Adrianna Martinez
Robert Fitch
Environmental Studies 140
June 9th, 2025

Revitalizing Indigenous Fire Management Leadership in Australia: Integrating Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Knowledge Systems into Contemporary Fire Regimes

Acknowledgement

As a non-aboriginal author, I acknowledge that this research draws upon the traditional knowledge and cultural practices of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, who are the traditional land stewards and first scientists of Australian landscapes. Aboriginal peoples, referring to the diverse Indigenous peoples who have inhabited mainland Australia for over 65,000 years, and Torres Strait Islander peoples, the Indigenous inhabitants of the Torres Strait Islands between mainland Australia and Papua New Guinea, have developed sophisticated fire management systems that have sustained Australian ecosystems for millennia. I recognize their connection to Country and acknowledge the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the primary knowledge holders and decision makers regarding their ancestral fire practices. This paper seeks to respectfully document the revitalization of Indigenous fire management leadership.

Introduction: Defining Australian Fire Regimes

While contemporary Australia faces an unprecedented fire crisis due to colonial fire suppression policies, a comprehensive examination of paleoecological, ecological, and economic evidence reveals that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander fire management consistently outperforms institutional approaches across all measurable outcomes, from emissions reduction and soil health to biodiversity conservation and economic sustainability. This scientific validation of traditional knowledge systems demonstrates that effective fire management requires not merely the adoption of Indigenous techniques, but genuine Indigenous leadership and decision-making authority, as institutional attempts to replicate traditional practices have repeatedly failed to achieve comparable results.

Australia's fire regimes represent some of the most complex and ecologically significant burning patterns globally, shaped by unique climatic conditions, vegetation assemblages, and over 65,000 years of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander fire stewardship (Bowman, D.M.J.S., 2022). Fire regimes, defined as the characteristic frequency, intensity, seasonality, extent, and

severity of fires across landscapes, are fundamental drivers of Australian ecosystem structure and function (Russell-Smith et al., 2013). These regimes operate across multiple temporal and spatial scales, from localized patch burns affecting individual plant communities to landscape-scale mosaics that influence regional biodiversity patterns and carbon cycling.

Australian ecosystems encompass diverse vegetation types with distinct fuel characteristics that influence fire behavior. Savanna grasslands are dominated by fine fuels such as grasses and herbs that dry rapidly and ignite easily, while forest systems contain complex fuel structures including fine fuels (leaves, twigs <6mm), 10-hour fuels (small branches 6-25mm), 100-hour fuels (medium branches 25-76mm), and 1000-hour fuels (large woody debris >76mm) that create vertical fuel continuity or "ladder fuels" capable of carrying fire into forest canopies. Northern Australian vegetation includes "sparse heathlands and hummock grasslands dominated by Triodia on skeletal soils and eucalypt savannas on sandy soils," with embedded patches of fire-sensitive species creating heterogeneous fuel mosaics (Bowman, D.M.J.S., 2022).

Savannas alone cover one-sixth of Earth's land surface and contribute significantly (~10%) to global carbon emissions through biomass burning, making Australia's fire-prone ecosystems globally significant (Russell-Smith et al., 2013). The continent's fire environment is characterized by pronounced seasonality, with distinct wet and dry periods creating predictable windows for controlled burning. In northern Australia, monsoonal climate patterns produce heavy summer rains (>1000 mm) and dry winters (May to September), establishing clear seasonal burning opportunities (Bowman, D.M.J.S., 2022).

Fire intensity and severity vary dramatically between Indigenous-led cultural burns and contemporary wildfires. Traditional Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander fire management involves "the lighting of 'cool' fires in targeted areas during the early dry season between March and July" (Kimberley Land Council, 2024), contrasting sharply with late-season wildfires that occur under more severe conditions. Aboriginal peoples historically implemented "extensive 'cleaning of country' management through intensive application of small patchy burns in the early-mid dry season" (Russell-Smith et al., 2013), creating complex pyrodiversity mosaics essential for ecosystem resilience.

Contemporary Australia faces an unprecedented fire crisis, with "contemporary fire regimes increasingly recognized as having drastic regional impacts on sustainable land use, biodiversity, and GHG emissions and C storage" (Russell-Smith et al., 2013). Growing recognition that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander fire management systems offer scientifically validated, culturally grounded solutions for creating fire-resilient landscapes has

prompted examination of how traditional burning practices are being integrated into contemporary fire regimes and policy frameworks.

Paleoecological Evidence of Cultural Fire Regimes and their Impacts

Paleoecological research provides compelling evidence for the long-term influence of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander fire management on Australian landscapes. Sediment core analysis from southeastern Australia reveals that "fire severity was lower over the past 18,000 years compared to the penultimate glacial/interglacial period and suggests increasing anthropogenic influence over the landscape during this time" (Constantine et al., 2023). This reduction in fire intensity coincides with increasing Aboriginal populations and archaeological evidence of cultural burning practices, suggesting that Indigenous fire management fundamentally altered natural fire regimes through strategic application of frequent, low-intensity burns that allow fire-adapted species to thrive.

The charring intensity index, a proxy for fire temperature and residence time, shows consistently lower values during periods of intensive Aboriginal occupation, indicating that cultural burning maintained fire intensities within ecological tolerance thresholds for fire-sensitive species. Constantine et al. (2023) found "a statistically significant difference in Charring Intensity between MIS 6-5 and 2-1," with the Holocene period showing "lower and less variable" charring intensity values consistent with frequent, low-intensity fires.

Research from southeastern Australia demonstrates that "shrub cover decreased as Indigenous populations expanded," with median shrub cover declining from approximately 30% to less than 15% during periods of intensified cultural burning over the past 6,000 years (Mariani et al., 2022). This reduction in shrub density directly influenced fuel connectivity and fire behavior, as "the sharp decline in shrub cover from 6 to 5 ka likely reduced vertical fuel pathways because of lower ladder fuels and altered fire behavior" (Mariani et al., 2022). Statistical modeling demonstrates that "projected shrub cover over the mid- to late Holocene—without considering human population density (28% of land cover)—differs significantly from that we observed (15% of land cover)," providing quantitative evidence for anthropogenic landscape modification (Mariani et al., 2022).

Traditional and Scientific Knowledge Systems

Traditional burning practices focus on strategic patch burning that maintains heterogeneous fuel age distributions across landscapes. Early European observers noted that "the natives were about, burning, burning, ever burning; one would think they... lived on fire instead of water," directly accounting for the significant role of fire as a historically social and ecological tool (Tropical Savannas CRC and the Bushfire CRC, 2005). The timing and intensity

of cultural burns are critical ecological factors as early season burns consume fine fuels while preserving soil organic matter and maintaining canopy integrity, creating conditions that inhibit subsequent high-intensity wildfires. As described in northern Australian contexts, "the fires burn slowly, reducing fuel loads and creating fire breaks. Not all the area is burnt, with the end result a mosaic of burnt and unburnt country" (Kimberley Land Council, 2024).

The ecological effectiveness of cultural burning is demonstrated through quantifiable emissions reductions and biodiversity outcomes. In northern Australia's West Arnhem Land Fire Abatement project, traditional fire management "reduced methane and nitrous oxide emissions by 37.7%" over seven years compared to baseline wildfire regimes (Russell-Smith et al., 2013). Recent collaborative research between the University of Wollongong and Ulladulla Local Aboriginal Land Council provides additional quantitative evidence of cultural burning's superior ecological benefits, finding that while both cultural burning and agency-led prescribed burning improved soil health, "cultural burns stand out for their remarkable ability to improve soil quality by making it lighter, allowing more nutrients and microbes to thrive" with soils showing "greater amounts of carbon and nitrogen" compared to areas that were unburnt or subject to agency-led burns (Murramarang Country et al., 2024).

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander fire management integrates multiple land management activities beyond burning. Among the Ngadju peoples of Western Australia, "other activities such as firewood collecting around the edges of woodlands and rock holes, and sweeping and scraping up litter around individual trees, were undertaken to help control wildfire" (CSIRO, 2021). The Ngadju traditionally "used fire as a cultural tool for keeping the country clear around rock holes, for encouraging grasses in open grasslands and mallee, and to smoke out animals when hunting. These fires were often small, around one hectare" (CSIRO, 2021). The spatial pattern created by traditional burning is crucial for landscape-level fire management, as "together this mosaic of Ngadju fires and related activities may have helped to slow wildfires across large tracts of country" (CSIRO, 2021.).

The ecological significance of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander fire regimes is particularly evident in their support for fire-sensitive species. Research on Callitris intratropica demonstrates how traditional burning creates essential habitat mosaics for species with complex fire tolerance thresholds (Bowman, D.M.J.S., 2022). Adult C. intratropica possess "thick, fire-resistant bark" enabling survival of low-intensity fires, but "more intense grass-fires typically partially defoliate adults and kill juveniles (seedlings and saplings), causing a severe recruitment bottleneck" (Bowman, D.M.J.S., 2022). Traditional Aboriginal fire management creates conditions where C. intratropica can complete its life cycle by maintaining patchy burn

mosaics that protect juvenile recruitment sites while managing grass fuel loads around mature trees.

Comparative analysis reveals dramatic differences between traditional and institutional management. On Aboriginal-managed estates where traditional burning continues, C. intratropica populations maintain healthy age structures, while Kakadu National Park shows "extreme declines of C. intratropica associated with widespread fires since the mid twentieth century" following disruption of traditional burning (Bowman, D.M.J.S., 2022). Critically, "fire management in Kakadu since 2007, designed to increase the size and abundance of patches of unburned vegetation, has not been able to reverse the population collapse," demonstrating that institutional fire management cannot replicate traditional patch dynamics (Bowman, D.M.J.S., 2022). This effectiveness stems not merely from the technical application of fire, but from the holistic understanding of ecological relationships embedded in Indigenous knowledge systems that treat fire as one component of comprehensive landscape stewardship. The inability of institutional fire management to replicate these outcomes, despite decades of scientific study and technological advancement, underscores the irreplaceable value of traditional ecological knowledge and the critical importance of Indigenous leadership in contemporary fire management.

Integration of Traditional and Scientific Knowledge Systems

The West Arnhem Land Fire Abatement (WALFA) project covers approximately 28,000 km² and demonstrates successful large-scale implementation through strong Aboriginal leadership, integration of traditional knowledge with monitoring technologies, and economic incentives supporting Aboriginal employment and cultural continuity (Russell-Smith et al., 2013). However, successful integration requires addressing power dynamics and cultural protocols. As Rawluk, et al. (2023) note, effective collaboration depends on "relationships built on shared values and time together on Country," with research needing to "take place on Country and with Country… being on Country builds meaningful relationships, supports ceremony, and centres learning."

Regional variations reflect diverse Aboriginal fire traditions, with the Ngadju people emphasizing integration of traditional burning with conservation objectives, seeking to "combine the best of old and new ways" in fire management (CSIRO, 2021). Aboriginal ranger programs provide employment while supporting traditional knowledge transmission, creating hybrid skill sets bridging Indigenous and Western knowledge systems. However, significant barriers remain, as "fire management… is a supremacist system," requiring "decolonization of that system… letting go of the need to control" from governments (Rawluk, A., et al., 2023). The

challenge lies in moving beyond extractive research models toward Indigenous-led research that "empowers Aboriginal peoples as leaders in both research and policymaking" (Rawluk, A., et al., 2023).

Economic sustainability depends on diversified funding including carbon markets, with traditional burning proving cost-effective compared to wildfire suppression while delivering multiple environmental benefits. Knowledge transmission faces challenges from disrupted traditional practices, requiring intensive efforts to reconnect young Aboriginal people with fire knowledge embedded in broader cultural contexts (Rawluk, A., et al., 2023). Climate change alters seasonal windows and environmental conditions, requiring adaptation of traditional practices while maintaining cultural integrity. Scaling traditional management requires attention to cultural protocols and ecological variability, with capacity constraints limiting rapid expansion. Regulatory frameworks remain poorly adapted to traditional burning approaches, requiring reform to accommodate fine-scale patch burning while maintaining safety standards.

Conclusion

The comparative evidence presents a clear verdict that traditional Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander fire management operates as a sophisticated ecological technology that institutional approaches cannot replicate. Where conventional fire management focuses on hazard reduction through systematic burning, traditional practices create complex landscape mosaics that simultaneously reduce wildfire risk, enhance ecosystem health, and support biodiversity. The quantitative data, from centuries of paleoecological stability to contemporary carbon market success, reveals that this effectiveness stems from treating fire as one component of integrated landscape stewardship rather than an isolated management tool. Institutional fire management, despite accessing modern technology and substantial funding, consistently fails to achieve the multifaceted outcomes of traditional approaches. The contrast between ongoing population collapses in institutionally-managed Kakadu and the thriving ecosystems under Aboriginal management illustrates a fundamental limitation to the technical replication of burning practices, without the underlying knowledge systems, that produce inferior results. Government agencies can adopt early-season burning schedules and attempt to create patch mosaics, but they cannot reproduce the deep ecological understanding that guides traditional decision-making about when, where, and how to apply fire across diverse landscape conditions.

The economic dimension reinforces this conclusion. Traditional fire management has created a viable industry generating millions in revenue while delivering environmental benefits, whereas institutional fire management remains a cost center requiring ongoing public investment with limited measurable success. This economic sustainability reflects the

fundamental efficiency of management systems developed through millennia of landscape interaction.

The evidence thus answers a critical question for contemporary environmental policy as the choice between traditional and institutional fire management is not a cultural preference but a practical decision between proven effectiveness and documented failure. The path forward requires recognizing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities as the primary authorities on fire management and restructuring institutional arrangements to support rather than supplant Indigenous expertise.

Works Cited

Bowman, D.M.J.S., et al. (2022). Population collapse of a Gondwanan conifer follows the loss of Indigenous fire regimes in a northern Australian savanna. *Scientific Reports*, 12(9081). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-12946-3.

Constantine, M., et al. (2023). Exploration of the Burning Question: A Long History of Fire in Eastern Australia with and without People. *Fire*, 6(4), 152. https://doi.org/10.3390/fire6040152

CSIRO. (2021). Aboriginal fire knowledge in the Great Western Woodlands. Indigenous Science and Engagement. Retrieved from https://www.csiro.au/en/research/indigenous-science/Managing-Country/Ngadju-Kala

Kimberley Land Council. (2024). Indigenous fire management. Retrieved from https://www.klc.org.au/indigenous-fire-management

Mariani, M., et al. (2024). Shrub cover declined as Indigenous populations expanded across southeast Australia. *Science*, 386(6721), 567-573. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adn8668.

Murramarang Country, Davis, J., et al. (2024). Quantitative Assessment of the Effect of Agency-Led Prescribed Burns and Cultural Burns on Soil Properties in southeastern Australia. *Fire*, 7(3), 75. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/fire7030075

Rawluk, A., et al. (2023). Tomorrow's Country: Practice-oriented principles for Indigenous cultural fire research in south-east Australia . *Geographical Research*, 61(3), 333-348. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12596

Russell-Smith, J., et al. (2013). Managing fire regimes in north Australian savannas: applying Aboriginal approaches to contemporary global patterns. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 11(1), e55-e63. https://doi.org/10.1890/120251.

Rutherford, P. (2024). *Cultural burning: A roadmap for future broadscale implementation*. NCOSS, LCSA, & AbSec. Funded by the Australian and NSW Governments through the Disaster Risk Reduction Fund. Cultural-Burning-A-Road-Map-for-Future-Broadscale-Implementation-June-2024.pdf

Tropical Savannas CRC and the Bushfire CRC. (2005). *Cultural burning: A roadmap for future broadscale implementation*. Fire Ecology and Management in Northern Australia. Fire ecology and management in northern Austrtalia