This paper provides a contextual framework for viewing Yorta Yorta occupation and connections with the Barmah-Millewa Forests and its surrounds (the study area). In doing so I am profoundly conscious of the need to ground the knowledge of my people’s connections with the ancestral lands in their worldview of Indigenous land relations. Indigenous wisdom throughout the world shares a common belief system that all things are related. What happens in one area sooner or later directly or indirectly impacts on other areas. History has tended to vindicate this view. In line with this philosophy, Yorta Yorta views about their natural and cultural heritage will engage a holistic approach. Occupying this position and, at all times, being careful not to compromise the track record of Yorta Yorta land-water management and care, will be the guiding framework for my analysis. It must be emphasized here that the purpose of this paper is not to paint an idealised image of Indigenous society, rather it presents a view that is based on a track record that took its own path, and remains unique and of its own kind.

This will be an important framework for examining Yorta Yorta culture and lifestyle, for assessing the misconceptions of Indigenous identity that are often constructed, and for analysing the impact of introduced land management practices on Yorta Yorta occupation, use and enjoyment of their ancestral lands and waters. The paper begins with a clarification of the term Yorta Yorta-Bangerang, and then discusses past and present connections including a critical analysis of the prevailing misconceptions about Indigenous people.

YORTA YORTA-BANGERANG

The people who identify as Yorta Yorta-Bangerang are the descendants of the original ancestors who occupied the Barmah-Millewa Forests (Fig. 1). The events of the last one hundred and seventy years have shaped the contemporary nature and structure of groups within the region. Previous narrower sub-groupings have evolved to encompass broader interests with greater emphasis being placed on collective identity and inter-relationships between family groups. Indeed, it is correct to say that Yorta Yorta-Bangerang are one and of the same peoples who trace their ancestral lineages (bloodlines) and cultural connections back to the ancestors who were on country at the imposition of British domination.
and control. This is reflected in the name of the organisation set up to represent Yorta Yorta-Bangerang people in land, compensation and heritage matters – the Yorta Yorta Nations Inc. (YYNI).

The YYNI is the principal structure for dealing with land, water, compensation and cultural matters. Its structure comes from a process whereby the inherent rights of the Yorta Yorta-Bangerang nation are represented through democratically elected representatives who make up the Elders Council and the Governing Committee. These representatives are drawn from the family groups who inherit their rights and interests from the ancestors who were in occupation at invasion, and through them to the ancestors who have been in occupation since creation. A rather amazing and unique inherence of hereditary bestowed, particularly when one considers the timeline of prior occupation, which has been put at 2,500-3,000 generations. This hereditary timeline gives rise to rights and interests in land, culture, identity and autonomy that are the rock solid foundations of Australia’s Indigenous history. Nothing, as it is often asserted by the original owners, will ever change that reality (discussed at Yorta Yorta Nations, Survival Weekend, Barmah Forest, January 2003).

Having discussed the collective nature of the relationship between the Yorta Yorta-Bangerang, and for the purpose of this discussion, where reference is made to their shared connections, I will use the term Yorta Yorta.

The introductory framework will be used as a guideline for supporting the current struggle of the Yorta Yorta and their supporters, for the Barmah-Millewa Forests to be declared a National Park, recognising the Yorta Yorta as the original owners under a Joint Management Arrangement (Atkinson 2004). I will now examine those issues that have overlaid the timeline of Yorta Yorta occupation and continue to play a dominant role in forest management policies and practices.
MISCONCEPTIONS OF ABORIGINALITY

When speaking of Indigenous Australians, there is a tendency amongst the majority within Australian society to distinguish between those people of the remote and the more settled regions. These binaries are also reflected in academic and politico-legal discourses. Those living in remote Australia are seen as ‘traditional’ or ‘real’ while those living in the more settled areas are often disparagingly referred to as ‘not real’ Aborigines (Gray 1999; Langton 1993:11-13; Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation 1996; Atkinson 2002). This distinction is based on stereotypical notions of Aboriginality. There are, of course, differences between Indigenous cultures in different parts of Australia today, just as there were before white invasion. The Murray Island people are, in culturally significant ways, ‘different from Indigenous people on mainland Australia who in turn differ from each other’ (Mabo (No. 2) Toohey J. at 179). But the consequence of cultural diversity is something very different from the dichotomy so frequently drawn between ‘real’ and ‘not real’. The same type of judgment is rarely applied to other cultures in the same way. No one suggests that white Australian culture is not authentic because people no longer wear 18th Century clothes and travel by horse-driven transport, or that other cultural groups within Australia do not live the ‘right’ kind of culture (Gray 1999).

The mindset that constructs what is authentic and what is not reflects the fact that racial hierarchies still persist as the dominant discourse. That is, the dominant culture still holds the power to impose value judgments on those who are seen as the ‘other’ (Said 1994:10-14; Anderson 1996). Such perceptions operate at the unconscious level much of the time, and are continuously reinforced by similar assumptions underlying much of the coverage of Indigenous issues by the media and the non-Indigenous education system. It is not a perception limited to overtly racist individuals, but is common even amongst well-educated, intelligent people who may be sympathetic towards Indigenous people. Many Indigenous people, including myself, continue to deal with these misconceptions on a regular basis (Indigenous Perceptions of the Academy 1994). The infiltration of such views into the dominant society is extremely great. Indeed it is one that continually confronts Indigenous communities such as my own. It takes immense time and commitment, not to mention the need for adequate resources, to break down such views. It is relatively recent that Professor Stanner called for Australians to transcend this mindset towards Indigenous Australians and to move on with a ‘better understanding’ (Stanner 1969; Gray 1999; Harvey 1999:17-18; Bourke & Bourke 1999).

The need to avoid perpetuating Aboriginal misconceptions is supported by one of Australia’s foremost Indigenous research institutions, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Canberra (AIATSIS). In its analysis of research into Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples, the Institute recognises the need for research to reflect the diversity of Indigenous societies and to avoid perpetuating the myth that most or ‘real’ Aborigines live in the ‘Top End’ of Australia (AIATSIS 1999:13-16; Foster 1999; Bourke et al. 1994:15).

Divisive notions of ‘authentic’ Aboriginality were used by opponents of the Yorta Yorta Native Title Claim (1994-2002) (YYNTC) to justify extinguishment arguments and to suggest that because we do not live like our ancestors did 170 years ago, all law and custom had ceased (Yorta Yorta 1996). In determining Native Title rights however, ‘no distinctions of Aboriginality need be made’, as the ‘relevant principles are the same’ (see Mabo (No. 2), Toohey J. at 179).

Having clarified some of the key misconceptions of Aboriginality, I will now focus on what I see as the up front factors that need to be considered in viewing Indigenous land relations. These are: Indigenous society in its proper time perspective; the notion of change in any cultural system; the existence of a living culture that continues to maintain connections with the ancestral lands; and an awareness of the extent to which imported constructs have been used to categorise, classify and to create stereotypical notions of Indigenous identity & culture (Broome 1994:121-4; Beckett 1994:1-8; Bird 1993:89; Clayton 1988:53; Keen 1988; Cowlishaw 1988; Aborigines Advancement League 1985:15-16; Langton 1981; Gilbert 1973:207).

PERCEPTIONS OF INDIGENOUS LAND RELATIONS

There is now a consistent Indigenous and academic view that sees Aboriginal perceptions of the land in terms of social, cultural and spiritual relationships (Rose 1997:43; Bourke & Cox 1994; Dodson 1994;
The word ‘use’ and its Indigenous counterpart ‘relationship’ have different meanings. The term ‘use’ or ‘relationship’ does not have the same meaning, for instance, to a woodchipper, a grazier, a town planner or a State Forest officer. The idea of ‘use’ from a western perspective is largely based on what the land is capable of producing economically and how it can be owned and controlled individually (Weberriss & Frauenfelder 1996). Indigenous ownership is based on communal relationships with the land in which rights are collectively shared and distributed between family groups. Traditional rights to land have their origin in those traditional laws, customs and uses identified by the High Court in *Mabo* (No. 1 & No. 2). These rights, exclusive to those in possession, were also capable of accommodating other cultural and economic interests (*Mabo* (No.2), Toohey J. at 146-8; Brennan J. at 43-5; Deane and Gaudron JJ. at 64).

In his role as Chief Protector, Port Phillip Aboriginal Protectorate (1838-49), George Augustus Robinson recognised Aboriginal ownership of land and property and was aware of the concept of territorial rights. “The Aborigines have ideas of property in land. Every tribe has its own distinct boundaries [which] are well known and defended. All the wild ducks are considered as much the property of the tribe’s inhabitants or ranging on its whole extent as the flocks of sheep and herds of cattle that have been introduced into the country by adventurous Europeans.” (Robinson, vol. 6:147).

Notwithstanding the gulf between Western and Indigenous concepts of land ownership there are some parallels that can be drawn. John Locke’s ideas of property rights, arising from one’s labour investment in the soil (Locke 1983:177-80), were not unfamiliar concepts to Indigenous people (Dingle 1988:30). They had well developed laws and practices based on using the land in accordance with economic and cultural interests. While English theories of land ownership may have been influential in 18th Century land acquisition policies, *Mabo* brought Australian law into line with contemporary notions of land justice. It abolished the concept of Australia as *terra nullius*, and rejected earlier Anglo-centric assumptions that were used to justify the denial of Indigenous land rights. The recognition of pre-existing Yorta Yorta rights in accordance with contemporary notions of justice and equality however remains the key issue (Butt 1996:885-886; *Mabo* (No.2), 1992, Brennan and Deane JJ. at 29-43; Donahue et al. 1983:177-80).

To understand and to appreciate the nature and antiquity of Indigenous land relations, the following timeline of Yorta Yorta occupation and connections will be used as a contrast to the relatively recent overlays of European history (Fig. 2).

When speaking of Indigenous occupation of Australia, we are dealing with an enormous time-span.

---

**TIMELINE OF YORTA YORTA OCCUPATION**

50,000 YEARS BP

25,000 BP

20,000 BP

2005

Lake Mungo

Yorta Yorta Occupation and Possession back to Biami and the Dreamtime

Cadell Fault creates changes to rivers

Kow Swamp Cranium

Invasion 170 BP

Pleistocene Epoch - end of last ice age

Holocene Epoch 10,000 BP

Fig. 2. Antiquity of Yorta Yorta occupation.
Indigenous occupation of the southeastern region has been put at 50,000-120,000 years (Kirk 1981:18; Singh & Kershaw 1981; Thorne et al. 1999; Beattie 1964). There are radiocarbon dates from Lake Mungo and Kow Swamp that range from 50,000 to 20,000 years before present (Fig. 3; Thorne & Macumber 1972). The 50,000-year timeline comes from new inflorescence dating methods at Lake Mungo (Thorne et al. 1999). Sites dated in the Murray Valley flood plain by Craib and Bonhomme in 1990-91 indicate that occupation of the claim area is at least 20,000 years before present (Craib 1992; Bonhomme 1990;...
Butler et al. 1973). Dates of vegetation core studies taken from Lake George (near Canberra) indicate that fire was and continues to be used by Indigenous people for land management and food production purposes from around 120,000 years ago (Singh & Kershaw 1981; Jones 1968).

**CHANGE AND ADAPTION**

Archaeological evidence predating the European invasion indicates that there have been changes taking place over this period but the extent of change does not appear to have been catastrophic. The arrival of Europeans with far reaching consequences, however, has tended to amplify the extent of change that has occurred, and has tended to overlook the way Indigenous society has adapted and continues to flourish as a vibrant living culture (Broome 1994:121-24; Kohen 1995:25-34; Gostom & Chong 1994; Flood 1989:142; Aborigines Advancement League 1985:1-10).

Indigenous and non-Indigenous writers have challenged such omissions. Those who tended to portray Aboriginal society in a wholly traditional sense have attempted to broaden their perceptions to include the more contemporary situation (for example, Berndt & Berndt 1977; Elkin 1974). Aboriginal Studies programs in schools and universities emphasise the need to teach traditional and contemporary culture (Bourke et al. 1994). Many historians recognise that Aboriginal resistance and survival was at the heart of the struggle to defend pre-existing rights to land and resources. Indeed some judges acknowledge that it was violence over land ownership that underwrote our history as a nation (Gray 1999; Mabo (No. 2), Brennan J. at 69; Cannon 1993; Reynolds 1981, 1987; Broome 1994; Howard 1982; Christie 1979).

Indigenous voices today are more likely to be heard by others. Their use of domestic and international legal processes has allowed Indigenous views to be expressed in international fora. The Working Group on Indigenous Peoples (WGIP), has developed its own charter of Indigenous rights in solidarity with other Indigenous groups, and has gained access to the United Nations Commission for the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD). The Yorta Yorta, as will be demonstrated, have adapted to many significant changes. Indeed they retain a remarkable sense of their cultural identity and connections with the claimed land and waters, and have continued to assert rights arising from prior occupation. The reality of me speaking at a Royal Society Forum (June 2005) and having the opportunity to write on Indigenous perceptions for this publication is another way of challenging and hopefully bridging the gap that has been created (ATSIC 2000, Djerrkura 1999:1-8; WGIP 1997; Evatt 1996; Bird 1993; Fletcher 1994; United Nations 1969, 1997, 1999).

While archaeological evidence can provide important insights into prior occupation, Yorta Yorta perceptions of their connections are equally important. The Yorta Yorta trace their origins back to the time of creation, which is often conceptualised as the ‘eternal Dreaming’. In Indigenous epistemology this is the time when the Indigenous world took its shape and form, and from where all other living entities including laws and territorial rights flowed. While the Dreaming is said to be eternal it is something that remains ever-present. Unlike the hard physical evidence it can’t be put under a microscope and dated, but it is as valid as any other belief system of origins and creation that runs parallel with linear timelines of occupation (Stanner 1969:225-36; Reynolds 1996:4-5).

It follows that if Archaeology vindicates occupation, then it goes without saying that the Indigenous ancestors have been in occupation for millennia before the imposition of British colonial rule. It is one of the areas where a Yorta Yorta view of the world is planted in its own cultural context and, while it may differ to that of Archaeology, both schools of thought have generally confirmed and consolidated prior occupation and possession of Australia by Indigenous nations (Wettenhall 1999:6-7; Yorta Yorta Native Title Evidence 1997-98; Weberriss & Frauenfelder 1996; Stanner 1987; Bowler 1971).

Against this background, it is often said that Indigenous Australians may possess the oldest living culture known to humankind (Bourke & Bourke 1999). In measuring the birth of western civilisation and the creation of the more recent overlays of the common law of England, one can conclude that these are relatively recent events (Watson 1998; Chisholm & Nettheim 1982:10-17; Cambridge En- encylopaedia of Archaeology 1980:21,109) A further translation of this timeline to Indigenous title, arising from prior occupation, confirms that we are dealing with a concept of land ownership that ‘transcends common law notions of property and possession’ (Mabo (No. 2) Deane and Guadron JJ. at 100), and is unique in its own right. The chain of inheritance stretches back to prior occupation, and rights
to land, culture, identity and economic security flow to present day Indigenous peoples not as a creature of the imported law but as inherent rights (Butlin 1983; Bartlett 1999; Reynolds 1996:14).

The interface between Anglo-Australian and Indigenous notions of land ownership needs to be evaluated. Anglo-Australian common law notions of property rights have been imposed on a vastly older Indigenous system. This exposes the absurdity of the common law’s classification of original interests as being a ‘burden’ on the far more recently introduced non-Indigenous system (Mabo (No.2), Brennan J. at 37, Deane and Gaudron JJ. at 69). The derogation of original rights smacks of imported western value systems rather than the nature and antiquity of Indigenous based rights. The priorities of the Indigenous system are logically and evidently clear. An equitable contemporary system would recognise the priority of Indigenous interests and require that any subsequent titles did not interfere with, or treat them as a lesser interest (Ridgeway 1997; Pearson 1997; Dodson, M. 1997; Dodson, P. 1997; Cummings 1997; Yunupingu 1997; Reynolds 1996:14).

In analysing Yorta Yorta occupation I will now look at the changing nature of Yorta Yorta land as a basis for examining the concept of adaption and continuity. This will be important for measuring the degree of change that has occurred before and after European contact and for examining the issue of continued connections.

**Change & adaption revisited**

To understand traditional relationships with the land and the process of change and adaption there are some common determinants. As survival depends on close interaction with the environment, a high weighting is given to natural conditions. From a holistic perspective the alteration to any one aspect can cause change within the whole system. Indeed there is an implied interdependence and in order to understand the interrelationship it is first necessary to examine the physical and cultural histories and how natural resources are distributed across the landscape (Redman 1978:7-11; Hole & Heizer 1973:440-1; Binford 1972:105-13).

Many of the changes that impacted on traditional Yorta Yorta occupation have been associated with the waterways. One of the most significant is the Cadell Fault, which occurred around 25,000 years ago. This probably began 60,000 years ago (Page et al. 1991).

The fault may have moved again 25,000 years ago. This tilt block was thrown up between Deniliquin and Echuca, forcing the existing westward flowing river system to divert and flow north towards Deniliquin before turning west again at the end of the 12 metre high tilt block. A large lake formed at the southern end, near Echuca, and remained until about 9,000 years ago when a channel was cut to the south to allow the stream to connect with the Goulburn River system (Duncan 1982:210; Coulson 1979:134-8; Currey & Dole 1978).

**Responding to change**

A Yorta Yorta story speaks of a ‘great flood’ occurring in the distant past that forced people to move from the forests up onto the sand ridges (Fig. 4). The old people watched as the water backed up until it nearly covered the tops of the trees. They were concerned about the loss of their traditional food areas and are said to have ‘walked along to a point where they decided to let her go’ and with their digging sticks they dug a drain through the sandhill. The force of the water cut its way through the more recent course of 8,000-10,000 years ago (Coulson 1979:134-6; Currey 1978; Currey & Dole 1978; pers. comm. with Yorta Yorta elder at site 1981). It is of profound interest that the point of release for the flood waters is at the site of the old Maloga Mission, which was established on the edge of the sandy promontory by Daniel Matthews in 1874. It was by no coincidence that Yorta Yorta elders told Matthews that this particular site was a ‘great gathering place for as long as anyone could remember’ (Cato 1976:19). The location of the traditional meeting place and its connection with the relatively recent cutting of the river course remains an intriguing question. Indeed the legendary site in terms of the events witnessed and the knowledge within, tucked away on the river bend east of Echuca, is of equal icon status to the more recent overlays of colonial history. Whether the meeting place was there before or after the fault is yet to be confirmed. The event itself, however, is a good example of the changing and evolving nature of traditional land relations. Traditional conventional mechanisms of land use and control would have adapted to accommodate for change and survival. Cultural continuity was the outcome.

As indicated in the map (Fig. 1) there are many features of the study area that remain of significant
Ancestral phases of the Murray that impacted on Yorta Yorta occupation

Fig. 4. Cadell Fault and story of the Great Flood (as told to Wayne Atkinson by Yorta Yorta elders). Yorta Yorta elders speak of a great flood that happened in the distant past. The story tells of the water backing up until it nearly covered the tops of the old gum trees in the forest, and how it forced Yorta Yorta people to go up onto the sand ridge on the edge of the forest. The elders became concerned as they watched the water rising and decided to release the water with their digging sticks, which they used to dig a drain through the sandhill and allow the water to cut its more recent course at the site of the old Maloga. (Changes to phases: 1: 30,000 yrs; 2: 20,000 yrs; 3: 10,000 yrs BP)
Fig. 5. View of Barmah Forest from top of sand ridge.

Fig. 6. Sand ridge towards Murray River.
icon status to the Yorta Yorta. The rivers, lakes, billabongs, sand ridges and ochre deposits are features of the area from earlier times. Given that Indigenous subsistence depended very much on utilising the resources of the suitable bodies of water and living zones, many adjustments like those described would have been common to Yorta Yorta occupation (Bowler 1971; Currey & Dole 1978).

Yorta Yorta subsistence patterns can be gleaned from an analysis of the resources available. Studies of similar environments in the region at the Willandra Lake system (Lake Mungo) to the north and at Kow Swamp in the west of the claim area provide insight into what the riverine environment was capable of producing. Bonhomme (1992) gives a good account of resources in the study area.

NATURE AND DIVERSITY OF YORTA YORTA LAND

Water

Change has been a central and continuing feature of the Murray Valley for most of its existence. During the last 9,000-10,000 years (Holocene), with the exception of some climatic fluctuations, general living conditions have remained relatively stable. The recent work by Ian Rutherfurd and Christine Kenyon, on Holocene climatic fluctuations reinforces the theme of adaption and continuity (Rutherfurd and Kenyon, Kenyon, this issue). That is in response to climatic fluctuations and other land changes that have occurred; Indigenous people adapted and survived most admirably, and the majority have remained in occupation of the region.

Studies of vegetation zones indicate that there were some marginal areas but the compensating factor for the Murray Valley region is the river systems. Like other inland regions, the water bodies have been extremely important for Indigenous subsistence (Bowler 1971). The major rivers flowing into the study area trace their sources to the highlands of the southeast where they are regularly replenished by annual rainfall and snow melts (Butler et al. 1973).

Although stream courses have changed, the river systems are likely to have served as major focal points throughout the time the area was occupied. The range of living zones utilised by the Yorta Yorta
have been identified (Penney 1979:10-33). These are the river; the river edge with its tall river red gums; the wetlands, including swamps, billabongs, streams and anabranches; grassy plains interspersed with patches of scrubland; and the drier mallee region (Butler et al. 1973; Mulvaney 1975:137-8).

Food Sources

The living zones produced a variety of food sources, including fish, waterbirds, yabbies, mussels, turtles, possums, kangaroos, emus, cumbungi reeds, water lily, dandelions, angled pig face, sow thistle and lerp (Pardoe 1988:203). These environments are described by archaeologists as ‘broad based economies’. They are capable of providing a broad range and abundance of foods on a regular basis (Goodall 1996:12). When describing the varied and abundant food supply, Yorta Yorta people often equate the study area with the concept of a ‘smorgasbord’, meaning ‘food and natural resources were there laid on and you didn’t have to go too far to fulfil your everyday needs’ (Age 7 Nov. 1998; Yorta Yorta 1998).

Living Patterns

As the food quest was largely determined by the seasonal availability of food, it is natural for groups to follow its cyclical nature. The warm months on the rivers were the most productive while the few colder months and when the river was in flood encouraged dispersal, in smaller groups, to areas away from the main water bodies (Beveridge 1889:27; Kirk 1981:73-5; Kneebone 1992). The Yorta Yorta used these living zones to satisfy their dietary needs at different times of the year.

Movement across these zones, though, was not simply for economic reasons. The seasonal arrival of food coincided with cultural activities. Many of the larger gatherings were organised in conjunction with the arrival of food and some of the ceremonies were held to perpetuate particular food species. The totemic restrictions on some foods also helped to protect certain foods from being over-exploited (Hagen 1997:60-9).

The general abundance of food would have reduced the amount of time required in the food quest, which in turn would have created much more time for leisure activities. Anthropologist, Marshall Sahlins, describes this type of lifestyle as one that supports his condition of the ‘original affluent societies’ (Sahlins 1974). Such groups typically invested about four to five hours a day in the food quest. This
allowed more time for the maintenance of cultural connections with the land and waters (Curr 1965:46; Sahlins 1974). Economic historian, Tony Dingle, notes that ‘two to four hours of intermittent effort’ was all that was required to provide sufficient food for the day. Furthermore ‘the food quest was not usually considered either arduous or unpleasant. Indeed we are looking at an economy which was enjoying a thirty to thirty-five hour working week at a time when European labourers worked almost twice as long in order to sustain themselves’ (Dingle 1988:30). Elsewhere, he suggests that it is probable that in 1788 ‘Aborigines enjoyed a somewhat greater life expectancy than the British who were poised to invade Australia in 1788’ (ABS 2000; Age 18 April 2000; Dingle 1988:33).

Looking at the impact of such changes on Yorta Yorta society one can better appreciate the desires to emulate the old ways. Many, myself included, prefer to follow aspects of our own culture rather than the undesirable elements of western culture that are making inroads into the well-being of many Indigenous communities (ABS 1999).

In recent years, Indigenous groups have chosen to return to their traditional homelands. Many Yorta Yorta have returned to Cummeragunja to reaffirm their cultural connections and many have returned to the residential centres within the claim area. This involves both a desire to get away from the undesirable aspects of mainstream life and the need to get back in touch with family and country. The movement does not suggest abandonment or severance of cultural ties but fulfilment of the need to maintain cultural connections and identity. Indeed, the ABS 1996 Survey revealed that the Yorta Yorta had maintained significant physical and cultural connections with the claim area (ABS 1996; Coombs 1994:24-31; McKendrick 1999).

Since the nadir of the assimilation policies of the 1940s, the Cummeragunja population has steadily increased. Declining economic opportunities in the mainstream labour market, racism, and the sense of being at home with one’s own mob have contributed to a population increase of over 200. The movement back may well be connected with the underlying socio-economic factors, highlighted in the Aboriginary Deaths in Custody Royal Commission Report (1991) and Bringing Them Home Report of The National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from their Families (1997). The reports on Aboriginal Health and Welfare matters by the ABS (1997) and on Aboriginal employment (Taylor and Altman 1997) further highlight the degree of inequality experienced by

The evidence of Yorta Yorta occupation exemplifies the rich and diverse nature of the study area. The importance of the wetlands and the holistic nature of land, water, vegetation and wildlife are exemplified. The Yorta Yorta took advantage of the stability and abundance of resources from which evolved a relatively large and resilient nation of people (Laurandos 1997:233-5).

Traditional Land Management Practices

Changes in traditional Yorta Yorta land management practices and technological strategies need to be highlighted (Flood 1989:48-50). These varied from simply managing existing resources to manipulating the environment to secure more sustainable returns. Dingle points to the Murray Valley as ‘a resource-rich area where there were moves towards complex resource management’ (Dingle 1988:48). The constructing of elaborate fish trap systems is an example of how the Yorta Yorta were able to increase returns and minimise individual effort. The use of fire was another important land management and food production tool (Yorta Yorta 1999:19-28; Kneebone 1992; Craib 1992; Bonhomme 1990; Atkinson & Berryman 1983; Penney 1979:10-22).

Use of Fire

Indigenous people used a system of land management which involved seasonal movement within their lands and a practice known as ‘fire-stick farming’. Edward Curr noted the use of the ‘fire-stick’ as a food production & land management practice in the Barmah-Millewa area in 1841. Curr explains ‘Living principally on wild roots & animals’ he [Aborigines] ‘tilled his land & cultivated his pastures with fire’, the frequency of which he estimated was ‘once in every five years’ (Curr 1965:88).

Fire was used by the Yorta Yorta for hunting and regeneration purposes, for clearing tracks through reed beds, and as a strategy for dissuading Europeans from venturing into the land (Curr, 1965:88; Hawdon, 1852:33; Sturt, 1899:138, 143). Traditional burning is still being used in Kakadu National Park (Northern Territory) and Gariwerd (Grampians) National Park, Victoria. The reintroduction of fire or controlled burning as a land management strategy is one of the rights being asserted by the Yorta Yorta (Koori Ranger, Barmah Forest, pers. comm. 21 Sept. 1998; Young et al. 1991:165-8). The immense value of such Indigenous strategies is becoming increasingly recognised amongst non-Indigenous experts and authorities responsible for land management. The larger raging bush fires often witnessed today are attributed to the absence of controlled burning, and understorey build-up, which is now being managed by fuel reduction burning. ‘Poor fire management’ as to efficient and controlled burning, however, has proved to be a problem in land management strategies, particularly in relation to the way fire is being used in state national parks (Sydney Morning Herald 9 July 2005).

ABORIGINAL SITES AS EVIDENCE OF OCCUPATION

While the study area has undergone rapid changes since white settlement, much of the evidence or manifestations of prior Indigenous occupation remains. This evidence, together with Yorta Yorta knowledge, becomes crucial for ascertaining pre-existing rights to land and resources and for cultural heritage protection. Given the antiquity of Yorta Yorta occupation and the extent to which it manifests itself in the nature and distribution of sites within the study area, it would be reasonable to submit that the study area is or at least can be seen as a cultural site within its own making (Redman 1978:7-11; Binford 1972:105-13; Hole & Heizer 1973:440-1; Oncountry Learning 2005).

Archaeological work in the claim area has been restricted to sample surveys, the re-burial of skeletal remains and the analysis of cultural objects (artefacts, stone tools, etc). Most of the cultural heritage work by the Yorta Yorta has focused on site management and protection. The impact of grazing, trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site type</th>
<th>New South Wales count</th>
<th>Victorian count</th>
<th>Total count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarred tree</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mound</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open scatter</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middens</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bikes, and four-wheel drives on sites is a major concern (Bonhomme 1992; Craib 1992; Atkinson & Berryman 1983). The more recent archaeological work conducted by Bonhomme (1992) and Craib (1997) provides a good sample of site density and distribution, within a relatively limited area. Over 1818 sites have been recorded, most of which are located in Barmah Forest (82%) and the other 333 (18%) are in the Millewa Forest, New South Wales (Craib 1997:32; Bonhomme, 1992:67). The distribution and types of sites recorded is indicated in Table 1.

While archaeology can ascertain site density in a particular area, it can also make inferences on broader site distribution and the extent of site loss, through the imposition of introduced changes and through the deposition of flood soils over the millennia.

**Material Evidence**

The material objects, which are expressions of traditional lifestyle and culture, do not, of course, include the many organic materials used by the Yorta Yorta. Most of the wooden spears, clubs and boomerangs, the fibre bags and nets, the shell knives, scrapers and hooks, the possum skin cloaks, the bark and grass huts and the myriad of single camp fires dotted around water margins have not survived erosive factors such as wind, fire, flood and bacterial decomposition (Atkinson & Berryman 1983). Archaeological research has been able to locate and date other artefacts and make inferences about their various functions and uses. The 15,000-year-old Kow Swamp excavation (Kirk 1981:24; Mulvaney 1975) has revealed various burial practices, together with the use of stone artefacts, shells and marsupial teeth as grave items. While burial practices have been adjusted to cater for changes in Yorta Yorta society, some traditional customs are still practised. Most Yorta Yorta prefer to be buried in the ancestral lands; some have personal belongings buried with them and many still use smoke as a cleansing process in mortuary ceremonies. Some states have recognised Indigenous people’s rights to be buried in their own land so that their spirits are free to join their people (Age 1 Nov. 1999; Atkinson 2000 chapters 7-8; pers. observation of funeral practices at Cummeragunja).

A bark canoe cut from the river red gums with stone axe heads is a traditional artefact of great significance to the Yorta Yorta. Canoes were used in
great numbers for travel, foraging and fishing platforms from which to spear and hook fish. They were used for transporting pastoralists and their stock across watercourses and for carrying goods to and from pastoral stations. The larger ones are believed to have been used to mount attacks on stations around the Moira wetlands during the resistance campaign. The age-old craft of extracting bark for various uses including canoes is a cultural practice that continues in adapted forms. Cultural activities like these are promoted by the Dharmya Centre and the Bangerang Cultural Centre Co-Operative, Shepparton (Yorta Yorta 1997; Beveridge 1889:19, 63-91; Curr 1965:84-91; Stone 1911; Brough-Smyth 1878, vol. 1: 215, vol. 2: 298; Stanbridge 1861).

The hard evidence (sites and objects) confirms that the Yorta Yorta people have maintained an interest and connection with the land and waters from long before Europeans arrived to the present. They still speak of this connection as an inherent right. Yorta Yorta perceptions of their heritage overlap with much of the archaeological data (Atkinson 1981; Morgan 1952).

Fig. 11. Canoe tree, Barmah-Millewa Forest.

Fig. 12. Fish trap system (Moira Forest) and natural water courses used for fish storage.
YORTA YORTA COMMUNITY TODAY

The Yorta Yorta declare that they have never relinquished their sovereign rights to territories occupied by their ancestors. Given the interference of those events described by Mabo as 'unjust and discriminatory', the Yorta Yorta have continued to live on the ancestral lands and to exercise their inherent rights to use resources, and to continue cultural practices (Mabo (No. 2) 1992 Brennan J. at 29, 40-3; Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner 1995:94-6; Yorta Yorta 1984, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1999).

The current Yorta Yorta population is estimated to be 5,000-6,000 (Hagen 1997; Alford 2002; Rubalara Aboriginal Community 2001). Figures from the 1996 ABS survey indicate that the majority of Yorta Yorta people, still physically occupy the ancestral lands and that the Yorta Yorta population continue to regard the area as their traditional homelands. Other reports that correlate the legacy of land loss with current health concerns support continued Yorta Yorta connections (Alford 1999; McKendrick 1999; ABS 1996; Department of Conservation & Environment 1992).

The majority of Yorta Yorta live in the townships of Echuca, Moama, Shepparton, Mooroopna, Cummeragunja, Barmah, Nathalia, Finley, Cobram, Kyabram, Wangaratta and Mathoura, and other smaller centres within the lands. Some live nearby at Albury, Wodonga, Deniliquin, Kerang, Barham and Swan Hill. Others have moved to the cities to pursue educational and economic interests, most of whom still visit the area regularly to maintain social and cultural links (ABS 1996; Hagen 1997:6-8; Yorta Yorta 1999-10; Atkinson 2000, chapters 8-9).

The Yorta Yorta have set up organisations to service the needs of their people in housing, health, education, employment, land, sport and heritage matters. These organisations provide mechanisms through which the Yorta Yorta have been able to deal with governments on both sides of the Murray and to maintain the social and cultural fabric of their society.

Many of the Yorta Yorta were instrumental in the fight for civil and political rights leading up to the 1967 Referendum. They established the first Aboriginal organisations in Melbourne and Sydney in the early 1930s. Some of the early leaders were active in highlighting similar injustices in other parts of Australia in the 1950s and in assisting those

**TIDE OF HISTORY REJECTED**

Yorta Yorta people reject the notion that their connections have been washed away by what is described in euphemistic phrases like the ‘tide of history’ and reassert their position as the traditional occupants and owners of the lands inherited from their ancestors. The history of race relations and conflict over land ownership expose the ‘tide of history’ as no more than fanciful language, dressed up in disguise, which was used to cover over the underlying and causative effects of the struggle for land justice. The application of the tide idea in the YYNTC as a barrier to land justice perverted the course of justice in the Yorta Yorta case. It is often likened with the analogy of rubbing salt into the deep wounds of Yorta Yorta society. Reconciling the unfinished business of land justice and reaching a position of real effective and genuine reconciliation are the challenges that confront all parties in the study region.

The Yorta Yorta asserts that those rights that arise from prior occupation have continued. Scientific analysis of past activities is able to substantiate that the land was occupied and possessed by Indigenous people. From this evidence we can see that Yorta Yorta culture was not frozen in time and place but was continually adapting to cater for the changing circumstances of the time.

Overlay the antiquity of Indigenous occupation use and enjoyment of the ancestral lands with the more recent events and any normal, rational thinking person would agree that they are indeed relatively recent events. However, overlay the impact of the last two centuries or more, in terms of their dominance and control over Indigenous existence and land management practices, and one can arrive at a position where the notion of the ‘search for common ground’ is a fundamental reality for Yorta Yorta survival and cultural continuity.
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