

East Kimberley Impact Assessment Project

ABORIGINES IN THE TOURIST INDUSTRY
Sue Kesteven*

ABORIGINES AND TOURISM IN NORTH AUSTRALIA:
SOME SUGGESTED RESEARCH APPROACHES
M.C. Dillon**

East Kimberley Working Paper No.14
ISBN 0 86740 276 8
ISSN 0816-6323

A Joint Project Of The:

Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies
Australian National University

Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies

Anthropology Department
University of Western Australia

Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia



The aims of the project are as follows:

1. To compile a comprehensive profile of the contemporary social environment of the East Kimberley region utilising both existing information sources and limited fieldwork.
2. Develop and utilise appropriate methodological approaches to social impact assessment within a multi-disciplinary framework.
3. Assess the social impact of major public and private developments of the East Kimberley region's resources (physical, mineral and environmental) on resident Aboriginal communities. Attempt to identify problems/issues which, while possibly dormant at present, are likely to have implications that will affect communities at some stage in the future.
4. Establish a framework to allow the dissemination of research results to Aboriginal communities so as to enable them to develop their own strategies for dealing with social impact issues.
5. To identify in consultation with Governments and regional interests issues and problems which may be susceptible to further research.

Views expressed in the Project's publications are the views of the authors, and are not necessarily shared by the sponsoring organisations.

Address correspondence to:

The Executive Officer
East Kimberley Project
CRES, ANU
GPO Box 4
Canberra City, ACT 2601

ABORIGINES IN THE TOURIST INDUSTRY
Sue Kesteven*

ABORIGINES AND TOURISM IN NORTH AUSTRALIA:
SOME SUGGESTED RESEARCH APPROACHES
M.C. Dillon**

East Kimberley Working Paper No.14
ISBN 0 86740 276 8
ISSN 0816-6323

* Department of Geography, The Faculties, Australian National University,
Canberra ACT 2601.

** Senior Private Secretary to the Hon. Clyde Holding, Minister for
Aboriginal Affairs, Parliament House, Canberra ACT 2600

ABSTRACT

These papers discuss the involvement of Aboriginal people in the tourist industry and its effects on their communities. Both authors argue that Aboriginal people and their culture have been considered as tourist attractions by governments and tourist operators, a practice which they consider is against the best interests of Aborigines. Kesteven uses her research in Kakadu National Park as a basis for discussing how Aborigines perceive tourists and the opportunities for Aboriginal participation in tourist enterprises. She concludes that Aboriginal people should direct their involvement in tourism to controlling access to facilities that tourists need. Dillon's paper highlights areas where research into the impact of tourism is needed. He argues for a distinction between the effects of tourism if Aborigines market their Aboriginality (cultural tourism impacts) and the general effects of the presence of tourists in an area (general tourism impacts). The existence of a property right would enable general tourism impacts to be controlled. Like Kesteven he concludes that without such rights commercial involvement in tourism may be a way of managing tourism impacts.

ABORIGINES IN THE TOURIST INDUSTRY

Sue Kesteven

In the more remote areas of Australia,¹ even if exploitable mineral deposits are present, the natural beauty of these areas is often seen as a resource to be exploited.² In these areas, Aboriginal culture is also seen as a resource to be exploited. Aborigines may be active participants in the tourism industry, for example as safari guides, or can be passive participants in that industry; that is, as objects which are of interest to tourists. It is often said that Aborigines will benefit from tourism - that there will be increased employment opportunities, that there will be improved facilities in areas where Aborigines live, that they will have increased incomes from tourist activities. It is necessary that tourist development should not be seen in isolation, but set in a wider context of development, including government policies regarding Aborigines, for example economic self-management.

The nature of tourism is that tourists generally want new experiences from a base of familiarity. They seek pleasure, and do not wish to confront problems or disagreeable situations while on holiday. If tourists wanted 'deep' experiences they would, for example, become students of anthropology. Rather, what they want are compacted experiences which are presented directly to them, and do not have to be sought or negotiated for. They also wish for comprehensible information not only in clear English, but also in the presentation of concepts which are not too complicated.

Because the areas we are considering are remote from the general Australian public, the feelings that people have about them are of frontier lands and wildernesses. Aborigines and non-Aborigines may have different views of what constitutes natural beauty; what is a wilderness and 'natural' to a tourist is in fact a social landscape to local Aborigines. It is familiar to them; they know the resources to be exploited; the land has been shaped by man, both living and in the past, and also by Dreamtime beings. They also know how to behave appropriately with respect to the land and its resources.

Studies I have undertaken in Kakadu National Park have led me to believe that there is a distinction made by Aborigines in this area between a category of person labelled 'tourist' and a category of person labelled 'visitor'.³ This distinction became evident after a series of questions were asked of Aborigines in unstructured interviews concerning the conduct of non-residents. The purpose of the interviews was to discover people's attitudes to tourism. I felt that prior to this, one had to understand what an Aboriginal person in this area understood by 'tourism' and 'tourist'. Without this understanding there seemed to be no point in asking questions of the sort, 'Are there too many tourists in Kakadu?', or 'Should there be more or less tourists in Kakadu?'

There were some variations in the answers, but basically people agreed that:

- Aboriginal people resident elsewhere who came to Kakadu were not tourists.
- Non-Aboriginal people who came to work for or with Aborigines were not tourists.
- Non-Aboriginal people who came to visit relatives were mostly not tourists.
- Scientists who came to Kakadu to study rocks, plants, etc. were not tourists.
- Aboriginal people from Kakadu who went to visit Darwin were not tourists.
- Aboriginal people from Kakadu who went to Sydney, Melbourne etc. were not tourists.

These categories of people were labelled 'visitors' instead of 'tourists'. The reasons for excluding these people from the category of 'tourist' revealed more of what the Aborigines perceived a tourist to be.

Aboriginal people who came to Kakadu would most probably be visiting kin, but even if they had no local kin they would 'know how to behave'. In other words, Aboriginal people would know how to behave in a socially acceptable manner, and they would seek out a traditional owner who would take responsibility for their behaviour, or 'look after them'. People who came to work for Aboriginal people would be assumed to be interested enough to fit in with a network of people who would educate them in behaviour appropriate in an Aboriginal context. Scientists studying the environment were demonstrating responsibility towards the land. Aboriginal people from Kakadu who went to Sydney would be going for a purpose, 'for a meeting', 'for an exhibition', or 'to visit friends'. The implication here is that there is an assumption that the hosts would accept responsibility for the visitors' behaviour. Aboriginal people from Kakadu who went to Darwin went 'for shopping', 'for meeting'. 'Visitors' therefore have directed purposes (which is understood and plausible) - to visit kin, to study, or to work.

'Tourists', on the other hand, were bad news. 'Tourists' wandered aimlessly, got lost and had to be rescued; they got themselves into trouble by tempting crocodiles; they transgressed on sacred sites or burial areas; even worse, they sometimes stole relics or vandalised sites. They over-fished, they couldn't be trusted with rifles. In short, 'tourists' act irresponsibly and 'visitors' do not; 'tourists' wander aimlessly, 'visitors' have a directed and socially approved purpose. Tourists have no commitment to the people of Kakadu or to the land.

So what does this dichotomy between 'visitor' and 'tourist' entail?

Firstly, it is meaningless to ask if there should be more tourists or less, when any tourist is a disagreeable phenomenon. But secondly, why do Aborigines tolerate tourists at all? At no time did Aboriginal people grimace, or rant against tourists, or condemn them outright, during my

interviews. In general Aborigines seemed acquiescent about tourist activities. Why is this so when it became so evident that tourists behave unacceptably? Possible answers are:

- Aborigines are forgiving of human foibles, including 'mad' behaviour.
- Tourists are inevitable, so there is no point in complaining.
- Tourists are unacceptable, but there is nothing Aborigines can do about reforming them.
- There is such disintegration of traditional life that no-one can exercise authority over land any more, and Aborigines no longer care about anything.
- Tourists bring benefits, so in spite of their behaviour they are to be tolerated.

The first of these points is probably true, but how far is it felt that *intruders* who are 'mad' are to be tolerated? Probably not very far, when one considers that they have no kin in the area, and therefore no-one to take responsibility for them, and thus there is no-one to support them. So this proposition might bear on the question of why Aborigines tolerate tourists' behaviour, but it cannot be the complete answer.

The second and third propositions are also probably true in part, but it is not saying much to believe that Aborigines acquiesce to inevitability all the time and tolerate all inconveniences.

The fourth proposition one can reject. Although there have been many changes in Aboriginal life styles over the last few decades, one cannot say that Aboriginal ways of life have no cohesion. To say that they cannot cope is to say that an Aboriginal way of life has no adaptive mechanisms.

So that leaves the last proposition - what benefits do Aborigines see that tourism might bring to them?

For example, what employment opportunities are there for Aborigines in the tourist industry? Again, an examination of the Aboriginal point of view is required. It is necessary first to discuss Aboriginal attitudes to employment in general: for the most part, satisfactory jobs are ones which offer power, either by access to money and its distribution, or access to desired goods such as vehicles, or to exclusive information. Therefore it is unlikely that Aborigines will enter aspects of the tourist industry that do not offer these incentives. Further, they will not enter positions in which they feel uncomfortable, by having to dress impeccably and stiffly, for example. Aborigines are especially unlikely to enter service industries in such positions as waiters, for yet another reason. Aborigines stress personal relations which are meant to be of an enduring nature. They are founded on such notions as 'looking after', or being responsible for another's long-term well-being.

Tourist activity is nebulous by its nature; tourists come and go, and so there is no possibility of Aboriginal people (or other residents) forming personal relationships with tourists. Because of the value that Aborigines place on personal relationships they are not likely to entertain tourists or to offer them hospitality, except in return for immediate gratification, such as in exchange for a bottle of beer.

It follows therefore that Aboriginal people cannot use tourists *as individuals* for establishing power bases. The only stable positions created by tourism are those of 'cultural brokers' who undertake liaison positions with agencies or as owners of the facilities used by tourists - that is, one establishes oneself with the personnel of the tourist organisations and not with the individual tourists.

Cultural tourism promotes the growth of cultural mediators, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal. What sort of people become cultural mediators and what training do they receive? Because tourists want compact, comprehensible information and ask an unlimited range of questions, many Aborigines are ineligible to act as guides because they do not speak English clearly. There is another reason why Aborigines may be reluctant to act as guides and impart information about the Aboriginal domain: that is, that only certain people may be allowed to talk about certain items even if others are allowed to know it. Further, in an oral society in particular, control over information is crucial for establishing power bases. It may therefore be the case that some people will not wish to divulge certain information, or that others may feel embarrassed when asked to answer a question about matters they are not entitled to talk about.

Non-Aboriginal guides may feel no embarrassment about the kinds of information they impart to tourists. Some awful nonsense is spoken. What controls do Aborigines have over this sort of thing? Virtually none.

The problem to be confronted is that if Aborigines are to be exploited in this cultural tourism, then it may result that there is form without content, or presentation without indigenous purpose, for ceremonies, art, dreamings, hunting and gathering practices. If tourism were to become the base of an Aboriginal economy, then Aboriginal culture is debased for the whims and entertainment of average people from another culture.

Nevertheless, it should not be assumed that Aborigines will want to view their lifestyles and social and cultural institutions as immutable. They may even wish to alter these to accommodate new factors deriving from tourism. They may alter the ways in which they perceive art sites, or even burial sites (as they no doubt have through the ages to adjust to new factors) and consider what use they might be able to put them to in order to get something out of tourists.

It is said that tourists bring money into the area they visit. But how true is this? And who gets the money?

Aborigines in Kakadu are dependent upon non-local entrepreneurs for most tourist activities in their area. The local infrastructure cannot support booking facilities or general administration. This means that most income leaves the local area.

In Kakadu the people who receive tourist dollars directly are:

- tour operators;
- shops at Jabiru (supermarket, petrol station, newsagency, take-away, post office, hairdresser; the Club however is not open to the general public);
- the Border Store (selling food, petrol, some other minor goods);
- Coinda Hotel-Motel (including its restaurant and bar);
- South Alligator Motor Inn (including restaurant, bar and the sale of petrol);
- the airline flying into Jabiru, and scenic flight operators;
- possibly the bus service to Jabiru.

Because of a reluctance to enter service industries, Aborigines benefit directly from tourism only if they own the facilities which tourists use, or if they are employees of tour operators and such. In Kakadu, the Gagudju Association⁴ owns the Coinda Hotel-Motel and the Border Store. The Kunwinjku Association⁵ invested in an airline. There were no Aborigines employed by tourist enterprises.

The infrastructure that is provided for the tourist industry sometimes benefits Aborigines in the area. Improved roads are appreciated, though the greater numbers of tourists that travel on them may not be. Improved banking facilities and the provision of take-away food and liquor outlets may also be desired.

The other side of the coin is that Aborigines may become disgruntled when they perceive that facilities provided for tourists and other non-Aboriginal people far exceed the facilities provided for their own communities. The cost of living in the area may also rise, although economies of scale could also operate so that prices are brought down.

It is said that tourists provide outlets for Aboriginal artists and craftspeople. In fact, in Kakadu arts and crafts are not a priority of the people. There are some artists and craftspeople in the Park, but the majority are to the east, in Arnhem Land settlements. Art works and artefacts are purchased by Darwin outlets mainly, though some were also for sale at the Border Store, the Jabiru Supermarket and the Coinda Hotel-Motel. Few works were sold directly to tourists. This entails that the art industry is run by mediators, which once again means that income leaves the area. It also infers that the mediators can influence the type of work that is produced - for example they will know the style and subjects that are most popular. They may also suggest the manufacture of non-indigenous articles.

Since it is sometimes argued that using traditional skills to make money is acceptable in a transition to a cash economy, one might like to ask just how 'traditional' the art market is. Aboriginal people themselves do not buy bark paintings from each other. Indeed, no Aboriginal household has bark paintings as part of its furnishings. An Aboriginal man viewing the bark paintings piled high at the Council Offices at Oenpelli ready to be picked up by the Darwin agency, said, mystified, to me: 'What do *balanda* (non-Aboriginal people) DO with these paintings?' The very activity, then, is dependent upon non-Aboriginal purchasers. One might argue that this activity is 'traditional' in that it uses techniques, subjects and symbols from the Aboriginal domain, but one could similarly argue that other interactions between Aborigines and non-Aborigines contain elements of social niceties taken directly from the Aboriginal domain.

In the case of Kakadu, there is a further source of income to Aborigines, albeit a small one: rental from the lease of the Park to the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. In addition, the National Parks and Wildlife Service provides a great many services to Aborigines - it has even been accused of being the new welfare agency for the area. Management of the Park takes account of Aboriginal wishes, even if Aborigines are not members of the Board of Management. This means that there has been sensitive response to Aboriginal people's wishes for privacy at outstations, for the protection of sites, for the siting of roads and buildings, and so on. Aboriginal people have also benefited as employees of the Service. But most importantly, the rangers in Kakadu act as a buffer between tourists and Aborigines.

Cultural tourism is by nature intrusive. Furthermore the effects of tourism are permanent. In comparing the effects of tourism with, say, the effects of a mining enterprise, one should ask which industry allows Aborigines to remain the dominant public.

Aborigines do resent being stared at. They resent tourists surreptitiously taking photographs of them. Aborigines also tend to vacate a spot when non-Aborigines arrive: unlike non-Aborigines who tend to stand their ground ('we were here first'), Aborigines tend to move on. Aborigines would not intrude upon other Aborigines without some claim to share the space - close relatives, for example. This means that unless tourists are controlled by some outside agency, Aborigines do not stand on authority and demand that the outsider leave the area. They therefore require some outside agency to control the movement of tourists. In Kakadu this agency is the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Control over tourists is important, because tourists cannot be expected to know that permission needs to be sought before entering land which is not one's own. In fact they are so 'uneducated' that they do not understand about Aboriginal land tenure at all, nor what is entailed by this.

Although there are Aboriginal rangers, they are not always confident about correcting tourists' behaviour. Part of the reason is similar to some Aboriginal people's reluctance to act as tourist guides; part is because it may be seen that an Aboriginal ranger controlling movement and behaviour of tourists may be seen to usurp the rights of the traditional owners of that land.

It is not easy to make suggestions to ensure that Aborigines can benefit from tourism whilst protecting themselves from exploitation, from cheapening themselves and their culture, and from being swamped by large numbers of outsiders. It is possible to suggest that there be accredited guides operating on Aboriginal land, people who have demonstrated a knowledge and understanding of the culture of the area. But it is probably most useful to understand what Aborigines take to be the nature of tourism, so that implications of the industry for these areas can be better predicted.

For a start it may be advisable to alter the general public's perception of Aborigines. It is futile to suggest that tourism provides Aborigines with an opportunity to 'better themselves'. For social mobility, a 'lower' class must have aspirations of bettering itself. Aborigines probably do not feel that they have to be improved, but rather that they need more facilities. It may be useful to ignore those aspects of Aboriginal lifestyles which make them unpopular with tourist operators (and the general public) - a down-and-out, poorly dressed, unclean, drunken, unwashed flotsam - and accept another view: that Aborigines are aristocratic. They are landowners, proud, traditional, unservile (and their preferred leisure pursuit is hunting). The only 'aristocratic' appurtenance they lack is a servant class.

How do British aristocrats deal with tourists? They ignore them if possible, but if they can see merit in encouraging them in order to help pay death duties/keep up country houses, then what do they do? They sometimes become cultural brokers, and show the lower orders how the upper classes live, or they sometimes start up the unusual - game parks for example. But they control tourists' access to the facilities they provide, and they take the profits.

FOOTNOTES

1. This terminology reflects a bias: what is remote to urban non-Aborigines is home to those who live in these areas.
2. Often it is thought to be expedient to use the infrastructure for one industry to facilitate the development of the other. This means that it is sometimes difficult to extract impacts of tourism from impacts of other developments that are taking place at the same time.
3. S. Kesteven 1984. Summary of Report to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on a Field Trip to Kakadu National Park to Discuss Tourism with Aboriginal Traditional Owners of the Park and Residents of the Park Area.
4. An association of traditional owners of the Kakadu area receiving royalties from the Ranger uranium mine.
5. An association of Western Arnhem Land Aborigines receiving royalties from Queensland Mines' uranium project at Nabarlek.

**ABORIGINES AND TOURISM IN NORTH AUSTRALIA:
SOME SUGGESTED RESEARCH APPROACHES**

M.C. Dillon

The standard conception of the tourism 'resource' is that of a number of characteristics comprising the natural and man-made environment. Demand for the tourism resource may be segmented, with the possibility that increased supply of one segment may be at the expense of other segments. An obvious example is the possibility that an increase in the number of 'round Australia' tourists might undermine the 'wilderness' or 'remoteness' characteristics which other tourists value. Similarly, it is commonly assumed that tourism is a renewable resource. While this is undoubtedly true in the short term, in the long term there may be a shift in demand away from certain characteristics, or the characteristics themselves might change. Furthermore, these long-term changes might well be related to current resource utilisation. However, it may be possible to increase the supply of new 'characteristics' in the long term, and thus prevent or defer the depletion of the tourism resource.

When research into these areas is placed in the context of Aborigines and tourism, it becomes necessary to decide whether Aborigines are, or should be, included within the definition of the tourism resource. There is a long-standing tendency on the part of governments, tourist bureaux and tourist operators to do just that. Witness the Northern Territory Development Corporation advertisements for 'Aboriginal Adventure Tours': 'the Aboriginal community ... has customs and culture which they are enthusiastic to share with tourists from Australia and overseas'. This approach is part of a historical inclination on the part of non-Aboriginal people in Australia to view Aborigines themselves as being an integral part of the natural environment. To date, when governments have raised the possibility of Aboriginal involvement in tourism, it has invariably been on the basis that Aboriginality is a major component of the tourism resource to be exploited (Burchett, 1985).

A number of implications flow from this for Aboriginal communities. The existence of tourism, and the inclusion of Aboriginality as a component of the tourism resource means that Aboriginality becomes a product or good to be controlled by Aboriginal people. Seen this way it would seem that Aborigines have an effective voice over their own exploitation by tourists. There are clearly going to be a host of potentially negative impacts on communities who choose to sell this product. In the extreme situation, the decision to allow exploitation of the resource may transform the nature of the resource itself, perhaps irreversibly. There is a further range of problems related to the fact that 'Aboriginality' is by its very nature associated with social and cultural externalities - an individual's decision to provide tourist access to his/her own Aboriginality will automatically involve other Aborigines. By the same token, Aboriginal communities will generally have a monopoly within particular regions on the marketing of the Aboriginal tourism resource.

This suggests the need for research directed to ascertaining the impacts on Aboriginal communities which decide to market this 'product'; to identifying negative and positive benefits; the distribution of these gains and losses within communities; and the net effects of these over time. Of course revenue from the 'sale' of the Aboriginal tourism resource must be integrated into the analysis, although it should not be assumed that it is necessarily a benefit to the community concerned. Clearly, the negotiation of a 'fair' price for the sale of this 'product' is a crucial determinant of the net impact of exploitation of the Aboriginal tourism resource. Research is required to determine which types of organisations are best suited to act on behalf of Aboriginal communities in these respects. The continuing dilemmas related to Aboriginal decision making and the scale of representative organisations are relevant here (cf. Williams and Kirkby, 1984).

At the other extreme, the tourism resource may not include any characteristics related to Aboriginality or Aboriginal culture. Until recently this has been the standard approach to tourism, with the focus on natural and/or aesthetic characteristics. When defined by the 'market' in this way, there are still potential impacts on Aboriginal communities, groups and individuals, either as a result of the inclusion of characteristics in the tourism resource which are of particular value to Aborigines (e.g. an attractive gorge may be an Aboriginal site) or due to the mere presence of tourists (e.g. travellers may boost the revenue of a community store).

Thus, there is a second set of potential impacts on Aboriginal communities which requires assessment. Because this type of impact might be present in any tourism situation, we might refer to them for present purposes as general tourism impacts, and those related to the exploitation of Aboriginality as cultural tourism impacts.

A major issue confronting any research in this area has to do with the criteria used for evaluation of such impacts. The notion that value-free criteria are available which would allow for an 'objective' assessment is fanciful. Even accepting this methodological condition the choice of criteria is not easy - there are disagreements within Aboriginal communities themselves over the choice of appropriate criteria for assessing social impacts on their communities. One potential solution is to adopt and make explicit criteria which appear likely to (i) be accepted as 'reasonable' by others; and (ii) throw light on the issues under examination. Alternatively, one might use a phenomenological approach to establish criteria, based on a mediation or confrontation between the frames of reference of various actors in the policy process and the analytical frameworks available to the researcher - a process Dryzek (1982) has labelled hermeneutic (or interpretive) policy analysis.

The question arises whether the two types of impacts distinguished above, are in fact distinguishable in practice. Any answer will require specific research; however, it would appear that the answer is yes. Going a step further, a preliminary (and perhaps contentious) hypothesis might be that cultural tourism is more likely than general tourism to involve net negative impacts since once Aboriginal consent has been granted there is little scope to mitigate or reverse the social effects. Moreover, there is substantial evidence available that processes

of rapid social change in Aboriginal society lead to massive social dislocation incorporating a wide range of characteristics generally assigned negative values (eg, petrol sniffing, alcoholism, health problems, social violence etc.).

We are now in a position to examine the possibility of Aboriginal enterprise in relation to tourism. Entrepreneurs in the tourism industry have the freedom to define the tourism resource they wish to exploit (subject to Aboriginal consent where relevant). Where the 'entrepreneur' is an Aboriginal Community Corporation, it will clearly have to take into account the potential general and cultural tourism impacts in deciding on the composition of the resource characteristics which are to be marketed. Also, these will inevitably be situation specific. If the hypothesis referred to above is correct (and its correctness has yet to be established to my knowledge) it would follow that Aboriginal-owned enterprises should structure their involvement in the tourism industry in a way so as to avoid negative cultural tourism impacts. In other words, they should generally seek to exploit the non-Aboriginal tourism resource (the natural environment, etc.).

Of course, the distinctions described here between general and cultural tourism are extreme ends of a spectrum which serves as a whole to establish a framework for analysis. Aboriginal enterprise corporations may well opt to undertake enterprises somewhere between these two extremes. For example, the operation of an Aboriginal cultural centre such as has been proposed for Kakadu (Cooke, 1983) by itself is not likely to be as disruptive as a stream of tourists visiting a community established in a park (cf. Kesteven's paper). This leads one to expect that where Aboriginal communities have control over access to their land and to natural phenomena likely to be appreciated by tourists, they are less likely to adopt a position involving cultural tourism impacts since they already have a property right which allows the establishment of an enterprise. Similarly, Aboriginal communities without an access veto are much more likely to wish to use their monopoly power in relation to Aboriginality to enable them to exert sufficient commercial and political leverage to establish an enterprise and/or to control access. The existence of a property right, as a result of land rights legislation, or through some other form of ownership would have a major positive effect since it allows general tourism impacts to be controlled. The absence of such property rights implies that the existence of general tourism impacts must be accepted, and attention focussed on controlling these impacts. Consequently, initiatives to take up a commercial involvement in tourism may be much more attractive in that context; indeed, it may be one of the few strategies available to alter the balance of negative and positive general tourism impacts.

Recognition that control may require initiative by Aboriginal interests focusses attention on a range of research problems with real world implications. A major question relates to organisational and corporate structures: what are the characteristics required by Aboriginal organisations operating in the tourist industry? How might they retain their own Aboriginality whilst maintaining their effectiveness as commercial entities? What are the appropriate revenue-retention policies for these organisations, and for the Aboriginal individuals, groups and community councils which own them?

Policy Implications

The analysis presented above emphasises the need for funding agencies and Aboriginal communities and groups to distinguish clearly between cultural and non-cultural tourism. Involvement in tourism is potentially costly and destructive, yet may be the only feasible means of exerting some control over the negative features of tourism and perhaps offsetting them through increased revenue/profits (and hence widened choices).

Aboriginal organisations and funding agencies such as the Aboriginal Development Commission and the recently established W.A. Aboriginal Enterprises Corporation, should seek to fund Aboriginal tourism enterprises in which cultural impacts are minimised. The availability of finance for non-cultural Aboriginal tourism enterprises will of itself reduce the need (though not necessarily the incentive) for Aboriginal enterprises to market their own cultural resources. Moreover, it is clear that the bulk of the expenditure by tourists who visit northern Australia is directed to general services such as accommodation, fuel, food, etc. Over-reliance on the monopoly that Aborigines have over Aboriginality may blind Aboriginal organisations to the natural locational monopolies which they often have, the potential for reasonable profits from effectively run enterprises notwithstanding the existence of competitors; and the reality that commercial activity is the *sine qua non* of effective political influence at local, State and Federal levels in the Australian polity. Perhaps more importantly, Aboriginal involvement in the tourism industry may provide a measure of control and independence for communities who to date have not achieved either.

Conclusion

Research on tourism and Aborigines will not be easy since it involves serious methodological problems. It is however not an issue that can be avoided as Aboriginal involvement in tourism has clearly arrived on the policy/option agenda.

Particular areas which warrant research include: the relationship between various types of tourism and changes to Aboriginal social structure; the assignment of values such as good/bad, positive/negative, to such changes; the design of appropriate organisational and commercial structures for Aboriginal owned enterprises; and appropriate financial strategies for Aboriginal enterprises and communities. Much of this research will either be, or lead into applied research as these questions will in one way or another confront most Aboriginal communities in north Australia at some stage in the future.

REFERENCES

- Burchett, C. 1985.
Tourism and Aborigines in the Northern Territory: A Discussion Paper.
Darwin : Northern Territory Tourism Commission.
- Dryzek, J. 1982.
Policy Analysis as a Hermeneutic Activity.
Policy Sciences 14 : 309-329.
- Williams, Nancy and Kirkby, I. 1984.
Decision Making at Turkey Creek.
Submission to the Western Australian Aboriginal Land Inquiry.
Mimeo.
- Cooke, P. 1983.
Aboriginal Cultural Centre, Kakadu.
Unpublished feasibility study presented to a number of government departments in the Northern Territory.

ATTACHMENT 1

EAST KIMBERLEY WORKING PAPERS 1985-86

- 1985/1 East Kimberley Impact Assessment Project: Project Description and Feasibility Study.
East Kimberley Working Paper No.1
ISBN 0 86740 181 8
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1985/2 The East Kimberley Region : Research Guide and Select References.
M.C. Dillon
East Kimberley Working Paper No.2
ISBN 0 86740 182 6
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1985/3 Aborigines and the Argyle Diamond Project. Submission to the Aboriginal Land Inquiry.
Dr W. Christensen
East Kimberley Working Paper No.3
ISBN 0 86740 202 4
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1985/4 Pastoral Resource Use in the Kimberley : A critical Overview
M.C. Dillon
East Kimberley Working Paper No.4
ISBN 0 86740 183 4
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1985/5 Preliminary Report : Ethnobotany in the Bungles
Dr Deborah Bird Rose
East Kimberley Working Paper No.5
ISBN 0 86740 186 9
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1985/6 A Preliminary Account of the Ethnobotany of the Kije People of Bungle Bungle Outcamp
N.H. Scarlett
East Kimberley Working Paper No.6
ISBN 86740 205 9
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1985/7 An Aboriginal Economic Base : Strategies for Remote Communities
Extracts from the Report of the Committee of Review of aboriginal employment and Training Programs
East Kimberley Working Paper No.7
ISBN 0 86740 190 7
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1985/8 A Preliminary Indication of Some Effects of the Argyle Diamond Mine on Aboriginal Communities in the Region : A Report to the Kimberley Land council and the National aboriginal Conference
East Kimberley Working Paper No.8
ISBN 0 86740 203 2
ISSN 0816-6323

- 1986/9 Structural Change in Wyndham
M.C. Dillon
East Kimberley Working Paper No.9
ISBN 0 86740 204 0
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1986/10 Inhabited National Parks: Indigenous Peoples in Protected
Landscapes
Stan Stevens
East Kimberley Working Paper No.10
ISBN 0 86740 263
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1986/11 An Assessment of the Social Impact of Argyle Diamond Mines on
the East Kimberley Region
Frank Donovan
East Kimberley Working Paper No.11
ISBN 0 86740 267 9
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1986/12 The Health of Kimberley Aborigines: A Personal 15-Year Perspective
Michael Gracey and Randolph M. Spargo
East Kimberley Working Paper No.12
ISBN 0 86740 268 7
ISSN 0816-6323
- 1987/13 Annotated Bibliography on Tourism and Aborigines. Prepared for
the East Kimberley Impact Assessment Project and the Central
Land Council
Compiled by Ian White
East Kimberley Working Paper No.13
ISBN 0 86740 275 X
ISSN 0816-6323