

Institutional Policy-Work in Northern Australia in 2024.¹

Helen Verran,
Northern Institute, Charles Darwin University
helen.verran@cdu.edu.au

Background

Policy-work is inquiry into policy effects when and where policy is 'happening'. Policy here is imagined as enactments in real times and places in particular collectives of those whose lives are governed by those policies, sometimes generating social goods and at others social bads.

The vision of policy-work we promote here is seen as happenings of partnerships between state, civil, and Indigenous institutions in aspiring to on-going reconciliatory negotiation based in recognition of and respect for difference. This notion of policy work recognizes that the relation between institutions expressing and enacting Indigenous polities, and institutions expressing and enacting the nation-state, is paradoxical. As we propose it, policy-work is expressed in undertaking institutional practices and procedures in articulating partnership in good faith. The outcomes of policy work arise here in the form of grounded collective judgements which all institutions and individuals involved in the collective process, can at least partially own to.

Let me start with a few clarifications.

- Policies are commonly thought of as what organizations say they will do, usually in document form. Here we're more interested in what institutions and organizations actually 'do', because the point of policy-work is not just to design good policy, but also to practice it. So, we define policies as what organizations do. Policies are no longer just made by governments. It's increasingly recognized that private sector organizations and local institutions, make and do policies too. Of course, if the differing sorts of institutions and organisations do policy-work together, the chances are improved that policies actually work well. This doesn't exclude the actuality that some policies are made mandatory in laws passed by the state.
- Institutions might be local organizations, but they also include other long-lived patterns of behavior, usually with some sort of norms or rules involved. The phenomenon of language is an exemplar institution along with the social metrics we use arising as they do in the institution of language. The social metric of numbers for example, or in Aboriginal Australia, named kinship relations. In addition, as expressions of cultural traditions, modern markets and Aboriginal ceremony traditions are also institutions. While those are background ramifying institutions of peoples, are significant so too are specific institutions like universities and Indigenous clan groups.
- Procedures are different from practices in institutions, although the line of differentiation is far from hard and fast. In a general sense both are forms of collective process. Inertia characterizes procedures; sets of practices are constituent of procedures. Where institutions are lively in developing partnerships with other institutions, the processes through which they operate must change, or fail in operation. Thus, the relation between procedures and their constituent practices is what is of interest. And that relationality is mediated with concepts.

- Governance brings the above together. The term is close to government, which is the form of governance that a state undertakes, but like policy, governance, is no longer a 'government only business'. We are governed by many other sorts of institutions.

Introduction

This image featured on the front page of the Taipei Times Sept 19, 2015, the day after I arrived in Taiwan to present a lecture as a keynote speaker at an international STS conference. The topic of my talk was "Indigenous Knowledge and Governance and the Modern Nation State". In 2015 Taiwan was preparing for an election and there was a degree of political ferment all through the country; even I who had just arrived in the country for the first time could sense it. These were clearly exciting times politically, and Indigeneity as an issue was part and parcel of that political ferment. Here the extent to which Taiwan as a polity diverges from and stays distinct from its always looming and threatening neighbour, the Peoples Republic of China, pivots on the extent to which Taiwan as a polity takes its self-understanding from the influence of the several Indigenous polities which are part of its constitution.

I was captivated by this image, because what you see here is two groups of Indigenous activists, protesting outside Taiwan's parliament building, supervised and separated by exercise of the State's coercive power—the figure of the policeman. For several days, the proposed laws being debated in the Parliamentary chamber concerned Indigenous self-rule. New "temporary regulations" were set to come into effect.

Aboriginal groups divided over self-government law

By Abraham Gerber / Staff reporter



A police officer separates members of the Indigenous Youth Front, left, and members of other Aboriginal groups, right, as the two groups engage in a war of words over the passage of the "Indigenous Self-Rule Temporary Regulations" outside the Legislative Yuan in Taipei yesterday.

Photo: Liao Chen-huei, Taipei Times

Proposed self-government legislation for Aboriginal groups drew competing protests from Aboriginal activists yesterday.

Protesters from the Indigenous Youth Front faced off against a smaller group of older Aboriginal representatives led by a Chinese Nationalist Party (KMT) county councilor outside the Legislative Yuan.

The demonstrators shouted competing slogans before laying out their contrasting positions on the adequacy of the "Indigenous Self-Rule Temporary Regulations" (原住民族自治暫行條例) under consideration by the legislature.

Figure 1. Front page Taipei Times 19th September, 2015.

The two groups of protesting Indigenous activists disagree with each other, and with the State. The group of young people is saying. “These proposed regulations are not good enough; the new regulations do not go far enough! These regulations do not guarantee the access of Indigenous peoples to the resources of their lands. The new regulations concern with language and culture is just window dressing!” In Australian terms this group expresses an ideology of Indigenous Polity Autonomy; perhaps some favour pursuing the negotiation of a treaty (Linda Burney).

The group of older people on the other hand, feel that no regulation is required here. The older indigenous people comprising this group are members of the KMT², which many in Taiwan still see as the political party of ‘the invaders’. This group is protesting that the regulations go too far because ‘We are all Chinese!’.³ In Australian terms this group favours an ideology of assimilationism (Reynolds, 2023)⁴ as promoted by the conservative politician Jacinta Price.

What I find interesting about the image, is these two Taiwanese indigenous groups, are separated by the state. This is interesting, because here we ‘see’ the political conditions of indigeneity in a liberal democracy like Taiwan, and like Australia. In the normative political ontology of political analysis in a liberal democracy (Hay, 2013)⁵, indigeneity and the state are always relational in being co-constituted, although their relation is paradoxical. We often forget the actuality that indigeneity constitutes the settler-state, and conversely that the settler-state constitutes indigeneity—each co-constituted the other in the politico-historical moment begun as a British sailor, James Cook stuck a flag-pole into a sandy beach.

That settler-statehood and indigeneity are mutually co-constituting, is an insight from Western political philosophy. It frames what follows as I inquire into what’s involved in good faith research in policy work in northern Australia in 2024. I recognize that the working imaginary of Indigeneity as a political phenomenon that I adopt here, is, and is not, incompatible with the formulation of Indigeneity often as an absolute, an eternal given real, by members of Australian Indigenous polities. The question is how to do that metaphysically situated disparity responsively and responsibly. Depending on what is in contention, on both sides sometimes and in some situations, it will be important to constitute profound incompatibility and distinction; at other times connection and limited compatibility will be necessary.

I am proposing that in the actual happening of Australia’s collective political life *within* the paradox that constitutes it, and in recognising policy work as a significant site in expression of that paradox, a workable formulation of the relation incompatible/compatible, is exactly what is at stake. I recognize that exercising care in working this relation at the level of institutional procedures and practices, will be done differently in Indigenous institutions than in settler institutions. Here I am positioned as a settler-Australian who works in a university, a modern settler institution. I do not presume to talk for Indigenous policy-workers, or for those settler-Australians policy-workers who work under the warrant of Indigenous institutions.

Paradox

Forgetting the paradox that lies at the core of modern indigeneity as it exists as a modern political phenomenon is perilous when it comes to governance and the policies that guide governance, as Australians collectively demonstrated on 14th October, 2023. It is crucial to remember that in modern political terms Indigeneity has a relational co-constituting political character.

Before British settlers arrived and set up their colonies in the continent that would, sometime later, be named 'Australia', largely by dint of its being mapped from a small ship that sailed around it⁶, there were many diverse extant Indigenous polities. These polities were, and still are, remarkably egalitarian in their political ontology. Albeit imperfectly and variably, the political ontology of Indigenous Australian polities are, as I understand it, effected in various versions of 'kinship egalitarianism' (Woodburn, 1982; Hoëm, 2018).⁷ Unlike in 'modern' polities this generates no need for the ideologies of democracy and liberalism to engender a degree of egalitarianism in a capitalist political economy; egalitarianism is built into the forms of social metrics through which the polities, including their political economies, were and in some places still are, ordered.

In Western political philosophy, the origins of the paradox of modern indigeneity as a modern political phenomenon arises in the contestation between two incompatible principled moral commitments embedded in and constitutive of modern indigeneity as a political phenomenon and concept. These contesting principles inevitably re-emerge as contradictory when it comes down to the nitty-gritty details of how indigeneity is 'done' in actual practices in the normative practice of policy work.

First, there is the moral principle of the sameness of all humans. Politically speaking according to this moral principle, all humans are created equal by virtue of their common humanity, and all adults have equal rights. This might be identified as beginning with Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) in Geneva.

Now we know that in the 18th century this principle was articulated as a political ideology in a slave-owning society in a declaration of the "thirteen united States of America" in 1776. So, it's clear that in actuality the principle and the practice has always been a complex, tense relationship. Nevertheless, in modern political thought the principle is there, and it has already been instituted in various forms in various polities for 300 years. The principle has been invoked and used effectively by women, poor people, and so on, groups who have recognized themselves as disenfranchised. Indigeneity and the group it defines, is of course in some ways similar to those categories. Feminists, workers, and racially marginalized groups have used this principle to push on the boundaries of freedom and liberty as enacted in practices in liberal democracies. Citizenship is not in principle defined by manhood, by being a boss, or by being white, and it in practice citizenship and the access to justice and freedom that comes with citizenship should not be confined to rich white men.

Gradually work by political movements have pushed the boundaries of liberty and freedom. These social goods have been extended and become more inclusive. In places where the democracy holds things are better than they were in the 18th century for women and for individual citizens who have dark skins—including some who are indigenous, and for individual people with limited financial resources—including Indigenous people who were chased away, or stolen away, from the lands they owned. Traditional political activism uses the sameness principle to expand freedoms and promote social justice in a democracy.

But commitment to this sameness principle is not one on which indigeneity as such and the collective rights of Indigenous polities and their members, can be argued as a political project. Indigeneity is a matter of belonging in a political collective which pre-dates the polity of the settler nation-state. This is a political principle of difference. It is constituted by virtue of having been present as a people, as a group who have nurtured and made themselves as themselves, as particular sorts of human collective—a people with a recognized territorialized and particularly encultured polity. Seeking to name it as a modern political phenomenon some name this political reality as 'cultural sovereignty'.

This difference principle says that humans become humans through the traditions of particular groups located in particular places, with rights to the resources of those places to support their traditions. Such traditions are linguistic, epistemic, political, and cultural in form. Becoming human is always particular and accomplished within institutions. There is not and there never has been a human who is generic, devoid of particularities invested in them as human by the particularities of the institutions within which they have grown to adulthood. To be human is to be a particular sort of human with rights to whatever is needed to remain as that particular sort of human.

In Western political philosophy this 'difference principle' has a history even longer than that of the 'sameness principle', and every bit as fraught. Perhaps the best articulation of this principle as a modern political ideology articulating a vision of 'different but equal', is that was developed by the early twentieth century Indian politician and political theorist, Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar (1891-1956). He designed the constitution of the contemporary Indian state by explicitly recognizing the paradox involved in constituting India as a single nation-state. Refusing any hierarchical ordering of India's many extant and disparate polities, in mid 20th century Ambedkar designed an egalitarian constitution for India as a nation state on the basis of the difference principle.⁸

Ambedkar could avoid getting caught in the flip-flop of Western political theory which rendered the difference principle by characterising 'others' as either socially noble (reification) and admirable in their political demeanor, or as natural savages with no political ontology (vilification). These images of the difference principle featuring the British naval captain James Cook and peoples of Pacific Island polities, both generated by English painters in the late eighteenth century, reveal this history of Western political theory: the 'difference principle' is fraught, oscillating between collective reification and vilification.



Figure 2. Contrasting Western representations of Pacific Island Peoples as different. a) "Transplanting the Breadfruit Trees from Otaheite" 1776 (b) "The Death of Captain James Cook F. R. S. at Owhyhee in MDCCLXXIX", 1784.

Before Western colonization, many Indigenous groups whose collective existence as a polity was established and recognized as a whole polity, were parts of a patchwork of polities that effectively governed within agreed boundaries across the Australian continent. Reading through the difference principle, Indigeneity is not about individual citizens but about the groups within which humanity is nurtured. To argue for rights as members of an Indigenous community encased within a modern nation state, one needs to invoke the difference principle. In a settler-nation state, when it comes to the constitutional position of groups of Indigenous people, of the peoples

who constituted the first polities which effected governance of this continent, it is different to the constitutional position of groups of women, groups of workers, or groups of black-skinned people, groups are constituted within the settler nation state. Indigenous groups are constituted without the settler nation state and are prior to it. In Australia such polities are said by their citizens, to originate in the work of Ancestral Beings in an eternally-present Dreaming.

One of the paradoxical fruits of modernity has been the simultaneous spread [in the twentieth century] of two ideas that often conflict... They are (a) that all humans are essentially the same in virtue of their common humanity and therefore, at least as adults, deserve to be treated equally; and (b) that humanity is divided into mutually exclusive and distinct groups and that human fulfilment can in fact only be achieved through belonging to such a group and being rooted in a particular place.⁹

As political principles the ideals encapsulated in these two notions or principles may have arisen sequentially in European polities, but they spread synchronically as former European colonies gained independence, and settler colonies became settler polities, establishing the political paradox around Indigeneity in many nation states.

Engulfed by a modern settler state and hence made as 'Indigenous', these polities are recognised by 'the state' as outside and prior. Usually, with no thought to the contrary, Indigenous institutions are assumed to be compatible with the modern state. In Australia legal recognition of this actuality was established with the 'Native Title Act 1993'. To the extent to Australian constitution recognizes Indigenous polities, the Australian state unproblematically sees them as embedded within and compatible with the procedures of mainstream institutions and legal apparatus. In contrast Indigenous polities identify their sovereign states as continuing to enact the collective intentions of their constituting Spirit Ancestors, as continually re-enacting as the eternally present Dreaming. To the extent that the nation state and its institutions are unable to recognize and acknowledge the collective intentions of the constituting Ancestor Beings, Indigenous institutions are incompatible with those of the nation state.

Seeing the Sameness and Difference Principles in Institutions and Policy Work

One way to think about colonization and imperialism is to see it as a social, economic and political campaign by established European institutions enacting policies designed to destroy, disrupt and/or subvert workings of the institutions of what would in the aftermath of invasion and incursion, become Indigenous polities. In the case of indirect rule by a colonizing power, a policy particularly favoured by Britain, policies of disruption and subversion were adopted, often in association with exemplar destruction of particular Indigenous institutions, which necessarily includes the knowledge traditions by and through which those unique institutions work.

In Australia such destruction began in denial. The policy of "terra nullius" enacted by the British State, denied the existence of Indigenous polities and their citizens. Anthropological scholars legitimated this British policy by insisting on an absence of Indigenous organization and institution. This policy was enacted by proceeding with violence and coercion on the part of the colonisers, and also more subtly and comfortably (for the invaders) though the effects of pandemics which decimated Indigenous populations and destroyed institutions. It was only in 1913 when in arguing against Durkheim, Malinowski published a monograph in which he assembled evidence for the existence the family and kin as the institutional basis of Australian life.¹⁰ Settler policy based on the

assumption that there were NO institutions in Indigenous Australian polities perhaps began to change at that time. Unfortunately, the change had the effect of instituting a state policy of removal of children from the governance regimes of Indigenous institutions, to prevent them growing up as citizens of these polities.

Contemporary responses to the question of practical constitutional arrangements to politically ‘manage’ the paradox that infests the political arrangements concerning the positionality of Indigeneity vis-à-vis the state, differ across jurisdictions. Nordic countries Norway and Sweden have instituted Saami Parliaments, New Zealand has established Māori electorates, in Canada the arrangements differ across different types of Indigenous groups, but each of the groups has the right to negotiate as a group, at all Canadian government levels.

In Australia there are no constitutional arrangements to politically manage the paradox of state governance and Indigeneity. However, an overwhelming ‘Yes’ vote in a referendum concerning the constitutional status of “Aboriginals” in 1967 was widely and institutionally read as acceptance of the recognition of ‘Aboriginal cultures’ rather than referencing Aboriginal individuals. Gradually over the course of half a century, the terminology of Aboriginal cultures became First Nations Peoples, so that two decades into the twenty-first century all Australian civic institutions, including government departments are required in-practice to recognize the needs and rights of the Indigenous citizens as members of Indigenous polities. In their engagements institutions are required to ensure the ‘cultural safety of Indigenous individuals’.

In Australia in 2023 a referendum was held which sought the agreement of a majority of Australian citizens, to establish an Indigenous ‘Voice to Parliament’, a constituted chamber external to the mainstream political arena. Such a constitutional structure could politically manage the paradox of Indigeneity and governance in Australia. This novel institution would speak for the many Australian Indigenous polities and their citizens in advising on policy issues that affected Indigenous citizens. The referendum failed to secure a majority for the ‘Yes vote’. The campaign to support invention of a novel contemporary Australian Indigenous institution failed.¹¹

In the continuing absence of constitutional structures that can politically manage the paradox of Indigeneity and state governance in Australia, management of the paradox in ways that avoid inflicting injustice in denial of difference, continues to fall to policy-workers in civic and public institutions. Australia has opted to devolve management of the paradox of Indigenous governance to ‘street level bureaucrats’, and those in First Nations polities whose institutions choose to locally partner with settler-state institutions. While this has undoubtedly led to the emergence of an endemic “wildness” in policy work involving Indigeneity and governance in Australia, which continues to plague the sector¹², the institutional level will remain the sole arena of Indigeneity-settler policy work.

Post 1967 the changed political tenor of Australian citizens led to the emergence of a policy landscape invested in recognising difference. Perhaps politically unintended, this shift recognises the paradoxical and different constitutional position of Indigenous Australian citizens vis-à-vis that of settler-Australian citizens (Taylor 2017), while cognizant of enormous diversity on both sides. Indigenous Australian histories and non-Indigenous Australian histories were and are recognised as intimately entangled and yet constitutionally different. Perhaps incautiously, in 2022 Australia’s large political class consisting of Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians working in concert, a class that had bloomed during those sixty years, came to a consensus view. It was time, they felt for this by now firmly established policy landscape invested in and as difference, to be recognised in the

constitution of the modern Australian state. The holding of a referendum concerning a proposal to alter the Australian constitution was announced. Australian voters rejected the proposal.

Will the policy landscape will shift as a result? What has been common sense for the past sixty years, which has led some Australian State institutions to mollify and soften their institutional demands for compliance from Indigenous institutions in their forms of practice, will perhaps harden. Demands for enactments in-practice that implement a centrally defined policy in Indigenous governance will become more insistently assimilatory in privileging the 'sameness principle'. Perhaps the dispersed and emergent policy landscape we are accustomed to working within on the ground in northern Australia in partnerships between settler Australian institutions and Indigenous institutions may now be lost, as a new politico-historical moment¹³ emerges in the Northern Territory in the decades ahead. Policy expressing the 'sameness principle' may now be reactivated, invested with a new insistence and urgency. As a social phenomenon, Australian Indigeneity may now be reduced to the status of a 'life-style choice', the profound metaphysical disparities which see Indigenous Australian individuals and institutions as giving alternative answers to the question of 'How should we live?', will again be denied and ignored.

Indigeneity and the State, Partnership and Policy-Work

Recognising that both sameness principles and differences principles play out in contemporary policy-work in modern institutional engagements with Indigenous polities, means that as policy workers we might adopt either one—sameness, or the other—difference, as a basis for our day to day practices as we undertake policy-work in-practice. Or alternatively we might adopt the position that good faith policy-work involves adopting both simultaneously. This last position involves managing paradox on the ground in real time happenings of policy-work.

Historically in Australian state policies a policy agenda of assimilation—a making the same, has been the norm, and Aboriginal Australian polities and individuals have suffered terribly for several centuries under policies justified under this ideology. Offered any chance to voice their claims to recognition, individual citizens of Indigenous polities, and occasionally as polities (for example the novel Corranderrk polity that formed in the late 19th century) have consistently refused and rejected state policies of assimilation, pursued under the sameness principle. Under this regime policy-work is a straight-forward matter of following the rules. Even if the rules require a policy worker to routinely inflict pain and suffering on other humans. Those policy workers who forcibly removed Indigenous children from their families in the 19th and 20th century are a well-known if extreme example of this type of policy work. This uncontested assimilationist policy landscape shifted in 1967

Looking back to 1967 it becomes clear that nearly sixty years ago in Australia, three political moments concerning relations between the many polities of Australia's first peoples, and the polity of the modern Australian State established as a federation of former British colonies one hundred and twenty years ago, were set flowing. These streams might be characterized as

- Envisaging difference as something that can and should be done away with. Difference is acknowledged here within a vision of sameness. Policies recognising Indigeneity as disadvantage and class difference take this form. Aboriginal Australians were and are notably lower in their socioeconomic status than any other group in Australia, a deplorable social fact; parity should be the aim of Indigeneity policy. Here

rendering a particular sameness will dissolve enough difference. In the twenty first century after a neoliberal political economy had been instituted at all government levels of the Australian nation state, a policy landscape of 'Closing the Gap' was developed. That is the dominant policy landscape in 2024.

- Second there is the now vibrant policy landscape which favours a vision of difference settled once and for all in either war or negotiated treaty, or many treaties. Difference here is unreconcilable difference for which apart from war, state acknowledged diplomacy procedures are the sole appropriate response. This stream of political thought now vibrant in Australia, perhaps originates in the establishment of the Aboriginal Tent embassy on 25th January 1972. Negotiation of treaties between a nation state and particular Indigenous polities, or groups of polities, recognizes the difference principle. However, the historical record evidencing the outcomes of such negotiations—in NZ and the USA, and to a lesser extent Canada, reveals that any such past treaty has been negotiated within a power imbalance. In practice historical treaty settlements have not served Indigenous polities well. In Australia increasing recognition of the many Australian frontier wars has invested the debate on the possibilities for treaty negotiations with a new vigour in the last decade. After a Native Title ruling in their favour, the Noongar Indigenous polity sued the Western Australian Government for treaty negotiations. A settlement was achieved effecting a workable treaty.¹⁴ An outsider might presume that for the Noongar people, this treaty offers the possibility for enough autonomy to enact enough difference of the right sort, albeit within the overarching nation state.
- The third possibility that is that policy workers practice knowingly *within* the paradox of the difference and sameness principles. This has been proceeding under policies promoting a reconciliatory demeanour in every Australian organization and institution, and at every level of governance. A reconciliation policy landscape began to emerge in the 1970s under the title of policy title of 'integration'. Subsequently a social movement launched under the title 'Reconciliation Australia'¹⁵ emerged as the voice of this policy position. The influence of this policy moment led to Australian organisations, small and large developing 'Reconciliation Policies': schools, universities, museums; governments and business corporations; religious organisations; Not for Profit organizations. At all levels a variety of policy initiatives were developed and implemented with varying degrees of commitment and enthusiasm. For example, the Victorian State required all schools to develop and add a unit on reconciliation on the social studies curriculum. In actuality however, in many perhaps most cases enactments of a policy landscape of reconciliation are mere conformings, rather like virtue signaling tolerance. Here Indigeneity is fetishized, reified as the unchanging and unchangeable 'other'. The fate of citizens of indigenous polities is to remain Indigenous
- Nevertheless, the term 'reconciliation' does have different meanings. The idea of mutual on-going conciliation can be a proper interpretation of reconciliation. As I use the term reconciling, it implies, struggling long and hard to find some connection in the face of profound incompatibility, and importantly also both sides recognized their *being changed* in the processes of institutions and individuals going-on together doing differences together in the face of arriving and unpredictable futures. The term 'consilient' or 'jumping together' embeds the sense of unlikeliness that hovers in this process. When it comes to understanding policy work as it needs to happen to enact a just enough reconciliation in the functioning of institutions of all shapes and sizes and origins, a policy landscape of mutual conciliation is required. We are just at the beginning here. This is never-ending negotiation at every level in institutional

practice and procedure. Here the Northern Institutes ground-up approach to policy-work is an example. It sees active mutual conciliation as work reaching down to a nitty gritty level of concepts as they feature in mediating partnership policy-work.¹⁶

¹ This short paper prepared at the end of 2023 is an edited and updated version of a talk given in a CDU Northern Institute workshop for PhD students in February 2016

² Kuomintang (KMT), also referred to as the Guomindang (GMD), the Nationalist Party of China (NPC), or the Chinese Nationalist Party (CNP), is a major political party in Taiwan. Initially based in mainland China, after the victory of Chinese Communist Party in 1949, the political part re-established itself in the republic constituted in Taiwan.

³ In 2023 Australia, this conflicted protest has an uncanny and strangely familiar ring.

⁴ Henry Reynolds 2023 "Assimilation re-Emerges" <https://johnmenadue.com/assimilation-re-emerges/>

⁵ Colin Hay (2013). "Political Ontology" in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science* (ed Robert Goodin), Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp 460-477.

⁶ <https://encounter.collections.slsa.sa.gov.au/flinders/namingaust.htm>

⁷ James Woodburn (1982). "Egalitarian Societies", *Man*, Vol 17, no.3, 431-451; Ingrid Hoëm (2018) "State, Labour, and Kin. Tensions of Value in an Egalitarian Community", *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (NS), 166-179

⁸ J.P.Misra and J.P.Misra (1991). "Dr B.R. Ambedkar and the Constitution Making in India" *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, vol 52, pp 534-541.

⁹ N. David Gellner (2011) "Belonging, Indigeneity, Rites, and Rights: The Newar Case", in *The Politics of Belonging in the Himalayas: Local Attachments and Boundary Dynamics*. (Eds) Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and Gérard Toffin new Delhi: SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd, pp 45-76

¹⁰ Bronislaw Malinowski (1913). "The Family among the Australian Aborigines. A Sociological Study" (London: University of London Press).

¹¹ Stan Grant (2023) "Witness to Poetry" <https://reporter.anu.edu.au/all-stories/i-thought-we-could-find-a-voice-stan-grant-on-the-referendum-defeat> ; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HW1waiBEX0c>; Henry Reynolds (2023), "Assimilation re-emerges" <https://johnmenadue.com/assimilation-re-emerges/> ; <https://johnmenadue.com/this-country-has-witnessed-a-counter-revolution-against-first-nations-rights/>

¹² Tess Lea (2020). *Wild Policy. Indigeneity and the unruly logics of intervention*, Stanford: Stanford University Press,

¹³ Blacker et al (2024). "Entanglements of Colonial and Postcolonial Planning: An Introduction", *The Planning Moment: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* Sarah Blacker, Emily Brownell, Anindita Nag, Martina Schlünder, Helen Verran, and Sarah Van Beurden, (eds)

¹⁴ Harry Hobbs and George Williams (2018). "The Noongar Settlement: Australia's First Treaty", *Sydney Law Review*, Vol 40, no.1.

¹⁵ Reconciliation Australia <https://www.reconciliation.org.au/>

¹⁶ Waṇambi, G, Bulkanhawuy J, Gundjarranbuy R et al. (2023) Djäga'yunminyawuy Yolṇuw Dhukarr (Yolṇu ways of mutual care). A response to the early management of COVID-19 in Northeast Arnhem Land. In: Özden-Schilling T, Elliott D, Million D, Callison C (eds) *Unsettling Technoscience: Theorizing Indigenous and Settler Science, Technology, and Society*.