

Indigenous landscape management and controlled burning

Juan Segurola

Core question

What changes when communities use accumulated ecological knowledge not merely to occupy landscapes, but to shape fire regimes, vegetation mosaics and resource distributions deliberately?

Historical and evolutionary context

Indigenous fire management is documented in multiple regions, but its practices, purposes and histories differ. PIO must therefore avoid treating “cultural burning” as a single universal technique. In Australia, historical, ethnographic and ecological evidence documents sophisticated Indigenous use of fire to manage fuel connectivity, vegetation structure, access and biodiversity. Rhys Jones's 1969 discussion of “fire-stick farming” helped frame the issue for archaeology, while later quantitative work with Martu communities showed how Aboriginal burning can generate fine-grained fire mosaics linked to foraging. Contemporary Indigenous practitioners also emphasize that burning knowledge is embedded in local authority, season, vegetation and responsibility, not a portable universal recipe. Evidence from other regions reinforces the need to treat cultural fire as plural rather than uniquely Australian. In the Pacific West of North America, Long, Lake and Goode synthesize evidence that Indigenous communities have long used cultural burning for ecological, material and cultural purposes, while emphasizing the place-specific character of those practices.

Long-term palaeoenvironmental evidence must be kept separate from those documented practices. In northern Australian tropical savannahs, Bird and colleagues identified a shift toward a human-modulated fire regime at least 11,000 years ago. That does not license projection of any one historically documented practice unchanged into the Pleistocene; it instead supplies evidence that human influence on fire regimes has roots reaching at least the Pleistocene-Holocene transition.

The broader significance is epistemic: landscape management requires repeated observation across seasons and years, memory of previous burns, classification of vegetation and fuels, and social rules governing where, when and how fire is used.

What could communities know before deliberate landscape management?

Foragers can exploit naturally occurring resource patches. Deliberate burning creates a further possibility: resource distributions can be influenced by planned intervention. This requires causal expectations about how vegetation, animals and future fuel loads respond after fire.

What changed?

Fire became a tool for managing spatial heterogeneity. Small, timed burns can break fuel continuity, create patches at different successional stages and alter access to plants or animals. The knowledge involved is not reducible to ignition. It includes weather, season, soil moisture, vegetation type, wind, previous fire history and social obligations.

Such systems are examples of **long-horizon ecological inference**. The effect of an intervention may only become clear months or years later. Knowledge is therefore distributed across repeated communal practice and intergenerational memory.

Why could this capability emerge?

Landscape management becomes possible when communities repeatedly occupy and know particular territories deeply enough to compare outcomes through time. Mobility does not preclude such knowledge; seasonal movement can itself create a structured observational cycle.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Managed fire regimes shaped ecosystems, subsistence possibilities and settlement patterns. In modern contexts, traditional ecological knowledge is increasingly considered alongside contemporary fire science, especially where suppression-only strategies have produced undesirable fuel accumulation.

New limits and risks

A technique effective under one climate, vegetation regime or population density may not transfer safely to another. Indigenous fire practices are context-specific and embedded in governance systems. Extracting a simplified “recipe” while ignoring local authority can be both scientifically misleading and politically appropriative.

What changed in the architecture of human knowledge?

Knowledge expanded from adapting behaviour to environments toward **deliberately managing ecological processes through feedback over time**. The landscape itself became partly a record of accumulated intervention.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

Colonial disruption frequently suppressed Indigenous burning practices and severed transmission. Modern ecological reconstruction therefore encounters both physical and documentary gaps. PIO should clearly separate well-documented recent practices from older palaeoecological interpretations whose human attribution may remain uncertain.

Dependency map

- PARALLEL ← PIO-003 Controlled fire, cooking and shared learning
- INDIRECT → PIO-009 Agriculture in multiple independent centres
- RETROSPECTIVE → modern ecosystem and fire science

References

1. Bird, M. I. et al. Late Pleistocene emergence of an anthropogenic fire regime in Australia’s tropical savannahs. *Nature Geoscience* 17, 233-240 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-024-01388-3>
2. Oliveras Menor, I. et al. Integrated fire management as an adaptation and mitigation strategy to altered fire regimes. *Communications Earth & Environment* 6, 202 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-025-02165-9>
3. Jones, R. Fire-stick farming. *Australian Natural History* 16, 224-228 (1969).
4. Bliege Bird, R. et al. The “fire stick farming” hypothesis: Australian Aboriginal foraging strategies, biodiversity, and anthropogenic fire mosaics. *PNAS* 105, 14796-14801 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0804757105>
5. Steffensen, V. *Fire Country: How Indigenous Fire Management Could Help Save Australia*. Hardie Grant (2020).
6. Long, J. W., Lake, F. K. & Goode, R. W. The importance of Indigenous cultural burning in forested regions of the Pacific West, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management* 500, 119597 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.119597>