental and cultural diversity and reduce social inequality by ensuring a high return to local people involved in tourism.

In 1995 the World Tourism Organisation (WTO) and the Earth Council adopted a joint declaration: *Agenda 21 for the Travel and Tourism Industry: Towards Environmentally Sustainable Development*. This included the principles that:

- tourism should contribute to the conservation, protection and rehabilitation of ecosystems;
- tourism should be planned at the local level and allow for the participation of the citizens;
- tourism should recognise and support the identity, culture and interests of indigenous peoples;
- international agreements to protect the environment should be respected by the tourism industry.

(WTO 1995, website)

However, the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), in its recent Millennium Vision on travel and tourism, actively supports the globalisation of the industry and increased control by transnational corporations. If local state
economies cannot bear the high cost of such modernisation to accommodate the needs of wealthy international visitors then privatisation of transport infrastructure is recommended, thus opening the way for increased control by large transnational corporations. Globalisation could be in direct conflict with the WTTC stated aim of local involvement and benefit from tourism. Critics like Pleumaron (1999) view tourism in developing and Indigenous societies as often just an extension of former colonial inequalities. The poor countries of the South become the ‘hosts’ of the wealthy Northern ‘guests’; the costs of the negative impacts of tourism are felt by the hosts and often as much as two-thirds of the tourism dollar ‘leaks’ back to the North. It is already well documented that in ‘some developing countries, more than two-thirds of the revenue from international tourism never reaches the local economy’ (Pleumaron 1999, website).

The WTTC has been strongly involved in the globalisation of tourism, while multilateral agreements facilitating globalisation have shown little, if any, concern for social and ecological issues. The market economy is driven by profit not conscience. Australia with its post-colonial legacy of inequality has a responsibility for government and non-government organisations to facilitate capacity building and access to the market economy for Indigenous peoples.

**Indigenous Tourism: In ‘Our Own Hands’**

In 1998 Terry Janke produced a benchmark report *Our Culture: Our Future on Australian Indigenous cultural and intellectual heritage rights*. This report and the Mataatua Declaration on the Cultural, Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples (1993) provide strong guidelines for the development of an Indigenous Tourism code of ethics. The Mataatua Declaration states the following:

> Indigenous people are the guardians of their customary knowledge and have the right to protect and control dissemination of that knowledge. They also have the right to create new knowledge based on cultural traditions.

*(Mataatua 1993)*
This is in accord with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which affirms that cultural heritage constitutes an irreplaceable tangible and intangible legacy of all peoples. There are inherent duties and responsibilities for individuals and communities, as well as for institutions and states, to protect this right for future generations.

The Indigenous Australians and Tourism Conference (IATC), held in Darwin in 1993, was the first national gathering of Indigenous and non-Indigenous stakeholders in Indigenous tourism. ATSIC, the Northern Territory Tourist Commission and the Office of Northern Development of the Commonwealth Department of Industry, Technology and Regional Development jointly sponsored the conference. The delegates including Indigenous tourism operators, policy makers, academics and tourism wholesalers, were convened with the principal objective of providing substantial input into the developing National Aboriginal and Torress Strait Islander Tourism Strategy. The executive summary cautioned that 'any consideration of Indigenous participation in the tourism industry needs to question the assumption that there is a necessary correlation or connection between the realisation of self-determination, self-management and economic self-sufficiency and tourism' (Office of Northern Development 1993:8).

This statement was made after thirty years of active promotion of Indigenous involvement in tourism by government agencies, dating from the 1960s. In 1984 the Northern Territory Tourist Commission was the first state agency to appoint an Aboriginal Tourism Officer. Since then there has been a huge investment in advertising Aboriginal tourism in the Northern Territory during the 1980s and 90s. The main marketing tool was a full colour glossy booklet, *Come Share Our Culture*, advertising all tours and attractions with Aboriginal content. The Australian Tourism Commission (ATC) engaged Tjapukai Dance Company in the early 1990s to tour Switzerland, Germany and the UK as part of the ATC tourism recovery plan following the pilot's strike. Despite this
marketed image of Aboriginal Australia, Brokensha’s subsequent research in the Northern Territory in 1992 found that ‘the expectations of tourists’ exposure to authentic Aboriginal cultural experiences is severely limited by lack of Aboriginal tourist experiences’ (Brokensha 1992:112-113).

It is necessary in any discussion of the sustainability of Indigenous tourism, to appreciate the extent to which Indigenous participation in tourism has been promoted by and is dependent upon continuing governmental support. This support continues to be directed towards capacity building, market research, strategic planning, training, regional and national business cooperatives and specific Indigenous representation in state and national tourist commissions and non-government associations. While this assistance is well intentioned, there is serious concern that expectations of both Indigenous people and tourists may have been raised by government business development funding without feasibility assessment and over marketing.

In 1997, as a response to the Report of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody released in 1991, the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Tourism Industry Strategy (NATSITIS) was released. Recommendations from this report identified tourism as a mainstream industry that offers Indigenous people opportunities for self-determination and economic independence. Indigenous tourism was identified as a vital and growing area of the Australian tourism industry. The Office of National Tourism and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) developed the Strategy jointly. This is the most comprehensive national government and industry collaborative strategy developed that seeks to direct and support ‘greater indigenous participation in the tourism industry’ (ATSIC 1997:v).

Glen Miller, the current manager of ‘Special Interest Tourism’ in Tourism Queensland 2005, has been involved in promoting and assisting the operators of Indigenous Tourism since 1992. He participated in the development of the
National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Tourism Strategy over four years and has assessed the industry in Queensland and nationally over many years. His response to the question, ‘How is it working?’ was: ‘Indigenous Tourism is not the spectacular success politicians tell us it has the potential to be’ (Miller pers.comm., 1999).

His realistic appraisal of the current situation raises serious questions about the value of previous government encouragement of Indigenous people’s involvement in the industry. Has the potential of Indigenous tourism been unrealisable due to failures to implement the recommendations of the National Strategy? The Strategy was designed to provide a support framework for building the capacity of Indigenous people to be involved in the tourism industry as a whole. It is recognised as an excellent model for building sustainable tourism but, unfortunately, the implementation plan was not actioned. The recent formation of the Indigenous Tourism Leaders Group provides new opportunities to revive the Strategy. This important document has wide industry support and could be updated to dovetail with the national government’s new ten year tourism plan.

In 2002 the Australian Government proposed a Ten Year Plan for Tourism but critic Jane Stanley felt it was not an advance on the benchmark, the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Tourism Industry Strategy. Stanley’s consultative group commented: ‘We are concerned that the Discussion Paper does not acknowledge the full significance of Indigenous tourism for adding value to the Australian tourism industry, nor the considerable work that has already been done by the Commonwealth Government in developing strategies for Indigenous tourism development’ (Stanley 2002). Though some aspects of the report are out of date, Stanley found that ‘recent scoping carried out amongst industry and government experts by the CRC [Cooperative Research Centre] for Sustainable Tourism has indicated that there is still a high level of support for the content of the Strategy as it stands’ (ibid).
Aboriginal Tourism Australia
Despite the success of some ventures, tourism has not fulfilled the promise of widespread employment for Indigenous people that was envisaged. One specific outcome of the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Tourism Industry Strategy (NATSITIS) was the formation of Aboriginal Tourism Australia (ATA). This is a non-profit industry organisation formed by Indigenous tourism operators. It is the peak body representing Indigenous tourism operators in Australia today and its development was supported by a national meeting of Aboriginal tourism operators in Alice Springs in 1995: ‘ATA is committed to raising the level of industry professionalism, enhancing economic sustainability and employment opportunities and protecting the cultural property rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders within the tourism industry’ (ATA 2000, website).

ATA has developed a financial management guide to assist Indigenous business development; it is actively running business management workshops in all states and is concurrently developing an Indigenous Tourism accreditation scheme for operators. The total package is called Respect Our Culture (ROC). This is a business development initiative that will address business management, cultural authenticity and integrity, and sustainable environmental (Caring for Country) practices. The program will meet the Australian tourism industry accreditation standards, providing operators with national tourism accreditation.

In 2003 the ROC program was first tried with operators. Now facilitator positions are funded in each state and territory to provide local-level support to potential and existing tourism businesses and Indigenous communities. This provision of direct capacity building at the grassroots level is necessary to ensure sustainable Indigenous tourism development. The ROC program is one of the many government and tourism industry plans to assist the development and marketing of Indigenous tourism. It is the first Indigenous-run program to be driven by and responsible to a national Indigenous tourism association. It has identified key areas essential to sustainable Indigenous tourism.
Aboriginal Tourism Australia’s (ATA) website, established in September 2000, promotes ‘Welcome to Our Land’, a set of protocols ‘to facilitate and encourage the tourism industry to operate on Aboriginal lands in ways that respect and enhance the cultural heritage and living cultures of local Aboriginal communities and which protect Aboriginal cultural, social, religious and spiritual values’ (ibid).

Cultural Protocols
The primary protocol emphasised by the ATA, which is also in the guidelines for visitors to Indigenous communities developed by Michael Dobson, is seeking permission of local elders:

Seeking and gaining permission from the appropriate individuals or groups is by far the most important aspect of dealing with or approaching Aboriginal people for information. Dealing with Aboriginal communities should always be through appropriate channels. Be aware that in urban areas cultural values and protocols still exist. (ATA 2000, website; Dodson 2000:3)

This relies on visitors having access to ‘accredited’ tour operators who will ‘ensure that protocols are gone through so that local Elders welcome you to their land and the correct interpretation of local culture, sites of significance, bush tucker use, art and craft of the region will enhance your Aboriginal experience’ (ATA 2000, website).

Ideally there would be accredited Indigenous guides in all regions and sectors of the tourism industry but currently this is not the case. In reality, the majority of tourists to Australia, even those with expressed interest in Aboriginal culture, do not visit Aboriginal land and meet Aboriginal tour operators, the notable exceptions being the Indigenous guided tours offered to visitors to Uluru and Kakadu National Parks. In other regions of Australia, especially urban areas, it is difficult for most visitors to access Aboriginal tour operators or
seek permission to enter country from Aboriginal elders recognised as having authority in the region. Nationally there is, as yet, no recognised system of accreditation of Indigenous tours or operators, though ATA is developing accreditation through the program, 'Respect Our Culture'.

It is important that visitors, the industry and government tourism authorities are guided by a code of ethics developed by a nationally recognised body of Indigenous people in the tourism industry. The ATA has developed a set of protocols that could form the framework for such a code for ethical Indigenous tourism under three main categories: relationship, responsibility and respect. These will be discussed with reference to:

- authenticity of tourism product and interpretation
- interpretation of Indigenous material/objects/stories
- protection of the cultural/spiritual landscapes
- protection of communal and individual intellectual heritage and communal heritage ownership; recognition of intellectual property rights in regards to communal oral history, story, dance, song and art designs
- permits/restrictions regarding access to Indigenous sites and ceremony
- respecting kinship, gender and age restrictions to knowledge
- media representation of Indigenous culture.

Indigenous people have identified the proposed protocols, issues and ethics as crucial to a sustainable Indigenous tourism industry. These will be considered in the context of Indigenous tourism in the Anangu Lands of Central Australia that include Uluru and the contiguous AP Lands south of the Northern Territory border. The Indigenous tourism ventures, Anangu Tours and Desert Tracks, have developed products for different sectors of the market. Anangu Tours operates short day tours within the National Park, while Desert Tracks operates extended camping tours from Uluru to remote Aboriginal homelands in the AP Lands.
Cultural Landscape Management under Two Laws

Indigenous people, from the coastal cities to the inland desert communities, say their main motivation for becoming involved in cultural tourism is the desire to keep our culture alive (James 1996b:8). Protection of tangible and intangible cultural heritage is a big issue for Indigenous tourism operating in the free trade market. The Federal Copyright Act is currently inadequate to provide protection for Indigenous arts, crafts, designs, symbols and oral stories that are usually communally rather than individually owned.

The 1998 report, Our Culture: Our Future identified these limitations of protection:

- commercial interests are protected under copyright law rather than interests of cultural integrity
- individual notions of ownership are recognised, rather than the Indigenous concept of communal ownership.

(Janke 1998:xxiii)

Protection of intellectual property must extend to traditional ideas and knowledge that identify places, customs, and beliefs. In 1957 the International Labour Organization, a legal instrument of the United Nations, developed a convention concerning Indigenous issues which was revised in 1987 as the Convention Concerning Indigenous Peoples. This states that governments ‘shall respect the special importance of the cultural and spiritual values of the peoples concerned, of their relationships with the lands and territories – and in particular the collective aspects of this relationship’ (Simmons 2000:415). In the absence of adequate copyright protection for Indigenous intellectual property, how can the growing tourist commercialisation of Aboriginal culture, especially exploitation of the Dreaming, be addressed within the industry? Will codes of ethics or standards of best practice be sufficient to control the Indigenous tourism industry?

Tourism marketing of Aboriginal culture has focused on the Dreamtime (see Chapter 2, ‘Key Concepts’, for full discussion of this term) because of ‘the
relative lack of arresting Aboriginal sites or permanent structures, with the exception of spectacular rock art sites’ (Zeppel 1998:68). However, the promotional material has not educated the tourist market about the sacredness and importance of this living heritage to Aboriginal people today. Rather, it has created an appetite to experience the exotic, with articles headlined ‘Tourists urged to relive Dreamtime’ (The Advertiser 15 May 1996:4). But it has not fulfilled the dream of helping ‘Indigenous Australians orchestrate their emergence from behind immense veils of misunderstanding and the prejudicial practices of the non-Aboriginal world which have grown up, about and around the precious numinousity of traditional Aboriginal Australians’ (Hollingshead 1996:309).

Inappropriate public knowledge of traditional beliefs, and visitors’ disregard of restrictions on visiting sacred sites or discussion of restricted secret information can result in the destruction of living cultural identity. Usually such transgressions are due to the visitor and tourism industry’s lack of understanding of the relationship between Aboriginal people, their land and their Dreaming. However, there is also the effect of market demand, especially from American and German visitors, for special access to restricted secret, sacred Indigenous knowledge. Visitors asking questions about secret ritual practices or sacred objects are more than embarrassing: they reveal either a complete lack of awareness or a disregard for the cultural protocols of others.

If customer expectations of authentic Indigenous cultural experience can be met in structured situations within national parks or in specifically designed eco-cultural camps or lodges, it reduces the intrusion of tourism into community life. In these situations, structured tourism experiences that are sometimes criticised as not being the real thing may actually ‘help to maintain an authenticity for Aboriginal Australians by locating tourists at arms length from their communities’ (Ryan & Huyton 2000:83).
The difference between the tourist demand for knowledge of and participation in Indigenous cultural experiences, and the need for Indigenous people to maintain their cultural laws regarding secret and sacred material, sites and knowledge, is an ontological divide that must be bridged in the promotion of Indigenous tourism. Aboriginal Tourism Australia (ATA) has recognised the problematic interface between cross-cultural protocols regarding language and questioning styles in its approach to tourism and Indigenous culture. In conjunction with the Federal Government Department of Environment and Heritage (DEH), they have produced an attractive brochure for tourists called Welcome to Country: Respecting Indigenous Culture for Travellers in Australia (ATA and DEH brochure 2004; see ATA and DEH 2000a, website). In this they emphasise that the tourist performance space should be one of ‘relationship, responsibility and respect’ for each other’s culture (see Figure 20).

Figure 20: Remember the 3Rs (ATA & DEH, 2004).
**Relationship** - Recognise Indigenous people’s relationship and connection to the land.

**Responsibility** - Acknowledge the ongoing responsibility Indigenous people have to their country, and recognise your own responsibility to travel thoughtfully.

**Respect** - Respect Aboriginal beliefs associated with country and culture. As a visitor, respect the wishes of your hosts and any restrictions that you have been asked to observe (ibid).

**Remember the 3 Rs**

1. **Relationship - Reconciliation to People and Land**

Indigenous cultural tourism businesses are often motivated by reconciliation. ‘They seek a greater understanding between two cultures, the indigenous and the later settlers’ (Kauffman 2000:xii).

> Aboriginal people believe that at the time of Creation, ancestral spirits made epic journeys across a barren earth creating the geographical features of the landscape. The ancestral spirits created Laws to govern every aspect of Aboriginal life and attributed ongoing custodianship of the land to local groups. This is the ‘connectedness’ to the land, the essence of Aboriginal spirituality which underpins the unique relationship with the land.

(ATA 2000, website)

1.1 **Authenticity**

NATSITIS (1997) Principle 3.1: Indigenous people have the right to determine how their culture is presented within the tourism industry.

Aboriginal Tourism Australia refers to the principles of authenticity and cultural integrity as those that encourage respect and consideration of Indigenous customs, spiritual and religious beliefs. Authenticity is defined by individual and group relationship to land and knowledge.
According to Indigenous belief, the activities of ancestral heroes and creator figures prescribe the peoples' rights to lands and informs their rich traditions of ritual, dance, music, art and stories. Particular groups have authority over the ownership of such knowledge and strict protocols determine who may narrate or paint particular stories or use associated designs.

(ibid)

Our Culture: Our Future identified Indigenous people as setting authenticity standards:

- Be recognised as the primary guardians and interpreters of their cultures, arts and sciences, whether created in the past or developed by them in the future.
- Prevent distortions and mutilations of Indigenous cultural and Intellectual Property.

(Janke 1998:xxi)

How is authenticity of product and experience to be maintained under the increasing pressure of domestic and international markets for their preconceived notion of the 'real Aborigine'? Tourism marketing has focused on stereotyped images of traditional Aboriginal culture. The international images of Australia, marketed by the large organisations such as the ATC, Ansett Australia, Qantas, and state tourism authorities, promote traditional Aborigines in north and central Australia. This advertising ignores non-traditional Aborigines living in contemporary Australia. It also raises the visitor expectation of seeing traditional Aboriginal people in ceremonial dress. This is rare and almost always in artificial performance situations which tourists criticise as inauthentic, even though the 'performance' is less culturally intrusive and often preserves the authenticity of the real culture.

International tourists might only visit one Aboriginal community or cultural centre when they come to Australia. Their expectations have been formed from films and advertising that promote a 'pan Australia Aboriginality' of didgeridoos, boomerangs, loincloths, spear throwing and smiling traditional
dancers. Should Indigenous tour operators cater to market demand by supplying these products, whether or not they are authentically of the traditional or contemporary culture of their people and region? Business profitability may make broad appeal essential.

In each of the Indigenous tourist enterprise case studies examined, the principle in determining ‘authenticity’ has been that the Indigenous people are the determinants of their traditional and contemporary authenticity of cultural expression. Desert Tracks incorporates an ethical statement at the beginning of its business plan:

Control of the itinerary and content of the tours remains with the elders. Authenticity of Indigenous product demanded by tourists means respect for culture and the status of elders is reinforced.

(Desert Tracks 1994)

This Central Australian tour enterprise has not succumbed to pressure to include didgeridoos or souvenir returning boomerangs in its product. It has taken education of the market as a goal, to explain in advertising and pre-trip information that this is an authentic tour of local desert Aboriginal culture as distinct from generically promoted pan-Australian Aboriginal culture. Important in maintaining this market respect for its authenticity has been the extensive education of travel agents, state and federal tourist commissions and non-government organisations.

1.2 Interpretation of Indigenous material/objects/stories
Relationship to land is crucial in determining who can speak for what country, which traditional stories can be told or painted, and who can use specific designs. As stated in the ATA guidelines, only local elders can welcome people to country and give correct interpretation of the local culture.
The ICOMOS (1999) principles of the International Cultural Tourism Charter are invaluable in developing high standards of interpretation of Indigenous cultural heritage, both for the host communities and the visitors:

Since domestic and international tourism is among the foremost vehicles for cultural exchange, conservation should provide responsible and well managed opportunities for members of the host community and visitors to experience and understand that community's heritage and culture at first hand.

The natural and cultural heritage is a material and spiritual resource, providing a narrative of historical development. It has an important role in modern life and should be made physically, intellectually and/or emotively accessible to the general public. Programmes for the protection and conservation of the physical attributes, intangible aspects, contemporary cultural expressions and broad context, should facilitate an understanding and appreciation of the heritage significance by the host community and the visitor, in an equitable and affordable manner.

(ICOMOS 1999)

The Desert Tracks business plan makes a similar ethical statement: ‘That Indigenous people tell their own story about their culture and land’ (Desert Tracks 1994). The traditional owners ensure the authenticity of oral interpretation of sites, dances, songs and stories. When new guides join the tour they learn these interpretations from the elder experienced guides, and then only the communally agreed version is told. The traditional elders, prior to any information being printed for tourists, must verify the written or recorded version of story or dance. All published material distributed or sold through the tours is under copyright to Desert Tracks and Anangu Pitjantjatjara.

The process of authenticating all government tourism publications through a recognised Indigenous approval process, by reference to the appropriate
Aboriginal or Torres Strait people, is gradually being implemented. In the past, Government Tourist Commission publications often used Indigenous images as generic material, non-specific to place or people. Keith Hollingshead points out: ‘If an agency or an organisation in the tourism marketplace sincerely seeks to introduce non-Aboriginal travellers to the realities of indigenous life and living in outback Australia, it must take informed and considered steps ‘to know’, and then to attune its visitors to the inner dreaming that is Aboriginal spirituality’ (Hollingshead 1996:309). The tourism industry needs to portray the specific cultures of the peoples it markets, rather than selling stereotypic postcards of Indigenous culture.

South Australia, in its 1996 brochure, Aboriginal Tourism Experience, was the first state tourist commission to ‘adopt the spiritual concept of songlines to market Aboriginal sites, destinations and wildlife encounters as transforming tourist experiences’ (Zeppel 1998:74) [my italics]. There is a serious attempt to ‘interpret’ this spiritual relationship through the concept of songlines (see Chapter 2 for origin and history of this term), which link important Dreaming sites featured in Aboriginal tours to the Flinders Ranges, Yalata and the Pitjantjatjara lands.

Desert Tracks is one of the Indigenous-owned tour companies in South Australia from which Aboriginal authority for this style of advertising is gained. The welcoming quote in the South Australian brochure is by Nganyinytja, of the Pitjantjatjara people, and the brochure includes photographs of Dickie Minyintirri in ceremonial dance and one of elder, Andy Tjilari, with tourists in a cave captioned ‘The Angatja people’s Ngintaka Creation Law Cave’ (South Australian Tourist Commission 1996:13). Permission was sought and given to use these photographs, but the accompanying text was not cleared by the elders and none of the conditions or limits on tourists’ access to Aboriginal sacred sites or knowledge were included from the Desert Tracks brochure. While consultation with traditional elders was a feature of this brochure
production, the marketing emphasis on Indigenous spirituality was a decision of the Commission. Aboriginal controls over information, photography and access to sites should have been clearly included to create a realistic tourist expectation and reduce unreasonable demand for secret, sacred material.

Caution is needed in marketing Aboriginal culture to prevent cultural stereotyping and market dissatisfaction with a less glossy ‘exotic’ reality. There has been a distinct bias in Tourist Commission marketing, at state and federal levels, towards traditional Aboriginal culture and relationship to land, rather than contemporary Aboriginal society: arts, dance, music, theatre and urban tourism enterprises. Modern Indigenous definitions of the authenticity of Aboriginal product need to be developed and included in an authentic portrayal and marketing of Australian Indigenous tourism.

The more recent Queensland Tour and Travel Corporation brochures promoting Indigenous tourism have depicted a wider range of authentic Indigenous product. Their research revealed that frequent depictions of Aboriginal people in ceremonial dress created visitor dissatisfaction, as the product did not match the advertisements. The Tjapukai Dance Company’s inclusion of part-Aboriginal performers was not accepted as ‘authentic’. In response to market research, the new brochure of 1996 focused on the ‘holiday experience’ but not the ‘culture’. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders are depicted in modern clothes in a greater variety of settings, part-Aboriginal people are included and more fun activities are illustrated. The brochure aimed to ‘present a non-threatening or more acceptable mainstream image of Indigenous tourism’ (Zeppel 1998:77).

2. Responsibility

Traditional owners or custodians of the land have the responsibility for looking after the environmental, cultural and spiritual wellbeing of the land. This is referred to as ‘Caring for Country’ and acknowledges that the local
Aboriginal community are custodians of the land and Indigenous culture of the area:

Traditional knowledge is considered to be intellectual property. Be aware that not every person you meet on your tour will be able to speak on all cultural matters. Certain knowledge is the responsibility of tribal elders and may be secret/sacred or imparted only on a ‘need to know’ basis. Consider what aspects of Aboriginal culture and history are of interest to you and accept if your guide tells you that he/she cannot speak about a particular matter.

(ATA 2000, website)

2.1 Intellectual property protection: communal and individual

*Our Culture: Our Future* defines Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual property thus:

Heritage consists of the intangible and tangible aspects of the whole body of cultural practices, resources and knowledge systems developed, nurtured and refined by Indigenous people and passed on by them as part of expressing their cultural identity.

Any definition of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property should be flexible to reflect the notions of the particular Indigenous group and the fact that this may differ from group to group and may change over time.

(Janke 1998:xvii-xviii)

The declaration of ICOMOS, marking the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1998, confirmed its support of these rights:

The right to cultural heritage is an integral part of human rights considering the irreplaceable nature of the tangible and intangible legacy it constitutes, and that it is threatened in a world which is in constant transformation.

(ICOMOS 1998)
The enterprises, Desert Tracks and Anangu Tours, referred to in these introductory chapters, have both developed high standards for cultural integrity and have managed to communicate selected cultural information, not secret or sacred restricted knowledge. This cultural information, though reduced and simplified, allows visitors an authentic insight into Indigenous culture. In each case the decisions about what was open and what was restricted information were made by the traditional elders in each community under the regional governance of their Indigenous Land Council. Both have encountered the difficulty of controlling the use of orally communicated traditional communal heritage.

The Creation stories, singing, body painting and ceremony shared on these tours are not the private property of any individual; many Aboriginal people of these communities are owners or custodians of this traditional knowledge. Control of this communally owned intellectual knowledge was the same problem faced by the Yanyuwa people when one of their artists painted their traditional designs on the Qantas jet. The use and transmission of such information needs to under the control of the owners of the traditional knowledge, regional Land Councils can enforce local by-laws on Indigenous land but misappropriation of Indigenous intellectual property is more difficult to police in the wider national and international community.

The problem arises when information shared in one context, while the visitors are on Aboriginal Land, is unable to be properly protected when the tourists return to Western society. Publication, or other commercial use of this information by these tourists, can cause serious problems for the traditional people who have assumed that it was shared only for private understanding. The direct and polite message of ATA’s ‘3 Rs’ may be sufficient in highly controlled situation like Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park where much Indigenous cultural property is protected by a system of strong permits and fines. However, in the experience of Desert Tracks on the AP
Lands, these ‘softly spoken’ protocols were not sufficient protection of cultural heritage. Western tourism culture is increasingly legislated, and the do’s and don’ts are spelled out specifically in each situation where a service is being provided or given to another person. The detail is necessary to protect the customer and the provider from litigation. It is easier for the Western tourist or tourism operator if the do’s and don’ts of the cross-cultural exchange on Indigenous Lands are clearly spelled out with associated permits and fines for breach of conditions. Desert Tracks had to design a specific legally binding declaration of intent for its customers to agree to on booking a tour. This was necessary after intellectual property was taken and resold by visitors. This case will be examined in detail in Chapter 13, ‘Stealing the Grindstone’.

Figure 21: Declaration of Intent by Tourists on Desert Tracks Tours (Desert Tracks brochure, 2000)

WELCOME TO OUR LANDS

Our Desert Tracks Tour offers visitors a unique opportunity to meet Pitjantjatjara people and learn from our culture and traditions. Information shared with you by us during a tour is not intended for publication or for professional use. For that reason, if you have a professional interest in our Pitjantjatjara culture, that interest must be declared prior to commencing your visit. If our Regional Council agrees to your purpose and (sic) Agreement will be prepared. Please note that it takes at least two months to finalise any such agreements. General conditions re. The recording of information is that photography is allowed only with the agreement of our Elders, confirmed via your Desert Tracks’ Guide.

We Aim to Educate people into our oral tradition of retaining and transmitting knowledge, and to experience our environment, culture and people directly, and to take home wonderful memories enlivened by some special photographs.

If you are printing and faxing or posting this booking form, please sign to indicate that you understand and are prepared to abide by the above conditions

Signature: .................................. Date: -----------------------------
Desert Tracks operates under permit from AP Council on Aboriginal Lands and each visitor must hold a permit under the Land Rights legislation of South Australia. The conditions of this permit preclude entry into houses or camps of Aboriginal people without their consent, and specify that no alcohol be taken onto Aboriginal Land. While these permit conditions cover physical intrusion into areas of cultural sensitivity, they do not cover intellectual intrusion and appropriation of Indigenous culture. A copy of the Desert Tracks customer declaration, a ‘welcome to country’ called ‘Welcome to our Lands’ is included here (see Figure 21).

This is part of the pre-trip information that influences the customer’s decision to go on this Aboriginal tour. To my knowledge, no other Indigenous tourism experience requires customers to sign a similar pre-trip declaration of intent. It does not reduce the Indigenous tour company’s responsibility to insure against any mishap that may occur to the customer whilst on the tour, as do many pre-trip ‘At Your Own Risk’ declarations; rather, it allows the company to prosecute any visitor who uses the information, photographs or stories, songs and dances taught in the exchange in a public or published forum without the consent of Anangu. It is an intellectual border check that the potential visitor must pass before they enter Aboriginal Land and become accountable under the Two Laws for their behaviour in Aboriginal country.

3. Respect

Aboriginal belief system and cultural teachings instil respect for the land, elders, kinship, sustainable use of the land and for every living thing. For Aboriginal people, the heritage value of the landscape is largely associated with Creation events and places; therefore a site may not have remarkable geographical features. Respect should be given to the legends associated with sites as well as the anthropological, historical and contemporary sites important to local
Aboriginal people. Respect that there are some sacred sites that by Aboriginal Law, you may not be permitted to visit.

(ATA 2000, website)

3.1 Permits: restrictions on access to Indigenous sites and ceremony.

*Our Culture: Our Future* recognises the rights of Indigenous people to:

Maintain the secrecy of Indigenous knowledge and other cultural practices

(Janke 1998:xxi)

Desert Tracks operating on Anangu Pitjantjatjara Land must obtain permits for each tourist and special permits for interest groups not covered under the general tourism provisions; film, television or print journalists.

The tourism enterprise, though Aboriginal owned, must apply for anthropological and legal clearance of any sites, communities or traditional songlines it wishes to visit. Due to the nature of communal ownership of all traditional knowledge the company must gain permission from traditional owners before Creation stories are told or dances performed. Tourists are issued with individual permits that prevent the taking of alcohol onto the Lands, restrict photographs without permission and specify the length of time and the areas they can visit.

Tourists often resent the restriction on photographs of the magnificent rock art site of Cave Hill. However, the elders, on the advice of rock art specialists, restrict photography to preserve ochre colours. Interestingly, some of the most strident demands for photographs have come from visiting archaeologists who feel that their profession gives them legitimate rights to photograph.

The first state tourism brochure to include comprehensive information on access to cultural sites was put out by Queensland Tour and Travel Corporation in 1994: *A Guide to Experiencing Aboriginal and Torres Strait*
Islander Culture. This brochure booklet included information on permits, sites protected by law, public viewing sites, photography permission, recognition of authentic Aboriginal artefacts, and reference books on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture. In comparison, the 1994 Northern Territory Tourist Commission brochure only mentioned that permits were necessary to enter Aboriginal land, with no information on visitor behaviour or cameras. The 1996 brochure of the South Australian Tourist Commission, *The South Australian Aboriginal Tourism Experience*, as mentioned earlier promoted ‘Aboriginal spiritual beliefs, without indicating that there are any limits on what tourists may see, know, or understand’ (Zeppel 1998:75)

State and National Tourist Commissions now adhere to a policy of consultation with all individual communities on use of Indigenous cultural images. New brochures include ‘advice on appropriate cultural interaction with Aboriginal people, rules for photography, restrictions on visiting sacred sites and permits to enter Aboriginal lands’ (Zeppel 1998:77).

While Aboriginal communities may be able to control interaction with tourists on their own lands, these protocols of respect are harder to enforce in commercial operations in areas of public access. Even in national parks such as Uluru, owned by Aboriginal people and involving them at all levels of tourist management, they can only recommend visitors not to climb Uluru.

Tony Tjamiwa, Traditional Owner of Uluru/Kata Tjuta, asserted the priority of Anangu interpretation of the Indigenous cultural landscape of Uluru but he could not enforce it:

This is Anangu land and we welcome you. We want our visitors to learn about our place and listen to us Anangu... Now a lot of visitors are only looking at sunset and climbing Uluru. That rock is really important and sacred. You shouldn’t climb it! Climbing is not a proper tradition for this place.

(Uluru/Kata Tjuta National Park 2000 website)
Some commercial companies still market the 'Climb' as a highlight of their tours so a large number of visitors still climb Uluru. Some visitors are disappointed that the Anangu request that they not climb is not more obviously signposted or in the information they receive before arrival in Australia and on arrival from the tour companies. However, the websites and advertising of Uluru all now reflect Anangu wishes that visitors do not climb. The major companies promoting this are Voyages who own Ayers Rock Resort, AAT Kings, Anangu Tours, Discovery Ecotours, the National Park and the Northern Territory Tourist Commission. Influencing mainstream tourism to respect Indigenous cultural protocols has been a difficult and long-term project, but attitudes are changing.

3.2 Media representation of Indigenous culture

*Our Culture: Our Future* recognises Indigenous people want the right to:

- Prevent derogatory, offensive and fallacious uses of Indigenous cultural and intellectual property in all media including media representations.

(Janke 1998:xxi)

On the AP Lands permits for the media are separate from tourist permits and are specifically designed for all journalists, film or television projects. These must be signed prior to obtaining permits to come on a Desert Tracks tour. The contracts include the usual restrictions on access to information, sites and photographs, and also a clause where the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Council, prior to public release, must clear all articles and films (see Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Media website for more information). While the media resent such restrictions on the 'freedom of the press', they generally come to an agreement because access to these Lands and people is denied otherwise.

As discussed previously in relationship to images, the State and National Tourist Commissions need to exercise great care in how they promote Indigenous Tourism. Detailed information of the permits required on
Indigenous Lands, and particularly the length of time needed to obtain journalist permits, often three months at Uluru and on AP Lands, would assist the media. A French journalist, who had come specifically to write stories about the Aboriginal tourism experiences available in South Australia, commented on the false impression overseas people often gain from Australian tourist publications. In 1996 the glossy Aboriginal tourism brochure produced by the South Australian Tourist Commission caught Jonathan Farren’s eye and inspired his visit:

The impression that Europeans receive from this glossy attractive booklet is that these many centres advertised are readily accessible and one can easily drive to them and spend time with Aboriginal people.

(James 1996:28)

The reality he found was very different:

In many areas one needs a permit which is difficult to get. Often one can only travel with a tour company. Tours are often not running. Aboriginal people do not run them themselves because of lack of business knowledge. Aboriginal people vary greatly in their exposure to European culture, ability to speak English and ability to deal with tourists. Traditional culture takes precedence over tourism, reliability is not high.

(ibid)

Even with his contacts in the South Australian Tourist Commission, Jonathan did not manage to go on one organised Aboriginal tour; although he visited the Coorong and Mimili Communities, no tours were running. This was a great disappointment to him personally, and a loss of international publicity for Indigenous tour operators.

The marketing of Aboriginal tourism by the state authorities of the Northern Territory in 1994 and South Australia in 1996 ‘clearly presented Aboriginal
traditional culture and knowledge as accessible and open to visitors' (Zeppel 1998:71). However, with the increase of direct Indigenous involvement in tourism there is more realistic information on cultural difference regarding the accessibility of sites and cultural knowledge appearing in advertising brochures.

There has been a significant improvement in the development of interpretive materials on Indigenous culture, particularly in co-managed Parks like Uluru, and there is greater availability of Aboriginal guided tours in many destinations around Australia. However, there remains a gap between the predominantly traditional image of Aboriginality as a passive, ubiquitous part of the Australian landscape, which is still marketed overseas, and the availability of contact with 'traditional' culture and peoples for the average tourist.

Conclusions
It is important that, in promoting Indigenous tourism, the State and Federal Tourist Commissions respect the integrity of traditional and contemporary culture. Appropriate marketing has the potential to increase market demand for authentic traditional and modern Indigenous cultural experiences. It is a dynamic time, when the need for Indigenous people to derive income from their land, cultural resources and new businesses coincides with a growing tourism industry interest in their participation. Whatever the nature of future Indigenous tourism product it is essential that Indigenous people are the determinants of their own standards of cultural integrity. Only through increased representation of Indigenous people, and consultations with rural and urban communities, can the industry develop authentic interpretation, appropriate guide training of Indigenous and non-Indigenous tour guides, approved media images and Indigenous intellectual heritage protection.

Aboriginal Tourism Australia is promoting 'Welcome to Our Land', outlining the Indigenous protocols of relationship, responsibility and respect to assist the
tourism industry to operate in ways that respect Indigenous culture and heritage. The national tourism industry is in the process of adopting codes of best practice that incorporate the specific ethical concerns of Indigenous peoples in regard to their culture and intellectual property rights.

The program ‘Respect our Culture’ incorporates the business management strategies, the cultural authenticity and integrity standards, and the caring for country environmental practices that are necessary to develop a sustainable Indigenous tourism industry in Australia. Aboriginal Tourism Australia is determined to provide relevant local assistance to all Indigenous tourism operators and communities involved in tourism. This grass roots planning and implementation by Indigenous people needs to be matched by government and tourism industry agencies’ commitment to implement recommendations of the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Tourism Industry Strategy through the new Ten Year Plan in the Tourism White Paper. Market demand, where shown to exist, does not convey rights to the industry or the Australian government, to use Indigenous imagery and culture to enhance their mainstream tourism marketing.

Aboriginal people have the right to participate in tourism or not at a level and rate they decide. Australian tourism must support the sustainability and integrity of Indigenous culture. Indigenous people who wish to develop their own tourism enterprises need to find a balance between profitability and meeting market demand while respecting their traditional lifestyle and ethics. These issues are complex and often difficult to balance as demonstrated in the following two chapters. Chapter 7 presents an overview of market demand for Indigenous tourism experiences and Chapter 8 is a detailed case study of how one such Indigenous tour company, Desert Tracks, has responded to this market demand and managed the impacts of tourism on their country and community on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Lands in Central Australia.
Chapter 7

INDIGENOUS TOURISM DEMAND: WHY TRAVEL TO ANANGU LANDS?

Introduction
Modern tourism demand for Indigenous experiences has its roots in the ancient epics and travellers' tales of Western culture. Homer's 800BC Greek poem, *The Odyssey*, gave birth to the usage of the term 'odyssey' to describe a series of wanderings or a long adventurous journey. Anangu culture has its own travellers' tales; the Ngintaka epic is the story of a journey of one of their Creator Beings who left his mark on the land and culture of the AP Lands. This is the *Tjukurpa* story used by Anangu guides on Desert Tracks tours to take modern travellers on a journey into their culture. The heroes of both these epics embarked on travels that would teach them more than they expected as they faced unforeseen challenges along the route. Modern-day tourists embarking on their personal odysseys can learn moral and ethical protocols that govern the behaviour of hosts and guests in this cross-cultural performance space of Western and Indigenous cultural exchange. These protocols will become clear as the stories of the actors in this performance space are told.

At the beginning of the journey it is useful to inquire of potential travellers, the reasons they are seeking an Indigenous experience. I will examine two sources of data on the question of why people travel: the market demand for Indigenous tourism experience in Central Australia. One source of data is the domestic and international visitor surveys conducted by state and federal tourism commissions. The other source is the direct accounts of people who have come on a Desert Tracks tour over the period 1988 to 2000.

The surveys of domestic and international visitors to tourism destinations within Australia distinguish various categories of visitor. Within these categories a useful distinction can be made between 'true travellers' and
‘tourists’. True travellers visit other places and people for the purposes of education, to attend religious, artistic, music or sporting festivals, professional conferences, to visit relatives, or to conduct business. In this sense travel is a universal human characteristic independent of culture, language, and economic or social status. In comparison, ‘tourists’ are considered to be people with disposable income to spend on leisure travel, which is consumptive of services, spectacles and cultural products of other people and places. Hence the tourism terminology of ‘product’ referring to any thing or event designed to cater specifically to this tourism market. In this sense, ‘tourism’ is a Western cultural phenomenon.

This chapter considers the categories of market demand and the travellers who express interest in Indigenous tourism experience, the types of experiences they demand, what they actually experience and their expressed levels of satisfaction. Quantitative results from visitor surveys are examined to attempt to quantify the specific demand for cultural immersion experiences as offered by Desert Tracks.

The Story of Desire: Modern Travel and Tourism

Carriage, take me with you! Ship steal me away from here!
Take me far, far away. Here the mud is made of our tears.
(Baudelaire, in De Botton 2002:35)

T.S. Eliot (cited in De Botton 2002:35) credits Charles Baudelaire as being the first nineteenth century artist to give expression to the beauty of modern travel destinations and machines. Eliot says, ‘Baudelaire...invented a new kind of romantic nostalgia for places of departure – docks, train stations, airports’.

Baudelaire may have been the first poet to romanticize modern departure stations and modes of locomotion but his voice was just another in the poetic tradition of romanticizing the other ‘where’, anywhere but the ‘here’ of everyday existence. The departure points, however grimy, epitomized the industrial world from which the traveller departed to enter the other world of paradise. The traveller boarded the train, boat or plane of Western desire to
return to paradise, 'The state of innocence, and the spiritual blessedness of man before the fall, in the paradisiac myth, becomes, in the myth of the good savage, the pure, free and happy state of the exemplary man, surrounded by a maternal and generous Nature' (Eliade 1960:41). Modern tourism advertising and travel writing is just a retelling of the old story of the Western psyche seeking paradise, the natural glades though which Odysseus walked, inhabited by Greek gods of the Golden Age, and a return to the original human, the 'noble savage' uncorrupted by civilization. In seeking this paradise tourism seeks access to the remotest places and peoples of the globe, ironically corrupting that which it seeks. As Tony Wheeler discovered, the man who pioneered the world's most successful guidebook series, The Lonely Planet, 'taught the world to travel, and now almost wishes he hadn't' (Sydney Morning Herald, Good Weekend, 13 August 2005:cover).

One of the deep stories of Western culture is that of 'seeking the noble savage', which has fired the imagination of poets, storytellers, anthropologists and scientists since the eighteenth century expansion of Western empires saw small ships set sail across uncharted oceans for unknown foreign lands. This imagination and desire for 'wilderness' and 'authentic Indigenous culture' continues to fire the modern eco-tourism and exotic cultural tourism world trade. Travellers' tales of the paradise of the Pacific islands preceded the ethnographies of primitive tribes and noble savages. The myth of the noble savage, despite the academic critique of such stereotypes, has continued to be elaborated throughout all the utopias and social theorizing of the West up to Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Eliade 1960:42). As an Italian folklorist, G. Cocchiara, claimed, 'Before being discovered the savage was first invented' (Cocchiara, cited in Eliade 1960:39), a Western myth of 'in the beginning', ab origine in Latin.

Today's Aborigines of Australia, with a history of continuous habitation of an isolated island in the South Pacific for approximately 40,000 years, present an ideal object on which to project this Western mythic image. Their modern reality has become cloaked in Western myth. It functions within modern
tourism to provide occidental man with contemporary people still living in an earthly Paradise. This Western myth of paradise on earth continues to generate market desire for destinations incorporating ever more beautiful 'wilderness' places and ever more authentic people living \textit{ab origine} in the state of original balance with nature. Places and peoples untouched by the rush and stress of modern Western lifestyle, from which we are constantly being enticed to escape. The title of very popular television program on Australian commercial station Channel Nine promotes travel as a 'Getaway'.

Some modern travellers' tales are similar to the literature on 'savages' that Eliade explored as a 'precious documentation for the study of the minds of western men' (ibid:43). A couple of travel books that have assumed similar modern mythic status are \textit{Mutant Message Downunder} by Marlo Morgan and \textit{Songlines} by Bruce Chatwin. These best sellers in America and Europe have had a direct impact on tourist demand for Indigenous experiences in Australia.

Morgan depicts Australian Aboriginal people as the 'good' people still living in tune with nature with a 'message of redemption' for Westerners who have become 'mutants' through the 'evil' effects of Western civilization. Traditional Aboriginal elders were so incensed by Morgan's false depiction of their culture that they travelled to America in 1988 to confront her. While she apologized and in further editions did not claim her story to be a true traveller's account, she has since recanted and said it was the elders who were deluded, not her. Marlo Morgan's book has been so successful at targeting the Western cultural desire to discover the noble savage that it lead to public disclaimers by travel agents, Diverse Travel, who specialise in connecting visitors with genuine Indigenous tours in Australia. They published a rebuttal, by Joc Smiechen:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{THE REAL AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINAL EXPERIENCE}
(Not Mutant Message Down Under) Many people, especially overseas, gain a false and often romanticized view of Australian Aboriginal culture, mainly through erroneous and hyped up journalist accounts or a few misleading books that have been cleverly
\end{quote}
mass marketed to large and unsuspecting audiences. 'Mutant Message Down Under' by Marlo Morgan is possibly the worst and most wide spread example. It is in essence fiction and a new age fairytale based on very little fact.

(Smiechen 2004, Aboriginal Australia Travel website)

Bruce Chatwin's story, by comparison, is based on a factual record of his journeys with Aboriginal people in Central Australia. He did travel there, with Toly Sawenko of the Central Lands Council as guide and interpreter, and the conversations he reports happened. As discussed earlier in Chapter 2, his interpretation of Aboriginal Dreaming in terms of 'songlines' has been criticised as too facile by some but it is a concept that has inspired many travellers to follow his footprints. His interpretation of the interconnectness of Aboriginal people's creation beliefs across the continent as 'songlines' is a useful translation metaphor for Westerners seeking greater understanding of Australian Indigenous culture.

Australia is often presented to the world as the land of the Dreaming. Indigenous artistic directors of the opening ceremony of the Sydney 2000 Olympics were happy to capitalise on this and call their dance sequence 'The Dreaming'. Tourism 'commodifies' culture and nature, and Australia's Indigenous lands offer both commodities: the natural environment and the pre-industrial culture that fits the advertising clichés of the 'dream getaway' to an 'island paradise', a place where the ugly side of civilization with its rush, smog, traffic and noise can be replaced by timeless clear skies, long empty roads and beautiful natural vistas and sounds. This is the language of modern tourism, the language of Eliade's Western paradisiacal myth, 'the islands, and the heavenly landscapes of the tropics, blessed nudity, the beauty of native women, sexual freedom and so forth' (Eliade 1960:42).

Western 'tourism dreaming', trips to paradise, is a powerful business that is rapidly expanding globally as more countries attain the affluence and appetites of the West. It is within this wider world market that the demand for
Indigenous cultural experiences exists. Visitor surveys indicate that it is a niche market that is interested in an Indigenous tourism experience in Australia. Within this market segment there is an even smaller group of travellers who seek a full cultural immersion experience, as offered by Desert Tracks tours. What type of person is drawn to this cultural experience and what do they perceive and value in these tours? The evidence suggests that these travellers are distinctly different from mainstream tourists. They travel to change their consciousness of 'the other' and themselves. They come to learn how Anangu care for country physically, culturally and spiritually.

**Australian Indigenous Tourism Dreaming: Reality versus Myth**

Since the 1840s Aboriginal people have chosen to be involved in tourism, and since the 1950s Aboriginal imagery and culture have been marketed as part of generic Australian culture. This focus on Aboriginal imagery increased during the 1980s as part of the Australian Tourist Commission's international marketing campaign presenting Australia as a place of 'pristine environment' and the home of the 'true Aborigine' (Russell 1994:4). This targeting of the Western desire for paradise, identified by Eliade, is a clever market strategy that has greatly benefited Australian mainstream tourism. However, it has not directly benefited the Aboriginal people depicted in the images. Their reality is continued social disadvantage and exclusion from most of the wealth generated by their cultural images. Secondly, the pervasiveness of the 'traditional archetype' as authentic Aboriginality distinctly disadvantages Indigenous tourism ventures that do not perform to the script of this myth.

The Australian natural landscape is not a 'wilderness'; it is not 'pristine', as in 'untouched by human hands', but a landscape co-created by human and natural forces over the last 40,000 years. Prior to colonisation, Aboriginal hunting and gathering, particularly their fire resource management methods, transformed the vegetation of this continent (see Flannery 1994; Latz 1995). Since colonisation, a far greater transformation of the natural and cultural landscapes of this continent has occurred. The Indigenous people are no longer living
‘blissfully en aborigine’, unaware of and unaffected by the spread of ‘civilization’ which has irrevocably changed their land and their lifestyles. Rather, they are the most socially and economically impoverished people within Australia today (HREOC 2003). In remote communities on Aboriginal lands the opportunities for economically sustainable lifestyles, independent of government support, is even more remote than their locality. Traditional living on the land is no longer possible due to the impacts of colonisation. Of the introduced industries, tourism is seen by many to be less destructive of their natural and cultural resources and more sustainable economically. This has yet to be proven.

Tourism, while offering a way forward, may be asking Indigenous people to turn the clock back. The tourism demand has been for Indigenous people living in touch with nature, undeveloped and unsophisticated in Western industry, business and global knowledge. To maintain the ‘pristine primitive’ lifestyles of the Western myth, Indigenous people may need to perform themselves, living displays in outdoor museums. The other peril of modern tourism is that it can, and has often, destroyed the very object of its desire. The touch of mainstream tourism turns nature into a nice view from a hotel window, and other human beings into colourful sideshows. Tourism demands the new and pristine then, by its touch, fouls its own bed and does not want to return; the demand declines and people who have become dependent on tourism are left penniless.

To continually feed the desire for paradise and fuel the travel industry ‘paradise’, pure nature or pure native must be recreated in the performance space of tourism. Australia is, as yet, still vast enough and has many scattered Indigenous communities which only attract small numbers of tourists. The most successful at handling large numbers of tourists have created ‘artificial’ performance spaces in which to interact, like Tjapukai Dance Company’s Cultural Theme Park in Cairns and the controlled interface of Indigenous guides and tourists in national parks like Uluru Kata Tjuta and Kakadu. This ability to perform culture with authenticity may not satisfy traditional elders like Armunta and Dickie Minyintiirri of Cave Hill who said ‘One day no good.
They come, walk around, go, no good, not proper way!’ (Minyintirri, pers. comm., June 2003). However, other traditional owners of Walinynga vetoed this view because the money flow and employment from tourism increased with regular daily tours; the satisfaction of teaching culture the proper way was replaced by the satisfaction of being employed and paid well. These are adaptive decisions of survival in a harsh global market place.

**History of the Market Dream**

Distinguishing myth from reality in an industry built on dreams is difficult, but we can reflect on how the dreams were built by tracing the history of market research into Indigenous tourism in Australia. In 1997 the first major review of Indigenous participation in the Australian tourism industry was undertaken by the then peak national Indigenous representative body, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Commission, and the Office of National Tourism. Pilot research projects were funded throughout Australia during 1995 and in 1996 they published the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Tourism Industry Strategy (NATSITIS). The conclusion of this report was, ‘In the absence of good information it is difficult to plan ahead...This is particularly critical in the area of market research, where it is important to establish what tourists want from Indigenous tourism, but where reliable data is lacking’ (ATSIC1997:44). In 2003 when the Australian Tourist Commission (ATC) overviewed the existing research on Aboriginal Tourism they echoed the earlier report: ‘there has been limited research conducted in the past specifically focusing on Aboriginal tourism’ (ATC 2003:1). Despite offering no answers the ATC summary of Aboriginal Tourism consumer research includes valuable insights into consumer perceptions, interest and participation in Aboriginal tourism products. The major conclusions regarding international demand were:

Overall, Aboriginal tourism experiences for most visitors were regarded as desirable but did not drive destination choice or holiday itinerary planning;

Interaction and authenticity were important aspects of an Aboriginal tourism experience. Visitors to Indigenous tourism product were
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typically keen to learn, to experience and interact with the Aboriginal people;
Western markets (United Kingdom and Europe in particular) hold most potential overall for Aboriginal tourism, with higher levels of awareness, interest and participation. (ibid:3)

My case study of Desert Tracks revealed similar international customer expectations of Indigenous tourism. The notable exception was that for most people the Desert Tracks cultural immersion tour of 7-10 days was the prime reason, and often their only reason, for visiting Central Australia. Rarely did international visitors decide to take this tour once in Central Australia because of the length and cost of tour. Travellers who joined a Desert Tracks one or three day tour to Cave Hill were more likely to have added it to their itinerary once in Central Australia. Since the year 2000 this has also been offered daily, as a one-day tour, to increase their appeal to the short stay international market.

**Unsatisfied International Demand**
The Australian Government Tourism White Paper, launched on 20 November 2003, identified Indigenous Tourism as one of the key niche markets to be developed as a high priority because of the supposedly high unmet demand. The Federal government tourism minister claimed that 72% of all international visitors want an Indigenous experience (*The Australian*, 2004, 24 November) though the evidence is that only 10-15% achieve it. Researchers, Jeremy Huyton and Chris Ryan (2000) say it depends on the sorts of questions being asked. They have found that the claims of unsatisfied tourist demand for Indigenous experiences have little quantitative substantiation in their extensive research in Indigenous tourism demand in the Northern Territory. They criticise the promotion of Indigenous tourism development based on ideals of self-determination and authenticity control with no assessment of the market demand:

This relative lack of firm data is socially, economically and culturally important...If oversupply of a given type of product means few, if
any, tourist offerings possess economic viability, the circle of income
derprivation is perpetuated against, in some instances, further
criticisms of a waste of public monies on “social engineering”.
(Ryan & Huyton 2000:54)

This is yet another scheme set up to fail for Aboriginal communities. The
promotion of Indigenous tourism without sound research is ‘irresponsible,
socially dangerous and obscene. It is a denial of any form of “sustainability”
however theorised in the touristic academic literature’ (ibid).

The National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Tourism Industry Strategy
recognised these problems of oversupply based on false expectations and the
difficulty of assisting ‘increased Indigenous participation in tourism by lack of
information about what is possible’ (ATISC1997:44). In 2002 the Indigenous
Tourism Leadership Group (ITLG) found the situation had not improved. In
response to the Government Ten Year Plan for Tourism it highlighted the need
for greater market research into visitor participation and satisfaction in
Indigenous tourism (ITLG 2002). While the 2003 Australian Government
Tourism White Paper identifies Indigenous Tourism as one of the twelve niche
markets to be developed, there is no guarantee that this will ensure future
detailed research into the international and domestic demand for Indigenous
tourism product that will empower the industry.

**Figure 22:** Cover images on the Tourism White Paper
Implementation Plan 2004 (DITR 2004a)
The Government Tourism White Paper promotes the Australian Dream using three iconic tourism images of Australia to introduce its implementation plan: the wild, wide horizon Outback, the Aboriginal exotic ceremonially decorated face of innocence, and the laid back beach lifestyle of our island paradise, evidence of the enduring myths of Western paradise, the ‘tourism Dreaming’.

**Domestic Market Demand**

The Australian Government commissioned the most detailed recent research into the domestic demand for Indigenous Tourism product in 2004. The Department of Tourism Industry and Resources (DITR) contracted Colmar Brunton Social Research (CBSR) to determine ‘what was missing in nature-based and indigenous tourism products in Australia’ (DITR 2004b:10). According to the DITR brief to consultants; ‘recent data indicates that domestic visitation to national parks is declining and domestic interest is low in Indigenous tourism product’ (DITR 2004a:28). Colman Brunton research findings were that; ‘54% of all Australians have participated in at least one Indigenous activity in the last five years. This is significantly lower than participation in nature-based activities (90%).’ (ibid:113). Of those who had visited an Indigenous activity, 31% had visited art galleries or museums specialising in Indigenous culture. Only 7% or less had engaged in more hands-on immersion experiences of visiting Indigenous communities and learning about their culture (ibid:112).

The DITR estimates tourism is worth $73 billion per annum of which 75% is generated by domestic tourism (DITR 2005, website). The importance of tourism to regional Australia is significant, attracting forty-eight cents of every tourism dollar, especially as traditional rural industries are in decline or undergoing restructuring. Regional Indigenous operators in remote locations are probably getting only a small slice of this domestic tourism pie; unfortunately, figures are not available. However, the domestic market is so significant a percentage of the overall tourism market that Indigenous operators should be refocusing their marketing. Domestic tourists are nearly three times
more likely than international tourists to stay outside major capital cities (CBSR 2004:10).

The Australian Tourist Commission (ATC) conducted an extensive review of research into the international visitor interest in Indigenous tourism experiences in 2003. The Brand Audit research showed that although a high percentage of international visitors expressed interest in Aboriginal culture, the actual numbers of visitors who experienced Aboriginal art and cultural displays was recorded as much less by the International Visitor Survey interviews for the year ended 30 June 2003 (ATC 2003:3-4). Visitors from Europe, the United States (US) and Canada registered the highest interest in Aboriginal culture; however, actual uptake of experiences was low: of 84% US interest there was only 24% uptake; of 75% English interest only 29% uptake, and the results for other European countries and Canada were similar (ibid). International visitors in total generate only a quarter of Australia’s tourism income and are more likely to spend that in major capital cities. The obvious conclusion is that Indigenous operators need to attract more of the domestic market to experience real growth.

**Specific Product Concepts**

The Colman Brunton 2004 report, *Demand for Nature-Based and Indigenous Tourism Product*, identified four distinct categories of visitor demand (see Figure 23) and then tested the market interest in five Indigenous tourism products (see Figure 24). In the following section of this thesis these categories of tourist demand for specific product types are compared with the qualitative records of visitor interest in and evaluation of tours offered by Anangu in Central Australia.

Colman Brunton described the types of visitors interested in Indigenous experiences as: ‘bonders’, ‘connectors’, ‘learners’ and ‘reflectors’ (see Figure 23). The researchers claim that each of these segments has ‘clearly different needs’ (CBSR 2004:19). Though they have identified different needs it is difficult to agree that these needs define different tourists.
Figure 23: Bonders, Connectors, Learners and Reflectors (CBSR 2004:19)

The travellers on Desert Tracks tours would commonly have fitted into at least two, and usually all four, of these segments. Visitors on these tours to the Anangu Lands wanted to ‘connect’ and interact with Indigenous people; they wanted to ‘learn’ and to share these experiences, usually with a friend or family member or like minded group of which they were a member; and they were all ‘reflectors’, keen to take time out from the group experience to think, often writing their reflections later and sending these back by letter to the Anangu and non-Indigenous guides. Rather than being distinct segments of the Desert Tracks market, these categories present a continuum of needs to be filled by the Indigenous experiences offered by these tours.

The CBSR researchers then identified five products that ‘described participants’ ideal Indigenous experience’, as shown in Figure 24:
The specific Indigenous product concepts researched were:

**Indigenous Theme Park**: a place where you can enjoy finding out more about Indigenous culture, people and art with your family or friends. A variety of hands-on activities would be available such as learning how to play a didgeridoo or track an animal, and you could also see Indigenous art or dancing. Facilities such as toilet blocks, shops and cafes would be available.

**Cultural Full-Immersion**: a place where you can get to know Indigenous people by participating with them in their daily activities. You could spend time with the Indigenous people and get to know about them and their culture. The experience would take place in a remote area on Indigenous land, and you would eat ‘bush tucker’ and sleep in the open in the traditional way.

**Indigenous Teachers**: a luxurious, 4-5 star resort where you can also experience traditional Indigenous culture. You could take guided walks in the natural environment during the day and experience traditional Indigenous dances and music at night. Both traditional
Indigenous and everyday foods would be available, and the experience would be suitable for both adults and children.

**Outback learning:** a place where you can learn about authentic traditional Indigenous culture. Indigenous people would teach you about relationships within traditional Indigenous communities, and about myths and storytelling. You could also learn the local environment and animals.

**Cultural Semi-Immersion:** a place where you can stay overnight with and learn from Indigenous people about their traditional culture and about their life in modern Australian society. Activities like sharing stories around a campfire and taking walks would be available. Traditional Indigenous and everyday foods would be available.

(CBSR 2004:20-21)

A quarter of those interviewed were interested in the Indigenous Teachers concept; 21% were interested in the Indigenous Theme Parks and Outback Learning; 20% were interested in the Cultural Semi-Immersion and only 16% expressed interest in the Cultural full-immersion concept. All concepts attracted only 6–7% of ‘extremely interested’ domestic travellers, which, in the opinion of the researchers, most accurately reflects those who will seek the experience. Interestingly, the five products developed are similar to existing Indigenous tourism products. Domestic participants in this survey were unaware of many existing Indigenous tourism products in Australia, including Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park in Cairns, which is well known internationally. Lack of domestic knowledge of existing product could be due to an international marketing focus of Indigenous tourism operators, tourist commissions and informative guidebooks.

These tourism products are ‘idealised concepts’ developed from qualitative research into domestic customer expressed needs for Indigenous product. However, as noted before, they are very similar to Indigenous tourism products
already existing in the market. Thus, this research is of value in terms of evaluating Indigenous tours that are offered by Anangu in Central Australia, the percentage of the domestic market they are appealing to and the aspects of these experiences, which match the ideals identified by the research. I will briefly overview some of the types of Indigenous tourism product available in the greater Anangu lands and how these are fulfilling perceived customer demand. The products examined will include Anangu Tours at Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park (UKTNP), Odyssey Safaris’ Cave Hill tour operating out of Ayers Rock Resort, and Desert Tracks operating on the Pitjanjatjara Lands.

**Indigenous Tourism at Uluru and on Anangu Lands**

1. The Park and the Resort

Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park can be considered as fulfilling the domestic tourist’s ideal Indigenous experience for all the types of tourist identified, and it fits within several of the ideal product descriptions. Firstly, because of its world heritage natural environment status it will attract 80% of Australians (CBSR 2004:114). While it is not an Indigenous Theme Park in the sense of a constructed landscape like the Tjapukai Centre in Cairns, it is packaged as the ‘Aboriginal Heartland’ of Australia and marketed around the ‘themes’ of natural and cultural world heritage landscapes. The advantages of the Park for mainstream tourists are that it can be explored from the comfort of luxury hotels or, more economically for the self-drive and safari tour market, from manicured campgrounds.

The Ayers Rock Resort itself is marketed as a destination where the ‘Indigenous Teachers’ experience is offered. The Resort positions itself in the Park as an eco-sensitive luxury adventure or escape holiday destination in the ‘wilderness’ of Central Australia where visitors can learn about Aboriginal culture from the traditional owners of Uluru. The advertising key words are ‘luxury’, ‘spiritual’, ‘authentic’, ‘mystery’, ‘far away’, ‘wilderness’: a perfect destination to fulfill the desire of people entranced by Eliade’s Western paradisiacal myth seeking ‘true nature’ and ‘true aborigines’.
Ayers Rock Resort lies 'at the gateway to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, in Australia's Northern Territory...Here you can immerse yourself in the timeless landscape of one of the world's most beautiful natural wonders...Everything about the Resort reflects a sensitivity to the environment and respect for the area's traditional Aboriginal owners (Voyages 2005, website).

It is interesting to note that the possibility of spiritual transformation is part of the package offered: 'Many people don't consider themselves as spiritual before they visit The Red Centre. Come out to Ayers Rock, Kings Canyon or Alice Springs Resorts for an adventure and you may be surprised who goes home' (ibid).

Visitors are offered scheduled times to experience particular natural and cultural 'shows' within the Park, particularly sunrise, sunset, the climb, the cultural centre, the night sky. Touring options and visitor experiences are intensely organised to fit into the 1.5 average day's duration of stay. Fences, walkways, signage and restricted access areas protect the environment and cultural heritage. Despite these protective measure visitors often diverge from the sign-posted tracks, but Park Rangers actively police this. The intention of the National Park management is that the natural landscape and the interaction with Indigenous people are structured and controlled.

Though the reasons for all these restrictions are to protect nature and the privacy of Indigenous people, it has the effect of creating an artificial performance space. Visitors, once inside the boundary of the National Park, enter a large natural theme park, a place where they can experience nature 'and enjoy finding out more about Indigenous culture, people and art with your family or friends' (CBSR 2004:20-21). The tourism experience is completely controlled by two major players: Voyages Resorts, managing all
accommodation, food and retail outlets at the Ayers Rock Resort, and Parks Australia managing the National Park.

The Resort is owned by a monopoly that garners revenue from high cost accommodation, food and has its own line in clothing and souvenirs. The tourists spend most of their money at the Resort while the Park Entry fee is a small percentage of their costs. The Aboriginal owned Ininti Store and Maṟaku Arts at the Cultural Centre inside the Park must compete for the tourism dollar. While Anangu traditional owners of the land are co-managers of the National Park and receive a percentage of entry fees, they do not receive a direct percentage of the larger tourism profit from the Resort. However, they successfully negotiated support from Voyages in 1994 to establish their own tourism business, Anangu Tours, which now employs many local people.

2. Anangu Tours

Anangu Tours is ideally located at Uluru, a ‘must see’ destination for both domestic and international tourists. Anangu tours are marketed as nature-based Indigenous experiences, thus satisfying the identified 90% of Australian domestic market demand for these two products. ‘On their tours they share their intricate understanding of the land, plants and animals with small groups’ (Anangu Tours, website). Anangu Tours offers a selection of 3–4 hour tours around the Park that also fit the tourism product concept categories of Indigenous Teachers and Outback Learning. International tourists whose destination choice is not driven by a desire to experience Indigenous tourism can add these short tours to their visit once they arrive or pre-book them as part of a package.

Anangu, as owners and co-managers of the UKTNP, want to create sustainable employment and income for their people, not just as Park Rangers but also as guides in their own tourism business. They share some of their culture and ‘spiritual’ understanding of their country through the displays in the Cultural Centre and as guides on Anangu Tours. Their
mission statement includes the following reasons why Anangu at Uluru
have started their own tourism enterprise:

It is important that all visitors to our country gain an understanding
of Tjukurpa, and it is our role to pass it on...
We have designed our tours to give visitors of all ages the
opportunity to learn Tjukurpa, and something of our lifestyle and
history...
We want you to see what we see inside that big Rock, and take home
some of our spiritual feelings for this place.

(Anangu Tours, website)

3. Odyssey Safaris

Odyssey tours, owned by Voyages Resorts, has been licensed by Desert
Tracks to operate a tour to Cave Hill on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara (AP)
Lands that fits the product concept of Indigenous Teachers: 'a luxurious, 4–5
star resort where you can also experience traditional Indigenous culture'
(CBSR 2004:20-21). Odyssey tours are marketing this tour to the top end of
the market, particularly to people who stay at their luxury tented safari
camp, Longitude 131. The price per person for a twin share tent overnight is
$812.50, minimum two nights stay, no children under 15 years. This is
double the rate of the next most expensive accommodation deluxe suites at
the five-star Sails in the Desert hotel at Ayers Rock Resort. This is a niche
market that demands luxury, exclusivity, authenticity, privacy, mystery and
spirituality, a totally encapsulated experience tailor-made for each guest:
'Our touring program has been developed with the aim of sharing an
authentic experience that will allow each guest a chance to immerse
themselves in the mystery and spirituality of this remarkable desert region'
(Voyages 2005, website).

This type of traveller seeks the Indigenous Teachers experience, in a
'luxurious, 4–5 star resort where you can also experience traditional
Indigenous culture' (CBSR 2004:20-21). This was the product that generated
the most interest in the domestic market, with, as previously mentioned,
24% being interested overall. However, the customers from Longitude 131 who take an Odyssey Safari tour to Cave Hill are a select group within an already select group of high-paying customers, both domestic and international. Their tents are the most expensive rooms at the resort. These tourists require the luxury cocoon of the resort so that personal comfort is not lost while they ‘enjoy the view’ of the Indigenous other.

4. Desert Tracks
Desert Tracks, established by Anangu on AP Lands in 1988, provided an in-depth ‘cultural immersion’ experience before this category of tourism was invented. Anangu teach by including the visitor their daily life, expecting them to look, listen and learn by becoming part of the experience. According to the CBSR research this experience of ‘cultural immersion’ is the least Indigenous tourism product least desired by the domestic market, only 16% overall with only 6% expressing extreme interest (CBSR 2004:20-21).

This research finding does not account for the high numbers of domestic visitors who filled 80% of the Desert Tracks tours in the first five years of operation. This high percentage of domestic visitors was probably due to the marketing method of targeting special interest groups within Australian society and not relying on mainstream marketing. Perhaps the tours tapped the latent unmet demand in the domestic market for real in-depth Indigenous experiences, which were not commonly available to tourists in the late 1980s. Since Desert Tracks started in 1990 there has been an explosion of Indigenous tours offered by Indigenous people around Australia. Without a doubt, the visitors to Desert Tracks reflect a special interest niche in both the domestic and international markets. It is a more difficult Indigenous tourism product to market: it costs more, takes more time and involves more personal risk for the average tourist as it requires leaving one’s cultural cocoon or comfort zone.
Desert Tracks Attracts True Travellers

Because people travel for complex reasons, the categories of ‘true traveller’ and ‘tourist’ overlap. It may well be that they might include luxury accommodation with the opportunity to participate in a genuine Aboriginal cultural tour. This takes our inquiry into another borderland where travelling to learn about other cultures interfaces with the tourism demand for the Indigenous other.

We travel, rather as Matisse and Klee painted, I think, to articulate and also to change consciousness, to remark on what happens when two ways of being in the world intersect. In other words, for wisdom’s sake...Tourists, needless to say, travel for the opposite reason: their whole tour, from the arrangement of the furniture in their hotel room to the 2.00pm performance of the Monkey Dance, is planned to make sure nothing at all happens – that no connections are made, no sparks fly, no planes of being intersect.

(Dessaix 1998:197)

The following chapter provides a background to the performance space of Desert Tracks where true travellers are invited by Anangu to experience their country and culture through cultural immersion that could possibly change their consciousness.
Chapter 8

CULTURAL NATURAL LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT OF DESERT TRACKS TOURISM ON AP LANDS

Introduction
This chapter examines the cultural and natural resource management issues that have occurred during the development of this business over the years from 1988 to 2005. Mistakes were made, as this was the first tourism business on the Indigenous lands of the Yankunytjatjara and Pitjantjatjara people of Central Australia that was jointly managed by Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. The business, of necessity, developed bi-cultural management strategies in the economic, social, cultural, spiritual and natural landscapes that overlap and interweave in the cross-cultural performance space of Indigenous tourism. An overview is presented of the hybrid economy that incorporates customary and Western economic systems in Indigenous community enterprise.

The Vision
Nganyinytja spoke of her vision for Desert Tracks:

My land is still alive with the Dreaming Law of the wamami, ‘rainbow serpent’ and the ngintaka, ‘perentie lizard’ and all the Creation Beings who travelled through here. Our families have kept these alive. Those who have lost their Dreaming Law, its been cut and finished, they can come here to learn, to reconnect to how it is for us and then they can go back and find that for themselves.

(Nganyinytja 1993)

The Tours
Desert Tracks offers Indigenous cultural immersion tours into the AP Lands of north-west South Australia. These 4wd camping tours take people from the comfort of Ayers Rock Resort, or direct from their plane flight from the green coastal fringe of Australia, into the red heart of the desert and its people. The
travelling distances are long because of the remoteness of the Pitjantjatjara homeland destinations. The visitor has firstly to overcome the strangeness of the vast empty spaces of the desert and then the differences of language and culture of our hosts. The desire to communicate both ways is there and with the aid of interpreter guides the differences are bridged.

The shortest tour offered is a one-day tour to Cave Hill. The tour commences and ends at the Resort at Uluru. Driving east 100 km on bitumen, the tour turns south onto a gravel road that passes Mt Connor, an impressive mesa, sometimes mistaken for Uluru, rising up out of this region of extended sand-dune plains. The next 100 km journey, over rough dirt roads, brings us to Cave Hill and the rock art site of Walinynga. Three-day tours are also offered by Desert Tracks, different itineraries having been tried over the years. Some incorporate visits to community art centres, some the Mt Woodroffe climb, others visit both Cave Hill and Angatja, briefly.

The longer 7–8 day tours have been called a ‘Bush College’ by the Angatja people. This is an intensive experience of desert living and Anangu traditional lifestyle. The major songline that traverses the country around Angatja is part of the Ngintaka Tjukurpa. This story is told that the songline followed some 20 km, and the song saga sung and danced for the visitors. The relation of Dreamtime Creation Law to country, food, water sources, daily life and tribal laws is explained. The experience of immersion into another cultural reality allows people to become open to the Land in a new way. City people need to forget their watches and slip into ‘Anangu time’.

The Business Plan

MISSION STATEMENT
Desert Tracks aims to provide a unique experience of Aboriginal culture and lifestyle for the participants on its tours into Pitjantjatjara Lands. Visitors enter the space where the two worlds meet, the Pitjantjatjara desert culture with the traditions stretching back over 40,000 years and the modern western technological society.
Desert Tracks Business Plan

1. Aims:
   i. The primary goal of any Desert Tracks business plan is to ensure: maintenance of cultural heritage and ensuring authentic information is given on all tours and in promotional material.
   ii. Profitability of the business and employment of traditional custodians in their homelands.

2. Objectives:
   i. Community control of the delivery of tourism business, creating pride and a real enterprise for the children to become involved with.
   ii. To provide employment opportunities for Anangu in the cultural tourism business as guides, interpreters and in public relations.
   iii. To provide employment in communities that economically sustains the maintenance of cultural heritage and current lifestyle of Anangu living on traditional land.
   iv. For Anangu to control the information being given to visitors about their country by telling their own story of the Law and Dreaming.
   v. To use legally appropriate contracts for the use of cultural material by journalists, photographers, artists, film makers and musicians.
   vi. To develop a profitable eco-tourism enterprise, the profits of which will be distributed equitably back to the participating communities.
   vii. Operate in accordance with internationally recognised standards of ecotourism.

In Western business terms the Anangu approach to tourism is heavily biased towards vision and community cultural goals and is not focused primarily on profit or economic viability. In fact, ‘profit’ was not initially mentioned in the first four objectives it was relegated to a lower priority than cultural continuity and sustainable living on homelands. It was only after consultation with ATSIC business advisers that ‘profitability’ was added in to the business aims (see Figure 25). The linear framework of Western business, the strict timetables of management thinking that moves in straight lines from product to sale to profit, would appear antithetical to Indigenous cyclical organisation of the traditional business of ceremonies, hunting and gathering and life responding to natural seasons. However, the continued success of Desert Tracks suggests that bi-
cultural models of business can be developed that integrate the different cultural and economic priorities of Indigenous and Western people.

**Strategies**

1. **Economic**

Aboriginal traditional economic activity on the AP Lands was cyclical, moving through country in response to seasonal patterns of water, growth and game. Sustainable practices of environmental resource management were essential in this marginal desert country. These practices were governed by strict rules encoded in Creation stories learnt from early childhood and enforced in customary law, reciprocity ethics, ceremony and restricted access to water and sanctuaries of biodiversity, often ‘sacred sites’. These rules and practices that governed social behaviour towards self, community and the environment were reinforced by cyclic performance of ritual along songlines. Anangu describe a traditional pattern of autonomous groups of varying sized ‘families’ who pursued independent economic activity, sustaining the livelihood of each group and producing excess to share when meeting for ceremonies. Each group was constrained in their exploitation of natural resources by their rights and responsibilities to country defined by regional Law, the *Tjukurpa* that links people, places and species across the Land.

On remote Indigenous lands, communities participate in what Jon Altman describes as a ‘hybrid economy’ made up of market, state and customary components. This system is often derided as ‘welfare dependency’ and ‘important Indigenous economic contributions remain unquantified in mainstream calculations’ (Altman 2001, 226:1). It is a testament to Indigenous ingenuity and adaptation that they continue to survive in an imposed foreign social, economic and political system, the boundaries of which have continued to change over the years since colonisation.

On the AP Lands, for example, the early explorers first traversed the lands in the late 1800s; then came the Afghan traders, pastoralists, doggers and
miners during early 1900s; the missionaries and rations of 1936; the
government settlements and welfare administration started in 1960; land
rights and self-determination in 1970–80s; to the self-governance of today,
that collapsed temporarily between 2001–2004, when an administrator was
appointed by the South Australian government. However, self-governance
has been restored and a new Land Council elected which has adopted the
new name of Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Council. During
these years the governance and economic rules of interaction with Western
society have changed many times, from rations and mission handouts, to
state welfare, to the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs
grants in aid, to the Aboriginal Development Commission business grants,
to ATSIC regional funding and now, the dissolution of this Aboriginal
controlled funding body and the return to grants through a variety of state
and commonwealth agencies.

Old Piti Piti, an elder at Pipalyatjara, expressed his opinion regarding the
changing white face of governance he had seen over the years since 1940:
'Ve had mission, we had welfare, DAA, ADC; maybe we work with mining
company now. Easy, they pay for what they want’ (Piti Piti, pers. comm.,
1980). To survive all these changes of economic rules within his lifetime, old
Piti Piti had become an astute economic opportunist. Like all Indigenous
people living at the mercy of seemingly flippant and changeable whitefella
law the clearest lesson learnt was to spend all the grant funds as quickly as
possible, leaving no surplus, or the government will take it back and give
less the next financial year. Short-term government funding practices have
ensured poor saving and money management practices, while long term
planning has not been encouraged, as government funding rounds are
yearly and policies likely to change every three years.

There are also few models of private enterprise that exist on Indigenous
lands from which people can learn to manage business. Anangu have been
involved in learning to manage community stores and local art centres but
as these are both community owned they do not operate on strict commercial lines. Community stores often allow ‘book up’ credit to pensioners or powerful political figures in the community; this system has often deteriorated into corruption, supporting store managers who themselves are living out of the store and embezzling profits. The art centres have survived on a combination of government grants and sales; usually this requires non-Indigenous management as the system is complicated and payments to artists piecemeal, dependent on sales and subsidies.

Desert Tracks began as a joint venture between the landowners Angatja community and financial partners Greg Snowdon and Diana James. There was no government assistance from 1988 to 1994. The partners and guides were not on salary as employment and payments to all guides and communities was dependent on tour income. This system has been retained, with a community camp fee per passenger per day and a fixed daily rate for the Anangu interpreter being costed into each tour. Other Anangu guides are paid from the community camp fee. Guide payments bring direct cash into the community after each tour. This is irregular but substantial income, and allows some families to save for cars, swags, tents or other large items. In the early years of operation large guide payments to younger guides did result in drinking binges at Curtin Springs. The elders have solved this by restricting the use of community vehicles.

Traditional obligations to share resources mean that most guide payments are quickly dispersed amongst a large number of kin. To allow the distribution of income according to the traditional obligations the guide payments were not made as wages to particular people but rather as a lump sum community camp fee. To ensure that a minimum of four guides was employed, with extra fees set aside for inma dance performances, a minimum daily rate for camp fees was established based on ten or fewer passengers. With over ten passengers the rate increased per passenger. The Anangu directors of Desert Tracks were responsible for distributing
payments to the individuals involved in each tour. This money then dispersed into the customary economy of communities (see Figure 29).

2. Funding for Enterprises

The difficulties of raising investment finance to start businesses on Indigenous native title lands have been discussed previously and apply to the AP Lands, which are owned in common by 3000 Anangu: individuals or communities cannot use land ownership as collateral for a business loan. To finance Desert Tracks the Angatja community proposed a joint enterprise with non-Indigenous partners, Diana James and Greg Snowdon, who could access a bank loan through the mortgage of private property. The business operated as a joint enterprise with these partners from 1988 to 1990.

The joint enterprise consisted of a Memorandum of Agreement between the parties involved and operated under a special business permit from AP Council that had to be reviewed every year. It was an arrangement based on mutual trust and good faith built up over many years of previous work on AP Lands by the non-Indigenous partners. This was a precarious business arrangement where the non-Indigenous partners were carrying the financial risk and the Angatja people were carrying the cultural risk. If the tourists were to enter, photograph or publish articles about areas of secret sacred cultural significance or cause offence to any traditional owners, the permit for the tours would be withdrawn. This would incur shame and traditional punishment for the Anangu involved and financial loss for their non-Indigenous business partners. Small tourism enterprises typically do not make a profit for the first five years of operation, as most income needs to be put back into the business to develop capital items, service loans and to increase market knowledge of the product. The insecurity of the permit conditions worked against long term planning and marketing, which was essential in this market niche where many international visitors plan eighteen months ahead.
Lack of profits and the stress of the permit insecurity caused one partner, Snowdon, to quit at the end of the season in 1990. Desert Tracks continued with James as sole trader and a new five-year permit contract with the AP Council was negotiated. This permit security allowed for longer-term business security and the siting of a permanent campsite with minimal infrastructure at Angatja. The reputation of the business grew and winning the National Award for Cultural Tourism in 1992 was recognition of excellence from the Australian tourism industry. The aim of full Indigenous ownership of the business could only be achieved with a government grant to purchase the capital assets. In 1994 the business was expanding and a long-term business plan had been developed with two community partners, Angatja and Cave Hill. This provided the business security that ATSIC required before they would give a grant to purchase and expand the business. The business is now 100% Aboriginal owned and ceased receiving ATSIC assistance in June 1996. Non-Indigenous office staff and management continue to be employed. The income from tours has continued to increase and the numbers of communities involved has grown.

3. Joint Business Management

The joint management of the business has involved non-Indigenous financial and tour operational management while the designing of tour itinerary, planning of where to go and what to see has been controlled by the elders of each tour destination. This division of management responsibility reflects the areas of expertise of all people in the business.

When the people of Angatja bought the business in 1994 they retained non-Indigenous management because there were no Anangu with business skills who wished to live away from their community at the Yulara resort or Alice Springs. The business office, buses and camping equipment had to be located near an all-weather airport to pick up the tourists, and at a centre with good phone, fax and computer communication, none of which was available on AP Lands prior to 2000, so it was located at Yulara. The
possibility of a trainee Anangu manager was considered but the location was problematic. Nganyinytja said: 'We don't want our Anangu manager to live at Yulara; too much drink, no family. If we have an office on the Lands our young people could work there. There are lots of young people eager to work as they get older' (ibid:21).

The system of non-Indigenous management, removed by physical distance from the Anangu directors, relies on mutual trust and good communication between the two. Few directors are literate or fluent in English, which is an added area of difficulty in the operation of a business that requires knowledge of company law, accounting, advertising, control of media reporting, permits to enter Aboriginal land, writing brochures, and communicating with clients and the tourism industry. The knowledge of the Pitjantjatjara language by the manager has been an essential element in the early development of the business and training of Anangu guides and directors in tourism business. Younger community members are becoming involved in the management of the business as the older generation pass on. However, the difficulties of low literacy levels and the distance of office management from the communities remains a source of potential misunderstanding.

Anangu management has not yet become a reality, with the business depending on non-Indigenous managers not resident on AP Lands. James resigned at the end of 2000 when Jim Montgomery, who had worked as tour operations manager for several seasons, was employed as manager from 2001 to 2004. In February 2004, Montgomery and the Anangu Directors, with assistance from AP legal advisors, negotiated a management contract with Discovery Ecotours who run special interest environmental tours at Uluru. Montgomery also negotiated a contract between Desert Tracks and Odyssey Safaris, the touring arm of Voyages and the owners of Ayers Rock Resort, to operate daily tours to Cave Hill paying Anangu guides a fixed rate and a percentage of the profits going to Desert Tracks.
Competing Economic and Cultural Enterprises

Cattle, horses and camels have at various times been primary industries at Angatja. In the 1980s and 1990s Ilyatjari and his sons ran a few head of cattle and horses around Angatja. They also herded wild camels for sale or for breaking in for tourist rides. These enterprises competed for water, access to country, human resources and community vehicles. Eco-cultural tours cannot operate in an area where domestic livestock is breaking fences, trampling vegetation and despoiling water sources.

Negotiation with the directors of Desert Tracks to resolve these issues was very difficult. Many Anangu have long term associations with stock work on stations; Ilyatjari and his sons had all worked at Curtin Springs for many years. These real skills are highly valued and provide one of the few opportunities for employment and enterprise on AP Lands. The stock work was not, however, providing a substantial income, the sale of camels was intermittent and the land could only sustain a small ‘killer’ herd of beef cattle. The camels polluted natural waterholes. Fencing and stock management continued to be a difficult management issue for many years.

Cave Hill was a different story as the family there were employed in Amata, less than 20 km away, in the police force and community services. The land surrounding Cave Hill had been depleted in the past by the grazing of cattle from Amata but these were irregular intruders by 1994 when tourism started there. Stanley Douglas, the senior traditional owner at Cave Hill, is concerned about native flora and fauna conservation:

I would like to see it like this. We could put up a fence to keep the cattle out. We would like to see our native plants grow back. Native grasses, and bush tucker like bush tomatoes will grow back. Bush turkeys eat these so they will return to the area. We don’t want the cattle and horses to interfere with tourism.

(James 1996a:21)