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Abstract

Architecture has contributed to the diverse and complex history of colonial social constructions of Aboriginality. Architectural interpretations of Aboriginal identities now play a significant role in informing how Aboriginality is perceived. Recently, several new forms of architecture have emerged in response to the increasing search for appropriate architectural expressions of Aboriginality. These buildings seek to generate an ‘Aboriginal’ identity that incorporates Aboriginal cultural references, environmental knowledge, signs and symbols. However, such strategies often reinforce the construction of Aboriginal peoples and cultures as irregular, natural and ‘primitive’. These architectural expressions of Aboriginality attempt to recover the past through the incorporation of traditional Aboriginal attitudes, customs and beliefs that are unchanged from historical descriptions. The designers of these buildings have defined, generalised and simplified the concept of Aboriginality in architecture from a non-Aboriginal perspective. This is an interpretive imposition of contemporary Western society’s application of stereotypes, icons and myths to present-day Aboriginal cultures. Furthermore, this contributes to the mis-representations that constrain contemporary Aboriginal peoples, identities and cultures, which also have the capacity to limit the possible meanings and functions of an ‘Aboriginal’ building.

This paper addresses the conference theme by examining and exploring preconceptions regarding current architectural approaches to representing Australian Aboriginal cultures and identities. Through the investigation of examples drawn primarily from three buildings that are forms of cultural centres, this process examines the way in which mainstream architectural discourse constructs Aboriginal peoples as the ‘Other’ in opposition to non-Aboriginal people. The argument is developed through standard cultural theory approaches and does not include empirical evidence. Possible future strategies for the representation of Aboriginality in architecture are
proposed to suggest how a ‘decolonised’ culturally appropriate Aboriginal architecture can be developed.

The Construction of Aboriginal Identity in Architecture

If there is one person more damaging to the position of Aboriginal Australians than a racist, it is the person who idealises and romanticizes them.¹

Stewart Harris

When the words ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘architecture’ are combined together in contemporary scholarship there are at least two potential meanings. First, the words may be a reference to historic practices and forms, and secondly, they may refer to structures that seek to reflect some aspect of Indigenous cultures or beliefs. In the first instance, Australian Aboriginal architecture is not a new phenomenon. Both before and after European contact in 1788, Aboriginal peoples self-designed and self-constructed grass and bark structures, huts and ‘lean-tos’, to accommodate their lifestyle, social patterns and environment.

More commonly, in the late twentieth century, the title ‘Aboriginal architecture’ has been reserved for describing buildings which are concerned with the expression, representation and symbolic meaning of cultural identity for Aboriginal peoples. Or, in a related definition, it has addressed the representation of a particular place or site that is considered significant for Aboriginal cultures. Such buildings represent an important movement toward cultural liberation and diversity that is a significant step away from Western domination. These buildings present a positive alternative when compared to present Western ethnocentric cultural forms.² Design approaches and concepts that are commonly used in buildings that claim to be ‘Aboriginal’ include the use of models based on traditional Aboriginal shelters, representations of Dreamtime Ancestors and animal totems, and interpretations of the environment and the Aboriginal people’s connection to the land. This second type of Aboriginal architecture is the focus of this paper.

In the last three decades, specific architectural design approaches have emerged to acknowledge the different cultural values of Aboriginal peoples. These ‘Aboriginal’ buildings have utilised sources of design inspiration that include replicating local
vernacular architecture, utilising raw materials, as well as organic interpretations of animal totems and of dramatic local landscapes. These buildings are defined both within the architectural profession and in the architectural media as ‘Aboriginal’, even though they have had different levels of Aboriginal community consultation and participation. Therefore, the concept of Aboriginality in architecture continues to be structured around a range of ‘primitive’ stereotypes which has the ability to restrain the possible meaning and function of an ‘Aboriginal’ building. Five major themes arise when reflecting on contemporary architectural interpretations of Australian Aboriginal identities and each of these are described in the present paper.

According to architectural theorist Simon Unwin, architecture ‘involves considering how things should be framed, theoretically (philosophically) as well as physically.’ For that reason, architecture necessarily involves taking a theoretical position on the representation of Aboriginal cultures in the built environment. Academic Stephen Muecke argues that ‘culture’ is essential to concepts of Aboriginality; Aboriginal peoples are continually being burdened with Western romantic concepts of Aboriginal culture.4 Culture is often treated as though it is a natural inheritance when, in actual fact, it is a construction. As a result, the only ‘authentic’ techniques available for Aboriginal peoples to self-identify in Australian society are through specific forms and expressions of culture.5 For instance, current design approaches and sources of design inspiration may seek an ‘authentic’ Aboriginality, but in doing so they largely exclude, exploit and appropriate Aboriginal peoples and cultures.

Over time in Australia, the processes of colonisation and essentialism have lead to Aboriginal peoples being identified as a ‘unified’ or singular community focussed on a series of unchanging and inherently mythical properties. Historically, Aboriginal peoples have only ever been defined through the ways in which they differ from Western peoples. These artificial divisions between Aboriginal peoples and European Australians rely on ‘the creation of dichotomies of past and present; black and white; us and them.’ Whereby, ‘the primitivization of the Other was one of the discriminatory strategies used by the colonizer in order to support its claims to cultural authority.’ Throughout the last century, the characteristics which colonial divisions identify as intrinsic to Aboriginal peoples have accumulated momentum and have been extensively reproduced ‘developed and extended through European textual and visual representations.’ Architectural sociologist, Garry Stevens argues such representations are ‘at once the filter through which we interpret the social world, organizing our
perceptions of other people’s practices, and the mechanism we use to regulate our actions in that world, [therefore] producing our own practices. Accordingly, social structures are internalised in a person through the continual repetition of similar beliefs and attitudes, which normalise practices to create social structures. Thus, the coloniser observes and studies Aboriginal peoples in an attempt to define those fixed and unchanging elements of their culture that can be used to categorise Aboriginality. Hence, as anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss concludes, ‘the primitive is, and can only be an imagined ideal.’ Contemporary society has a similar expectation that these same ‘fixed and innate properties … must be possessed in order to permit definition’ and define an ‘authentic' Aboriginal culture, practice or belief. Researcher Lynette Russell explains, that within Aboriginal discourses ‘antiquity has become an important signifier of Aboriginal culture for contemporary Koori groups and individuals … [where] Symbols of past activities signify the continuity between pre-contact and modern Aboriginal Australia.’ In this way Aboriginality is a socially constructed concept that too often locks Indigenous Australians “into a primitivist discourse that could not be repudiated without jeopardising their authenticity.” This is especially true of architectural expressions of Aboriginality because, as theorist Umberto Eco maintains, architectural discourse ‘generally aims at mass appeal: it starts with accepted premises, builds upon them well-known or readily acceptable “arguments”, and thereby elicits a certain type of consent.

New buildings that seek to generate an ‘Aboriginal’ identity are often covered in signs reflecting Aboriginal myths; a design approach that conforms to the aesthetic, environmental and social expectations of the non-Aboriginal community. As a result, this paper analyses the construction of Aboriginal identity in architecture, whereby sources of design inspiration are continually fixed in the ‘primitive’ past. Furthermore, this paper will also examine issues that limit the perceptions of contemporary Aboriginal peoples and cultures through maintaining myths and stereotypes in the way in which Aboriginal identities are being portrayed within modern architecture.

The Use of Totemic Representations

The tension between the desire to reflect, in architectural form, a culture and the need for that culture to be clearly delineated for this to occur, is at the core of this research. To survive in this world, human beings necessarily classify and categorise objects, peoples and things in order to manage and to control our surrounding environments. For example, traditional Aboriginal cultures have been ‘narrowly defined [by] European
construction based on perceptions of what was in place before (or at most immediately up to) European contact. Similarly, in architecture, architectural theorist Geoffrey Broadbent explains,

... we categorise our experience after which we know what to do every time we meet a new situation in any of those known categories. We know what ... [things] ‘look like’ so when we meet a new and strange building which ‘looks like’ one of those, we naturally put it into that category.

Many building designs intentionally represent recognisable ‘Aboriginal’ images to the non-Indigenous community. The influence of, and abstract use of, representations of Aboriginal Dreamtime Ancestors and animal totems are generally visually appealing in the building form. For example, Aboriginal animal totems were the basis of the design for Gregory Burgess’ Brambuk Living Cultural Centre (1990) located in the Grampians National Park, at Halls Gap. Aboriginal animal totems were also used as a source of design inspiration for Burgess’ Uluru-Kata Tjuta Aboriginal Cultural Centre (1995) positioned alongside Uluru, in Central Australia. However, if the totemic representations are used as sources of design inspiration in the building layout, they are usually illegible and the original meaning can only be appreciated and understood when looking at the architect’s plans; something relatively few people have the opportunity to do. Furthermore, if we briefly accept the proposition that totemic representation is a reasonable approach to Indigenous design, then the plan of the building cannot be changed or modified without distorting the building’s initial source of design inspiration and undermining its supposed cultural significance. This approach to architecture, wherein a building’s form has a singular (or limited) range of interpretations, can be called the production of a ‘closed’ form because it suggests the production of a relatively fixed meaning that remains static over time. This promotes, in a theoretical sense, a circular logic to reading the building. The form must be relatively ‘closed’ for it to represent a particular Aboriginal totem, but in doing so it also projects a vision of Aboriginal peoples as similarly fixed within a ‘primitive’ and ‘authentic’ state.

The Creation of Connections with the Natural Environment

The majority of ‘Aboriginal’ buildings are carefully absorbed into their surrounding natural environments. Each building’s integration tends to occur through the use of local materials and forms that replicate or reflect the landscape. Typically vegetation
encircling the buildings assists in blurring the boundaries between the built and natural environments. Such examples include the Brambuk Living Cultural Centre and the Bowali Visitor Information Centre (1994) located in the Kakadu National Park in the top end of the Northern Territory, which is designed by Glenn Murcutt, in association with Troppo Architects. Therefore, it might be concluded that for ‘Aboriginal’ buildings, a key design inspiration has been the concept of creating a harmonious connection with the environment. However, this approach, and especially in its mythologising tendencies, works to associate Aboriginal peoples and cultures with nature and the landscape and, consequently, reinforces stereotypes of the ‘primitive’ and the ‘authentic’. A better solution would be for a designer to move beyond predictable ‘primitive’ clichés and seek to represent an autonomous relationship between the built and natural environments. As such, the Bowali Visitor Information Centre is an exceptional example of recognising the landscape, and therefore, the building could be considered to be an ‘open’ form.

Open forms evoke a wide range of potential readings and interpretations and they have the ability to be altered or amended without undermining their purpose (one of the problems previously identified for closed forms). However the difference between open and closed forms is more complex than this implies. For example, Simon Unwin warns that:

… the symbolic meaning of works of architecture can be open to variable interpretation. A single work might be interpreted in different ways by different people, even if its architect intended no symbolism at all. And even when symbolism is intended, the message sent may be interpreted differently in the minds of the recipients.  

Thus, architectural meaning is fluid and is made anew by each person who experiences a form. However, some forms are sufficiently arbitrary with ‘no strong relationship to narrative space or time’ that they encourage a range of readings while others do not.

Planning to Reflect Aboriginal Peoples’ Patterns of Movement
A third common factor that has been uncovered in ‘Aboriginal’ buildings is that they have indirect twisting and turning approaches through the landscape. In each case, the meandering journey allows for the opportunity to intensify the visitors’ experience and
engage them with the local climate and the surrounding environment, focussing on their senses. This characteristic passage through the landscape is often repeated internally in the meandering journeys; for example, inside the Bowali Visitor Information Centre and the Brambuk Living Cultural Centre. The architects’ explanation and justification for such specific design intentions relates to Aboriginal peoples’ ‘informal patterns of movement.’ Although, another description could possibly suggest that the internal and external meandering paths are a reminder that it is the journey that is important and not just the final destination. Alternatively, it could be argued that ‘an architect avoids the most direct route [so] that the person approaching … can be lead through a progressive sequence of experiences.’

Architect Graham Jahn argues that ‘good architecture should heighten experiences by providing stimulation and selective cultural reinforcement.’ All of these are potential explanations and each is appropriate for suggesting the complexity of contemporary Aboriginal culture.

The use of all three of these strategies – (a) the use of totemic representations; (b) the creation of connections with the natural environment; and (c) planning which reflects Aboriginal peoples’ patterns of movement and inhabitation – as sources of design inspiration tends to evoke, and appeal to, the static concept of a ‘primitive’ and ‘authentic’ traditional Aboriginal culture that is forever ‘timelocked in the past, repressed and undeveloped’; an approach which unwittingly distances Indigenous peoples and identities from the contemporary reality. Such representations of Aboriginal culture that are found in these three award winning buildings match people’s images and expectations, providing ‘the non-Aboriginal audience with a sense of comfort, a reassurance that Aborigines are just as they had imagined them to be.’

This suggests that non-Aboriginal people prefer a view of Aboriginal Australia that they recognise and are familiar with. Furthermore, anthropologist Jeremy Beckett has observed that the non-Aboriginal public in general ‘are uncomfortable with urban Aboriginality, seeing this as diluted and unauthentic.’ While the three sources of design inspiration that have been considered so far all relate to architectural form and materiality, the next theme identified concerns the desire for an inclusive design process.

**Community Consultation and Participation**

Historically, consultation with Aboriginal peoples ‘has often been absent, intrusive, or frequently unsatisfactory or culturally inappropriate.’ As a result of this lack of
consultation and representation, the resultant buildings may not meet the needs of the Indigenous building users; however, the effects are rarely understood as post occupancy evaluations are not often conducted. In buildings that are portrayed to be ‘Aboriginal’, the local Aboriginal communities’ consultation and participation throughout the design and construction processes of the buildings vary greatly. Initially, the Bowali Visitor Information Centre was not intended to display or represent Aboriginal cultures, which was reflected in the local Aboriginal community’s minimal amount of consultation and participation. In comparison, the local Aboriginal community were consulted on the site selection, design concepts and the interpretative displays for the Karjini National Park Visitors Centre (2001), designed by John Nicholas from Woodhead International and located in the semi-desert landscape of the remote, iron-ore rich Pilbara region of Western Australia. However, no training and employment opportunities were provided for the local Aboriginal peoples during or after the completion of the Visitors Centre.

Memmott and Reser argue that it:

… may be the case that what is ultimately most symbolic and powerful about the meaning of a building for Aboriginal and Islander people is that they participated in the process whereby the building came about - i.e., they were involved in the place-making and creative thinking that generated the complex. This element may be more important in making this an ‘Aboriginal’ building than any design elements per se.

Therefore, rather than the end building product being the primary focus, the act of doing, making decisions and being part of the process is what is most important from Aboriginal people’s perspective. Supporting this proposition, Aboriginal interior designer and artist, Alison Page proposes that:

… Indigenous architecture is not a style but a culturally appropriate process based on communication, trust, and community development…. From the moment a building idea is conceived to the moment it is realised, communication, in whatever form, and community involvement will determine the Aboriginality of the architecture. Within the process, there are many considerations which may not necessarily exist in a non-Aboriginal project. Designers are asked to consider culture, place and identity as well as employment and training opportunities, social justice, and health issues. The failures in the past were not only due to
misconceptions about culture, but to the coupling of this omission with a lack of community consultation.\textsuperscript{31}

Furthermore, with over 30 years of experience working with remote Indigenous communities, architect Geoff Barker explains that he does not agree with the term consultation. Instead he suggests that ‘methods such as engagement, negotiation and partnering need to be promoted, developed, widely understood and implemented if we are to participate in the wider development goals espoused by Indigenous people.’\textsuperscript{32}

An example of such an approach is found in the Brambuk Living Cultural Centre, where new bricks were made by local Aboriginal community members and local Aboriginal carpenters and labourers were employed during construction. Yet, it is frequently recounted that members of the committee camped close to the site where there was ‘dancing and singing, eating and drinking and telling stories.’\textsuperscript{33} This description mystifies the local Aboriginal people’s participation in the process and gives the impression ‘of the white man in the process of becoming Aboriginal.’\textsuperscript{34} This form of participation is not as important as the genuine collaboration called for by Page, Barker, Memmott and Reser.

**Authorship of Aboriginality in Architecture**

A final theme arising from this research into recent ‘Aboriginal’ buildings concerns the question of authorship and the architects’ complicity in creating cultural forms. The design of visitor centres presents architects with the opportunity to participate in the construction of cultures. Mike Austin argues that this is due to the fact that ‘[e]verywhere architecture is framing defining and representing.’\textsuperscript{35} Consequently, architects are repeatedly ‘portraying cultures other than their own, which raises the issue of who or what is being represented.’\textsuperscript{36} Likewise, architect Lisa Findley maintains that for a designer creating a project for another culture, that:

\[
\ldots \text{the complexity of this act of translation increases dramatically. This is due, in part, to the fact that architecture is primarily European cultural practice. It has particular protocols, terminology, processes and sensibilities. It assumes specific dynamics between architect and client. And it is fairly particular about the purpose and values of buildings.}\textsuperscript{37}
\]
Moreover, the architect’s ‘decision-making process is clearly centered on the architect’s ego-driven ability to make the correct and wisest decisions.’ As Austin observes, in architecture:

… [t]here is an assumption about giving people what is best for them, (the benefits of technology and civilisation), what they themselves could never achieve, a reinterpreting and improving of their life … [and, therefore] building organises and re-frames the indigenous.

This desire to do what is ‘best’ could be considered as another strategy adopted by Western society to once again ‘protect’ Aboriginal peoples; an approach that further reinforces European paternalism. Thus, regardless of the architect’s intentions, such design approaches unwittingly stop Aboriginal peoples from establishing their own present and future cultural representations of themselves. Dillon Kombumerri, a founding member of the Merrima Aboriginal Design Unit, declares that:

… the issue of the representation of indigenous architecture by white society has nothing to do with the building being good or bad, it simply has to do with the idea that the representation of an indigenous culture by an indigenous architect would result in a more enriched outcome.

This reasoning appears to assume that the building will become more ‘authentic’ or perhaps simply be better if it is designed by an Indigenous architect. One of Australia’s leading Aboriginal scholars, Marcia Langton, agrees when she argues that there “is a native belief that Aboriginal people will make “better” representations of us [Aboriginal peoples], simply because being Aboriginal gives “greater” understanding.” However, both assumptions recall the colonial view of the undifferentiated ‘Other’, and infer that all Indigenous peoples are the same, without regard to cultural and gender differences. This is problematic because even though Merrima are an association of Indigenous architects and designers, they may not have connections to the particular local Aboriginal community of a building project. Furthermore, Merrima’s designs are derived from the same sources used by non-Indigenous architects for interpreting and shaping building designs. Despite this criticism, Merrima as a group of Indigenous architects, may have an advantage coming from within this group of cultures and may be attuned to understanding Aboriginal cultural practices.
According to Barker, the architect’s ‘role is to challenge and question assumptions and introduce ideas and alternatives.’ As such, architect Peter Eisenman believes that ‘architecture has a serious problem’ because advances are not occurring in the architectural field at the same rate as they have been occurring in other fields. This is particularly true in regard to the representation of Aboriginality in architecture; as the same sources of design inspiration are being repeatedly used without serious contemplation of the different local Aboriginal people’s culture and of their natural environment. While speaking in a different context, Eisenman maintains that:

… we need to displace this concept of architecture as a service, as an accommodating profession … [and the belief that] architecture is OK as long as it indulges [in] the habits of people. But once you question the habit … you upset the balance, you cause a stir. [Therefore, the] only way to advance in a discipline is to displace knowledge. And the only discourses that remain healthy are those that are displacing discourses.

Knowledge and discourses about Aboriginal peoples and cultures in architecture are not being questioned or displaced by contemporary design practices. One reason for this is ‘that the European modes of talking about Aborigines limit their ways of knowing what Aborigines might be’, a move which does not allow for new thoughts and ideas regarding Aboriginal peoples.

Jillian Walliss and Liz Grant argue that ‘it is critical that future design professionals gain access to education that achieves cultural awareness of Australia’s original inhabitants.’ They suggest that the curriculum should be restructured to focus on the beliefs of Aboriginal cultures and government policies to gain an understanding of their implications and the issues for contemporary Indigenous peoples and their built environment. However, Walliss and Grant advise against ‘the emphasis of stereotypical design projects on remote communities [that] tends to limit students’ understandings of the diversity and complexity of Indigenous cultures.’ In addition, current learning processes need to take into consideration and incorporate Indigenous cultures and pedagogies to encourage Aboriginal peoples to become future design professionals.
Towards a Culturally Appropriate Indigenous Architecture?

This paper explores the way in which certain discourses about Aboriginal peoples and cultures are maintained through architectural form, expression, materiality and program. Ultimately, the simplification, mystification and appropriation of Aboriginality denies the possibility of an architecture that thoroughly addresses local Aboriginal peoples’ needs (spatially and symbolically), in addition to respecting their natural environments. As researcher Ian McNiven notes, the ‘problem is more than a clash of belief systems – it is a clash of powers to control constructions of identity.’

As a consequence, ‘[w]ho controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.’ Therefore, there is a need to eliminate the classification and categorisation of Aboriginality in architecture, to create a new language that is focused on the future, rather than continually looking at the past. Furthermore, the concepts of ‘authenticity’ and ‘primitive’ must become redundant in order to create a ‘decolonised’, culturally appropriate Indigenous architecture. As architecture ‘is both form and process, it can transform ways of seeing.’
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